

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT REPORT

PROGRAM: Counseling
SUBMITTED BY: Dr. William Sterner
DATE: 9/28/20

Executive Summary: Description of Assessment Process

List *all* of the program's learning outcomes, as of the assessment year's catalog: *(regardless of whether or not they are being assessed this year)*

Learning Outcome	Year of Last Assessment	Assessed This Year (Y=Yes)	Year of Next Planned Assessment
1. Demonstrate a knowledge base required for professional counselors and as outlined by CACREP in: Advanced Developmental (formerly referred to as Human Growth and Development).	2014	Y	2020
2. Demonstrate a knowledge base required for professional counselors and as outlined by CACREP in: Multicultural Counseling (formerly referred to as Social and Cultural Foundations)	2014		2018
3. Demonstrate a knowledge base required for professional counselors and as outlined by CACREP in: Individual Skills (formerly referred to as Helping Relationships)	2014		2022
4. Demonstrate a knowledge base required for professional counselors and as outlined by CACREP in: Group Counseling (formerly referred to as Group Work)	2014		2022
5. Demonstrate a knowledge base required for professional counselors and as outlined by CACREP in: Career Development and Counseling (formerly referred to as Career & Lifestyle Development)	2014	Y	2020
6. Demonstrate a knowledge base required for professional counselors and as outlined by CACREP in: Testing and Assessment (formerly referred to Appraisal)	2014		2018
7. Demonstrate a knowledge base required for professional counselors and as outlined by CACREP in: Research Methods (formerly referred to as Research & Program Evaluation)	2014		2018
8. Demonstrate a knowledge base required for professional counselors and as outlined by CACREP in: Professional, Legal, and Ethical Issues in Counseling (formerly referred to as Professional Orientation and Ethics)	2014		2022
9. Demonstrate an understanding of current trends in the job market through self-marketing strategies.	2014		2022

Provide a **brief** description of the assessment process used including how results are shared and discussed and strengths, challenges, and planned improvements to the **process**, providing evidence of a culture of continuous improvement based on assessment. If there is something that is impeding your ability to implement improvements, please comment on those issues *(generally not more than two paragraphs, may use bullet points)*:



Assessment Process: The assessment process used combines data from various measures, including rubric data from the capstone assignment for each course or overall course grade if there is not a capstone assignment, *Graduating Student Survey* (GSS) and the *GSS—Counseling Alumni Supplemental Report* (GSS-CASR), *Counseling Alumni Employer Survey* (CAES) data (where applicable) and the National Counseling Exam (NCE) and National Clinical Mental Health Counseling Exam (NCMHCE).

Strengths: Data from course rubrics or grades that measure key content knowledge, NCE scores, *Graduating Student Survey* (GSS), *Graduating Student Survey—Counseling Alumni Supplement Report* (GSS—CASR), and *Counseling Alumni Employer Survey* (CAES) data were determined to be the best measures of student learning for the learning outcomes. These data provide a wealth of information addressing learning outcomes that align the CACREP-accreditation and NBCC core competencies for counselors.

Challenges: Due to the unique settings of each program (CMHC/PCMHC and SC) work is ongoing to develop capstone assessments and standardize rubrics. Further, faculty turnover, changes to institutional structure, administrative reorganization, and revisions to teaching methods due to COVID-19 have presented challenges with respect to this process.

Planned Improvements: The department is taking several steps to address these challenges including: 1) working to obtain approval to replace vacated core faculty positions, expanding the adjunct pool to meet immediate staffing needs, and reorganizing course coordinator to ensure courses have standardized assessment rubrics and processes as well as established capstone assignments to ensure continuity in outcome measures.

Closing the Loop: Progress on Planned Improvements from Prior Year

Describe how the program implemented its planned improvements from last year:

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update
Instituted detailed and standardized rubrics for those courses reviewed prior year.	Better coordination with faculty to provide standardized measures of capstone assignments for CACREP core courses at the end of fall and spring semesters. Further, better interpretation and integration of data to identify strengths and shortcomings, and implement data to make program improvements	Following the last program review, faculty were informed of the process to provide data from course capstone assignments for each semester. Data were collected from course rubrics and examined for any issues and concerns with course objectives or curriculum concerns. Data were then used to identify what efforts were needed to improve program curriculum and outcomes. Currently the department is working to fill multiple faculty lines and provide consistency in end of semester reporting of outcome data for all CACREP core courses.

Provide a response to last year’s University Assessment Committee review of the program’s learning assessment report:

Comment: *Keep up the great work. You obviously have a strong assessment process in place, but the key to effective assessment is using the results to make improvements. Without this critical step, your assessment process loses meaning. Look at the data in detail and discuss what the data tells you about the strengths and shortcomings of your program and what you need to do to improve.*



Response: *The department put a process in place to review course data each semester to examine the data. This process involves faculty sending the assessment and accreditation coordinator summary data captured from their capstone course rubric data for the eight CACREP core course areas. These data are then analyzed to highlight areas where concerns exist as it relates to the course objectives and outcomes. Then the department faculty discuss this summary data to determine what areas are needed for program improvement, strengths that need to be reinforced, and any potential challenges.*

Outcomes Assessment 2019-2020

Learning Outcome 1: *Demonstrate a knowledge base required for professional counselors and as outlined by CACREP in: Advanced Developmental (formerly referred to as Human Growth and Development).*

<p>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define the acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss the process for collecting this data: who conducted the assessment, when, and how?</i></p>	<p>Result <i>Did you meet your target? What was the result?</i></p>
<p>OM#1: (Direct) Prior to the end of the program, and with the completion of six (6) required courses and enrolled in the remaining two (2) (core competencies) outlined by CACREP (listed in the Learning outcomes), students can take the NCE, which is the qualifying licensure examination for the LPC in most states. The NCE assesses the minimum core competencies for counselors. The mean of aggregate data for the NCE, over the past two years, is calculated and used for this report. Each of the 8 core competency areas (listed in Learning outcomes) are measured and data are compiled and distributed by NBCC. Data compared (1) MU results and (2) national results. “Human Growth and Development” is one of the core competency areas on the NCE. Starting in 2020, data from the NCMHCE was used as an overall measure of CMHC student learning as highlighted in two categories: <i>Information Giving (IG)</i> and <i>Decision Making (DM)</i>. The rationale for including this measure is that the overall scores for IG and DM reflect knowledge gained across all eight (8) CACREP core courses. Further, more students are opting for the NCMHCE vs. NCE due to changing requirements for CMHC licensure across state licensure boards..</p>	<p>OM#1: Acceptable level of student performance is measured by comparing the MU mean to the national mean (all counseling programs across the country) and for the MU mean to be higher than the national mean for both NCE and NCMHCE. <i>The program strives to EXCEED the mean of all CACREP programs.</i></p>	<p>Data from the previous two years of NCEs and NCMHCEs were used. The NCE and NCMHCE are offered in October and April of each year. Students from all MU CACREP counseling programs (CMHC, PCMHC, SC) are eligible for these examinations. Individual scores are not generated or distributed by NBCC due to student confidentiality. The means of the test population are generated by NBCC and distributed to institutions with data generated for each core category and comparison data results for MU and National outcomes.</p>	<p>OM#1: NCE:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The mean is calculated over the assessments and compared to the national mean (acceptable level) for comparison purposes in each of the eight (8) core areas. Findings: $N=14$. Acceptable level: The MU mean in this core category was 8.42 compared to the national mean of 8.06. MU was above the mean as compared to all national counseling programs. <p>NCMHCE:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The mean is calculated over the two assessment categories, Information Giving (IG) and Decision Making (DM) and compared to the national mean (acceptable level) for comparison purposes. Findings $N = 32$. Acceptable level: The MU mean for the IG category was 122.45 compared to the national mean of 119.01. The

<p>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define the acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss the process for collecting this data: who conducted the assessment, when, and how?</i></p>	<p>Result <i>Did you meet your target? What was the result?</i></p>
			<p>MU mean for the DM category was 110.63 compared to the national mean of 102.82. The MU means for both categories were above the means for national counseling programs.</p>
<p>OM#2: (Direct) Students who were enrolled in CE503 do not have a course capstone assignment that serves as a course outcome measure. For this course, the metric to evaluate student learning was the course grade for each student and a calculation of the average grade for the course.</p>	<p>An acceptable level of performance in CE503 is a final course score of 84%. An 84% is a B in the departmental grading policy and is the minimum grade required to pass the course.</p>	<p>All students enrolled in CE503 in during the past two years were used in this assessment data to address this learning outcome. At the end of each course, the average for all the students was used to determine if the acceptable level of performance was achieved.</p>	<p>OM#2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Data from all sections of CE503 (Fall 2018-Spring 2020) were examined to determine if an acceptable level of performance was achieved for CE503 2. Findings $N = 81$. Acceptable Level: 66 students received a course grade of "A," 10 students received a course grade of "A-," 1 student received a course grade of "B+" and 1 student a course grade of "B," and 1 student received a course grade of "B-." Thus, 80 out of 81 students were at or above the minimum course grade with the average course grade for CE503 = 97%.
<p>OM#3: (Indirect) Annually, PIE distributes the <i>Graduating Student Survey</i> (GSS) and the <i>GSS—Counseling Alumni Supplemental Report</i> (GSS-CASR). The GSS is sent to all graduating MU graduate students. The GSS-CASR, developed by the Department of Counseling, targets program specific content that aligns with the CACREP core courses. The Department of Counseling was originally responsible for the development, distribution, collection, and analysis of <i>Counseling Alumni</i></p>	<p>The GSS assesses preparedness to work as a professional counselor using responses on a 5-point scale from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). The GSS-CASR ranks alumni content knowledge responses on a 5-point scale from 1 (unsatisfactory) to 5 (excellent). The CAES ranks employer's perception of alumni content area knowledge on a scale of 1 (very poor) to 5 (excellent)</p>	<p>Annually, PIE distributes the <i>Graduating Student Survey</i> (GSS) and the <i>GSS—Counseling Alumni Supplemental Report</i> (GSS-CASR). The GSS is sent to all graduating MU graduate students. The GSS-CASR, developed by the Department of Counseling, targets program specific content that aligns with the CACREP core courses.</p>	<p>OM3#:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Annually, the GSS survey is sent to all graduating students. The Department also submits a supplemental survey GSS-CASR with more program specific questions to PIE to administer at the same time. The Department of Counseling also developed and distributes <i>Counseling Alumni</i>

<p align="center">Outcome Measures</p> <p align="center"><i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p align="center">Performance Standard</p> <p align="center"><i>Define the acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p align="center">Data Collection</p> <p align="center"><i>Discuss the process for collecting this data: who conducted the assessment, when, and how?</i></p>	<p align="center">Result</p> <p align="center"><i>Did you meet your target? What was the result?</i></p>
<p><i>Employer Survey (CAES). As of 2017, PIE assumed responsibility for all aspects of the CAES as part of the overall alumni survey. Regarding distribution of the CAES, PIE forwards the survey link to the Department who sends the link to alumni on the Department’s counseling listserv. Counseling alumni forward the survey to their supervisor and the completed survey is collected by PIE. The GSS, GSS-CASR, and CAES are used as indirect measures for this learning outcome. The GSS asks 18 evaluation of preparation questions including “Succeed in a job in your field.” The GSS-CASR and CAES asks alumni and employers respectively, to evaluate preparedness to be professional counselors and content knowledge across the eight (8) core domains. Alumni are asked to “rank the level of education you received in each category” and employers are asked “How would you rate Marymount graduates with respect to the following counseling content areas?”</i></p>	<p><i>Department strives for a minimum score of 4 or better</i></p>	<p>The CAES is on a two-year cycle with the last survey administration being in 2017. PIE did not collect data CAES data for 2019 so we were unable to use this metric for OM#3.</p>	<p><i>Employer Survey (CAES) on the counseling listserv.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Findings GSS: Twenty (<i>N</i> = 20) graduating students completed the GSS. Data were compiled by PIE and submitted to the Department. For the question “Succeed in a job in your field” the mean = 4.00. The mean met the minimum score. 3. Findings GSS-CASR: Twenty-five (<i>N</i> = 25) alumni completed the GSS-CASR and 23 answered this question “rank the level of education you received in each category” for CE503. Data were compiled by PIE and submitted to the Department. The mean = 4.00 (Unsatisfactory = 1, Needs Improvement <i>n</i>=1, Satisfactory <i>n</i> = 4, Very Good <i>n</i> = 5, Excellent <i>n</i> = 10, N/A = 2). Mean (4.00) met the minimum score. 4. Findings CAES: No survey was administered by PIE in 2019. No data to report for this metric.

Interpretation of Results

Analysis and Implications: *What does this result tell you about the extent to which your students achieved this outcome? What are the strengths and weaknesses that this result highlights, and what are the implications for your curriculum or your program?*



OM#1: NCE: The MU mean for the core category was 8.42 compared to the national mean of 8.06 and thus met the accepted level for this core category. **NCMHCE:** The MU mean score for the IG and DM was 122.45 and 110.63 respectively compared to the national mean of 119.01 and 102.82 respectively and thus met the accepted level for this category.

Marymount NCE Results

Comparison of Overall Results

Mean=8.42	Mean=8.06
-----------	-----------

OM#2: All students enrolled in CE503 during the past two years were included in this assessment ($N = 81$). At the end of each semester, course grades for each student were calculated and an average course grade was determined. Eighty of the 81 students in CE503 (Fall 2018-Spring 2020) were at or above the acceptable level of 84%.

OM#3: Twenty graduating counseling students and 25 alumni from all counseling programs (CMHC, PCMHC, SC) completed the GSS and GSS-CASR, respectively. Data generated indicated the students and alumni believed the department prepared students for their current positions through the *Advanced Developmental* course as evidenced by the mean score of 4 out of 5.

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

The *Advanced Developmental* course provides a critical foundation for understanding human growth and development over the lifespan. Core knowledge of human growth and development is integrated into virtually every class in the curriculum across programs. The expectation is that students develop competencies in various aspects of advanced developmental theory and application. As in clinical coursework, if a student is not meeting the expectations for competencies in this course, as put forth by the counseling profession at any time during the program, the student is brought up on student review (outlined in the student handbook) and remediation may occur. If the remediation is not effective, transition out of the program may be an option. Even though one student out of 81 had a grade below the minimum of 84%, further examination revealed this student’s course grade (>80% and <84%) was slightly below the acceptable minimum. As is the process for grades below the minimum grade of 84%, the student was discussed during the student review process. Faculty evaluated the student’s course grade and overall GPA. Since the student’s overall GPA was above the Department and University required minimum program GPA, no further action was taken to remediate the situation.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:

Curriculum improvements for this course include identification and establishment of a specific capstone assignment and applicable rubric that can serve as a key outcome measure. Program improvements for this course will involve reestablishing a course coordinator to oversee consistency in course assignments once the department is fully staffed.

Learning Outcome 2: *Demonstrate a knowledge base required for professional counselors and as outlined by CACREP in: Career Development and Counseling (formerly referred to as Career & Lifestyle Development)*

Outcome Measures	Performance Standard	Data Collection	Result
OM#1: (Direct) Prior to the end of the program, and with the completion of six (6) required courses and enrolled in the remaining two (2)	OM#1: Acceptable level of student performance is measured by comparing the MU mean to the	Data from the previous two years of NCEs and NCMHCEs were used. The NCE and NCMHCE are	OM#1: NCE:

Outcome Measures	Performance Standard	Data Collection	Result
<p>(core competencies) outlined by CACREP (listed in the Learning outcomes), students can take the NCE, which is the qualifying licensure examination for the LPC in most states. The NCE assesses the minimum core competencies for counselors. The mean of aggregate data for the NCE, over the past two years, is calculated and used for this report. Each of the 8 core competency areas (listed in Learning outcomes) are measured and data are compiled and distributed by NBCC. Data compared (1) MU results and (2) national results. “Career Development and Counseling” is one of the core competency areas on the NCE. Starting in 2020, data from the NCMHCE will also be used as an overall measure of CMHC student learning as highlighted in two categories: <i>Information Giving</i> (IG) and <i>Decision Making</i> (DM). The rationale for including this measure is that the overall scores for IG and DM reflect knowledge gained across all eight (8) CACREP core courses. Further, more students are opting for the NCMHCE vs. NCE due to changing requirements for CMHC licensure across state licensure boards.</p>	<p>national mean (all counseling programs across the country) and for the MU mean to be higher than the national mean for both NCE and NCMHCE. <i>The program strives to EXCEED the mean of all CACREP programs.</i></p>	<p>offered in October and April of each year. Students from all MU CACREP counseling programs (CMHC, PCMHC, SC) are eligible for these examinations. Individual scores are not generated or distributed by NBCC due to student confidentiality. The means of the test population are generated by NBCC and distributed to institutions with data generated for each core category and comparison data results for MU and National outcomes.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The mean is calculated over the assessments and compared to the national mean (acceptable level) for comparison purposes in each of the eight (8) core areas. Findings: $N=14$. Acceptable level: The MU mean in this core category was 13.90 compared to the national mean of 13.58. MU was above the mean as compared to all national counseling programs. <p>NCMHCE:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The mean is calculated over the two assessment categories, Information Giving (IG) and Decision Making (DM) and compared to the national mean (acceptable level) for comparison purposes. Findings $N = 32$. Acceptable level: The MU mean for the IG category was 122.45 compared to the national mean of 119.01. The MU mean for the DM category was 110.63 compared to the national mean of 102.82. The MU means for both categories were above the means for national counseling programs.
<p>OM#2: (Direct) Students who were enrolled in CE530 do not have a course capstone assignment that serves as a course outcome measure. For this course, the metric to evaluate</p>	<p>An acceptable level of performance in CE530 is a final course score of 84%. An 84% is a B in the departmental</p>	<p>All students enrolled in CE530 in during the past two years were used in this assessment data to address this learning outcome. At</p>	<p>OM#2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Data from all sections of CE530 (Fall 2018-Spring 2020) were examined to

Outcome Measures	Performance Standard	Data Collection	Result
<p>student learning was the course grade for each student and a calculation of the average grade for the course</p>	<p>grading policy and is the minimum grade required to pass the course.</p>	<p>the end of each course, the average for all the students was used to determine if the acceptable level of performance was achieved.</p>	<p>determine if an acceptable level of performance was achieved for CE530</p> <p>2. Findings $N = 80$. Acceptable Level: 75 students received a course grade of “A,” 3 students received a course grade of “A-,” 1 student received a course grade of “B+” and 1 student received a course grade of “C.” Thus, 79 out of 80 students were above the minimum course grade with the average course grade for CE530 = 98%.</p>
<p>OM#3: (Indirect) Annually, PIE distributes the <i>Graduating Student Survey</i> (GSS) and the <i>GSS—Counseling Alumni Supplemental Report</i> (GSS-CASR). The GSS is sent to all graduating MU graduate students. The GSS-CASR, developed by the Department of Counseling, targets program specific content that aligns with the CACREP core courses.</p> <p>The Department of Counseling was originally responsible for the development, distribution, collection, and analysis of <i>Counseling Alumni Employer Survey</i> (CAES). As of 2017, PIE assumed responsibility for all aspects of the CAES as part of the overall alumni survey. Regarding distribution of the CAES, PIE forwards the survey link to the Department who sends the link to alumni on the Department’s counseling listserv. Counseling alumni forward the survey to their supervisor and the completed survey is collected by PIE. The GSS, GSS-CASR, and CAES are used as indirect measures for this learning outcome. The GSS asks 18 evaluation of preparation questions</p>	<p>The GSS assesses preparedness to work as a professional counselor using responses on a 5-point scale from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). The GSS-CASR ranks alumni content knowledge responses on a 5-point scale from 1 (unsatisfactory) to 5 (excellent). The CAES ranks employer’s perception of alumni content area knowledge on a scale of 1 (very poor) to 5 (excellent)</p> <p>Department strives for a minimum score of 4 or better</p>	<p>Annually, PIE distributes the <i>Graduating Student Survey</i> (GSS) and the <i>GSS—Counseling Alumni Supplemental Report</i> (GSS-CASR). The GSS is sent to all graduating MU graduate students. The GSS-CASR, developed by the Department of Counseling, targets program specific content that aligns with the CACREP core courses.</p> <p>The CAES is on a two-year cycle with the last survey administration being in 2017. PIE did not collect data CAES data for 2019 so we were unable to use this metric for OM#3.</p>	<p>OM3#:</p> <p>1. Annually, the GSS survey is sent to all graduating students. The Department also submits a supplemental survey GSS-CASR with more program specific questions to PIE to administer at the same time. The Department of Counseling also developed and distributes <i>Counseling Alumni Employer Survey</i> (CAES) on the counseling listserv.</p> <p>2. Findings GSS: Twenty ($N = 20$) graduating students completed the GSS. Data were compiled by PIE and submitted to the Department. For the question “Succeed in a job in your field” the mean = 4.00. The mean met and exceeded the minimum score.</p> <p>3. Findings GSS-CASR: Twenty-five ($N = 25$) alumni completed the GSS-CASR</p>

Outcome Measures	Performance Standard	Data Collection	Result
<p>including “Succeed in a job in your field.” The GSS-CASR and CAES asks alumni and employers respectively, to evaluate preparedness to be professional counselors and content knowledge across the eight (8) core domains. Alumni are asked to “rank the level of education you received in each category” and employers are asked “How would you rate Marymount graduates with respect to the following counseling content areas?”</p>			<p>and 25 answered this question “<i>rank the level of education you received in each category</i>” for CE530. Data were compiled by PIE and submitted to the Department. The mean = 4.00 (Needs Improvement $n=4$, Satisfactory $n = 6$, Very Good $n = 5$, and Excellent $n = 10$). Mean (4.00) met the minimum score.</p> <p>4. Findings CAES: No survey was administered by PIE in 2019. No data to report for this metric.</p>

Interpretation of Results

Analysis and Implications: *What does this result tell you about the extent to which your students achieved this outcome? What are the strengths and weaknesses that this result highlights, and what are the implications for your curriculum or your program?*

OM#1: NCE: The MU mean in this core category was 13.90 compared to the national mean of 13.58 and thus met the accepted level for this core category. **NCMHCE:** The MU mean score for the IG and DM was 122.45 and 110.63 respectively compared to the national mean of 119.01 and 102.82 respectively and thus met the accepted level for this category.

Marymount NCE Results

Comparison of Overall Results

Mean=13.90	Mean=13.58
-------------------	-------------------

OM#2: All students enrolled in *Career Development and Counseling* during the past two years were included in this assessment ($N = 80$). At the end of each semester, course grades for each student were calculated and an average course grade was determined. Seventy-nine of the 80 students in CE530 (Fall 2018-Spring 2020) were at or above the acceptable level of 84%.

OM#3: Twenty graduating counseling students and 25 alumni from all counseling programs (CMHC, PCMHC, SC) completed the GSS and GSS-CASR, respectively. Data generated indicated the students and alumni believed the department prepared students for their current positions through the *Career Development and Counseling* course as evidenced by the mean score of 4 out of 5.

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:



The Career Development and Counseling course provides an essential foundation for understanding career counseling theory and application within CMHC. Core knowledge of career development is integrated into the curriculum across all programs, especially in practicum and internship where students address career issues as part of the overall client assessment and treatment. The expectation is that students develop competencies in various theoretical and practical aspects of career development and counseling within the CMHC framework. As in clinical coursework, if a student is not meeting the expectations for competencies in the **Career Development and Counseling** course, as put forth by the counseling profession at any time during the program, the student is brought up on student review (outlined in the student handbook) and remediation may occur. If the remediation is not effective, transition out of the program may be an option. One student out of 80 had a grade below the 80%. As is the process for grades below the minimum grade of 84%, the student was discussed during the student review process. Faculty evaluated the student's grade and overall GPA. Since students are permitted to receive no more than two course grades of "C," the student was officially notified of the University and Departmental policy regarding course grades and GPA. No further action was taken to remediate the situation; however, the department continues to monitor any student who receives a deficient grade in a course.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:

Curriculum improvements for this course include identification and establishment of a specific capstone assignment and applicable rubric that can serve as a key outcome measure. Program improvements for this course will involve reestablishing a course coordinator to oversee consistency in course assignments once the department is fully staffed.

Appendices *(please only include items that will help reviewers understand your process – for example, test questions, rubrics, survey questions, more detailed description of assessment measures, summary tables of survey results, etc.)*