Assessment Plans & Report
Update & Status

The following is a summary of the status and findings of the Assessment Plans and Assessment Reports that were submitted in June 2011. Also provided are some suggestions to improve the assessments conducted by both administrative and academic departments. Recommendations to streamline the submission process are also presented.

2010-11 COMPLIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen almost all the academic and administrative departments have submitted Assessment Reports in 2010-11. About half the academic departments and about two-thirds of the administrative areas have submitted Assessment Plans for 2011-12.

ASSESSMENT REPORTS

ACADEMIC

Goals
- Some mission statements include department goals
- Most goals are oriented towards student learning. However, some focus on extraneous factors such as faculty development and enrollment (ex. History, American Studies)
- Learning goals do not always reflect “uniqueness” of program (ex. Political Science)
- In some cases goals and level of mastery for minors are same as for majors (ex. Biology, Computer Science-Certificate, Mathematics)
- One goal does not a program or minor make (ex. Health Studies, Political Science- Minor)

Criteria
- Criteria are not always stated or implied
  - Criteria are unclear (ex. Classics- Minor “Proficiency”)
  - Criteria used are often grades (ex. Computer Science-Major, Classics, B.A., Globalization Studies Program, Goal 2 & 3, Theater- Certificate)

Assessment/ Assessment Results
- Most assessments focus on evidence of student learning
  - Some assessments rely on surveys, students self-reported perceptions of learning (ex. Globalization Studies Program, Goal 1, Political Science- Minor)
- “Taking a class” is not an assessment (ex. Theater- Certificate)
- Unclear if assessment results meet goal. Again criteria for meeting goal is often not articulated

Overall
- The connection between assessment, assessment results, and use of assessment results are non-existent or illogical
- In some cases, the submitted Assessment Plan and Assessment Report are the same
• There may be some confusion on the timeline. For example, it is unclear when the Assessment Plan is intended to be implemented

ADMINISTRATIVE
Goals
• For the most part, goals are operational- more similar to short term tactics than long term aspirations
• Obtaining tenure or reporting are not assessments or goals but the ends to the means
Assessment/Assessment Results
• Attention to criteria, measures, and specific results were laudable
Overall
• The connection between assessment, assessment results, and use of assessment results are non-existent or illogical
• Connection between assessment, assessment results, and use of results are confusing

RECOMMENDATIONS
INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
• Revise Assessment Plan template so that it can be easily differentiated from the Assessment Report template (See draft)
• Only require submission of course alignment grid when there is a substantive course or program change

ACADEMIC
Mission
• Assist departments in the development or revision of program mission statements that state the program’s purpose and contribution to Siena
• Remove learning goals from mission statements
Goals
• Continue to ensure that goals reflect student learning
• Add column to require articulation of criteria to determine if goal(s) are met
• Require departments to distinguish differences in student learning goals and/or level of mastery among certificates, minors, and majors
Assessment/Assessment Results
• Assist faculty devise assessments that measure student learning
  Include in the Assessment Report template the key components of assessment design and implementation (See draft)
• Provide examples of assessment instruments that should be included in the Assessment Report. Also provide examples of what does not need to be submitted
• Reinforce that assessment results should be summarized. Suggest to departments that they need not provide a complete compilation of results or submit collected raw data (Mathematics)

ADMINISTRATIVE
• Ensure that goals reflect student learning and/or meaningful student experiences
• Add a column to require articulation of criteria to determine if goal(s) are met (See draft)
NEXT STEPS

Assessment Cycle: Impression is that the academic departments are required to assess every goal every year. Recognizing limited resources for assessment, an “assessment cycle” should be considered. An assessment cycle would not require each student learning goal be assessed every year. However, the assessment cycle would require that effort and resources are targeted toward developing and implementing meaningful evaluations of student learning. The assessment cycle would empathize:
- Prioritizing of student learning goals for the purposes of assessment
- Providing sufficient time for conducting assessment, analyzing results, making corresponding changes to the department, major, minor, or certificate
- Providing sufficient time to observe if the changes have, in fact, impacted student learning/ experiences

Streamline Submission Process:
Decrease the frequency in which the Assessment Plan is submitted. Proposed is the Assessment Plan must be submitted when:
- New program is proposed
- Existing program has undergone a substantive revision
- Existing program has merged with another program/area
- Student learning goal(s) have been added, revised, or eliminated
- Current assessments are not addressing student learning goal(s)
- Mandated by the VPAA
- Directed by the AVPAA-Institutional Effectiveness

Otherwise the Assessment Plan should be reviewed annually but not necessarily submitted to OIE.

Assessment Review: Develop a formative review process of Assessment Plans and Assessment Reports that improves student learning. The review process would be implemented by the Assessment Committee. In addition, implement reviews for new programs as stipulated by the Board of Instruction. The primary purpose of both review processes is twofold. First, the review would help departments articulate key student learning goals. Second, the review would provide assistance in the construction of assessment methodology that would be beneficial to student learning.

Incentives: To improve the compliance rate, create a system that acknowledges departments that submit Assessment Reports and Assessment Plans. In addition, communication of assessment practices that are exemplary should be executed. Recognition of the faculty, administrators, and staff would be a key component of this communication.

Online Submissions: Evaluate feasibility of an online submission of assessment reports and assessment plans. Functionality would include:
- Online review of previous submissions
- Reports to help track past and planned assessments
- “Slugging” or populating previously submitted information as starting point for subsequent submission to lessen burden of reporting