The Learning Outcomes Oversight Committee (LOOC) 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 supporting 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.

The following report is a summary of activity during the academic 2017-2018 year.

**Item #1: Committee Actions**

LOOC subcommittees approved the student learning outcomes Assessment Plans for the following potential programs and certificates:

- a. Undergraduate program: International Studies and Diplomacy
- b. Undergraduate program: Innovation and Entrepreneurship
- c. Undergraduate Certificate in Innovation and Entrepreneurship
- d. Post Masters Graduate Certificate: Psychiatric Mental Health Nurse Practitioner
- e. Graduate Certificate in Aquaculture and Fisheries
- f. Graduate Certificate in Science Writing

**Item #2: Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Reporting and Academic Program Recognition**

Since 2012, the University of Rhode Island has followed a cohort-based system for biennial reporting of the more than 120 accredited and non-accredited academic programs with a mix of graduate and undergraduate programs reporting every May at graduation. Programs are divided into one of two cohorts and roughly half of all programs report each May.

Success in learning outcomes assessment reporting is defined by two metrics: 1) Compliance with program reporting requirements and 2) Reporting Proficiency, the use of best assessment practices to examine learning. As was noted last year, beginning with the 2016 Cohort I reporting cycle, accredited programs now submit streamlined assessment reports in
recognition of their reporting demands for their accrediting agency or agencies. The May 2017 report cycle was the first time for accredited programs in Cohort II to use the new reporting forms. All assessment reports are evaluated during the summer using a formal two-level faculty team review process. Faculty reviewers apply to evaluate reports, are vetted, and trained with compensation provided by the Provost’s Office.

In 2017, there were 12 Level 1 reviewers and 5 Level 2 reviewers. Faculty reviewers evaluate and score all reports using set rubric criteria which are available on the Assessment Office website. Two scoring rubrics guide report review accommodating the two types of assessment report forms. To meet expectations in reporting, non-accredited program reports are expected to achieve a score of Well Developed; accredited programs are expected to achieve a score of Satisfactory. Scores do not reflect a judgement about instructors nor about the learning results uncovered during the assessment process. Assessment results are used by the program for curricular improvement only.

### A. Compliance and Reporting Proficiency Results for May 2017 Reports (Cohort II)

#### Undergraduate Programs

**Non-accredited:**
13 of 16 non-accredited programs submitted reports assessing a new outcome (Section I); of these, 11 met or exceeded expectations.

11 of 17 non-accredited programs were expected to submit reports following-up on recommendations made for improvement in prior reports (Section II); of these, 8 met or exceeded expectations.

**Accredited:**
8/8 of accredited programs submitted reports; all 8 met expectations.

#### Graduate Programs

**Non-accredited:**
8 of 14 non-accredited programs submitted reports assessing a new outcome (Section I); of these, 4 met or exceeded expectations.

2 of 4 non-accredited programs were expected to submit reports following-up on recommendations made for improvement in prior reports (Section II); of these, 1 met or exceeded expectations. (Note: This was the first report cycle for some graduate programs and re-assessment may not have been expected.)

**Accredited:**
7 of 14 accredited programs submitted reports and scored satisfactory; all 7 met expectations.

**Assessment Plans:**
Outcomes assessment in graduate programs is guided by an Assessment Plan (2012/2013). This round, several Graduate programs focused efforts on revising Assessment Plans to better guide assessment efforts: 5 Plans were due; 4 were submitted; 3 required revision; 1 was approved.
B. Recognition for Excellence in Assessment Reporting for Undergraduate and Graduate Programs from May 2017, Cohort I:

These programs exceeded expectations in reporting by achieving overall scores* of Advanced, for major criteria areas in one or both sections of the report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Faculty Member(s) Submitting Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, BA (Sec I)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Naomi Mandel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science and Management, BS (Sec I)</td>
<td>Natural Resource Science</td>
<td>Environment and Life Sciences</td>
<td>Laura Meyerson, Yeqiao Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development and Family Studies, BS (Sec I and Sec II)</td>
<td>Human Development and Family Studies</td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>Karen McCurdy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing and Rhetoric, BA (Sec I)</td>
<td>Writing and Rhetoric</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Ryan Omizo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, PhD (Sec II)</td>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>Alan Shawn Feinstein College of Education and Professional Studies</td>
<td>Julie Coiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science, MA (Sec I)</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Kristin Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition, MS (Sec I and Sec II)</td>
<td>Nutrition and Food Sciences</td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>Ingrid Lofgren</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Feedback rubrics used to score each type of report can be found at:  
[https://web.uri.edu/assessment/planning_reporting_documents/](https://web.uri.edu/assessment/planning_reporting_documents/)
C. Recognition of Faculty Assessment Fellows

Faculty engagement in the assessment process is a critical part of meaningful and manageable assessment. Each spring, faculty have the opportunity to apply to become a Faculty Assessment Fellow to undertake peer review of undergraduate and graduate program assessment reports. Following report review, Fellows are encouraged to apply their experiences and knowledge as Assessment Mentors. Mentors volunteer for one year after the summer report review concludes to provide expertise to programs as they develop their reports. This practice began in fall 2017 and enhances the institution's capacity for excellence in assessment. The 2017-18 Assessment Mentors are listed at: https://web.uri.edu/assessment/faculty-mentors-17-18/

Faculty Assessment Fellows recognized for outstanding commitment to supporting learning outcomes assessment through participation in the peer review process for 2 or more years:

- **Participated 4 years:**
  - Kristin Johnson, Political Science
  - Ingrid Lofgren, Nutrition

- **Participated 3 Years:**
  - Melissa Boyd-Colvin, Leadership Minor
  - Adam Moore, Education
  - Norma Owens, Pharmacy

- **Participated 2 Years:**
  - Kris Bovy, Anthropology
  - Susan Brand, Education
  - Aaron Ley, Political Science
  - Christine McGrane, Nursing
  - Miriam Reumann, History
  - Cathy Semnoski, Education
  - Susan Thomas, Music
  - Simona Trandafir, Environmental and Natural Resource Economics
  - Martha Waitkun, Communication