Program Name (DEGREE)

Annual Program Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Section I: Program Information

1. Program Faculty

Year in Review	Program	Chair	Faculty Member(s)

2. Professional Advisory Group

Report members below:

Meeting Date(s):			
#	Members	Organization	Title
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			

Section II: Closing the Loop

1. Summary of "Closing the Loop" on Last Year's Annual Program Improvement Plan

a. In the following table, list last year's planned program improvements
b. Informed by data, evaluate the effect of the change (use KPA data, observations, etc. as appropriate)
c. Use this rating scale to score each action in the "Concern Addressed" column

5	4	3	2	1
• Change was addressed • Data was collected • Changes were effective and no further action is needed	• Change was addressed • Data was collected • Additional monitoring is needed	• Change was addressed • Data was collected • No evidence of effectiveness	• Change was addressed • No additional data was collected to determine if the change was successful	Not addressed

Last Year's Annual Program Improvements					Closing the Loop
#	Action	Data Source	Person Reporting	Timeline for Implementation	Concern Addressed (Rate 1 – 5)
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					

**Actions that receive a score of 1 – 4 in "Concern Addressed" are required to be included on this year's improvement plan*

2. “Closing the Loop” | Detailed Description

Please provide one or two detailed descriptions of how you have “Closed the Loop”. These examples are used for department/school, college, professional accreditation, and Higher Learning Commission accreditation reports.

Describe in detail:

a. The initial issue to be addressed – reference data
b. The changes made
c. The effect of these changes both positive and negative – reference data

Example of using data to “Close the Loop” (view more examples in Section VI):

*In the College of Education, Elementary Education (B.Ed.), students scored a **220.59 average** on the written constructed response in the Oklahoma Subject Area Test compared with a **221.1 state average**. In response, the faculty began integrating in-depth writing tasks aligned with professional examinations in several core courses. In addition, the faculty provided students with exemplary examples of written assignments, encouraged them to have non-education majors read their papers, required them to submit work to the on-campus writing lab, and provided them with test preparation through the Teacher Candidate Leadership Association. Scores on the section improved to a **234.5 average**.*

1	
2	

Section III: Current Year Data Review

1. Professional Advisory Group Recommendations

Report recommendations below:

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	

2. Key Program Assessment Data

a. **Professional Outcomes**
   i. By Professional Outcome
   ii. By Key Program Assessment & Criterion (Rubric Line)
   iii. By Criterion (Rubric Line)
b. **General Education Outcomes**
c. **University Outcomes**

3. Strengthening University Outcomes

How did you develop curriculum and instruction to strengthen one of the University outcomes of Spiritual Integrity, Personal Resilience, Intellectual Pursuit, Global Engagement and Bold Vision?

University Outcome	Curriculum and Instruction Improvement

4. Other Data

Other significant data sources *(see Section V: Appendices for examples):*

	Data (Department meeting minutes, research, assessment day activities, accreditation reports, student surveys, alumni surveys, market reports, cocurricular assessment, etc.)	**Recommendations for Continuous Improvement**
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		

Section IV: New Annual Improvement Plan

List your improvement plan for this year.

- If Key Program Assessment (KPA) scores are low please address these in your plan
- Include all actions that received a score of 1-4 under "*Concerns Addressed*" in the *Summary of "Closing the Loop" on Last Year's Annual Program Improvement Plan*

Year:				
#	**Action**	**Data Source**	**Person Reporting**	**Timeline for Implementation**
1				
2				
3				

Section V: New Program & Teach-Out

If this is the first or last year the program will be listed in the academic catalog, please complete this section.

Please provide the rationale, data, and documentation that describe why this program is opening or closing:

#	Rationale	Data	Documentation (include as attachment)
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

Section VII: Appendices

Possible appendices addressing continuous improvement of the program may include:

- Academic Research
- Professional Accreditation Self-Study & Response
- Meeting Minutes
  - Assessment meeting
  - Department meeting (containing program specific references)
  - Professional Advisory group meeting
- Survey Results
  - Alumni survey
  - Student opinion survey
  - Senior exit
- Reports
  - Market research
  - News releases/articles
- Professional Exam Results

Section VIII: "Closing the Loop" Examples

- In the College of Arts and Cultural Studies, the assessment indicated **a low score (2.98/4.00) for the Dance (B.A.) program's outcome #1**, which evaluates students' ability to create and defend choreographic works. To improve this area, faculty members added a more comprehensive study in the element of time and gave music restrictions to choreography projects. They also added three self-assessments where students reflected on their accomplishments. **By 2020, the score for this outcome increased to 3.80/4.00.**
- In the College of Business, the Management (B.S.) program draws data from the Strategic Management (MGT 431) course for program outcomes three, four, and six. In the course, students demonstrate an understanding of firms' operations within industries from a macro perspective and the implementation of strategic planning. **In fall 2018, scores were below the target of 3.5**. Faculty recognized the need to improve the course by requiring teams to focus on one case (instead of the multiple cases used previously) to focus on continuous improvement quality rather than quantity. Professors also split up the teams into small working groups rather than using only large teams. Scores improved over the following years:

Management (B.S.) Program Outcome	**Fall 2018** *(out of 4.00)*	**Spring 2021** *(out of 4.00)*
#3	**3.37**	**3.79**
#4	**3.29**	**3.81**
#6	**3.13**	**4.00**

- In the College of Health Sciences, graduates from the Nursing (B.S.) program **in 2017 had an NCLEX-RN licensure pass rate of 79.55 percent, below the national average of 87.12 percent**. Faculty members began (1) using instant feedback devices (clickers) in the classroom to increase engagement, (2) integrating Assessment Technology Institute (ATI) modules to focus on NCLEX-RN test preparation, and (3) increasing the number of individual faculty-student meetings to review study habits. **By 2018, the average NCLEX-RN pass rate rose to 94 percent and remains above the national average.**
- In the College of Science and Engineering, **upper-division students in the Engineering (B.S.) program (2017) earned scores of 2.68/4.00** for Engineering outcome (a), the ability "to apply knowledge of mathematics, science, and engineering" due to a persistent struggle with vectors and free-body diagrams. The Engineering faculty members refocused the entry-level Physics course homework assignments to reinforce applied problem-solving, specifically with vectors. Primarily based on the changes, the **Physics final exam scores increased from 66.8 percent in 2017 to 91.0 percent in 2022**.
- In the College of Theology and Ministry, **the Undergraduate Department faculty have been tracking persistently low scores for "Style and Format," with 2.88/4.00 in 2018-19, 3.29 in 2019-20, and 2.93 in 2020-21**. Following an assessment of the problem from an overall program point-of-view, faculty members have identified that using multiple format styles (e.g., Turabian, SBL, and APA) in different courses may lead to student confusion. **In 2022, the faculty-initiated a thorough revision of the Undergraduate Style manual and are implementing it in Spring 2023. Results of these changes are forthcoming.**