



One Size Does Not Fit All:

Multiple Approaches to Evaluating Institutional Assessment Processes

Q: How can we improve our institutional assessment process?

A: So many different ways!



Quantitative Data

Amy Cappleman, Director of Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness

ICC at a Glance . . .

College Overview

- 2 year, open admission community college
- Located in rural, north Mississippi
- Serves career-technical, health science, and university parallel
- AA, AAS, and Certificates
- Large workforce development program with 4 WIN Job Centers
- 5,199 Headcount
- 3,387 taking 1 or more online classes
- 143 FT, 182 PT Faculty

Assessment Process Overview

- 5 year college level strategic plan
- Annual plan for all planning units across the College (instructional & non-instructional)
- 5 year program reviews for almost all planning units across the College (instructional & non-instructional)
- **Annual planning is the primary vehicle for assessment and change** at ICC. It is where the "rubber meets the road."
- Electronic annual planning as ICC currently knows it has existed for 12 years with constant small adjustments rather than major overhauls to the planning process.

Annual Planning Framework

Types of Outcomes

1. Student Learning Outcomes
2. Operational (a.k.a. administrative) outcomes

How It Works

- Annual planning occurs March 1-July 15
- Open loop (set new outcomes) and close loop (report data on previous outcomes) at the same time
- Each planning unit must have a minimum of 3 solid, high quality outcomes with an emphasis placed on quantitative data used in reporting as much as possible

How ICC Makes It Work

- Attempts at committee peer review failed at our institution.
- ICC makes planning units **accountable to themselves**.
- Emphasis on quality during outcome, assessment, and target development puts burden on planners.
- Harder for planners to not act on results when quantitative data is used at our institution.
- Lots of support for planners (training, assistance appointments, online resources, etc.).
- A good attitude.

| | Total Outcomes | Success | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------|---------|---------------------------|---------|--------------|---------|
| | | Achieved | | Not Achieved but Improved | | Not Achieved | |
| | | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |
| College Overall | 293 | 155 | 53% | 60 | 20% | 78 | 27% |
| Business Services | 7 | 2 | 29% | 3 | 43% | 2 | 29% |
| Development & Planning | 11 | 8 | 73% | 2 | 18% | 1 | 9% |
| Economic & Community Services | 16 | 9 | 56% | 3 | 19% | 4 | 25% |
| Instructional Services | 199 | 105 | 53% | 36 | 18% | 58 | 29% |
| Student Services | 39 | 20 | 51% | 11 | 28% | 8 | 21% |
| Office of the President | 17 | 10 | 59% | 2 | 12% | 5 | 29% |

| | Results | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-------|---|
| | Assessment Changed | Course or Program Addition/Revision | Curriculum Changed | Economic Improvement | Employment Increased | Enrollment Increased | Financial - Cost Savings | Financial - Revenue Enhancement | Financial - Funds Needed | Infrastructure Improved | Instructional Method Changed | New Policy Implemented | Outcome Abandoned/Revised | Professional Development Completed | Retention/Persistence/Graduation Increased | Service/Process Improved | Other | |
| College Overall (Duplicated*) | 29 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 100 | 12 | 16 | 28 | 21 | 56 | 68 | |
| Business Services | | | | | | | 3 | | | 5 | | | | | | | 3 | 4 |
| Development & Planning | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| Economic & Community Services | | 3 | | 3 | 2 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | |
| Instructional Services | 24 | 1 | 3 | | 2 | 4 | | | | 99 | 6 | 11 | 11 | 20 | 21 | 21 | 43 | |
| Student Services | 2 | | | | | | 1 | | | | 6 | 4 | 10 | | | 23 | 11 | |
| Office of the President | 3 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | 3 | | 4 | 7 | | |

**Each outcome may qualify as multiple results.*

| | Total Outcomes Aligned with Strategic Initiatives | Success | | | | | |
|---|---|----------|---------|---------------------------|---------|--------------|---------|
| | | Achieved | | Not Achieved but Improved | | Not Achieved | |
| | | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |
| Overall (For All 4 Strategic Initiatives) | 293 | 155 | 53% | 60 | 20% | 78 | 27% |
| Enrollment Management | 87 | 37 | 43% | 20 | 23% | 30 | 34% |
| Accountability | 227 | 121 | 53% | 46 | 20% | 60 | 26% |
| Campus Safety | 16 | 11 | 69% | 2 | 13% | 3 | 19% |
| Technology | 49 | 31 | 63% | 8 | 16% | 10 | 20% |

| | Total Outcomes Aligned with Institutional Goals | Success | | | | | |
|--|---|----------|---------|---------------------------|---------|--------------|---------|
| | | Achieved | | Not Achieved but Improved | | Not Achieved | |
| | | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |
| Overall (For All 9 Institutional Goals) - Unduplicated | 274 | 144 | 53% | 55 | 20% | 75 | 27% |
| 1A. Persistence & Retention of Current Students | 72 | 31 | 43% | 16 | 22% | 25 | 35% |
| 1B. Non-Traditional Student Enrollment | 17 | 9 | 53% | 3 | 18% | 5 | 29% |
| 2A. Improve Student Outcomes | 172 | 91 | 53% | 32 | 19% | 49 | 28% |
| 2B. Local Workforce & Economy | 27 | 13 | 48% | 4 | 15% | 10 | 37% |
| 2C. Manage Resources Wisely | 44 | 23 | 52% | 10 | 23% | 11 | 25% |
| 3A. Safety Training | 14 | 9 | 64% | 2 | 14% | 3 | 21% |
| 3B. Safety Plan | 7 | 3 | 43% | 2 | 29% | 2 | 29% |
| 4A. Training On & Use of Technology | 42 | 25 | 60% | 7 | 17% | 10 | 24% |
| 4B. Maintain Adequate Technology | 3 | 3 | 100% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |

* This was the second open loop cycle for the 2016-2020 strategic plan. Of the twenty-five (25) original outcomes of the plan, seven (7) have been completed or implemented, three (3) are in a permanent "ongoing" state, twelve (12) are in progress, and three (3) have not yet been started. Two of the three outcomes that have not been started are directives assigned to the Enrollment Management Committee. (Please see the yellow highlighted outcomes in this report.)



Assessment Peer Review Committee

Ginny Cockerill, Assistant Director of Assessment

About UAH ...

- 4-Year public state institution established in 1950
- **505** acre campus in Huntsville, Alabama
- Strong emphasis on Research and STEM with **17** Research Centers on campus
- Enrolls **9,988** students in **90+** programs across **9** Colleges
- Taught by **372** full-time faculty and **300+** Adjunct Faculty



Assessment Plan & Report

| Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) | | Operational Outcomes (OPOs) |
|---|---------------|--|
| 1. Outcome (observable knowledge/skill /attitude for student group) | | 1. Outcome (service/process with who it helps & how) |
| 2. Assessment Methods (two ways to measure) | <i>PLAN</i> | 2. Assessment Method (one way to measure) |
| 3. Assessment Targets (expected results) | | 3. Assessment Target (expected results) |
| | | |
| 4. Data Collected (actual results) | <i>REPORT</i> | 4. Data Collected (actual results) |
| 5. Use of Results (changes made) | | 5. Use of Results (changes made) |
| | | |
| Degree = 3 | + | 2 |
| Admin Unit = 0 | + | 3 |

Assessment Peer Review Committee

Who? Representatives from across the institution (faculty and staff)

How? Three in-person meetings with work assignments between meetings

What? Provides feedback
 (a) to each unit using the Review Tools
 (b) on assessment process overall (revisions to Review Tools)

Why? To assist individual units in improving their assessments
 To guide the overall process for the institution

Most Recent Results

| Review Student Learning Outcome | % of Outcomes | | | | Review Operational Outcome | % of Outcomes | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|-----|-----|-----|------------------------------|---------------|-----|-----|-----|
| | E | NE | NA | | | E | NE | NA | |
| Outcome Title | | | | | Outcome Title | | | | |
| 1.1 Knowledge/ Skill/ Behavior | 90% | 4% | 0% | 5% | 1.1 Service or Process | 78% | 19% | 0% | 3% |
| 1.2 Succinct Statement | 92% | 7% | 0% | 1% | 1.2 Succinct Statement | 84% | 13% | 0% | 3% |
| 1.3 Program Length | 92% | 6% | 0% | 2% | 1.3 Unit Responsibilities | 85% | 15% | 0% | 1% |
| 1.4 Student Population | 64% | 34% | 0% | 2% | 1.4 Expected Beneficiary | 52% | 24% | 0% | 24% |
| 1.5 Observable Verb | 81% | 17% | 0% | 2% | 1.5 Intended Impact | 27% | 40% | 0% | 32% |
| Assessment Method/s | | | | | Assessment Method/s | | | | |
| 2.1 Two Methods | 70% | 26% | 0% | 4% | 2.1 Outcome Alignment | 84% | 13% | 0% | 3% |
| 2.2 Complete Description | 38% | 61% | 0% | 1% | 2.2 Complete Description | 36% | 63% | 0% | 1% |
| 2.3 All Aspects | 76% | 23% | 0% | 2% | 2.3 Focus on Improvement | 43% | 24% | 0% | 34% |
| 2.4 Focus on Improvement | 59% | 6% | 0% | 35% | | | | | |
| 2.5 Direct Measure | 61% | 5% | 0% | 34% | | | | | |
| 2.6 Complex Thinking | 54% | 5% | 0% | 41% | | | | | |
| Assessment Target/s | | | | | Assessment Target/s | | | | |
| 3.1 Expected/Desired Results | 91% | 7% | 0% | 1% | 3.1 Expected/Desired Results | 79% | 20% | 0% | 1% |
| 3.2 Perf/ Achievement Level | 92% | 6% | 0% | 2% | 3.2 Perf/ Achievement Level | 72% | 27% | 0% | 2% |
| 3.3 Rationale | 18% | 47% | 0% | 35% | 3.3 Rationale | 13% | 49% | 0% | 38% |
| 3.4 Multiple Components | 14% | 43% | 0% | 43% | | | | | |
| Data Collected | | | | | Data Collected | | | | |
| 4.1 Similar Format | 69% | 30% | 0% | 1% | 4.1 Similar Format | 66% | 32% | 0% | 1% |
| 4.2 Summary and Details | 29% | 37% | 0% | 34% | 4.2 Summary and Details | 44% | 47% | 0% | 9% |
| Use of Results | | | | | Use of Results | | | | |
| 5.1 Gap Analysis | 28% | 13% | 57% | 2% | 5.1 Gap Analysis | 40% | 22% | 37% | 2% |
| 5.2 Specific Improvements | 23% | 17% | 58% | 2% | 5.2 Specific Improvements | 33% | 21% | 44% | 2% |
| 5.3 Next Steps | 10% | 24% | 28% | 37% | 5.3 Next Steps | 11% | 19% | 39% | 32% |
| 5.4 Future Impact | 19% | 33% | 0% | 48% | | | | | |
| 5.5 DM Documentation | 8% | 43% | 0% | 49% | 5.4 DM Documentation | 9% | 53% | 0% | 38% |
| Strategic Plan | | | | | Strategic Plan | | | | |
| 6.1 Strategic Plan | 21% | 23% | 0% | 57% | 6.1 Strategic Plan | 33% | 26% | 0% | 40% |

Revisions to Peer Review Tools

| Review Operational Outcome (Complete for each OPO) | | |
|--|---|--|
| Title | Criteria | Response Options |
| Outcome Title – Service or Process | The Outcome Title describes a service or process offered by the unit. | <input type="checkbox"/> Evident <input type="checkbox"/> Not Evident |
| Outcome Title – Succinct Statement | The Outcome Title is succinctly stated. | <input type="checkbox"/> Evident <input type="checkbox"/> Not Evident |
| Outcome Title – Unit Responsibilities | The service or process described in the Outcome Title is included in the unit's responsibilities. | <input type="checkbox"/> Evident <input type="checkbox"/> Not Evident |
| OPTIONAL Outcome Title – Expected Beneficiary | The Outcome Title describes the group(s) of people who are expected to benefit from the unit's work in this area. | <input type="checkbox"/> Evident <input type="checkbox"/> Not Evident |
| OPTIONAL Outcome Title – Intended Impact | The Outcome Title describes how the unit's work is intended to help or serve this group or groups. | <input type="checkbox"/> Evident <input type="checkbox"/> Not Evident |
| OPTIONAL Outcome Title – Strategic Plan | The Outcome is appropriately linked to one or more of the Strategic Plan goals within Compliance Assist. | <input type="checkbox"/> Evident <input type="checkbox"/> Not Evident |
| Comments on Outcome Title | | |
| Assessment Method – Outcome Alignment | The Assessment Method measures some aspect of the service or process described in the outcome. | <input type="checkbox"/> Evident <input type="checkbox"/> Not Evident |
| Assessment Method – Complete Description | The Assessment Method describes how the data will be collected, reported, and analyzed and who will be responsible for each step. | <input type="checkbox"/> Evident <input type="checkbox"/> Not Evident |
| OPTIONAL Assessment Method – Focus on | The Assessment Method focuses on a characteristic, dimension, or element of the | <input type="checkbox"/> Evident <input type="checkbox"/> Not Evident |

| Review Operational Outcome | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| Reviewer Name | Outcome Number |
| Unit Name | |
| Outcome Title | |
| Criteria | |
| 1. OUTCOME TITLE | |
| <i>This is the blue link used in CIRA-Planning to access the whole outcome or the statement in bold at the top of a report.</i> | |
| 1.1 Service or Process: The Outcome Title describes a service or process offered by the unit. | <input type="checkbox"/> Evident |
| <i>Focus on whether it describes a service they provide or a process they do. How it fits with the unit mission/ vision/ responsibilities is addressed in Unit Responsibilities below.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Evident |
| 1.2 Succinct Statement: The Outcome Title is succinctly stated. | <input type="checkbox"/> Evident |
| <i>Focus on whether the outcome includes just the information required (based on this checklist) or if it has extra information that should be in other sections (e.g. Assessment Target). The content of the statement is more important here than the number of words or characters.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Evident |
| 1.3 Unit Responsibilities: The service or process described in the Outcome Title is included in the unit's responsibilities. | <input type="checkbox"/> Evident |
| <i>Interpret this in the context of the whole outcome. Focus on whether there is enough information provided anywhere in the outcome to know what this unit does. Then you can decide if this outcome seems to fit within those parameters.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Evident |
| 1.4 Expected Beneficiary: The Outcome Title describes the group(s) of people who are expected to benefit from the unit's work in this area. (OPTIONAL) | <input type="checkbox"/> Evident |
| <i>Look for this throughout the outcome title; it may not be at the beginning.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Evident |
| 1.5 Intended Impact: The Outcome Title describes how the unit's work is intended to help or serve this group or groups. (OPTIONAL) | <input type="checkbox"/> Evident |
| <i>Look for "so that" or a similar phrase.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Evident |
| Comments on Outcome Title | |
| 2. ASSESSMENT METHOD | |
| 2.1 Outcome Alignment: The Assessment Method measures some aspect of the service or process described in the outcome. | <input type="checkbox"/> Evident |
| <i>Focus on whether the method seems to "match" the outcome. Keep in mind that the method doesn't have to measure every aspect of the outcome since some units may be looking at just one aspect at a time.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Evident |
| 2.2 Complete Description: The Assessment Method describes how the data will be collected, | <input type="checkbox"/> Evident |

J.F. Drake State Community and Technical College

Planning Hearings

LESLEY SHOTTS

RESEARCH AND GRANTS COORDINATOR

ABOUT DRAKE STATE...

Two-Year Community and Technical
College Located in Huntsville, Alabama

Unduplicated Headcount around 1100
students

AA and AS Degrees for Students
Planning to Transfer and AAS Degrees,
Certificates and Short Certificates for
Students Wishing to Enter the Workforce
or Retrain

ABOUT PLANNING HEARINGS...

Process in Place Since 2005

Lawson State Community College -
Mentor Institution

Has Undergone Modifications Over the
Years, Most Recently in AY 2018-2019



Benefits

- Ensures Periodic Assessment and Improvement
- Clear Links to Institutional Mission and Strategic Plan
- Better Budgeting
- Improved Communication
- Exchange of Ideas
- Reduction of “Tunnel Vision”
- Creation of Partnerships
- Chance to “Show Off”

Challenges

- Time
- Scheduling
- Turnover
- Scaling for large institutions
- Technical Problems

The image shows three large, black, handwritten characters in a cursive script: 'Q', 'L', and 'A'. The 'Q' is on the left, the 'L' is in the middle, and the 'A' is on the right. The letters are thick and fluid, with visible pen strokes and some overlapping.

**Amy Cappleman**

Director of Strategic Planning & Institutional Effectiveness

Itawamba Community College

Phone: 662.862.8028

Email: accappleman@iccms.edu

**Ginny Cockerill**

Associate Director, Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA)

The University of Alabama in Huntsville

Phone: 256-824-6254

Email: gdc0004@uah.edu

**Lesley Shotts**

Research and Grants Coordinator

J. F. Drake State Community and Technical College

Phone: (256) 551-5206

Email: lesley.shotts@drakestate.edu