Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program Name (no acronyms): Emergency Management	Department: Emergency Management / SPS
Degree: or	

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 the importance of developing policies across abroad 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 an emergency management background 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

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

- Canvas Course program templates
- Coordinated teaching of subjects
- Improvements in technology
- Prerequisites
- Course sequence
- Coordinate with industry Core Competencies

Changes to the Assessment Plan

- Added course learning outcomes
- Artifacts of student learning
- Internalize evaluation process in Canvas
- 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