

University of Houston-Clear Lake
Office of Institutional Effectiveness
Assessment Report for FY17 and FY18

The Office of Planning and Assessment in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) has completed its review of the 2017-2018 Assessment Cycle, which includes academic year 2016-2017 (results and use of results) and academic year 2017-2018 (outcomes and methods/criteria for success). OIE annually reviews assessment plans for completion and quality of content. For completion, all plans should have submitted the following components: Program Outcomes, Student Learning Outcomes (Academic and Non-Academic: Student Services, Library), 2017-18 Methods, 2016-17 Methods, Results, and Use of Results. For quality of content, components are scored as Very Good (3), Acceptable (2), and Needs Improvement (1). See rubrics in Appendix A.

Total Number of Assessment Plans: 160
Total Number of Components: 893
Total Number of Completed Components: 786
Percentage of Completeness: 88%
Overall Quality of Assessment Plans: 2.44

Summary and Status of Assessment Review as of April 2, 2018

College of Business

- Total: 22 plans, 130 components
- Submitted and Reviewed: 127 components
- Completed: 126 components
- Need Revision: 1 component (Management BS)
- In Progress: 3 components (Management BS)

Status: Incomplete

Overall Quality of Assessment Plans: 2.41

College of Education



- Total: 19 plans, 108 components
- Submitted and Reviewed: 108 components
- Completed: 108 components

Status: 100% Completed.

Overall Quality of Assessment Plans: 2.99

College of Human Sciences and Humanities

- Total: 39 plans, 225 components
- Submitted and Reviewed: 225 components
- Completed: 223 components
- Needs Revision: 2 components (Children's Art School and Family Therapy MA)

Status: Incomplete

Overall Quality of Assessment Plans: 2.78

College of Science and Engineering

- Total: 26 plans, 155 components
- Submitted and Reviewed: 102 components
- Completed: 89 components
- In Progress: 44 components (Biological Sciences BA/BS and MS, Computer Engineering BS and MS, Computer Science MS, CSE Plan, Cyber Security Institute, Environmental Sciences BS and MS, Industrial Health and Hygiene BS, Physics BS and MS, Safety BS, and Software Engineering MS).
- Needs Revision: 13 components (Biological Sciences BA/BS and MS, Computer Engineering BS, CSE Plan, Environmental Sciences BS and MS, Software Engineering MS, and Statistics MS).
- Work Not Started: 9 components (Computer Engineering BS, CSE Plan, Cyber Security Institute, and Safety BS)

Status: Incomplete

Overall Quality of Assessment Plans: 1.44

Non-academic: Academic Affairs

- Total: 5 plans, 22 components
- Submitted and Reviewed: 19 components
- Completed: 19 components
- In Progress: 3 components (Office of Sponsored Programs)

Status: Incomplete

Overall Quality of Assessment Plans 2.48

Non-academic: Administration and Finance

- Total: 19 plans, 92 components
- Submitted and Reviewed: 75 components
- Completed: 75 components
- In Progress: 12 components (Risk Management, Business Services, Emergency Management/Fire Safety, and Systems Operations)
- Needs Revision: 1 component (Emergency Management/Fire Safety)
- Work Not Started: 4 components (Risk Management)

Status: Incomplete

Overall Quality of Assessment Plans: 2.35

Non-academic: Enrollment Management

- Total: 10 plans, 50 components
- Submitted and Reviewed: 48 components
- Completed: 48 components
- In Progress: 2 components (Testing Center)

Status: Incomplete

Overall Quality of Assessment Plans: 2.75

Non-academic: Information Resources Division

- Total: 3 plans, 16 components
- Submitted and Reviewed: 13 components
- Completed: 13 components
- In Progress: 1 component (Environmental Institute of Houston)
- Work Not Started: 2 components (Environmental Institute of Houston)

Status: Incomplete

Overall Quality of Assessment Plans: 2.27

Non-academic: President's Office *

- Total: 1 plan, 5 components
- Completed: 2 components
- In Progress: 1 component
- Work Not Started: 2 components

Status: Incomplete

Overall Quality of Assessment Plans: 1.20.

** Plan under major revision*

Non-academic: Student Services

- Total: 13 plans, 75 components
- Completed: 68 components
- In Progress: 6 components (Math Center, Campus Recreation and Wellness, and Dean of Students)

Status: Incomplete

Overall Quality of Assessment Plans: 2.58

Non-academic: University Advancement



- Total: 3 plans, 15 components
- Completed: 15 components

Status: 100% complete

Overall Quality of Assessment Plans: 2.80

Components								
Division	Total Plans	Total Components	Submitted and Reviewed	Completed	In Progress	Needs Revision	Work Not Started	Average Score
BUS	22	130	127	126	3	1	0	2.41
COE	19	108	108	108	0	0	0	2.99
CSE	26	155	102	89	44	13	9	1.44
HSH	39	225	225	223	0	2	0	2.78
Academic Affairs	5	22	19	19	3	0	0	2.48
Administration and Finance	19	92	75	75	12	1	4	2.35
Enrollment Management	10	50	48	48	2	0	0	2.75
Information Resource Division	3	16	13	13	1	0	2	2.27
President's Office	1	5	2	2	1	0	2	1.20
Student Services	13	75	68	68	6	0	1	2.58
University Advancement	3	15	15	15	0	0	0	2.80
TOTAL	160	893	802	786	72	17	18	2.44

3 Point Scale – 3=very good; 2=acceptable; 1 needs improvement

See rubrics pp. 7-8

- 71 plans (44.4%) had an average score of 3.00
- 54 plans (33.7%) had an average score between 2.00 and 2.99
- 23 plans (14.4%) had an average score between 1.0 and 1.99
- 12 plans (7.5) had an average score between 0.00 and 0.99
- The average of all plans is 2.44
- The average of the Divisions (combined averages) is 2.37

Workshops 2017-2018

During the university annual assessment period (from May through October), the Office of Planning and Assessment provided a variety of workshops for faculty and staff. In January, it provided upon request an Open Lab for faculty from the College of Science and Engineering.

Workshop	# Attending	
AMS	36	60-minute workshop for hands-on instruction to Taskstream's AMS system; open to all.
June 5, 2017	12	
July 11, 2017	11	
August 7, 2017	9	
October 2, 2017	4	
Academic	4	90-minute workshop for academic programs and faculty; reviewed mission statements and elements of a strong assessment plan, including student learning outcomes and program outcomes.
June 15, 2017	3	
September 21, 2017	1	
Administrative	15	90-minute workshop for staff; reviewed mission statements and elements of a strong assessment plan, focusing on program outcomes only.
May 16, 2017	5	
July 17, 2017	6	
September 8, 2017	4	
Co-Curricular	11	90-minute workshop for Student Services and Library; reviewed mission statements and elements of a strong assessment plan, including student learning outcomes and program outcomes.
June 13, 2017	10	
August 8, 2017	1	
Round-Up (2016-2017)	15	Faculty and staff worked on assessment plans with one-on-one assistance from OIE staff
October 16, 2017	2	
October 17, 2017	6	
October 18, 2017	1	
October 19, 2017	3	
October 20, 2017	3	
FMC Workshop	5	Upon request.
June 5, 2017		
Student Services Workshop	10	Upon request.
September 13, 2017		
Open Labs CSE	12	Upon request.
January 10, 2018	4	
January 11, 2018	8	
Total	108	

One-on-One Support 2017-2018

In addition to the workshops, four members of the OIE staff provided frequent one-on-one support by phone, by email, or in person. Because of transitions within the office, only two staff members will be able to provide support or training in the upcoming 2018-2019 Assessment Period. Please see the OIE Assessment Workshop Calendar 2018.

OIE Assessment Workshop Calendar 2018

All sessions in the UCT/HR training room, B2132

AMS WORKSHOP

In this one-hour workshop, we will review Taskstream's AMS system and answer questions that you may have regarding your assessment plan. Please bring your notes or previous plans with you. Before attending the workshop, you must be enrolled in the AMS system. If you are unsure, go to www.uhcl.edu/taskstream and log in. If you are unable to log in, please notify the Assessment Coordinator in the OIE office. No registration is required but RSVP is preferred because of limited seats. You may attend one or all of the sessions.

1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.	May 30
9:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.	June 28
3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.	July 30
2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.	August 28
9:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.	September 28

Assessment Coordinator

Karen Elliott, elliott@uhcl.edu, ext. 3053

Executive Director of Planning & Assessment

Pat Cuchens, cuchens@uhcl.edu, ext. 3065

ASSESSMENT FREE-FOR-ALL/ROUNDUP

Drop by any time for one-on-one help in completing your assessment plans for FY17-18 and FY18-19.

9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.	October 15
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.	October 16
2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.	October 17
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	October 18
9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.	October 19

October 31, 2018 – Deadline to submit all Assessment Plans.

APPENDIX A

Assessment Plan Review Rubric: Program Outcomes

Needs Improvement [1]	Acceptable [2]	Very Good [3]
Program Outcomes are specific statements that focus on operational objectives.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describes a process rather than an outcome Unclear how Program Outcome will be observed or measured Number of outcomes are not sufficient nor representative of program or unit Few or none are mapped to University Goal(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some are appropriate but language may be vague or need revision Some are observable or measurable Number of outcomes may be sufficient and representative of program or unit Some are mapped to appropriate University Goal(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All or most are clearly stated focusing on academic program or administrative unit development All or most are observable and measurable Number of outcomes are sufficient and representative of program or unit All are mapped to appropriate University Goal(s)
Assessment Methods identify a variety of assessment methods. Direct measures include tangible, self-explanatory evidence of what is to be assessed; indirect measures include surveys, interviews, or discussions that provide evidence that is less clear and convincing.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few or no measures are identified or are adequately described Few or no direct measures are used Few or no assessment instruments are described or attached Assessment instruments need improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some outcomes have multiple measures Multiple measures are both direct and indirect Some assessment instruments are clearly described and attached Some assessment instruments reflect good methodology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All or most outcomes have multiple measures Multiple measures are both direct and indirect All or most assessment instruments are clearly described and attached Assessment instruments reflect good methodology
Criteria for Success uses specific, identifiable, or measurable target performance.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No or few benchmarks or targets for achievement are identified Targets are not clearly defined; language is vague and subjective 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some target levels of achievement are identified Some targets may seem arbitrary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target level of achievement is identified for each measure Measures are specific and measurable
Assessment Results provide specific, quantifiable data. Indicate specific numbers and type of what is being assessed when possible.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incomplete findings Findings do not prove whether targets were met, partially met, or not met Number and types are not defined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses the achievement targets. Complete and organized Evaluated with appropriate statistical models Number or types are defined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concise and well organized Provides solid evidence that targets were met, partially met, or not met Number and types are clearly defined
Use of Results includes a narrative that reflects analysis of results and faculty/stakeholder discussion of results as they relate to program outcomes; identifies strategies for continuous improvement.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too general, not specific Relates only indirectly to the outcome and the results of the outcome 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflects, with sufficient depth, on what was learned during the assessment cycle Relates directly or indirectly to the outcome and the results of the assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflects on program outcomes Exhibits good understanding of finding implications to the program or administrative unit Identifies key areas that need to be monitored, remediated, or enhanced
Status Report documents implementation of continued action or improvements. Describes specific actions (planned or taken) to improve. Explains reasons for delay or inaction.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incomplete or no action plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offers "next steps" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defines a logical "next step" for the program in response to the findings Indicates actions to be taken: dates, responsible parties, resources

Rev. 3 DEC 2016

Assessment Plan Review Rubric: Student Learning Outcomes

Needs Improvement [1]	Acceptable [2]	Very Good [3]
<p>Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) are specific statements that focus on the knowledge, skills, and/or attitudes/dispositions that students should gain or improve their engagement in the academic program or learning experience.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describes a process rather than an outcome Inappropriate for level of mastery Unclear how SLO will be observed or measured Number of outcomes are not sufficient nor representative of program Few or none are mapped to University Learning Outcome(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some are appropriate but language may be vague or need revision Some correspond to level of mastery expected Some are observable or measurable Number of outcomes may be sufficient and representative of program Some are mapped to appropriate University Learning Outcome(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All or most are clearly stated focusing on knowledge, skills, and attitudes or dispositions All or most correspond to level of mastery expected (BS/BA, MS/MA, EdD) All or most are observable and measurable Number of outcomes are sufficient and representative of program All are mapped to appropriate University Learning Outcome(s)
<p>Assessment Methods identify a variety of assessment methods. Direct measures include tangible, self-explanatory evidence of what students are to learn; indirect measures include surveys, interviews, or discussions with students that provide evidence that is less clear and convincing.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few or no measures are identified or are adequately described Few or no direct measures are used Few or no assessment instruments are described or attached Assessment instruments need improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some outcomes have multiple measures Multiple measures are both direct and indirect Some assessment instruments are clearly described and attached Some assessment instruments reflect good methodology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All or most outcomes have multiple measures Multiple measures are both direct and indirect All or most assessment instruments are clearly described and attached. Assessment instruments reflect good methodology
<p>Criteria for Success uses specific, identifiable, or measurable target performance.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No or few benchmarks or targets for student learning are identified Targets are not clearly defined; language is vague and subjective 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some target levels of achievement are identified Some targets may seem arbitrary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target level of achievement is identified for each measure Measures are specific and measurable
<p>Assessment Results provide specific, quantifiable data. Indicate number of students/papers assessed. Indicate types of students of students (sampling/only majors/all students).</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incomplete findings Findings do not prove whether targets were met, partially met, or not met Number and types of students are not defined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses the achievement targets Complete and organized Evaluated with appropriate statistical models Number or types of students are defined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concise and well organized Provides solid evidence that targets were met, partially met, or not met Number and types of students are clearly defined
<p>Use of Results includes a narrative that reflects analysis of results and faculty/stakeholder discussion of results as they relate to student learning outcomes; identifies strategies for continuous improvement.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too general, not specific Relates only indirectly to the outcome and the results of the outcome 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflects, with sufficient depth, on what was learned during the assessment cycle Relates directly or indirectly to the outcome and the results of the assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflects on student learning outcomes Exhibits good understanding of finding implications to the academic program Identifies key areas that need to be monitored, remediated, or enhanced
<p>Status Report documents implementation of continued action or improvements. Describes specific actions (planned or taken) to improve. Explains reasons for delay or inaction.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incomplete or no action plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offers "next steps" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defines a logical "next step" for the program in response to the findings Indicates actions to be taken: dates, responsible parties, resources

Rev. 3 DEC 2016