

## **Assessment Committee Annual Report 2017 - 2018**

### **Overview:**

The Assessment Committee received and reviewed assurance of learning assessment reports from 28 of the 31 of the academic units that were expected to submit reports. This is a 90% response rate, down from 100% last year and 96% the prior year. Of the 28 reports received, 18 were rated adequately or completely Implemented in all categories (64%), down from 20 reports last year (69%), but up from 16 reports (59%) the prior year.

### **Assurance of Learning Assessment Program:**

Each academic unit defines goals for its students' learning, developed from the unit's mission. The purpose of a system of assessment is to set those goals, develop measures for performance versus the goals, to measure and analyze that performance, and to develop and track corrective and improvement actions when needed. The purpose of the Assessment Committee is to oversee that process. Each educational unit makes a report regarding the status of its assessment system annually to the Assessment Committee, and conducts a review of its learning goals and assessment methods at least every three years.

### **Committee Highlights:**

The committee began the year with a training of all assessment plan reviewers to work to be more consistent in the review process. We also held a training session with assessment plan coordinators to answer questions and concerns to ensure a smooth process. We will continue that practice next year.

The committee also began using SharePoint to evaluate assessment reports. It is our hope that this fall we will be able to use the same system for assessment report submissions. This will streamline the process and hopefully ensure an easier process for both program assessment coordinators and committee members alike.

In our final meeting, the committee began strategizing how to handle the assessment process in the future given the need to review certificate programs, and the proliferation of programs at the University. While no changes will be needed in the near future, the committee was able to discuss several backup plans should the workload become too heavy for committee members.

### Summary of Academic Unit Assessment Report Reviews:

Assessment Plan	Coordinator	On Time	Methods	Criteria	Data	ActionPlan	PriorYear
Art Studio Graphic Design	Matthew Donaldson	Y	C/A	C/A	C/A	C	C
Biology	Ben Montgomery	Y	C	C/A	C	C	C
Business	Jim O'Connor	Y	C	C	C	C	C
Chemistry	Astrid Rosario	N	Report Ratings Not Finalized				
Commercial Music	Nolan Stolz	N/A					
Communications	Michelle Garland	Y	C	A	A/I	A/I	N
Computer Science	Frank Li	N	A/I	S	I	N	N
Criminal Justice	Reid Toth	N/A					
Education Art	Mary Lou Hightower	Y	C	C	C	C	C
Education Child Development and Family Studies	Nur Tanyel	Y	C	C/A		S	C
Education Early Childhood	Laura Hooks	Y	A/I	A/I	A/I	A	A
Education Elementary	James Charles	Y	C	A/I	C	A/I	A
Education Exercise Science	Kelvin Wu	Y	C	C	A/I	C	C
Education Graduate ECE Elementary	Tina Herzberg	Y	C	C	C	C	C
Education Graduate VI	Tina Herzberg	Y	C	C	C	C	C
Education Learning Disabilities	Holly Pae	Y	C	C	C/A	C	C
Education Middle Grades	Stephen Bismarck	Y	C	C	C	C/A	N
Education Physical Ed.	Jim Kamla	Y	C	C	C	C	A
Education Secondary	Stephen Bismarck	Y	C	C	C	C	N

Engineering Technology Management	Tim Ellis	Y	A	A	C	C	C
English	Colleen O'Brien	Y	C	C/A	C/A	C/A	C
Healthcare Information Management	Deshia Leonhirth	Assessment Program Plan Submitted					
History	Carol Loar	N/A					
Informatics	Deshia Leonhirth	Y	C	C/A	C/A	C	N
Interdisciplinary Studies	Yancy McDougal	Y	C/A	C/A	C	A	C/A
Mathematics	Bernard Omolo	Y	C	C	C	A	C
Nursing	Lynette Gibson	N	C	C	C	C	C/A
Political Science	Allison Pingley	Y	C	C	C	C/A	C/A
Psychology	Andrew Beer	Y	C	C	C	A	C/A
Sociology	Samantha Hauptman	N	C	C/A	C	C	C
Spanish	June Carter	Y	C	C	C/A	A	C/A
Theatre	Lee Neibert	Y	C	A	C	C	N

C = Completely Implemented  
 A = Adequately Implemented  
 I = Incompletely Implemented  
 S = Sparsely Implemented  
 N = No Data