

Assessment Committee Report to Faculty Senate

Academic Year 2018-2019

Assessment Committee

Colorado Mesa University

Committee Members:

David Weinberg, Chair

Nancy Alex/Nick Bardo, Vice-Chair

Olga Grisak, Secretary

Tyler Anderson

Alison Harris

Eliot Jennings

Dan McClintock

Suzanne Owens

Chris Penick

Ben Reigel Substituting for Jeanine Howe

Markus Reitenbach

Jun Watabe

Denita Weeks

Nikki Williams

Morgan Bridge, Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs for Assessment and Accreditation

(Ex-Officio)

Laureen Cantwell (Ex-Officio)

## **CMU Assessment Committee Mission Statement**

The CMU Assessment Committee oversees the implementation and advancement of Essential Learning 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. The Assessment Committee reviewed three-year summary reports, new assessment plans, and the assessment section of program reviews and provided feedback to program faculty. Overall, the assessment reports showed progress in moving assessment forward and evidence of closing the loop with programmatic improvements.

In order to decrease the assessment workload for program faculty members, the Assessment Committee relaxed the formatting requirements for yearly assessment reports, 3-year reports, and program reviews. Previously, the Assessment Committee required that different templates be used for these different types of reports, and programs were required to use the official templates. This process often required programs to do a lot of tedious reformatting for the different reports that they were required to submit. This year, the committee developed a single template that can be used for yearly assessment reports, 3-year reports, and program reviews. Furthermore, programs now have the option of using their own templates.

To further encourage on-campus assessment, the Assessment Committee updated the Assessment Spotlight on the CMU Assessment webpage. The committee voted to spotlight two programs per year for outstanding utilization of assessment. The Chemistry Program was spotlighted during the spring semester, and another program will be chosen for each subsequent semester.

Select members of the Assessment Committee and outside faculty participated in assessing Essential Learning Outcomes after the completion of the academic year. In the Fall of 2019, the Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs of Assessment will lead the analysis of this assessment, and recommendations will be made for the 2020 – 2021 academic year.

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

## **Program Reviews and Assessment Reports AY 2018-2019**

During 2018-2019, the assessment committee reviewed three-year reports from eleven programs. Additionally, the Assessment Committee participated in the program review process by reviewing the assessment portion of the program reviews for the following programs:

- Chemistry
- Construction Technology
- Criminal Justice/Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST)
- Kinesiology/Exercise Science
- Sociology

The Assessment Committee reviewed the program reviews and provided feedback to the programs prior to the external reviewer site visits. In addition, the Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs for Assessment and Accreditation met with each external reviewer during the site visits. The highlights below represent (partial) feedback from the Assessment Committee on the reports.

### **Highlights in Program Assessment**

#### **Chemistry**

Many different assessment activities were used including tests, papers, presentations, and MFT. Student numbers were included and assessment was clearly systematic and intentional. Faculty may want to consider having more than just one problem on a test if you are using for assessment. Also, make sure that MFT data is providing you with meaningful information upon which decisions could be made.

While no programmatic changes were made based on assessment, several changes have been implemented within the courses of the program. For example, practice exams and extra emphasis were placed on areas identified as needing improvement.

Overall, excellent assessment work by the chemistry faculty!

## **Construction Technology**

They have well-developed, balanced SLOs that line up with the institutional SLOs. The construction program is on track. The SLOs need more information, and more assessment data in more classes. The Construction Technology program will be working closely with the Construction Management program to align the program to ensure easy transfer for students from the associates to the bachelor degree both in SLO and assessment practices.

## **Criminal Justice/Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST)**

The outcomes are fine. Any adjustments made in the past have been effective. The program uses both written and skills-based assessments. The tests are standardized for POST programs throughout the state. Skills-based assessment requires specific results to pass. The program is continually reviewed by outside local and state law enforcement and judicial agencies to maintain standards. The program has been accredited by outside agencies since the program's inception. Assessment data is thorough as required by outside reviewing agencies. The program does after action meetings and reports with full- and part-time faculty after each graduating class, however this is not indicated on CMU Assessment 3- and 6-year reports. This was noted through conversation with the program's director. Actions taken were thorough. Changes are made if required after each graduating class. Of the 427 students who have graduated from the program, 425 have successfully passed the POST certification exam.

## **Kinesiology/Exercise Science**

The SLO's are clear and are the result of collaboration between department faculty. The outcomes are clear, specific, and measureable and align well with Bloom's Taxonomy. The faculty are diligent about covering SLO's throughout the offered courses. A variety of assessment methods to characterize student learning have been determined (e.g., lesson plans, individual projects, tests, projects, written papers). Consider revising evaluation methods 5, 6, and 7 (research project, presentation, and group project respectively) to more useful methods as they are not currently used to measure outcomes in any coursework. Showed analysis of results and action

taken for up to three semesters shown in 3-year summary report. The data presented is valid and represents good sample sizes as student numbers were included. Assessment was systematic (with some gaps) and intentional.

It is clear that assessments are the outcome of collaboration among department faculty as multiple faculty are involved in data collection and analysis. Data is driving action upon analysis. Based on the assessments and analysis, changes were implemented at the course level based on faculty analysis of key findings and recommendations. A tie-in between a benchmark/target and the analysis could spur additional actions to be taken. Differences in performance scores from cohort to cohort could use further explanation.

The program may want to consider adopting an SLO assessment cycle as outlined in the Assessment Handbook to avoid assessment fatigue.

## **Sociology**

The assessment portion of the Sociology Program Review appears to show that the faculty's assessment efforts are benefiting the program. Despite turnover in the Sociology program, faculty have still made progress in their assessment over the last several years. Their actions taken are proactive and appropriate. They are in the process of developing an exit exam for graduating seniors, and have already begun administering a pre-test. Their alumni survey indicates a high level of satisfaction. They are moving from collecting data to using the data for improvement. Overall, the Sociology program has been thoughtful, deliberate, and reflective throughout their assessment, and we encourage them to continue these efforts in the future.

## **2019-2020 Assessment Committee Plans**

During the next academic year, the Assessment Committee plans to maintain the positive momentum in assessment that has developed. Following is a list of Assessment Committee activities planned for 2019-2020:

1. Monitor continuing progress on of all graduate, baccalaureate, associate and technical certificate program assessment plans.
2. Provide advice to faculty on data collection, reporting, etc, on an as-needed basis.
3. Review and provide feedback for 2019-2020 program reviews and third year progress reports.
4. Provide guidance and feedback to new programs on the development and implementation of assessment plans.
5. Update the Spotlight on Assessment webpage each semester
6. Work with the Essential Learning Committee to analyze, report, and make recommendations based on the results of the Essential Learning Assessment performed during the Spring and Fall of 2019.
7. Work with the Essential Learning Committee to collect and assess artifacts related to the analytical problem-solving and quantitative literacy SLOs.
8. Work with the Essential Learning Committee to promote Essential Learning Assessment on campus.