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Purpose of Assessment

• Why do we assess?
  – It is so we can improve the learning and performance of students. Fletcher, Meyer, Anderson, Johnston, & Rees (2012)

  – NILOA - Findings are intended to:
    • Enable institutions to make improvements
    • Assess the impact of changes
    • Provide evidence of learning outcomes to those whom they are accountable
Context and Status of UCM Assessment

• Established in 1871
• Regional Comprehensive
• Enrollment: about 12,300 in 2017
• Approx. 150 undergraduate and graduate academic programs
• HLC Accreditation – Open Pathway
Context and Status of UCM Assessment

• Implemented campus-wide, holistic program assessment in 2014-15.

• Currently collect data and artifacts for program assessment and general education.
# Program Assessment Report 16-17

## Criteria in Program Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria in Program Assessment</th>
<th>UCM (%)</th>
<th>CAHSS (%)</th>
<th>CHST (%)</th>
<th>COE (%)</th>
<th>HCBPS (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Entry Complete</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication of Program SLOs (Evidence-Sample syllabus)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Map</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program SLOs Met Benchmark</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss Assessment Results with Faculty Within the Program</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Board</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Provided by Program Coordinators</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All programs had higher percentage of data entry compared to AY 15-16.
- 1/3 of programs had evidence of discussing the assessment results with faculty.
- 1/2 of programs have academic advisory board.

## Peer Review of Program Assessment Report

(Sampling: 27 programs)

- Programs need to get an average score of 3 or above in the program assessment rubric to meet the benchmark.
- About 50% of 27 programs met the benchmark.

## Actions for Improvement

- SLOs: 10.0% - 9.1%
- Curricular Change: 12.6% - 8.2%
- Assessment Strategies and Measures: 13.6%
- Teaching and Learning Pedagogy: 10.0% - 9.1%
- Resource Support: 4.4%
- No Change: 15.0% - 13.6%
- No Action: 14.9%
- Admission Requirement: 8.0%

### Comparison:
- 2015-2016
- 2016-2017
General Education Assessment Report 17-18

2 YEAR TIMELINE

**FALL:** University collects data of Comp 1,2,3,4 and 5
**SPRING:** Communicate assessment results to stakeholders

MODIFIED VALUE RUBRIC RESPONSE RATE 2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Total</th>
<th>Managing Information</th>
<th>Oral Communication</th>
<th>Quantitative Literacy</th>
<th>Written Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NATIONAL SURVEY OF STUDENT ENGAGEMENT (NSSE)

FRESHMAN PERCEPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Communication</th>
<th>Oral Communications</th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SENIOR PERCEPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Communication</th>
<th>Oral Communications</th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MODIFIED VALUE RUBRIC BY COMPETENCY 2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>No of Freshman Students</th>
<th>% of Student Rating 4</th>
<th>% of Student Rating 3</th>
<th>% of Student Rating 2</th>
<th>% of Student Rating 1</th>
<th>Average Student Rating</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Literacy</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Information</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT (GEA)

- **UCM GEA Policy:** Earn 425 score (above 25th percentile)
- **Performance Indicator:** 60% of students need to score above the 50th percentile on the GEA.
- **UCM GEA mean (448.92) is higher than National GEA mean (440.1)**
- **65.67% of students met 50th percentile.**
- **97.03% of students met 25th percentile.**
- **Only 42.87% of students met 50th percentile in Math.**
Transparency of Assessment Results

Discussion Questions
- What is transparency of assessment results at your institution?
- How much information needs to be shared and with who?
- Benefits of transparency
- Concerns of transparency
What Happens with Assessment Results

• What are you currently doing with your assessment results?
  – Faculty
  – IR-IA
  – Administrators
Examined 19 Institutions using the NILOA Transparency Framework – Only able to access 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution level</th>
<th>Number of institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.learningoutcomesassessment.org/TFfield.htm
NILOA Transparency Framework

• Examined websites for content on:
  • Learning Outcomes
  • Assessment Plans
  • Assessment Resources
  • Current Activities
  • Evidence of Student Learning
  • Use of Evidence
Websites Review

- **Learning Outcomes**
- **Assoc.** – focus on Gen Ed and core curriculum
- **Bac.** – links back to department. Exemplar syllabi
- **Masters** – differentiate between UG and GRAD outcomes
- **Doc.** – link back to depts. Included non-academic
Websites Review

- **Assessment Plans**
- Assoc. – 2 year plans
- Bac. – 4 year plans. 1 provided info on non-academic
- Masters – 4 and 5 year plans
- Doc. – provided institutional assess. plans, exec summaries, program review process, non-academic
Websites Review

- **Assessment Resources**
- Assessment handbook, rubrics, glossary typically provided by all
- Regional accreditation info
- A few provided info on specialized accreditation
- Masters and doc – provided info on professional organizations, resources
Websites Review

- Current Activities
- Assoc. – Info on institutional assessment – 1 included program level assess.
- Other levels included info on program assessment
- Doc. – one institution aligned assessment activities with scholarship by providing resources such as funding
Websites Review

- **Evidence of Student Learning**
- 12 of 16 provided an assessment report
- 8 institutions provided summary reports
- 4 provided full reports (2 bac. And 2 doc.)
Websites Review

• **Use of Evidence**
  • All institutions provide narrative on how they use direct and indirect assessment to improve student learning
  • One bac. University mentioned how assessment results are used by a committee for decision making
  • 4 Doc. Institutions did not provide much info on use
Websites Review

• **Summary**
• Most institutions have an assessment office and report up through a vice provost or provost
• Most provide data and info on assessment process on web
• Only 3 institutions provided non-academic assess. info.
• 1 Doc. institution provided info on administrative units
• Most provide summary info
• A few Masters and Doc try to align with faculty scholarship
UMC Assessment Website

- https://www.ucmo.edu/offices/assessment/
  - Learning Outcomes
  - Assessment Plans
  - Assessment Resources
  - Current Activities
  - Evidence of Student Learning
  - Use of Evidence
Tools to Share Assessment Results

- UCM – Power Bi
  https://app.powerbi.com/groups/me/reports/e9897882-40d0-4595-965e-3acf626f969f/ReportSectionfef7d6ba73bd258334bd

- K-State Power Bi –
  http://www.k-state.edu/assessment/surveys/dashboard/index.html

- Tableau
  https://public.tableau.com/profile/winston.salem.state.university.institutional.assessment.research#

- WebFocus

- Many other interactive software