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Clark Atlanta University is a consolidation of two institutions: Clark College, founded in 1869, the nation's first four-year liberal arts college to serve primarily African Americans, and Atlanta University, founded in 1865, the nation's first African American graduate institution. The institutions were consolidated in 1988 to become Clark Atlanta University.

- CAU is the largest of the four autonomous institutions (*CAU, Morehouse College, Spelman College, and Morehouse School of Medicine*) in the Atlanta University Center Consortium (*AUCC*), which boasts one of the largest concentrations of African American students and faculty of color in the United States.

- CAU is the only historically black college/university in the Georgia Research Alliance, an alliance of research institutions in the state.

- CAU is a United Methodist Church-affiliated institution.

- CAU is home to the only National Public Radio-affiliated jazz station in Atlanta, WCLK.
CONTEXT
In 2016, SACSCOC requested a First Monitoring Report to address two recommendations from the Visiting Committee...

1. **Visiting Committee Recommendation:** The Committee recommends that the institution develop an effective plan to assess the impact of the QEP on student scholarly endeavors.

   **CS 3.3.2 (Quality Enhancement Plan) Recommendation 1**
   The institution has developed a Quality Enhancement Plan that (1) demonstrates institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP; (2) includes broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the QEP; and (3) identifies goals and a plan to assess their achievement.

2. **Visiting Committee Recommendation:** The Committee recommends that the institution provides documentation of the extent to which students have attained general education competencies.

   **CS 3.5.1 (General education competencies), Recommendation 2**
   This standard expects an institution to identify college-level general education competencies and the extent to which students have attained them.
The Commission requested Clark Atlanta University to:

- Realign the rubric developed to directly assess learning of Discovery of Scholarship (DS) outcomes with the skills associated with DS outcomes. This is because the rubric developed and submitted by the university for DS outcomes more closely aligned with skills associated with Scholarly Inquiry (SI) outcomes.
- Develop an effective plan to assess the impact of the QEP on students’ scholarly endeavors. This is because the assessment plan submitted by the university, while meaningful, did not demonstrate how the impact of the QEP on student scholarly endeavors would be measured.

In response, Clark Atlanta University has:

- Realigned the Discovery of Scholarship (DS) rubric used to directly assess the skills associated with DS outcomes.
- Developed a rubric to directly assess the skills associated with Scholarly Inquiry (SI) outcomes.
- Developed an effective assessment plan to directly measure the impact of the QEP on student scholarly endeavors.

The Commission requested Clark Atlanta University to:

Provide **documentation** of student attainment of competency in critical thinking.

In response, Clark Atlanta University has:

Provided evidence and supporting documentation that it assesses student attainment of competency in critical thinking.
### QEP Impact 
**Assessment Plan**

QEP Assessment Plan of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) - Utilizing Direct Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QEP Goal(s)</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)</th>
<th>Assessment Method</th>
<th>Criteria (Expected Outcome)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>QEP Goal 1.</strong> Enhance the visibility and student awareness of creative and research activities at CAU.</td>
<td>SLO 1. Upon completion of select QEP courses, CAU first-year students will be able to demonstrate Discovery of Scholarship (DS).</td>
<td>Assessment Method 1A. DS Level Course Research Project Assignment <strong>Rubric</strong>.</td>
<td>Expected Outcome 1A. 80% of first-year students enrolled in DS level I selected courses will demonstrate a 3 or higher on the DS Level I Course Research Project Assignment Rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment Method 1B. DS Level Course Writing Assignment <strong>Rubric</strong>.</td>
<td>Expected Outcome 1B. 80% of first-year students enrolled in DS level I selected courses will demonstrate a 3 or higher on the DS Level I Course Writing Assignment Rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment Method 1C. DS Level Course Oral Presentation Assignment <strong>Rubric</strong>.</td>
<td>Expected Outcome 1C. 80% of first-year students enrolled in DS level I selected courses will demonstrate a 4 or higher on the DS Level Course Oral Presentation Assignment Rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment Method 1D. Pre- and Post-Exam</td>
<td>Expected Outcome 1D. 80% of first-year students enrolled in DS level I selected courses will earn at least a 70 or higher on the Pre-test and 80 or higher on the post-test.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **QEP Goal 2.** Establish a culture and an environment in which creative and research activities are translated into practice. | SLO 2. Upon completion of select QEP courses, CAU second and/or third year students will be able to demonstrate Scholarly Inquiry (SI). | Assessment Measure 2A. SI Level Course Research Project Assignment **Rubric**. | Expected Outcome 2A. 80% of sophomore and/or junior students enrolled in SI level II selected courses will demonstrate a 2 or higher on the SI Level II Course Research Project Assignment Rubric. |
|                                                                             |                                                                                               | Assessment Measure 2B. SI Level Course Written Report and Oral Presentation **Rubric**. | Expected Outcome 2B. 80% of sophomore and/or junior students enrolled in SI level II selected courses will demonstrate a 2 or higher on the SI Level II Course Written Report and Oral Presentation Assignment Rubric. |
Realigned the Discovery of Scholarship (DS) rubric used to directly assess the skills associated with DS outcomes.
Developed a rubric to **directly assess** the skills associated with Scholarly Inquiry (SI) outcomes.

---

**Clark Atlanta University - QEP**

**Mentored Undergraduate Scholarly Endeavors (MUSE)**

**B-1. SI Level Course Research Project Assignment Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>(Prefix/#/Title)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Research Methodology Project Scoring Metrics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreements/Components</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unacceptable (1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) <strong>RESEARCH METHODS</strong>&lt;br&gt;Research methods such as, qualitative, quantitative, single-case designs, action research and outcome-based research.</td>
<td>Students provides an inadequate description of research methods such as, qualitative, quantitative, single-case designs, action research and outcome-based research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) <strong>STATISTICAL METHODS</strong>&lt;br&gt;Statistical methods used in conducting research and program evaluation</td>
<td>Student provides an inadequate description of statistics for a sample, including central tendency, and standard deviation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) <strong>EVIDENCE BASED METHODS</strong>&lt;br&gt;The use of research to inform evidence-based practices.</td>
<td>Student provides an inadequate description of the use of research to inform evidence-based practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) <strong>ETHICAL AND CULTURAL RESEARCH METHODS</strong>&lt;br&gt;Ethical and culturally relevant strategies for interpreting, and reporting the results of research and/or program evaluation studies. (Students are quizzed and do papers based on CITI ethics online course)</td>
<td>Student provides an inadequate description of ethical and culturally relevant strategies for interpreting and reporting the results of research and/or program evaluation studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) <strong>STYLE, MECHANICS AND CONTENT</strong>&lt;br&gt;Assignment: Structured field observation, a field experiment, and a questionnaire survey. Students write a report on each. Each project worth 20% of the final grade. Each project will be evaluated based on the quality of the report as well as your contribution in the data collection process.</td>
<td>(a) stylistic errors in APA style or formal writing style that detract from paper, and (b) mechanical errors in type of technique (Data Collection) being discussed. Also, paper contains many spelling, grammar, and punctuation errors that detract from paper. Writing is informal at times and sections can be choppy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORING**

Total Score: **4**

**NOTE:** Maximum score is 20. Minimum passing score is 14 (Grade C)**
### General Education Assessment Report AY 2015-2016 (sample)

**Critical Thinking Skills**

**Table 3.5.1-3B General Education Assessment Report for AY 2015-2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>SLO(s)</th>
<th>Course(s) Reviewed</th>
<th>Key Assessment Assignment</th>
<th>Criteria/Benchmark</th>
<th>Results/Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CMAT 104: Algebra II</td>
<td>Final Exam: Students will be assessed on their ability to demonstrate complete understanding of mathematical content to respond accurately to questions on the departmental final exam.</td>
<td>At least 60% of students are expected to score at a level 3 or higher on the evaluation rubric in CMAT 104.</td>
<td><strong>Criteria Met:</strong> Yes. Of the 451 students enrolled students in CMAT 104 during AY 2015-16, 361 (80%) earned a level 3 on the departmental final exam, exceeding the established criteria 20%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|            |        | CMAT 105: Pre-Calculus I | Final Exam: Students will be assessed on their ability to demonstrate complete understanding of mathematical content to respond accurately to specific questions (1-3) on the departmental final exam. | At least 60% of students are expected to score at a level 3 or higher on the evaluation rubric for questions 1-3 in CMAT 105. | **Question 1**<br>**Criteria Met:** Yes. Of the 86 students enrolled students in CMAT 105 during AY 2015-16, 68 (79%) earned a level 3 on the question 1 on the departmental final exam, exceeding the established criteria 19%.<br>**Question 2**<br>**Criteria Met:** Yes. Of the 86 students enrolled students in CMAT 105 during AY 2015-16, 55 (64%) earned a level 3 on the question 2 on the departmental final exam, exceeding the established criteria 4%.<br>**Question 3**<br>**Criteria Met:** Yes. Of the 86 students enrolled students in CMAT 105 during AY 2015-16, 52 (61%) earned a level 3 on the question 3 on the departmental final exam, exceeding the established criteria 15%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a plan of action for reviewing university progress on assessing</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
<td>OPAR – Digital Communication/Emails</td>
<td>Approved by the Provost February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and documenting critical thinking competency during the past three</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic years (for review and approval by the Provost/VPAA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Gen Ed Faculty/ Critical Thinking Courses</td>
<td>Tuesday February 14, 2017</td>
<td>President's Conference Room - Harkness Hall</td>
<td>This initial meeting was with a representative group of faculty (15 of 42) currently teaching the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:15-1:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>selected courses with high concentration in Critical Thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Workshop: Assessing and Evidencing Critical Thinking,</td>
<td>Thursday February 23, 2017</td>
<td>Holmes Business Bldg. Room 237</td>
<td>Alternate date: Tuesday February 21, 2017 - 12:15-1:30 for one-on-one training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including review of assessment template</td>
<td>12:15-1:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of identified required documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Description of assignment tools used to assess critical thinking</td>
<td>Friday March 10, 2017</td>
<td>Electronic/emails</td>
<td>Follow-up meeting on March 16th or 21st (if necessary) to discuss &amp; provide feedback submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty review of assessment tools used to assess assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Syllabus with course learning outcomes for each term between Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 – Spring 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assessment data collection begins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of student assessment results for AY 2014-2015 &amp; AY 2015-</td>
<td>Monday April 10, 2017</td>
<td>President's Conference Room - Harkness Hall</td>
<td>Follow-up meeting on April 20th (if necessary) to discuss reports. Otherwise feedback provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 completed on the assessment template provided</td>
<td>Business Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>in writing via email on or before April 20th. Location: TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of Revised Assessment Reports for AY 2014-2015 &amp; AY 2015-</td>
<td>Friday April 28, 2017</td>
<td>President's Conference Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Business Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provided</td>
<td>Business Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT OF GENERAL EDUCATION CRITICAL THINKING ON STUDENT LEARNING

AY 2014-2015
• 2,556 students were represented in the assessment of the selected Critical Thinking Learning Outcomes.
• 2,011 (79%) students met or exceeded the established benchmark compared to 545 (21%) of students who did not meet the established benchmark.

AY 2015-2016
• 2,389 students were represented in the assessment of the selected Critical Thinking Learning Outcomes.
• 1,762 (74%) students met or exceeded the established benchmark compared to 624 (26%) of students who did not meet the established benchmark.

AY 2016-2017
• 2,902 students were represented in the assessment of the selected Critical Thinking Learning Outcomes.
• 2,303 (79%) students met or exceeded the established benchmark compared to 599 (21%) of students who did not meet the established benchmark.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>SLO(s)</th>
<th>Relevant Core Learning Areas</th>
<th>Course Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Critical Thinking Skills | Independently demonstrate competency in utilizing critical thinking processes and problem-solving techniques to evaluate arguments or conclusions, to explore causal questions and explanations, and to evaluate data for consistency with facts or hypotheses. | • Science Requirement  
• Mathematics Requirement  
• History Requirement  
• Humanities Requirement  
• Religion/Philosophy Requirement | 1. CBIO 101: Biological Sciences  
2. CCHE 112 General Chemistry  
3. CCIS 100: Information Technology & Computer Application  
4. CPHY 112/L: General and Modern Physics & Lab  
5. CMAT 104: Pre-Calculus I  
6. CMAT 105: Algebra II  
7. CMAT 111: Calculus I  
10. CHIS 212: United States History Since 1877  
11. CHUM 228: Interdisciplinary Humanities I  
12. CPHI 105: Logic and Critical Thinking  
13. CREL 101: The Biblical Heritage  
14. CREL 211: Comparative Religion |
Based on the selected critical thinking learning outcome examples for the three-year period, majority of the students upon completion of their GE course were able to **demonstrate**:

- Complete understanding of mathematical content to respond accurately to specific questions (1-3) on the departmental final exam.
- Understanding and mastery of basic computing concepts.
- Ability to conduct research and provide evidence of “The Role of Microchimerism in Autoimmune Diseases”.
- Overall understanding of physical principles and problem solving skills.
- Ability to decipher the structure of the argument and evaluate the examples for validity, and/or to analyze and identify given arguments for informational fallacies.
- Ability to understand and develop a supported perspective of basic concepts of biblical heritage.
- Ability to critically examine the theories and social, economic, political, racial and geographical ideas and events that have shaped human relations, social change, and the global society.
- Ability to critically examine and research major developments and themes in U.S. History, such as, race, class, and the changing definition of freedom.
- Ability to explain how selected media (video, essay, etc.) had impacted world view in the 21st century. Students are required to be well versed on the media’s content to synthesize, analyze, and communicate the subject matter,
- Complete understanding of General Chemistry content to respond accurately to key questions on the American Chemical Society Exam.
Clark Atlanta University’s assessment process and institutional effectiveness are designed to enhance student academic and career success by continuously improving instruction, support services, and administrative functions.
Six – Step Annual Assessment and Improvement Process

1. Define Student Learning/Support/Administrative Service performance outcomes
2. Identifying assessment methods and tools
3. Establish criteria of success
4. Collect and analyze data
5. Plan and execute improvement actions
6. Report and document findings in University’s Electronic Assessment System - IMPROVE
STREAMLINING ASSESSMENT ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND EXPECTATIONS
Each Unit has a designated **Assessment Liaison** who manages the assessment efforts for their programs/units.

The Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research (OPAR) coordinates and monitors all assessment efforts by supporting the 136 Assessment and Improvement planning units and their liaisons through the facilitation of **one on one trainings**, **workshops**, creation of **assessment resources**, and **monthly assessment communications**.

The **University Effectiveness Committee** (UEC) ensures the quality assurance throughout the assessment process by providing oversight and guidance regarding the development and implementation of the University’s Six–Step Annual Assessment and Improvement process.

- The UEC is tasked with the facilitation and implementation of CAU’s continuous improvement efforts through reviewing, collaborating, and presenting findings back to the University’s Assessment Units.

*Note: Assessment Reporting Structure has been modified since the development of graphics in August 2017.*
The Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research (OPAR) conducts campus-wide workshops and one on one trainings to support the University’s continuous improvement efforts through the Six-Step Assessment Process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop(s)</th>
<th>Description(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAU’s Six – Step Assessment Process (Academic Programs and AES Units)</td>
<td>This workshop is designed to present the University’s Six – Step Assessment Process to the IMPROVE Administrators. The training will focus on the complete assessment cycle; Phase I (Planning Phase) and Phase II (Submission of Assessment Results). The submission requirements for each phase will be covered. Participants should come prepared to enter (or edit) their annual plans and assessment results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding IMPROVE (Academic Programs and AES Units)</td>
<td>This workshop is designed to help IMPROVE Administrators navigate the IMPROVE Electronic Planning and Assessment System.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating &amp; Assessing Student Learning Outcomes for Academic Programs</td>
<td>This hands-on workshop is designed to assist faculty members and department chairs in developing measurable Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) that clearly identify what each student should know, be able to do, and value upon completion of their respective academic program. The workshop will focus on developing SMART SLOs, appropriate means of assessments (i.e. tools, methods, and criteria for success), and application of assessment results for program improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Annual Assessment Plans for AES Units</td>
<td>This workshop is designed to assist staff members in Administrative and Educational Support (AES) Units develop annual objectives that are measurable and related to the unit’s strategic plan. The workshop will focus on developing SMART objectives, appropriate assessments methods and tools, and the “closing-the-loop” process using assessment results for continuous improvements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over 90 faculty and staff members attended one or more workshops in AY 2017-2018, and OPAR received an overall rating 96% in which the participants felt the effectiveness of the workshop met expectations.
• Sub-University Effectiveness Committee (S-UEC) reviewed and evaluated **55** (33 Academic and 23 Educational Support Units).

• A sample of **83** Assessment and Improvement Plans (AIPs) were submitted in AY 2016-2017 utilizing an electronic Quality Feedback Evaluation form in the IMPROVE system.

• OPAR developed and disseminated a Quality Feedback & Peer Review Report through the IMPROVE system to each School/Unit Head in efforts to use the feedback to strengthen the AIPs prior to the upcoming assessment cycle.
TRANSITIONING PAPER-BASED DOCUMENTATION AND EVIDENCE TO AN ELECTRONIC ASSESSMENT SYSTEM
The Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research manages IMPROVE-Electronic Assessment System for institutional planning and assessment. This is an electronic method of storing and maintaining Institutional documentation/evidence which demonstrates progress towards compliance of continuous improvement, allows for the development of action plans and follow-ups which are aligned with assessment results/findings (data), and documents can be shared across units/departments through a secured portal.
CONSTRUCTIVE CONVERSATION
Identify your institution's assessment strengths

When poll is active, respond at PollEv.com/laurenlopez545  Text LAURENLOPEZ545 to 22333 once to join
Identify your institution's assessment weaknesses

When poll is active, respond at PollEv.com/laurenlopez545  Text LAURENLOPEZ545 to 22333 once to join
When poll is active, respond at PollEv.com/laurenlopez545  Text LAURENLOPEZ545 to 22333 once to join
TIME TO SHARE ANY QUESTIONS, THOUGHTS, AND OPINIONS....
THANK YOU!