University Assessment Committee  
Analysis and Summary Report - Assessment of Academic Programs  
For AY 2011 – 2012

Part I Academic Programs Table instructions: review the assessment reports submitted by the academic programs in your college, division or unit and complete the table for each program using the following ratings.

**Student learning outcomes:**  
Level 0  No reported activity  
Level 1  Learning outcomes have been articulated but not all are written in terms of observable student behavior, some are unclear or not measurable  
Level 2  Learning outcomes have been created, they are clear and measurable.

**Assessment measures:**  
Level 0  No reported activity  
Level 1  A list of measures was developed to assess learning and appear appropriate for student learning outcomes  
Level 2  Measures are developed, described, aligned with learning outcomes and include multiple sources of data, internal, external, direct and indirect

**Faculty involvement and review:**  
Level 0  No information provided regarding the role of faculty in reviewing data  
Level 1  Faculty review assessment data at the level of the individual course  
Level 2  Program faculty meet as a group to review and discuss data (structured review such as curriculum or assessment committees etc.)

**Assessment results:**  
Level 0  No reported activity or data  
Level 1  A sample of assessment results/findings is presented  
Level 2  A sample of assessment results/findings is presented and the significance of the data described

**Actions to improve learning:**  
Level 0  No reported activity  
Level 1  At least one action to improve learning for the 2012 – 2013 academic year was identified  
Level 2  Actions were proposed to improve learning and related to directly to data and assessment results

**Communication of assessment results:**  
Level 0  No reported activity  
Level 1  Assessment results are shared within the program and/or department, with faculty and students  
Level 2  Assessment results are shared with others outside the department or program including prospective students or at the college level

**Student involvement**  
Level 0  No reported activity  
Level 1  Assessment results indicate that student involvement is included but could be improved  
Level 2  Assessment results indicate that student involvement is well defined and utilized appropriately
**Part I Academic Programs Table**: rate each program using the rating levels 0, 1, 2 based on your impression of the academic program’s level of achievement regarding the various components of the assessment process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Measures</th>
<th>Faculty Involvement and Review</th>
<th>Assessment Results</th>
<th>Actions to Improve Learning</th>
<th>Communication of Results</th>
<th>Student Involvement</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy and Library Instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assessment Results: data lacking Communication of Results: Advertising and promoting instruction is not communication of assessment results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part II instructions: after reviewing the reports submitted and completing Table I, write a brief evaluation of your college, division or unit activity and status as requested for each of the components of the assessment of student learning outcomes in parts 1-7 below.

II.1 Overview of the articulation and adequacy of student learning outcomes.
Description from Academic Programs form: List the student learning outcomes (SLOs) for the academic or educational program. These must be written in terms of measurable student behavior. SLOs describe what students will be able to do or what skills students will gain as a result of instruction.

SLOs are well articulated but several use “Understand” which is not an action verb. It would be better to use a term like “Describe” or “Define” or some other action verb from Bloom’s Taxonomy (see http://www.utoledo.edu/offices/provost/main/assessment/committees/liaison.html for list of good links)

II.2 Selection and identification of a range of assessment methods.
Description from Academic Programs form: List the explicit assessment measures or methods used as a means to confirm student learning in your program. For each measure, provide information about the frequency of data collection and the review of this information.

The listing of assessment measures is solid but there seems to be a lack of data collection and reporting concerning the post test information.

II.3 Faculty involvement in the review of assessment data.
Description from Academic Programs form: No explicit description was provided. This information is provided in the column labeled “Person(s) responsible for reviewing data” in the Program template data collection table.

It is indicated that there are library faculty involved in the analysis and review of the data but results of the analysis is very limited. How are the “Write down one thing that you feel would make this session better” comments analyzed at the end of some post-tests? This is something that might be compiled and reported.

II.4 Appropriateness and adequacy of reports of results for the college.
Description from Academic Programs form: Provide a sample of your findings from the 2011-2012 academic year. Report the data collected for at least three and no more than six of the measures listed in the table above. In a brief narrative, describe the significance of these data and how these data provide evidence to determine whether your program is meeting its student learning outcomes.

The assessment results data is very limited. There was only data for the number of instructional sessions and students. Lacking was the number of instructors and other data such as post-test data collected from one time sessions. Although it is indicated that “assessment is determined by the successful completion of class assignments”, what constitutes success or failure? Are they graded or is there a scale such as poor, good, excellent? Did all the students pass or get As? There needs to be more data with the narrative. Also, are the course evaluations could be analyzed and reported.

II.5 Appropriateness and adequacy of reported actions to improve learning across the college.
Description from Academic Programs form: Describe examples of changes made in your unit in response to the data gathered. You do not need to limit this discussion to the data presented in the assessment results section. Explicitly describe the data that led to the changes. These changes or modification can be at the level of an individual course, including changes in course content or educational experiences; or at the level of the program, including addition of new course options and elective experiences.

Good description of actions to improve learning.
II.6 Communication of assessment results.

Description from Academic Programs form: Describe how your assessment results are made known to stakeholders. These assessment results should include the assessment data described in the assessment measures and results sections, and the planned changes described in the section to describe actions to improve student learning.

Good that the results are shared via a webpage. However, the information about advertising and marketing the program does not constitute communication of assessment results. It is suggested that the results be communicated via the different vehicles mentioned in the narrative as well as maybe meeting with students.

II.7 Student involvement in the assessment process.

Description from Academic Programs form: Describe how students are involved in any aspect of the assessment process for your program. This could involve input on assessment measures, methodology and frequency of data collection, eliciting their feedback on courses or the program in general, or their participation on curriculum or assessment committees that review data and recommend program changes. Include any strategies used to encourage students to provide feedback that has the potential to improve learning outcomes.

Good student involvement. One suggestion might be to survey the students who participated in the instructional sessions.

Part III instructions: identify the strengths of your college or division related to the assessment of student learning outcomes. You should also address any possible concerns, opportunities for faculty development and support needed for the assessment activities.

If your college, division or unit submitted a report to summarize the assessment of service outcomes, please indicate whether any strengths or concerns about the assessment of service outcomes had an impact on the assessment of student learning outcomes.

The Information Literacy and Library Instruction program has been in a state of flux the past several years. It has been transiting from a completely instruction on demand to part credit courses and continued instruction on demand as the numbers of instructors are available. The assessment of the program has been ongoing but there needs to be some better analysis of the data collected. This is evident from the lack of data reported but indication that continues to be collection of post-test information. It was good to note that information literacy assessment seminars will be developed this coming year to assist campus faculty in this area. This would then become another rich resource for assessment data.

Looking at last year’s COIL assessment report, it is agreed that” we could use professional development about how---types of data, data collections tools, and analytical methods--to assess the efficacy of our efforts.”
Part I Service Programs Table instructions: review the assessment reports submitted by the service programs in your college, division or unit and complete the table for each program using the following ratings.

Service Outcomes:
Level 0  No reported activity
Level 1  Service outcomes have been articulated but not all are written in terms of observable outcomes, some are unclear or not measurable
Level 2  Service outcomes have been created, they are clear and measurable.

Assessment measures:
Level 0  No reported activity
Level 1  A list of measures was developed to assess service outcomes and appear appropriate for service outcomes
Level 2  Measures are developed, described, aligned with service outcomes and include multiple sources of data, internal, external, direct and indirect

Assessment results:
Level 0  No reported activity or data
Level 1  A sample of assessment results/findings is presented
Level 2  A sample of assessment results/findings is presented and the significance of the data described

Actions to improve service:
Level 0  No reported activity
Level 1  At least one action to improve learning for the 2012 – 2013 academic year was identified
Level 2  Actions were proposed to improve service outcomes and related directly to data and assessment results

Communication of assessment results:
Level 0  No reported activity
Level 1  Assessment results are shared within the program and/or department, with faculty and students
Level 2  Assessment results are shared with others outside the department or program including prospective students or at the college level

Student involvement
Level 0  No reported activity
Level 1  Assessment results indicate that student involvement is included but could be improved
Level 2  Assessment results indicate that student involvement is well defined and utilized appropriately
Part I Service Programs Table: rate each program using the rating levels 0, 1, 2 based on your impression of the service program’s level of achievement regarding the various components of the assessment process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Service Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Measures</th>
<th>Assessment Results</th>
<th>Actions to Improve Service</th>
<th>Communication of Results</th>
<th>Student Involvement</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Student involvement could be improved by including a student on the Library Assessment Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The same person who completed the Assessment of Service Outcomes report is completing this analysis and summary report. It is very difficult to include objective criticism and
Part II instructions: after reviewing the reports submitted and completing Table I, write a brief evaluation of your college, division or unit activity and status as requested for each of the components of the assessment of service outcomes in parts 1-7 below.

II.1 Overview of the articulation and adequacy of service outcomes.
Descriiption from Service Units form: List the service outcomes for this program. These must be written in measureable, quantifiable terms. Service outcomes describe services the unit or college provides to support teaching and learning across multiple academic programs, activities of the service program required to satisfy its objectives and mission, and/or how these activities support the UT academic enterprise.

Good articulation of service outcomes.

II.2 Selection and identification of a range of assessment methods.
Description from Service Units form: List the explicit assessment measures or methods used as a means to validate service outcomes in your unit. For each measure, provide information about the frequency of data collection and the review of this information.

Measurements are solid.

II.3 Appropriateness and adequacy of reports of results for the college.
Description from Service Units form: Provide a sample of your findings from the 2011-2012 academic year. Report the data collected for at least three and no more than six of the measures listed in the table above. In a brief narrative, describe the significance of these data and how these data provide evidence to determine whether your program is meeting its service outcomes.

The survey revealed information that can help in strategic planning and the follow-up survey may validate the information obtained in the first survey.

II.4 Appropriateness and adequacy of reported actions to improve learning across the college.
Description from Service Units form: Describe examples of changes made in your unit in response to the data gathered. You do not need to limit this discussion to the data presented in the assessment results section. Explicitly describe the data that led to the changes. These changes or modification can be at any level in the unit, for example, at the point of delivery, in unit practices, or in policies.

The data is there to support the need for changes. It is hoped that there is support to make the changes requested. Next year’s report will tell.

II.5 Communication of assessment results.
Description from Service Units form: Describe how your assessment results are made known to stakeholders. These assessment results should include the assessment data described in the assessment measures and results sections, and the planned changes described in the section to describe actions to improve service.

Communication of results is available in a passive manner. It is suggested that the results be shared more actively with stakeholders. Maybe present the results of the survey to student groups who may be interested as well as faculty and staff groups on the campuses.
II.6  Student involvement in the assessment process.

*Description from Service Units form:* Describe how students are involved in any aspect of the assessment process for your service program. This could involve eliciting their feedback and recommendations for services in general or their participation on service committees or advisory boards that review data and recommend changes. Include any strategies used to encourage students to provide feedback that has the potential to improve service outcomes.

The survey was a solid way of involving students but it would be helpful to have a student on the Library Assessment Committee (LAC) to provide the group with a fresh viewpoint. It is suggested that the chair of the LAC maybe approach some student organizations to see if they would suggest a representative.

**Part III instructions:** identify the strengths of your college or division related to the assessment of service outcomes. You should also address any possible concerns, opportunities for faculty development and support needed for the assessment activities.

If your college, division or unit submitted a report to summarize the assessment of student learning outcomes, please indicate whether any strengths or concerns about the assessment of student learning outcomes had an impact on the assessment of service outcomes.

The University Libraries have a good assessment plan but could use an update and an opportunity for this will occur when the strategic plan is complete. Collecting the data from all the areas in the libraries is a large task especially when areas are not consistent in their collection of data. It has been the desire of the librarian in charge of library assessment to construct a data farm for collecting and housing the data for easy access. A student or staff member would be helpful in this endeavor.

Currently it is not yet clear if the libraries report on student learning outcomes is having an impact on services. This might be measured in the usage statistics concerning the databases and resources offered through the libraries and it is suggested that this might be something to report in the future.