|  |
| --- |
| **Assurance of Student Learning Report****2023-2024** |
| *Ogden College of Science and Engineering* | *Department of Biology* |
| *Biology (617)* |
| *Michael Smith, Program Coordinator; Kerrie McDaniel, Doug McElroy, Assessment Coordinators* |
| ***Is this an online program***? [ ]  Yes [x]  No | Please make sure the Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf . Indicate verification here [x]  Yes, they match! (If they don’t match, explain on this page under **Assessment Cycle)** |

**\*\*\* Please include Curriculum Map as part of this document (at the end), NOT as a separate file.**

|  |
| --- |
| ***Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages. Add more Outcomes as needed.*** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 1:**  Graduates will demonstrate a level of biological content knowledge appropriate to their degree level. |
| **Instrument 1** | Biology Assessment Exam |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | **[ ]  Met** | **[x]  Not Met** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 2:**  Graduates will demonstrate an understanding of research ethics and the responsible conduct of research. |
| **Instrument 1** | CITI Responsible Conduct of Research Course modules |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 3:**  Graduates will demonstrate the ability to apply scientific methodology and field/laboratory/analytical skills to a biological question. |
| **Instrument 1** | Representative biology process artifact selected by the student from their required Biology Process Course or Biology Independent Research Experience |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | **[ ]  Met** | **[x]  Not Met** |
| **Assessment Cycle Plan:**  |
| During 2023-24 and consistent with it’s five-year assessment plan, the Department of Biology Program Review/Assessment Committee (the ‘Committee’) and faculty (1) assessed 2022-23 artifacts for all SLOs and analyzed results from those assessments; and (2) developed and approved recommendations for program improvements based on assessment findings. These follow-up actions will be undertaken during the 2024-25 academic year, and be fully implemented by Fall 2025. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 1** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome**  | **Graduates will demonstrate a level of biological content knowledge appropriate to their degree level.** |
| **Measurement Instrument 1**  | **Biology Assessment Exam**The Biology Assessment Exam is an instrument, newly developed in 2020-21, designed to assess content knowledge within the program discipline. The exam is constructed around 14 vignettes, 2 each representing the six major areas of emphasis in our core curriculum (Cells, Metabolism, Genetics, Ecology, Evolution, Diversity); in 2022-23, the assessment exam was expanded to also include 2 vignettes addressing topics related to molecular biotechnology, immunology, and microbiology.These major areas are literally the elements introduced in our required introductory course sequence (BIOL 120/121 and BIOL 122-123), and reinforced in our restricted elective core choices at the 200-level (BIOL 222/223, 224/225, or 226/227) and 300-level (BIOL 319/322 or 327/337 and BIOL 315 or 316). Free elective courses at the 300- and 400-levels provide students the opportunity to further master these topics in more specific contexts aligned with their individual professional interests. Within each area of emphasis, there are 2 vignettes that are associated with 9 multiple-choice questions. Three (3) questions each test student content knowledge at the introductory, developing, and mastery level. In each area, several questions require interpretation of tables and/or figures, and assess students’ ability to apply the scientific process. This exam design allows for redundant assessment of knowledge by area of emphasis as well as mastery level; in addition, it provides the ability to carry out a meta-analysis of higher-order knowledge and skills such as correct interpretation of data and application of the scientific process.The exam is given either electronically or in-person as part of BIOL 489, our required program capstone course that is taken by students during their final semester at WKU prior to graduation.  |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students will score at least 50% or higher, with the score on Introductory-level items at least 60%. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | At least 75% of students will attain the criterion level of success. | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 57.8% of students attained the criterion level of success, with 39.1% meeting the sub-criterion. The sample size was 64.  |
| **Methods**  | Given that the assessment instrument has been utilized through only 2 assessment cycles (and modified in-between in accordance with follow-up activities derived from analysis of the 2020-21 assessment results), we are reluctant to draw too many conclusions or implications from patterns in the scores within and among content areas. Nevertheless, we can summarize the patterns based on this assessment. Across all mastery levels, students as a group performed best on questions related to the BIOL 120/121 content - metabolism (63.0% correct responses), genetics (55.4%), and cells (53.9%), and somewhat lower on BIOL 122/123 content – evolution (52.6%), ecology (47.5%), and diversity (44.9%). This distribution of scores across content areas makes sense with respect to emphasis of students in the program. Most 617 majors are preprofessional and take elective classes in cell and molecular biology; however, it is a bit different from the pattern observed during the 2020-21 assessment cycle. Overall, students performed worst on the new module related to biotechnology, immunology, and microbiology (42.0%); again, this is not surprising, as these topics are more specialized and targeted at students in our Molecular Biotechnology and Medical Laboratory Science programs.Across all content areas, student performance on introductory-level questions was 56.6%, 47.6% on intermediate-level items, and 49.8% on mastery-level items; this pattern was consistent with that observed during the 2020-21 assessment cycle.  |
| **Based on your results, highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | **[ ]  Met** | **[x]  Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** |
| **Results and Conclusions:** The2021-22 follow-up activity incorporating the new module into the assessment instrument was fulfilled, and met the intent. Our assessment results suggest it would be appropriate and valid to evaluate the extent to which key topics from BIOL 120/121 and BIOL 122/123 and other foundational courses (which form the basis of the assessment exam) are clearly scaffolded across the curriculum.**Actions:**1. The Committee analyzed 2022-23 assessment results and develop recommendations for program improvement to bring to program faculty. (Spring 2024)2. Program faculty reviewed and approved specific program improvement actions to be undertaken based on assessment findings. (Spring 2024).**Follow-Up:**1. The Committee will work with program faculty to evaluate the degree to which the coverage of important topics in foundational courses is adequate and aligned to promote student learning and success in subsequent courses. (Fall 2024).**Next Assessment Cycle:**2024-25 academic year |

|  |
| --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 2** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome**  | **Graduates will demonstrate an understanding of research ethics and the responsible conduct of research.** |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **CITI Responsible Conduct of Research Course Modules**The Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) is a web-based ethics training course for responsible conduct in research that has been adopted by the WKU IRB, IACUC, and IBS Committees as a prerequisite certification to be attained by any investigator seeking approval for a research project through one or more of these committees. All PIs, Co-PIs, and Faculty Sponsors are required to complete CITI RCR training and receive certification (based on a minimum score of 80%) across all course training modules. These module educate and evaluate researchers on up-to-date issues and standards of research ethics, research integrity, and researcher conduct.The Physical Science RCR Course used to assess this SLO consists of 7 individual modules: (1) Research Misconduct; (2) Data Management; (3) Authorship; (4) Peer Review; (5) Mentoring; (6) Conflicts of Interest; and (7) Collaborative Research. Within each module, participants review a multimedia presentation and several seminal articles related to the topic. At the end, participants demonstrate competency through a five-question multiple choice test, with test items randomly drawn from a larger question pool.Completion of CITI RCR training is required of all students enrolled in BIOL 489, our required program capstone course that is taken by students during their final semester at WKU prior to graduation. Students are required to submit (1) a Completion Certificate indicating that they have attained a minimum score of 80% across all course modules, and (2) individual module scores (percentage of questions answered correctly) from their first attempt. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students will attain the required minimum score for certification, with at least 60% correct answers on each module from their first attempt. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | At least 75% of students will attain the criterion level of success. | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 97.0% of students attained the criterion level of success. The sample size was 67. |
| **Methods**  | Students performed well across all seven modules that make up the assessment instrument, demonstrating a solid understanding of research ethics gained through completion of the CITI training course. However, comments from students included such statements as ‘I had no idea that…’ and ‘I wish I had known this earlier.’ These suggest that it would be beneficial for student learning and professional development to gain exposure to research ethics earlier in the curriculum. In so doing, the program could also enhance learning in this regard by scaffolding a series of increasingly-advanced levels of CITI training at various points thoughout the curriculum; this will both expand and deepen students’ exposure to research ethics issues. |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** |
| **Results and Conclusions:**  The2021-22 follow-up activity scaffolding relevant CITI modules into our core and restricted-elective curriculum is in process. Our assessment results suggest it is appropriate to ontinue with this plan.**Actions:**1. The Committee analyzed 2022-23 assessment results and develop recommendations for program improvement to bring to program faculty. (Spring 2024)2. Program faculty reviewed and approved specific program improvement actions to be undertaken based on assessment findings. (Spring 2024).**Follow-Up:**1. Require all students in BIOL 225 and 227 to complete the Basic Biosafety Course. (Fall 2024)2. Require all students in BIOL 322 and 337 to complete the NIH rDNA Guidelines Course or similar, appropriate CITI course. (Fall 2024)**Next Assessment Cycle:**2024-25 academic year |

|  |
| --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 3** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome**  | **Graduates will demonstrate the ability to apply scientific methodology and field/laboratory/analytical skills to a biological question.** |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **Representative Biology Process Artifact** All students in the program are required to successfully complete one of several approved process courses, which incorporate specific course SLOs related to application of the scientific process to address relevant questions in biology. In addition, many students undertake faculty-directed independent research. Both of these experiences yield artifacts – such as evidence and argument papers, research presentations or posters, Honors CE/T projects, or manuscripts – that allow for assessment of this SLO. As part of BIOL 489, students are required to submit the artifact from their process course(s) or independent research experience that they consider to be both representative of their best work as well as best aligned with the elements of the assessment rubric for this SLO.Artifacts are assessed by 2-person program faculty teams using the AAC&U LEAP Inquiry and Analysis rubric. Faculty teams independently assess each artifact they are assigned; when faculty ratings differ by more than 25% across all rubric elements, artifact ratings are reconciled either by a third reviewer or by discussion between team members. The Inquiry and Analysis rubric is attached to this report. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students will receive an rating of 3.0 or higher across all rubric elements, with no rubric element below 3 (out of 4). |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | At least 75% of students will attain the criterion level of success. | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 20.8% of students attained the criterion level of success, with 15.1% attained the sub-criterion. The sample size was 53. |
| **Methods**  | The mean overall rating was 2.0 out of 4.0, indicating a milestone level of performance across all rubric elements. The six rubric elements are divided into three sub-scores (2 elements each) reflecting different aspects of the SLO: (1) Evidence-gathering; (2) Analysis; and (3) Argumentation. Subscores were highest for evidence gathering (mean subscore 2.2 out of 4.0), followed by analysis (2.1) and argumentation (1.6). Student performance was lowest on the rubric element associated with drawing implications from their analysis, with a mean element score of 1.5. These score trends are not surprising, and are consistent with the Bloom’s taxonomic level of the different rubric elements; however, the absolute scores are below targeted levels. Nevertheless, the percentage of students meeting the criterion and sub-criterion were improved relative to the 2020-21 assessment cycle (13.6%, 9.1%), which may reflect increased emphasis on the artifacts within process courses. Additional years of data will be required to fully evaluate this hypothesis. |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | **[ ]  Met** | **[x]  Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** |
| **Results and Conclusions:**  The assessment process again revealed a very high level of variability in artifacts among science process courses from which they were drawn. This seems to indicate that faculty teaching these courses do not have a consistent set of expectations regarding what constitutes a valid capstone-level science process artifact. As a follow-up activity from the 2021-22 assessment cycle, program faculty developed and approved a set of minimum standards for the process artifact, effective Fall 2023; however, because students submit process artifacts for assessment during their last semester (drawn from process courses they took at an earlier point), there will be a time lag before we see any meaningful changes in student artifacts. Our assessment results from this cycle suggest that the next logical step would be for faculty teaching process courses to self-evaluate their assignment to ensure artifacts will address all of the approved minimum standards.**Actions:**1. The Committee analyzed 2022-23 assessment results and develop recommendations for program improvement to bring to program faculty. (Spring 2024)2. Program faculty reviewed and approved specific program improvement actions to be undertaken based on assessment findings. (Spring 2024).**Follow-Up:**1. The department will establish a framework and process within the department for faculty teaching process courses to self-evaluate and (as needed) correct their process course artifact assignments to meet established standards. (Fall 2024)**Next Assessment Cycle:**2024-25 academic year |

**INQUIRY AND ANALYSIS VALUE RUBRIC**

*for more information, please contact value@aacu.org*

**Definition**

Inquiry is a systematic process of exploring issues/' objects/works through the collection and analysis of evidence that result in informed conclusions/ judgments. Analysis is the process of breaking complex topics or issues into parts to gain a better understanding of them.

*Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or selection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level of performance.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Capstone****4** | **Milestones** **3 2** | **Benchmark****1** |
| **Topic selection** | Identifies a creative, focused, and manageable topic that addresses potentially significant yet previously less explored aspects of the topic. | Identifies a focused and manageable/doable topic that appropriately addresses relevant aspects of the topic. | Identifies a topic that while manageable/doable, is too narrowly focused and leaves out relevant aspects of the topic. | Identifies a topic that is far too general and wide-ranging as to be manageable and doable. |
| **Existing Knowledge, Research, and/or Views** | Synthesizes in-depth information from relevant sources representing various points of view/approaches. | Presents in-depth information from relevant sources representing various points of view/approaches. | Presents information from relevant sources representing limited points of view/approaches. | Presents information from irrelevant sources representing limited points of view/approaches. |
| **Design Process** | All elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are skillfully developed. Appropriate methodology or theoretical frameworks may be synthesized from across disciplines or from relevant subdisciplines. | Critical elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are appropriately developed; however, more subtle elements are ignored or unaccounted for. | Critical elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are missing, incorrectly developed, or unfocused. | Inquiry design demonstrates a misunderstanding of the methodology or theoretical framework. |
| **Analysis** | Organizes and synthesizes evidence to reveal insightful patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus. | Organizes evidence to important patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus. | Organizes evidence, but the organization is not effective in revealing important patterns, differences, or similarities. | Lists evidence, but it is not organized and/or is unrelated to focus. |
| **Conclusions** | States a conclusion that is a logical extrapolation from the inquiry findings. | States a conclusion focused solely on the inquiry findings. The conclusion arises specifically from and responds specifically to the inquiry findings. | States a general conclusion that, because it is so general, also applies beyond the scope of the inquiry findings. | States an illogical, or unsupportable conclusion from inquiry |
| **Limitations and Implications** | Insightfully discusses in detail relevant and supported limitations and implications. | Discusses relevant and supported limitations and implications. | Presents relevant and supported limitations and implications. | Presents limitations and implications, but they are possibly irrelevant and unsupported. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CURRICULUM MAP TEMPLATE** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Program name:** | 617 Biology |  |  |
| **Department:** | Biology |  |  |
| **College:** | Ogden |  |  |
| **Contact person:** | Michael Smith |  |  |
| **Email:** | michael.smith1@wku.edu |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |
| **KEY:** |  |  |  |  |
| **I = Introduced** |  |  |  |  |
| **R = Reinforced/Developed** |  |  |  |  |
| **M = Mastered** |  |  |  |  |
| **A = Assessed** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | **Learning Outcomes** |  |  |
|  |  |  | **LO1:** | **LO2:** | **LO3:** |
|   |  |  | Graduates will demonstrate a degree of biologcial content knowledge appropriate to their degree level. | Graduates will demonstrate the ability to apply scientific methodology and field/ laboratory/ analytical skills to a biological question. | Graduates will demonstrate an understanding of research ethics and responsible conduct of research. |
| **Course Subject** | **Number** | **Course Title** |   |   |   |
| BIOL | 120/121 | Biological Concepts: Cells Metabolism and Genetics Lecture/Lab | I | I | I |
| BIOL | 122/123 | Biological Concepts: Evolution, Diversity, and Ecology Lecture/Lab | I | I | I |
| BIOL | 222/223 | Plant Biology and Diversity Lecture/Lab | R |   | R |
| BIOL | 226/227 | Microbial Biology and Diversity Lecture/Lab | R |   | R |
| BIOL | 224/225 | Animal Biology and Diversity Lecture/Lab | R |   | R |
| BIOL | 319/322 | Introduction to Molecular and Cell Biology Lecture/Lab | R | R | M |
| BIOL | 327/337 | Genetics Lecture/Lab | R | R | M |
| BIOL | 315 | Ecology | R |   |   |
| BIOL | 316 | Evolution: Theory and Process | R |   |   |
| BIOL | 2xx | Approved Elective Courses in Biology | R | R |   |
| BIOL | 3xx | Approved Elective Courses in Biology | M |   |   |
| BIOL | 4xx | Approved Elective Courses in Biology | M |   |   |
| BIOL | 3xx/4xx | Approved Biology Process Courses |   | M |   |
| BIOL | 489 | Professional Aspects of Biology | A | A | A |