

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Waded Cruzado-Salas, Provost

FROM: Shelly Stovall, Chair OAC1  
Carmen Santana-Melgoza, IRPOA

SUBJECT: 2007-08 NMSU Summary Report of Outcomes Assessment in the Major

### **Introduction**

This memorandum summarizes the results of the 2007-08 academic year cycle of departmental reporting on assessment of student learning in the major.

### **Procedure**

In the fall of 2007, the OAC1 set a timetable for requests/reviews of annual reports of student learning assessment. They also developed a template for reporting. A request for submission of annual reports on program assessment of student learning in the undergraduate and graduate programs was sent out in November of 2007. Included was a template for reporting, a list of required components for each report, and a copy of the review document that the OAC1 members use in evaluating the program reports. Deadline for submission was Jan. 15. Reports were then forwarded to teams from the OAC1 for review. A norming session for team members was held on Jan. 24, and a deadline for reviews was set for Feb. 15. On March 7, the OAC1 met to discuss changes to the current reporting format, as well as discussion on the state of assessment at NMSU.

Both the OAC1 committee members and the IRPOA staff should be commended for their efforts and effectiveness in accomplishing this task. The committee members have participated over and above their 'job description' in making this a productive endeavor. Likewise, the IRPOA office has been extremely efficient and responsive in collecting and disseminating data as needed.

### **Results**

Forty-six (46) of fifty (50) undergraduate programs were reviewed. Three programs were not reviewed due to extenuating circumstances in their departments. Of the 46 reviewed, only 3 were determined to *not* be directly assessing student learning.

Forty (40) of forty-three (43) graduate programs were reviewed, and all but one were determined to be directly assessing student learning. Again, three programs were not reviewed due to extenuating circumstances in their departments.

Overall, of the 86 programs reporting, 95% were reported to be directly assessing student learning. Of all programs total (93), 88% were found to be directly assessing student learning.

Although the statistics are impressive for the number of departments found to be directly assessing student learning, the percentages of departments found to be in stage three, or

'using the results of assessment to improve academic programs,' appears to have dropped dramatically. While indeed the numbers represent this, this is likely more a reflection on the change of approach of the OAC1 committee in reviewing programs, than a drastic change in what programs are doing, as compared to previous years. During the norming session, the committee decided that departments that did not include a Plan, as requested, could not be appropriately evaluated, and therefore could receive no stage assignment other than '0', or 'cannot determine'. This, and perhaps a more stringent set of criteria applied to the requirement for 'using findings', has likely been the reason for the perceived decrease in the number of departments placed at the stage 3 level. None-the-less, it is unfortunate that although the committee made this determination in tandem, not all evaluators applied the strict criteria. Additionally, there are other inconsistencies across evaluation teams as to which departments were determined to be at stage 0, stage 2, stage 3, stage 4 and stage 5.

### **Award Recommendation**

Several departments have done a commendable job improving and sustaining their assessment efforts. However, given the variance with which departments have been evaluated, and in looking forward to a restructured assessment approach in the near future, it is recommended that we forego the annual recognition stipend and plaque for this academic year.

## REPORTS BY COLLEGE

In the College of Agriculture & Home Economics, of the 8 undergraduate programs, 2 received stage 3 rankings. Of the 7 graduate programs, 2 received stage 3 rankings. It was pleasing to note that all 11 of the programs for which reports were received were determined to be directly assessing student learning.

In the College of Arts & Sciences, of the 22 undergraduate programs, 10 received stage 3 rankings, and of the 20 graduate programs, 9 received stage 3 rankings. It was pleasing to note that of the 38 programs total that reported thus far, all but one were determined to be directly assessing student learning.

In the College of Business Administration & Economics, of the 7 undergraduate programs, 2 received stage 3 rankings, and of the 5 graduate programs, 2 received stage 3 rankings. It was pleasing to note that all 12 programs reported, and that all 12 were determined to be directly assessing student learning.

In the College of Education, of the 3 undergraduate programs, 1 received a stage 3 ranking, and of the 4 graduate programs, 3 received stage 3 rankings. It was pleasing to note that of the 7 programs total, all reported, and all but one were determined to be directly assessing student learning.

In the College of Engineering, of the 7 undergraduate programs, 3 received stage 3 rankings, and of the 6 graduate programs, 2 received stage 3 rankings. While it was pleasing to note that all of the 13 programs were determined to be directly assessing student learning, it is a concern that 4 of the 6 graduate programs were determined to be at stage 0.

In the College of Health & Social Services, of the 4 undergraduate programs, 2 received stage 3 rankings, and of the 3 graduate programs, 2 received stage 3 rankings. Although 5 of the 7 programs were determined to be directly assessing student learning, it is a concern that 2 were *not* considered to be directly assessing student learning.