

1-1-1995

DOC 1995-02 Assessment Plan

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Assessment Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_docs

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Assessment Committee, "DOC 1995-02 Assessment Plan" (1995).
Senate Documents. 126.

https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_docs/126

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Senate Documents by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

PROPOSAL TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE

TITLE Assessment Plan

SUBMITTED BY Assessment Committee

DATE April 21, 1995

Indicate the action required: Legislative, Concurrence, or Consultation, and refer to the appropriate reference in the Senate Constitution (Article 11B, 1, 2, 3).

ACTION IS: _____ REFERENCE IS: _____

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Question One: To what extent has the institution demonstrated that the plan is linked to the mission, goals, and objectives of the institution for learning and academic achievement, including learning in general education and in the major?

Over the past fifteen years the University community encouraged by its President has engaged in a dialogue over the institutional mission that has produced a series of statements and reports that articulate the traditions, philosophy, goals and objectives of the University. **Using these documents and working with the Assessment Plan Committee, all academic departments and programs have developed assessment plans that closely link the University Mission with specific learning outcomes including those for general education and for the major.** Further, University assessment has been integrated into the University's annual strategic planning and budget review process which is based on the systematic linkage of University goals with decision-making and the allocation of resources.

Question Two: What is the institution's evidence that faculty have participated in the development of the institution's plan and that the plan is institution-wide in conceptualization and scope?

The Assessment Plan Committee that developed the University assessment plan was structured to ensure faculty participation and leadership as well as institution-wide involvement and commitment. The membership of that Committee reflects the structure of the University as a comprehensive institution and its traditions as a Catholic and Marianist university. Consequently, there is a faculty representative from each of the professional schools, three from the College, one for general education, and the Chair of the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate. The faculty representatives from each of the academic divisions and for general education received additional compensation to assure that they had time to work closely with faculty in the development of assessment plans at the department level and for general education. In addition, the Associate Dean of the Graduate School served on the Committee to represent the overall area of graduate education. The result was ongoing participation and ownership by faculty at every stage in the development of the assessment plan. This participation began at the essential level of defining outcomes that flowed from the University Mission and the selection of multiple measures for these outcomes.

The assessment plan was submitted to the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate for its consideration. Under the auspices of this faculty-led committee, the plan was sent to every academic department with a request for comments and criticisms based on the five evaluative questions framed by the North Central Association. In response to these critiques, the plan was revised and submitted by the Academic Policies Committee to the Academic Senate for legislative concurrence. The Academic Senate made up of faculty, students, and academic administrators favorably reviewed the assessment plan.

At the same time, the Mission of the University includes educational goals that extend beyond the curriculum to include the entire undergraduate experience. Clearly, the formulation of a University assessment plan must include university-wide involvement. Consequently, the Assessment Plan Committee had strong representation from Student Development, academic administration, and academic support areas. The result is a comprehensive assessment plan that seeks to define and measure academic attainment and educational outcomes that flow not only from the classroom and laboratory but also from participation in the University community and, often, from broader society. This approach makes the University assessment plan institution-wide in conceptualization and scope.

Question Three: How does the plan demonstrate the likelihood that the assessment program will lead to institutional improvement when it is implemented?

The University assessment plan has been systematically integrated into the strategic planning and budget allocation process of the University. **As part of the planning process to ensure that continual improvement is integral to assessment, each department and program must submit an annual report that includes the following information: the iteration of four to six carefully defined outcomes; the linkage of these outcomes directly to the University Mission; the multiple measures developed for each outcome; a schedule for the application of the measures and an analysis of the results; and a summary of how documented deficiencies are being addressed by the faculty or staff. Over a three-year cycle, departments and programs can request additional resources to remedy deficiencies found through assessment as part of the strategic review and budget allocation process.**

The assessment and revision of general education requirements that have taken place over the past decade provide convincing evidence that the University is committed to continued improvement. After careful evaluation of how well existing general education requirements were addressing the educational goals that flowed from the University's Mission, the faculty (through the auspices of the Academic Senate) revised these requirements in 1991. A strong assessment component was built into the development, approval, and implementation of these new requirements which included a Humanities Base and thematic clusters. For example, assessment was integral to the workshops for faculty offering the Humanities Base, and this has already led to changes to remedy deficiencies.

Question Four: Is the timeline for the assessment program appropriate? Realistic?

The timeline for implementation of the assessment plan is appropriate for **three** reasons. First, numerous elements of the assessment plan are well on their way to implementation. For general education, assessment has already led to systematic revision of requirements. Each academic department has developed and submitted an assessment plan to the Assessment Plan Committee. Departmental pilots have been run by the faculty in each academic division on both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Second, the assessment plan utilizes the University's existing planning process to assure careful integration of assessment into the strategic review and

resource allocation cycle. **Beginning with the 1995-96 academic year, all departments will submit a summary of assessment activities as part of the strategic review process. (This report is detailed in the response to Question Three.) In the 1996-97 academic year, the regular cycle for departments to seek additional resources based on assessment becomes integral to the strategic review and budget allocation process.** Third, the assessment plan and timeline for implementation have been developed through an institution-wide process of participation, consultation and review that assures that the **University both understands and accepts the timeline for implementation as realistic.**

Question Five: What is the evidence that the plan provides for appropriate administration of the assessment program?

The administration of University assessment will be the responsibility of the University Assessment Committee which will report directly to the Provost. The Committee will be organized to reflect the educational mission of the University, to provide faculty leadership, and to achieve continual improvement through collaboration. First, given the nature of the University as Catholic, Marianist, and comprehensive, the Committee has been structured to provide for representation from all those who contribute significantly to the achievement of the educational goals of the institution including the faculty, Student Development, Campus Ministry, students, academic support personnel, and academic administrators for both undergraduate and graduate education.

Second, the faculty representatives from the schools and the College as well as for general education are key to the implementation and oversight of the assessment plan. As members of the University Assessment Committee, the faculty representatives are to be compensated for serving as liaisons with the departments and the divisions they represent, for assisting faculty with the development of assessment plans for majors and general education, and for critiquing assessment reports for the purpose of facilitating improvement and support for assessment plans. Clearly, this approach signals a strong institutional commitment to faculty leadership and ownership of University assessment.

Finally, the Committee is structured to use a collegial approach to assessment administration without sacrificing accountability. The broad spectrum of representation on the Committee assures institution-wide consultation concerning assessment. But at the same time, the appointment of the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education as chair of the Committee as well as the designee of the Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research as a Committee member assure that University assessment will be integral to strategic planning and resource allocation by the central administration.