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**Project Description**

This action project was proposed to “review and revise the means by which departments use the data they collect and include a mechanism for administrative review of internal and external benchmarks and progress toward meeting [academic and service department] goals.”

**History**

Outcomes Assessment is a required element in the AQIP accreditation process. NMU recognized the difficulty of standardizing and routinizing this process soon after our adoption of the AQIP system. Establishing AQIP Outcomes Assessment Plans was one of our first Action Projects in 2002. Before 2002, while assessment had been part of the evaluation process, it had not been standardized. At the time of NMU’s 1996 focused accreditation visit, compliance with our assessment program was substantial, but unit responses thereafter became somewhat variable. Effort was renewed after the adoption of the AQIP model to develop effective measures and processes for assessing student learning.

Outcomes Assessment applies to both Academic and Service units. For Academic units, the assessment emphasis is to “Ensure Student Learning”. For Service units, the assessment emphasis is “Efficiency and Effectiveness” to support and facilitate student learning. Outcomes Assessment provides measures which inform the University community and external reviewers of the maintenance of outcome measures, the alignment of unit missions with the mission of the university, and the sharing and use of outcome data and feedback to maintain strong academic outcomes and effective service units.

Between 2002 and 2006, the revived outcomes assessment process was evolving on campus and the reporting process was not as consistent as it should have been. Since 2006 there has been a concerted effort to improve the campus-wide standardized process by educating the NMU community about the process and by evaluating assessment reports. The goal is to establish a process that can be institutionalized to ensure continual quality improvement.

**Current Action Project**

The NMU Portfolio appraisal feedback suggested that:

“NMU had not reported the details of its campus-wide assessment plan, nor provided sufficient data and analyses of the student learning outcomes process. It was also noted that we had not described our common student learning outcomes goals and objectives, and how those goals and objectives were measured” (Prosen, Northern Michigan University Quality Program Summary, February 2009, p. 3).

In addition, the appraisal feedback indicated that:

“NMU needs to better demonstrate its active engagement with AQIP at the highest leadership levels and, therefore, throughout the University” (Prosen, Northern Michigan University Quality Program Summary , February 2009, p. 4).

This action project, **Documenting and Benchmarking the NMU Outcomes Assessment Process,** reflects recognition of the above shortcomings and is meant to correct the shortcomings through the evaluation, refinement, and coordination of the unit-level processes for our assessment of student learning outcomes. In addition, we believe success of this action project would result, first, in a clearly defined standardized process for collecting, evaluating, and using assessment reports and ,second, in the ability to better report the extent to which assessment outcomes impact programmatic quality and potential revisions. The resultant process should facilitate understanding, compliance, and effective refinement at the academic- and service-unit level.

There are at least three reasons for developing effective outcomes assessment at NMU: First, we need to demonstrate that each unit is serving its learning or service function. Next we need to provide units information for development and self-improvement in assessment. Finally, we need to provide consistent and reliable annual data for the systems portfolio (i.e., accreditation).

Activities of the Action Project Committee

The following AQIP Action Project Committee Work Plan has been adopted:

**Process and Outcome Measures Stated in Action Project Proposal**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Process/Outcome Measure** | **Status** |
| 1. Action Project Committee assesses the scoring rubric to be applied to service department assessment plans and reports. | Completed March 2009: SS/S/O/OO scoring rubric was adopted to be applied to service committee reports and plans. Preliminary Service Report appended (Attachment A). |
| 2. Scoring rubric is used by Service Department Heads to score reports. | Completed March 2009: Scoring rubric was used by Service Department committee to score reports. The Outcomes Assessment Committee has received a comparative report (Attachment B) |
| 3. Action Project Committee assesses the type of data to collect, the outcome measures to target, and the scoring rubric to be applied to academic department assessment plans and reports. | Completed March 2009: Individual units currently report the assessment measures they employ and what they reveal. Those plans and outcomes have been reviewed by an Outcomes Assessment Committee or, formerly, a single evaluator. Outcome measures for each department must be developed within the department. This process has been deemed feasible. |
| 4. Scoring rubric is used by academic college deans and department heads to score reports. | Completed March 2009: The SS/S/O/OO scoring rubric has been adopted by academic college deans and department heads to score reports. |
| 5. Academic departments reconsider 2007-08 Reports and Plans with respect to the evaluation data provided. | Completed Summer 2009: Reports have been returned to departments with opportunity to fine-tune plans and reports based upon commentary.  Limitations: The University still needs to establish a system for review of revised learning outcomes plans and reports, as well as the alignment of unit-goals with new University and College (where appropriate) missions. To understand the extent of and to profile such feelings the committee will conduct a formal survey. The survey has been completed and the summary of the survey report, the survey, and extended results are included in Attachment H. |
| 6. Centrally-located infrastructure developed to document processing of report documents and display example documents. | A report archive has not been established. However, it is recommended that sample reports be displayed, on a website, along with assessment tools which might be useful to departments. |
| 7. Available resources from Outcomes Assessment Committee, guest experts, and in-house best practices are used to build a repository of outcomes assessment measures and data collection methods and tools. | This would be an expansion or subset of the website recommended above. Currently reports are archived in the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs office. |
| 8. Visit from outcomes assessment expert, who describes current best practices in measuring student learning to university community. | Complete: Susan Hatfield visited Campus February and held two ½ day workshops on measuring student learning. |
| 9. Action Project Committee compares 2006-07 and 2007-08 scored feedback from both service and academic units. | Completed: The scored feedback from the last two years has been compared. The Outcomes Assessment Committee has documented improvement in the use of assessment plans and programs in academic units (Attachment C). Further corroboration of improvement is provided by in-house analyses conducted by the College of Arts & Sciences (Attachment D). |

Our basic findings from the review of service and academic reports is that the service departments appear to have established a workable reporting system (Attachment B) and have room to improve in the areas of establishing measures, and collection and use of data. The academic department compliance has increased from about 70% in 2007 to 100% in 2008, but the departments have clear room to improve in mission congruency (Department to University) establishing outcome measures or criteria, and collection and use of data.

Recommendations

1. For Academic Departments, two levels of review would be ideal: one available as plans are being set up and one for overseeing the review of the final reports.

First, a point-person for outcomes assessment questions and help setting up assessment plans. This person should be familiar with academic outcomes assessment and the different types of data which would be appropriate for different programs. The Department Head survey suggested that just 9 of the 22 (41%) of the responding department heads indicated they would benefit from one-on-one help and only 3 of 22 (14%) indicated they would benefit from help analyzing data. Five department heads (23%) indicated they are not clear on what would be appropriate data.

Second, a committee with a clearly named chair will review the final reports. There are close to 80 academic reports to be reviewed. The committee assigned this task should include at least a faculty representative from each college and a department head from each college. This would ensure a representative from each college who was, or could quickly become, familiar with the programs in each college. The term for serving on this committee should be two or three years with staggered terms so that there is continuity in the process. This sytem has been adopted by other AQIP schools. A complaint in the past and also stated on the Department Head survey is a lack of consistency in the way the reports have been evaluated.

2. NMU should have a place (e.g., the website) where reports are available for review and where a listing of resources to assist planning could be reviewed.

3. A standardized, web-based reporting protocol, possibly modeled after that currently used by service-units (Attachment F), should be adopted by academic departments to facilitate annual reporting and archiving of assessment data (Attachment G).

4. Time-lines and flow-charts of process (functional standard operating procedures) which are readily available to units. Time-lines (with reminders) and flow charts may be different for academic and service units. The service departments have established a workable system (Attachment B) and we have provided an example Academic Unit Flow Chart (Attachment E).

5. We continue to use the four-point scoring rubric (report evaluation system) based on satisfactory reports and opportunities (SS/S/O/OO) on five categories for each report. The categories are Mission is provided, Outcomes to be evaluated are clearly stated and tied to the mission, Appropriate outcome data and proposed measures are provided, Data collected based on measures, and the data are used by the department. The review rubric might look as follows.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rubric for evaluating Academic Department Reports** | | |
| **Category** | **Review** | **Comments** |
| **Mission** |  |  |
| **Outcomes to be evaluated** |  |  |
| **Assessment Measures** |  |  |
| **Data** |  |  |
| **Use of Data** |  |  |
| **Additional Comments** |  | |

The five recommendations are predicated on the fact that the service departments have worked out a fairly effective system and time line for their reports. The academic departments have improved in terms of their reporting compliance, but have selective needs when evaluating the adequacy of their reports. Those departments which are subject to external accreditation standards do quite well. Those departments which are not accustomed to external evaluation have areas of weakness and incompleteness. We believe that the recommendations above will serve to improve the adequacy of the academic department reports, and, with a clear flowchart accompanied by a timeline and reminders, the process will become increasingly enculturated.

**Attachments**

1. **Service Units Progress Report**
2. **Service Units Assessment Annual Plans and Reports**
3. **2008 Assessment Feedback Summary for Academic Units**
4. **Learning Outcomes Assessment Follow-Through, College of Arts & Sciences**
5. **Service Units Computerized Template for Assessment Reports**
6. **Potential Academic Unit Assessment Process Flow Chart**
7. **Academic Department Computerized Template for Assessment Reports**
8. **Survey of Academic Department Heads**

**Attachment A**

**NMU Service Department Outcomes Assessment**

**Current Evaluation and Feedback Process**

**March 19, 2009**

The Service Department Outcomes Assessment Committee is comprised of a team of six people, representing the divisions of the Office of President, Office of Vice President for Finance and Administration, and Office of the Associate Provost for Student Services and Enrollment. Committee members were selected by the heads of those divisions. Dr. Cynthia Prosen also served on this committee, as the NMU AQIP Liaison.

Thirty-five departments and units, Service Department 2008-09 Reports and 2009-10 Plans were submitted to Dr. Cynthia Prosen, Office of the Provost.

Reports and plans were distributed to Service Department Outcomes Assessment Committee members for review.

The Committee met weekly to review and score the reports/plans. The AQIP scoring rubric (*Strengths* identified as S or SS, and *Opportunities* designated as O or OO) was utilized. Final scores were based on group consensus for each area (mission, objective, means of assessment, data collection, and use of results). When scores of less than SS were given, rationale was provided, along with suggestions for improvement or clarification.

The feedback format is the same as that used in last year’s feedback report, and the same as that used by AQIP in the evaluation of the Systems Portfolio (*Strengths* are identified as S or SS, and *Opportunities* are designated as O or OO). If your report has “NA” in a feedback column, this indicates that no information was provided for the corresponding section.

In some cases, most often when the department/unit head was new to the assessment process, reports and plans submitted lacked the requested content and/or information was not provided in the required format. In these instances, selected Committee members met with respective department/unit heads to provide guidance on this process. The Committee asked that only plans for the upcoming year (2009-10) be resubmitted.

Feedback reports were provided to each department/unit during the first week of March 2009. Those plans requiring revision are expected by March 31, 2009. These revised plans will be reviewed and scored, with feedback provided by mid-April.

During this year’s review process, it became apparent that there was need for education on the assessment process. The Committee discussed a variety of options including the need for a training session, providing the required form online along with examples of the various information requested. These suggestions have been provided to the Outcomes Assessment Process AQIP Action Project Committee.

**Attachment B**

**Service Units Assessment Annual Plans and Reports**

**Presentation Outline**

1. Condensed Service Unit Assessment Process
2. Service Unit Plan/Report Template
3. The Service Unit Review Team
4. The Scoring Rubric/Evaluation of Plans and Reports
5. Service Unit Assessment Data
6. Review Team Objectives

**Condensed Service Unit Assessment Process**

1. By June 30 of each year, each unit submits an annual plan of improvement for the coming year to the NMU AQIP Coordinator.
2. Also by June 30, each participating service unit provides a report on their annual plan.
3. The NMU AQIP Coordinator convenes the review team to evaluate both plans and reports.
4. The review team reads, reviews and discusses each plan and, using a scoring rubric, evaluates the unit mission, new objectives of the unit for the coming year, and the means of assessment.
5. At the same time, the team reads, reviews and discusses each report and, using the same rubric, evaluates how well the respective service unit met its objectives, how well they collected and presented data, and their plans for use of the data to improve services of the unit.
6. The review team then communicates (usually via e-mail) how respective units fared and provides any suggestions for revision to either the report or the annual plan.

**Service Unit Plan/Report Template**

In an effort to provide consistency in the documents associated with annual plans and reports, and as a training aid to staff not familiar with the annual assessment process, the review team has devised a template for service units’ use.

The template is first used when preparing an annual plan of improvement. The template provides areas in which each unit representative would enter the unit’s mission, objectives for that year, and measurable means of assessing how the objectives are to be met.

At the close of the year, the same document is be used to provide the report for the year. The items listed in the first stage are already included; the unit representative only completes the final two sections regarding data collected and how the results will be used to further improve the department.

**The Service Unit Review Team**

*Note:* It must first be noted that the Review Team actually began its activities in 2004 and continued up to the point in time of Dr. Teresa Hunt’s death. For about a year afterwards, the team was not utilized and, in fact last year, was replaced by a singular faculty member who reviewed and evaluated all plans and reports from service units. During this academic year it became apparent that, while the individual providing reviews was quite capable, they were not necessarily familiar with service units or the units’ activities, operations, processes, and goals. Further, it was determined that the “team” concept offered a greater breadth of knowledge to be mined – ‘two (or more) heads was deemed to be better than one’ –and members of service units needed to be integral to the review process.

The seven-person review team consists of two representatives from each of the three university divisions – Academic Affairs (specifically from Student Services and Enrollment), Finance and Administration, and the Office of the President – and the university’s AQIP coordinator, Dr. Prosen.

The review team reviews all submitted plans and reports, uses the scoring rubric to evaluate submitted documents, and communicates constructive feedback to service units. Once all revisions have been made, and documents are re-submitted, the team ‘approves’ the annual plans and reports.

**The Scoring Rubric/Evaluation of Plans and Reports**

The scoring review was adopted last year to have a means to consistently evaluate plans and reports and provide meaningful feedback to service units. The ‘scale’ runs from SS to OO and is described more fully in the rubric document provided in the review binder.

Specifically, the review teams use the scoring rubric to evaluate the following items in annual plans:

* 1. Unit mission – does the mission match that of the university, does it match the mission of the division, is it clear, concise, and well-ordered?
  2. Objectives – are the objectives stated clearly and understandable, is it evident how meeting these objectives will improve the unit, are they reasonable?
  3. Means of assessing the objectives – are the means clearly understood, are they reasonable, do they match the objective closely, are they ultimately measureable and demonstrate that the objective has been met?

The review team employs the rubric to also evaluate items in the annual reports:

1. Summary of data collected – is the data collected what was promised, is it reliable and valid, does it match to the stated means?
2. Use of results to improve services – how will the data (and other findings) be used to further improve the unit, even if the data fell short of desired outcomes, what may be done to continue to improve the unit?

**Service Unit Assessment Data**

The data collected over the last two years were quite easy to compare using the scores of the rubric. The chart below depicts the improvement noted when comparing annual plans/reports from 2006-07 and those from 2007-08 (the deadline for the 2008-09 reports is June of 2009).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Report Item** | **Score** | **2006-07 Reports (%)** | **2007-08 Reports (%)** |  |
|  | Unit Mission1 | SS and S  S/O  O and OO | 100%  n/a  0% | 88%  n/a  12% |  |
|  | Objectives | SS and S  S/O  O and OO | 36%  38%  26% | 90%  0%  10% |  |
|  | Means of Assessment | SS and S  S/O  O and OO | 26%  45%  29% | 61%  0%  39% |  |
|  | Data Collected | SS and S  S/O  O and OO | 39%  29%  32% | 62%  0%  38% |  |
|  | Use of Data | SS and S  S/O  O and OO | 23%  13%  64% | 50%  0%  50% |  |

1The new university mission was adopted during the 2008-09 academic year; obviously, plans had been submitted prior to the new mission being adopted and congruence, therefore, suffered, affecting the scoring for this item.

There are three notable factors that may have influenced the improvement in the rubric scores:

1. The 2006-07 plans were not scrutinized by a review team, but rather an individual somewhat unfamiliar with the operations and activities of service units, and feedback was not communicated to service units until after plans/reports had been scored. Consequently, the reports for 2006-07 were based on the plans that did not undergo the scrutiny provided by a dedicated team.
2. In January of 2009, the review team concept was re-introduced and members of the team immediately began to review the reports for 2007-08 (and plans for 2008-09). The team also began to provide feedback, meet with certain unit representatives to provide ‘in-service’ training regarding assessment activities, and serve as a sounding board for unit representatives in regards to completing their assessment activities.
3. The service units simply did a better job of collecting data, and describing how the data would be used to improve unit services and effectiveness, in the 2007-08 reports.

**Review Team Objectives**

As the review team continued to meet, members became increasing aware that inconsistencies still exist in regards to assessment activities, use (and non-use) of the template in writing annual plans and reports, etc. The team, therefore, has instituted, and will continue to seek other, ways to improve the assessment process for service units, including:

1. Development of a template training document that may be used in one-on-one and group training sessions, as well as being linked to the NMU AQIP web site. The document outlines for the reader how the assessment template should be completed, along with ‘tips’ on how best to present objectives, means of assessment, data, etc.
2. Visits conducted by review team members with service department heads and/or unit representatives to better outline how best to not only report on assessment activities, but also to provide advice on how best to prioritize objectives, seek input from unit staff, etc.
3. Implementation of a formal, yearly training session for service units in regards to assessment activities. For some unit representatives, this will serve as a ‘refresher’ session, while for others (e.g., newly hired staff members) it may be their initial experience with the assessment process. This session is being planned for this spring/early summer; prior to the plan/report June deadline.

**Attachment C**

**2007-08 Academic Outcomes Assessment Report Review**

**Process.** In August of 2008, Academic Departments were provided with a template for report submission. They were also provided with a rubric to be used to provide feedback to the Departments. The same rubric was used to evaluate the 2006-07 Outcomes Assessment Reports; the intent was to use the same process during both years, and evaluate the feedback to determine if our academic departmental assessment of student learning had improved as a result of the feedback that was provided the previous year. Reports were due on or before October 15. The assessment committee consisted of the five academic deans, and the Director of Institutional Research. The Outcomes Assessment Reports were evenly divided among the committee members, such that each report was reviewed by two committee members. After completing all reviews, the committee met to discuss the Outcomes Assessment Reports filed by each department. When the evaluations from the two reviewers were disparate, the reports were discussed to attempt to provide the departments with consistent feedback. Written comments were also included as appropriate. All comments and scores were then collated, and a single report per program per department was provided in early January. The Deans then met with each of their Department Heads to review the Feedback Reports. Finally, in early January, Dr. Susan Hatfield, the Assessment Coordinator at Winona State University and an expert in the assessment of student learning, came to the NMU campus and conducted two half-day sessions on best practices in student learning outcomes assessment.

**Compliance.** In 2006-07, 72% of the Academic Departments submitted an Outcomes Assessment Report. In 2007-08, 100% of the Academic Departments submitted an Outcomes Assessment Report.

**Comparison with 2006-07 data.** As indicated on the accompanying report, our evaluation of the Outcomes Assessment Reports from the Academic Departments indicated improvements between 2006-07, and 2007-08. When the data were examined with respect to scores in the top 50% (i.e., receiving feedback rated SS or S) in each category between the two time periods, more Departmental Mission Statements were congruent with the University Mission Statement (27% vs. 59%) and Outcomes were more clearly identified (69% vs. 85%). Smaller gains were realized in the categories of Presented Data (50% vs. 59%) and Use of Data (38% vs. 47%), while a slight decrement was noted in the category of Clearly Identified Criteria (54% vs. 52.5%). Overall, improvements were seen in the assessment, while the weaknesses identified above will be attended to carefully when the 2008-09 Outcomes Assessment Reports are developed.

**Outcomes Assessment Action Project.** One of our 2008-09 Action Projects, entitled “Documenting and Benchmarking the NMU Outcomes Assessment Process”, will “…review and revise the means by which departments use the data they collect and include a mechanism for administrative review of internal and external benchmarks and progress towards meeting goals”. We look forward to the final report and recommendations from this Action Project to document our Outcomes Assessment Process at NMU so that our measurement of student learning will continue to improve.

**2008 Assessment Feedback Summary for Academic Units**

The report consists of five sections: Congruence between University, College and Departments Mission; Measurable Educational Outcomes; Criteria for Success; Summary of Data Collected and the Use of Results. The feedback on each of these sections identifies strengths and opportunities for improvement. An S or SS, identifies strengths, with the double letter signifying important achievements or capabilities upon which to build. Opportunities are designated by O, with OO indicating areas where attention may result in more significant improvement.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **S/O** | **% Dept** | **% Receiving**  **S or SS**  **2007 2008** | **Comments** |
| **Mission** | SS  S  S/O  O  OO | 48  9  3  32  8 | 27% **58.5%** | Compared to 2007, in 2008 the majority of departments addressed mission statement congruency. |
| **Outcomes** | SS  S  S/O  O  OO | 54  27  8  10  1 | 69% **85%** | A larger majority of departments had clearly identified outcomes in 2008 compared to 2007. |
| **Criteria** | SS  S  S/O  O  OO | 37  18  15  18  12 | 54% **52.5%** | Slightly fewer departments had clearly identified criteria in 2008 vs. 2007. The main problems were that the criteria were not clearly tied to the outcomes, or that the criteria were not measurable. |
| **Data** | SS  S  S/O  O  OO | 24  28  14  23  11 | 50% **59%** | More departments presented data in 2008 compared to 2007. However, this is a recognized weakness in the process, one we hope to address through continuing educational opportunities that we will offer throughout the current and next academic years. |
| **Use of Data** | SS  S  S/O  O  OO | 21  22  8  27  21 | 38% **47%** | Those departments that did not collect data clearly could not use data to make changes in expected outcomes, criteria, or their curriculum. While use of data improved in 2008, it remains an opportunity for improvement. |

**Attachment D**

**Learning Outcomes Assessment Follow-Through**

**College of Arts & Sciences**

What changes in departmental curriculum were made as a result of learning outcomes assessments over the past two year period?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Department/Center/School | **Results of Outcomes Assessment** |
| Art and Design | Through the Individual Art Review assessment of student portfolios, both Cognate (Foundation) and capstone courses were completely revised. Photography and Digital Cinema studio areas also had major course revisions as portfolio reviews indicated program deficiencies. |
| Biology | After determining that students were not getting the lab experiences that the department had determined were important, the curricula for the particular labs used in the outcomes assessment were reassessed and changes in lab content suggested. |
| Chemistry |  |
| CAPS | **Electronic Journalism**: No changes were made to this curriculum or in the courses it contains.  **Entertainment & Sports Promotion**: Basic concepts learned in early-sequence courses are not being retained by students at proficiency levels and changes in pedagogy have been instituted to re-emphasize introductory material in subsequent courses. An additional case-studies approach has been included in the major so as to illustrate further the practical application of concepts.  **Media Production & New Technology**: Devoting greater attention to audio techniques in the advanced course of the major as a result of FY2007 outcomes findings appears to have paid off. Similar efforts concerning other aesthetic principles are being undertaken in FY2009.  **Public Relations**: Similar to what was seen in the Entertainment & Sports Promotion major, basic concepts learned in early-sequence courses are not being retained by students at proficiency levels and changes in pedagogy have been instituted to re-emphasize introductory material in subsequent courses.  **Communication Studies**: Based upon previously measured outcomes regarding skill/knowledge attainment and student satisfaction, the Speech Communication major was significantly revamped and is now named “Communication Studies.” In addition, the curriculum has been altered in a number of significant ways, including (a) the elimination of EN 211e as an alternative to SP 200 since students were not acquiring sufficient argumentation skills/knowledge in the non-CAPS major, (b) the inclusion of a required internship experience at the senior level, and (c) the institution of a capstone seminar in which to both assess outcomes in a more rigorous setting as well as hone applied communication skills of soon-to-graduate majors.  **Theatre**: Despite continued high rates of post-graduation employment by Theatre majors, the jury system employed by faculty suggested that students are not achieving levels of “professionalism” expected as an outcome of the program. Consequently, the curriculum is currently undergoing revision and changes have been made in the pedagogy of courses to further emphasize professional conduct in the craft. |
| Economics | The 2007-2008 outcomes assessment report has been distributed to Department faculty, and each faculty member has incorporated changes into their course content in areas where improvement in learning outcomes can be achieved. For example, since graduate economic programs emphasize the use of mathematics, increased mathematical content has been added to EC 410 Managerial Economics. Additionally this May, the Department Head is planning to meet with the Director of Graduate Studies at Northwestern University and with a former student who is completing her first year of graduate study at Notre Dame. The purpose of these visits is to gather information on the mathematical expectations of Ph.D. programs in economics and incorporate at least some of these expectations in the course content of EC 410. Students who hope to pursue advanced degrees in economics or business administration will be encouraged to take EC 410 as an elective in their program. A more general curricular improvement comes from the area of Utility Theory. The amount of time spent on Utility Theory in EC 401 Intermediate Microeconomics has been increased as this was identified as a relatively weak area of student learning in the latest report. |
| English | The results of the assessment of our undergraduate and graduate programs was shared with the departmental Curriculum Committee, which recommended several changes for departmental consideration in the way we collect the data, the amount of data we collect, and the possible implications for the curriculum of some of the findings.  The department met on 3/18/09 to discuss the assessment data and the recommendations of the Curriculum committee. It was the unanimous sentiment of the department faculty to adjust our assessment process in the following ways:   1. Expand the number of undergraduate portfolios assessed and identify them by major in order to develop sufficient data to assess each major, compare semester achievements more effectively, and continue to assess each portfolio on the basis of all five of our stated criteria. 2. To amend our benchmarks in both the undergraduate and graduate assessment plans to reflect the nature of the data we are now collecting and capitalize on what it reflects in terms of the success or problems in the program. Instead of a certain percentage of graduating students meeting a numerical standard, our benchmarks will focus on achieving certain overall averages by criteria and semesters which will better reflect program outcomes rather than individual student outcomes. 3. The data will be monitored each semester by the Assessment Committee, Graduate Committees and Curriculum Committees to determine what emendations need to be made in our delivery, course structure, program outlines, or the development of new courses if needed. The committees will jointly determine what recommendations will be made to the department faculty as a whole and discussed annually in order to implement needed changes based on the assessment data.   The Curriculum Committee also initiated a review of the Writing Major already because of concerns raised by this data, concerns about the current organization of the major, and confusion on the part of students with the requirements. We are currently revising the Writing Major and will be discussing ways of addressing better inculcation of critical approaches to literary analysis in our students’ work. |
| Geography | The Geography Department formally assesses its students through two courses as they progress through our programs. First, students are required to take GC205 Introduction to Geographic Research, usually in their sophomore year. Students then take our capstone course, GC489 Human Impact, typically in their senior year. Student learning is assessed in both of these courses through a series of assignments such as research projects, presentations, and technical reports. Based on the department’s learning outcomes assessment, we see a continuing challenge in our curriculum in preparing our students to think critically, apply the scientific method, and use analytical skills in research. Consequently, we made changes in terms of the types of assignments and projects that students would be expected to complete in our upper level courses, in essence we incorporated more critical thinking, writing and research into many of our courses. This is particularly true of GC205, which requires literature reviews, proposal development, essays, and presentations, which are carefully worked on in consultation with faculty. Furthermore, in GC489, the outcomes assessment process allowed comparisons of the effect of having students complete independent research projects versus projects in an academic service learning (ASL) environment. In sum, it was found that students did a much better job and seemed to learn a great deal more when they were involved in academic service learning projects. Consequently, in the future GC489 will likely continue to involve academic service learning projects. We also decided to try an incorporate more ASL projects into other upper level courses such as GC428 and GC460. |
| History |  |
| MLL | Based on findings from our outcomes , we made three fundamental changes:  1. We made SN400 (Advanced Grammar and Composition) a requirement for the Spanish major (Liberal Arts curriculum).  2. We no longer allow FR400 or SN400 to be taken abroad. If students take a similar class abroad, we count it as SN495 on the transcript, then require that they take and pass a 400 final exam at NMU to show that they have achieved the appropriate competency.  3. We require that students take at least 8.0 of the credits toward their major from NMU faculty. (We found that some students were taking almost all or all their language courses abroad, and with varying results.) |
| Math & CS | **Mathematics:** MA 361 (*Differential Equations*) was designated as a capstone course in which each student will do a multifaceted, large-scale project which will be included in the student’s portfolio.  Furthermore, the Mathematics capstone examination was modified and improved.  **Computer Science:**  CS 480 (*Senior Project in Computer Science*) was designated as a capstone course in which each student is expected to complete a significant software and/or hardware project which will become an important part of the student’s portfolio, the Computer Science capstone examination was modified and improved, and the number of credit hours for MA 240 (*Discrete Mathematics*) was increased from 3 to 4.  **Mathematics Education:** The mission and outcomes in Secondary Mathematics Education were rated satisfactory by both reviewers and, therefore, no changes were made in this curriculum. It was decided to add a narrative to clarify congruency between the mission of the University and Department and also between the goals of the Department and Secondary Mathematics Education. The criteria for all outcomes will be revised so that it is clear how they are related to the goals of the Secondary Mathematics Education. |
| Music | Each semester students are assessed in the following areas/proficiencies:   * Juried Performance (vocal and Instrumental) * Fundamentals of music * Sight Singing * Music Theory * Literature and History   Based on results of these exams and NASM (our accrediting body) we have:   * modified our provisional acceptance policy into the MAJOR * combined ***MU 205 Form and Analysis*** with ***MU 203 and MU206 Music History and Literature*** * added ***Arranging/Composition*** to the upper division music theory courses ***MU 201 and MU204*** |
| Philosophy |  |
| Physics | None. Our report had very mixed reviews. We have very few data points from which to extract useful information (one of the criticisms).One assessment we apply in the intro calc-based course is used by that particular faculty member to possibly improve how a certain part of that course is presented (Force Concept Inventory). I think our assessment program is still evolving….but data is sparse and heavily student dependent. |
| Poli Sci/PA | Undergraduate: Created a capstone course- PS 490, Created a common core for majors, Creating a PS section of UN 100 taught by PS Faculty, Requiring majors to create a portfolio, Evaluating 100 level courses to ensure appropriate content is being covered (especially examining state standards for education majors), Established a capstone exam, and Increasing internship opportunities.  Graduate: Established a thesis option, Requiring portfolios for student who do not choose the thesis option, Established higher GPA requirements for admissions, Established capstone exam, Requiring GRE for admissions, and Increased the number of professional development activities for students. |
| Psychology | Two majors were changed based on outcomes assessment. Analysis of enrollment histories, long-term interests, and classes completed compared to those required for graduate education in applied fields let us to revise and increase the flexibility of the Graduate Preparation and General Psychology majors. |

**Attachment E**

**A Working Model (Dates to be Added)**

**A Process for Collecting, Evaluating, & Using Assessment Reports**

OAO Determines if the Report is Complete

Unit Administrators Develop Report Using Web-Based Template & Post Report by Due Date

OAO Selects a Rotating Panel of Academic & Service Unit Administrators to Check the Intercoder Reliability of a Random Sample (20%) of Scored Reports

Unit Administrators Consider Feedback, Revise Assessment Plan as Appropriate, & Institute Change

OAO Interacts with Unit Administrators to Interpret Report Feedback, Revise Assessment Plans, Institute Change, & Prepare for the Next Reporting Cycle

OAO Scores All Complete Reports with AQIP Rubric (SS, S, O, OO)

OAO Sends Report Evaluation to Unit Administrators & Archives Electronic Copy

If Not Complete, OAO Works with Unit Administrator to Ensure Compliance

Outcomes Assessment Officer (OAO) may be Consulted re: Use of Web-Based Template or Content of the Report

Unit Administrators are Notified that Their Assessment Reports will be Due on a Specific Date

**Attachment F**

**NMU Service Department**

**Outcomes Assessment Plan/Report Details**

**Directions for Template Usage**

**(Revised Fall 2009)**

Definitions and Deadlines

PLAN – By July 1st each year, service departments are to submit a PLAN of departmental improvement for the current fiscal year (July 1 through June 30). The template provided is the preferred method of delivering the PLAN. The plan will be reviewed by the Outcomes Assessment Committee, and either accepted or sent back for revision or modification.

The PLAN includes filling out the form except for the Summary of Data Collected and the Use of Results sections of the form.

REPORT - By July 1st each year, service departments are to submit a REPORT outlining their efforts to improve their department for the past fiscal year (July 1 through June 30). The template provided is the preferred method of delivering the REPORT. The REPORT will be reviewed by the Outcomes Assessment Committee, and either accepted or sent back for revision or modification.

The final REPORT each year includes the PLAN and completing the Data and Use boxes for each objective and measure.

Suggested Process for Developing Improvement Plans

1. Department heads should solicit input regarding areas of improvement from staff (some departments incorporate this process in staff meetings via a staff exercise, while others ask for ideas via e-mail, etc.).
2. Department staff should help prioritize the items identified above and select three items that will be included as part of the PLAN for next year.

**NOTE:** Although collecting input and prioritizing items should be on-going throughout the year, it is suggested that the process outlined in #1 and #2 above be completed by early spring in time to begin writing the PLAN.

1. The person(s) responsible for writing the PLAN should draft all three selected items as objectives and begin to work on how the objective will be met and how progress will be measured (it is at this point that the person responsible may seek advice from the committee that reviews the PLAN). This draft should be reviewed by and discussed with all departmental staff prior to final submission (this ensures awareness and “buy-in” of all department staff).
2. Once final review has been completed in the department, the PLAN must be submitted to the AQIP Coordinator no later than July 1 using the template provided.
3. Upon receipt of the PLAN, the committee will complete its review and report back to the person responsible for the PLAN. The committee may ask for revision or modification before it accepts the PLAN.
4. Once the PLAN has been accepted, the person responsible must share the final PLAN with all departmental staff. Discussion should begin in the department on how/when to collect necessary data, etc.

**Northern Michigan University**

**OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PLAN/REPORT TEMPLATE**

**Administrative or Educational Support Unit**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name of Department or Unit | |  | | | | | | |
|  | |  | | | | | | |
| This document is the | **🞎 PLAN or 🞎 REPORT for July 1, 20\_\_, to June 30, 20\_\_** | | | | | | Date Submitted |  |
|  |  | | | |  |  |  | |
| Submitted by (Unit Representative) | | |  | | | | | |
|  | | |  | | | | | |
| **University Mission Statement** | | | |  | **Department or Unit Mission Statement** | | | |
| Northern Michigan University challenges its students and employees to think independently and critically, develop lifelong learning habits, acquire career skills, embrace diversity and become productive citizens in the regional and global community. | | | |  |  | | | |
|  | | | |  |  | | | |
| **Intended Administrative Objective #1** | | | |  | **Means of Assessment for Objective** | | | |
| 1. | | | |  | 1a.  1b.  1c. | | | |
|  | | | |  |  | | | |
| **Summary of Assessment Data Collected** | | | |  | **Use of Results to Improve Unit Services** | | | |
|  | | | |  |  | | | |
|  | | | |  |  | | | |
| **Intended Administrative Objective #2** | | | |  | **Means of Assessment for Objective** | | | |
| 2. | | | |  | 2a.  2b.  2c. | | | |
|  | | | |  |  | | | |
| **Summary of Assessment Data Collected** | | | |  | **Use of Results to Improve Unit Services** | | | |
|  | | | |  |  | | | |
|  | | | |  |  | | | |
| **Intended Administrative Objective #3** | | | |  | **Means of Assessment for Objective** | | | |
| 3. | | | |  | 3a.  3b.  3c. | | | |
|  | | | |  |  | | | |
| **Summary of Assessment Data Collected** | | | |  | **Use of Results to Improve Unit Services** | | | |
|  | | | |  |  | | | |

**Attachment G**

**NMU Academic Department**

**Outcomes Assessment Report Details**

**Directions for Template Usage**

**(revised Fall 2009)**

Definitions and Deadlines

REPORT - By October 15 each year, academic departments are to submit their reports of assessment outcomes data and how they used assessment information improve their department for the past fiscal year (July 1 through June 30). The template provided is the preferred method of delivering the report. The report will be reviewed by the Academic Outcomes Assessment Committee, and either accepted or sent back for revision or modification. This form asks for the same information as the old forms. It can be downloaded and filled in either by writing in the appropriate areas or by cutting and pasting to the appropriate boxes. If additional boxes are required, they may be added by cutting and pasting a new box or set of boxes. Boxes expand to fit your needs.

Below the term plan refers to the development of goals and measures developed by the department and the term report refers to the final report (plan plus data collected and use of results) submitted each October.

Suggested Process for Developing Outcomes Assessment Plans and Reports.

1. Department heads should solicit input regarding assessment plans and reports from faculty and individuals in charge of the report for any given unit (some departments incorporate this process in staff meetings via a staff exercise, while others ask for ideas via e-mail, etc.).
2. Department faculty/staff should determine outcome objectives and means of measurement that will be included as part of the upcoming report. Ideally, the objectives and means of assessment will contain continuity with prior reports. New programs and changes in programs or objectives are likely to require changes in objectives and /or measures.
3. The person(s) responsible for writing the plan and report should draft all selected objectives and begin to work on how the objective will be met and how progress will be measured (outcomes to be measured). It is at this point that the person responsible may seek advice from the committee or person available to review academic plans. This draft should be reviewed by and discussed with the department prior to final submission (this encourages awareness and “buy-in” of all department staff).
4. Once final review has been completed in the department, the REPORT must be submitted to the AQIP Coordinator no later than October 15 using the template provided below.

Within a year, we should have a review committee or lead assessment person in place to help Departments with their reports. When such a person/committee is in place, departments may submit any questions for a current or future review to that individual or committee. (This may be difficult the first year, but possible in the following years.)

**Northern Michigan University**

**OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT REPORT**

**Academic Departments**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name of Department or Unit | | **Department Name** | | | | | | |
|  | |  | | | | | | |
| This document is the | **REPORT for July 1, 20\_\_, to June 30, 20\_\_** | | | | | | Date Submitted |  |
|  |  | | | |  |  |  | |
| Submitted by (Unit Representative) | | |  | | | | | |
|  | | |  | | | | | |
| **University Mission Statement** | | | |  | **Department Mission Statement** | | | |
| Northern Michigan University challenges its students and employees to think independently and critically, develop lifelong learning habits, acquire career skills, embrace diversity and become productive citizens in the regional and global community. | | | |  | Department Mission:  Program Mission (if applicable): | | | |
|  | | | |  |  | | | |
| **Intended Objective #1** | | | |  | **Means of Assessment for Objective** | | | |
| 1. | | | |  | 1a.  1b.  1c.  etc. | | | |
|  | | | |  |  | | | |
| **Summary of Assessment Data Collected** | | | |  | **Use of Results to Improve Department Program(s)** | | | |
| 1a.  1b.  1c.  etc. | | | |  |  | | | |
|  | | | |  |  | | | |
| **Intended Objective #2** | | | |  | **Means of Assessment for Objective** | | | |
| 2. | | | |  | 2a | | | |
|  | | | |  |  | | | |
| **Summary of Assessment Data Collected** | | | |  | **Use of Results to Improve Department Program(s).** | | | |
|  | | | |  |  | | | |
|  | | | |  |  | | | |
|  | | | |  |  | | | |
|  | | | |  |  | | | |
| **Intended Objective #3** | | | |  | **Means of Assessment for Objective** | | | |
| 3. | | | |  | 3a. | | | |
|  | | | |  |  | | | |
| **Summary of Assessment Data Collected** | | | |  | **Use of Results to Improve Department Program(s)** | | | |
|  | | | |  |  | | | |

**Attachment H**

**Summary and Extended Results of Survey of Academic Department Heads**

**Summary Results**

A majority of the academic departments are comfortable with the academic outcomes assessment needs. Those departments which are still having difficulties are interested in having a consistent form, a clear timeline, and someone with whom they can discuss the plans or measures adopted by their departments. The departments understand their data and do not want help analyzing the data. Mission alignment is not a problem. Faculty buy in is sometimes a problem.

**Learning Outcome Assessment Needs Survey**

**Extended Results**

The survey consisted of 11 Likert-scale items rated on a five-point “Definitely-Yes to Definitely-No” scale. These will be referred to as agreement items. There was one item asking for the number of reports submitted by the department and three open ended questions at the end. The survey was sent out electronically to the Department Head List twice (July 31, 2009 and August 5, 2009). Twenty-two of the 26 academic units responded for an 85% response rate.

Agreement Items

The 11items are listed below. A high score on these items represents agreement and a low score represents disagreement.

1. Do you feel you, as a Department Head, have a good grasp on what is needed for the annual learning outcomes assessment report?

2. Do you feel your department, in general, has a good grasp on what is needed for the annual learning outcomes assessment report?

3. Are you satisfied with your department’s Annual Outcome’s Assessment Report Process?

4. Do you feel you, or your department, would benefit from an expert to talk to about your plan?

5. Do you feel you, or your department, would benefit from an expert to talk to about your measures?

6. Do you feel you, or your department, would benefit from a University forum focusing on how to set up plans and reports?

7. Would you, or your department, benefit from one-on-one help in setting up plans and reports?

8. Do you need help in analyzing the data you collect?

9. Do you know the type(s) of outcome data which would be appropriate for your department?

10. Are you able to tie your departmental mission to specific program goals?

Figure 1 shows the frequency distribution for each item.

Figure 2 shows the same data collapsed into disagree (responses 1 and 2 combined), ?? (response 3), and agree (responses 4 and 5 combined).

These two figures show that there were four items on which respondents clearly agreed (agreement at least 20% greater than disagreement): Item 1—the Department Head has a good grasp on the report needs; Item 9 –Know what the appropriate data are; Item 10 -- Able to tie Department Mission to goals; and Item 11—Able to tie program goals to measured outcomes. There were two items on which there was clear disagreement (disagreement at least 20% greater than agreement): Item 6 -- the department would benefit from a forum and Item 8 -- the department would benefit from help analyzing data. There were five items on which the distributions were bimodal (both agree and disagree ratings high and middle ranking low): Item 2 – Department has a good grasp on report needs; Item3 -- satisfaction with the departmental process; Item 4 – would benefit from an expert in setting up the plan; Item 5 – would benefit from expert in helping with measures; Item 7 -- would benefit from one-on-one help.

The mean and standard deviation on each item provides essentially the same information. The most strongly agreed with items were 1, 9, 10, and 11. The more moderately agreed with items were 2, 3, 4,5, and 7. There were two items, 6 and 8, with which the respondents clearly disagreed. These last two items also had the smallest standard deviations.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 1. Mean and Standard Deviation of Responses to Each Item** | | |
| **Item** | **Mean** | **Standard**  **Deviation** |
| **1. DH good grasp on report needs?** | **3.73** | **1.24** |
| **2. Dept good grasp on report needs?** | **3.27** | **1.35** |
| **3. Satisfied w/dept process?** | **3.09** | **1.38** |
| **4. Benefit from plan expert?** | **3.09** | **1.63** |
| **5. Benefit from measure expert?** | **3.36** | **1.56** |
| **6. Benefit from forum?** | **2.23** | **1.11** |
| **7. Benefit from one-on-one help?** | **2.95** | **1.65** |
| **8. Help analyzing data?** | **1.95** | **1.00** |
| **9. Know appropriate data?** | **3.73** | **1.16** |
| **10. Able to tie dept mission to goals?** | **3.81** | **1.12** |
| **11. Able to tie program goals to measured outcomes?** | **3.86** | **1.15** |

These data suggest that in general Department Heads are comfortable with the Learning Outcomes Assessment Report needs, but that they don’t see their departments as being as clear on the needs. Item 1 and 2 being different suggests that while the department heads understand the report needs, the department members are not so sure in all cases. There are clearly (as can be seen in individual reports) some departments are very comfortable with their process, plan, and measures, while other departments are uncertain. Just about half the departments are not satisfied with their department process. This suggests that all departments do not need the same level of expert help. Those departments which report they would benefit from expert help are looking at plans and measures, not analyzing data or recognizing appropriate data. It would be useful to have experts or consultants from campus to help uncertain departments with report needs and process, refining the assessment plan, and choosing measures.

These conclusions are further supported by correlations between Item 7, benefit from one-on-one help, and the bimodally distributed Items 2, 3, 4, and 5. The significant negative correlation between Items 7 and 2 indicates that those departments where the department is viewed as not having a good grasp of report needs is viewed as more apt to benefit from one-on-one help, r(20) = .52, p <.01. Also negative is the correlation between Items 3 and 7: Those departments where the department is viewed as having a weaker grasp on the assessment process (low on 3) also are more apt to view more benefit from one-on-one help, r(22) = .52, p < .02. The remaining two correlations are positive. Those departments reporting they might benefit from a plan expert (item 4) indicate they might benefit from one-on-one help (Item 7), r(22) = .76, p < .01. Finally, those departments who report they would benefit from a measure expert (Item 5) also tend to indicate they would benefit from one-on-one help, r(22) = .53, p < .02. These relationships can be seen in Figure 3 which plots the mean ratings on Items 2, 3, 4, and 5 as a function of the rating on Item 7. Scatter plots indicated these correlations did not appear to result from one or two outliers or unusually cases.

Number of Reports

Departments with multiple programs may turn in more than one report. The mean number of reports is 2.95 (standard deviation = 3.00). However, this is misleading. Half (11 of 22) the reporting departments make a single Learning Outcomes Assessment Report. Three departments turn in two reports and three turn in three reports. Five departments turn in five or more reports (5, 7, 7, 8, and 12). Thus, while the mode is a single report, half the departments are preparing multiple reports and the result is 65 different reports from academic departments.

Open-Ended Questions

There were three open ended questions on the survey: #13: How does your department assign responsibility for developing outcomes assessment goals and measures for the annual report?; #14. What type of support, if any, would most benefit the ease with which you set up and complete your academic plans and reports?; and #15. Other comments or suggestions.

Responsibility for the report. More than half of the departments (12 of 21 who responded) report having a specific person in charge. That person may be specifically an AQIP person, a program coordinator , or a program evaluator. In six departments that person is the department head. Five departments report having a committee in charge and three departments use primarily information from faculty, especially those faculty who teach the capstone courses.

Type of beneficial support and general comments. It seems most reasonable to combine these two questions since the responses overlapped. Eight comments focused on the need for someone to query about the plan or measures. Those departments with mandated accreditation from external sources or with an in-house expert were not concerned about their plans or the need for an expert. This is consistent with the Likert data in which only about half of the respondents indicated that they would benefit from a plan or measurement expert. There were five mentions of the need for consistency in the form and expectations. This was tied to the need for a clear time frame. There were three explicit statements of the need to increase faculty “buy-in” to the process.

**Academic Departments**

**Outcomes Assessment Needs Survey**

**Part of the 2009 AQIP Action Project:**

**Documenting and Benchmarking the NMU Outcomes Assessment Process**

**This action project was designed to improve the system used at NMU for Learning Outcomes Assessment Plans and Reports, from both academic and service departments. The service departments have developed a system which incorporates separating the plan and report stages of the assessment and provides review by a standing committee. We are in the process of recommending a procedure for academic departments. One unknown factor is the degree to which academic departments feel they need or would benefit from support in either developing their outcome assessment plans or finalizing their reports.**

**Currently, outcomes assessment report compliance is virtually 100%. However, those reports include a great deal of variability in their adequacy, based on the current evaluation system (OO/O/S/SS). This survey is designed to investigate the degree to which academic departments feel they, or their learning outcome assessment committees, would benefit from support in developing learning outcome assessment plans and reports and what types of support would be beneficial.**

**This two-page survey is being sent to academic Department Heads. You may respond directly on this document and return the changed file through email or print it and return a copy of the survey to Sheila Burns (sburns@nmu.edu), Chair of Action Project Committee, Department of Psychology.**

**In analyzing the data, no academic department or department head will be named or associated with a specific response. Our primary interest is in summary information. Please circle or highlight your responses on those items which provide choices.**

**Please feel free to make any additional comments you have on the process at the end of the survey. Thank you for your cooperation.**

**1. Do you feel you, as a Department Head, have a good grasp on what is needed for the annual learning outcomes assessment report?**

Definitely NO 1 2 3 4 5 Definitely YES

**2. Do you feel your department, in general, has a good grasp on what is needed for the annual learning outcomes assessment report?**

Definitely NO 1 2 3 4 5 Definitely YES

**3. Are you satisfied with your department’s Annual Outcome’s Assessment Report Process?**

Definitely NO 1 2 3 4 5 Definitely YES

**4. Do you feel you, or your department, would benefit from an expert to talk to about your plan?**

Definitely NO 1 2 3 4 5 Definitely YES

**5. Do you feel you, or your department, would benefit from an expert to talk to about your measures?**

Definitely NO 1 2 3 4 5 Definitely YES

**6. Do you feel you, or your department, would benefit from a University forum focusing on how to set up plans and reports?**

Definitely NO 1 2 3 4 5 Definitely YES

**7. Would you, or your department, benefit from one-on-one help in setting up plans and reports?**

Definitely NO 1 2 3 4 5 Definitely YES

**8. Do you need help in analyzing the data you collect?**

Definitely NO 1 2 3 4 5 Definitely YES

**9. Do you know the type(s) of outcome data which would be appropriate for your department?**

Definitely NO 1 2 3 4 5 Definitely YES

**10. Are you able to tie your departmental mission to specific program goals?**

Definitely NO 1 2 3 4 5 Definitely YES

**11. Are you able to tie your program goals to measurable outcomes?**

Definitely NO 1 2 3 4 5 Definitely YES

**12. Does your department submit multiple reports because of multiple programs? YES NO**

**If so how many? \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**13. How does your department assign responsibility for developing outcomes assessment goals and measures for the annual report?**

**14. What type of support, if any, would most benefit the ease with which you set up and complete your academic plans and reports?**

**15. Other comments or suggestions.**