



HLC Accreditation Evidence Document

Title: Table 1: Evidence of Student Learning Samples

Time Period: 2009-2016

Summary: This table was created to demonstrate that CSC is assessing student-learning outcomes across our curriculum. We have included items from academic assessment reports, including undergraduate and graduate degree programs and the two versions of our core curriculum—General Studies and Essential Studies. We present evidence to show that we use assessments to improve our programs in Table 2: Evidence of Assessment Based Changes (Criterion 4.B.3).

Table One
Evidence of Student Learning- Samples

| Graduate Program | Academic Year | Evidence of Student Learning |
|---|---------------|---|
| Masters of Business Administration | 2015-16 | Students taking the Peregrine exam score approximately 15% over the national average. MBA program graduates score consistently above average in all subject areas. Over a four-year period, outbound exam results have increased from 66.5 to 70.85. The difference between the inbound against the outbound is approximately 6.5% based on the three-year average. |
| Masters of Arts in Education - History | 2013-14 | Students were posed questions during the culminating oral defense. There were four students who took the oral defense. One student scored an <i>exceed</i> evaluation, while others ranged from <i>adequate</i> to <i>above average</i> . The students demonstrated an exceeding adequate understanding of historical content and adequate understanding of theoretical questions. |
| Masters of Arts in Education - Math/Science | 2014-15 | Based on oral examinations and scholarly project submissions, candidates scored very well (3.5-4.0) in two categories: Knowledge of Content/Theory and Proficiency in Scientific Inquiry, Data Gathering. Candidates scored lowest in the Interpretation of Data and Clear and Concise Articulation of Information during oral examinations (3.0). |
| Masters of Science in Organizational Management | 2014-15 | Overall rating for student outcomes had 52% at Advanced Performance and 30% at Proficient Performance. Over 50% of students demonstrated Advanced Performance in Organizational Management and Leadership Outcomes 1, 2 and 4, and in Focus Area outcomes 1 and 2. None of the students (n=23) received an Unsatisfactory Performance rating. The major weakness is: A moderately high percentage of students scored a Progressing Performance level in Research Design/Methods outcomes one (30%) and two (26%). |
| Masters of Education – School Counseling; Masters of Arts in Education - Clinical Mental Health Counseling | 2014-15 | To pass the Counseling Oral Examination, students must have a total composite score of 80 or above. Overall results indicate students scored <i>Proficient</i> on the majority (66.02%) of exam items, <i>Advanced</i> on 30.23% of items, and <i>Progressing</i> on 3.00% of items—which indicates that the majority of students in the program are proficient in meeting the expected outcomes for the Counseling Program. The data reveals that all students are meeting the expected outcomes on the majority of elements within all eight areas covered in the program: professional orientation, social and cultural diversity, human growth and development, career development, helping relationships, group work, appraisal/assessment, and research and program evaluation. |
| Masters of Education - Education Administration | 2014-15 | All candidates were required to take the Praxis II as a program requirement for graduation. Those seeking Nebraska certification were required to pass the Praxis II exam for education administration. |

Table One
Evidence of Student Learning- Samples

| | | |
|--|----------------------|---|
| | | Major strengths based on the oral exam data were: “Uses leadership position to promote positive social change,” “Works to meet the educational needs of all learners in all settings,” “Sets high expectations for meeting the needs of all learners,” and “Models and practices effective methodologies including the use of technology to support student learning.” Many other scores were above 3.5 as well. Overall, the results show many strengths. Weaknesses noted in the oral exam include “Demonstrates research skills to identify quality information for school improvement,” “Uses a variety of assessment techniques in making decisions about student learning and school,” and “Demonstrates effective means of communication about organizations, operations and resources.” All average scores in each category were well above the 3.0 Proficient rating. |
| Masters of Education - Education, Curriculum & Instruction | 2014-15 | Major strengths based on the oral exam data were: “Respects families’ beliefs, norms, and expectations and seeks to work collaboratively with learners and families in setting and meeting challenging goals,” “Uses interactions with learners, families, and communities to better understand variations in development that can guide curriculum development and work with learners,” and “Develops curriculum using a wide variety of developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate instructional strategies to achieve learning goals.” Many other scores were above 3.5 as well. Weaknesses noted in the oral exam data included “Develops curriculum based on central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches,” “Implements curriculum based on central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches,” and Aligns assessment techniques to information needed to maximize individual student learning and improve curriculum and instruction.” It is difficult to compare the results of the Summer/Fall 2014 oral exams and the Spring 2015 oral exams because of the change to the updated rubric. It was noted however, that the average score in Spring 2015 was 3.79, which was lower than the combined Fall 2015/Spring 2015 average of 3.89. All average scores in each category were at or above the 3.0 Proficient rating. |
| Undergraduate Program | Academic Year | Evidence of Student Learning |
| Bachelors of Science in Education – elementary Education | 2014-2015 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Student grade point average, 2. Teacher intern evaluation score, 3. Teacher work sample, 4. PRAXSII, 5. Post-graduate follow-up survey of graduate and employer. <p>Results from GPA - Overall GPA mean scores indicate that candidates as a whole have passed courses in essential studies, professional studies, and specialized content area programs at levels higher than the minimum 2.75 GPA requirements for</p> |

Table One
Evidence of Student Learning- Samples

| | | |
|---|-----------|---|
| | | <p>gateway points in the teacher education program, and thus graduation from Chadron State College. Of the 58 elementary level graduates for the Fall of 2014 semester, only individuals had a cumulative GPA lower than a 3.0. During the Spring 2015 semester 4 individuals out of 48 had a cumulative GPA below a 3.0. Thus, students GPA as an indicator of content area knowledge indicates above acceptable levels.</p> <p>Results from PRAXIS II - Nebraska minimum cut score is 153 points. CSC Elementary Education candidates with a mean of 162 points, scored 9 points above the cut score, but 14 points below the national average of 176 points.</p> |
| Bachelor of Arts - English | 2014-2015 | <p>There are two major direct summative data collections: the ETS® Major Field Test (MFT) for Literature in English, which graduating seniors take in spring of their senior year, and a writing sample, collected from students in ENG 440. The MFT exam consists of 150 multiple-choice questions on poetry, prose and drama, drawn from a variety of genres and covering British and American literature extensively with a lesser focus on World Literature. The test emphasizes major authors, works, genres and movements. As an indirect summative assessment, students completed a final Exit Survey in Sakai, which allows them to self-assess their learning within our department.</p> <p>Results of MFT - According to ETS, the mean score was 153.8 and the median score was 153. For CSC students who tested between the same time periods, the mean score was 154.75. The major strengths as determined from the data were: (1) Our students' scores indicate that, compared to the national average, they have slightly above-average content knowledge in American and British Literature; (2) understanding and analysis of prose fiction. The major weakness is: (1) students have a below average understanding of literary theory and criticism; (2) students are weaker in their analysis of poetry and drama than prose fiction</p> |
| Bachelors of Science – Family and Consumer Sciences | 2014-2015 | <p>National Pre-Pac exams (American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences) and student essays embedded in the FCS 422 course addressing specific program learning outcomes.</p> <p>Results - The exam scores provided evidence that students have the knowledge expected in both the FCS core and the FCS options. The Student Essays of Student Learning Outcomes were very insightful and provided validation that the FCS program is effectively addressing and accomplishing each of their eight program outcomes</p> |
| Bachelor of Arts – Health, Physical Education | 2014-2015 | <p>ETS Praxis II exam as the exit data collection for content knowledge.</p> <p>Results for the Praxis II exam were strong. Content knowledge developed during the completion of the program has provided</p> |

Table One
Evidence of Student Learning- Samples

| | | |
|---|-----------|--|
| | | students with the necessary knowledge and training to have success on the exit exam. |
| Bachelor of Art – Justice Studies, criminal justice | 2014-2015 | ETS criminal justice exam Results – ETS mean score was 150.5 and the CSC mean score was 164 with a range of 142 – 190 (max = 200), and a median of 165 and a mode of 164. |
| Bachelor of Arts – Music | 2014-2015 | Data collections were made for the Freshman Admission to Candidacy (MUS 199), the Piano Proficiency (embedded in MUS 220), Principles of Conducting (MUS 240), the Sophomore Qualifying Exam (MUS 299), and Recital Hearings (MUS 399 and 499). While they appear to be summative, juried assessments for the various levels of Private Instruction (115/215/315/415) are formative until the culminating recital hearing. Results- Currently the department does not allot a time for data analysis. A large amount of time is spent on data collection. Since “assessment day” is utilized by the department for data collection, the department needs to establish a dedicated data analysis day and time. |
| Bachelor of Science – Physical Science | 2014-2015 | The following four collections comprise the program assessment plan for the comprehensive major in physical sciences. Collection A; Capstone 1: Formative data for all three options were collected on presentations by students in the first semester of the three-semester capstone. Students were typically in their junior year. Surveys were completed by faculty in the physical sciences and occasionally by other visiting faculty from biology. The scoring rubric was based on the Value Rubric for oral communication from the Association of American Colleges and Universities (http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/). Collection B; Capstone 3: Summative data for all three options were collected on presentations by students in the third semester of the three-semester capstone. Students were typically in their senior year. The presentations were made at the Nebraska Academy of Sciences conference. Assessment data are from discussions with faculty attending the talks. Collection C; Field Camp Survey: Summative data for students in the geoscience option are collected by means of a 12-question survey administered to students completing the field camp requirement at another institution. Collection D; American Chemical Society Chemistry standardized tests were administered to students finishing general chemistry II (CHEM 131) and organic chemistry II (CHEM |

Table One
Evidence of Student Learning- Samples

| | | |
|--|----------------------|--|
| | | <p>234)</p> <p>Results - Collection A: Capstone presentations were evaluated by faculty on the dates of presentation in April, 2015. Quality of presentations and validity of data were discussed at that time.</p> <p>Collection B: Faculty evaluating Nebraska Academy of Sciences presentations discussed the presentations on the date of presentation, April 21, 2015.</p> <p>Collection C: The field camp survey was not completed by any students this year.</p> <p>Collection D: Scores on the American Chemical Society Chemistry standardized tests were tabulated immediately after the tests were administered in April, 2015.</p> |
| Bachelor of Science – Range Management | 2014-2015 | <p>Departmentally developed examination conducted as a pre-posttest.</p> <p>Results- Too short of dataset for trends to be visible and missed December graduates last Fall, so the sample size for exiting students is small. However the average test scores show a knowledge gain from entry to exit.</p> |
| Bachelor of Art - Theatre | 2014-2015 | <p>Students are given major assignments in productions including: acting, directing, stage management, and design. Students must audition, and or apply for these positions. Each assignment is rated on a 25-35 point rubric. In this way, students are evaluated for the entire tenure at CSC rather than a single, final assessment. These are summative in that they all present the students work to a public audience in a high stakes situation. They are also formative in the sense that they allow the faculty to identify strengths and weaknesses in individual student skills as well as strengths and weaknesses in the program at large. Data is also collected from TH 412 Senior Assessment and is collected in TH 400 independent study (Senior Assessment) when students graduate in Dec. rather than the traditionally offered course in the Spring.</p> <p>Results - Students demonstrated 80%-90% competencies in assessed assignments overall indicating relative strength in skills, organization, and comprehension and application.</p> |
| General Studies Program | Academic Year | Evidence of Student |
| Component Mathematics | 2011-2012 | <p>Individual instructors chose one or two problems with which to assess student performance in each of the three performance criteria. These problems were embedded in course exams and evaluated on a 10 point basis. The mean value for each performance criteria was calculated for all</p> |

Table One
Evidence of Student Learning- Samples

| | | <p>courses and the results shown below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Communicate quantitative ideas using mathematical terminology. 2. Demonstrate skill manipulating mathematical expressions. 3. Organize, analyze, interpret, model, and solve problems mathematically. <p>Results: using a 10 point basis, Item 1 scores 7.75; Item 2 scores 6.55 and Item 3 scored 6.04 on average.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----|-----|----------------------|-----|-----|-----------------------|-----|-----|---------------------|----|----|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Component History | 2011-2012 | <p>Embedded formal essays (one in beginning of course and one at conclusion) scored on a common rubric.</p> <p>Results –</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>First time Instrument</th> <th>Second time Instrument</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Advanced (A level)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">11%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proficient (B Level)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">30%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">31%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Progressing (C Level)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">39%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Deficient (D Level)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unacceptable (F Level)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">12%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">11%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | First time Instrument | Second time Instrument | Advanced (A level) | 11% | 30% | Proficient (B Level) | 30% | 31% | Progressing (C Level) | 39% | 25% | Deficient (D Level) | 8% | 3% | Unacceptable (F Level) | 12% | 11% |
| | First time Instrument | Second time Instrument | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Advanced (A level) | 11% | 30% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proficient (B Level) | 30% | 31% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Progressing (C Level) | 39% | 25% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Deficient (D Level) | 8% | 3% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Unacceptable (F Level) | 12% | 11% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Component Composition | 2009-2010 | <p>Three randomly selected student essays from each composition II course are evaluated on a standard rubric by each of the composition instructors. The rubric is based on the Nebraska six-traits of writing rubric.</p> <p>Results - Though students performed fairly consistently across the five writing issues examined (ideas, organization, word choice, fluency, & conventions), they were clearly strongest in their development of ideas. Again, though student performance was consistently acceptable, students were clearly weakest in matters of organization</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Component Communications | 2009-2010 | <p>In a pre-post format, using assessment measures sanctioned by the National Communications Association of HURIER and FOC.</p> <p>Results: In fall 2009 we were able to demonstrate that students perceived a significant difference in all of the categories for the HURIER based upon the paired t-tests conducted. In Spring 2010, this was not the result. Only the categories of Hearing, Interpreting and Responding were significant. In Fall 2009 the FOC skill areas of Content, Delivery and Organization all were</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table One
Evidence of Student Learning- Samples

| | | significant. In Spring 2010, Delivery and Organization were significant. |
|--|----------------------|---|
| Essential Studies Program | Academic Year | Evidence of Student |
| Student Learning Objective – Skill Communication | 2012-2013 | In a pre-post format, using assessment measures sanctioned by the National Communications Association of HURIER and FOC. Results: Significantly higher percentage of students reported that they have improved in all the categories in listening, significant improvement in all areas of public speaking, and mixed numbers in “remembering” and “responding” categories. |
| Student Learning Object – Personal and Social Responsibility | 2014-2015 | Use the Comprehensive Health Exam as a measure of collecting evidence for personal /social responsibility. This is in pilot mode. Results: Preliminary indication are that students scored high on the Comprehensive Health Assessment Survey. Students believed that their current understanding and responsibility in the components of health were strong. The Comprehensive Health Exam was administered and results showed 77% of the students scored at the adequate or superior level of understanding. We are unable at this time to conduct an item analysis to determine if specific strengths and weaknesses exist. This further analysis will be implemented with future data collection. |
| Student Learning Outcome - Capstone | 2014-2015 | Rubric bases rating of the performance which includes external and internal scores. The original assessment plan included a double-sided sheet containing two rubrics. External reviewers were to use the holistic rubric on one side, which assigns a rating for overall performance, using the criteria on that side as a guide. Course faculty were to use the second side, which features an analytic rubric that articulates levels of performance for each criterion. This is in pilot mode. Results: The holistic rubric was applied to final products/projects in all three courses, so we do have some data that may prove useful in assessing the performance of the students on their capstone projects. Ellis and Moody were able to fully utilize TK20 to collect the data from their course, and that data was subsequently delivered in a report so this demonstrates the possible use of TK20 for this assessment plan going forward. It is also likely a good thing to have all the sections of CAP on the same page when it comes to measurable outcomes and the need to assess a major product/project. The shared rubric helps to communicate our shared standards. |