

**Program Assessment Task Force**  
**Final Report & Recommendations**

**I. Background**

The Program Assessment Task Force held its first meeting at the Faculty Senate retreat in August 1998. Thereafter the Task Force met a number of times to consider issues related to Program Assessment at Indiana University East. The Task Force formed two subgroups, one focusing on the philosophical bases for assessment, the other focusing on standards. The subgroup findings have been incorporated into these recommendations.

**II. Recommendations**

Based on the extensive discussions over the months, the Program Assessment Task Force recommends the following:

- A. The Indiana University East Faculty Senate accept this report of the Program Assessment Task Force.
- B. The Indiana University East Faculty Senate recommend to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs the adoption of the three statements on Division /Program Review contained in this report:

Statement 1 **Philosophy of Division/Program Review and Assessment**

Statement 2 **Standards for Division/Program Review and Assessment**

Statement 3 **Procedures for Division/Program Review and Assessment**

for the review of all academic divisions and programs starting Fall 1999.

- C. A group of appropriate faculty be assembled to work with Academic Affairs to review the materials from the Regional Campus Excellence project, the report from the study Assessing the Effectiveness of Indiana University's Academic Program Review Processes by Trudy Banta and other relevant resources to develop benchmarks, examples, exemplars and other indicators of good practice concerning the Standards for Division/Program Review and Assessment at Indiana University East.
- D. The Indiana University East Faculty Senate recommend to the Chancellor the appointment of a more broadly based Assessment/Review Task Force at Indiana University East to develop and recommend to administration an assessment program for non-academic offices and programs at Indiana University East. It is further recommended that this more broadly based task force include faculty and staff members and that this Assessment/Review Task Force develop an assessment and review program that reflects the proposed structure for academic divisional and programmatic assessment (i.e.: Philosophy, Standards, Procedures, Indicators). This Assessment/Review Task Force should consider in its deliberations the Values Audit process developed by the Long Range Planning Committee a number of years ago, the Customer Service program, and other assessment/review initiatives performed on an ad hoc basis since the last NCA visit in 1992.

### **III. Faculty Participation**

The Program Assessment Task Force consisted of a number of faculty who initially (and many on a continuing basis) have developed these recommendation. The following individuals have contributed to these recommendations:

Betty Goerss, Mary Blakefield, Cheryl Stolle, John Dalphin, Sharon Corder, Marilyn Watkins, Laverne Nishihara, Karen Clark, Sherry Rankin, Peggy Branstrator, and Walter Wagor.

## Division / Program Review and Assessment

### PHILOSOPHY OF DIVISION / PROGRAM REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT

Division and program assessment provides the unit with a foundation to strengthen itself and the institution; it involves a careful examination of the unit's mission and goals. One objective of assessment is an accurate evaluation of how successfully the unit's purposes are being fulfilled. To this end, the unit gathers essential information: for example, an academic program compiles data about student outcomes as measured against learning objectives and the students' own goals; it gathers information about faculty's teaching, professional development, and service in terms of the program's and university's missions and objectives. The assessment process reveals and reports on the program's needs. In assessment, Division/program members examine the results and determine priorities, such as the pursuit of essential resources, or the increased ability to strengthen skills and areas of knowledge identified through assessment, always with the purpose of improving quality.

Division and program assessment provides information in support of campus planning. It allows us to look at ourselves and to ask questions about the role and value of various components and programs on our campus. It helps us determine how to concentrate our efforts to raise quality, to refine our goals, and to accomplish our goals. These efforts are enhanced when similar information is available about all academic divisions and programs .

Beyond such outcomes as program accreditation, there are outcomes stemming from program improvements. The university enhances its ability to attract students and promote its programs. Ultimately, the community benefits through its citizens' improved level of education, an increasingly skilled workforce, and enterprise or cultural development to which units contribute.

Some of the primary bases for assessment are:

**1. Benefits to Students:**

*Assessment:*

- addresses student outcomes, skills, learning objectives and mastery of the conventions/modes of inquiry in discipline;
- provides opportunity to receive student feedback and implement programmatic change as appropriate;
- determines whether students' goals are addressed by program, including areas such as clinical experiences and career placement

**2. Benefits to Faculty:**

*Assessment provides:*

- evidence of teaching quality both individually and as a unit
- opportunity to review outcomes of teaching techniques
- review of faculty scholarship and service (including adequate variety)
- review of continued faculty development in teaching, scholarship, service

**3. Benefits to Program as a Whole:**

*Assessment involves:*

- objective evaluation of program;
- analysis of program's assessment plan
- determining the program's mission/philosophy, priorities, goals and needs;
- potential of receiving accreditation

**4. Benefits to Institution:**

*Assessment is:*

- useful in cost-analysis
- promotes effective use of resources
- eliminates program duplication
- provides information to decision-makers
- improves overall quality of institution

## 5. **Benefits to Community:**

### *Assessment:*

- promotes higher education by raising the education and culture of region
- supports enterprises in business and government
- supports assessment of partnerships and community linkages
- assures quality

## **STANDARDS FOR DIVISION / PROGRAM REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT**

Recognizing that the reviews serve the functions of providing information for both improvement as well as evaluation, the following standards provide the evidences upon which divisions and programs will be reviewed.

### **1. Mission/Goals**

Does the division/program have well-defined goals?

How are the goals of the division/program related to the core mission of the campus and the university?

### **2. Faculty**

What is the quality of teaching in the division as measured by both student and peer evaluations?

How does the division ensure that the full-time and part-time faculty are sufficiently qualified to teach the curriculum?

How does the service productivity of divisional faculty compare to expected levels, both quantitatively and qualitatively?

How does the creative activity/professional development/scholarship productivity of divisional faculty compare to expected levels, both quantitatively and qualitatively?

### **3. Students**

What are the enrollment trends for the units of the division?

How is the division/program addressing the future goals and needs of the students (e.g. employment, future education, transfer to another program)?

What is the level of student involvement in the division, the campus, the profession or discipline?

How well does the division/program perform on student retention measures?

### **4. Curriculum**

How well does the curriculum meet the enrollment trends, student employment outlook projections or student educational goals?

Is there a long range plan for curriculum over the next 5-10 years and does it include changes in existing programs as well as planning and justification for any additional programs?

Does the curriculum avoid duplication with other programs; fulfill a needed purpose?

Does the curriculum connect with and fulfill mission/goals of each academic program?

## **5. Outreach/Community Involvement**

Is there an active outside advisory board?

How well does the division market and promote its activities and programs?

How well does the division supplement its resources from outside sources (e.g. reverse sabbaticals, grants, outside speakers)?

To what extent is the division involved in community educational activities (e.g. math and speech contest, art shows, SCOPE)?

#### 6. Resources

Is the budget sufficient to meet divisional and individual program needs?

Are the physical facilities sufficient to meet divisional and individual program needs?

Are equipment and technology support sufficient to meet instruction and scholarship needs?

Are there sufficient, appropriately-trained support personnel?

#### 7. Assessment

Are appropriate methods of measuring student academic achievement used?

Is the assessment plan linked to program goals?

Do the assessment results show that students are meeting the campus learning objectives?

Are the results of student learning outcomes assessment used to improve programs?

#### 8. Overall

Is the division/program better than, same as, or worse than five years ago?

What changes are needed in the next five years?

How does the division/program encourage and participate in interdisciplinary activities?

### **PROCEDURES FOR DIVISION / PROGRAM REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT**

- Division and programs are evaluated every five years. For those units accredited by outside agencies, these standards and procedures are intended to complement, not compete with, such accreditation reviews. It is believed that information relevant to these standards can and will be gathered as part of the regular accreditation review processes by those respective units. It is not proposed nor is it intended that such units undergo separate or additional review under this document.
- A self-study is completed by the Division to address the questions listed in the "Standards" section.
- The review team will consist of at least two external evaluators and one tenured Indiana University East faculty member from another division identified by the Division Chair and selected in consultation with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Evaluators receive a copy of the self-study and are invited for an on-site visit. During the visit, the Evaluators interview faculty in the Division, the Division chair, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and other institutional personnel as deemed appropriate by the Evaluators.
- A written report is submitted by the Evaluators to the Division chair and copies are distributed to the Division and University Administration.

- A written response to the evaluation report is submitted to the Chancellor and/or Vice chancellor for Academic Affairs by the Division.
- The Division Chair, Vice chancellor for Academic Affairs and/or Chancellor will meet to discuss possible action(s) to consider as a result of the evaluation.
- The Division develops an action plan (both long-term and short-term) based on all available input.