

To: Adam Ryburn, Presiding Officer of Faculty, Chair of College Senate

From: Patty Francis, Associate Provost for Institutional Assessment and Effectiveness

Date: December 1, 2008

Re: Draft Action Plan for Planning and Assessment

This memo contains information and a set of materials that are important to the College Senate's upcoming action, scheduled for December 8, on my draft action plan for planning and assessment. These materials include a brief description of the principles that guided the development of the plan; a series of "frequently heard concerns" raised about the plan by the campus community as well as my responses; and a table summarizing issues expressed by the Committee on Administrative Review, Committee on Instruction, and Curriculum Committee as well as my responses (Appendix A). In addition, I am attaching revisions of the September action plan narrative (Appendix B) and draft action plan (Appendix C) reflecting input and feedback received from the campus community and Senate committees; both Appendix B and Appendix C show tracked changes so the revisions are clear.

As usual, thanks to you and the Steering Committee for your much-appreciated (and needed!) support and collegiality throughout this process. And, of course, please let me know if you require additional information.

Principles Underlying Action Plan

First and foremost, the Draft Action Plan for Planning and Assessment reflects AAHE's nine principles of good assessment practice. These nine principles are as follows (a more complete explanation of each principle can be found at <http://www.facet.iupui.edu/resources/AAHE%20Principles.pdf>):

1. The assessment of student learning begins with educational values.
2. Assessment is most effective when it reflects an understanding of learning as multidimensional, integrated, and revealed in performance over time.
3. Assessment works best when the programs it seeks to improve have clear, explicitly stated purposes.
4. Assessment requires attention to outcomes but also and equally to the experiences that lead to those outcomes.
5. Assessment works best when it is ongoing not episodic.
6. Assessment fosters wider improvement when representatives from across the educational community are involved.
7. Assessment makes a difference when it begins with issues of use and illuminates questions that people really care about.
8. Assessment is most likely to lead to improvement when it is part of a larger set of conditions that promote change.
9. Through assessment, educators meet responsibilities to students and to the public.

In addition, the draft action plan relies heavily on lessons and values I learned in helping formulate and lead the SUNY Assessment Initiative, particularly as co-chair of the Provost's Advisory Task Force on Student Learning Outcomes (1999-2000) and of the General Education Assessment Review Group (GEAR) (2001-present). Two of these lessons/values can be articulated as follows:

1. Assessment guidelines should always focus on **process**, not content. This point is perhaps best demonstrated in GEAR's Review Process Guidelines which ask SUNY campuses to provide evidence that their assessment approach will yield "credible evidence" that students are achieving desired student learning outcomes but are entirely non-prescriptive with respect to the specific assessment measures or methods faculty elect to use. (GEAR's Guidelines can be accessed at <http://www.cortland.edu/gear/GEAR%20Guidelines%2002-01-06.pdf>).
2. Like many other functions in higher education, good assessment practice is most likely to emerge and benefit from a system of peer review, with colleagues who have expertise in assessment providing feedback and support to departments and units in the process of developing and implementing assessment plans. The SUNY-wide GEAR group serves as a good model in this respect, evaluating campus general education assessment plans based on the guidelines described immediately above and offering suggestions for revision as appropriate in order to strengthen plans.

Frequently Heard Concerns

The concerns included in this section reflect comments and feedback offered in a variety of campus venues since discussion of the action plan began earlier this semester. These venues include department /office meetings, College Senate meetings, and a session of the Council of Chairs. Following each item, I offer my response, including a statement as to whether the concern is "true," "false," or somewhere in between.

1. ***By having to adhere to assessment plan guidelines developed by APAC and IAC, programs and offices will lose all flexibility and autonomy in their formulation and implementation of assessment activities.***

False. The guidelines to be developed by APAC and IAC will focus on the assessment process itself, and will therefore be relatively "generic" in their requirements (e.g., does the plan include objectives and outcomes, are proposed measures sound, is there a clear mechanism for "closing the loop"?). In addition, programs and offices that have quality assessment programs in place (and therefore are already meeting or exceeding expectations conveyed in the APAC or IAC guidelines), as determined by their dean or vice president, will not have to submit new assessment plans in response to the guidelines.

2. ***A major objective of the plan is to standardize assessment across the campus and impose a "one size fits all" approach to assessment on departments and offices.***

False. First, refer to the points about flexibility/autonomy immediately above. Those things said, it is important for members of the Oneonta community to realize that some campus programs and offices have not been implementing assessment effectively, and would in fact benefit greatly from some guidance and feedback. Hopefully, the proposed plan provides a reasonable balance between this guidance (for those units that need it) and autonomy (for those that don't).

- 3. APAC and IAC will have the authority to “force” specific assessment approaches and measures on departments and offices.**

False. According to the SUNY Board of Trustees, faculty are responsible for the development and delivery of curricular programs on SUNY campuses, which includes the evaluation or assessment of those programs. As such, faculty members are always the content specialists when determining the best measure or strategy for assessing their curriculum. Similarly, non-teaching faculty are the experts when determining the best way to assess the programs and services offered by their offices or units.

- 4. The action plan will significantly increase workload for faculty and staff and lead to redundancy in what programs and offices have to do (i.e., another layer of bureaucracy).**

Unlikely. To the greatest extent possible, activities related to implementing the draft action plan will be folded into existing activities. For example, academic programs that have undergone the SUNY program review process will have already done much of the work required for developing an assessment plan. Similarly, every year programs and offices have to submit an annual report summarizing many of the elements that would be part of a good assessment plan (e.g., objectives (including student learning outcomes for academic programs), actions to be taken, measures, results). Most important, the draft action plan emphasizes making assessment part of what we do on a day-to-day basis as opposed to conceptualizing it as “separate” from what we do. In this way, assessment activities actually become streamlined.

Those things said, the extent to which implementing the action plan requires additional effort is dependent on the current status of assessment in a particular program or office. In addition, in most cases consideration will have to be given to how to better document the assessment process and use of assessment results to effect change, since many programs and offices seem challenged by these functions at present. It is intended that progress made in planned activities related to improving information and access to information across campus will help in this regard.

- 5. Having a committee to facilitate general education assessment (i.e., GEAC) will likely lead to changes in our SUNY-approved general education assessment plan.**

True. However, campuses submit changes to their GEAR-approved plan all the time (as we did recently when we decided as a campus to administer the Collegiate Learning Assessment or CLA to assess Critical Thinking as part of Strengthened Campus-Based Assessment). More important, a major strength of the proposed action plan is the fact that Oneonta will for the first time have a standing committee to advise the Senate on general education assessment. Possible issues for discussion and review by GEAC include the fact that Oneonta has been assessing all twelve SUNY general education student learning outcome areas every semester, when GEAR only requires that each area be assessed every three years. Further, it is imperative that the campus address the general lack of “closing the loop” for general education assessment – GEAC would be an obvious entity for addressing this problem and making recommendations for change.

6. *The plan doesn't clarify how academic departments will receive the technical and advisory support and assistance they need to conduct assessment in a useful fashion.*

Sorry this isn't clearer. First, the College made a significant commitment to and investment in beginning to provide this support when it decided to create and fill the Associate Provost for Institutional Assessment and Effectiveness position in Fall 2007. Indeed, a major part of my office's charge is to consult with programs and offices on these issues, and I have done so very frequently this past year, on topics ranging from developing mission statements and unit objectives to the most appropriate assessment methodologies and measures to the use of e-portfolios.

In addition to my role, the proposed action plan would help build and promote "cadres" of individuals capable of assisting programs and offices on assessment-related issues, primarily in the form of APAC, IAC, and GEAC. Further, the plan calls for bringing external consultants to campus to provide assessment expertise as appropriate. Other parts of the action plan that should be very helpful to faculty and staff include those activities related to enhancing the state of information and access to information across campus.

7. *In the current budget climate, spending money on the proposed action plan simply can't be justified.*

Hmmmm, that's a hard one. Of course, colleges have to make hard decisions all the time about how to allocate resources, and as a community we have to have confidence that the President's Cabinet, when faced with competing demands and needs, will make decisions in the best interest of the institution. While it would be disingenuous for me to state that I don't care whether or not the draft action plan is funded, I can honestly argue that a decision to endorse the plan should not depend on whether or not the President's Cabinet will decide to fund it. Instead, this decision should be based on the plan's merits, on its potential for serving as a model for good and valuable assessment practice in an institution of higher education. Moreover, a review of the plan shows that only six of 28 actions contained in the plan require funding at all, meaning that a great deal of progress can be made without additional resources.

Appendix A
Planning and Assessment Action Plan
SUNY Oneonta
Associate Provost’s Responses to Concerns Raised About Plan

Concern/Issue	Source ¹	Associate Provost Response	
		A/D ²	Comments
1. Specify how GEAC and IAC are constituted and structured.	CAR, CC	A	This specification, as proposed by the College Senate Steering Committee, is now attached to the plan.
2. Eliminate “oversee and” in Sub-Objective 1, Actions A and B.	CAR	A	Appropriate changes have been made in the plan.
3. For Sub-Objective 1, Actions C and D, replace “template” with “guidelines.”	CAR	A	Appropriate changes have been made in the plan.
4. Amend Sub-Objective 1, Action F to include “Academic Departments,” “Administrative Units,” “Deans” and “Vice Presidents” in “Person(s) Responsible.”	CAR	A	Appropriate changes have been made in the plan.
5. For Sub-Objective 3, Action B, make the College Senate the “lead partner” in drafting the “Assessment Philosophy.”	CAR	A	Appropriate changes have been made in the plan.
6. For Sub-Objective 4, replace “incentive” with “remediation” and eliminate “competitive” in Actions A and B.	CAR	D	The major intent of Actions A and B are to reward good assessment practice, which is fundamentally counter to the shifting of these funds for “remediation.” However, any department or unit will be able to apply for these funds for the purpose of advancing any aspect of its assessment plan, regardless of how “advanced” that plan is.
7. For Sub-Objective #5, add “mission of the College after “ensure they support.”	CAR	A	Appropriate changes have been made in the plan.
8. The plan does not clearly demonstrate how the College will move closer to “closing the loop” on assessment.	CI	A	The process of reviewing assessment results and feeding that information back into what faculty and staff members do (i.e., “closing the loop”) is an integral, in fact indispensable component of “assessment plan implementation” referred to in Sub-Objective #1 Action G. The action plan now makes explicit reference to this fact.

¹ Key: CAR=Committee on Administrative Review; CI=Committee on Instruction; CC-Curriculum Committee

² This column indicates whether or not the Associate Provost agreed or disagreed with the concern expressed, as appropriate.

Concern/Issue	Source ¹	Associate Provost Response	
		A/D ²	Comments
9. The plan's emphasis on "templates" and "uniformity" raises concerns about the extent to which programs will have autonomy and flexibility in developing and implementing their assessment plans.	CI, CC	A	This concern should be alleviated by replacing "template" with "guidelines in Sub-Objective 1, Actions C and D (see Number 3 above).
10. The plan doesn't include criteria by which assessment plans will be reviewed by APAC and IAC.	CI	A	A major activity for APAC and IAC is to develop guidelines for departments/units to follow in developing assessment plans. Since the guidelines do not yet exist, it is not possible to provide the criteria by which plans will be reviewed. As these processes advance, draft versions of both the guidelines and evaluative criteria will be provided to the campus community for review and feedback.
11. More information is needed about the "Assessment Coordinator" referenced in the plan.	CC		Dr. Anuradhaa Shastri has served in this capacity for a number of years, and would continue to do so, providing an important liaison function primarily to faculty in their assessment and accreditation efforts (including Middle States).

Appendix B
Narrative Accompanying Analysis & Action Plan –
Planning and Assessment at SUNY Oneonta
December 2008

Introduction and Background Information

The State University of New York College at Oneonta (SUNY Oneonta) has clearly positioned itself in the last five years as a highly selective institution of choice within the SUNY system. Through careful planning, assessment, and resource allocation, the College has had extraordinary success achieving its goals as determined through major performance indicators in areas such as enrollment, admissions, student retention and graduation, student satisfaction and engagement, faculty hiring, facilities management, and fundraising.

Specifically with respect to planning and assessment, since 1997 the College has been guided by its Comprehensive College Plan (CCP), a dynamic document that addresses seven institution-wide themes (Academic Quality, Enrollment Management, Student Engagement, Diversity and Inclusion, Quality of Campus Life, Community, External Support and Image) and is revised periodically (i.e., five times since 1997) to reflect changes in local context as well as in the higher education landscape more generally. The CCP derives directly from the College's Mission Statement, and the processes of developing and revising the CCP have been widely participatory, with many campus groups and constituents providing input and feedback.

SUNY Oneonta's assessment-related activities are also impressive. Although the College received no formal recommendations in this area from the Middle States Commission in Higher Education (MSCHE) following its last decennial evaluation in 2003, the institution implemented a number of relevant suggestions from MSCHE, including the provision of more resources to support faculty development directed toward the assessment of student learning outcomes. Similarly, SUNY Oneonta is in complete compliance with the requirements of the SUNY Assessment Initiative, implemented in 2001. To be specific, with respect to the assessment of academic majors, the College completed its first full cycle of these assessments – which include independent evaluations by two external consultants – in the 2007-08 academic year. In terms of assessing general education, SUNY Oneonta has exceeded SUNY requirements, being one of only a few institutions that on an annual basis assess all ten Knowledge and Skill areas and two Competencies making up the SUNY General Education Requirement. Further, the College has engaged itself in the national discussion on outcomes assessment and accountability, becoming one of only 17 institutions in Fall 2007 to participate in the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) pilot project; the College's participation in VSA continues past the pilot phase, with the final draft of the institutional College Portrait posted in May 2008 on the VSA website (<http://www.oneonta.edu/general/vsa/CollegePortrait.pdf>). Finally, effective 2008-09, SUNY Oneonta began to administer the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) as a result of a resolution endorsed by the College Senate.

Despite these accomplishments in the areas of planning and assessment – or perhaps because of them – SUNY Oneonta has refused to rest on its laurels in these key areas. In November 2007 the College created and filled a new position, Associate Provost for Institutional Assessment and Effectiveness. This position has explicit responsibility for providing leadership in academic planning and assessment and for developing and advancing a college-wide model of institutional assessment and effectiveness. The

College is to be commended for taking this step, especially given the fact that it has consistently demonstrated strength in its planning and assessment activities.

Challenges, and Opportunities

Although SUNY Oneonta has recently distinguished itself in the areas of planning and assessment, there are reasons to suggest that the institution would benefit from a formal action plan to guide these activities over the next five years. First and foremost, planning and assessment – conceptualized and implemented properly – are by definition ongoing and iterative, (i.e., they are never really “over”). A renewed, systematic approach would surely serve the College well as it prepares for its 2013 decennial visit from MSCHE, especially since the institution has not undergone an on-site MSCHE evaluation under MSCHE’s new standards, introduced in 2006, on planning, learning outcomes assessment, and institutional assessment.

More important, a close review of planning and assessment documents since 2003, as well as multiple conversations with faculty and staff members, reveal challenges that, although not uncommon in higher education institutions, require resolution if SUNY Oneonta aspires to advance its planning and assessment efforts beyond their current status. These challenges are as follows:

1. The quality of outcomes assessment is very uneven across academic programs and administrative units, with some programs/units characterized by high quality assessment plans and others still in the beginning stages of developing a plan. Similarly, there is great heterogeneity among faculty and staff members with respect to their knowledge of and experience with outcomes assessment.
2. Although support for academic program assessment has existed for many years in the form of the Academic Program Assessment Committee (APAC), for the most part this group has served to advance the “accountability” functions of assessment (e.g., developing guidelines and forms for assessment reporting) as opposed to helping guide assessment policy and assisting faculty and academic programs develop good practice assessment plans.
3. Despite the abundance of assessment activity being conducted by faculty members, there is a strong sense that few changes are being made in teaching, learning, and curricular programs based on assessment results; this situation is especially characteristic of general education assessment. In large part, this situation reflects a lack of *documentation* with respect to assessment (i.e., the process of explicitly recording assessment data, using those data to make changes relative to target objectives, and having a written record of these activities).
4. Unlike academic program assessment, there is no campus-wide body to guide general education assessment, which may partially explain the perception that, overall, general education assessment is not leading to curricular enhancements.
5. Similarly, there is no campus-wide body to guide the assessment of administrative units.
6. In general, assessment is viewed, especially by faculty, as more “top down” than “bottom up,” a situation that has resulted in some resistance to and skepticism about the process. Similarly, SUNY Oneonta students have played a minimal role in the institution’s assessment efforts.

7. Sources of institutional data – the foundation of sound planning, assessment, and decision-making – are not well integrated across the College, and faculty and staff members are not generally aware of important data sources nor do they have access to them.
8. Although there are examples at the institutional level of linking planning and assessment activities on an ongoing basis, such linkages – especially *documented* linkages – are not prevalent at the unit level, and it is even more difficult to identify explicit linkages between planning and assessment and resource allocation. Further, much of unit-level planning is annual as opposed to longer-term.

It is worth noting again that these challenges are not atypical for colleges and universities today, and SUNY Oneonta has an advantage relative to other institutions in that its past achievements in planning and assessment provide a solid foundation – and opportunity – for making further progress in these areas. If there is a criticism to be made of these previous efforts, it is that the College has been more successful at implementing “assessment as accountability” and less successful at establishing a culture of assessment – and institutional effectiveness – that emphasizes assessment as a mechanism for *enhancing* its programs, services and community overall. The attached action plan for planning and assessment at SUNY Oneonta explicitly attempts to instill a planning and assessment program that does stress “assessment as enhancement,” with objectives and strategies that specifically address the challenges described above. Simply put, this action plan is based on the assumption that, although the accountability and enhancement functions of assessment are critical, the latter is more important. Further, while “assessment as enhancement” will directly lead to “assessment as accountability,” the opposite does not necessarily hold true.

Principles Underlying Action Plan

The action plan for planning and assessment at SUNY Oneonta was conceptualized as an approximately four-year process, so that it can be completed in time to develop and write the institutional self-study for MSCHE’s decennial evaluation in Spring 2013. In particular, it is intended that the plan enable the College to meet the following standards included in the MSCHE *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education* (2006), which states that an “accredited institution is expected to possess or demonstrate the following attributes or activities”:

- goals and objectives or strategies, both institution-wide and for individual units that are clearly stated, reflect conclusions drawn from assessment results, are linked to mission and goal achievement, and are used for planning and resource allocation at the institutional and unit levels;
- a documented, organized, and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve student learning that maximizes the use of existing data and information; is of sufficient quality that results can be used with confidence to inform decisions; is supported by faculty and administration; demonstrates that student learning assessment information is used as a part of institutional assessment; and
- documented, organized, and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve the total range of programs and services.

In addition, the action plan for planning and assessment is based on the following principles:

1. Planning and assessment are first and foremost processes which, properly implemented, lead to the enhancement of teaching, learning, curricular programs, and campus services as well as faculty and staff dialogue, development, and community-building.
2. Effective planning and assessment practice can only be attained through participation by and consultation with all members of the campus community, including faculty, staff, administrators, and students.
3. All academic programs and administrative units should have sound planning and assessment programs in place, with mechanisms built in to assure that information gained through assessment is used to modify practices as appropriate and inform subsequent planning, decision-making, and resource allocation.
4. To the greatest extent possible, planning and assessment processes should be guided and facilitated by groups consisting of faculty, staff, and students as appropriate.
5. The institution should provide as much guidance and direction as programs and administrative units need to support good planning and assessment practices. At the same time, the institution should allow autonomy and flexibility in the program or unit's selection of specific assessment strategies and measures consistent with discipline and/or functional area.
6. The College should disseminate and make widely available important sources of institution-wide and program-specific data, taking precautions to assure the latter are accessible only to the individual programs themselves.
7. The institution should demonstrate on an ongoing basis and in concrete and visible fashion that it values and rewards programs and administrative units that engage in effective planning, assessment, decision-making, and resource allocation.

The Action Plan's Sub-Objectives

Although the attached action plan is intended to enable SUNY Oneonta to advance planning and assessment in a holistic, cohesive fashion, it does consist of six individual sub-objectives that contribute toward that objective in specific, individualistic ways. As such, the current section includes a description of each sub-objective, complete with a brief rationale and explanation of its primary themes.

Sub-Objective #1 – Enhance the quality of outcomes assessment across the institution through a coordinated, efficient, and sustained effort. The activities outlined under this sub-objective are directed toward achieving more uniformity in assessment practices and less variability in the quality of those practices across the institution. Similarly, these activities reinforce the notion that the general education program as well as administrative units require direction as is now the case for academic programs in the form of APAC. Reflecting the variability in quality of assessment practices across academic programs and administrative units, it should be noted that many of the actions included in this sub-objective will focus on those programs and units more in need of guidance and direction. Those programs and units that already have solid planning and assessment plans in place – as identified by deans and vice presidents – will simply continue with their ongoing implementation of those plans.

Sub-Objective #2 – Increase faculty and staff members’ and students’ knowledge and understanding of outcomes assessment. One of the surest ways to increase community members’ support for – and decrease their skepticism about – planning and assessment is to provide a program of activities that highlight the many ways these processes can benefit them and improve the campus environment. This particular sub-objective aspires to use a variety of strategies and venues – featuring both in-house and external expertise as needed – to emphasize this perspective. Such an approach can be especially effective if faculty, staff, and students new to the College have the opportunity to acquire this information in their earliest experiences at the institution.

Sub-Objective #3 – Elevate the College’s public commitment to outcomes assessment and its importance in enhancing programs, services, and campus life. The overarching intentions of this sub-objective are twofold: to demonstrate faculty and staff support for the planning and assessment processes and to show in a public and visible fashion the degree to which SUNY Oneonta views these processes as mechanisms for enhancing its programs and services. The activities under this sub-objective also serve the important function of emphasizing to students that the institution values outcomes assessment.

Sub-Objective #4 – Establish incentive structure for programs, units, and individuals contributing to the College’s planning and assessment efforts. This sub-objective’s actions provide a mechanism to help programs and units advance their planning and assessment efforts as well as to reward them for achievements in these areas. Similarly, faculty and staff members can learn more about planning and assessment – information they would then be expected to share with their colleagues back on campus – and at the same time participate in valuable professional development activities.

Sub-Objective #5 – Maximize the accuracy, utility, and transparency of institutional data sources and ensure they support the mission of the College. The activities included under this sub-objective are intended to clarify what existing faculty and staff members need with respect to institutional data as well as to determine the best way of providing that information, taking care to assure that program-specific data sources are protected appropriately. As much as possible, attempts will be made to focus on existing data, institutional structure, and technologies, although there may be some need to at least consider the possibility for the future of institutional reorganization (e.g., creation of an institutional research office) and new ways of integrating and providing data (e.g., building a data warehouse).

Sub-Objective #6 – Develop and implement a plan that links long-range planning, assessment, and budgeting across and at different levels of the institution. At present, there is little explicit linkage among planning, assessment, and resource allocation across institutional levels (i.e., from program to school, from school to division). Further, much of the planning that is done is annual as opposed to longer-term. The activities included as part of this sub-objective would result in a review and discussion of good educational practices – using institutions designated as such by MSCHE and the Society for College and University Planning (SCUP) – and, ultimately the selection of a model to be used by SUNY Oneonta for this purpose. They would also lead to the annual publication of a report documenting how the College links planning, assessment, and budgeting, which would bring constructive transparency to the process as well as demonstrate to the campus community that such linkages are valued and rewarded.

It is important to note that the focus of this sub-objective is not to “reward” units that achieve good assessment results and to “punish” units that achieve less positive outcomes. Rather, it is to assure that SUNY Oneonta practices effective planning, the purposes of which are, as stated by MSCHE,

“to determine if institutional and unit level mission and goals are being achieved, to understand why they have or have not been achieved, to evaluate whether institutional resources are being allocated and used in accordance with the priorities established by the institutional mission and goals, and to determine if the quality and quantity of resources allocated for the achievement of each institutional goal is appropriate.” Of course, these are complex issues and processes and therefore likely to lag behind the development and implementation of unit level planning and assessment procedures. Therefore, as shown in the attached action plan, implementation of this sub-objective is scheduled for later in the four-year timeline.

Appendix C
Planning & Assessment at SUNY Oneonta
Analysis and Action Plan
September 2008

Objective: *Develop and implement a college-wide plan for transforming SUNY Oneonta’s “accountability culture” to one that uses planning and assessment to enhance all elements of the campus community.*

Sub-Objective	Action(s) Required	Success Indicator	Target Completion Date	Resources Required	Person(s) Responsible
1. Enhance the quality of planning and outcomes assessment across the institution through a coordinated, efficient, and sustained effort.	A. Establish a committee to facilitate planning and assessment in the College’s administrative units. ¹	A. Representative committee (IAC) formed and operational	A. 09/30/08	A. N/A	A. APIAE, VP’s, CS
	B. Establish a committee to facilitate GE assessment planning.	B. Committee (GEAC) formed and operational ²	B. 09/30/08	B. N/A	B. APIAE, Provost, Deans, CS
	C. Develop guidelines and prototypes for academic programs to follow in developing assessment plans.	C. Guidelines and prototypes developed/ disseminated	C. 11/15/08	C. N/A	C. APIAE, APAC, AC
	D. Develop guidelines and prototypes for administrative units to follow in developing assessment plans.	D. Guidelines and prototypes developed/ disseminated ³	D. 11/15/08	D. N/A	D. APIAE, IAC
	E. Staggered schedule developed/				

¹ Administrative units refer to all college units that are not academic departments.

² Specification for forming IAC and GEAC, as proposed by College Senate Steering Committee, can be found immediately following Appendix C.

³ As IAC and APAC develop guidelines and evaluative criteria, both groups will periodically provide drafts to the campus community for review and feedback.

Sub-Objective	Action(s) Required	Success Indicator	Target Completion Date	Resources Required	Person(s) Responsible
1. Enhance the quality of planning and outcomes assessment across the institution through a coordinated, efficient, and sustained effort (cont.).	<p>E. Develop schedule for assessment plan submissions by academic programs and administrative units.</p> <p>F. Ensure that all academic programs and administrative units have approved assessment plans.</p> <p>G. Complete first round of assessment plan implementation by academic programs and support and service units.</p>	<p>disseminated</p> <p>F. All assessment plans approved</p> <p>G. All assessment plans fully implemented⁴</p>	<p>E. 11/15/08</p> <p>F. 06/01/09</p> <p>G. 06/01/12</p>	<p>E. N/A</p> <p>F. N/A</p> <p>G. N/A</p>	<p>E. APIAE, APAC, IAC</p> <p>F. APIAE, APAC, IAC, AD's, AU's, VP's, Deans</p> <p>G. APIAE, VP's, Deans</p>
2. Increase faculty and staff members' and students' knowledge and understanding of outcomes assessment.	<p>A. Conduct session on outcomes assessment at new faculty/staff orientation.</p> <p>B. Conduct assessment workshops on as-requested basis for academic departments and administrative units.</p> <p>C. Develop schedule each semester of assessment-related events conducted by in-house and external presenters.</p> <p>D. Meet with Student Association do discuss importance of outcomes assessment and benefits to students.</p>	<p>A. Session developed and conducted; Positive feedback via surveys</p> <p>B. 5 workshops held each semester for academic departments and for support and service units; Positive feedback via surveys</p> <p>C. 3 events held each semester, with one by external presenter; Positive feedback via surveys</p> <p>D. Meeting held each semester</p>	<p>A. Summer 2008</p> <p>B. Ongoing</p> <p>C. Ongoing</p> <p>D. Ongoing</p>	<p>A. N/A</p> <p>B. N/A</p> <p>C. \$3,000</p> <p>D. N/A</p>	<p>A. APIAE, AC</p> <p>B. APIAE, AC</p> <p>C. APIAE, AC, APAC, IAC</p> <p>D. APIAE</p>

⁴ "Implementation" of assessment plans necessarily includes using assessment data to make improvements (i.e., "closing the loop") as appropriate.

Sub-Objective	Action(s) Required	Success Indicator	Target Completion Date	Resources Required	Person(s) Responsible
2. Increase faculty and staff members' and students' knowledge and understanding of outcomes assessment (cont.).	E. Develop brochure on the value of outcomes assessment to students and distribute at orientation.	E. Brochure developed and distributed	E. Ongoing	E. \$1,000	E. APIAE
3. Elevate the College's public commitment to outcomes assessment and its importance in enhancing programs, services, and campus life.	<p>A. Prepare resolution for College Senate in support of planning and assessment activity and request its endorsement.</p> <p>B. Prepare assessment philosophy for College Senate, request its endorsement, and disseminate widely.</p> <p>C. Update College's Assessment Website to emphasize assessment as <i>enhancement</i>.</p> <p>D. Hold campus-wide Assessment Day featuring good assessment practices by academic programs and support and service units.</p>	<p>A. Resolution developed & endorsed</p> <p>B. Philosophy developed & endorsed, published in <i>Catalog</i> and on Web</p> <p>C. Website updated and revised on regular basis</p> <p>D. Assessment Day held on annual basis; 50% of academic departments and administrative units participate; Positive feedback via surveys</p>	<p>A. Fall 2008</p> <p>B. Fall 2008</p> <p>C. 09/01/08</p> <p>D. 05/09 and ongoing</p>	<p>A. N/A</p> <p>B. N/A</p> <p>C. N/A</p> <p>D. \$3,000</p>	<p>A. APIAE, AC, APAC, IAC, CS</p> <p>A. CS, APIAE, AC, APAC, IAC,</p> <p>B. APIAE, AC, APAC, IAC</p> <p>C. APIAE, AC, APAC, IAC</p>
4. Establish incentive structure for programs, units, and individuals contributing to the College's planning and assessment efforts.	A. Develop and implement competitive grants program for academic departments and units to advance their assessment plans.	A. Program implemented and submissions received from 5 academic departments and 5 administrative units; 5 grants awarded	A. 11/08	A. \$10,000	A. APIAE, AC, APAC, IAC

Sub-Objective	Action(s) Required	Success Indicator	Target Completion Date	Resources Required	Person(s) Responsible
4. Establish incentive structure for programs, units, and individuals contributing to the College's planning and assessment efforts (cont.).	<p>B. Develop and implement competitive program to fund faculty and staff travel to assessment-related conferences and workshops.</p> <p>C. Recognize good assessment practice programs and units in various public fora (e.g., Web site, Assessment Day, college publications).</p>	<p>B. Program implemented and submissions received from 10 faculty and staff; 5 grants awarded</p> <p>C. Good practices site added to Assessment Website; good practices acknowledged in annual reports</p>	<p>B. 11/08</p> <p>C. 11/08</p>	<p>B. \$10,000</p> <p>C. N/A</p>	<p>B. APIAE, AC, APAC, IAC</p> <p>C. APIAE, AC, APAC, IAC</p>
5. Maximize the accuracy, utility, and transparency of institutional data sources and ensure they support the mission of the College.	<p>A. Reconstitute IRC for the purpose of studying institutional information needs and making recommendations.</p> <p>B. Survey faculty and staff regarding information needs and access to institutional information.</p> <p>C. Interview appropriate individuals and staff regarding current status of institutional data.</p> <p>D. Study good practices at other colleges with respect to institutional data sources and dissemination of information.</p> <p>E. Prepare and submit report and recommendations to President's Cabinet for approval.</p>	<p>A. IRC reconstituted and operational</p> <p>B. Survey developed and administered</p> <p>C. Interviews conducted</p> <p>D. Study completed and information compiled</p> <p>E. Report and recommendations completed and submitted</p>	<p>A. 09/08</p> <p>B. 11/08</p> <p>C. 11/08</p> <p>D. 11/08</p> <p>E. 12/08</p>	<p>A. N/A</p> <p>B. N/A</p> <p>C. N/A</p> <p>D. N/A</p> <p>E. N/A</p>	<p>A. President</p> <p>B. IRC, APIAE</p> <p>C. IRC, APIAE</p> <p>D. IRC, APIAE</p> <p>E. IRC, APIAE</p>
6. Review and improve existing mechanisms	A. Study good practices at other colleges with respect to linking planning,	A. Study completed and information compiled	A. 09/09	A. N/A	A. APIAE

Sub-Objective	Action(s) Required	Success Indicator	Target Completion Date	Resources Required	Person(s) Responsible
for linking planning, assessment, and budgeting across and at different levels of the institution.	<p>assessment, and budgeting.</p> <p>B. Develop and delineate specific mechanisms for linking assessment activities across operational units and levels of the College.</p> <p>C. Review and improve existing mechanisms for linking planning and assessment activities to the College's budgeting process.</p> <p>D. Publish annual report on the College's planning and assessment activities clearly demonstrating the integration of assessment across the College and the linking of assessment, planning, and budgeting.</p>	<p>B. Flow chart of assessment plan activities across the College developed and submitted to the President's Cabinet for approval</p> <p>C. Flow chart linking planning, assessment, and budgeting across the College developed and submitted to the President's Cabinet for approval</p> <p>D. Report prepared and disseminated to campus community and posted on Website</p>	<p>B. 05/10</p> <p>C. 05/10</p> <p>D. 06/11</p>	<p>B. N/A</p> <p>C. N/A</p> <p>D. \$5,000</p>	<p>B. APIAE, AC, APAC, IAC</p> <p>C. APIAE, AC, VP'S, COD</p> <p>D. APIAE, AC</p>

TOTAL RESOURCES REQUIRED - \$32,000

KEY:

APIAE=Associate Provost for Institutional Assessment and Effectiveness
 CS=College Senate
 APAC-Academic Program Assessment Committee
 AC=Assessment Coordinator
 COD=Council of Deans

IAC=Institutional Assessment Committee
 IRC=Institutional Research Council
 AD=Academic Departments
 AU=Administrative Units

In the spirit of shared faculty governance the College Senate Steering Committee presents the following recommendations regarding the assessment committees' structure for the Action Plan for Planning and Assessment. The intent of these recommendations is to maintain the position of the College Senate as a recommending body to the administration while also voicing active interest in this process.

Proposed Committee Structure for Action Plan for Planning and Assessment

Part I: Institutional Assessment Committee

IAC is to oversee and facilitate planning and assessment in the College's administrative units. Persons responsible for establishing this committee are the Associate Provost for Institutional Assessment & Effectiveness, Vice Presidents for the Divisions of the College, and College Senate.

Committee Member Selection: After appropriate consultation with the Divisional Vice Presidents and the College Senate Steering Committee, the Presiding Officer of the Faculty will nominate and forward one Non-Teaching Faculty member from each administrative division of the College to the College Senate for approval.

Additionally, one member from each of the administrative divisions will be appointed by the respective Vice President. Also, one representative from the Faculty Committee on Administrative Review will serve on this committee and be chosen by said committee.

Length of Committee Service: Members of the Committee shall have a term of three years with a two term maximum; after an intervening term, one may seek additional term(s). Terms shall be staggered to allow for appointments on a rotating basis.

Part II: General Education Assessment Committee

GEAC is to oversee and facilitate General Education assessment planning. Persons responsible for establishing this committee are the Associate Provost for Institutional Assessment & Effectiveness, Provost, Academic Deans, and College Senate.

Committee Member Selection: Full time teaching faculty from departments offering courses in the following attribute groups will nominate and forward one full time Teaching Faculty member from each of the following general education attribute groups to the College Senate for approval.

- Sciences (NL and NL2)
- Mathematics (M2)
- Social Science (S2)
- Humanities, Arts, and Foreign Language (AA2, AH2, FL2)
- History & Civilization (HA2, HW2, HO2)
- Basic Writing and Communication Skills (BC2, WS2, OS2)

Additionally, two members from each academic division will be appointed by the respective deans.

Length of Committee Service: Members of the Committee shall have a term of three years with a two term maximum; after an intervening term, one may seek additional term(s). Terms shall be staggered to allow for appointments on a rotating basis.

Part III: Academic Program Assessment Committee

APAC is to oversee and facilitate academic program assessment planning and with assisting academic departments and programs in undertaking programmatic assessment and reporting. Persons

responsible for establishing this committee are the Associate Provost for Institutional Assessment & Effectiveness, Provost, and College Senate.

Committee Member Selection: After appropriate consultation with the Provost and the College Senate Steering Committee, the Presiding Officer of the Faculty will nominate and forward three Faculty members from each of the academic divisions and one from the library to the College Senate for approval.

Additionally, two members may be appointed by the Provost.

Length of Committee Service: Members of the Committee shall have a term of three years with a two term maximum; after an intervening term, one may seek additional term(s). Terms shall be staggered to allow for appointments on a rotating basis.