Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name (no acronyms): Emergency Management</th>
<th>Department: Emergency Management / SPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree or Certificate Level: Undergrad Degree</td>
<td>College/School: School for Professional Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (Month/Year): Sept 2023</td>
<td>Primary Assessment Contact: Shawn Steadman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? Academic year 2023
In what year was the program’s assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2021

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. (SLO1) |
| Examine the professional role of the emergency manager. (SLO2) |

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, Exams and Semester Paper
EMGT 4830 – Computer Modeling for Emergency Planning and Management – Quizzes, Assignments, Final Project

SLO 2
EMGT1500 – Fundamentals of Emergency Management – Quizzes, Exams and Semester Paper

**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 tool(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and include them in/with this report.

Instructors were sent a survey at the end of their courses to collect data about student performance and artifacts used to assess learning outcomes. Data was then pulled to analyze and make changes as needed to the 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, especially since the courses were now included in the university CORE, which will be explained further in section 5 of this report.

Most instructors used quizzes, case studies, final exams, and final projects or papers as their assessment tools 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 private, 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 to fulfill the objectives of the Presidential Policy Directives for the United States of America.

3) Students were able to evaluate organizations and agencies' performances during disasters critically and improve upon future deployments and mitigation efforts.

4) Students successfully demonstrated their ability to provide gap analysis in plans through the development of Threat Identification and Hazard Analysis (THIRA) to test and evaluate those plans.

5) Case studies/real-life scenarios in discussions and assignments were extremely helpful. Students expressed in their reflections how previous incident analysis helped 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 strongly 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) Continue to assess rubrics for artifact assessment to be more universal across the program.
3) Continue to standardize course delivery in Canvas through improved universal templates.
4) Canvas-embedded assessment tools used to assess the student’s progress toward Program Learning Objectives (PLOs) and Course Learning Objectives (CLOs) were ineffective, and we support the use of the SPS-designed course assessment tool.
5) Continue to submit and receive approval for CORE course recognition status.

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 meets semi-annually to discuss the program's learning outcomes and how their course affects those outcomes. Updates and modifications are discussed in
these faculty meetings. In addition, one-on-one conversations are held with adjunct faculty throughout the year.

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
- Continue to update Canvas
- Course program templates.
- Coordinated teaching of subjects
- Improvements in technology
- Add GIS as a modeling tool

Changes to the Assessment Plan
- Continue to collect artifacts from the students.
- Apply the SPS assessment tool throughout all the courses.
- Continue to standardize course evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)

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

We will be reviewing the course offers and updating the frequency as necessary. 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 have moved to the SPS course learning objectives assessments and have moved away from the Canvas internal assessment tool.

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) when they instructed the course.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

Standard rubrics for the different types of assignments are continuing to be updated. For example, papers, exercises, case studies, etc. will 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 on the various evaluation methods.

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

Rubrics attached below