

Office of Planning and Assessment
Academic Assessment Report for Closure of FY18-19 and Rollover for FY19-20
April 2020

Overview of Assessment Report and Process

The Office of Planning and Assessment (P&A) in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) annually reviews assessment plans in two areas: academic and administrative. P&A completed its review of the academic assessment plans for 2018-2019 Assessment Cycle in February 2020, but was unable to close out the administrative plans because of the changes brought about with COVID-19. With the upcoming SACSCOC reaffirmation process, the assessment coordinators will close out both 2018-19 and 2019-20 administrative assessment plans in the upcoming assessment cycle (May-October 2020).

This report focuses on the review of the academic assessment plans for completion and quality of content. For completion, all plans should have submitted the following components: Program Outcomes, Student Learning Outcomes, 2018-2019 Methods, Results, and Use of Results. For quality of content, components are scored as Very Good (3), Acceptable (2), and Needs Improvement (1). See rubrics in Appendix A.

The submission deadline for completing the 2018-2019 assessment plan with results and use of results was October 31, 2019, and all sections were locked on November 1, 2019. During the review process, some sections were revised for clarity and consistency by the OIE reviewer. If the information was not clear or the section was incomplete, the reviewer returned the item to the user for revision and re-submission. All completed plans were reviewed, scored, and released.

Although a few plans were changed in College of Education, most plans remained in the organizational structure for the 17-18 assessment cycle.

Summary:

Total Number of Academic Assessment Plans: 109 Total Number of Components: 506 components
Total Number of Completed Components: 481 components Percentage of Completeness: 95%
Overall Quality of Assessment Plans: 2.84

Conclusions and Recommendations

At the February 23, 2020, meeting of the UHCL Assessment Committee, members reviewed the results and discussed the recurring issue of late and incomplete submissions (See Table 1). The committee discussed changing the deadline to October 1 to avoid conflicting internal college deadlines but, more significantly, the committee agreed that each college needed an assessment liaison to provide leadership and direction to faculty on assessment, similar to the College of Business and the College of Education. As OIE continues to build a culture of assessment, it hopes to instill best practices, which places more direct responsibility within the colleges and less direct management by OIE. The committee recommended that an Assessment Coordinator attend college faculty meetings to address the importance of use of assessment. It also recommended that the Executive Director of Assessment and Planning discuss college assessment liaisons with Dr. Kathryn Matthew, the Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs, and Dr. Steve Berberich, the Provost.

Table 1. Summary of Assessment Review

Division	Components						
	Total Plans	Total Components	Submitted and Reviewed	Completed	Needed Revision	Submitted Late	Avg. Score
BUS	22	108	108	108	0	0	2.93
COE	24	93	93	93	0	0	2.98
CSE	26	126	126	111	15	50	2.68
HSH	37	179	179	169	10	20	2.84
TOTAL	109	506	506	481	25	70	2.84

3 Point Scale – 3=very good; 2=acceptable; 1=needs improvement See rubrics in Appendix A

- 64 plans (58.7%) had an average score of 3.00
- 45 plans (41.3%) had an average score between 2.00 and 2.99
- 0 plans (0%) had an average score between 1.0 and 1.99
- 0 plans (0%) had an average score between 0.00 and 0.99
- The average of all plans is 2.84

**Part 1: Assessment Report for FY18-19 Results/Use of Results in Academic Plans
(Fall 18, Spring 19, Summer 19 – Previous Academic Year)**

Summary and Status of Academic Assessment Review as of February 10, 2020

Academic Division

College of Business

- Total: 22 plans, 108 components
- Submitted and Reviewed: 108 components
- Completed: 108 components
- Needs Revision: 0 components
- Submitted Late: 0 components
- Status: 100% completed
- Overall Quality of Assessment Plans: 2.93

College of Education

- Total: 24 plans, 93 components
- Submitted and Reviewed: 93 components
- Completed: 93 components
- Needs Revision: 0 components
- Submitted Late: 0 components
- Status: 100% completed.
- Overall Quality of Assessment Plans: 2.98

College of Human Sciences and Humanities

- Total: 37 plans, 179 components
- Submitted and Reviewed: 169 components
- Completed: 169 components
- Needs Revision: 10 components
- Submitted Late: 8 plans, 20 components (Exercise and Health Sciences MS, Nursing BSN, Social Work BSW, Digital Media Studies MA, Humanities BA, Humanities MA, HSH Advising, Public Service Leadership BS)
- Status: 95% completed
- Overall Quality of Assessment Plans: 2.84

College of Science and Engineering

- Total: 26 plans, 126 components
- Submitted and Reviewed: 126 components
- Completed: 111 components
- Needs Revision: 15 components
- Submitted Late: 20 plans, 50 components (Computer Information Systems BS, Computer Information Systems MS, Computer Science BS, Computer Science MS, Information Technology BAS, Computer Engineering BS, Computer Engineering MS, Engineering Management MS, Mechanical Engineering BS, Software Engineering MS, Systems Engineering MS, Biological Sciences BA/BS, Biological Sciences MS, Environmental Sciences BS, Environmental Sciences MS, Physics BS, Physics MS, Occupational Safety and Health-Industrial Hygiene BS, Occupational Safety and Health-Safety MS, CSE Plan)
- Status: 88% completed
- Overall Quality of Assessment Plans: 2.68

**Part 2. Assessment Report for FY19-20 Methods
(Fall 19, Spring 20, Summer 20 – Current Academic Year)**

Summary and Status of Academic Assessment Review as of February 10, 2020

Academic Division

College of Business – 22 Methods sections

- 22 completed

College of Education – 17 Methods sections

- 17 completed

College of Human Sciences and Humanities – 37 Methods sections

- 36 completed
- 1 needs revision: (Geography BS)

College of Science and Engineering – 26 Methods sections

- 26 completed

Combined Totals of Colleges

- 102 Methods sections (100%)
- 101 sections completed (99%)
- 1 section needs revision (1%)

Workshops 2018-2019

During the university annual assessment period (from May through October), the Office of Planning and Assessment provided a variety of workshops for faculty.

Sessions	# Attending	
AMS	14	60-minute workshop for review and assistance in using Taskstream's AMS system; open to established users.
May 20, 2019	1	
June 18, 2019	0	
July 17, 2019	0	
August 22, 2019	1	
September 25, 2019	12	
One-on-One Training	32	90-120 minute one-on-one training for faculty (academic plans); provided instructions on assessment and creating an assessment plan.
May 31, 2018 through November 13, 2018	32	
Brown Bag Discussions	9	60-minute discussions that explore best practices in out outcomes assessment.
May 6, 2019	1	
June 4, 2019	0	
August 8, 2019	4	
September 6, 2019	1	
October 9, 2019	3	
Workshops (2018-2019)	21	Faculty worked on assessment plans with one-on-one assistance from OIE staff.
October 21, 2019	4	
October 22, 2019	10	
October 23, 2019	2	
October 24, 2019	3	
October 25, 2019	2	
Total	76	

Based on attendance for 2018-2019, the Assessment Coordinators will revise the workshop and training schedule to better meet the needs and preferences of the faculty and staff. The Brown Bag Discussions will be discontinued and the number of AMS workshops will be reduced so that Coordinators can spend more time on one-on-one training and offer additional one-on-one workshops in October.

Appendix A. Rubrics

Assessment Plan Review Rubric: Program Outcomes

Needs Improvement [1]	Acceptable [2]	Very Good [3]
Program Outcomes are specific statements that focus on operational objectives.		
Describes a process rather than an outcome Unclear how Program Outcome will be observed or measured Number of outcomes are not sufficient nor representative of program or unit Few or none are mapped to University Goal(s)	Some are appropriate but language may be vague or need revision Some are observable or measurable Number of outcomes may be sufficient and representative of program or unit Some are mapped to appropriate University Goal(s)	All or most are clearly stated focusing on academic program or administrative unit development All or most are observable and measurable Number of outcomes are sufficient and representative of program or unit All are mapped to appropriate University Goal(s)
Assessment Methods identify a variety of assessment methods. Direct measures include tangible, self-explanatory evidence of what is to be assessed; indirect measures include surveys, interviews, or discussions that provide evidence that is less clear and convincing.		
Few or no measures are identified or are adequately described Few or no direct measures are used Few or no assessment instruments are described or attached Assessment instruments need improvement	Some outcomes have multiple measures Multiple measures are both direct and indirect Some assessment instruments are clearly described and attached Some assessment instruments reflect good methodology	All or most outcomes have multiple measures Multiple measures are both direct and indirect All or most assessment instruments are clearly described and attached Assessment instruments reflect good methodology
Criteria for Success uses specific, identifiable, or measurable target performance.		
No or few benchmarks or targets for achievement are identified Targets are not clearly defined; language is vague and subjective	Some target levels of achievement are identified Some targets may seem arbitrary	Target level of achievement is identified for each measure Measures are specific and measurable
Assessment Results provide specific, quantifiable data. Indicate specific numbers and type of what is being assessed when possible.		
Incomplete findings Findings do not prove whether targets were met, partially met, or not met Number and types are not defined	Addresses the achievement targets. Complete and organized Evaluated with appropriate statistical models Number or types are defined	Concise and well organized Provides solid evidence that targets were met, partially met, or not met Number and types are clearly defined
Use of Results includes a narrative that reflects analysis of results and faculty/stakeholder discussion of results as they relate to program outcomes; identifies strategies for continuous improvement.		
Too general, not specific Relates only indirectly to the outcome and the results of the outcome	Reflects, with sufficient depth, on what was learned during the assessment cycle Relates directly or indirectly to the outcome and the results of the assessment	Reflects on program outcomes Exhibits good understanding of finding implications to the program or administrative unit Identifies key areas that need to be monitored, remediated, or enhanced
Status Report documents implementation of continued action or improvements. Describes specific actions (planned or taken) to improve. Explains reasons for delay or inaction.		
Incomplete or no action plan	Offers "next steps"	Defines a logical "next step" for the program in response to the findings Indicates actions to be taken: dates, responsible parties, resources

Rev. 3 DEC 2016

Assessment Plan Review Rubric: Student Learning Outcomes

Needs Improvement [1]	Acceptable [2]	Very Good [3]
Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) are specific statements that focus on the knowledge, skills, and/or attitudes/dispositions that students should gain or improve their engagement in the academic program or learning experience.		
Describes a process rather than an outcome Inappropriate for level of mastery Unclear how SLO will be observed or measured Number of outcomes are not sufficient nor representative of program Few or none are mapped to University Learning Outcome(s)	Some are appropriate but language may be vague or need revision Some correspond to level of mastery expected Some are observable or measurable Number of outcomes may be sufficient and representative of program Some are mapped to appropriate University Learning Outcome(s)	All or most are clearly stated focusing on knowledge, skills, and attitudes or dispositions All or most correspond to level of mastery expected (BS/BA, MS/MA, EdD) All or most are observable and measurable Number of outcomes are sufficient and representative of program All are mapped to appropriate University Learning Outcome(s)
Assessment Methods identify a variety of assessment methods. Direct measures include tangible, self-explanatory evidence of what students are to learn; indirect measures include surveys, interviews, or discussions with students that provide evidence that is less clear and convincing.		
Few or no measures are identified or are adequately described Few or no direct measures are used Few or no assessment instruments are described or attached Assessment instruments need improvement	Some outcomes have multiple measures Multiple measures are both direct and indirect Some assessment instruments are clearly described and attached Some assessment instruments reflect good methodology	All or most outcomes have multiple measures Multiple measures are both direct and indirect All or most assessment instruments are clearly described and attached. Assessment instruments reflect good methodology
Criteria for Success uses specific, identifiable, or measurable target performance.		
No or few benchmarks or targets for student learning are identified Targets are not clearly defined; language is vague and subjective	Some target levels of achievement are identified Some targets may seem arbitrary	Target level of achievement is identified for each measure Measures are specific and measurable
Assessment Results provide specific, quantifiable data. Indicate number of students/papers assessed. Indicate types of students of students (sampling/only majors/all students).		
Incomplete findings Findings do not prove whether targets were met, partially met, or not met Number and types of students are not defined	Addresses the achievement targets Complete and organized Evaluated with appropriate statistical models Number or types of students are defined	Concise and well organized Provides solid evidence that targets were met, partially met, or not met Number and types of students are clearly defined
Use of Results includes a narrative that reflects analysis of results and faculty/stakeholder discussion of results as they relate to student learning outcomes; identifies strategies for continuous improvement.		
Too general, not specific Relates only indirectly to the outcome and the results of the outcome	Reflects, with sufficient depth, on what was learned during the assessment cycle Relates directly or indirectly to the outcome and the results of the assessment	Reflects on student learning outcomes Exhibits good understanding of finding implications to the academic program Identifies key areas that need to be monitored, remediated, or enhanced
Status Report documents implementation of continued action or improvements. Describes specific actions (planned or taken) to improve. Explains reasons for delay or inaction.		
Incomplete or no action plan	Offers "next steps"	Defines a logical "next step" for the program in response to the findings Indicates actions to be taken: dates, responsible parties, resources

Rev. 3 DEC 2016