

Commission
al Association

Collaboration Network
Academy For Assessment Of Student
Learning Network



Team Leader Menu

[My Institutional Profiles](#)

[Browse the Network](#)

[Search Project Details](#)

[Search Contacts](#)



Project successfully submitted for Response

From the Ground Up: Assessment of Student Learning

[Version 5.0](#) ▼

[Plan](#)

[Responses](#)

[Comments](#)

Project Detail

Identify and explain any specific changes to your project scope or design since January 2014.

The university continues to make progress toward reaching the goals identified in the Academy Project, there have been no changes to the Project goals, scope of work or design.

One area of discussion, and recommended change, was in the composition of the Academy Team. At the end of the spring semester 2014 the Academy Team recommended to the Provost that the Academy Project be formally integrated into The Assessment Committee. To provide some context for this recommendation, it may be helpful to review that in the fall 2011 the university established

The Assessment Committee as a shared governance strategic committee with representation from academic administration, faculty, administrative professionals (AP), educational support personnel (ESP) and students. With our entry into the Academy for Student Learning in the spring 2012, a separate team comprised of four faculty each representing a college, a dean and the associate provost were appointed to attend the Academy training in the summer of 2102. Through the past two-three years, the Academy project, and the work of The Assessment Committee have overlapped both in terms of their charge and to some extent their membership. The recommendation to merge the Academy Team into the Assessment Committee is intended to expand the understanding and support for the Academy goals, and to streamline committee processes. Minutes of the Academy Team and The Assessment Committee are posted to their respective web pages, along the periodic reports from The Assessment Committee to the Shared Governance Oversight committee.

[Assessment Committee Minutes](#)

[Academy Project Website](#)

What were your goals for the past six months—since January 2014? Did you achieve them? Why or why not?

Our goals for the past six months included raising the percentage of courses and programs with documented assessment activities to the 70% level for development of outcomes, and the 40% level for the development of measures and reporting of findings. We did not meet all our course-level performance targets for the past six months, we did meet all the program-level targets. We provide a graphic and more detailed explanation in our Supplemental Narrative to Version 5 which details progress in each of the four stages of our assessment cycle (develop – measure – report – act). The reported targets represent the percentage of courses and programs which have documented activity within Tracdat, our institutional assessment archive, for each category. While the level of activity increased in every category of course-level assessment, e.g. from 54% of courses showing ‘develop’ activity to the current 60.5%, our target for this category had risen from 60% to 70% for the same time period. In course-level assessment we exceeded our target of 40% only in the category of measure (meaning to define assessment measures aligned to each of the course goals). As described in a previous report, we undertook a side-project to reduce a number of inactive courses which were being tracked within our assessment database. Deans were in some cases hesitant to submit the courses for deletion at this time, but they had not been taught for the previous two-three years and were not scheduled again for in the immediate future. Deans agreed that were these courses to be reactivated such action would be accompanied by the entry of the course assessment data at that time.

Program-level assessment continues ahead of our projected timeline in every category. Again, these percentages reflect the number of programs with documented activity in each category of our assessment cycle. Similar to the program review, the Deans identified academic programs from the original master-list which were no longer active and which could be removed from the assessment database. This database had been created several years ago by capturing a listing of all programs/degrees from the university catalog. In the intervening years some programs have been suspended, others deleted and through this process we were able to clean the database of inactive programs.

Not directly an Academy Project, but related to program assessment, the Deans were charged to move forward with program review for 25% of all active programs with reports submitted by the beginning of summer 2014. As of the date of this report only 14 programs, of an anticipated 25 have been submitted. The status of program assessment is tabulated on the SLOAP webpage, and the program review template is posted under the name "PlanforProgramReviewV4a". The Deans have begun a formal review and feedback process on these program reviews and the supporting evidence documented in Tracdat.

Tabulation of Course-level assessment

Program Level Outcome Reporting (SLOAP)

Program Review Criteria

Tabulation of Program-level assessment

Supplemental Narrative for Version 5.0

Plan for Program Review

How did you incorporate the feedback that you received on your previous posting in January 2014?

The reviewer feedback is regularly reviewed and used to guide our dialogs and activities. We have provided an expanded and annotated response to the V.4 reviewer comments in the file below "Response to Reviewer Feedback". In addition, this past cycle we looked at how we are providing feedback internally related to assessment processes. We undertook a systematic review of assessment practices and developed a report format to provide specific, critical and we hope constructive feedback to faculty, schools, deans, and administrators. These reports were prepared for the Provost for their review, approval and subsequent distribution. Each report began with a restatement of the relevant HLC criteria, the Assumed Practices or relevant elements of the Federal

Compliance Report which impacted the specific area. The reports each next summarized the documents and resources which the committee reviewed and referenced in their report. Finally the report summarized their findings, observations and recommendations. Reports were generated specific to strategic planning, program review, general education, and course-specific reviews using a representative course from each of the 12 schools. The courses were selected based on their role as a general education course, the high frequency with which the course is taught, or the relatively high enrollment of students in the course. We have posted these reviews on our Academy Website, discussed them at the Provost Council and distributed them to the Schools through their respective deans.

[Academy Project Website](#)

[Response to Reviewer Feedback](#)

What are your plans and goals for the next six months—up until January/February 2015? What challenges do you anticipate?

As mentioned in the response to reviewer feedback document, the fall 2014 brings several significant changes to the university. These changes include a new president, new collective bargaining agreements for faculty and support staff, and a new state-wide transfer agreement which substantially impacts our general education framework. The president is keenly aware of the importance of the next HLC site visit which will occur in 2016 and of the work and responsibilities that this entails. The merger of the Academy Team with the Assessment Committee offers an opportunity to expand the leadership scope of the project. The committee anticipates that the direct and critical feedback offered in the areas of strategic plan, general education, program review, and course-level feedback for each school individually, will raise sensitivity and focus for the assessment efforts in the coming year. Faculty are not particularly active in the summer session at our institution and much of the assessment work capturing and documenting the events of the previous year could reasonably be expected to be done this fall. It is therefore critical that administration affirm this, framed where necessary as an express obligation under the new contract. The initial 13 program reviews did not generally reflect the direct assessment of program-level outcomes relative to student learning, this is a deficiency which needs to be addressed through revisions/addendum to the program reviews even as schools begin the assessment of their next 25% of programs, and complete those which were not completed as scheduled.

We take some solace from the knowledge that our institution is not alone in the challenges of shifting our focus from inputs to the assessment of student outcomes. The development of the new Faculty Center for Teaching, funded through our recent \$1.86M Title III grant, can play a key role in helping

faculty make this transition. The new president has the opportunity to shift the focus for administrative support activities. These changes take time and we are confident that over time such changes will not only strengthen student achievement of our outcomes, but strengthen the institution as well.

[LSSU Title III Project Website](#)

Update Questions

Please confirm that this Activity is ready for review.

This project is ready for review.

Edit Tags

Tags:

- Assessment Practices

Stop Following © The Higher Learning Commission

Today : 2014-09-10