	SU	2021 Academic Program Assessment Report		Program current assessment plan here:		nt-and-student-learning/_doc/2019/report/biology-bs-assessment-plan-2019.pdf						
PU	JEBLO	Biology BS		Program prior assessment report here:			rt/biology-bs-assessment-report-2020.p					
Report Completed	d By:	Jeff Smith										
Date Report Comp	oleted:											
Faculty members i Assessment:	involved in this											
graduate program in	n your department.) Plea	se also submit any addenda su	ogram below. (Separate sheet for uch as rubrics which are not availa as well as faculty peer reviewers.									
Brief Statement of and Goals:	f Program Mission											
recommendations	•	learning. Use Column H to	luding processes, results, and describe improvements									
	1 Os ara pastad hara	P. When was this SIO last	C. What method was used	D. Who was assessed?	E What is the expected	F. What were the results of	G. What were the	H. What				
verbatim from you Please enter info in	GLOs are pasted here ur assessment plan. in columns B-H only d during this annual	reported on prior to this cycle? (semester and year)	for assessing the SLO? Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.	Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved (N).	E. What is the expected proficiency level and how many or what proportion of students should be at that level?	the assessment? (Include the proportion of students meeting proficiency.)	department's conclusions about student performance?	changes/improvements to				
<ol> <li>Students will develop and application of conce terminology in molecular evolutionary and ecolog</li> </ol>	ar, cellular, organismal,	3 June 2020	SLO 1. Administer the GRE to each class of First Year Seminar (BIOL 171) for baseline assessment. Administer the GRE and MFAT exam to each class of Senior Seminar (BIOL 493).	Fourty graduating seniors (2020) received the MFAT exam at the end of spring semester BIO171 GRE, n = 17, 1 section. 493 section n = 14.	Our goal is to have 75% of our senior students score at 70% or higher on the GRE in the BIOL 493 class, and to have 75% of our senior students score at or above 50% of National percentile on the MFAT exam.	For the MFAT exam, 51% of students scored at or above 50th percentile.	We failed to meet our goal when using the the MFAT exam. using the GRE results.	The department discussed the result and determined that an improvement would be to increase our delivery of cell biology materials. A process to develop a curriculum map was initiated to more finely evalute where the gaps in instruction are.				
	o applied scientific skills atory experience and data					The first year BIO 171 sudents scored 28.5% (50 questions) on the GRE exam. Graduating seniors scored 42+/- 2.5%. None scored above the 70% level.						
	o skills in reading and c literature and in presenting tely in oral and written form.											
	strate critical thinking and sing experimental design d.	This was the first time	Written artifacts from each class of College Biology I (BIOL 181 Lab) were collected and compared to the same skills during the junior or senior year in Microbiology (BIOL 301 Lab), Cell Biology (BIOL 412/Lab), Plant Physiology (BIOL 412/Lab), Plant Physiology (BIOL 412/Lab), Plant Usrtebrate Physiology (BIOL 414 Lab). I addition, faculty completed a rubric for each student in Senior Seminar (BIOL 493) that assessed critical thinking based on their operation of the scientific method within their Senior Capstone Oral Presentation and their written Senior Capstone Research Proposal.		Our goal was to have our students show increased proficiency across the course of the 4-year curriculum. For the capstone course, our goal was to have at least 80% of our senior students be at Proficient level.	Students showed clear improvement over the course of the 4 year curriculum. Students failed to meet the goal in the capstone course.	It was determined that a revision of the rubric for the capstone course, or a revision of the artifact parameters to better match the rubric would be needed.	The department met and discussed the outcome, initiating a revision of the assessment process for this SLO, and a curriculum mapping process to better evaluate potential gaps in departmental curriculum.				
Commonto or com	<b>+ 1.</b>											
Comments on part	ti:											
	are those that were ba	e data-informed change to sed on, or implemented to	-									

address in this cycle? Please include SLOs verbatim from the assessment plan, as above.	data which informed the change? Please indicate the semester and year.	recommendations for change from the previous assessment column H and/or feedback?	change acted upon?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?		
SL01	Spring 2020	The department planned to discuss the result in the fall of 2020 determine whether the goals are too high, or whether there is a deficiency that needs to be addressed.		none		
SL04	This was the first time	N/A				
Comments on part II:						

Summary of CSL	J-Pueblo Biology [	epartment's Bac	helor's Degree SI	O4 Assessment:	Completed 2021										
SLO4															
senior year in Mi to have our stud (BIOL 493) that v	crobiology (BIOL 3 ents show increase vill assess their cri	01 Lab), Cell Biolo d proficiency dur ical thinking base	ogy (BIOL 412/Lab ing all these evalued on their operat	b), Plant Physiolog uations. I addition tion of the scientif	BIOL 181 Lab) and gy (413 Lab), and/o h, faculty will comp fic method within t for students be at 1	or Vertebrate Phy lete a rubric for e heir Senior Capst	siology (BIOL 4141 ach student in Ser	Lab). Our goal is nior Seminar							
Summary															
	-	-	-		em skills with the f	ollowing specific	aims:								
	rease in proficienc														
					t for 80% of gradu										
The method use	d a rubric (p.3) to	assess attributes o	of critical thinking	g and problem-sol	ving skills among 6	courses taken ov	ver the 4-year spa	n of the curriculu	ım.						
Roughly 100 writ	tten artifacts, distr	ibuted across the	6 courses, were a	assessed by 11 ins	structors in the de	partment.									
A score sheet wa	is used to evaluate	performance in e	each category def	fined in the rubric											
Faculty met to di	iscuss the outcom	es and made reco	mmendations.												
Main results.															
An increase in st	udent proficiency	over the 6 course	s was clearly appa	arent.											
The 80% benchn	nark was not reach	ed.													
Areas for improv	ing the assessmer	t methodology.													
The SLO has an e	error that should b	e corrected in the	wording of the f	irst line, which sh	ould read "critical	thinking and prob	lem-solving skills								
Artifacts from BI	OL 493 did not ma	tch the rubric wel	II in the last two o	ategories about o	lata interpretation	. Either the artifa	ct or the rubric sh	ould be changed	to match.						
The last two cate	gories in the rubr	c were not clearly	/ differentiated. T	he rubric will be	edited (pp. 4-5).										
Detailed results															
for each course.	The courses are p	esented on the o	rdinate in chrono	logical order to m		on of the 4-year l	biology curriculun	n. Clear upward ti	ifacts which demo rends for each ber						
strategies" categ include actual re meet "the depar	ory. In the rubric, search "results", a	this category was nd so would not a 80% of our senio	identified by facu appropriately mat	ulty as poorly diffe tch the rubric. The	erentiated from th erefore, it was unc	e category "evalu lear whether the	ate results". It was rubric-artifact inte	s also identified t erface, or student	worst performanc hat the artifact, be t achievement, wa ether the artifact v	eing a research pro s the cause of the	posal, did not failure to				
Below is the rub	ric that was used.														
Scoring was 4.3.3	2,1 for each colum	n with 5 benchma	arks.												
Below is a propo	sed edited rubric														
	BENCHMARK	Excellent = 4	Proficient = 3	Developmental = 2	Ineffective = 1										

			Articulates a partial, weak, or													
1)	A) Understanding of research significance and	Articulates a clear and comprehensive understanding of the significance of the research hypothesis Utilizes and integrate multiple sources to support the research significance and experimental design Background and significance and materials presented are matched and appropriate for the research	understanding of the significance of the research	Attempts to articulates an understanding of the significance of the research but is not compelling Fragmented and insufficient support of the research from the literature Partial, fragmented, and fragmented, and fragmented, and fragmented, and design	Significance of the research is not articulated Support from the literature is absent or mostly fails to support the research information is taken from inappropriate source(s)											
		Hypothesis is clearly stated, is testable, and omits extraneous or confusing additional information	Hypothesis is well-stated, is testable, but is presented with some confusing or extraneous elements	Hypothesis statement is clearly deficient in easily identifiable ways, involves confusing ideas unrelated to the hypothesis, is not completely												
	B) understanding of specific aims and methodology and	Aims dissect and directly flow from the hypothesis, would test it entirely, methods would achieve each aim	break it down into its component elements, the methods are directed at the aims but would incompletely test them	Aims would not	Hypothesis is very poorly articulated or untestable											
2) INTEGRATED RESEARCH DESIGN	understanding of how different components of	Aims and methods contain all hypothetical elements, do not create elements not presented in the hypothesis, and match the significance	Aims and methods mostly match the hypothetical elements and significance with some inconsistencies identifiable	Aims and methods do not flow from the hypothesis, are largely unrelated to it, or the stated significance of the research	Aims or methods are missing											
	A) Contextual summary of the products of the proposed or reported science and B) Significance of the scientific products	Each of the aim- driven scientific results produced or anticipated is understoad in the context of the current literature with appropriate citations included The significance of the real or anticipated scientific results described is specifically linked to the research design	Most, but not all, of the real or anticipated results are understood in the context of the	Anticipated or real results are poorly understood or described, literature support is weak or absent sweak or absent only a slight or marginal reference to the significance of the anticipated or real results, stated significance does not relate to the experimental design												
3) CRITICAL	C) Pitfalls, alternative	Potential pitfalls or interpretive disparities are identified and discussed with literature support; pitfalls are not confused with biases	Pitfalls are confused with biases, Ockham's razor principles not used in interpretations	Bias in expected results is mainly presented, pitfalls not identified, obvious alternative possibilities not addressed, Ockham failure	Results not addressed in any meaningful way											
The scoring sheet	would use a 1A,	1Bdesign refle	ecting 9 benchmar	ks evenly distribu	ited into 3 broad o	ategories pointed	d at assessing the students grasp o	f 1) the theoretical	foundation for a p	articular scientifi	c project, 2) the integrated elemen	ts of a scientific r	esearch design, an	d 3) how to critic	ally interpret real or anticipated sc	ientific results.
nis SLO will be n	eassessed in the s	pring of 2023.														