

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program Name (no acronyms): Emergency Management	Department: Emergency Management / SPS
Degree or Certificate Level: Undergrad, Certificate	College/School: School for Professional Studies
Date (Month/Year): May 2021	Primary Assessment Contact: Shawn Steadman
In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? Academic year 2020-2021	
In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2020	

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle? (Please list the actual learning outcome statements and not just numbers, e.g., Outcomes 1 and 2.)

Comprehend emergency management and homeland security principles that impact local, regional, national and global communities. (SLO 1)

Examine the professional role of the emergency manager. (SLO 2)

Apply the fundamental principles of emergency management across its core phases of mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery. (SLO 5)

2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please identify the course(s) in which these artifacts were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

SLO 1

EMGT1500 – Fundamentals of Emergency Management – Quizzes and Final Exam

SLO 2

EMGT1500 – Fundamentals of Emergency Management – Quizzes and Final Exam

SLO 5

EMGT1600 – Managing Natural, Man-Made and Technological Disaster – Case Studies

EMGT1710 – First Responder and Healthcare Coordination in High Impact Disasters – Emergency Management Plan Analysis

EMGT2900 – Emergency Management Fundamentals Practicum – Final Exercise

**All courses were taught 100% online

3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and include them in/with this report.

Instructors were sent a Qualtrics survey at the end of their courses to collect data about student performance and artifacts used to assess learning outcomes. Data was then pulled from Qualtrics to analyze and make changes as needed to assessment of learning outcomes.

4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

Instructors reported that many of the artifacts had properly assessed student learning outcomes for their specific courses, but some minor adjustments might be needed; which will be explained further in section 5 of this report.

Most instructors used quizzes, case studies, final exams and final projects as their assessment tool and felt it was appropriate for the type of students in these classes. Findings showed:

- 1) Students were able to evaluate methods used to develop policies for emergency management and homeland security. They understood the phases and the importance of developing policies across a broad spectrum of local, state and federal agencies.
- 2) The students developed a working knowledge of how agencies and organizations in both the public and private sectors must work together in fulfilling the objectives of the Presidential Policy Directives for the United States of America.
- 3) Students were able to critically evaluate performances of organizations and agencies during disasters and improve upon future deployments and mitigation efforts.
- 4) Students successfully demonstrated their ability to provide gap analysis in plans through the development of exercises to test and evaluate those plans.
- 5) Case study/real-life scenarios in discussions and assignments were extremely helpful. Students expressed in their reflections how previous incident analysis help them strengthen their knowledge and theory. During the discussions, students who don't have emergency management backgrounds benefited from their peers' input in their postings who hold positions currently in the emergency management field.

There is a special personal excitement amongst students in the program that encourages them to achieve higher grades than in typical college courses. The concept of having the ability to save lives resonates strong in our student population.

****All courses were taught online, so there is no difference in teaching modality to note****

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

As discussed in section 4, the data has largely supported that the learning outcomes have been supported by the artifacts chosen. However, there is always room for improvement. Some suggestions made by instructors about possible ways to strengthen learning outcomes are as follows:

- 1) Update rubrics for artifact assessment to be more specific with components being assessed.
- 2) Review software used in courses for updated versions or other competitor software for a variety of options
- 3) Incorporate the embedded Canvas course assessment tool for detailed analysis of course learning objectives in the future.

6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

Faculty are provided with opportunities to share quantitative and qualitative feedback at the end of the term (eight week terms) they taught the course. The faculty also meet on a semi-annual basis to discuss the learning outcomes for the program and how their course affects those outcomes. Updates and modifications are discussed in these faculty meetings.

B. How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies

- Course content
- Teaching techniques
- Improvements in technology
- Prerequisites

- Course sequence
- New courses
- Deletion of courses
- Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings

Changes to the Assessment Plan

- Student learning outcomes
- Artifacts of student learning
- Evaluation process

- Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)
- Data collection methods
- Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of these findings.

We will be reviewing the course offerings and update frequency as necessary.
Add instructor feedback section to canvas outcomes where data is collected.
Review program-level learning outcomes in courses to assess changes that might be necessary.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

NA

7. Closing the Loop: Review of Previous Assessment Findings and Changes

A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

We are moving to the embedded Canvas learning objectives assessments.

B. How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

Faculty provided quantitative and qualitative feedback at the end of the term (eight week terms) they taught the course. The embedding of the Canvas learning outcome assessment will be evaluated next assessment cycle on its implementation.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

Standard rubrics for the different types of assignments need to be updated. For example, papers, exercises, case studies, etc.. need to have specific and consistent rubrics that all program instructors use.

D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

We will continue to assess and improve based upon the various evaluation methods.

**IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools (e.g., rubrics) with this report.
Rubrics attached below**