Director’s Corner

Is the campus-wide assessment system that we have all worked very hard to install still relevant? You bet it should be! Yes, SACS has come and gone. The enviable verdict at the SACS Annual meeting was soothing: The Commission on Colleges (COC) confirmed Reaffirmation without any recommendations for ten years! But we must not rest on our laurels.

Assessment was relevant yesterday, assessment remains relevant today and assessment will be relevant tomorrow because there is now an international dimension of it as a requirement on the horizon. As an institution, systematic assessment is the only assurance that we have that we will always be able to furnish required documentation of evidence of institutional effectiveness, whether it is coming from the State, or from the accrediting bodies/agencies.

The assessment process is critical to responding to calls for quality assurance of desirable student learning outcomes and the effectiveness of the various operations of our university. The latter includes the outcomes and effectiveness of administrative units, support services, research activities and public service. And lest we forget, FAMU’s Institutional Level Assessment Committee (ILAC) was formed to provide leadership in the implementation of the university’s assessment system. Formed in the Fall of 2004, ILAC was charged to spearhead the development, implementation and monitoring of FAMU’s assessment processes. To this end, each program and division assigned a representative to this entity. Each ILAC member is expected to act as the coordinator of assessment activities in their setting and this needs to be reflected in the assignee’s assignment of responsibility (AOR). Recent experiences of tardiness in submitting requested assessment plans and reports point to a lack of clarity about this assignment and acceptance by some ILAC members. This issue needs to be resolved so that ILAC representatives are recognized and empowered to play their expected roles of keeping their supervisors and colleagues updated on the progress of their units’ assessment system.

The Office of University Assessment (OUA) will continue to conduct training sessions to introduce/reinforce the “FAMOUS” Assessment Approach which is currently being used to plan and document all institutional assessment activities. Such trainings are recommended for all university personnel, especially new faculty and staff members. Please check out the workshop schedule which is posted on the assessment webpage and in the section “upcoming events” in this newsletter.

On a final note, I urge our campus community to support our Assessment Training and Research Institute (ATaRI) to be hosted by our office from May 17-19, 2010 to share our best practices in assessment and research presentations on the evidence of the impact of assessment on student learning outcomes and institutional services outcomes. We are looking forward to an exciting keynote address by none other than Dr. Trudy W. Banta, the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement, and Professor of Higher Education, at Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis. For those who are unfamiliar with this assessment legend, Dr. Banta is a distinguished personality in the higher education assessment movement that started in the early 1980’s. She has received numerous national awards for assessment literature and is the founding editor of the journal “Assessment Update”. She continues to consult on outcomes assessment worldwide. Join us on May 18, 2010 and bring whatever assessment questions you have ever had and you will not be disappointed!

With Much Cheer:

Uche Ohia, Ph. D.
The focus of assessment at Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University (FAMU) during the academic year of 2008-2009 was dominated by the Compliance Certification Documentation (CCD) for the University’s reaffirmation of accreditation. With the collaborative efforts of all involved entities, the University successfully completed this very important requirement of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and received excellent feedback from both the off-site and on-site SACS review committees. The climax of these efforts was the University’s reaffirmation of accreditation for ten (10) years by SACS-COC on December 2009. The following summarizes results of other major assessment activities in 2008-09.

Exit Survey
Ninety percent (94%) of the students agreed that they had acquired adequate abilities and skills with regards to communication, critical thinking, technology, cooperation, ethics/integrity, life-long learning, and cultural diversity.

2008 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
The results indicated that freshmen and seniors had a significantly higher mean score than their counterparts in the selected peers group, particularly in terms of the Level of Academic Challenge (LAC), Active and Collaborative Learning (ACL), Student-Faculty Interaction (SFI), Enriching Educational Experiences (EEE), and Supportive Campus Environment (SCE).

Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP)
The 2009 graduating seniors performed significantly higher than the 2006 freshmen in all the skills (critical thinking, reading, writing, math, humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences).

General Education Portfolios
Students’ artifacts evaluation results indicate that 62% received a passing score in communication, 80% in Critical Thinking, 59% in Cultural Diversity, and 76% in Ethical Values.

Focus Groups
Overall, students gave favorable responses to questions asked during the focus groups organized by GEAC with regards to Technology Literacy, Life-long Learning, and Collaboration. However, it was recommended that the university upgrade computers and allow unlimited free printing. A general consensus of students was that FAMU had prepared them to become lifelong learners – that FAMU had, in fact, prepared them to “learn how to learn”. Participants also reported that they had numerous opportunities to complete team activities, and class presentations in particular. Some students anticipated that the collaborative assignments will benefit them significantly in the professional setting.

Licensing / Professional Examinations
The results indicate an overall pass rate of 89% (332 out the 373) students who took these examinations. At the college or school level, the results indicate a 91% (30/33) pass rate for the College of Education, 50% (101/203) for the College of Law, 88% (127/145) for the College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, 87% (61/70) for the School of Nursing, and 67% (22/33) for the School of Allied Health.

Assessment Reports/Plans Submission Status
As of July 2009, 80% (39/49) of assessment reports were submitted by the ADESUs for the academic year 2008-2009. For the previous academic years, there were 17% (10/60) submissions in 2005-2006, 88% (44/50) in 2006-2007, and 100% (56/56) in 2007-2008.

As of July 2009, 67% (72/108) of assessment reports were submitted by the IPs for the academic year 2008-2009. For the previous years, there were 94% (102/108) in 2005-2006, 94% (100/106) in 2006-2007, and 100% (108/108) in 2007-2008.
Recommendations

- Upgrade computers and provide more learning opportunities for Technology Literacy to students.
- Implement the newly adopted ILAC organizational structure during the academic year 2009-2010.
- Design or purchase by September 30, 2009 a web-based assessment system that efficiently works with the University’s adopted assessment approach.
- Implement the desired connection between the FAMOUS Approach, the planning, and the budgeting processes.
- Continue to administer the MAPP test to graduating seniors and increase the number of participants per college/school.
- Improve parking availability and financial aid processing.
- Engage students more in those activities that freshmen and seniors students reported in the NSSE survey as not having enough engagement with. These include:
  - Coming to class without completing readings or assignments (seniors).
  - Using e-mail to communicate with an instructor (freshmen and seniors).
  - Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course reading (freshmen).
  - Number of written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages (freshmen and seniors).
  - Exercising or participating in physical fitness activities (freshmen).
  - Foreign language coursework (freshmen).
  - Study abroad (seniors).
  - Culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, etc.) (seniors).
  - Relationships with faculty members (freshmen).
  - Continue to annually hold the Assessment Training and Research Institute (ATaRI).
  - Implement the GEAC recommendations to improve the General Education artifacts scoring and assessment processes.

“Implement the desired connection between the FAMOUS Approach, the planning, and the budgeting processes.”

“Engage students more in those activities that freshmen and seniors students reported in the NSSE survey as not having enough engagement with.”
The Institutional Level Assessment Committee (ILAC) Internal Organizational Structure was approved by a vote of ILAC members on 5/6/09. The committee adopted a proposal and it was implemented during the 2009-2010 academic year. The following was included in the proposal.

⇒ Membership – ILAC membership will consist of the assessment coordinator from which college, school, ESI, University Libraries and the offices of Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Research, Information Technology, Administrative and Fiscal Affairs.

⇒ University Development, Audit/Compliance, the President’s Office, and the Faculty Senate may select two representatives from its members to serve on the Committee. The Student Government Association may also send a representative. Each unit shall designate an alternate person who is expected to represent the unit at meetings if the main representative is unable to attend.

⇒ Member responsibility – Each ILAC member shall be responsible for (1) the dissemination of assessment information to his or her unit, and (2) submission of assessment document from his or her unit.

⇒ Leadership team
⇒ Chairperson’s responsibility
⇒ Replacement of chair or vice chair
⇒ Meeting frequency
⇒ Review of the NSSE results will be added to the Internal Organizing Structure.

Each ILAC member shall be responsible for (1) the dissemination of assessment information to his or her unit, and (2) the submission of assessment documentation from his or her unit.

The General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC) continues steadfastly to fulfill its charges with particular focus in developing, implementing, and monitoring the General Education assessment processes for the University.

The goal of GEAC for this academic year is to assess the assessment process used over the last four years, starting with revising rubrics and revisiting methods of collecting artifacts as well as phasing in the remaining three outcomes. At this point they have revised some of their rubrics and begun the second phase of assessment—phasing in Technology Literacy, Life-Long Learning, and Collaboration, (TLC).

The theme of the GEAC for this year is ‘Pause, Reflect, and Project’. The GEAC will continue to refine rubrics, collect artifacts, utilize the expertise of the most qualified faculty to evaluate artifacts, and share findings with officials and the University at large so that collectively we may revitalize and strengthen our general education program and ensure that all students at FAMU receive a quality education that will not only prepare them to be successful in their respective careers, but also empower them to lead more enriched lives. The main activities of the GEAC during the FALL 2009 semester are listed below.

⇒ Developed a proposal for a new structuring of GEAC which was approved by the Provost.
⇒ Formed several subcommittees
⇒ Reviewed requirements for the Fifth Year Report required by SACS to prepare for sections involving general education.
⇒ ETS Proficiency profile (formerly the MAPP Test) was administered to incoming freshmen.
⇒ Conducted a focus group with various students regarding the three remaining outcomes being phased in.
⇒ Developed a plan to move to an electronic portfolio.

The goal of GEAC for this academic year is to assess the assessment process used over the last four years, starting with revising rubrics and revisiting methods of collecting artifacts as well as phasing in the remaining three outcomes.
Assessment Activities

Testing Graduating Seniors
In an effort to evaluate the General Education Program and the flow of knowledge into the degree programs, all graduating seniors are asked to take the ETS Proficiency Profile (formally Measurement of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP) test). Participation is critical in helping the University evaluate the educational process. The score received will not have any impact on students’ academic record. However, these scores will be used as one method to assess the General Education Program. As an incentive, the top three (3) performers will receive a digital camera.

What is ETS Proficiency Profile?
Information provided by the Educational Testing Services (ETS) indicates that the ETS Proficiency Profile is a single and integrated measure of general education that focuses on academic skills rather than knowledge. The ETS test provides invaluable data for accreditation, strategic planning, curriculum improvement, performance-based funding, benchmarking, determining “value added” or learning gains and for use in the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA).

What does it measure?
The skills measured by the test have equal weight of 25% and include College-Level Reading, Critical Thinking, College-Level Writing, and College-Level Mathematics.

The ETS Proficiency Profile also assesses these academic skills in the contexts of:

- Humanities focused on (1) selections of poetry, fiction, and nonfiction prose and (2) discussions of painting, music, or philosophical issues
- Social Sciences focused on History, Economics, Political Science, Psychology, Anthropology, or Sociology
- Natural Sciences focused on Biology, Chemistry, or Physics.

What does it yield?
The test provides two types of scores: the norm-referenced scaled scores and the criterion-referenced proficiency classifications.

“The ETS test provides invaluable data for accreditation, strategic planning, curriculum improvement, performance-based funding, benchmarking, determining “value added” or learning gains and for use in the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA).”

“Norm-referenced” means “a score that takes its meaning from comparison against the scores of others. Such scores can be used easily for benchmarking or for determining “value added” or learning gains by conducting a longitudinal or cross-sectional study. Eight (8) Norm-Referenced Scaled scores are reported from the MAPP test:
- Total Score
- Skills Sub scores (Critical Thinking, Reading, Writing, and Mathematics)
- Context Sub scores (Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences)

“Criterion-referenced “means “a score that takes its meaning from comparisons against specific learning objectives such as a set of skills or abilities or specific content from a content domain”– Such scores can be used easily for curriculum improvement. The skills measured by the MAPP test are grouped into nine (9) Criterion-Referenced Proficiency Classifications proficiency levels:
- Mathematics (Level 1, Level 2, Level 3)
- Writing (Level 1, Level 2, Level 3)
- Reading (Level 1, Level 2)
- Critical Thinking
Assessment Activities - Continued

The abbreviated form of the MAPP test is online and only 40 minutes long. The testing session will be open from Monday, February 1, 2010 through Friday, April 23, 2010.

At the completion of the test session, an Individual Student Score Report will display. Students will need to print out their Score Report information and submit to the registrar’s office, along with the receipt that shows they have completed the exit survey. Both items will be needed in order for students to receive their graduation card for Cap & Gown pick-up.

Colleges and schools can even get more use of the ETS Proficiency Profile by adding up to fifty customized items to gather specific information from their students. However, the minimum sample size required for meaningful result is fifty (50). Colleges/schools/institute and programs are encouraged to add customized items to the ETS Proficiency. For more information regarding the test and for sample questions, go to www.ets.org/mapp. For additional information, contact Brandi Newkirk at 850-412-5266 or brandi.newkirk@famu.edu.

Results of the FAMU Pre-Post ETS Proficiency Profile.

FAMU administered the test to voluntary samples of 125 entering freshmen in 2006 and 243 seniors as a post-test in 2009. Only students who responded to 75% or more questions were included in the analysis.

The summary of the results shown in Figure 1 indicate that the average mean scores of seniors of 2009 on the skills measured by the MAPP are all significantly higher than those of the entering freshmen of 2006 but lower than the national average mean scores.

As depicted, it can be concluded that seniors graduating from the University performed significantly higher than freshmen in all the skills areas (critical thinking, reading, writing, math, humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences) measured by the MAPP.

As an incentive, the top three (3) performers received an iPod Touch. The top 3 performers were:
- Ronald Trehorne from the School of Architecture.
- John Machala from the School of Architecture.
- Megan Ross from the College of Arts & Sciences, Department of Biology.

Figure 1: FAMU Pre-Post ETS Proficiency Profile Results
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS</th>
<th>Assessment Results for 2008-2009</th>
<th>Assessment Plans for 2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 99% (107/108) have submitted 2008-2009 assessment results</td>
<td>• 95% (103/108) have submitted 2009-2010 assessment plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1% (1/108) have not submitted 2008-2009 assessment results</td>
<td>• 5% (5/108) have not submitted 2009-2010 assessment plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Outstanding:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>CESTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology (M.S.)</td>
<td>Art Teacher Education (B.A./B.S.)</td>
<td>BASE (B.S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English (B.A./B.S.)</td>
<td>College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Teacher Education (B.A./B.S.)</td>
<td>Law (J.D.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE &amp; EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT UNITS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 82% (40/49) have submitted 2008-2009 assessment results</td>
<td>• 88% (42/48) have submitted 2009-2010 assessment plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 18% (9/49) have not submitted 2008-2009 assessment results</td>
<td>• 12% (6/48) have not submitted 2009-2010 assessment plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Outstanding:</td>
<td>Still Outstanding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the President</td>
<td>Office of President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental Relations</td>
<td>Governmental Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title III Program</td>
<td>Title III Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
<td>Instructional Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Relations</td>
<td>New Beginnings Child Care Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Student Health Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 50% (4/8) have submitted 2008-2009 assessment results</td>
<td>• 88% (7/8) have submitted 2009-2010 assessment plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 50% (4/8) have not submitted 2008-2009 assessment results</td>
<td>• 12% (1/8) have not submitted 2009-2010 assessment plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Outstanding:</td>
<td>Still Outstanding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Faculty Development and Research</td>
<td>Undergraduate Experience Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Lab</td>
<td>TRIO- Student Support Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 83% (10/12) have submitted 2008-2009 assessment results</td>
<td>• 92% (11/12) have submitted 2009-2010 assessment plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 17% (2/12) have not submitted 2008-2009 assessment results</td>
<td>• 8% (1/12) have not submitted 2009-2010 assessment plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Outstanding:</td>
<td>Still Outstanding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>College of Law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY/PUBLIC SERVICE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 92% (11/12) have submitted 2008-2009 assessment results</td>
<td>• 100% (12/12) have submitted 2009-2010 assessment plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 8% (1/12) have not submitted 2008-2009 assessment results</td>
<td>• 0% (0/12) have not submitted 2009-2010 assessment plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Outstanding:</td>
<td>Still Outstanding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>College of Law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment News

Assessment Training and Research Institute (ATaRI): May 17-19, 2010

About the Assessment Training and Research Institute (ATaRI)

The Assessment Training and Research Institute is designed for practitioners to develop/reinforce the skills for designing and managing the challenges of implementing assessment programs, processes, or projects. In particular, participants of the ATaRI will be guided through each step of the F.A.M.O.U.S. Approach and the provided hands-on experiences will give them the confidence necessary to implement and manage successful assessment systems. Concurrent sessions focused on “closing-the-loop” will allow for participants to share their experiences with implementing desirable changes based on assessment findings.

The keynote speaker this year will be Dr. Trudy W. Banta. She is the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement, and Professor of Higher Education, at Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis. Dr. Banta has received 8 national awards for her work and has consulted with faculty and administrators worldwide on the topic of outcomes assessment. Dr. Banta has written/edited 16 published volumes on assessment. The latest publication being “Designing Effective Assessment”, in which FAMU’s General Education Assessment Model is mentioned.

Institute Theme and Areas of Interest

The 2nd Annual ATaRI theme is “The Closed Loop: Where is the Evidence?” Consistent with this theme, we are especially interested in receiving proposals that highlight research related to assessment efforts, particularly research on how assessment activities have enhanced student performance, student services, as well as developed institutional effectiveness.

Topic Areas of Interest are:

⇒ Improvement decisions triggered by assessment results.

⇒ Impact of assessment on programs/institutional effectiveness with focus on areas such as improvement, accountability or accreditation.

⇒ Implemented improvements based on assessment results: course/classroom, program/department, institutional level or student affairs.

⇒ Obtaining/securing grant funding based on assessment results.

⇒ Improving student enrollment and retention.

Proposals are currently being accepted. Go to www.famu.edu/assessment and click on ATaRI for more information. Please direct all inquiries to the Office of University Assessment, 850-412-5266 or brandi.newkirk@famu.edu

Assessment Day

The Assessment Day is organized under the auspices of the Institutional Level Assessment Committee (ILAC) to administer assessment related tests and instruments as well as to host the Assessment Roundtable which is a forum where faculty, staff, students, and other stakeholders share their experiences. This year the Assessment Day will be held on March 17, 2010.

New Personnel

The Office of University Assessment has added two new employees to their staff, Ms. Kethura Pullins and Mr. Senthilkumar Mehalingam. Ms. Pullins is employed as a Federal Work Study student and Mr. Mehalingam as the Coordinator of Computer Applications. We welcome them to the assessment team and look forward to their great contributions.
ACADEMIC LEARNING COMPACTS

According to Board of Governors Regulation 6C-8.016, universities must develop Academic Learning Compacts (ALCs) and related assessment processes to ensure student achievement in baccalaureate degree programs in the State University System. Although the Board of Governors (BOG) supports the ongoing devolution of much authority to the universities, campus-level decision making, and institutional accountability, yet the Board also expects due diligence from institution and BOG personnel to ensure that Academic Learning Compacts and related assessment processes are of high quality and comply with the expectations outlined in Board of Governors and university regulations.

Each university is asked to submit a status report which includes an analysis of the progress being made in each baccalaureate program on the development and implementation of Academic Learning Compacts and related assessment processes.

There are a total of 62 undergraduate programs. Only 58 programs are reported in this summary. Four programs were considered inactive during the 2008-2009 academic year.

1. PROCESS: Program faculty have identified expected core student learning outcomes in the areas of communication, critical thinking, and content/discipline knowledge and skills:

⇒ Fifty eight (58) out of 58 Undergraduate Programs showed evidence that Process 1 is Completed and in Continuous Improvement Mode.

2. PRODUCT: Program faculty have made core learning expectations in the areas of communication, critical thinking, and content/discipline knowledge and skills readily available to prospective and enrolled students:

⇒ Fifty eight (58) out of 58 Undergraduate Programs showed evidence that Product 2 is Completed and in Continuous Improvement Mode.

3. PROCESS: Program faculty have identified the different ways in which individual students are assessed within the context of the program to determine if they have mastered the articulated core learning expectations:

⇒ Fifty eight (58) out of 58 Undergraduate Programs showed evidence that Process 3 is Completed and in Continuous Improvement Mode.

4. PRODUCT: Program faculty have included EXAMPLES of the kinds of assessments individual students will encounter in the program to determine if they have mastered these core learning expectations:

⇒ Fifty eight (58) out of 58 Undergraduate Programs showed evidence that Product 4 is Completed and in Continuous Improvement Mode.

5. PROCESS: Program faculty have developed a system of program assessment/evaluation, including external validations, (which can involve sampling) to corroborate that graduates have truly attained the expected core competencies:

⇒ Fifty eight (58) out of 58 Undergraduate Programs showed evidence that Process 5 is Completed and in Continuous Improvement Mode.

6. PRODUCT: Program Faculty have submitted a Seven-Year Program Review Summary Report to the Board of Governors Office - Must include a hyperlink to the Academic Learning Compact for each baccalaureate degree program under review:

⇒ Four (4) out of 58 Undergraduate Programs Completed Program Reviews during the 2008-2009 academic year.

7. PROCESS: Program faculty have used information from the periodic review of Student Learning Outcomes, as well as from the evaluation of corresponding assessment mechanisms to improve student achievement and program effectiveness:

⇒ Fifty seven (57) out of 58 Undergraduate Programs showed evidence that Process 7 is Completed and in Continuous Improvement Mode.
Emerging Assessment Practices Presented at National and International Forums this Year

During the academic year 2008-2009, the Office of University Assessment attended several national and international forums focusing on assessment and institutional effectiveness. Best practices in this relatively new area of higher education were shared in these occasions by scholars and practitioners. The following sections highlight some of those that we thought might be of interest to staff and faculty members coordinating assessment activities across the University.

“Overcoming Faculty Concerns-Building Faculty Expertise”

Source: Bea Babbitt and Angelina Hill, University of Nevada, 2009 Assessment Institute, Indianapolis, Indiana.

The guiding principle of this presentation indicates that “changing campus climate to support assessment efforts is a multi-faced systems process”. The presenters described a set of faculty support structures and faculty development strategies that have allowed a large public university to move from zero to 90 percent participation in four (4) short years. Such things as hiring a Director of Academic Assessment and creating an advisory assessment committee, which includes representative from instructional programs and related areas within the university. These are similar to structures and strategies followed at FAMU. Other strategies consisted of identifying faculty concerns which include skepticism, fear that assessment findings will be used against them, and lack of resources, knowledge about assessment, and uniform measurement tools across classes, schools and programs.

- To address faculty fear, the University of Nevada developed and adopted an assessment policy that protects faculty against use of assessment findings against them;

- To address the belief that assessment will go away after a while, the administration continuously repeated the message at every occasion;

- To address the knowledge gap that hundreds of faculty never heard about learning outcomes, necessary trainings were conducted;

- Common assessment tools were created to address that need.

It was emphasized to faculty that every field of study has a body of knowledge where learning outcomes can be derived from:

- Areas of application
- Ethical values that graduate should embrace
- Sets of skills required from graduates

Therefore, these should be the starting points of identification of the type of assessment needed in every field of study.

Ideas to build faculty expertise were:

- Use working sessions rather than talking sessions.
- Use different types of professional development.
- Pull available expertise across campus instead of only bringing in expensive outside consultants.
- Use roundtables, paid assessment workshops and panels.
- Pay participants to develop usable assessment tools during work sessions
- Do an assessment symposium every fall; an occasion for faculty to share expectations
- Treat faculty professionally during work sessions

Overall, one of the most important lessons learned in the process and identified by the presenters was that faculty members become more motivated as they gain more assessment expertise.
New Assessment Initiatives - Continued

“Assessing Assessment: What Makes Assessment Good?”

Source: Christian Reiner, Purdue University, 2009 Assessment Institute, Indianapolis, Indiana.

This session focused on how to identify characteristics that can be used to evaluate the quality of an assessment and highlighted several criteria:

**Criterion #1:**
- Partnership is essential: involve faculty, current students and alumni, and potential employers at the very beginning of the process.
- Clearly state learning outcomes and performance criteria.

**Criterion #2:**
- Develop a curriculum matrix.

**Criterion #3:**
- Focus on getting evidence to understand (what is going on?), evaluate, and confirm student learning.

**Criterion #4:**
- Develop a process to improve guidance on how to identify areas of improvement and assessment results and provide evidence that backs up the need for improvement.

**Criterion #5:**
- Clearly define and support changes.

**Criterion #7:**
- Provide a clear evidence that other key stakeholders share responsibility for defining and measuring learning outcomes: faculty, advisory council, employers, and alumni.