

Strategic Plan Progress Report: Goal 1, Improve Through Assessment Progress Measures

I-1: Create a vision for assessment that embraces and embodies improvement.

- A vision has been created and shared; it is on the new Institutional Effectiveness webpage, www.improve.vinu.edu
- “A” category because it will continually be reviewed and revised as needed.

I-2: Create, define, and share a common assessment vocabulary.

- A glossary has been created and shared; it is on the new Institutional Effectiveness webpage, www.improve.vinu.edu
- “A” category because it will continually be reviewed and revised as needed.

I-3-A: Develop University-wide general and liberal education curricular and co-curricular outcomes.

- The Educational Futures Task Force charged with developing new outcomes has submitted the outcomes to CAAC for discussion.
- “3” category because the Committee completed significant review of literature and they have been shared with Dr. Terrell Rhodes of AAC&U. They are also being experimented with by the English Department special assessment project; they are beginning to produce results.

I-3-B: Develop program and course curricular and co-curricular outcomes.

- Workshops have been conducted, a list of assessable programs has been created, and the Assessment Committee has worked with programs to create mission statements and outcomes that have been assessed during Fall 2011 or will be assessed this spring.
- “2” or strong 2 because of progress on curricular outcomes, but co-curricular and non-academic outcomes have not been developed.

I-3-C: Implement a course outline review process.

- The Assessment Committee recognizes the need to review common course outlines to ensure that program and general/liberal education course outcomes are correctly written and mapped to program outcomes. The Assessment Committee will make a motion to CAAC to begin the process Spring 2012.
- “1” because this has not progressed beyond the discussion and research when the assessment strategic plan was put together.

I-3-D: Develop curriculum mapping for outcomes alignment.

- The Assessment Committee has begun its study of mapping, and models for program and general/liberal education outcomes have been developed. Plans to implement Spring 2012.
- “1” because the development has not progressed beyond the models and discussion.

I-4: Utilize a variety of methods to communicate and coordinate plans, issues, challenges, successes, and results to all stakeholders.

- Communication of assessment issues has occurred through all of the following: Workshops on assessment plans and processes, email to faculty and staff, liaisons to divisions working directly with faculty, presentation during opening meetings, sharing model assessment plans, guest

speakers Dr. Terrell Rhodes and Kathleen Gabriel, the Campus Quality Survey, and the development of the new Inst. Effectiveness website.

- “3” because of the quantity of presentation, but the Committee recognizes that time is needed to discuss strengths and weaknesses of the new assessment process, develop an assessment peer review process, and expand the celebration of model assessment plans.

I-5-A: Design and organize committees and teams to manage university assessment.

- The Assessment Committee has representation from the academic divisions, Jasper, and staff. The members have worked as liaisons and representatives to their respective units.
- “3” because academic liaisons have received released-time, thus showing a University commitment to assessment. However, non-academic and co-curricular assessment plans have not been developed to the point that it is clear if the committee structure, as it currently exists, is sufficient.

I-5-B: Designate and empower an administrative position responsible for University assessment-driven improvement.

- The position of Director of Institutional Effectiveness has been developed and filled.
- “A” because the position and a budget for it are now an on-going part of the University structure.

I-5-C: Use annual survey results of faculty, staff, and students to evaluate and improve assessment leadership.

- The Director of IE and the Committee have begun the process. Faculty and staff have participated in a SWOT analysis and an audit of programmatic assessment to build a baseline for improvement and understanding. The University is participating in a Campus Quality Survey, which asks about assessment and improvement.
- “2” because assessment, thus far, is baseline, and no annual survey has been deployed.

I-6-A: Implement a timetable and develop forms for completing assessment reports, data analysis, and dialogue about results to plan and implement improvement measures.

- The forms and timelines for the assessment process have been developed and progress on assessment is currently being reported weekly.
- “3” because one complete cycle of the process has not been completed and there is a potential for a slight evolution of the form, as has already occurred in the early stages of implementation of the plan. Also, the plan is to move to an electronic version after this year’s initial process.

I-6-B: Explore effective practices to create collaborative assessment and improvement opportunities.

- Collaboration among various members of the Assessment Committee and between the Vincennes and Jasper campuses on assessment are models for developing collaboration University-wide. Also, collaboration is developing within departments doing program assessment.
- “2” because the peer review process will not be implemented until Fall 2012, and assessment of co-curricular and non-academic assessment will require the development of more collaborative models.

I-6-C: Implement a process of recording, reporting, and moving information within the assessment framework.

- The Committee has developed report form and is using liaisons to work with faculty to complete the reporting process. The IE website will house the completed forms for internal and external stakeholders to access.
- “3” because the process is in place and working thus far. The full initial academic assessment cycle will be finished in March, 2012, but other assessment is yet to be completed. The model is working but needs to be verified as relevant and workable for all.

I-6-D: Implement an annual process to identify and mitigate barriers to effective assessment and to celebrate improvement successes.

- The liaisons are working with division faculty to reduce barriers to completion, and each program report is being reviewed by the Committee. Suggestions for improvement and completion are shared and implemented. A report form has been developed to record progress.
- “2” because the full process is not complete. Barriers might still exist, including resistance to the process by some individuals. A process for celebrating improvement is not fully implemented.

I-6-E: Measure of and response to internal and external stakeholders’ perceptions of institutional value.

- The recent North Central criticism that VU measure the perception of internal stakeholders is being addressed by the nationally-normed “Campus Quality Survey.” Results and analysis will be available by the end of March.
- “2” because a measure of external perception must be completed and responses to both types of evaluations will need to be developed.

I-6-F: Establish a pilot program for an e-portfolio system.

- Various groups on campus have attended workshops and researched e-portfolios; some faculty have experimented with systems.
- “1” because no systematic pilot has been developed. The Assessment Committee has the item in its list of continuing agenda items and is working to identify potential users. Due date is August 15, 2012.

I-7-A: Develop and sustain an adequate annual assessment budget for assessment projects, improvement projects, and leadership roles.

- An initial budget for the Office of Institutional Effectiveness has been developed and implemented.
- “3” because the Office of Institutional Effectiveness has yet to participate in the annual review process and complete an entire cycle, which should address the issues of “sustained” and “adequate.”

I-7-B: Integrate assessment into all aspects of personnel management (i.e., hiring, promotion, evaluation, etc.).

- The Committee has met with the Human Resources director and initial discussions have begun.
- “1” because there is very little to confirm assessment will figure significantly in the hiring, promotion, or evaluation processes.

I-8-A: Define the purpose of assessment-driven program review.

- The Committee did initial research during the strategic planning process and plans to begin development of the process Spring 2012.
- “1” because communication of the purpose and plan has been limited to references about future plans.

I-8-B: Implement a systematic process of program review and improvement, including a public reporting system.

- The Committee did initial research during the strategic planning process and plans to begin development of the process Spring 2012.
- “1” because the system has been neither developed nor implemented.

I-9-A: Define and develop the purposes of internal and external benchmarking processes.

- The Committee recognizes the value of benchmarking, and workshops have identified it as an important step. Some communication of the meaning and purpose has been discussed and is implied in the use of nationally-normed surveys, the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), used 5 times in the last 10 years, and the Campus Quality Survey, used in January, 2012.
- “2” because a full discussion of benchmarking is not due until May, 2013, and a plan for defining and developing understanding of its purpose has not been designed, although benchmarking results will be shared and discussed.

I-9-B: Identify, initiate implementation, and communicate benchmarking process.

- Internal benchmarking is occurring due to the completion of the assessment process; results will serve as a baseline data for future assessment work. Some external benchmarking is occurring because of the use of nationally-normed survey tools, the Community College Survey of Student Engagement and the Campus Quality Survey.
- “2” because some internal and external benchmarking is occurring, but a systematic process of program and unit benchmarking has not been developed.

I-10-A: Develop and sustain adequate assessment professional development.

- Assessment professional development is underway. Multiple campus workshops explaining the assessment process have been presented. Speakers Dr. Terrell Rhodes and Kathleen Gabriel have been invited to present, and their publications shared with faculty and staff.
- “2” because the process is developing, but evidence of a sustained, adequate, funded, assessment professional development process will require time.

I-10-B: Invite and support participation in assessment and improvement learning communities.

- Learning communities are beginning to develop with in departments as faculty work to collect, evaluate, and use data for improvements and with the analysis required of the narrative report form. The Assessment Committee and department committees are learning communities.
- “2” because the concept of “learning communities” is not fully explained or formalized in practice, and because processes such as the peer review process is yet to be developed. Also, learning communities for general/liberal education assessment have yet to be set-up.

I-10-C: Support VU personnel participation as AQIP and other peer reviewers.

- The Committee recognizes the value of learning about assessment as part of participation in an external peer review process.

- “2” because a willingness to support faculty efforts has been signaled, but currently AQIP is not accepting new participants in the review process. The Committee also needs to explore all the peer review options and encourage faculty and staff to participate in specialized accreditation activities.

I-10-D: Focus and enhance the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.

- The Committee has developed an assessment process and strategic plan that will by their nature develop the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.
- “3” because the collection and review of learning is underway, workshops delivered by both internal and external speakers have been presented, and an audit of assessment practices has occurred. A number of faculty have also presented assessment sessions at national conferences, and the English Department is participating in a national assessment project that will lead to more presentations and a publication. Funding has been provided for conference and travel-related costs.