

## AY 2021-2022 Assessment Reports and AY2022-2023 Plans

### *Overview of Assessment Reporting and Processes*

The Office of Planning and Assessment annually reviews assessment plans in three areas: academic, co-curricular, and administrative. This report provides an executive summary, a review of the assessment process, details on completion, and recommendations for future processes.

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The closing of the assessment cycle for AY2022 completed with 100% participation. The planning for the AY2023 year is missing two plans but they will be completed. This full participation/completion has been a trend for multiple years. Tracking the revisions needed is new to this year. Over one third of all submissions required revisions after submission; with the largest area of revision falling to the reporting and specifically toward the use of assessment results. Therefore, it is apparent that the current institutional assessment culture is focused on compliance. The Office of Planning and Assessment continued to support all areas through the assessment committee, shared resources and training materials, and one-on-one support. This report will no longer track cycle support, as this will continue, and the need to focus on the shift of the assessment culture is more critical for the institution.

As the culture of assessment at UHCL continues to mature, it is imperative that the assessment cycle mature with it. In this report, there is a transition from the reporting of the completion of the cycle to the need to more use of data for continuous improvement. This next step is imperative to continue to serve our students and community and for successful, continued accreditation for our institution and programs. Further, program and college accreditation agencies require strong assessment planning and reporting (e.g. ABET, TEA, ACEN, AACSB, etc.). As re-accreditation from SACSCOC was granted and celebrated, there are points of concern around assessment that must be addressed. Specifically, the institution, division, and department transparency in the connection of assessment to strategic planning, student achievement metrics, and budgeting must be demonstrated for multiple cycles. New revisions to the SACSCOC federal requirements mandate that institutions connect these in a formal, published way.

The use and importance of assessment planning and reporting cannot be understated. This work brings continuous improvement to the forefront of all we do. Programs, academic colleges, divisions, and the entire institution rely on the assessment cycle work for documentation of the improvements made and the accomplishments towards achievement of our goals. We need a strong, mature assessment culture for documentation, reporting, and accreditations. This work is used regularly by all those engaged in the cycle. Therefore, the ending recommendations are provided to assist programs, divisions, and the campus in moving the needle toward a strong assessment culture while we reach stakeholder and accreditation expectations.

#### **REVIEW OF THE ASSESSMENT CYCLE - REPORTING AND PLANS**

The process mirrored previous year's opening (September 1<sup>st</sup>) and closing (October 15<sup>th</sup>) of the cycle. As a result of the reaffiliation feedback, there were few additions to the cycle. Items that were added this cycle were:

- Assigned liaisons for all programs, with one-on-one reviews of expectations with some new liaisons
- Renamed and revised submission form with more rubric details to assist liaisons and plan owners
- Removal of the Office of Planning and Assessment providing any deadline extensions to programs
- Assigned liaisons were engaged in the revisions for reports and plans (see Appendix B)

However, it is noted that since changes began in late summer there were items that were either overlooked or not done well in this cycle. The assigned liaisons occurred late in the process and were not given adequate preparations for these modifications, while the new liaisons could have used more support.

The assessment committee completed a review of successes and opportunities for improvement. These are provided below and are the foundation for some the recommendations provided in the recommendations section.

What worked:

- Same deadline/timeline for all in the cycle
- Use of the Teams location for files
- New submission form with rubric added
- Liaisons using the rubric for the submissions
- Inclusion of leadership in the liaison discussions and timelines

What did not work:

- Use of email for submissions
- Lack of assessment structure in all academic colleges and divisions – not all liaisons have the same knowledge and/or authority
- Teams often confused versions and or forms (required lots of downloading and local saving of submissions)
- Confusion on the submission process (not done the same across the institution)
- The co-mingling of SLOs and Program Outcomes is difficult for programs and inconsistencies in this across different colleges
- Lack of alignment and accountability to the actual measures in the Tier 2 Plan
- When this cycle happens (Fall) it is challenging
- Needed more instructions with examples

## COMPLETION DETAILS

This section of the report contains details of the assessment planning cycle on completion and content. For completion, all plan owners should have submitted the following components: 2021-2022 Results and Use of Results (report) and 2022-2023 Methods and Criteria for Success (plan) to the Office of Planning and Assessment (OPA).

During the review process, revisions were requested for clarity and consistency by the OPA staff. If the information was not clear or the section was incomplete, the reviewer returned the item to the plan owner for revision and re-submission. All requests provided details of needed revisions and were given a completion and re-submission deadline for OPA approval. All completed plans were reviewed, scored, and approved.

As of the time of this report: 23 items were submitted past deadline (with leadership acknowledgement), 1 report for AY 2022 still requires revision, and 1 plan for the AY2023 has not been submitted. The expectation is that the missing AY2023 plan is expected to be submitted before the middle of the Spring term.

New data points from this cycle are the number of revisions that were required after submission. From the total of 311 reports and plans reviewed, 111 (36%) required revisions. In summary, 25% of reports in academic, 7% of plans in academic, 65% reports in administrative/co-curricular, and 70% of plans in administrative/co-curricular required revisions. It is imperative that a reduction in the number of revisions occur; this requires an approach that is differentiated for the academic units and the administrative/co-curricular units.

Tables. Summary of Assessment Review and Completion\*

Academic Reports and Plans						
Division	AY2022 Results & Use of Results			AY2023 Methods & Criteria for Success		
	# Reports	Approved at Submission	Approved after Revisions	# Plans	Approved at Submission	Approved after Revisions
COB	22	22	0	22	22	0
COE	17	13	4	17	17	0
CSE	27	13	14	27	27	0
HSH	35	22	12	36	28	8
<b>TOTALS</b>	101	70	30	102	94	8

\*where report and plan totals are not equal in submissions and revisions, missing items exist

Administrative & Co-curricular Reports and Plans						
Organizational Area	AY2022 Results & Use of Results			AY2023 Methods & Criteria for Success		
	# Reports	Approved at Submission	Approved after Revisions	# Plans	Approved at Submission	Approved after Revisions
Academic Affairs	3	2	1	3	1	2
Administration and Finance	1	1	0	1	1	0
Facilities Mgmt. and Construction	7	6	1	7	6	1
Finance	9	2	7	8	2	6
Office of the President	2	0	2	2	0	2
Provost Office	2	0	2	2	0	2
Information Technology	3	1	2	3	1	2
Student Success and Initiatives	6	2	4	9	1	8
Division of Student Affairs	10	0	10	12	0	12
Strategic Enrollment Mgmt.	4	2	2	4	3	1
University Advancement	5	2	3	5	2	3
<b>TOTALS</b>	52	18	34	56	17	39

\*where report and plan totals are not equal in submissions and revisions, missing items exist

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT IN THE NEXT ASSESSMENT CYCLE

New to the report is a section on recommendations for the future cycles. After approval from the Provost, the Office of Planning and Assessment will work on the necessary changes to continuously improve the assessment work and culture across campus.

1. To address the concerns of utility of the assessment planning cycle and the expected accreditation requirements, add requirements that the academic colleges and administrative/co-curricular areas include the **institutional student achievement metrics and/or UHCL progress card** in the assessment plans.
2. To address the concerns of utility of the assessment planning cycle and the expected accreditation requirements, add requirements that the academic colleges and administrative/co-curricular areas include the metrics from the **strategic plan** into the plans and reporting.
3. To address the concerns of utility of the assessment planning cycle and the expected accreditation requirements, add requirements that academic college or department/program accreditation indicate the **metrics that track compliance** with any accreditation agency.
4. Review the assessment support structures in the academic college and find ways to improve the disparities; specifically, the differences in resources of staffing across all colleges.
5. Create a new process that removes program outcomes from the academic assessment planning. The recommendation is that the college-level (or dean) aggregate the program outcomes and begin tracking as a college replacing the program level tracking (e.g. use the College of Education as an example of how to improve this process). This will still require programs to be engaged at the college-level, but that the planning and reporting occur at the next higher level. This may simplify the prior three recommendations as well.
6. Create new fields for the plans or reports that may include the following:
  - a. Indication when the metric of success is met, not met, or partially met as a required checkbox,
  - b. Indication if the outcome will be continued or discontinued in the next cycle as a required checkbox,
  - c. Indication if the actions for the outcome will require budgetary support for the upcoming cycle,
  - d. Improvements the strategic plan connection to potentially include drop-downs (may not be possible with current technology in this first cycle but is important for future cycles), and
  - e. Indication that the outcomes are requirements for college or program accreditation.
7. Provide more support and training for the liaisons; to occur during Spring 2023 for teams to assist in the reduction of the number of revisions needed. Specialized content needs to be given to academic and administration/co-curricular as the needed revisions varied across those groups.
8. Improvements need to be made on the submission processes that do not require email versions, reduce confusion, and/or fix versioning information.
9. Set targets for the revisions in the next cycle to be lower than 25% items at the institutional-level; and under 40% of items in the administrative/co-curricular to require revision.

## Appendix A. Rubrics

### Assessment Reporting Review Rubric

AY 2022 Results and Use of Results						
	Terms	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Exemplary	Liaison Shared Consent Form Notes	Liaison Notes To be completed if Needs Improvement is selected.
AY 2022 Assessment Reporting	Results	<input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete findings. Findings do not prove whether targets were met, partially met, or not met.	<input type="checkbox"/> Addresses the targets. Evaluated with appropriate statistical models.	<input type="checkbox"/> Provides solid evidence that targets were met, partially met, or not met.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, notes were shared with contact person.	
	Use of Results	<input type="checkbox"/> Too general, not specific. Recommendations are not made.	<input type="checkbox"/> Reflects on what was learned during the assessment cycle.	<input type="checkbox"/> Reflects on outcomes. Exhibits good understanding of finding implications to the program or unit. Identifies key areas that need to be monitored, remediated, or enhanced.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, notes were shared with contact person.	

## Assessment Plan Review Rubric

AY 2023 Outcomes, Methods, and Criteria for Success						
	Terms	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Exemplary	Liaison Shared Consent Form Notes	Liaison Notes To be completed if Needs Improvement is selected.
AY 2023 Assessment Planning	Student Learning Outcome	<input type="checkbox"/> SLO is too broad and not measurable. Confuses grades as SLO.	<input type="checkbox"/> SLO is broad, but can be measurable if rubric is well developed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly states the expected knowledge, skills, attitudes, abilities, and competencies that students are expected to acquire.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, notes were shared with contact person.	
	Program Outcome	<input type="checkbox"/> Describes a process rather than a function, purpose, or initiative. Unclear how PO will be observed or measured.	<input type="checkbox"/> PO is appropriate but language may be vague.	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly describes the program's fundamental purpose.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, notes were shared with contact person.	
	Method	<input type="checkbox"/> Method is not identified or effectively described.	<input type="checkbox"/> Method can be identified and reflects good methodology.	<input type="checkbox"/> Method can be clearly identified as direct or indirect and reflects good methodology.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, notes were shared with contact person.	
	Criteria for Success	<input type="checkbox"/> No or few benchmarks or targets identified. Targets are not clearly defined; language is vague and subjective.	<input type="checkbox"/> Basic level of achievement was described. Targets may seem subjective.	<input type="checkbox"/> Targets are specific, detailed, measurable, and related to the Method.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, notes were shared with contact person.	

## Appendix B. 2022-2023 UHCL Assessment Committee and Liaison List\*

Committee Member List	Liaison Assignment
Dr. Kathy Matthew, Office of the Provost	Academic Affairs Division
Ms. Deja Sero, Administration and Finance	Administration and Finance Division
Ms. Maureen Villarreal, Administration and Finance	Administration and Finance Division
Mr. Russell Miller, Administration and Finance	Administration and Finance Division
Ms. Sherry Hawn, Administration and Finance	Administration and Finance Division
Mr. Steve Kitchen, Administration and Finance	Administration and Finance Division
Dr. Donna Stringer, College of Business	College of Business
Dr. Joan Bruno, College of Business	College of Business
Dr. Troy Voelker, College of Business	College of Business
Ms. Michelle Lane, College of Education	College of Education
Dr. Terry Shepherd, College of Education	College of Education
Mr. Greg Haines, College of Human Sciences and Humanities	College of Human Sciences and Humanities
Dr. David Garrison, College of Sciences and Engineering	College of Science and Engineering
Mr. Mike Livingston, Office of Information Technology	Information Technology
Dr. Pam Shefman, Office of Planning and Assessment, Co-Chair	Office of the President and Office of the Provost
Ms. Sandy Ng, Strategic Enrollment Management	Strategic Enrollment Management Division
Dr. David Rachita, Division of Student Affairs	Student Affairs Division
Ms. Iliana Melendez, Division of Student Affairs	Student Affairs Division
Mr. Patrick Cardenas, Division of Student Affairs	Student Affairs Division
Ms. Mary Ramos, Student Success & Initiatives	Student Success and Initiatives
Ms. Laurice Larsen, University Advancement	University Advancement Division
Mr. Richard Zalesak, University Advancement	University Advancement Division
Ms. Tammy Braswell, Office of Planning and Assessment, Co-Chair	
Mr. Joseph Staley, University Advancement	
Ms. Kara Hadley-Shakya, Strategic Enrollment Management	
Mr. Mark Denney, Administration and Finance	

\*list as of December 2022