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Learning Goals

• Review what is expected of institutions in demonstrating compliance with Standard 7 (Institutional Assessment)

• Discuss institutional assessment information that is commonly used by campuses, and some themes associated with such use—alignment, integration, meaningfulness, and usefulness

• Suggest techniques that campuses successfully use in institutional assessment to engage in periodic and useful evidence-based management
Standard 7
Institutional Assessment:

The institution has developed and implemented an assessment process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals and its compliance with accreditation standards.
In a nutshell...

An accredited institution is expected to possess or demonstrate the following:

- Identification of institutional and unit goals and their inter-relationships with one another and with the institution’s mission
- Collection of information related to those goals
- Evidence of sharing of results among appropriate stakeholders
- Use of data for documenting success and improving programs and services
- A process which informs institutional and unit planning
- A process that is periodically evaluated
Assessment Infrastructure

- Integration
- Sustainability and Planning
- Validity and reliability
- Usefulness
- Cost-effectiveness and efficiency
Integration

• Institutional and unit goals are clear.

• Institutional and unit outcomes have something to do with one another.

• Avoidance of silos--sometimes this starts with a strategic plan.
Sustainability

- Cost-effective
- Organized
- Efficient
- Periodic, not episodic
Validity and Reliability

• Accurate

• Directly related to goals they assess

• Reliable--consistently applied over time and used with confidence by key stakeholders

• Periodic, not episodic
Useful

• Discussions lead to recommendations to enhance performance with regard to the goals.

• Recommendations affect resource allocation decisions.

• Multiple stakeholders can describe how a regular, systematic process has been used in their own contexts, vertically and horizontally.
Cost-Effective & Efficient

• Is it organic or imposed?

• Can you describe, at least qualitatively, the "returns on investment" that have resulted from your assessment efforts?

• Or, do your choices of assessment approaches exhaust key people such as faculty, staff, and administrators?
Tips for Successfully Navigating the Institutional Assessment Standard
Tip 1:

It is a Good Idea to Organize a Meta-Strategy First and Share with Your Supervisor Periodically for Support and Advice
Planning a Process

A Structural Model for Demonstrating Institutional Effectiveness at Genesee Community College

**Cabinet**
- Approve (with Board of Trustees as needed) KPIs, Strategic Plan, budget requests, Facilities & Technology Master Plans

**IE Committee**
- Monitor Strategic Plan, KPIs, submit revisions to Cabinet
- Review Academic & Administrative Assessment Results
- Ensure budget allocations are tied to assessment outcomes and linked to the Strategic Plan
- Submit budget requests to Cabinet
- Review Approves changes to assessment processes

**Supports Data**
- Provide data to support Strategic Plan, Academic and Administrative assessment activities
- (RA, SI report writers)

**Supports Communication**
- Organize IFAD, Mini Summit presentations, Web presence, newsletters, reports, etc.

**Academic Assessment Committee**
- Review Academic outcomes at all levels
- Expose linkages between levels
- Receive and approve GBI EC Summary Report
- Monitor Program Learning Documents
- Develop/propose changes to assessment process
- Facilitate requests for resources
- Facilitate closing the loop w/Units

**Administrative Assessment Committee**
- Review Unit Action Plans and Outcomes
- Expose linkages between units and find opportunities for collaboration
- Expose/work linkages to Strategic Plan
- Develop/propose changes to assessment process
- Facilitate requests for resources
- Facilitate closing the loop w/Units

**Course SLOs**
- Monitor, Report
- Facilitate Collection

**Gen Ed SLOs**
- Prepare Submission Report

**Program SLOs**
- Annual Check-in Facilitates Documentation

**Institution SLOs**
- Monitor progress against institutional goals

**AA Units**
- Visit Presidents Monitor Plans within units
- Update Institutional Assessment Workloads in other assessment Outcomes Software

**GE Units**
- monitor

**BO Units**
- monitor

**EZA Units**
- monitor

**P8 Units**
- monitor

14
Tip 2:
Think You Can Go It Alone Without A Provost/VP Willing to at Least Consider What Assessment Information Says?

Maybe...But Not Likely
Value of Leadership

• An interested and invested VP or Dean makes a big difference when it comes to “closing the loop”

• Assessment professionals (student learning assessment, institutional assessment, a combination thereof, or all) are not the policy makers

• Overall success in closing the loop is not within the domain of the person/office assigned with assessment tasks

• At the time of an accreditation visit, this is usually quite apparent

• Documenting this via memos, signatures, etc., is usually a good idea.
Tip 3:

Don’t Let People Convince You that Electronic Portfolio Systems are the Only Convenient Substitutes for Closing the Loop
Electronic Portfolio Systems

• Think of the purpose—if it is to facilitate conversations and produce assessment information that is useful (and is worth the expense), GREAT IDEA

• But if you think electronic portfolio systems will ensure that such conversations and recommendations will occur, THINK AGAIN

• If the purpose is to store information aligned with standards, this is not closing the loop. Still, use MS Excel©, wikis, etc., to share documentation and to demonstrate that you are closing the loop
Tip 4:

To Demonstrate that you “Close the Loop,” Document (Within Reason)
### Binghamton University

**General Education Assessment System 2006-2008**

**Mission Statement:** Binghamton University is a premier public university dedicated to enriching the lives of people in the region, nation and world through discovery and education, and to being enriched by its engagement in these communities.

**Vision:** A truly distinguished and unique institution of higher education, one that combines an international reputation for research, scholarship and creative endeavor with the new undergraduate programs available at any public university.

#### Objectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Communication</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate proficiency in oral presentations.</td>
<td>Indirect: NSSE (FY and SR), Graduating student survey, OCC internship survey, undergraduate alumni survey, faculty survey; direct: general education portfolios</td>
<td>1. Several instructors do not have a great deal of experience teaching oral communication. 2. There appears to be a lack of understanding among instructors about how oral communication courses address the student learning outcomes in this area. For example, joint (T) courses, which include student learning outcomes for both communication and oral communication, appear to stress the communication student learning outcomes more than the oral communication outcomes (2006 Oral Communication ACT Report).</td>
<td>Instructors teaching oral communication courses might benefit from a seminar on how to include meaningful oral communication instruction in their courses, how to assess oral communication skills, and how to give meaningful feedback to students (2005 Oral Communication ACT Report).</td>
<td>Proposed: Workshop for oral communication instructors, taught by a faculty member, to address recommendations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Communication</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate ability to improve oral presentations in response to critiques</td>
<td>Indirect: NSSE (FY and SR), Graduating student survey, OCC internship survey, undergraduate alumni survey, faculty survey; direct: general education portfolios</td>
<td>1. Students are obtaining oral communication skills as a result of taking 0 courses as part of their general education courses of study at Binghamton University. 2. That students’ use of content in their oral presentations needs some improvement—a natural consequence when the delivery of the oral communication student learning outcomes is an afterthought (2005 Oral Communication ACT Report).</td>
<td>Instructors should consider the role of diversity in oral communication. Because students communicate and listen in different ways, it might be better to work with instructors on how to assess and teach oral communication to students from varying backgrounds (2001 Oral Communication ACT Report).</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Communication</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate skill in listening to and critiquing oral presentations.</td>
<td>Indirect: NSSE (FY and SR), Graduating student survey, OCC internship survey, undergraduate alumni survey, faculty survey; direct: general education portfolios</td>
<td>Students need more opportunities to call-critique, and to critique one another’s presentations. The data from the internship supervisor surveys, suggesting that students are sensitive about receiving such critiques from their supervisors, is symptomatic of this issue (2008 Oral Communication ACT Report).</td>
<td>Train instructors on how to help students understand and critique each other’s presentations. The feedback and critiques are highly confidential, and will be kept on file in oral communication courses (2008 Oral Communication ACT Report).</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Interdependencies</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate knowledge of central characteristics of western societies (i.e., those in Europe and North America) as they developed and continue to develop in dynamic interaction with other regions of the world and in the context of global systems of economic and/or cultural exchange</td>
<td>Indirect: NSSE (FY and SR); direct: general education portfolios</td>
<td>1. A review of some syllabi suggests that a few instructors may not know what the student learning outcomes are for global interdependencies. 2. In general, student performance is satisfactory. It is also clear from a review of the syllabi that faculty teaching 0 courses that students are taking these courses to move beyond knowledge, and to engage and grapple with issues having to do with interdependencies on a global scale—to negotiate the complexities of different points of view. This is a complement to instructors teaching these courses at Binghamton University— instructors want students to move beyond the mere semblance of knowledge, and to acquire an ability to critically engage issues having to do with the global interdependencies student learning outcomes (2008 Global Interdependencies ACT Report).</td>
<td>Encourage faculty teaching global interdependencies courses to place student learning outcomes on their course syllabi. Encourage faculty to articulate the correlation between course assessment and student learning outcomes. (2008 Global Interdependencies ACT Report).</td>
<td>Proposed: Workshop on writing student learning outcomes in general education courses (already requested by IEPE department).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tip 5:
Mundane Documentation Might Provide More Powerful Evidence than Dramatic Evidence
## Dramatic and Mundane Ways to Close the Loop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dramatic</th>
<th>Mundane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, staff, and administrative discharges</td>
<td>Adjustments in lesson plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum overhauls</td>
<td>Follow-up studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New programs</td>
<td>Organization of task forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New buildings</td>
<td>Highlighted pre and post changes in course syllabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional initiatives</td>
<td>Discussions with service providers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tip 6:

Periodic Reviews Are GREAT Ways to Document Closing the Loop
Periodic Reviews

• Important to have a guidelines document that explicitly indicates that self-study should have assessment in it and that reviewers should consider assessments when making recommendations

• Count number and percentage of recommendations not enacted, being considered, and enacted
Implementing Recommendations from Periodic Reviews, 2005-2009

- Implemented: 40%
- In progress: 37%
- On hold: 23%

Legend:
- Implemented
- In progress
- On hold
Tip 7: Linking Budgeting and Planning Based on Assessment Can Be Documented
2012-2013 ALLOCATION REQUEST FORM FOR THE DIVISION OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Please keep in mind the importance of aligning your requests to the University's Strategic Plan. Please complete this allocation request form in its entirety; you should submit one form for each initiative. Your submitted request will go to your Vice President for consideration.

Organization Name:

Requester's Last Name:

Requester's First Name:

Requester's Email: (please use Binghamton University email address)

Please describe the objective to be accomplished by your allocation request and how this request supports the University's strategic plan and/or your unit's strategic plan.

If applicable, please describe how your unit's assessment process contributed to the decision to make this request.
Tip 8:
The Process Takes Time
• From establishment of system to implementation takes time to develop

• 3-5 years at a minimum
Assessment Techniques—A Few Campus-Based Examples
Using Dashboards Backed Up With Meeting Minutes or Other Documents
General Education Student Learning Assessment Dashboard
Composition—Fall 2010

Composition Assessment Category Team Report Findings (2008)

The result of the SCBA rubric evaluation of 100-level papers indicates that student performance with regard to thesis/purpose, development, paragraph writing, sentence structure, style, and mechanics meet expectations. The committee also reviewed alumni, senior, and NSSE survey data, and concluded that students' writing skill appears also to meet expectations. The alumni and senior evaluations indicate that alumni are less sanguine than senior students are about how much the institution offered them opportunities to write, but the committee also concluded that student writing performance is satisfactory in all areas. One weakness, although not at critical levels, is that NSSE scores, faculty open-ended survey results, and the results of the rubric evaluation of critical thinking papers suggest that Binghamton University students might improve in the areas of formulating appropriate arguments, evaluating evidence, and synthesizing information, concerns which were also expressed in the Critical Thinking ACT report.

Composition Rubric Evaluations Scores--Senior Papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Progress</th>
<th>Thesis or Purpose</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Paragraphs</th>
<th>Sentence Structure</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Mechanics and Grammar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison--2010 v. 2008</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4=Exceeds expectations; 3=meets expectations; 2=approaches expectations; 1=does not meet expectations; Green spotlight=3.00 or higher; yellow=2.5 or higher; red=lower than 2.5

ETS Proficiency Profile Scores--Writing (3rd, Highest Level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Progress</th>
<th>Percentage Proficient or Marginal</th>
<th>Progress--Compared to National Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU Seniors</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU Transfer Seniors</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green spotlight= 75% or higher proficient or marginally proficient; yellow spotlight=between 75% and 33%

Composition Instructors' Estimates of Students Who Exceed or Meet Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle Year</th>
<th>% Who Meet or Exceed Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green =>80%, Yellow=Between 70% and 80%; Red=<70%; 2011 cycle not yet complete
### How well has Binghamton University prepared you with regard to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizing thoughts in written projects</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing grammatically correct sentences and phrases</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of respondents reporting "extremely well," "very well," and "moderately well." Green stoplight=90% or higher; yellow=between 90% and 75%; red=<75%. * Alumni survey question worded as follows: "...Writing coherently and effectively."

### National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Compared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing clearly and effectively</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Internship Supervisor Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>4-Year Avg</th>
<th>Compared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing Ability</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Percentage of respondents reporting "excellent" and "good." Green stoplight=90% or higher; yellow=between...
Assessment on a Dime: IPEDS Feedback Report

IPEDS DATA FEEDBACK REPORT 2010

What is IPEDS?
The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) is a system of surveys components that collects data from nearly 6,700 institutions that award associate's and higher degrees or certificates in the United States. IPEDS collects institution-level data on students (enrollment and graduation rates), student charges, program completions, faculty, staff, and finances.

These data are used at the federal and state level for policy analyses and development at the institutional level for benchmarking and peer analysis, and by students and parents through the College Navigator for college search purposes. For more information about IPEDS, see http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds.

What Is the Purpose of This Report?
The Data Feedback Report is intended to provide institutions a context for examining the data they report to IPEDS. Our goal is to ensure a sound understanding of the data, not only for the institution itself but also for the institution's competitors. This understanding can help improve the quality and comparability of IPEDS data.

What Is In This Report?
The figures provided in this report are those requested by the IPEDS Technical Review Panel. They were developed to provide selected institutions and data elements for their institution and a comparison group of institutions. The figures are based on data made available via the IPEDS Electronic Data System (EDS) at the time this report was produced and made available. Additional information about these institutions is provided in the Methodological Notes for each report. The Methodological Notes provide details about the institutions in your comparison group and the details used for their calculation. These data in the "Comparison Group" are the Methodological Notes for more information.

Where Can I Do More with IPEDS Data?
The Executive Peer Tool (EPT) is designed to provide campus comparisons easy access to institutional and competition group data. Using the EPT, you can produce reports using different versions of the IPEDS variables. The EPT is available through the IPEDS Data Center (http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds).
### Documenting Use of Assessment

**Figure 19**

**Student Learning Outcomes Assessment – Phase I Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMS</th>
<th>Featured Assessment Method(s)</th>
<th>Data Assessment Date(s)</th>
<th>Most Recent Outcome/Findings</th>
<th>Resulting Action</th>
<th>Assessment of New Data</th>
<th>Effectiveness of Change</th>
<th>Next Steps/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Learning Outcomes – Documented in the Official Catalog and Embedded in 100% of Degree Plans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td>-Standardized assessment in COMM150, Information Literacy and Research</td>
<td></td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; cycle of assessment: Aug 2009</td>
<td>Information Literacy assessment results (all locations) did not consistently meet minimum competency levels.</td>
<td>Retrain faculty; revise assessment instrument and assessment rubric (Jan 2010)</td>
<td>Implement revisions</td>
<td>Aug 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Career</td>
<td>-Standardized assessment in CMSSM001, Internship Prep Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; cycle of assessment: Dec 2012</td>
<td>Community and career assessment results (all locations) did not consistently meet minimum competency levels.</td>
<td>Retrain faculty; revise assessment instrument and assessment rubric (Jan 2010)</td>
<td>Implement revisions</td>
<td>Apr 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognition</td>
<td>-Standardized assessment in PHIL250, Practices in Analytical Reasoning and Critical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; cycle of assessment: Aug 2009</td>
<td>Metacognition assessment results (all locations) did not consistently meet minimum competency levels.</td>
<td>Retrain faculty; revise assessment instrument and assessment rubric (Jan 2010)</td>
<td>Implement revisions</td>
<td>Aug 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Learning</td>
<td>-Standardized assessment in SOCS102, Principles of Sociology</td>
<td></td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; cycle of assessment: Aug 2009</td>
<td>Relational learning assessment results did not consistently meet minimum competency levels.</td>
<td>Retrain faculty; revise assessment instrument and assessment rubric (Jan 2010)</td>
<td>Implement revisions</td>
<td>Aug 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessing Assessment

Chart 3

% of All Programs Citing 2 Key Assessment Methods/Tools (2007-08 vs. 2011-12)

- Undergraduate
- Graduate/First-Prof

Culminating experiences *
* Capstone, senior project or practicum, internship, scholarly project, student teaching, thesis or dissertation.

Projects, papers, presentations **
** Graded using a rubric
Questions?