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The Learning Outcomes Oversight Committee is committed to promoting, supporting, and ensuring effective assessment as an integral part of the student learning experience at the University of Rhode Island.

The LOOC committee affirms that program assessment is a university-wide responsibility and shows our commitment to curricular and student learning improvement. Data and results from outcomes assessment for all programs are examined in the aggregate only and are not used to evaluate individual faculty or students.

The charges to the committee are contained within 5.84.10-5.84.12 of the University Manual.

Item #1: Committee Actions  
LOOC approved student learning outcomes Assessment Plans for the following new program or new certificate proposals:

a. MS – Psychiatric Mental Health Nurse Practitioner (Nursing)  
b. BS/BA – Data Science (Computer Science/Data Science Collaborative)  
c. Certificate in Embedded Systems (Engineering)  

Item #2: Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Assessment Reporting and Program Recognition  
SLO assessment includes a biennial cohort-based reporting structure with graduate and undergraduate, accredited and nonaccredited programs reporting every other year in May (at graduation) using NEASC reporting templates. Beginning with the 2016 review cycle, accredited programs use streamlined NEASC assessment forms for accredited programs, with an additional request for highlights of learning outcomes assessment issues which affected the learning success of their students.

Programs receive feedback on submitted learning outcomes assessment reports from a formal two-level faculty review process during the summer. In 2016, there were 12 Level 1 faculty reviewers and 5 Level 2 reviewers. Faculty reviewers score all nonaccredited reports using a rubric with established performance criteria to score the proficiency of the assessment process used. Scores of ‘well developed’ and ‘advanced’ reflect meeting or exceeding campus reporting expectations respectively. Accredited program reports are scored with a new rubric created to indicate satisfactory completion of the form. Feedback rubrics are available online; feedback results are provided to the program, Chairs, Deans, Provost and the Graduate School.

A. Compliance Results from May 2016 reporting (Cohort I)  
Undergraduate Non-accredited:

22/23 (96%) of programs submitted reports assessing a new outcome and 21 of these reports (95%) met or exceeded expectations

13/15 (87%) of programs submitted reports re-assessing an outcome from the prior report and 11 of these reports (85%) met or exceeded expectations

Undergraduate Accredited:

11/11 (100%) of programs reported
Graduate Non-accredited
15/18 (83%) of graduate programs reported on a new outcome with 10 reports (67%) meeting or exceeding expectations

7/7 (100%) of the programs followed up on a prior recommendation and 4 of the reports (57%) met or exceeded expectations

Graduate Accredited
1/2 (50%) of accredited graduate programs reported

B. Recognized Performance of Undergraduate and Graduate Results from May 2016 (Cohort I)

1. The following programs received overall scores* of Advanced in either section of the report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Faculty Member Submitting Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences, BS; Biology, BA</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>College of Environment and Life Sciences</td>
<td>Joel Chandlee &amp; Marian Goldsmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Disorders, BS</td>
<td>Communicative Disorders</td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>Bethany Milner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science, BA/BS</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Lisa DiPippo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recognized Graduate Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Faculty Member Submitting Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Development &amp; Family Studies, Developmental Science, MS</td>
<td>Human Development &amp; Family Studies</td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>Sue Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development &amp; Family Studies, Couple &amp; Family Therapy, MS</td>
<td>Human Development &amp; Family Studies</td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>Jerome Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Relations &amp; Human Resources, MS</td>
<td>Labor Relations &amp; Human Resources</td>
<td>Schmidt Labor Research Center</td>
<td>Matthew Bodah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceutical Sciences, MS &amp; PhD</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>Drs. Ruitang Deng &amp; Norma Owens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The following programs achieved overall scores* of Advanced in both sections of the report:

Recognized Undergraduate Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Faculty Member Submitting Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History, BA</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Timothy George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science, BA</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Kristin Johnson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Highest recognition:** The following program achieved scores* of *Advanced* for all major criteria for both sections of the report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife &amp; Conservation Biology, BS</td>
<td>College of Environment and Life Sciences</td>
<td>Graham Forrester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental &amp; Natural Resource Economics (ENRE), BS</td>
<td>College of Environment and Life Sciences</td>
<td>Simona Trandafir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Overall scores: the average of rubric scores for major criteria areas of the report.  
Scores for major criteria areas: the average of rubric scores of the multiple sub-criteria within the report.  
Rubrics can be found [here](#).
C. Summary of Reviewers Comments for recognized programs in Cohort I 2016

College of Arts and Sciences:

1. Computer Science BS/BA

   A solid process was used to re-evaluate multiple courses over multiple semesters. Both faculty and an engaged undergraduate assessment committee helped to create rubrics for analysis of student work. The narrative in the report provided detailed context and extensive documentation.

2. History, BA

   This program is commended for routinely evaluating all 7 program outcomes using a capstone course. They follow up on all recommendations for change in a comprehensive manner. There is broad faculty involvement in the assessment of the capstone course.

3. Political Science, BA

   In Section I of their report, an impressive amount of detail was included using clear rubrics to provide evidence of student achievement. Break down of test scores allowed faculty to determine areas that needed to be further addressed. In Section II, there was thoughtful follow-up on outcomes from the previous reporting cycle and, again, an impressive amount of detail was examined. A trend analysis was conducted to consider the influence of different time and different instructors.

College of the Environment and Life Sciences

4. Biological Sciences, BA

   Several measures were used to evaluate student learning outcomes including homework, embedded exam questions over two courses. Recommendations from the prior assessment report were implemented and included targeted efforts to support learning, in-class exercises, and weekly review sessions. This report included an excellent and thoughtful summary about student performance.

5. Animal Science & Technology, BS

   This program used a nationally tested rubric, an internal grading rubric, and the new STEM general education rubrics to assess student learning outcomes. There was excellent faculty engagement in the scoring process and analysis of results. In Section II, a comprehensive follow-up on prior recommendations for change was included.

6. Environmental and Natural Resource Economics, BS

   The summary narrative provided excellent context for report review including data tables and results by outcome. An external reviewer was involved in scoring the capstone activity. When a potential area of concern was identified, methods were suggested to help students improve.

7. Wildlife & Conservation Biology, BS

   There was evidence of impressive faculty involvement to revise the 2014 student learning outcomes. Extensive documentation and reporting occurred with an excellent rubric that was constructed and validated. This program used assessment information with respect to multiple profession standards and continues to align their curriculum with external stakeholders to the benefit of its students.
College of Health Sciences
8. Communicative Disorders, BA

Both direct and indirect measures were used to provide evidence of the learning outcomes. Outcomes were taught and assessed at multiple course opportunities across the curriculum and the results highlight notable student achievement.

9. Couples and Family Therapy, MS

Two outcomes were introduced, reinforced, and emphasized over multiple semesters throughout the curriculum. Clear rubrics were used to evaluate and measure each outcome and detailed and comprehensive results and analysis were reported.

10. Developmental Science, MS

Several faculty developed and used a shared rubric to assess student proficiency. A research project was presented and evaluated over multiple semesters and by multiple faculty and the rubric provided clear constructive feedback to the students.

College of Pharmacy
11. Pharmaceutical Science MS, PhD

Multiple outcomes were evaluated with a variety of direct and indirect measures and in a variety of settings (presentations, thesis proposals, comprehensive exam pass rates, and surveys). There was a strong sample of student work to document achievement.

Schmidt Labor Research Center
12. Labor Relations and Human Resources, MS

The report was well organized and provided detailed evidence from a number of authentic and experiential learning opportunities. There was supplemental information including rubrics, and guidelines that were helpful in understanding how the data was assessed. This program also included plans for how rubric development and assessment activity will occur in the future.