Unit Name: Department of Biology Assessment Summary
Fall 2008-Spring 2009

Chair: Dr. Spencer Cortwright

Describe the assessment plan and procedures currently in place in your unit, noting the specific outcomes measured, measurement tools used, and parties responsible for collection, analysis, and action.

Note: include the full ‘loop’ of assessment from student learning outcome through targets for improvement and change.

The Department of Biology has four primary student learning outcomes for our Majors:

1. Students will obtain a firm foundation and advanced study in all important sub-fields of biology.
2. Students will learn critical evaluation of new scientific results and incorporate key findings into their base of knowledge.
3. Students will conceive and perform biological experiments that include data collection, data analysis and interpretation, and synthesis of findings.
4. Students will learn effective communication via scientific writing of research reports, essay exams, and grants; and via oral presentation of scientific studies.

We assess these goals in the following ways.

**Capstone Course** – This is a generally small, senior-level course that requires students to demonstrate in-depth scientific achievement. Students must master reading and comprehension of primary literature in preparation for exams, must write a detailed paper focusing on use of primary literature, and must make connections among a wide variety of sub-fields in Biology on exams. Because of the small size of the class, student achievement on these counts is readily monitored and course goals emphasized.

**Upper-Level Exams** – Each course features exams using a variety of short answer and essay questions that address student skills in the four outcomes.

**Senior Seminar** – This seminar varies from one semester to another, but either requires students to prepare a grant proposal or present an oral presentation of a primary research project (actual research or literature research).

**GPA & Standardized Test Scores** – We ask students to volunteer information on their professional test scores (e.g. MCAT, DAT, GRE, etc.), which we compare to GPA. We seek a positive correlation between the two and over the past 15 years we have been pleased with the correlation. More thorough record-keeping can firm our interpretations of the trend.
The department also serves Nursing and Allied Health students. We frequently discuss how students are performing in these classes, with the goal of identifying any needed adjustments to the curriculum. For example, in our Anatomy & Physiology courses we keep close track of DWF rates and institute course changes as perceived necessary. Addition of discussion sections is one way we have modified our anatomy and physiology courses.

**Chart / describe the data collection, analysis, and reporting cycles in your unit assessment plan.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Activity</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Timetable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of theoretical concepts per dept. student learning goals</td>
<td>In-depth short answer or essay tests, research papers, laboratory exercises with lab reports, capstone papers / projects</td>
<td>Dept. chair &amp; full-time faculty work together</td>
<td>Assessment info discussed at monthly dept. meet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of applied concepts, per dept. student learning goals</td>
<td>Some course projects have applied applications. Students earn internships, discussions with students.</td>
<td>Dept. chair &amp; full-time faculty work together</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of research and analytical skills per dept. student learning goals</td>
<td>Lab &amp; field exercises, independent research projects, both of which require written scientific papers and / or scientific presentations</td>
<td>Dept. chair &amp; full-time faculty work together</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical evaluation of biological research, per dept. student learning goals</td>
<td>Capstone course requires intensive critical analysis of primary literature research on exams and in research papers</td>
<td>Dept. chair &amp; full-time faculty work together</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 new improvement target areas suggested for next yr. – congruent with dept., gen ed, &amp; campus student learning outcomes</td>
<td>Dept. meetings will continue focus on student success in L101. Survey data correlate with DWF rate, so we will plan course adjustments accordingly.</td>
<td>Dept. chair &amp; full-time faculty work together</td>
<td>New efforts discussed during 09-10 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In one brief paragraph, indicate the data you collected and the results (what specifically did your assessment yield for the things you worked to improve?)**

During 08-09 we implemented a survey taken by our L101 classes. The survey featured 10 questions of fundamental scientific and biological knowledge. We found that a score of 6 correct or lower correlated well with DWF rate. We found that only about 50% of students score a C- or better as a final grade. Combining results of the survey and the percentage of students scoring C- or better, we need to address this course. Our first attempt was to urge students receiving a low survey score to take L100 as preparation for L101. Few did, perhaps it is a pride issue. We are now considering requiring a 5 session late summer preparation course for students entering L101 in Fall 2010, but that will be finalized during spring 2010. We find that C- or better rates in L211 approach 60%, so once students make it through the freshman sequence, they do better though
not yet acceptably so. As for upper level classes, we have recently had more money to spend on equipment so our labs should be improving, though it is too early to tell if that effect is helping student progress.