



Assessment Brief

Volume 8, Issue 1

December 2018

Points of Interest

Assessment Training Survey

We need your help in deciding what assessment training we need to hold next semester.

The Office of Assessment would like your assistance in scheduling the training based on your needs. Please take time to complete the

[Training Needs Survey](#).

Need help with TracDat? Schedule a meeting with Wrenette Tedder at 230-5270 or tedderw@hsu.edu or Brett Serviss at 230-5158 or servissb@hsu.edu.

If you have suggestions for items and/or information to be included in future editions of the Assessment Brief, send them to tedderw@hsu.edu.

Inside this issue:

Assessment Awards	1
Mathematics and Statistics Program Assessment	2-3
Academic Assessment Process Update	4
Assessment Training	4
Update on Non-Instructional and Academic Assessment Events, Activities, and Process for 2018	5
Assessment Team Roster	6

Assessment Awards Brett Serviss, Faculty Assessment Coordinator

In 2010, the Assessment Team created and implemented the Assessment Awards process, which is designed to honor one academic program and one non-instructional unit for outstanding work in assessment over the course of a year's time. The first academic and non-academic (currently non-instructional) assessment awards were presented in 2011 to Computer Science and Athletics, respectively. At present, the assessment awards process is used to determine outstanding assessment practices for three categories: 1. Program Review (non-instructional), 2. Annual Unit Operating Plan (non-instructional), and 3. Academic Program Assessment. To determine a series of finalists from each of the three areas, all assessment plans, which also must include observations and action plans, for every program/unit are evaluated initially by the Assessment Team, with five plans for each area ultimately selected. Specific rubrics, consisting of multiple criteria, are used for determination of the finalist plans. The finalist plans are then ranked by the Assessment Team to determine the three winning plans. Rating rubrics for the Program Review, Annual Unit Operating Plan, and Academic Program Assessment were modified specifically for the assessment awards process.

In 2018, the Assessment Team decided to add an additional category for the assessment awards — “most improved assessment plan.” This category focuses on the level/amount of improvement that has occurred within a program/unit assessment plan over a year period. The winner of this category will have an assessment plan that has exhibited significant development and/or improvement over what it was the previous year. As with the standard assessment awards, a most improved plan will be determined from a review and evaluation of academic programs and non-instructional units; thus, two awards for the most improved assessment plan will be given annually.

The assessment awards process for this round will begin during the fall 2018 semester, with awardees determined and honored in spring 2019. Academic programs will be honored during the faculty awards ceremony. Non-instructional units will be honored during the HSU staff luncheon awards. Awardees and their departments also are invited to attend a luncheon with the Assessment Team.



Mathematics and Statistics Program Assessment

Debra Coventry, Associate Dean of Ellis College and Professor of Mathematics

The mathematics and statistics program annually assesses its effectiveness as related to five goals and corresponding outcomes; three of these apply to all tracks, one is specific to the secondary licensure track, and one is specific to the statistics track. This annual assessment process is designed to target specific opportunities for growth associated to specific student learning outcomes. The department collects, analyzes, reflects on, and makes recommendations based on the collected data.

The assessment measures include nationally normed and licensing exams. For these measures, time series analyses are done to identify patterns and trends. Additionally, institutional, state, and national comparative analyses also are conducted. Specifically, the Major Field Test for Mathematics (4IMF) and the Praxis II Mathematics Content Knowledge (5161) are used for these purposes. These exams reveal how our students compare to those across the state and nation, while the subscores break down the information in a way that allows the department to create action plans to improve rather than just pat ourselves on the back and say 'job well done.'

Other measures apply departmentally developed rubrics. By designing the rubrics ourselves, we focus on areas with potential for the greatest growth, as well as monitor areas that students consistently demonstrate proficiency. We have found that the rubric development and revision process is a valuable collaboration tool among faculty and associated discussion topics include, but are not limited to: what components make up a task, which components are most essential, and how do we measure students' understanding of these components. These conversations, as well as the data, sometimes reveal differences between individual faculty perspectives and approaches. By recognizing and talking about these differences, we get closer to a shared vision of how to best help our students accomplish the desired outcomes.

The secondary mathematics licensure track has been accredited by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Specialized Professional Association of the National Council for the Teachers of Mathematics. Indeed, our program has earned a rating of nationally recognized. The accreditation report contains seven assessments, including the ETS[®] Praxis II Mathematics Content Knowledge nationally normed exam, an extensive alignment of required courses to the NCTM content standards with proficiency evidenced by course grades, and extensive rubrics. Five of these seven assessments contained in the report appear on the CAEP website as exemplar assessments: <http://www.caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/spa-standards-and-report-forms/nctm>. Portions of these CAEP assessments inform the program outcomes. As such, specific criteria and accompanying data from the CAEP assessments are used for university program assessment.

Programs with accrediting bodies should look for balance between the accreditation reports, and the requirements for university program assessment and college assessment, where applicable. This can be a difficult road to navigate because the assessment cycles are likely different, as are the software systems used to submit the reports – AIMS, TracDat, Tk20. Thought should be given to selecting data for university program assessment that already are being collected for accreditation, but not in such a way that it becomes more of a burden.

Mathematics and Statistics Assessment Plan

The mission of the Bachelor of Science program in mathematics and statistics at Henderson State University is to impart the knowledge, practice, and communication of mathematics and statistics to our students.

Mathematics and Statistics Program Assessment

(Continued)

Goal: Develop fluency in mathematical thought, knowledge, and procedures.	
Outcome: Students will demonstrate knowledge of vocabulary and problem-solving skills in the major areas of mathematics and statistics.	
Assessment Method 1: ETS ^a Major Field Test Mathematics (4IMF)	Criteria: Institutional Mean Percent Correct falls no less than one standard deviation below the national mean for the indicators of Calculus, Algebra, and Routine.
Assessment Method 2: ETS ^a Praxis II Mathematics: Content Knowledge (5161)	Criteria: Each subscore should be no less than one standard deviation below the national mean.
Goal: Enhance logical and analytical reasoning skills.	
Outcome: Students will be able to effectively abstract and communicate mathematical ideas.	
Assessment Method 1: Proof Writing Rubric is applied to a set of standard proofs embedded in the final exam of MTH 3573 Transitions to Advanced Mathematics.	Criteria: At least 75% of students earn a rubric score of acceptable (2) or better in the rubric categories of reasoning and communication.
Assessment Method 2: Proof Writing Rubric is applied so student's research paper and presentation in MTH 4901 Senior Project.	Criteria: At least 75% of students earn a rubric score of acceptable (2) or better in the rubric categories of reasoning and communication.
Goal: Strengthen problem solving skills.	
Outcome: Students will model and solve practical problems from the sciences.	
Assessment Method 1: Problem Solving Rubric is applied to either an outside Project or an appropriate problem embedded in final exam of MTH2044 Calculus II.	Criteria: At least 75% of students earn a total rubric score of acceptable or better (total score \geq 6).
Assessment Method 2: Statistical Methods Problem-Solving Rubric is applied to a set of problems embedded in final exam of MTH 2323 Statistical Methods.	Criteria: At least 75% of students earn a rubric score of acceptable or better (total score \geq 6).
Goal: Build the pedagogy for students to utilize their content knowledge and skills to teach secondary mathematics.	
Outcome: Teacher candidates will plan, implement and assess the effectiveness of instruction.	
Assessment Method 1: MTH Impact on Student Learning Project (ISLP) Rubric - Mathematical Practices will be applied to student's ISLP completed during internship.	Criteria: Each candidate earns a mean score of acceptable or better (≥ 2) for NCTM SPA Standard 2 Mathematical Practices Elements 2a, 2b, and 2c.
Assessment Method 2: MTH Impact on Student Learning Project (ISLP) Rubric – Student Engagement and Assessment Results will be applied to student's ISLP completed during internship.	Criteria: Each candidate earns a mean score of acceptable or better (≥ 2.0) for NCTM SPA Standard 5 Impact on Student Learning Elements 5b and 5c.
Goal: Strengthen design and analytical skills.	
Outcome: Students will analyze models, design experiments, and perform statistical analysis.	
Assessment Method 1: Statistical Reasoning Rubric is applied to a set of problems embedded the in the final exam in STA 2323 Statistical Methods	Criteria: The mean total rubric score is at least 11.2 (at least 70%) or better and no student has a score less than 2 on any rubric criteria.
Assessment Method 2: Statistical Reasoning Rubric is applied to a set of problems embedded the in STA 4103 Regression and Analysis.	Criteria: The mean total rubric score is 9.6 (at least 80%) or better and no student has a score less than 2 on any rubric criteria.

Academic Assessment Process Update

Brett Serviss, Faculty Assessment Coordinator

Currently, academic programs are in year three of the four-year assessment cycle. For this (third) year (2018-2019) of the cycle, academic programs will continue to collect, analyze, and discuss assessment data associated to program learning outcomes, and determine action plans and potential follow up activities to address inferences and trends shown via data analysis. Consistent collection and timely analysis of assessment data can provide regular opportunities to make minor adjustments or even large, but necessary, changes to the assessment plan.

Consideration of data and the associated trends should be done at the departmental level, rather than by only a single individual or small group. If a specific individual or departmental subcommittee is responsible for maintaining departmental assessment plan(s), then after compilation and analysis of the data, this information should be shared and discussed department-wide, with any proposed changes discussed and agreed upon by departmental faculty. Changes or adjustments, based on data analysis, may be made to an assessment plan at any point in the cycle, without waiting until the end of a single year or the four-year duration.

In year four (2019-2020), no assessment data will be collected. During fall 2019, departments will discuss the data and associated trends from years one through three, and determine what, if any, changes should be made to the assessment plan. During the spring 2020 semester, departments will create a new assessment plan for the next four-year cycle, which will commence with the 2020-2021 academic year. Departments may use the same assessment plan from the previous cycle, if deemed appropriate or necessary, or may partially or completely revise and change their assessment plan(s), to reflect different areas or facets of the program to be investigated. The new assessment plan always should be based on data and analysis of that data from the previous cycle, combined with discussion and input about this information from departmental faculty.

Assessment Training

Wrenette Tedder, Director of Assessment

The Director of Assessment has provided training on an as needed basis to both academic and non-instructional units. During the spring 2019 semester, however, the director will schedule a series of training opportunities for faculty and staff that cover various aspects of the assessment process. The following is a list of potential subjects for training sessions:

- “How to Write Outcomes”
- “How to Write Measures with Appropriate Criteria”
- “How to College Data”
- “How to Enter Observations from Data Collection”
- “How to Enter Action Plans from Observations”
- General Overview of the Academic Assessment Process and Cycle
- General Overview of the Non-Instructional Program Review or Non-Instructional Annual Unit Operating Plan Improve (TracDat) for New Users
- Improve (TracDat) Refresher

The Office of Assessment would like your assistance in scheduling the training based on your needs. Please take time to complete the [Training Needs Survey](#).

Survey can be found at: <https://snapweb.hsu.edu/snapwebhost/s.asp?k=154350645783>

Update on Non-Instructional and Academic Assessment Events, Activities, and Process for 2018
 Wrenette Tedder, Director of Assessment

Non-Instructional Program Review

During spring 2018, the Assessment Team reviewed and subsequently worked on revising the Non-Instructional Program Review data submission file and associated review rubric. The program review process was initiated in 2017. In the program review process, the goals of the Assessment Team were: 1. evaluate, and where necessary, revise the current program review process to make it more streamlined and easier to follow; 2. communicate more effectively about the process, 3. assist units in the development of their respective program reviews, and 4. provide examples of exemplary Non-Instructional Program Reviews. An Assessment Team subcommittee was formed to evaluate the suggested changes for the Non-Instructional Program Review data submission form and the review rubric, based on feedback about the process from Assessment Team members and non-instructional units. The subcommittee met several time prior to submitting their recommendations to the Assessment Team. The Team then made the final decision on the changes for both documents, based on subcommittee recommendations.

There were 23 non-instructional units assigned to complete a program review in 2018. Once the revised documents were approved by the Assessment Team, the Non-Instructional Program Review form and review rubric were sent to each of the 23 units on June 20th. The Non-Instructional Program Reviews were due on September 3rd. The program reviews evaluated by the Assessment Team were sent back to the units for their consideration, with subsequent revision by the units. Units were given an opportunity to resubmit their (revised) Program Review after receiving the evaluations and feedback. Only two units resubmitted their plans for a second, optional review.

**NON-INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW
 FALL 2018**

Exemplary	15	65%
Strong	6	26%
Adequate	1	4%
Needs Improvement	0	0%
Did Not Submit	1	4%
	23	100%

Non-Instructional Annual Unit Operating Plan

The 36 non-instructional units not designated to complete a program review were asked to complete an Annual Unit Operating Plan. The Director of Assessment and Faculty Assessment Coordinator worked during the summer (2018) to develop a Non-Instructional Annual Unit Operating Form and associated Review Rubric. These documents were forwarded to the Assessment Team during late summer for evaluation and feedback. Once the documents were approved by the Assessment Team, the Non-Instructional Annual Operating Plan form, review rubric, and university operating plan were sent (on August 8th) to each of the 36 units. The completed annual operating plans were due on October 5th. The Assessment Team has completed the review process for the annual operating plans and the Director of Assessment is currently compiling the feedback to forward to each unit.

Academic Assessment — Closing the Loop

Academic units also had deadlines during the fall 2018 semester pertaining to Closing the Loop for 2017-2018 program assessment. On September 14, units were to analyze data collected for year two (2017-2018 academic year) of the four-year assessment cycle. Units also were to look at trends and make conclusions and inferences from the year two data, and enter those into Improve (formally TracDat). Subsequently, on October 12, units were to determine the necessary adjustments/action plans for their assessment plans, based on the data collected and observed. These changes are to be made during the fall 2018 semester. Currently, the Director of Assessment and Faculty Assessment Coordinator are evaluating the progress for the academic units. The Assessment Team will complete the review process for academic assessment plans during the spring 2019 semester.

Assessment Team Roster 2018-2019

Feel free to contact your representative on the Assessment Team. They are willing to assist you in the assessment process.

Role	Committee Member	Term Expires
Director of Assessment	Wrenette Tedder, Co-Chair	Ex officio
Faculty Assessment Coordinator	Brett Serviss, Co-Chair	Ex officio
Faculty member-Library	Lacy Wolfe	2021
Faculty member-School of Business	Jennifer Sigman	2021
Faculty member-Ellis College, at large	Doug Heffington	2021
Faculty member-Ellis College, Fine Arts	Darrel Farmer	2021
Faculty member-Ellis College, Math, Science, and Nursing	Shannon Clardy	2019
Faculty member-Ellis College, Liberal Arts	Deepak Pant	2021
Faculty member-Teachers College	Judith Jenkins	2019
Administrative Staff-Academic Affairs	Chanda Hooten	2019
Administrative Staff-Athletics	Lenette Jones	2021
Administrative Staff-Finance and Administration	Scott Freeman	2020
Administrative Staff-Student Affairs	Nikki Laird	2019
Administrative Staff-University Advancement	Yvonne Saul	2019
Associate Dean-Ellis College	Deb Coventry	Ex officio
Associate Dean-Teachers College	Matthew Sutherlin	Ex officio
Associate Dean-School of Business	Nathan Campbell	Ex officio
Chair, General Education Committee	Deb Coventry	Ex officio
Research Associate	Ginger Otwell	Ex officio
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs	Steve Adkison/Kenneth Taylor	Ex officio
Graduate Student	Clayton Alspaw	2020
Undergraduate Student	currently vacant	

NEED HELP.....CALL THE OFFICE OF ASSESSMENT

The Office of Assessment supports the University's continued efforts in assessment and program effectiveness. The office is available to consult on any part of the assessment process. Please contact Wrenette Tedder at 230-5270 or tedderw@hsu.edu.