Wilmington University

Academic Affairs Assessment Plan

Introduction

The mission of Wilmington University is rooted firmly in building exemplary and innovative academic programs within the context of a student-centered learning environment. Faculty, staff, and administration at Wilmington University genuinely care about their students which is expressed in a number of ways including individual attention to students, small class size, mentoring of new students and flexible course delivery formats. Further, “excellence in teaching” and “relevance of the curriculum” are viewed as foundational criteria for excellent student service. It is in this spirit that we routinely assess our academic programs to determine the extent to which learning has occurred and student educational needs have been met.

A Context for the Assessment

The Academic Affairs Outcomes Assessment Plan (AA0AP) is a component of the institutional effectiveness assessment plan which is entitled: Proof Positive\(^3\): A Framework for Institutional Assessment (PP\(^3\)). It is within the context of PP\(^3\) that Academic Affairs has established its planning and data reporting cycles. Our approach to outcomes assessment is consistent with the Mission of Wilmington University, as it emphasizes a focus on the teaching/learning experience in all programs.

The foundation of this assessment plan is the concept that “good assessment must begin in the classroom and end there” (Walvoord & Anderson, 2010, p. 149). Additionally, according
to Suskie, (2009), the major purposes of assessment are twofold – to improve teaching and to demonstrate the effectiveness of our current efforts. Therefore, academic assessment must be developed and owned by the faculty – in essence, developed by the faculty for the faculty. As a result, the Wilmington University AAAP is intended to be a vehicle for faculty to make what they already do more public (Walvoord & Anderson, 2010). As written by Middle States (2007, p.74), “Assessment, first and foremost, is a tool for faculty members to use as they do their very best to teach their students well”.

**A Four Pronged Approach to Assessment**

The AA0AP utilizes a four pronged approach to assessment. These prongs are: Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness; Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes; Assessment of Student Satisfaction; and Promotion of Educational Values. Each of these prongs is tied to the University’s mission and is graphically depicted below. The first three assessment prongs include benchmarks and assessment tools. The fourth prong, Promoting Educational Values, while not directly measured, is framed around values the faculty wishes to develop among students.
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I. Assessment of Student Learning

Student learning outcomes, as reported at the University level, relate to the achievement of the graduation competencies. At the program level, mapping identifies the linkage of graduation competencies, program competencies, course objectives, and assessment measures. The linkages are depicted as follows:

Graduation Competency → Program Competency → Course Objective → Graded Assignment

Academic Affairs has developed broad graduation competencies at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Each academic college collects data related to the assessment of student learning at the course level and demonstrates the linkage to the specific program competencies and the graduation competencies. Each academic college has a college-specific assessment plan rooted in the Academic Affairs Outcomes Assessment Plan. Programs with external accreditation requirements may vary their assessment plan as appropriate.

Academic Affairs views student learning as both a formative and a summative process and utilizes direct and indirect methods in order to access learning.

**Formative Assessment:** According to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (2007), “formative assessment is ongoing assessment that is intended to improve an individual student’s performance” and “is used internally, primarily by those responsible for teaching a course or developing a program” (p. 27). Course-embedded outcomes assessment conducted in some courses is done to improve the course content, provide feedback to faculty and program administrators, assist faculty in integrating the concept of outcomes assessment as a routine part of their instruction, and provide consistent evaluation parameters that will inform
both students and faculty of expectations. Formative assessment results are the purview of the academic program and college and are not reported at the University level.

**Summative Assessment:** Assessments at this level are intended to provide a true gauge of “outcomes” of the students’ experiences at the University (Smith & Barclay, 2010). Results are used to evaluate the extent to which program goals have been achieved. Summative data are generally collected in one to four courses near program completion. An exception is the general education assessment which is collected at varying points of program completion. Each course-embedded project, test, portfolio, or other student learning experience may assess several graduation and program competencies.

**Direct Evidence:** Direct evidence of student learning indicates whether or not a student; (1) has command of a specific subject content area, (2) can perform a certain task, (3) exhibit a particular skill, (4) demonstrate a certain quality in his/her work, or (5) hold a particular value (Middle States Commission on Higher Education, 2003). Examples of such measures include course homework assignments, term papers and reports, rubrics, research projects, etc. at the course level as well as capstone projects, and employer or supervision ratings of student performance at the program level.

One primary method of assessing student learning is through *course-embedded, criterion-referenced, assessment measures (CECRAM)*. This approach was developed by consensus of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and all College Deans in the year 2000. CECRAM is typically implemented through grading rubrics that are designed to explicate each criterion to be assessed with an explanation of the product scoring at each performance level from 1 (unsatisfactory) to 5 (excellent).

Additional direct methods are used to assess student learning outcomes and may include:
Exams with embedded questions (generally used for science or math courses that may be measured on a percentage scoring system),

- Clinical evaluations (generally, but not always, used in conjunction with a rubric in programs such as nursing and education), and
- Standardized comprehensive exams.

**Indirect Evidence:** Indirect evidence of student learning is correlational - meaning that data exists which indicates that students are probably learning, but the evidence is less clear than evidence from direct methods (Suskie, 2009). As a result, indirect evidence should not be the only means of assessing outcomes (Middle States, 2007). Examples of indirect methods at the course level include course grades, as well as the time spent on service learning or homework. At the program level, employer or alumni surveys, student perception surveys, and graduate school placement are some examples of indirect evidence.

**Graduation Competencies:** Critical outcomes of the academic experience have been developed by the Faculty Senate and are called competencies (See Appendix B: Graduation Competencies).

The undergraduate competencies are subdivided into *general education* and *academic program* competencies. The general education competencies are assessed by both the College of Arts & Sciences and specific academic programs, which also are responsible for assessing the program competencies. The graduate - level competencies are assessed at the program level. Each college has developed a written outcomes assessment plan that delineates the assessment process for each program. In this plan, the terms, *university-level proficiency*, and *advanced level* as they pertain to the graduation competencies should be defined. In addition, an Ad hoc
Faculty Senate Committee on Information Literacy has developed a rubric available for use by all academic programs to access Information Literacy.

**Data Collection and Implementation Cycle:** “A commitment to assessment of student learning requires a parallel commitment to ensuring its use” (Middle States Commission on Higher Education, 2009, p. 66). In conjunction with the above mentioned mapping, templates have been developed by faculty as a reporting mechanism and typically define the scheduled assessment activity, benchmarks, annual levels of performance and specific decisions or actions taken (“closing the loop”) to improve student learning. The templates are designed to provide a record of previous year’s data collection and decisions/actions carried out based upon these data.

**Academic Program Improvement**

The AAOAP indicates a clear linkage between graduation competencies and student learning. The true value of the assessment of student learning may be found in improvements made to specific programs. Osguthorpe, Bradley and Johnson (2010) present a framework of questions which link student learning outcomes, student performance and program improvement. These questions are utilized by faculty in order to improve the process of student learning. Faculty are urged to frame assessment measures around these questions.
**II. Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness:**

Teaching effectiveness is essential to fulfilling the Mission of Wilmington University. Therefore, teaching effectiveness is the second arm of the assessment plan for Academic Affairs. The basis for assessing teaching effectiveness includes the review of GPA reports each semester, the faculty evaluation process, and analysis of IDEA reports as well as an annual review of institutional results. Students are given the opportunity to provide evaluative data at the conclusion of each course. Teaching effectiveness data are gauged by the items, “Overall excellence of this course”, “Progress on relevant objectives” and “Excellent Teacher”.

Although each faculty is given a written analysis of the course evaluation, an institutional as well as academic college analysis is also provided. Collaboration between IR and Academic Affairs ensures data analysis and review continues. In addition, an annual GPA analysis is conducted by Institutional Research and distributed to Academic Affairs. The results of these evaluations are presented for discussion at Faculty Senate every spring.
III. Assessment of Student Satisfaction with the Academic Experience:

Wilmington University is a student-centered institution. Therefore, student satisfaction with the academic experience is an obvious parameter in our assessment plan. To measure student satisfaction, we have used the ACT College Outcomes Survey which is a standardized survey administered to graduating undergraduate and graduate students. One section assesses student satisfaction with various aspects of the University. Another section assesses students’ perceptions of achievement of graduation competencies. Institutional Research extracts the items pertaining to the academic experience. Because this survey has been administered since 2000, we have extensive trended data on these outcomes The Academic Council reviews the analysis of the College Outcomes Survey provided by Institutional Research on an annual basis, typically in October. Deans include analysis of this survey in their annual report each summer. As of 2013, ACT eliminated the College Outcomes Survey from its product line. In 2013 and 2014, Institutional Research, with permission from the ACT, developed and administered a survey using select questions from the ACT College Outcomes Survey. This is referred to as the Wilmington University College Outcomes Survey. Consequently, we have been able to continue to trend the results and benchmark against previous years’ results. A committee is currently investigating a potential replacement for the ACT so that we may once again benchmark against national norms.

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) is utilized in much the same way as the College Outcomes Survey. In conjunction with Institutional Research, items pertaining to the students’ academic experiences are analyzed (http://nsse.iub.edu/pdf/Lessons_from_the_Field_2009.pdf). The NSSE was first administered in 2010, so as results continue to be analyzed, trend data has proven to be useful.
IV. Assessment of Faculty Learning & Satisfaction

Faculty Development and Educational Technology

In August, 2012 it was determined that the Faculty Development Department and the Educational Technology Department would develop an outcomes assessment plan to be included in the AAOA plan. A committee was formed and a plan of action created. During the 2012-2013 AY, the committee worked to determine the framework to be used, create measurable learning outcomes for each of the identified outcome assessment workshops/courses, determine the level/type of measurement for each outcome assessment workshop/course, create the various assessment tools, determine a system for deploying the tool, and determine a timeframe for the entire process. The committee determined that the steps outlined above would be completed during the 2012-2013 AY. Data collection would occur during the 2013-2014 AY and the results would be analyzed and a baseline identified. The information would then be shared at the October, 2014 Outcomes Assessment summit.

Outcomes assessment related to faculty development activities determine the degree to which the various activities have achieved their specific outcomes. This kind of assessment is based on a curricular model and is similar to academic program assessment (Hines, 2011). An academic degree program is usually one of several offered in an academic school or department. The academic degree program is broken down into individual courses and each course is broken down into individual classes. The same framework is used for our faculty development programs. The departments offering faculty development are analogous to the academic programs. Specific department programs—lunch and learn series, scholarly practitioner series, technology training, etc.-
are analogous to academic degree programs. Within these programs we have individual offerings.

Different programs or offerings require different measurements in terms of both content and degree. To begin the outcomes assessment process for faculty development activities, it was necessary to determine the levels of evaluation to be used in the plan. Because of the nature of outcomes assessment related to faculty development, the assessment extends past the four pronged approach used by the colleges. Our plan includes six levels (Chism & Szabo, 1997; Hines, 2011; Kirkpatrick, 2006), with a strong emphasis placed on the first four levels.

*Level 1-Participation:* The first and most basic determination is participation. It is important to know who comes and who does not come to the various activities.

*Level 2- Satisfaction/Reaction:* The next level is satisfaction/reaction. Did participants like or dislike the event?

*Level 3- Learning:* This level asks the participant whether he/she has learned something. It is important to note that this is not a question of student learning, but of faculty learning. At this level we measure the participant’s perception of how much his/her knowledge has increased as a result of the training.

*Level 4- Behavior/Impact on teaching:* This level asks whether faculty changed their behavior (instructional practices) as a result of what they learned. Specifically, this looks at how faculty members apply the information.

*Level 5- Impact on student learning:* This level measures the impact on students as a result of faculty applying information learned.
Level 6-Impact on Institution: This measure is the most complex of all, and usually only a small percentage of faculty development offerings will have a measurable institutional impact (Hines, 2011).

Although we believe that we have established a solid foundation for developing an assessment plan for faculty development activities, outcomes assessment will continue to be a work in progress as we continue to refine our programs and our process.

V. Promotion of Educational Values

The Faculty Senate of Wilmington University has developed a set of educational values. These values are actively promoted by faculty. Data gathered from the Student Alumni Survey (ACT) and the (NSSE) National Survey of Student Engagement provides feedback to faculty indicating examples where the educational values are infused in the student life cycle. Academic Affairs will provide an annual status report regarding the Promotion of Educational Values on an annual basis.

Reporting Results

Program Review

Academic programs at Wilmington University have undergone Five Year Program Review process. Since our mission is to provide relevant curricula and career-oriented degree programs, and in response to the changing external environment, the program review process was shortened from a five-year to a three year cycle beginning November 1, 2013.

Certain programs, however, are accredited or approved by an external agency which may require a different time table. Programs undergoing the University’s Program Review process are to include a section which reflects an aggregate of assessment since the last program review was held. Based upon this information the program review should address the following
question: Are students able to successfully integrate learning from individual courses into a coherent whole? An overview of program review results is presented to the Faculty Senate.

**The Academic Affairs Outcomes Assessment Summit**

An annual Summit is held in order to review progress to date of the outcomes assessment process, discuss strengths and weaknesses of the process and most importantly, present, analyze, and discuss examples of data-based decision making (“closing the loop”) related to Academic Assessment. Attendees at the Summit include the Chief Academic Officer, the Assistant Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, the College Deans, and the Manager of Institutional Research as well as other invited guests. As per PP3, a summary report is presented to the Faculty Senate. In addition, regular reports are offered throughout the academic year to the Faculty Senate by the Deans as a way to inform and motivate faculty regarding the effective use of outcomes assessment data and subsequent decisions based on those data. The minutes of Faculty Senate (Faculty Senate Blackboard site) include these presentations and any related materials such as copies of handouts and PowerPoint slides for review at a later time.

**College Meetings and Advisory Committees**

It is critical for all faculty to be informed of academic assessment results. Each college has a process by which all key stakeholders are apprised. Members of the faculty participate in regular college meetings to review assessment data and processes. During these meetings, successes are celebrated and specific changes in areas such as curriculum, pedagogy or policy are made. In addition, academic program and course related meetings are regularly scheduled.
throughout the year as a method to keep the full time and adjunct faculty apprised or results presented at the annual Summit.

The various Colleges routinely present assessment results to scheduled program advisory committee members for review and input. These committees consist of members of the community, practitioners in the field, and faculty members as well as student representatives.

**The University Website**

The Wilmington University website provides a platform for ongoing communication of outcomes including changes and academic program improvements. The assessment plans for Academic Affairs, and the various Colleges, are housed on this site. Academic program maps, newsletters, assessment updates and PowerPoint presentations may be viewed via the web. This information is openly available to faculty, students and the general public. Further, an Outcomes Assessment web site is also available for public view and includes the Academic Affairs Outcomes Assessment Plan as well as college/area assessment maps and plans ([http://www.wilmu.edu/outcomes/academicaffairs.aspx](http://www.wilmu.edu/outcomes/academicaffairs.aspx)). Additionally, an intranet site is available for the use of the Wilmington University community and contains specific data and reports pertaining to the assessment of student learning for each College, the Student Success and Advising Center and the Library.

**Additional Information**

**Guidelines for Benchmarks**

The following guidelines have been established for summative assessments.
The benchmark for program/graduation competencies should be recorded as a mean score.

The benchmark for rubric-based assignments at the graduate level is a mean of 4.00/5.00. The target for rubric-based assignments for undergraduate programs is a mean of 3.00/4.00.

For data reported as percentage (e.g., comprehensive examination scores), the target for graduate level programs is a mean of 90% unless otherwise benchmarked by the outside accrediting bodies. For undergraduate programs reporting data as percentage, the target is a mean of 80%.

The benchmark for teaching effectiveness, as measured by the IDEA results, is that Wilmington University will score at or above the national norm.

The benchmark for student satisfaction with the academic experience, as measured by the ACT University Outcomes survey, is that Wilmington University will score at or above the national norm. Benchmarks for items from the NSSE have yet to be established.

Benchmarks can be changed over time based on reflection upon assessment results.

Use of Representative Sampling

A representative sampling of course selections can be utilized for the collection of outcomes assessment data. The following guidelines have been established for representative sampling.

As a goal, data collection should be statistically meaningful;

Data should be collected from all course sections if seven or fewer sections are offered in a data collection year.
All University sites and instructional formats (face-to-face, hybrid, on-line, etc.) should be included.

**Academic Affairs and Institutional Research**

The relationship between Institutional Research (IR) and Academic Affairs is crucial in order to successfully assess student learning at the University. IR provides indirect measures of instructional effectiveness such as retention and graduation rates for all students and assists with various types of direct measures of student learning. In addition, analytical research projects, such as compiling and analyzing data for academic program review, and designing and administering various surveys of students and alumni, are supportive of the assessment of student learning.

Below is a list of several ongoing IR projects which relate to the assessment of student learning. This list is dynamic and will change from time to time and serves to illustrate the collaborative working relationship between Academic Affairs and IR.

- Assist with the specialized accreditation requirements.
- Develop and manage a shared data base for storage of CECRAM data at the academic college level.
- Produce and analyze annual reports related to the IDEA student evaluation form.
- Develop and analyze regularly scheduled GPA and enrollment reports by academic college.
- Collect and analyze data of the relevant information from the ACT and NSSE surveys.
Plan for Evaluation

It will become necessary, on a periodic basis, to evaluate the Academic Affairs Outcomes Assessment Plan. As a result, every two years a task force will be formed to evaluate the efficacy of the AAAP. Membership will consist of the University’s Academic Council, and the leadership of Institutional Research. Resources such as the Middle States Commission on Higher Education rubric for Evaluating Institutional Student Learning Assessment Processes may be used for such purposes (http://www.msche.org/publications/Asmt-process-rubric-3-11-08.doc).

Opportunities for Enhancement

A review of the current status of academic assessment at Wilmington University presents several opportunities for growth and improvement, include the following:

- Further develop an institutional understanding of student learning assessment as a key component of teaching and learning.
- Clearly link the learning which occurs within individual courses to an integrated programmatic whole.
- Implement multiple forms of assessment of graduation competencies including direct and indirect measures.
- Ensure that assessments are yielding results appropriate to the amount of time and expense incurred.
- Continue to improve the level of systematic and clear feedback of academic outcomes to internal and external constituents (faculty, students, parents, alumni, future students, accreditation agencies, employers, etc.).
➤ Further promote a “culture of evidence” (Kramer, Hanson & Olsen, 2010, p. 43) throughout Academic Affairs.

➤ Ensure that the curricula of the varied course delivery formats are “coherent, cohesive, and comparable in academic rigor” (Middle States Commission on Higher Education, 2011, p. 9).

➤ Ensure that general education course work provides a strong foundation for student learning in the major course of study.
Appendix A

The Evolution of Academic Assessment at Wilmington University

In 2000, Wilmington University began to develop a comprehensive academic outcomes assessment plan which continues to evolve. Early efforts focused almost entirely upon course-embedded assessment. At that time, several difficult obstacles were encountered and eventually worked through. In 2003, the Academic Affairs Outcomes Assessment Plan (AAOAP) was written and slightly revised in 2004. Over the years we have implemented every aspect of the plan which included gathering data, drawing conclusions and in some cases, acting upon the results.

In January 2006 an initial evaluation of the 2003 AAOAP was prepared by the Vice President and Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs. It was noted that the workload related to the current plan was excessive. Moreover, a review of new guidelines from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (2006) indicated that Wilmington University had a plan that went beyond MSCHE standards. Specifically, MSCHE recommends that assessment be (1) useful, (2) cost-effective, (3) reasonably accurate and truthful, and (4) organized, systematized, and sustainable.

Utilizing these criteria, the following conclusions were drawn: (1) Wilmington University had an assessment plan that was useful. We had already implemented a few changes based upon results. (2) Our plan was not cost-effective in terms of human resources, particularly for program coordinators. For example, data were to be collected in all sections of targeted courses every time they were offered at every site. With a large cadre of adjunct faculty and growing enrollment, it appeared that the assessment process was becoming unwieldy. MSCHE guidelines recommend keeping assessment “simple”, focusing on 3-6 important goals in each program,
staggering assessments, and using samples. Our plan was not designed to use student samples nor were the assessments staggered. Additionally, we assessed every program competency, which for some programs totaled 14. (3) Our plan was designed to be truthful and valid, especially with the use of standardized surveys and examinations along with criterion-referenced rubrics. (4) Sustainability was jeopardized because of the volume of data collected and the effort required to collect the data.

In March 2006, the Academic Council and Institutional Research department of the University further evaluated the AAAP process and noted the following accomplishments:

- Competency mapping had been completed for all academic programs;
- Data had been collected for each targeted course;
- Examples of the utilization of outcomes data in order to enhance student learning had been documented by most academic colleges;
- Positive feedback had been received from the Middle States accreditation visit.

This group then considered the AAOAP with the above referenced Middle States Association (2006) guidelines for assessment and the following was determined:

- The Academic Affairs outcomes assessment process was useful but too ambitious.
- The current process was not cost-effective.
- The process was accurate (“good enough”) (Suskie, 2004, p. 302) and truthful.
- The organization and particularly the sustainability of the process were of concern.

Additional discussion was held later that spring at the Academic Council Retreat and the following decisions were made:
Utilization of a five year data collection and implementation cycle would make the process more cost-effective and sustainable.

Representative sampling would be implemented.

A formal reporting cycle would be included in the program review process.

The current set of undergraduate and graduate graduation competencies would be revised.

The three pronged academic assessment plan remains valid. Wilmington University gathers evidence on three components: teaching effectiveness, student learning, and student satisfaction with the academic experience. Monitoring the quality of academic programs is achieved when student learning outcomes data are compared to established performance standards (benchmarks) for graduation competencies and national scores. Trended data analysis would further help us to monitor quality.

In October 2006, a representative Ad hoc Committee of the Faculty Senate was formed to begin the task of revising the Graduation Competencies. The revised Competencies were approved by the Faculty Senate in March 2007. During the summer of 2007, the revised Academic Affairs Assessment Plan was published.

During the Fall, 2010 semester an Ad hoc committee was formed in order to review the Graduation Competencies which was later approved by the Faculty Senate. During this timeframe, the 4th prong of our assessment plan, the Promotion of Educational Values was added. An assessment web site was also developed as a communication tool for faculty, students, parents, staff and the community. The annual Summit has been institutionalized as a part of the annual calendar of events.
APPENDIX B

GRADUATION COMPETENCIES

In 1987 the Faculty Senate adopted a list of expected graduation competencies for undergraduate students. Undergraduate and graduate competencies were adopted in November 1994. Both of these sets of competencies were reviewed, revised, and adopted by the Faculty Senate in 2007. In 2010 the competencies received some minor revision which is reflected in this document.

Educational Values

In keeping with the Wilmington University mission of providing career-oriented programs, our "scholar-practitioner" faculty are actively engaged in promoting the following educational values:

- Commitment to self-directedness, self-discipline and lifelong learning;
- Sensitivity to and respect for a pluralistic society;
- Awareness of self in relationship to others and the benefits of working in teams;
- Appreciation of creative expression including the arts and humanities;
- Commitment to responsible citizenship as a contributing member of society.

Undergraduate Competencies

It is intended that students earning an undergraduate degree will demonstrate college level proficiency in the following areas:

General Education

Oral Communication

- Speak with confidence, clarity, and conciseness.
- Research, prepare, and deliver professional presentations.

Written Communication

- Write with clarity and precision using correct English grammar: mechanics (punctuation) and usage (sentence structure and vocabulary).
• Correctly and ethically present scholarly writings utilizing the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (APA).

**Disciplined Inquiry**

• Exercise critical thinking strategies, including scientific and quantitative reasoning, problem solving, analysis and evaluation.

**Academic Programs**

Each academic program has specified competencies in the following areas:

• Information literacy as related to one's academic discipline.

• Ethics as related to one's academic discipline.

• Three or four additional program competencies as determined by the College.

**Note:** Additional competencies may be included as per external accreditation requirements.

**Graduate Competencies**

It is intended that students will have an advanced level of applicable knowledge in the following areas as appropriate to one's field of study:

**Oral Communication**

• Speak with confidence, clarity, and conciseness.

• Research, prepare, and deliver professional presentations.

**Written Communication**

• Write with clarity and precision using correct English grammar: mechanics (punctuation) and usage (sentence structure and vocabulary).

• Correctly and ethically present scholarly writings utilizing the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (APA).
Disciplined Inquiry

Effectively apply appropriate processes of inquiry (such as quantitative, qualitative and scientific reasoning) in order to gather and analyze complex issues and construct logical conclusions.

Information Literacy

- Access and use information effectively, efficiently, and appropriately.
- Evaluate the quality of sources and content.
- Use technology to effectively locate and communicate information.

Ethics

- Demonstrate knowledge and application of prescribed ethical code(s) and/or behaviors promoted by the profession.

Additional Program Competencies

- Two or three additional Program Competencies as prescribed by the College.

Note: Additional competencies may be included as per external accreditation requirements.
## Program Review/Accreditation Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Programs</th>
<th>Accreditor or Program Review (PR)</th>
<th>Current Accreditation/Review Date</th>
<th>Next Program review Cycle</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>2012/2013</td>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences - Liberal Studies</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business (all programs)</td>
<td>IACBE</td>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education (all programs)</td>
<td>CAEP (NCATE)</td>
<td>2012/2013</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health Professions</td>
<td>CCNE</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health Professions - Allied Health</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012/2013</td>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Programs</th>
<th>Accreditor or Program Review (PR)</th>
<th>Current Accreditation/Review Date</th>
<th>Next Program review Cycle</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Business (all programs)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education (all programs)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012/2013</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health Professions</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014/2015*</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>*DNP initial accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences - MHC</td>
<td>CACREP</td>
<td>2013/2014</td>
<td>2014/2015*</td>
<td>*Interim report due to CACREP April 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012/2013</td>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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