

**Assessment Strategic Task Force
End of Year Progress Report (June 2014)**

Task Force Name: Assessment

Charge: To support the development of an integrated university assessment process that aligns with university strategic priorities and the new UPS on assessment, facilitates the development of a campus-wide educational effectiveness plan, and recommends resources necessary to implement the plan.

Committee Members: Anil Puri (Chair), Jochen Burgtorf, Claire Cavallaro, Sheryl Fontaine, Kiran George, Peter Nwosu, Tania Perez (student), Eileen Walsh

Meeting Dates: 10/10/13, 12/13/13, 3/12/14, 4/11/14, 5/14/14

Summary of Work Performed:

At its very first meeting in October 2013, it became clear to the taskforce that there was no reliable database of assessment activities that had been taking place on the campus. It, therefore, spent some time in the fall assembling the existing information. It confirmed what WASC report stated, i.e., assessment was undertaken unevenly across the university. In particular, GE and major assessments were not coherent and did not clearly measure university learning goals that themselves were not clearly stated. Working with the university General Education committee, a set of measurable university learning goals was defined. A spring 2014 all-university conference on assessment further refined and approved these goals and outcomes.

With the hiring of a new Director of Assessment in February 2014 and allocation of dedicated resources for assessment activities, more rapid progress was made in the last three months. Examples of accomplishments include:

1. A six-step process for developing and implementing program and course level assessments was established.
2. An Assessment Management System was identified and currently being implemented.
3. A website that showcases the university's commitment and progress on assessment, as well as provides comprehensive resources and support on assessment, has been established.
4. A series of professional development events focused on assessment is being planned for the 2014-2015 academic year, whereas consultations with individual colleges and programs have already taken place to help unify the vision of assessment on campus.
5. A grant was received to broaden faculty expertise on assessment and quality assurance, with a special focus on online courses.
6. A dedicated office space in MH-136 was established in February 2014 to house assessment and educational effectiveness activities, and to provide a space for technical support to faculty and staff.
7. An assessment survey was completed, which highlights assessment of student learning outcomes across the university's seven colleges over a two-year period AY 2012-13 and AY 2013-2014. The assessment data provides information to guide professional development opportunities for faculty and staff, and information needed to develop a section of the WASC Interim Report.

Additionally, the Assessment and Educational Effectiveness Committee developed a campus-wide Assessment and Educational Effectiveness plan that clarifies the process of assessment and the role of

key stakeholders.

The taskforce did not work on the planned budget; however, Academic Programs has indicated a need for 10 faculty assessment liaisons to be assigned to colleges based on release time. The actual number and budget will be finalized in fall.

Recommendations:

1. Create a campus-wide "Assessment Network" to exchange information and coordinate assessment activities of all units.
2. Implement the recently approved educational effectiveness plan to guide assessment planning, execution and documentation.
3. Implement a faculty and staff professional development program that provides substantive and technical training on assessment (e.g. workshops, conferences), as well as provide direct, customized support to meet individual unit's needs on assessment.
4. Faculty ownership and a campus culture of assessment are keys to success. The university should create and sustain activities that highlight, reward, and celebrate best assessment practices. Utilize the Annual Assessment Conference for expanded discussion of current campus assessment activities as well as best practices around the nation.
5. Further investigate ways to provide appropriate credit for faculty assessment efforts, with possible inclusion in the RTP (Retention, Tenure and Promotion) process.
6. Involve other campus divisions (non instructional) in assessment, outcome measurement and quality improvement processes.
7. Provide resources (staffing and operation) for campus-wide assessment activities.

Conclusions:

Integrated assessment of General Education and majors are essential to meeting the mission and goals of the university, improving the quality of education, and ensuring student success. WASC report pointed out the unevenness of our current assessment activities. Our analysis confirmed it. But the university has made a head-start in improving assessment on campus with the hiring of a director of assessment and committing resources for basic operation of the office. The university committees have also made progress in laying out policy documents on assessment and GE learning outcomes. A software system has been selected to document and report on university-wide assessment activities.

Yet there is much more to do, as discussed in the recommendations section. The university must make a substantial and sustained investment of resources, and the faculty and staff must adopt assessment as an integral and valuable activity on an ongoing basis. Positioned correctly and implemented with focus and flexibility, assessment of student learning outcomes and other performance outcomes can become one more enviable attribute of Cal State Fullerton.

Supporting Documents (Please Attach):

- Progress Reports
- Agendas
- Meeting Minutes
- Statistics/Papers/Reports
- Other