The University Assessment Committee At A Glance

The University Assessment Committee is committed to enhancing the culture of assessment at the University of Toledo. Through the 12 month dedication of the faculty, staff and students who comprise the committee, assessment processes are continuously developed and reviewed to document that academic programs and service units have appropriate methods in place providing constructive feedback at the level of the program and service unit. The committee also continuously monitors its own processes, revising and implementing changes in an effort to improve oversight and to make recommendations regarding the assessment activities and resources available for those involved in assessment at the university.

The following report outlines the past year’s work of this committee. A description of the subcommittees of the University Assessment Committee is provided and a graphic representation of the assessment process is introduced. The report concludes with the year’s points of pride, documentation of challenges and recommendations for future direction.

The University Assessment Committee Charge and the current membership of the committee can be found in Appendices A and B.

How the Work Gets Accomplished

The University Assessment Committee fulfills its responsibilities through monthly meetings, working subcommittees and overlapping memberships with other university and college committees. The University Assessment Committee is presently made up of 26 members, representing all of the academic colleges on the Main and Health Science Campuses, and the student service units of Student Affairs, College of Innovative Learning, College of Graduate Studies, College of Adult and Lifelong Learning, and the University of Toledo Learning Collaborative. Other members of the committee have been invited to join the committee based on their role in supporting university assessment, including a representative from Institutional Research and the Chair of the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee. To ensure the active involvement of students on this committee, there is a representative from the Student Senate and a representative from the Graduate Student Association. To ensure the active representation of the faculty on this committee, there is also a representative from the Faculty Senate. There are three subcommittees of the University Assessment Committee.

Report Subcommittee: The Report Subcommittee reviews and provides feedback about Colleges’ and Service Units’ assessment reports and ensures submission of reports by the established due date. The Report Subcommittee also drafts the annual report of the University Assessment Committee for review and revision by the full membership prior to submitting to the administration.

Training and Development Subcommittee: The Training and Development Subcommittee identifies training and development needs for faculty, administrators, and staff involved in the assessment process. Members of the subcommittee work with appropriate resources, on- and off-campus, to arrange necessary training and development. They also are in the process of
developing an academic year calendar of programs and events and the learning objectives and assessment processes for those programs and events.

**Website Subcommittee**: The Website Subcommittee reviews the current assessment website and identifies content and resources for the site. Its members continually update, review and enhance the website and content.
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University Assessment Committee Annual Report 2010-2011
Overview of the 2010 – 2011 Assessment Process

Assessment process. The assessment process for 2010-2011 is depicted above. Beginning with the 2009-2010 academic year, year-end assessment reports for academic programs followed a revised and standardized template approach. This template approach incorporated the unique college plans that had been previously required prior to 2009. The template was reviewed by the committee during the summer of 2011 and a revised template was introduced for all programs and service units for 2010-2011. All programs were asked to provide information related to the following elements of their assessment process:

• mission;
• accreditation status;
• specific student learning outcomes;
• data collection methods to assess student learning;
• student and faculty involvement in the process of assessment;
• assessment results;
• actions to improve learning;
• communication of assessment results;
• student involvement in the assessment process; and
• actions to improve the process of assessment.

All service units followed the following template:

• mission;
• external accreditation;
• service outcomes;
• assessment measures;
• assessment results;
• actions to improve services;
• communication of unit outcomes;
• student involvement; and
• actions to improve the process of assessment.

Review Process starting with 2010 – 2011 reports:

• A review of the 2009-2010 assessment report template took place over the 2011 summer and a new template was presented to the liaisons at that time. The Training and Development Subcommittee trained the liaisons on the use of the template at the end of the summer in 2011. At that time, the Report Subcommittee was also developing a standardized rating scale and summary rubric for the liaisons to use when they were summarizing all of the individual reports for their college. The service units were not required to complete the standardized rating scale and summary rubric.

• Review of the program/service unit assessment information was first completed by the college or service unit liaison who served as a member of the University Assessment Committee. Each liaison summarized the findings for the individual college programs/service units and entered a summary report into the standardized rating scale.
and rubric, using the same categories as their programs. College liaisons provided feedback to program directors/unit managers as needed regarding the reports submitted.

- Members of the University Assessment Committee conducted the second review of each college or service unit summary during the Fall of 2011. Feedback was provided to the colleges/service units and college deans/unit managers regarding the overall adequacy of the assessment activity for programs in the college/service unit. Strengths were noted and recommendations were made.
- It is of special importance that the service units provided standardized and very detailed reports for review by the committee. In 2009-2010 the service units provided reports but they were not consistently reviewed by the report committee and they were not provided with feedback regarding strengths and recommendations. This year the feedback loop was completed for these units.
- An additional requirement of the liaisons was requested this past year. Liaisons were required to present their college/service unit summary reports to the Assessment Committee. The addition of sharing the summary reports has increased members’ knowledge of the assessment activity that is occurring across the University. This universal understanding is crucial to the continuous improvement process that needs to take place with regards to assessment at the University.
- Copies of the revised assessment report template for the programs and service unit are attached. The standardized rating and summary rubric template for both programs and service units is also attached. See Appendices C-E.

**Analysis and evaluation of outcomes (based on 2010 – 2011 reports):**

- One hundred percent of the college and service units turned in reports for the 2010-2011 academic year but some college reports did not include all of the required data for one or more individual programs.
- There was considerable growth in the assessment processes for graduate and undergraduate programs who are not externally accredited compared to last year’s reports.
- In a dedicated feedback session with the University Assessment Committee’s liaisons regarding the process for the 2010-2011 assessment reports, many positive comments and suggestions were made:
  - Committee members stated that we had honed in on the final data collection template version and the assessment process from the program/unit level. It was clear that changes will be made in the future but members overall felt that we had improved the process this past year.
  - Members appreciated the vetting process that took place with the data collection templates and suggested that we continue with the iterative process so that programs/service units can put their best assessment practices forward.
  - The service unit reports were of high quality and committee liaisons should be commended for their hard work in this area. It was discussed that we still need to work on the assessment process for the service units in the upcoming year and attention needs to be given to them to bring them to the same level of reporting that is now in place for the colleges and programs. This is especially difficult for those service units that have both academic and service outcomes. It is possible
that the committee may need to develop a third data collection template for those service units in the upcoming academic year.

- Future assessment reports should focus on tying proposed actions and curriculum changes to the data gathered. A continuity element with each year’s report that references the previous year’s proposed actions and changes was also suggested. This would help to close the feedback loop that the committee has been working on over the past few years.
- Overall, the University Assessment Committee has increased the rigor in reporting the assessment of student learning outcomes. The timeline for requesting and submission of assessment reports from programs to the University Assessment Committee should continue to be reviewed.

**Points of Pride**

**Culture of Assessment**
The culture of assessment at the University continues to be elevated. As evidence of this, the College of Pharmacy and the Honors College have college student learning outcomes in addition to program specific student learning outcomes. In addition, those colleges and service units that did not have Assessment Committees have formed them over the past year. New colleges and service units have also been developing new Assessment Plans for their new colleges and service units.

**Training and Development**
The Training and Development Subcommittee, under the direction of Scott Molitor, has identified training and development needs of faculty and staff. They have also conducted college specific training workshops at the request of Committee liaisons. It is recommended that the subcommittee continue to work with the Provost’s Office to identify the institutional training resources that are already available (e.g., Learning Ventures) to fulfill these needs.

**University Assessment Committee Members and Subcommittee Chairs**
The University Assessment Committee members are dedicated to the charge of the committee and the ongoing support needed to increase the culture of assessment at the University. Without this commitment, the successes that have occurred over the past year would not have come to fruition. All three subcommittee chairs, Connie Shriner, Scott Molitar, and Marlene Porter, have provided needed leadership and guidance to advance the important work of the Assessment Committee.

**Redesigned website**
In the 2009-2010 Annual Report of the UAC it was identified that a redesign of an Assessment of Student Learning website was needed. Under the direction of Marlene Porter, the Website Subcommittee Chair, members designed a new website for Assessment of Student Learning at the University of Toledo. A picture of the homepage is below. Committee members use the website for sharing committee minutes, training modules and general assessment information. It is anticipated that the website will continue to be updated and provide needed information to support the culture of assessment at the University.
Welcome!

Assessment is an ongoing process aimed at understanding and improving student learning. It involves:
- making our expectations explicit and public
- setting appropriate criteria and high standards for learning quality
- systematically gathering, analyzing, and interpreting evidence to determine how well performance matches those expectations and standards
- using the resulting information to document, explain, and improve performance

When it is embedded effectively within larger institutional systems, assessment can help us:
- focus our collective attention
- examine our assumptions
- create a shared academic culture dedicated to assuring and improving the quality of higher education

Challenges and Future Directions

Culture of Assessment Processes
The committee will need to work on the assessment processes to continue the increased culture of assessment. It is recommended that all new undergraduate and graduate courses include an assessment component on their application when requesting a new course to be approved. This process has begun at the graduate level as well as with the new general education courses that are currently being reviewed.

Although there are still gaps in reporting, it has improved. There will need to be continuous monitoring as new programs/courses/service units continue to emerge. With this monitoring, administration should be cognizant of the efficient use of faculty time and resources in the assessment of student learning outcomes. It is suggested to align program review with assessment reports. It is also suggested that program review be aligned with the timeline for program accreditation self studies and site visits for externally accredited programs.

There continues to be ongoing work with the assessment of the general education curriculum. During Fall 2010 and Spring 2011, extensive discussions took place regarding core curriculum and its assessment. In April 2011, the Faculty Senate passed a general education resolution which reframed the core experience in terms of the following five competencies: communication; scientific and quantitative literacy and reasoning; personal, social, and global responsibility; information literacy; and critical and integrative thinking. Recent efforts to redefine the core curriculum in terms of competencies have the potential to make assessment of students’ learning in the core more efficient and viable. The processes established by the Core Curriculum Committee of the Faculty Senate should be reviewed by the University Assessment Committee when they are available and adjustments made as needed to ensure that assessment of these desired outcomes/competencies is appropriate as well as comprehensive and informs future revisions.

The continuous involvement of students, faculty and staff is also recommended to further the culture of assessment at the University. Students are an important constituent in the assessment process and dissemination of assessment outcomes. The involvement of faculty and staff in the education process of assessment and the acknowledgement of assessment processes that faculty/staff are currently doing will further the validation of the importance of assessment at the University.

Office of Assessment
To validate the importance of assessment at the University, it is recommended that an Office of Assessment be created. With personnel and additional resources dedicated to assessment of student learning outcomes, faculty and staff will have the necessary tools to continue and improve the current assessment processes that are in place. Resources to permit key faculty and staff to attend national conferences on best practices in assessment that are disseminated with faculty and staff upon their return will begin the continuous educational process that is needed to sustain a culture of assessment. Resources to explore software programs for the systematic gathering of assessment data across colleges and service units also will assist in increasing efficiencies in the assessment process.
Action Items for 2011-2012

Action items for 2011-2012 are as follows.

- The current standardized template and rubric will be reviewed by the members of the University Assessment Committee and will take place beginning in March. Particular attention should be given to the rubric for the service units. Both the standardized template and rubric will be made available to faculty and staff for the 2011-2012 assessment reports.
- Training needs for faculty and staff will be evaluated. Current resources to provide the training within the University should be researched to determine where additional resources are needed.
- The process for including an assessment component for all new undergraduate and graduate courses on their course application should continue to be developed.
- An alignment of program review and assessment report timelines should be developed. Program review should be aligned with the timeline for program accreditation self studies and site visits for externally accredited programs.
- Continued assessment of student learning outcomes of the general education curriculum should continue.
- An Office of Assessment should be created. Personnel and additional resources should be dedicated to assessment of student learning outcomes. Resources to permit key faculty and staff to attend national conferences on best practices in assessment should be explored. Resources to investigate software programs for the systematic gathering of assessment data across colleges and service units should also be explored.

Conclusion

The ongoing evolution of the work of the University Assessment Committee continues to strengthen the institution’s position related to assessment of student learning across the institution. Recent changes in the reporting and review processes have strong potential to provide the institution with a system to manage and monitor assessment data and information at various levels that include course, program, college and institution. The continued use of the standardized reporting format ensures that colleges and programs review uniform elements of the assessment of students’ learning on a routine basis.
Appendix A

University Assessment Committee Charge

The University Assessment Committee leads the continued development of learning assessment policies at UT. Through College, academic support units, student affairs, and core curriculum liaisons, the University Assessment Committee monitors assessment activity at the program/service unit level, and reviews and provides feedback on the annual reports. The University Assessment Committee collaborates with the appropriate internal and external resources to provide leadership for the professional development of faculty, administration and staff on assessment processes and resources. The University Assessment Committee website serves as a source for archiving assessment activity and resources available for those involved with assessment at the university. Specifically, the University Assessment Committee will:

- Lead the development of learning assessment policies at UT.
- Provide leadership in the review, evaluation and continuous improvement of the University’s assessment plan.
- Provide a clearinghouse for the dissemination of information on student learning and assessment.
- Identify external professional development opportunities to help faculty understand the complexities of assessment and to help articulate learning outcomes.
- Provide leadership for training faculty in the use of assessment tools such as portfolios, surveys, formative and summative instruments, capstone experiences, applied experiences, course embedded assessment and use of multiple measures in student outcomes assessment.
- Communicate with University senior leadership and the campus about assessment policies and activities, assessment report summaries and recommendations, and recognition of substantial individual and group contributions to progress in the assessment of student achievement.
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Members of the University Assessment Committee
As of December 2011

It is important to note that the colleges and services units responded very quickly with the reorganization of the University in January 2011 with regards to membership for this committee. The committee was expanded and all colleges and services units were prompt in taking action to ensure that they were represented on this committee. The committee members regard their position on this committee with respect and have fulfilled their responsibilities in an exemplary manner. The quality and commitment of the liaisons is to be commended.

- Barbara Kopp Miller; Chair (as of June 2011)
- Ron Opp; Chair (until May 2011)
- Scott Molitor College of Engineering; Chair – Training and Development Committee
- Marlene Porter Library; Chair – Website Committee
- Connie Shriner; College of Medicine and Life Sciences; Chair – Report Committee
- Brian Ashburner; College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics
- Jamie Barlowe; College of Languages, Literature and Social Sciences
- April Dix; Graduate Student Association representative
- Anthony Edgington; Faculty Senate representative
- Peggy Fritz; College of Adult and Lifelong Learning
- Terribeth Gordon-Moore; College of Business and Innovation
- Kay Grothaus; College of Nursing
- David Hale; Student Senate representative
- Heather Johnson Huntley; Office of the Provost
- Mary Humphreys; Faculty Senate Core Curriculum Committee
- Alana Malik; Division of Student Affairs
- Laurie Mauro; College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences
- Holly Monsos; College of Visual and Performing Arts
- Susan Pocotte; College of Graduate Studies
- Penny Poplin Gosetti; Office of the Provost
- Nicole Porter; College of Law
- Terry Romer; Institutional Research
- Barbara Schneider; College of Innovative Learning
- Rebecca Schneider; Judith Herb College of Education, Health Science and Human Service
- Linda Smith; Honors College
- Suzanne Spacek; UT Learning Collaborative and Center for International Studies and Programs
- Lois Ventura; Judith Herb College of Education, Health Science and Human Service
UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO PROGRAM OUTCOMES REPORT
Assessment of Student Learning in Academic Programs:
Undergraduate, Graduate and Certificate
2010 - 2011

Program Name __________________________________________ Date ______________

Program Director(s) ________________________________

Instructions:
Please respond to the items below to describe the assessment activity in each degree or certificate
program. The completed form should be submitted as a Word document to your college
University Assessment Committee (UAC) liaison. Please refer to the sample assessment report
provided as an example.

All program reports submitted in your college will be summarized by your college UAC liaison.
This summary report for all degree and certificate programs in your college will then be
submitted to the UAC. The UAC will in turn develop a report for the Provost’s Office,
summarizing assessment activity across colleges.

I. Mission:
If your program has a mission statement that is different from the college mission, please
provide it.

II. External accreditation status:
If your program is reviewed and accredited by an external organization, please provide
information regarding your accreditation status including the name of the accrediting
body and the date of your next self-study and review.

III. Student learning outcomes:
List the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the program. These must be written in
terms of measurable student behavior. SLOs describe what students will be able to do as
a result of instruction. (More information about writing learning objectives can be found
at the following link. Vodcasts on Learning Objectives )

Approved by UT Assessment Committee July 2011
IV. **Assessment measures:**
Complete the following table. Include the explicit assessment measures or methods used as a means to confirm students’ learning in your program based on activity at the course level as well as other indicators of student achievement in your program. For each measure, provide information about the frequency of data collection and the review of this information. Add additional rows as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation instrument / Source of Data</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Data Review Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal/external Direct/indirect</td>
<td>Frequency of data collection</td>
<td>Who analyzes and reviews the data?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. **Assessment results:**
Provide a sample of your findings for 2010-2011. Report the data collected and aggregated for at least three of the measures listed in the table above. Briefly describe the significance of these data, how they provide evidence of students’ mastery of your program objectives.

VI. **Actions to improve learning:**
Describe examples of changes made in your program in response to data gathered to improve student achievement – not limited to the data presented above. Explicitly describe the data/source of data that led to the changes. These changes or modification can be at the level of an individual course (e.g., changes in content or educational experiences) or at the level of the program (e.g., addition of new course options, elective experiences). If no changes are planned for the upcoming year (2011 – 2012) please state that this is the case.

VII. **Communication of assessment results:**
Describe how your program assessment results are made known to stakeholders. This should include communication to students, faculty, your department or prospective students as well as the larger university community.

Approved by UT Assessment Committee July 2011
VIII. Students’ involvement
Describe how students are involved in any aspect of the assessment process for your program. This could involve eliciting their feedback on courses or the program in general, or their participation on curriculum committees that review data and recommend program changes. Also include any strategies used to encourage students to provide feedback that has the potential to result in changes.

IX. Actions to improve the process of assessment
Describe any changes made in any aspect of the process of assessment of student learning in your program. Include, for example, a description of new or revised assessment methods or tools, changes in the way data are reviewed, or strategies related to communication of assessment results revised methods. If no changes are planned or made, state that this is the case.
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UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
SERVICE UNIT OUTCOMES REPORT
2010 - 2011

Unit Name ___________________________ Date ______________

Unit Director(s) ___________________________

Instructions:
Please respond to the items below to describe the assessment activity in the unit. The completed form should be submitted as a Word document to your University Assessment Committee (UAC) liaison.

Outcomes for all components of your unit will be summarized by your college UAC liaison. This summary report will then be submitted to the UAC. The UAC will in turn develop a report for the Provost’s Office, summarizing assessment activity across all service units and academic program in all colleges.

X. Mission:
If your unit has a mission statement that is different from the university/college mission, please provide it.

XI. External accreditation status:
If any component of your unit is reviewed and accredited by an external organization, please provide information regarding your accreditation status including the name of the accrediting body and the date of your next self-study and review.

XII. Service outcomes:
List the specific service outcomes for the unit or components of the unit. These must be written in measureable, quantifiable terms. Service outcomes describe what services the unit provides to support teaching and learning.
XIII. Assessment measures:

Complete the following table. Include the explicit assessment measures or methods used as a means to confirm that the intended services for your unit have been successfully provided. For each measure, provide information about the frequency of data collection and the review of this information. Add additional rows as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Outcomes</th>
<th>Data Collection methods, metrics; Sources of data</th>
<th>Frequency of data collection and review</th>
<th>Person(s) responsible for reviewing data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XIV. Assessment results:

Provide a sample of your findings for 2010-2011. Report the data collected for at least three of the measures listed in the table above. In a brief narrative, describe the significance of these data, how they provide evidence that your unit is meeting its service objectives.

XV. Actions to improve services:

Describe examples of changes made in your unit in response to the data gathered – you do not need to limit this discussion to the data presented in section V above. Explicitly describe the data/source of data that led to the changes. These changes or modification can be at any level in the unit, for example, at the point of delivery, in unit practices, or in policies. If no changes are planned for the upcoming year (2011 – 2012) please state that this is the case.

XVI. Communication of unit outcomes:

Describe how your unit assessment results are made known to stakeholders. This should include any communication to students, faculty, administrators, or prospective students as well as to the larger university community.
XVII. Students’ involvement
Describe how students are involved in any aspect of the assessment process for your unit. This could involve eliciting their feedback and recommendations for services in general or their participation on unit committees or advisory boards that review data and recommend changes. Also include any strategies used to encourage students to provide feedback that has the potential to result in changes.

XVIII. Actions to improve the process of assessment
Describe changes made in any aspect of the process of assessment of service outcomes for your unit. Include, for example, a description of new or revised assessment methods or tools, changes in the way data are reviewed, or strategies related to communication of assessment results revised methods. If no changes are planned or made, state that this is the case.

Approved by UT Assessment Committee July 2011
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University Assessment Committee
College Assessment Report
2010 – 2011

Instructions to UAC Liaisons:

Part I: Review the assessment reports submitted by the programs in your college and complete the table for each program using the following ratings.

**Student learning outcomes:**
Level 0  No reported activity
Level 1  Learning outcomes have been articulated but not all are written in terms of observable student behavior, some are unclear or not measurable
Level 2  Learning outcomes have been created, they are clear and measurable.

**Assessment measures:**
Level 0  No reported activity
Level 1  A list of measures was developed to assess learning and appear appropriate for student learning outcomes
Level 2  Measures are developed, described, aligned with learning outcomes and include multiple sources of data, internal, external, direct and indirect

**Faculty involvement and review:**
Level 0  No information provided regarding the role of faculty in reviewing data
Level 1  Faculty review assessment data at the level of the individual course
Level 2  Program faculty meet as a group to review and discuss data (structured review such as curriculum or assessment committees etc)

**Assessment results:**
Level 0  No reported activity or data
Level 1  A sample of assessment results/findings is presented
Level 2  A sample of assessment results/findings is presented and the significance of the data described

**Actions to improve learning:**
Level 0  No reported activity
Level 1  At least one action to improve learning for the 2011 – 2012 academic year was indentified
Level 2  Actions were proposed to improve learning and related to directly to data and assessment results
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication of assessment results:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 0</td>
<td>No reported activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Assessment results are shared within the program and/or department, with faculty and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Assessment results are shared with others outside the department or program including prospective students or at the college level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students’ involvement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 0</td>
<td>No reported activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Assessment results indicate that student involvement is included but could improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Assessment results indicate that student involvement is well defined and utilized appropriately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rate each program using the rating levels 0, 1, 2 based on your impression of the program’s level of achievement regarding the various components of the process of assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Student learning outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment measures</th>
<th>Faculty involvement and review</th>
<th>Assessment results</th>
<th>Actions to improve learning</th>
<th>Communication of results</th>
<th>Students’ Involvement</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part II: After reviewing the reports submitted and completing the table for your college/unit, write a brief evaluation of your college activity and status as requested for each of the components of the assessment of students’ learning.

II.1 Overview of the articulation and adequacy of student learning outcomes. (Description from the Program template - List the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the program. These must be written in terms of measurable student behavior. SLOs describe what students will be able to do as a result of instruction.)
(Enter narrative here)

II.2 Selection and identification of a range of assessment methods. (Description from the Program template - Complete the following table. Include the explicit assessment measures or methods used as a means to confirm students’ learning in your program based on activity at the course level as well as other indicators of student achievement in your program. For each measure, provide information about the frequency of data collection and the review of this information. Add additional rows as needed.)
(Enter narrative here)

II.3 Faculty involvement in the review of assessment data. (This information is found in the Program template data collection table.)
(Enter narrative here)

II.4 Appropriateness and adequacy of reports of results for the college. (Description from the Program template - Provide a sample of your findings for 2010-2011. Report the data collected and aggregated for at least three of the measures listed in the table above. Briefly describe the significance of these data, how they provide evidence of students’ mastery of your program objectives.
(Enter narrative here)

II.5 Appropriateness and adequacy of reported actions to improve learning across the college.
(Description from the Program template - Describe examples of changes made in your program in response to data gathered to improve student achievement – not limited to the data presented above. Explicitly describe the data/source of data that led to the changes. These changes or modification can be at the level of an individual course (e.g., changes in content or educational experiences) or at the level of the program (e.g., addition of new course options, elective experiences). If no changes are planned for the upcoming year (2011 – 2012) please state that this is the case.)
(Enter narrative here)
II.6 Communication of assessment results. (Description from the Program template - Describe how your program assessment results are made known to stakeholders. This should include communication to students, faculty, your department or prospective students as well as the larger university community.)
(Enter narrative here)

II.7 Students’ involvement in the assessment process. (Description from the Program template - Describe how students are involved in any aspect of the assessment process for your program. This could involve eliciting their feedback on courses or the program in general, or their participation on curriculum committees that review data and recommend program changes. Also include any strategies used to encourage students to provide feedback that has the potential to result in changes.)

Part III: Identify your college’s strengths related to the assessment of students’ learning and any possible concerns that should be addressed, opportunities for faculty development, support needed for assessment activity.
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University Assessment Committee
Service Unit Assessment Report
2010 – 2011

Part I: After reviewing the reports submitted and completing the table for your college/unit, write a brief evaluation of your college activity and status as requested for each of the components of the assessment of students’ learning.

II.1 Overview of the articulation and adequacy of service outcomes. (Description from the Unit template - List the specific service outcomes for the unit or components of the unit. These must be written in measurable, quantifiable terms. Service outcomes describe what services the unit provides to support teaching and learning.)

(Enter narrative here)

II.2 Selection and identification of a range of assessment methods. (Description from the Unit template - Complete the following table. Include the explicit assessment measures or methods used as a means to confirm that the intended services for your unit have been successfully provided. For each measure, provide information about the frequency of data collection and the review of this information. Add additional rows as needed.)

(Enter narrative here)

II.3 Appropriateness and adequacy of reports of results for the college. (Description from the Unit template - Provide a sample of your findings for 2010-2011. Report the data collected for at least three of the measures listed in the table above. In a brief narrative, describe the significance of these data, how they provide evidence that your unit is meeting its service objectives.)

(Enter narrative here)

II.5 Appropriateness and adequacy of reported actions to improve service across the college.  
(Description from the Unit template - Describe examples of changes made in your unit in response to the data gathered – you do not need to limit this discussion to the data presented in section V above. Explicitly describe the data/source of data that led to the changes. These changes or modification can be at any level in the unit, for example, at the point of delivery, in unit practices, or in policies. If no changes are planned for the upcoming year (2011 – 2012) please state that this is the case.

(Enter narrative here)

II.6 Communication of assessment results. (Description from the Unit template - Describe how your unit assessment results are made known to stakeholders. This should include any communication to students, faculty, administrators, or prospective students as well as to the larger university community.)

(Enter narrative here)
II.7  Students’ involvement in the assessment process. (Description from the Unit template - Describe how students are involved in any aspect of the assessment process for your unit. This could involve eliciting their feedback and recommendations for services in general or their participation on unit committees or advisory boards that review data and recommend changes. Also include any strategies used to encourage students to provide feedback that has the potential to result in changes. (Enter narrative here)

Part II: Identify your college’s strengths related to the assessment of student services and any possible concerns that should be addressed, opportunities for development, support needed for assessment activity.