CASTLETON UNIVERSITY
COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF VERMONT
NORTHERN VERMONT UNIVERSITY
VERMONT TECHNICAL COLLEGE

VERMONT
— STATE COLLEGES SYSTEM —

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR
PO BOX 7
MONTPELIER, VT 05601
P (802) 224-3000

TO: Education, Personnel, and Student Life Committee
Megan Cluver, Chair
Karen Luneau, Vice Chair
Janette Bombardier
David Durfee
Shirley Jefferson
Mary Moran
Perry Ragouzis

FROM: Yasmine Ziesler, Chief Academic Officer

RE: EPSL Meeting on August 31, 2022

DATE: August 24, 2022

The EPSL Committee of the Board of Trustees is scheduled to meet on Wednesday, August 31st from 1:00 to 2:30pm by Zoom.

The agenda includes a review of the committee's overall plan for the year, including the creation of faculty and staff liaisons to the committee. The focus for committee consideration at this meeting is the work anticipated to revise academic policies focused on academic programs as described in the attached materials.

Continuing its focused oversight of specific transformation efforts, the committee will also receive an update on the continued work on academic transformation for Vermont State University, including the review of the optimized program array, faculty governance design, general education, and development of "face-to-face plus" delivery modalities.

I can be reached directly at (802) 224-3025 if you have any questions.

Thank you.

Cc: VSC Board of Trustees
Council of Presidents
Chief Academic Officers
Student Affairs Council
HR Council

Vermont State Colleges Board of Trustees
Education, Personnel, and Student Life Committee

August 31, 2022

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Comments from the public
3. Approval of May 23, 2022 meeting minutes
4. Student trustee update
5. Review of EPSL Committee plans and faculty and staff liaisons role for 2022-2023
6. Review of anticipated academic policy revisions
7. Vermont State University academic transformation progress update
8. Other business

MATERIALS

1. May 23, 2022 minutes
2. EPSL Committee meeting plan for 2022-2023
3. Draft EPSL Committee liaisons role
4. Academic policy revisions memo

ITEM 1:

May 23, 2022 Minutes

Minutes of the VSCS Board of Trustees' Education, Personnel, and Student Life Committee meeting held Monday May 23, 2022 at 1:00 p.m. via Zoom - UNAPPROVED

Note: These are unapproved minutes, subject to amendment and/or approval at the subsequent meeting.

The VSCS Board of Trustees Education, Personnel, and Student Life Committee met on Monday, May 23, 2022 via Zoom.

Committee Members present: Megan Cluver (Chair), Ryan Cooney, David Durfee (1:47 p.m.) Shirley Jefferson, Karen Luneau (1:12 p.m.), Mary Moran

Absent:	Janette Bombardier
Other Trustees present:	Lynn Dickinson, Jim Masland
Presidents:	Parwinder Grewal, Joyce Judy, John Mills, Pat Moulton
Chancellor's Office Staff:	Donny Bazluke, Network/Security Analyst
	Kellie Campbell, Chief Information Officer
	Wilson Garland, Director of Transformation
	Katherine Levasseur, Director of Governmental and External Affairs
	Jen Porrier, Administrative Director
	Patty Turley, General Counsel
	Meg Walz, Director, Project Management
	Sophie Zdatny, Chancellor
	Yasmine Ziesler, Chief Academic Officer
From the Colleges:	Nolan Atkins, Provost, Northern Vermont University
	Sarah Chambers, Coordinator of Instructional Technology, Castleton University
	Ana Gaillat, Dean of Academic Affairs, Vermont Technical College
	Robin Guillian, Faculty, Vermont Technical College
	Perry Ragouzis, Student, Castleton University

1. Call to Order

Chair Cluver called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

2. Approval of March 21, 2022 Meeting Minutes

Trustee Luneau moved and Trustee Moran seconded the motion to approve the March 21, 2022 meeting minutes. The motion was approved unanimously with one abstention by Trustee Jefferson.

3. Policy 102 New Program Proposal in Aviation Maintenance Technology

Chief Academic Officer Yasmine Ziesler explained that this new program proposal comes to the committee via Policy 102 and asked Vermont Technical College President Pat Moulton to introduce the program. President Moulton stated that Vermont Tech is seeking approval for the Aviation Maintenance Technology Program in partnership with the Burlington Technical Center. President Moulton then introduced Robin Guillian, a pilot and Director of Aviation, who spoke further about the program. Further details can be found here on pages 8-31. Chair Cluver expressed an interest in the program moving forward and to hear a report back on how it is working.

Trustee Jefferson moved and Trustee Moran seconded the motion to recommend to the Board the approval of the Policy 102 New Program Proposal in Aviation Maintenance Technology. The motion was approved unanimously.

4. Policy 301 revision

General Counsel Patty Turley shared that the passage of Senate Bill 283 directs that certain immigrants be eligible to receive in-state tuition at the Community College of Vermont. As a result, VSC Policy 301 will be updated to include the new law. Ms. Turley explained that what is before the committee for consideration is the possibility of extending this provision to eligible immigrants who seek to attend other institutions within the system. There was overwhelming support from the committee members.

Trustee Luneau moved and Trustee Moran seconded the motion to recommend to the Board the revision of Policy 301 as outlined. The motion was approved unanimously.

5. Workforce Development update

Vermont Technical College President Pat Moulton shared an update from the Continuing Education and Workforce Development Planning team. After discovery work at the campuses a variety of needs and populations needing service emerged. President Moulton then shared a working definition of Workforce Development which can be found here. While there is a project charter that sets forth a mission/vision, there are four major challenges currently being worked on: developing design principles around system improvement and integrations, developing design principles around product development and student services, developing communication and engagement of customers, and finally, developing financial sustainability. The team would like to capitalize on integrated efficiencies between Vermont State University and Community College of Vermont to reduce costs

6. Benefits review by labor-management task force

General Counsel Patty Turley provided an update on the labor management task force, being led by Associate General Counsel Kathryn Santiago, that is examining the health insurance benefits package as part of the transformation efforts to improve efficiencies. Representatives of the three full time bargaining units, as well representation of the non-bargaining staff, are all participating in a review regarding health insurance options. The purpose of the task force is

educational and informational, not bargaining.

7. Academic transformation progress update

Dr. Ziesler provided an update on the Academic transformation progress which can be found here. Dr. Ziesler provided updates on the optimized program array work, general education design, the face-to-face plus pilot project, and academic structure and governance.

8. Other Business

There was no other business.

9. Comments from the public

There were no comments from the public.

Chair Cluver adjourned the meeting at 2:25 p.m.

ITEM 2:

EPSL Committee meeting plan for 2022-2023

DRAFT plan for EPSL Committee work for 2022-2023

Priorities:

1. Continue monitoring Vermont State University program array work and related academic operations transformation projects.

2. Include student, faculty, and staff perspectives on EPSL work.

3. Revise academic policies to align with new configuration of the system and the program review framework recommendations from rpk GROUP and the optimization process.

4. Focus on understanding the student experience at CCV and VTSU and transformation plans: who are the target populations for each institution, how are these target populations currently reflected in each institution's enrollments and in workforce development offerings, and what are the key components of the student experience that address specific needs for each target population?

5. Focus on talent management in the system, beginning with an overview by the System Chief Human Resources Officer of talent retention practices, key gaps, salaries and compensation philosophy, approaches to hybrid and remote work, and advancement of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Scheduled meeting dates and potential topics:

August 31, 2022: Overview of academic policies and clarify board's directions for revisions

October 27, 2022: Student experience and populations overview

January 9, 2023: Talent Management overview

March 13, 2023: Student experience and workforce development focus TBD

May 8, 2023: Complete academic policy revisions

ITEM 3:

Draft EPSL Committee liaisons role

DRAFT CONCEPT FOR EPSL COMMITTEE FACULTY AND STAFF LIAISONS
August 23, 2022

I. Background and Rationale:

The VSCS Board of Trustees Education, Personnel, and Student Life Committee (EPSL) has primary responsibility for the development and implementation of policies related to Academic Affairs, Personnel, and Student Affairs. On an annual basis, EPSL reviews reports on quality improvement of academic programs; system performance indicators related to academic programs, student populations and student success; personnel and legal affairs reports; and reports on other strategic initiatives. On an as-needed basis, EPSL also reviews and makes recommendations to the full Board on action regarding new program development, policy revisions, awarding of emeritus status and honorary degrees, and VSC Faculty Fellows.

EPSL's areas of responsibility, of all the Board's committees, most closely and comprehensively connected to the ongoing work of faculty and staff. Given the scale and scope of transformation efforts across the system and within each institution, establishing a formal role and supportive organizational structure for EPSL to be directly informed by faculty and staff perspectives is desirable. This draft concept for EPSL faculty and staff liaisons seeks to ensure balanced and supported representation of faculty and staff perspectives from the system's two future institutions (the Community College of Vermont and Vermont State University).

II. Potential roles and responsibilities:

1. Receive EPSL materials and projected agenda topics in advance of meetings from the Office of the Chancellor;

2. Identify to the EPSL Chair and Chancellor/designee any topics of particular interest to faculty or staff for EPSL consideration;

3. Attend EPSL meetings (5/year, typically 1.5 hours per meeting); and

4. As appropriate to the topic, solicit input or feedback from all faculty or staff through regular faculty and staff organization and governance mechanisms and represent this input at EPSL meetings;

III. Potential organizational structure and support for liaisons:

1. Liaisons will be members of, and identified via, appropriate faculty and staff governance groups at CCV and the future VTSU, subject to final approval by their respective Presidents.

2. At CCV, faculty liaisons would be identified from among faculty representatives on the Academic Council, and staff liaisons would be identified from among CCV's College Council members. While final governance structures are under development for VTSU, this could be a representative from VTSU's future faculty assembly, potentially a leadership group within that assembly, and a representative from a potential future VTSU-wide staff council.

3. Liaisons would receive a stipend annually.

ITEM 4:

Academic policy revisions memo

TO: Education, Personnel, and Student Life (EPSL) Committee

FROM: Yasmine Ziesler, Chief Academic Officer

DATE: August 24, 2022

SUBJECT: Proposed Academic Policy Revision Work for AY2022-2023

EPSL Committee Members:

There are three primary policies guiding academic program oversight at the VSC. These policies and associated procedures were originally developed to support collaborative and strategic approaches to program development, review, and improvement, all within a 5-institution system with duplicate and overlapping programs.

As the system transforms, these three policies need to be re-aligned to the system's new structure and governance with two accredited institutions, an optimized program portfolio and recommended program review framework for Vermont State University, and expanded system-wide shared services.

In preparation for an initial discussion at the August 31st EPSL committee meeting, the following is a brief review of the three policies and initial recommendations from the chief academic officers for revisions.

[Policy 101](#) (Program Review and Continuous Improvement Process)

Policy 101 defines board standards for high-quality programs and directs a process at the college and system level to ensure continuous quality improvement. Programs engage internally on an annual basis in assessment and quality improvement activities, and every five years comprehensive self-studies are prepared, reviewed, and the results of that work shared with the Board to facilitate board understanding and exploration of these questions related to program quality outcomes:

- How does the program assess student learning, and what does the program's data on student learning outcomes indicate?
- What strategies are being used for continuous improvement?
- How does the program meet board standards for quality?

CAO review and recommendations for Policy 101 revisions:
1. The goals and focus of Policy 101 are appropriate and effective in supporting continuous quality improvement.
2. The current policy contains some procedural options that have not been utilized in practice and could be removed from the policy.

3. The procedure for clustering programs in disciplinary clusters for the five-year cycle of review committees should be continued, however these disciplinary clusters will need to be redefined.
4. The most recent revisions to procedures and report templates for Policy 101 implemented beginning in 2019-2020 as "PreCIP 2.0" (see rationale from 2019 and most recent report template below) are proving effective at supporting more robust program assessment and improvement activities on an annual basis and are in alignment with strengthened accreditation standards related to educational effectiveness.
5. Given the Board's priority to support diversity, equity, and inclusion, an important update to report templates would be to include disaggregated data on admissions, retention, and completion.

Policy 102 (Approval of New Degrees and Majors)

Policy 102 directs a process for new program development that ensures alignment with the mission of the VSC, encourages system collaboration in planning, and supports flexible, nimble program development. Policy 102 and the new program proposal template and rubric support the Board's understanding of these questions in making its decision whether to approve a new program for launch:

- Is the new program aligned with and in support of VSC and institutional missions and strategic planning directions?
- Will the program provide a clear and viable career path for graduates?
- Will it assist in meeting State needs and/or serve a new student market?
- Will the new program strengthen the college and complement, extend and/or diversify the offerings of the VSC?
- Is there reasonable evidence to suggest the program can achieve financial sustainability within the institution's program array?

CAO review and recommendations for Policy 102 revisions:
1. A clear, defined analysis of the program's financial model (all program expenses, including annual quality improvement work and overhead contribution margin to the institution) and projected enrollments should be incorporated into the initial stages of program proposal development outlined in the policy and Step 1 rubric.

Policy 109 (Annual Enrollment and Cost Effectiveness Review)

Policy 109 directs Presidents to review program enrollment and cost data on an annual basis and with the Chancellor provide summary reports to EPSL, including information on any programs identified for closure. EPSL reviews these reports and determines whether to recommend any actions to the board. Annual data provided in these reports supports Board understanding:

- How well does the academic portfolio align with enrollment trends and state workforce needs?
- What are the relative delivery costs of programs within the portfolio?

- Which programs are being identified for investment, optimization, or elimination?

CAO review and recommendations for Policy 109 revisions:

1. Annual data production for Policy 109 reports should be produced by the system IR office for use by senior administration at each institution as well as the Board.
2. The framework utilized by rpk GROUP should serve as the foundation of the data report for Vermont State University.[1] A new framework will need to be developed for the Community College of Vermont and may best be oriented to measures such as those required by Perkins program reporting.
3. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion metrics should be identified and included in the framework.
4. Data on certificate and workforce development programs should also be reviewed annually by EPSL.

---

[1] See overview presentation at https://www.vsc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/rpk-GROUP-Presentation-to-EPSL-May-24-2021-FINAL.pdf and detailed report at https://www.vsc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/rpk-GROUP-Final-Report-to-the-Vermont-State-Colleges-System-Final-Version-REVISED-5-20-21.pdf. In brief, the framework used by rpk GROUP included a metric for relative enrollment size and growth, relative job growth and job openings, and matriculation, retention, and graduation rates.

PreCIP 2.0: Building on Our Progress with Program Assessment
January, 2019

What are we observing from the most recent cycles of PreCIP reports?

1. Programs are making good progress refining student learning outcomes at the program level:
    a. Some programs now include post-graduation outcomes (e.g. readiness for graduate school, entry into specific profession such as teaching).
    b. Some programs have refined curriculum and learning activities (particularly capstone courses and field placements) to align with outcomes.

2. Programs are making good progress increasing the breadth and depth of evidence used for overall program assessment, particularly the direct assessment of student work products. In general, program assessment remains organized around discrete assessment activities and evidence, not around program outcomes, for example analysis of feedback from internship placement supervisors, or deans' interviews with majors.

3. Across programs, there is work still emerging or in-progress:
    a. Relationships between program outcomes and program curriculum and related co-curricular experiences may not yet be fully defined or understood.
    b. Shared standards for understanding and evaluating learning outcomes represented in student work (e.g. via common rubrics for evaluation) may not yet be fully developed or implemented.

4. Programs continue to identify needs for more robust data and data collection/management mechanisms.

5. Programs continue to struggle to find a sustainable level of assessment activity that supports genuine continuous improvement.

6. With limited exceptions, programs have yet to achieve demonstrable improvements in student learning outcomes as a result of assessment activities that prompted subsequent program improvement activities.[2]

---

[2] See, for example, NECHE Standard 2.7 "The institution's principal evaluation focus is the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of its academic programs. Evaluation endeavors and systematic assessment are demonstrably effective in the improvement of academic offerings, student learning, and the student experience…" https://cihe.neasc.org/standards-policies/standards-accreditation/standards-effective-july-1-2016#standard_two_two

How do we improve our continuous improvement process?

1. Provide more comprehensive data to programs.
2. Continue to refine and focus the scope of PreCIP reports on outcomes assessment, via additional guidance and report templates to support this focus.
3. Align related efforts to improve student success and retention with program assessment work.

What does this look like, in the PreCIP 2.0 report template?

1. The "Program Overview and Enrollment History" section of the report is replaced with a focus on "Student Success & Retention."

2. The VSCS Institutional Research Office will provide new data annually to each college for analysis, including

    a. 15+ credit enrollment patterns for first-semester program students;
    b. Course success rates (percentage of students withdrawing or receiving D or F grades);
    c. Program retention and transfer patterns; and
    d. Annual program completion rate (number of program completers as percentage of total program enrollment).

3. Programs will use structured templates to support their work in mapping
    a. curriculum to an "on-track" student graduation plan with key milestones identified;
    b. program outcomes to curriculum and co-curricular learning experiences;
    c. assessment activities to outcomes; and
    d. a full complement of planned assessment activities to be completed on a five-year cycle.

VSCS Policy 101: Program Review & Continuous Improvement (PReCIP)

2021 PROGRAM REPORT Guidelines

Introduction
Consistent with its mission, the Vermont State Colleges System is dedicated to providing academic programs that are of high quality and remain current. Towards that end, the VSCS Board of Trustees adopted Policy 101: Program Review and Continuous Improvement Process (PReCIP) in order to ensure that VSC colleges regularly engage in practices designed to foster the improvement of academic degree programs. Through this process, faculty involved in designing and delivering VSCS academic programs periodically, systematically, and collaboratively review evidence regarding their collective effectiveness in achieving desired student learning outcomes, and commit to making the changes needed to ensure continuous program improvement.

VSCS presidents must submit all PReCIP reports to the Chancellor no later than July 30. Reports must follow the guidelines below. Reports should be no longer than 20 pages, excluding appendices.

I.   Student Success and Retention Review
Intent: Programs regularly review college-wide student success and retention data from a program perspective as an essential component of continuous improvement of the program.

> ***System Data (to be provided in the PreCIP portal site; include any summary analysis as an attached appendix to the report):***
> A. 15+ credit enrollment patterns for first-semester program students
> B. Course success rates (percentage of students not withdrawing or receiving D or F grades)
> C. Annual program completion rate (number of program completers as percentage of total program enrollment)

Narrative:
   1. Identify and interpret any meaningful patterns in the student success and retention data.
   2. Describe specific strategies to improve student academic success, retention, and on-time completion, including a timeframe, specific individuals to be involved, and the intended goal(s) to be achieved via these strategies.

II.   Student Outcomes and Assessment Plan (See also VSC Assessment Systems Rubric)

Intent: A program has clearly articulated student learning outcomes at the course and program level, mapped to a transparent program of study that communicates to students the critical sequences and milestones for on-time degree completion. The program assessment plan includes a variety of direct and indirect measures, distributed across a sustainable five-year cycle, through which faculty determine the extent to which the program achieves its goals for student learning and post-graduation outcomes.

Student Outcomes: required attachments to be completed (see template examples below):
A. Degree Program Map and Milestones
B. Curriculum and Learning Outcomes Crosswalk
C. Program Outcomes Assessment Matrix

III.   Program Review

Intent: Programs are designed to support students in acquiring the knowledge, skills, and values expected of entry-level members of the field. They are prepared for employment or further education in the field of study. Consistently delivering a high-quality educational program requires thoughtful planning but also honest and meaningful evaluation that is broad-based, systematic, ongoing, and supported by committed program faculty. Faculty and other academic resources must allow adequate time for class preparation, student evaluation and advising, program development and review, and professional development. This process will likely improve a program's effectiveness in achieving its student outcomes.

Narrative: Describe the program's most recent cycle of learning outcomes assessment and improvement efforts, including constituents involved in the process. Include in this narrative:

1. Any significant results and trends observed in the assessment data in student achievement of learning outcomes.

2. Any specific strategies to improve student learning that were implemented in the most recent assessment cycle.

3. Any curricular reviews that involved consideration of student learning outcomes data.

4. Any curriculum revisions or other programmatic changes that have been made as a result of using evidence regarding student learning, post-graduation outcomes, employer surveys, or other evaluations of the currency and relevance of program requirements and content.

5. Any needed academic resources and support identified via the program review process related to attainment of the program's outcomes.

6. Any other program assessment and improvement accomplishments from the past five years as reported in annual program progress reports to the college's chief academic officer and/or including progress on program improvement recommendations from the last PReCIP review.

IV. Continuous Improvement Plan

Intent: Program faculty collaboratively use periodic reviews to reflect on past efforts and outcomes and to plan the continuous improvement of the program. The resulting plans are living documents that regularly receive the collective attention of all faculty (full and part-time, within and across contributing departments) teaching in the program.

Narrative:

1. Describe 1-3 goals identified through this PReCIP review for continuous program improvement work over the next several years.
2. How will these goals be accomplished via the next five years of the program's specific assessment activities, as outlined in the Program Outcomes Assessment Matrix completed in Part II Attachment C above?
3. What specific improvements in learning outcomes, as demonstrated by future assessment results, would you anticipate as a result of achieving these specific program improvement goals?
4. What are the program improvement questions you still have? What are your preliminary thoughts on how and when you might pursue these questions? For example, what data would you need to help you answer each question?

STUDENT OUTCOMES TEMPLATES

A. Degree Program Map and Milestones

Directions: Provide a semester-by-semester map of the <u>optimal</u> curriculum sequence for a full-time student and, if applicable for your program, part-time student. Identify any required or recommended milestones (e.g. minimum grade in a key introductory course; overall GPA required for program; completion of prerequisite courses in a multi-semester sequence).

Sample:
SEMESTER 1
1. First-semester seminar course
2. Intro to [Program] *milestone: must earn a "C" grade or better
3. College Writing I
4. General Education Distribution Requirement in ...
5. Biology I *milestone: must complete this course before semester 3 to stay on track for graduation

SEMESTER 2
1. Program Topic Course ABC
2. College Writing II
3. Math
4. General Education Distribution Requirement in
5. Biology II *milestone: must complete this course before semester 4 to stay on track for graduation

SEMESTER 3
1. Course ...
2. Course...
3. Course...
4. Course...
5. Course...
*milestone: complete department interview/application to the major

SEMESTER 4
1. Course ...
2. Course...
3. Course...
4. Course...
5. Course...
*milestone: achieve 2.5 GPA

SEMESTER 5, etc

B. Curriculum and Learning Outcomes Crosswalk
Directions: Identify which program curriculum or aligned co-curricular learning experiences address each of the program's learning outcomes. Where relevant, indicate whether a curriculum requirement provides an <u>introductory</u>, <u>applied</u>, or <u>mastery</u> learning experience. Also where relevant, identify specific course learning outcomes.

Sample:

	Program req course 1	**Program req course 2**	**Program req: field experience**	**Program req: elective course options/ categories**	**Program req: capstone seminar**	(Additional columns for additional program req's)
Program Outcome 1	Introductory (course learning objectives 1, 3, 4)*	Applied (in course learning objective 3)*			Mastery	
Program Outcome 2		Introductory	Applied		Mastery	
Program Outcome 3	Introductory (course learning objective 2)		Applied		Mastery	
Program Outcome 4		Introductory		Mastery (common learning objective(s)		

*For all required program courses or required elective options, identify those specific course-level objectives below that are necessary to support program outcomes (i.e. considered part of a common course syllabus or core, regardless of the individual course section taught).

Sample, following crosswalk above:

Program Req. Course/Elective	**Course-level learning objective**
Req. Course 1	**Objective 1:** **Objective 2:** **Objective 3:** **Objective 4:**
Req. Course 2	**Objective 3:**
Elective Course Options/Category	**Common learning objective (s):**

C. Program Outcomes Assessment Matrix

Directions: For each program outcome, identify the evidence used for assessment, the responsible parties conducting the assessment, and the schedule for and use of assessment results. Note: to achieve sustainability and depth in outcomes assessment, programs are strongly encouraged to distribute assessment of outcomes across a 5-year program review cycle.

Sample:

	Changes made as a result of using the data/evidence during the past cycle (2016-2020), as discussed in Section III.	**Evidence To be Collected in Next Cycle (2021-2025)** Consider direct and indirect evidence.	**Responsible Parties**	**Assessment Schedule (distributed across a 5-year program review cycle)**	**Plan for Taking Action to "Close the Loop" through the next cycle**
Outcome 1 [Title]	*Adoption of common assignment rubric in 2018 by faculty after evidence showed student learning gaps in Outcome 1.*	Scores from shared rubric on assignments in [designated program courses]	Faculty teaching [designated courses] to use rubric; review of summary data by entire department	Collect rubric score data every semester within [designated courses]; Year 1 focus for analysis of assessment results	Program will use its analysis of assessment results to inform faculty development activities.
Outcome 2 [Title]	*Addition of narrative reflection assignment field placement course in 2016 after evidence showed students not recognizing learning gains in field placement.*	Shared rubric on narrative reflection assignment; Field placement supervisor feedback	Faculty supervisors of field placement experience	Collect data every semester within [designated courses]; Year 2 focus for analysis of assessment results	Program will use its analysis of assessment results to inform outreach with field placement supervisors.
Outcome 3 [Title]	*Program added public presentation capstone assignment in 2019 to upper-level required course after*	Capstone assignment; evaluation rubric	Faculty and/or other evaluators of capstone assignment	Collect rubric data for every capstone assignment; Year 3 focus for analysis of assessment results	Program will use its analysis to inform curriculum revisions.

Outcome 4 [Title]	*student feedback identified concerns about having sufficient preparation to succeed in workplace environments.*	Student feedback survey results Deans' interviews of students	Dept chair to administer survey; academic dean; entire department for review of evidence	Annual completion of surveys and deans' interviews; Year 4 focus for analysis of assessment results	Program will use its analysis to inform program outcome revisions.