UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT REPORT
(including report years 2007-2009 and 2009-2010)

The Mission

The University Assessment Committee (UAC) was established in the spring of 2002 to create policies and practices to support university assessment initiatives. The committee reports to the Vice Provost for Assessment and Strategic Planning, who provides administrative oversight and support to the committee’s efforts.

Membership

The UAC conducts its work through a variety of subcommittees and overlapping memberships with other university and college committees. The UAC is presently made up of 23 members, representing all of the academic colleges on the Main and Health Science Campuses, as well as University Libraries, Student Affairs, and UTLC units. Other members have been invited to join the committee based on their role in supporting university assessment, including representatives from Institutional Research and Distance Learning as well as 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.

Committee Structure

Six subcommittees, including an Assessment Plan, an Assessment Report, an Assessment Training and Development, a Website Development, an Executive Committee, and a Steering Committee, accomplish the work of the UAC. The Assessment Plan committee is responsible for reviewing and providing feedback for all five-year assessment plans. The Assessment Report committee is responsible for reviewing and providing feedback on the annual assessment reports. The Training and Development committee is responsible for providing all professional development with regards to assessment and with regards to the tools that are available on campus to gather and review student artifacts. The Steering Committee meets once a month to create the agenda for the monthly UAC meetings. The Executive Committee meets weekly to discuss policies and practices that might enhance university assessment initiatives.

The UAC works closely with Institutional Research in using data from the Student Centeredness Survey, the National Survey of Student Engagement, and the Collegiate Learning Assessment, among other university-wide surveys and tests, to inform student outcomes in student services and in general education. The UAC also works closely with the Faculty Senate Core Curriculum committee to promote initiatives to assess core competencies.

The overall review process is illustrated below on the next page.
Program Assessment Reports (Prepared by program faculty)

College assessment coordinators and teams review reports and provide feedback to programs

College Assessment Reports are prepared

UAC reviews college reports and provides feedback

UAC Assessment Report to President, Provost and Chancellor

Overview of 2007 - 2009

Assessment planning and reporting processes. A formal process for the assessment of student learning began in mid-to late 2002, with the hiring of Dr. Rob Sheehan as the Vice Provost for Assessment, Strategic Planning and Program Review, and the formation of the University Assessment Committee (UAC), whose members were liaisons representing each academic college and the student service unit. Sheehan put into place a structure that called for a five-year assessment plan and yearly assessment reports from each college and the student service unit. The UAC members staffed the Plan and Report subcommittees, whose tasks were to review these submissions and to provide feedback to improve the plan or report. Assessment plans were evaluated by a structured rubric with 21 criteria that covered the following topics:

- unit mission,
- learning outcomes,
- assessment methods, and
- reporting and use of results.

Feedback was provided to each academic or service unit and the revised assessment plans can be found on the UT assessment website at http://www.utoledo.edu/offices/provost/main/assessment/plans/Index.html

Review Process starting with the 2007-2009 reports:

- Inspection of the website indicated that, with the exception of the core curriculum, all colleges and units in the former UT submitted annual reports in 2003 and 2004, but less than full completion was noted starting in 2005.

- Remediation strategies were put into place that included permitting colleges/units to submit a combined 2007-2009 report. These were reviewed in fall 2010. Due to time constraints and the ongoing work to develop a common assessment matrix (see below), the Review Committee focused its efforts on the 2007-2009 academic college reports. (Also in late fall 2010 all 2009-2010 college and service unit reports received a full review).

Analysis and evaluation of outcomes (based on 2007-2009 academic college reports):

- The level of assessment varied greatly among the programs and departments within and among colleges.
• The report format and level of reporting (i.e., program, department, or college level) was not consistent across colleges, making it difficult to compare assessment characteristics and to assist colleges to focus on those fundamental aspects identified by HLC as important to student learning evaluation.

• One outcome of the 2007-2009 review was to call for a standardized matrix that would be used by all colleges/units and that would require reporting at the program level. This would also focus on the fundamental aspects of student learning assessment.

Conclusions:
• Review of the academic college 2007-2009 reports and informal examination of service unit reports indicated that colleges having external accreditation and some service units had robust reporting, while others did not.
• From the information provided, it was possible to identify which college programs had student learning objectives and measurement methods, and would meet HLC expectations, as well as those with program- or college-specific external accrediting agencies.

Overview of 2009 - 2010

Assessment planning and reporting processes. In 2010 the University Assessment Committee (UAC) made a substantive change to its procedures with the introduction of an electronic Assessment Portal, the Epsilon© Assessment Matrix. The introduction of this tool has facilitated the UAC’s ability to standardize reporting and monitor assessment activity at the level of the program, to verify the processes in place across the institution, and to track changes made as a result of the analysis of data. Beginning with the 2009-2010 academic year, year-end assessment reports for academic programs were uploaded into this electronic database in the Assessment Portal. The adoption of the database has standardized the reporting elements for each college and its programs - a “program” has been defined at the level of the major. This template approach replaced the unique college plans that had been previously required. All programs were asked to provide information related to 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 findings
• program or course changes made based on assessment data
• dissemination of assessment results

To further standardize the reporting process and facilitate review of assessment activity, the UAC adopted an assessment matrix and Epsilon© Portal as the official repository for all year-end assessment reports for the institution. Each of the required report elements was uploaded into a specified matrix cell. Supporting units such as the library, student services, and UTLC also
participated in this new reporting process and shared a common template for reporting as well, with their elements slightly modified from those required for academic programs.

Review Process starting with 2009 – 2010 reports:
- Review of the program assessment information was first completed by the college or service unit liaison who serves as a member of the UAC. Each liaison summarized the findings for the individual college (or service unit) programs and entered a summary report into a separate matrix, using the same categories as its programs. College liaisons provided feedback to program directors as needed regarding the reports submitted.
- Members of the UAC conducted the second review of each college or service unit summary. Feedback was provided to the colleges/college deans regarding the overall adequacy of the assessment activity for programs in the college (or service unit). Strengths were noted and recommendations were made. Copies of the letters sent from the UAC to the college deans are included as an appendix at the end of this report.

Analysis and evaluation of outcomes (based on 2009 – 2010 reports):
- Comprehensive assessment practices are documented for programs externally accredited, as well as for programs that do not have external accreditation. See college-specific letters in appendices.
- The comprehensiveness of program assessment information varies by college, and some colleges did not provide all of the requested information for programs listed for the college.
- Complete assessment reports were available for supporting units, including the libraries, student services, and the UTLC.

Conclusions:
- The standardized template and reporting format have greatly facilitated the review process, since all programs/service units now address the same elements and provide information in a similar manner. This directly addresses a challenge faced by the UAC for the 2007 – 2009 reporting cycle.
- Assessment information is now available at the level of the academic program and all programs are held accountable for documenting assessment of student learning, as well as for quality improvement, that is, describing program or course changes based on analysis of data.
- Continued faculty development efforts are needed to help orient all colleges and programs to the articulation and assessment of learning outcomes and to facilitate full participation in the UAC assessment process.
- An identified challenge in the use of Epsilen is the lack of reporting features that would allow the college liaisons or the UAC to easily and efficiently generate reports across matrix elements to monitor participation by individual academic programs. Upgrades in the reporting features available are requested to facilitate the 2010 – 2011 review.
**Points of Pride**

**Ongoing evolution of assessment processes**
The University Assessment Committee has evolved the assessment process to a higher level of accountability for all degrees and certificates offered at the University of Toledo. In the process of reinstating program review, the Provost’s office has had to verify the accuracy of each and every degree and certificate program, and every major offered in each college on campus. During this verification process, it was decided that from this point forward, assessment and program review would assess and review *every* degree and certificate program, and *every* major within degree programs. This eliminated the ambiguity that had previously existed about the level to which faculty were being asked to assess student learning outcomes, as several of the professional colleges are being asked by their professional accrediting agencies to assess student learning outcomes at the *degree* level, but not at the *major* or *certificate* level.

In addition to requiring all degrees and certificates to have an assessment plan and yearly assessment review of their processes, the University Assessment Committee developed a rubric tool for what would be required in the assessment review reports that were submitted by the college liaisons to the University Assessment Committee. This allows for standardizing the data that are provided by each program and, thus, the evaluation of the assessment review by the college liaisons can be standardized.

**College Assessment Committees**
Many Colleges have formed College Assessment Committees. Examples of the responsibilities that have been undertaken by these committees include: overseeing and compiling the Annual Assessment Report; developing college-wide assessment tools; developing assessment tools to help meet common accreditation standards across programs of study; disseminating existing assessment survey data; and documenting use of College-wide assessment data. It is the goal of the University Assessment Committee that all Colleges and supporting services form College/Unit Assessment Committees. These Assessment committees can aid the University Assessment Committee and the College Liaisons.

**Enhancing faculty development initiatives**
The Training and Development Committee of the University Assessment Committee is charged with developing and implementing all assessment training and professional development for university, college, division, department, and program initiatives. This past year, a number of new initiatives have been undertaken by this committee and Learning Ventures. Faculty resources can be found at the following website: [http://www.utoledo.edu/dl/faculty/index.html](http://www.utoledo.edu/dl/faculty/index.html).

In addition to training the College liaisons on the Assessment Portal, a 3-part podcast series was developed that addressed different parts of the assessment process (e.g., writing student objectives, components of effective syllabi, best practices in assessment). This subcommittee planned a series of assessment workshops for over the spring semester to train faculty to create program assessment matrices and rubrics that they can use to gather student artifacts and to assess them in time for next year’s assessment report.
Introduction of Epsilen
The University of Toledo signed a five-year contract with Epsilen in the summer of 2010, and agreed to serve as the beta site for the development and implementation of its assessment tools. The UAC Executive Committee, along with the Director of Learning Ventures and its academic support staff, have worked closely with the chief executive officer, programmers and customer support staff at Epsilen in the development and implementation of these assessment tools. The Assessment Portal became active in the summer of 2010, and the UAC agreed to pilot its use as the repository for the year-end assessment reports for all of the colleges and academic support and student service divisions on campus. Epsilen staff members have also agreed to work with the appropriate staff from the University of Toledo to enhance their product by developing a single sign on in UT’s web portal, implementing automatic Epsilen account creation, and providing real-time integration with the student information system (Banner). We anticipate that these value-added components will greatly enhance the user-friendliness and the utility of Epsilen for assessment purposes on campus.

During this piloting of Epsilen as a repository for year-end reports, the assessment liaisons have been trained by academic support staff of Learning Ventures in how to upload their year-end assessment reports, how to assess the reports, and how to run a summative report for their college/division matrix. In the cycle of year-end assessment reports for the next academic year (2010-2011), similar assessment workshops will be provided to coordinators of degree and certificate programs in each of the academic colleges, and for coordinators of programs in the student service and academic support divisions.

Enhancing a culture of assessment
With the requirement of every degree and program to have an assessment plan and yearly review, the University Assessment Committee is able to take the lead in transforming our practices for assessing student learning outcomes on campus. To foster the culture of assessment, Dr. Penny Poplin Gosetti conducts an assessment workshop for new faculty during new faculty orientation. She also provided workshops for university faculty to which College Assessment Committee members, chairs, associate deans, and deans were strongly encouraged to attend. We intend to increase the assessment reporting for non-externally accredited programs as well as to encourage voluntary accreditation when appropriate. The Master’s of Science in Athletic Training has begun its self study to apply for voluntary accreditation through the National Athletic Trainer’s Association. Initiatives such as this will serve as models for other programs across the University.

Challenges and Future Directions

Core Curriculum
The Core Curriculum Committee is a committee charged by the Faculty Senate to develop and implement the assessment plan for the general education program at the University of Toledo. The Core Curriculum Committee has clearly defined the student learning objectives required of all graduates regardless of their degree program. These learning outcomes fall into categories: English composition, mathematics humanities, fine arts, social science, natural science and diversity. Assessment of these objectives was conducted via standardized tests. From 2002 –
2008, the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) test from ACT was given to seniors, and in 2009-2010, an alternate test of general education skills and abilities, the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), was adopted and replaced the CAAP. The Core Curriculum Committee also defined a review process for the courses included in the Core Curriculum that involved a review of the overall coverage of student learning outcomes in the General Education Curriculum on a rotating four-year schedule. This review has proved to be very cumbersome and has not been done as originally planned. This leaves a significant gap in assessment activity related to the core curriculum. The Faculty Senate is currently revisiting the issue of the core curriculum, how to define it, and how to assess students’ achievement.

**Gaps in Reporting**
There are still gaps in compliance with providing assessment reports. For example, the previous College of Business did not complete the Assessment Portal matrix for all of its degrees and certificates. The goal for university assessment should be that every degree and certificate and every major should have available a completed assessment report in their respective college assessment matrix.

**Faculty Development**
Although gains have been made in faculty development and in professional development much more needs to occur. If we are going to require that each degree and certificate have assessment plans and reports, then we have the responsibility to provide the resources to the faculty to enable them to do this successfully. Assessment should be viewed as a professional responsibility of all faculty members.

**Redesigned Website**
The maintenance privileges of the University Assessment Committee website were recently shifted from the Office of Institutional Research to the Office of the Provost. With this transition came the perfect opportunity for the formation of the UAC website sub-committee that will focus on the redesign of the website to make it more consistent with the University and Provost’s home pages and to make the website more user-friendly. The website sub-committee will continue to check the site to make sure the content is up-to-date.

**University Reorganization**
One of the new opportunities for University Assessment is to infuse the committee with new members as a result of the reorganization of the University. The UAC has new liaisons for the College of Adult and Lifelong Learning; the College of Innovative Learning; the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics; the College of Languages, Literature, and Social Sciences; the College of Visual and Performing Arts; and the Honors College. This is the largest infusion of new members to the UAC since its inception. Each of these new assessment liaisons will bring fresh ideas and perspectives to the committee, and it is hoped that they will bring new energy and new direction to the committee’s efforts.