Faculty Initiatives in Assessment

Academic Year 2014-2015

Assessment Committee

Colorado Mesa University

Committee Members:

Suzanne Lay, Chair and Faculty Assessment Coordinator
Shawn Robinson, Vice-Chair
Judy Williams
Gig Leadbetter
Dave Weinberg
Carrie McVean-Waring
Vince Patarino
Ann Gilles
Paul Behl
Heather Patterson-McCulloch
Sean Flanigan
Jeanine Howe
Jason Reddoch
Bette Schans, Director of Student Learning Assessment (Ex-Officio)
Steve Werman (Ex-Officio)
Kelly O'Connell (Ex-Officio)
Gillian McKnight-Tutein (Ex-Officio)

CMU Assessment Committee Mission Statement

The CMU Assessment Committee oversees the implementation and advancement of General Education and Program Assessment of student learning and achievement.

The Committee's responsibilities per the Faculty Senate handbook are as follows:

1. Recommend assessment criteria and methods.
2. Research and reflect on current trends and best practices in assessment of student learning.
3. Support faculty within each department working to implement plans and reports in program assessment.
4. Assist programs to articulate student learning outcomes.
5. Verify that assessment results have been used for programmatic improvement.
6. Promote student learning assessment on all three campuses, on-line programs and early scholars programs.
7. Review assessment documents in the initial stages of program review, at the three-year interval and during the final program review in the six-year process. Draw inferences from the results and recommend methods of improvement of the learning experience.
8. Report to Faculty Senate the quality and effectiveness of the overall assessment process on a yearly basis.
9. Analyze results of national student surveys, make comparisons to previous years and make recommendations for the University.

Advancement of Student Learning Assessment at CMU

The Assessment Committee continued to focus on providing quality feedback and to encourage two-way communication between faculty and the Assessment Committee.

In the fall of 2014, the Assessment Committee focused mostly on Essential Learning (EL). Members of the Committee each participated in at least one pilot session for assessing communication, critical thinking and quantitative fluency in EL. Prior to the pilot sessions, the

Committee broke into small groups and calibrated the rubrics using a student artifact. These pilot sessions were held in November with many other members of the CMU faculty participating. During these sessions, the AAC&U Value Rubrics were used to determine if they would work for our institution. It was decided to revise the wording of the critical thinking rubric, use the written communication rubric, and find another method of assessment for quantitative literacy.

By the fall of 2014, all baccalaureate, associate, and technical certificate programs were in the data collection phase of their assessment plans that were reviewed in 2013-2014 by the Committee. Gloria Rogers, Senior Scholar to the HLC, met with all programs over a two-day period in January to discuss progress made and review assessment reports. In the Spring 2015, the Assessment Committee reviewed all baccalaureate assessment progress reports and provided feedback to program faculty with an offer for a face-to-face meeting, if requested. Overall, the assessment reports looked very good. The plan is to move into the three-year review cycle of program assessment reporting from this point forward.

The Assessment Committee reviewed the ETS Proficiency Profile results from 2013-2014.

The Assessment Committee members continue to work actively as assessment advisors within their departments.

Program Review and Assessment AY 2014-2015

During 2014-2015, six programs were reviewed. As part of the Program Review process, the Assessment Committee reviewed the assessment portion of the reviews for the following programs:

- Construction Management
- Computer Information Systems
- Mathematics
- Spanish
- Visual Communication

- Psychology

The Assessment Committee received the program reviews much earlier in the academic year than in the past which allowed them to provide more timely feedback to the programs via the appropriate department heads. In addition, the Faculty Assessment Coordinator and/or the Director of Assessment met with each external reviewer during the site visits. The highlights below represent feedback from the Assessment Committee on the reports. It is important to note that some of the program reviews reported on assessment activities that were developed <u>before</u> significant changes were made to the assessment process. In other words, some data collected was based on old assessment plans (prior to Fall 2013).

<center>**Highlights in Program Assessment**</center>

<u>Construction Management</u>

There are clear student learning outcomes and a clear course curriculum map. Is there a reason why Bloom's taxonomy is in the margin? The Assessment Committee Subgroup members are impressed by the 100% success rate on the AIC; however, there needs to be more information about that percentage (e.g. total number of students taking the test, why some did not take the test, etc.) In terms of organization, the program review packet section titles do not always correspond exactly to what is found in the program review manual instructions. It also appears that section D should be where section C is. Did program faculty fill out an assessment plan template? It should be included it in the program review packet, perhaps as an appendix.

<u>Computer Information Systems</u>

The Assessment Committee Subgroup members really appreciated Table 5.1. It simplified the information and clearly showed the results of assessment activities. There is a wide variety for means of assessment. The nuanced presentation of hard data is good. A brief prose narrative before the table that sums up the content would be beneficial. There is effective narrative explaining the assessment activities throughout the whole program review packet but more information is needed, especially in Section C. Below is a list of questions and concerns to consider in relation to the program review assessment section:

1.   Is it possible to incorporate more information from Table 5.1 into the program assessment plan?

2.   How did faculty create the standards? This could be explained in narrative form before Table 5.1.

Math

The assessment plan looks sound and well done. Workable SLOs have been created; SLOs have been applied to courses; data has been collected; and faculty are heading toward a meaningful review of the data. It is noted that due to recent implementation of the SLOs, one semester of data is not enough to draw conclusions. Other anecdotal evidence was presented to show evidence of success in these programs. There was assessment of student learning done on Senior Seminar projects, Major Field Achievement Tests, and PLACE exams. There is evidence of good performance on these measures, while acknowledgement of the limitations of these assessment activities. Reference was made to rubrics that were used in assessment. In future reports, please include rubric examples and numbers of students assessed.

Spanish

The committee found this work to be a very complete and detailed assessment report with explicit links to CMU's values and Student Learning Outcomes. Were the SLOs listed in the report current? Avoid the word "understanding" in SLOs as it is difficult to measure. The student performance data reported were specific and easily interpreted. The analysis of the data was fair and conscientious. Faculty acknowledge that more time to collect data is needed in order to make meaningful evaluation. It was a well written, thorough report.

Visual Communications

The committee found this work to be a broader synopsis of assessment with potential to grow and be more detailed and informative in the future. The report seemed to focus on course level SLOs and assessments. In the future, please include the program SLOs and indicate how those will be assessed. The committee supports the adoption of project-based learning and assessment and think that is a strong piece of this report. However, how will the quality of the work be

assessed? Will there be a rubric? Has that rubric been developed? It would be helpful to attach the rubric to future reports.

Psychology

The report was very thorough and up-to-date with regard to the use of the assessment plan. They referred heavily to the curriculum map that was used to revise the curriculum. However, the committee was not able to locate the map. The self-reflection portion of assessment was beneficial as was the future plans for assessment. The committee had a couple of minor questions on the assessment for SLO 3. Are these all psychology majors? How many students were assessed in each of these courses? It would be helpful to have the number of students in addition to the percentages. The faculty did an excellent job following up on concerns from the previous program review. The student quotes in section F were a nice addition to the report.

Notes for all Program Reviews

It would be helpful for all programs to include the most current curriculum map, assessment plan, and report with the program review.

2014-2015 Assessment Committee Plans

During the next academic year, the Assessment Committee plans to maintain the momentum in assessment that has developed. Following is a list of Assessment Committee activities planned for 2015-2016:

1. Complete reviews and provide feedback for associate and technical certificate program assessment reports.
2. Monitor progress on implementation of all baccalaureate, associate, and technical certificate program assessment plans.
3. Provide advice to faculty on data collection, reporting, etc, on an as-needed basis.
4. Work with the Essential Learning Committee to analyze the results of the assessment completed in May 2015 for communication and critical thinking based upon the AAC&U Value Rubrics.
5. Review and provide feedback for 2015-2016 program reviews.

6. Review and provide feedback for graduate program assessment plans.