

E1A: INVENTORY OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

	Have formal learning outcomes been developed? ¹	Where are these learning outcomes published?	Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved stated outcomes for the degree?	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?	How are the findings used? ¹	Date of last program review for this degree program.
At the institutional level:	yes (See General Education below)					
For general education if an undergraduate institution:	yes	website;	Direct: Pilot Writing Assessment; VSA-related Standardized Test (pending); Indirect: Instructional Benchmarks; NSSE Survey Results; Senior Survey Results; Instructor Survey; Junior Year Writing Program Review;	Faculty Senate Council on Undergraduate Education; Faculty Senate Writing Committee; General Education Task Force; Council of Undergraduate Deans; Gen Ed Instructors during Workshops;	Revisions to Gen Ed curriculum and Learning Objectives; Enhanced Course Review System; Increased Instructional support to Gen Ed instructors; Improvements to first-year experience;	2007-2009
School of Education						
Teacher Education and Curriculum Studies	yes		multiple direct and indirect evidence	Data used by multiple parties, shared with stakeholders in partnership meetings.	revision and refinement of programs	2008
College of Engineering						
Chemical Engineering	yes	website	Direct: Faculty Assessment of each course Indirect: Surveys of students, alumni, Advisory Board	Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meet twice yearly, forwards recommendations to faculty.	course, curricular and program revisions	2007
Civil and Environmental Engineering	yes		Indirect: surveys, CQI program assessments, feedback from Student Advisory Committee	ABET Steering Committee, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee review, faculty meeting and workshop discussions.	course, curricular and program revisions	2007
Electrical and Computer Engineering	yes	website; syllabi	Direct: Senior Design Project, portfolios Indirect: surveys of students/alumni/industry; student participation in non-class activities.	Faculty review of evidence, recommendations sent to ECE faculty by Instructional Development Committee.	course, curricular and program revisions	2005
Mechanical and Industrial Engineering	yes		Direct: reports of student outcomes achievement Indirect: surveys and other feedback from students, faculty, alumni, employers.	Evidence is examined by Undergraduate Committee, which reports to the faculty and the department IAB.	course, curricular and program revisions	2007

¹For more detail, see: http://www.umass.edu/oapa/oapa/prog_improvement/ugrad_prog.php

	Have formal learning outcomes been developed? ¹	Where are these learning outcomes published?	Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved stated outcomes for the degree?	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?	How are the findings used? ¹	Date of last program review for this degree program.
College of Humanities and Fine Arts						
Afro-American Studies						2004
Art, Architecture, and Art History	yes	Foundations outcomes on website	Direct: Junior Year Writing sample; Junior/Senior exhibit	faculty and juror review, faculty meetings	course improvements implemented	2004
Classics	yes		Indirect: Tracking graduates, student success in competitions			2003
English	yes		Indirect: survey of seniors, faculty survey of students' strengths and weaknesses	faculty review; department-wide meetings; meetings between instructors for ENG 200 and 300, department-wide retreat	revision of goals and objectives; curricular improvements	2004
History	no		Indirect: faculty brown bags			2003
Judaic and Near Eastern Studies	yes		Direct: language proficiency tests Indirect methods: curriculum committee meetings; student focus groups; end of program reports; alumni tracking; discussions at faculty retreats	faculty review		2002
Languages, Literatures and Cultures	yes		Direct: performance on proficiency tests; student papers; public presentations; student portfolios. Indirect: in-house surveys; exit interviews; employer feedback.	LLC executive committee meetings	changes in curriculum to raise proficiency levels; other curriculum modifications	2006
Linguistics	yes		Indirect: in-house designed senior survey			2006
Music and Dance	yes		Direct: Multiple assessments and reports at various points in program (Music Education). Indirect: Educator Licensure Office Exit Survey.	Faculty-driven approach; Music Education assessment plan as model for other programs	changes in curriculum, advising, protocols, changes in assessment process itself	2007
Philosophy	yes		Direct: Senior Seminar term paper (seminar is planned and pending University approval as a graduation requirement)	Department as a whole reviews evidence viz. teaching and learning goals (planned)		2003
Theater	yes	website, student handbook, distribution to Undergraduate Advisory Board	Direct: review of student work by Undergraduate Committee Indirect: exit interviews, alumni survey	Faculty meet to review evidence (direct and indirect)	changes to methods in play production and to class/curricular strategies	2004
Women, Gender, Sexuality Studies	yes	course syllabi	Direct: faculty review of student work Indirect: student self-evaluations; focus groups; informal surveys; faculty sponsor evaluations	Faculty meet with students for feedback, then meet without students to consider all sources of evidence.	identify areas for program or curricular improvement	2005

¹For more detail, see: http://www.umass.edu/oapa/oapa/prog_improvement/ugrad_prog.php

	Have formal learning outcomes been developed? ¹	Where are these learning outcomes published?	Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved stated outcomes for the degree?	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?	How are the findings used? ¹	Date of last program review for this degree program.
Isenberg School of Management						
Accounting and Information Systems	yes		Direct: examples of student work, data analyzed in light of ISOM benchmarks.	Faculty evaluators, who report to Undergraduate Curriculum Committees.	Improvement in areas where students are not meeting benchmarking standards.	2006
Finance and Operations Management	yes		Direct: examples of student work, data analyzed in light of ISOM benchmarks.	Faculty evaluators, who report to Undergraduate Curriculum Committees.	Improvement in areas where students are not meeting benchmarking standards.	2006
Hospitality and Tourism Management	yes		Direct: examples of student work, data analyzed in light of ISOM benchmarks.	Faculty evaluators, who report to Undergraduate Curriculum Committees.	Improvement in areas where students are not meeting benchmarking standards.	2006
Management	yes		Direct: examples of student work, data analyzed in light of ISOM benchmarks.	Faculty evaluators, who report to Undergraduate Curriculum Committees.	Improvement in areas where students are not meeting benchmarking standards.	2006
Marketing	yes		Direct: examples of student work, data analyzed in light of ISOM benchmarks.	Faculty evaluators, who report to Undergraduate Curriculum Committees.	Improvement in areas where students are not meeting benchmarking standards.	2006
Resource Economics	yes	plan to include in course syllabi	Indirect: in-house designed junior survey; internship stakeholder feedback. Other indirect and direct tools planned.	Undergraduate Studies Committee makes recommendations to faculty.	Curriculum Committees take action to improve curriculum.	2005
Sport Management	yes		Direct: examples of student work, data analyzed in light of ISOM benchmarks.	Faculty evaluators, who report to Undergraduate Curriculum Committees.	Improvement in areas where students are not meeting benchmarking standards.	2006
College of Natural Sciences						
Astronomy	yes		Direct: student work samples Indirect: in-house designed student survey questions	Undergraduate Curriculum Committee presents findings to entire faculty	Plans to use findings for program improvement	2003
Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	yes		Indirect: in-house developed Senior exit survey	Currently developing mechanisms to review evidence		2007
Biology	yes		Indirect: surveys Direct: evaluation of HHMI courses	periodic departmental review of curriculum; regular monitoring by instructors; review of evidence by Committee for Teaching and Learning.		2007
Chemistry	no		Indirect: tracking students doing research Direct: Online Web-based Learning data			2008

¹For more detail, see: http://www.umass.edu/oapa/oapa/prog_improvement/ugrad_prog.php

	Have formal learning outcomes been developed? ¹	Where are these learning outcomes published?	Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved stated outcomes for the degree?	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?	How are the findings used? ¹	Date of last program review for this degree program.
Computer Science	yes		Indirect: exit interviews; course evaluations	faculty meetings to discuss evidence and plans		2007
Food Science	yes		Indirect : surveys, exit interviews, employer feedback. Direct: capstone course project	Undergraduate Program Committee and Department Head; data reviewed annually.	Plans to use findings for program improvement	2002
Geosciences	yes	webpage	Indirect (planned): in-house designed exit interviews and questionnaires	Department Head and Undergraduate Program Directors will gather evidence, department faculty involved in interpretation.		2005
Mathematics and Statistics	no					2005
Microbiology	yes		Direct: student presentations; special assignments. Indirect: employer feedback	Curriculum Committee, review of data	Plans to use findings for program improvement	2005
Natural Resource Conservation	yes	website	Indirect: student evaluation of learning objectives	Departmental faculty review student responses.	Plans to use findings for program improvement	2006
Physics	yes		Direct: student work in 440, research, honors thesis presentations. Indirect: in-house developed senior survey.	Annual faculty meeting discussion of assessment data.		2002
Plant, Soil and Insect Sciences	yes		Indirect: student survey questions (planned); input from stakeholders Direct: evaluation of work from capstone or other key courses (planned)	Undergraduate Curriculum Committee will present findings to entire faculty	Findings will be used to improve students' achievement of learning outcomes.	2007
Psychology	yes	website; emails to faculty	Direct: student performance from Psych 100	Psych 100 instructors review student work	to be determined	2005
Veterinary and Animal Sciences	yes		no information			2004
School of Nursing						
Nursing	yes	student handbook; website	Indirect: faculty and student end of course evaluations; exit interviews; Systematic Evaluation Plan	Formative and summative student learning assessment practices are in place.	program/curricular improvements	2005

¹For more detail, see: http://www.umass.edu/oapa/oapa/prog_improvement/ugrad_prog.php

	Have formal learning outcomes been developed? ¹	Where are these learning outcomes published?	Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved stated outcomes for the degree?	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?	How are the findings used? ¹	Date of last program review for this degree program.
School of Public Health and Health Sciences						
Communication Disorders	yes		School-wide: Indirect: student surveys; student reflection paper Direct: examples of student work	Full faculty and subcommittee meetings	addition of courses to meet student needs	2007
Kinesiology	yes		School-wide: Indirect: student surveys; student reflection paper Direct: examples of student work	Faculty meetings to develop methods of assessment, review evidence		2007
Nutrition	yes		Indirect: student surveys; internship Director surveys. Direct: student work on selected learning objectives (planned)	Faculty meetings, Nutrition Advisory Committee meetings, Curriculum Committee meetings.	curricular changes; changes in assessment process as necessary	2007
Public Health	yes		School-wide: Indirect: student surveys; student reflection paper Direct: examples of student work Department: examples of classroom work; in-depth discussions with graduates.	Faculty-wide meetings each semester; end-of-year undergraduate faculty/advisory board meeting.		2007
College of Social and Behavioral Sciences						
Anthropology	yes		Indirect: surveys of undergraduates, feedback from Undergraduate Caucus	Curriculum Committee, review of data	Findings examined to plan for improvement of student experiences in the major.	2005
Communication	yes		Indirect: surveys of students, other student feedback Direct: student writing samples from foundational courses	Review of evidence by Undergraduate Studies Committee; faculty collaboration	changes in curriculum; enhancement of faculty support for students	2005
Economics	no		Indirect: student surveys, focus groups, alumni feedback.			2002
Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning	yes					2004
Legal Studies	yes		Indirect: in-house designed course evaluations; faculty-student discussions; student academic success and job placement.			2004
Political Science	yes		Indirect: syllabi review	Undergraduate Studies Committee present data to faculty, encourage participation in assessment.	Curriculum revision; instruction to faculty on incorporation of assessment practices.	2001

¹For more detail, see: http://www.umass.edu/oapa/oapa/prog_improvement/ugrad_prog.php

	Have formal learning outcomes been developed? ¹	Where are these learning outcomes published?	Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved stated outcomes for the degree?	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?	How are the findings used? ¹	Date of last program review for this degree program.
Social Thought and Political Economy	no					2005
Sociology	yes	disseminated to faculty, will disseminate to students, method unknown.	Direct: student papers	Assessment Committee	Findings presented to faculty for consideration of programmatic improvement.	2005
Other						
Bachelor's degree with Individual Concentration	yes	website				2006
University Without Walls	yes	student handbook; website	Indirect: student monitoring; course evaluations; in-house alumni surveys	Faculty review of evidence	program/curricular improvements	2006

¹For more detail, see: http://www.umass.edu/oapa/oapa/prog_improvement/ugrad_prog.php