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)?

The Canvas outcomes 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 final projects as their assessment tool and felt it was appropriate for the type of students in these classes.

More specifically, we found the following for each LO:

LO 3 – 67 total artifacts assessed

Meets Standard - Student shows ability to demonstration knowledge of – 30 students met this level Approaches Standard - Student shows ability to demonstration knowledge of –4 students met this level Does Not Meet Standard - Student does **not** demonstrate knowledge of – 0 students met this level Did not report = 33

LO 4 – 38 total artifacts assessed

Meets Standard - Student shows ability to demonstration knowledge – 0 students met this level Approaches Standard - Student shows ability to demonstration knowledge of – 0 students met this level Does Not Meet Standard - Student does **not** demonstrate knowledge of – 0 students met this level Did not report = 38

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

5. Findings: Interpretations & Condusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you? Address both a) learning gaps and possible curricular or pedagogical remedies, and b) strengths of curriculum and pedagogy.

As discussed in section 4, the data has largely supported that the learning outcomes have been supported by the artifacts chosen. With this said, faculty are not all reporting assessment data in Canvas. This has prompted administration to reflect with all faculty directors in SPS to come up with a school wide plan moving forward.

Solution summary = Dr. Matt Grawitch is in the process of developing a school wide assessment tool that will be implemented in fall of 2023. This new assessment tool will more strictly monitored by program directors.

6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of <u>Ourrent</u> Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss the results and findings from this cycle of assessment? The Brewing Science & Operations program employees an external advisory board as part of it oversight process. All faculty teaching in the program are members of the board. In July of 2023, the board met to discuss operations, teaching, marketing, etc. A great ad-hoc discussion aaround course delivery and evaluation was had. As an outcome, all agreed that the program is delivering an applied and up-to-date program of student to the students.

It was, however, stressed that all faculty will need to report tangible data this coming year to support our discussion.

)0: Final Project Rub	ric				BREW1
Criteria			Ratings		Pts
inare C.Daath	Below Expectations	= . 15 pts :	Excellent		୧ ୬ର Needs Improvement
- A CATACINATION OF A			Collections of a continue of the	a instingting given in the line line in a second or	edenterioren grach en sufficie de stangte an
	. Ext	pti-	8-pfs Nead's Imprexament		0.pts BNIov -Expectations
				1-26212 175	
Anganication					
					en en la construction de la constru La construction de la construction d
	mathlenn ad fuil de saigh tenn, san saigh	s il emisselluquittisionnis.	be title Silve among Mean-		
йрій		läev			Real Processing Action VCS ac
wellin	n an tha tha an the second the strengt ment	March Internet and A Divers 1 American Constant Internet American American A Divers 1 American American American American A Diversity American American American A Diversity American A Diversity American A Diversity American A Diversity American A Diversity American A Diversity A Diversity American A Diversity A Diversity American A Diversity A Diversity A Diversity A Diversity A Diversity A Diversity A Diversity A Diversity A Diversity A Diversity A Diversity A Diversity A Diversity A Diversity A Diversity A	Titless-Topicitibus- 		

Brew 1500 Final Project Rubric

	Tole press, nee ReisenBauer B	Bienzels way major tranges tolik arres	t their assessment results.				
Pts	Criteria		Ratings				
	Paper		30 pts	18 pts		0 pts	
1et :	Parbia y Met		Did not meet		30 pts	 Proven must include. 1) An overview of journal entries 2) What went well? 	s to tell a 'story' of your brew.
pts		Presensition		30.pts		18 pts	meridikt som Obbiek ande beissenterer i neiterer G
		กรรณา และระบบ และระบบให้เหล่าที่มีสารสูบไป สารสีมีความสารสีมาณสมัยวิธีสารสีมากระบบไปเป	and the second	ner and an		an a	in the set of the set
5.pts	3į		0 pts			oftertaste of your beer	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	anges Paleor a indifferences and		man and the start for the same of the same	anter de la reira Main anterio	Hospitcheres.		antical of branching and for mental war war
	0 pts		Creative Los		-is-pts		3 pts


Brew 1750 Final Project Rubric



Brew 2000 Final Project Rubric

REW 2000: Brewing Project Rubric				N Q
			and the second	and the second

Brew 2500 Final Project Rubric



Brew 2600 Final Project Rubric

	Here w	-	See a see qua ta co	
eto arresto o terre ^l evente dalens per una di considi. 	Rava Data			
	23 I (
	ا الانتخاب الحيار الانتخاب المكونات	 Tht] Pointe: 60		

Brew 2750 Final Project Rubric

