

Assessment Council
Status of Assessment at CSU Channel Islands
Annual Report to the President
2010-2011

Introduction:

In 2010-11, the Assessment Council accomplished two goals:

- (1) establish a process for evaluating the status of assessment university-wide and
- (2) provide a report on the current status of assessment at CSU Channel Islands.

In accomplishing the first goal, the Council collected and archived relevant documents and a self-assessment report from each of the five university divisions. This Annual Report fulfills the second goal by providing a summary of the divisions' self-assessments and an analysis of strengths, areas for improvement, and recommendations.

Process:

The Policy on Assessment AA.04.005 establishes responsibility for assessment within each division of CSUCI to define its goals and methods of assessment. In fall 2010, the Assessment Council sent out two separate questionnaires to the President's Cabinet requesting information on their assessment processes. The first questionnaire asked for an inventory of documents relating to assessment created by each division including assessment plans, rubrics, guidelines, analyses, reports, and improvement plans. The Council archived the documents returned by each division using the software application, CampusWide, by Tk20.

The second questionnaire asked for a self-assessment by each division, using a WASC-like rubric developed by the Assessment Council. Divisions responded to 12 questions by evaluating their status based on a four-point scale ranging from "initial" to "highly developed." **All divisions responded in a timely fashion to both questionnaires.** A summary of these responses is included in this report. The last column of this report provides a numeric summary of each item where "Initial" was given a value of 1 and "Highly Developed" was given a value of 4. The total score of individual items across all division areas range from 7 to 14 out of a possible score of 20. The Council developed their analysis of the status of assessment at CSUCI based on a review and discussion of all of this material.

Analysis:

Strengths

- All divisions have developed some aspects of their assessment processes at a level above "initial" and some divisions have developed a few aspects at a "highly developed" level.
- The self-assessment items achieving the highest overall scores are 1) identified goals that are aligned with the university mission/priorities, 2) division goals are disseminated to all units in the division and 3) division has observable and measurable outcomes.
- The University Strategic Plan provides an institution-wide focus for aligning division and unit actions.
- Student Affairs has a strong assessment plan that has been reviewed by an independent, external evaluator. All units participate in assessment. Staff participate in training on a regular basis and a common assessment language has been developed.

Student Affairs is now in the process of designing improvements to make it more effective as a result of several years of experience implementing the process.

- Academic Affairs has a strong program review process in place. The full cycle, which results in a Memorandum of Understanding between the Provost, Dean, and Program Chair, is just now being completed for the first programs started at CI. PARC is updating the policies and procedures for program review as a result of experience in these first rounds. Assessment of student learning outcomes is a major aspect of the program review process. Programs that have gone through the external and internal reviews to-date were at the Initial or Emerging stage of student learning outcome assessment and have upgraded their processes as a result of external review and PARC recommendations.

Areas for Improvement

- The self-assessment items achieving the lowest overall scores are Rubric #1, "documents describing the assessment process" and Rubric #12, "the division regularly reviews its assessment structure for effectiveness."
- Our current organizational structure and assignment of responsibility does not account for university-level outcomes and assessment. Some of this assessment is being done but there appears to be a gap in terms of assignment of responsibility for these processes and reporting at an institutional level. Institution-level assessment would include outcomes such as Strategic Plan reporting and student learning outcomes such as General Education, the four pillars, and the characteristics of graduates.
- There is no evidence of a clear link between outcomes assessment and institutional planning processes. Processes are missing that would link the Strategic Plan to annual planning at the division and unit levels. Division annual reporting is not necessarily aligned with their annual goals, action plans, and intended outcomes. Therefore, assessment appears to be occurring in a vacuum in many cases.
- Documents such as the *Seven-year Plan for Student Learning Outcomes Assessment, 2006*, do not describe current practice or are not fully implemented. For example, General Education student learning outcomes assessment and assessment of the four mission pillars are described but have not been implemented.

Recommendations

- Charge appropriate staff with responsibility for developing an institution-wide planning process that links the Strategic Plan to annual planning at the division-level and units within divisions. Define and require annual reporting from the Divisions that is aligned with annual goals, action plans, and intended outcomes. This will provide the structural support and alignment within which institutional assessments can occur. (Rubric #4)
- Encourage the President's Cabinet to create and/or update their documentation of existing assessment processes. (Rubric #1)
- Charge appropriate staff with responsibility for coordinating institution-level student outcomes assessment related to (1) the mission pillars and (2) the published statement of "Characteristics of Graduates."

Annual Evaluation of Division Assessment Process Assessment Council 2010-11

SUMMARY						
Division Evaluation Questions	Academic Affairs	Student Affairs	Finance & Admin	Advancement	T&C	Score Sums
Culture of Assessment						
1. The division has document(s) describing the assessment process & plan.	Dev	Emg	Ini	Ini	Ini	8
2. The division has an administrative structure for assessment (e.g., assigned staff, training, budget).	Emg	Dev	Emg	Emg	Emg	11
3. The division's assessment processes and division's criteria are defined.	Dev	Dev	Ini	Emg	Emg	11
4. The division has identified goals that are aligned with the University Mission and/or priorities.	Dev	Dev	Emg	HD	Emg	14
5. Division goals are disseminated throughout all divisional units.	Dev	Dev	Emg	HD	Emg	14
6. The division uses a common language to discuss assessment.	Ini	Dev	Emg	HD	Ini	11
Feedback Loop						
7. The division has observable and measurable outcomes.	Dev	Dev	Emg	HD	Ini	13
8. Data are collected according to an established time line.	Emg	Emg	Emg	HD	Ini	11
9. Data are analyzed according to the division's criteria.	Emg	Emg	Ini	HD	Ini	10
10. Assessment results are used to adjust divisional processes as needed.	Emg	Emg	Emg	Dev	Ini	10
11. The division reports and documents evidence of changes made as a result of the assessment process.	Emg	Emg	Emg	Dev	Ini	10
Process Review						
12. The division regularly reviews its assessment structure for effectiveness (e.g., documentation, goals, processes, outcomes, measures, criteria).	Emg	Emg	Ini	Ini	Ini	7

Ini = Initial: Absent, loosely defined, unclear, or being developed; no outcomes measured. Score=1

Emg = Emerging: Clearly identified, applied to some units, some outcomes measured & analyzed. Score=2

Dev = Developing: Fully established, applied to all units, most outcomes measured and analyzed. Score=3

HD = Highly Developed: Refined through several feedback loops; all outcomes measured and analyzed; effective, current, regular process understood by all units. Score=4

Council Members:

Baker, Harley	Faculty	Harley.Baker@csuci.edu	
Clarke, Tia	President's Office	Tia.Clarke@csuci.edu	Until 12/2010
Doll, Caroline	Finance & Administration	Caroline.Doll@csuci.edu	
Francois, Marie	Faculty	marie.francois@csuci.edu	
Lefevre, Stephen	Academic Affairs	Stephen.Lefevre@csuci.edu	
Moffett, Nelle (chair)	Academic Affairs	nelle.moffett@csuci.edu	
Morten, George	Student Affairs	george.morten@csuci.edu	
Mosinskis, Peter	Technology & Communication	peter.mosinskis@csuci.edu	Starting 3/1/2011
Nuhfer, Ed	Academic Affairs	edward.nuhfer@csuci.edu	
Ross, Andre	Student	andre.ross005@myci.csuci.edu	
Smith, Diana	University Advancement	diana.smith@csuci.edu	
Swanson, Judy	Technology & Communication	Judy.Swanson@csuci.edu	Until 3/2011