3.3.1

Institutional Effectiveness

The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas:

3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

3.3.1.2 administrative support services

3.3.1.3 academic and student support services

3.3.1.4 research within its mission, if appropriate

3.3.1.5 community/public service within its mission, if appropriate

Judgment

☑ Compliant ☐ Non-Compliant ☐ Not Applicable

Narrative

Note: Text for all linked documents below can be increased/decreased for ease of reading by pressing your keyboard's Ctrl key while rotating the mouse wheel.

Angelo State University's mission, vision, and goals, as articulated in the strategic plan (Vision 2020 Update 2012), guide institutional planning and assessment in all administrative and academic units and support strategic goals of the Texas Tech University System (TTU System) and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB). ASU's research-based planning and evaluation efforts result in continuous improvement at ASU and enable the university to accomplish its mission, as described in Core Requirement 2.5, Institutional effectiveness.

In July of 2009, ASU began using Strategic Planning Online (SPOL) software to integrate the institution's planning and assessment processes and to facilitate institutional effectiveness reporting through the collection of data related to strategic planning, academic and nonacademic assessment, and budgeting. The campus has been steadily incorporating SPOL into its practices since its adoption, with increasing amounts of meaningful data being collected in the three areas supported by the software—planning, assessment, and budgeting. Ongoing faculty development and support from the Office of Institutional Planning, Policy, and Effectiveness and the Coordinator of Academic Assessment (previously the Director of Academic Assessment) have resulted in continuous improvement in the quality of objectives, the use of assessment measures, and the reporting and use of results.

3.3.1.1 EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Over the past four years, ASU has reinvented its assessment program, developing a campus-wide systematic approach to continuous improvement of assessment results that is integrated with the university's strategic plan. Historically, ASU had an outcomes-assessment program that was based

primarily on summative assessments of student learning as measured by comprehensive end-of-program exams, such as the Educational Testing Service (ETS) Major Field Tests (MFT). In contrast, the university's new student learning outcomes assessment program is based on best practices and uses measures that are collected at the student level; aggregated across students, courses, and faculty members; and can be analyzed for trends and needed course or curriculum improvements.

This process facilitates continuous quality improvement of ASU's academic programs. All academic assessment processes and instruments used in the core curriculum and academic programs are applied consistently across sections of a course, regardless of delivery method. Results are able to be separated by delivery method (online and traditional) for the purposes of comparing results and making needed improvements. Assessment outcomes, plans, and improvements are documented in SPOL, as summarized below.

Incorporating Strategic Planning Online into Academic Assessment Process

As mentioned above, the incorporation of SPOL into university practices began in 2009. Having just been placed on monitoring for comprehensive standard 3.3.1.1, ASU made great strides to operationalize its new assessment process and create a stable, sustainable environment for conducting assessment of student learning in academic programs. ASU has been successful in establishing an institutional culture of assessment, as evidenced by the institution's removal from monitoring in June 2012 (SACS letter July 11, 2012) and as summarized below.

Faculty and staff were asked to enter 2009–2010 assessment data into SPOL, including results and use of results, by October 1, 2010. At that time, each academic department had entered at least one of its Student Learning Outcomes into the SPOL Planning module, thereby providing access to the data until the SPOL Assessment module was fully functional. Complete rollout of the assessment module was delayed, both by later-than-anticipated company release of the finished module and by university efforts to load a correct and comprehensive course list into the system. By the fall of 2010, all academic departments were using the SPOL Planning module to track strategic planning endeavors, and 11 of 18 departments had completed their Student Learning Assessments in the planning module.

In the fall of 2010, the Academic Assessment Committee was created to facilitate academic assessment efforts, to provide feedback to departments for shaping and reporting on their student learning outcomes, and to foster participation in the assessment process. As administrator for the SPOL software, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness worked closely with the new Director of Academic Assessment to facilitate congruency between templates developed by the Academic Assessment Committee and the software interface used to collect assessment data that would eventually be entered into SPOL. In January 2011, ASU's SPOL Assessment module became fully functional. After submitting all Student Learning Assessment Plans to the Academic Assessment Committee in the fall of 2010 and receiving feedback on those plans early in the spring of 2011, academic departments (except for those that were allowed to continue their assessments in the SPOL Planning module for continuity) entered approved assessment plans into the SPOL Assessment module with their accompanying results data.

In academic year 2011–2012, all academic departments reported assessment of student learning outcomes for every program. All programs completed the assessment loop, meeting at least the minimum quality standard, and many programs achieved very good quality in their assessment reports. Marked

improvement in the development and/or evolution of student learning outcomes was seen as program outcomes became more closely aligned with university learning goals and more evolved assessment measures were implemented. Additional tools were created locally in academic year 2012 to assist in the assessment process. Although SPOL was the required mode of submission for assessment reports, other tools were used for collection of some assessment data at the university level. Upon review of this process, it has been decided that the additional tools complicated the submission process and, from here forward, SPOL will remain the only tool for managing assessment of student learning at the university level. At the program level, different tools may be used to collect assessment data as long as results are documented in SPOL.

Institutional Observations

Below are descriptions of outcomes from programs within each college of the university, including the College of Graduate Studies, demonstrating compliance with Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1.1. The outcomes described below, organized by college, were chosen based on their ability to describe assessments resulting in corrective actions over a one- to two-year period. All academic programs have completed a full annual assessment cycle. The outcomes below represent programs that have completed not only their annual assessment cycle, but have also implemented corrective action and conducted subsequent assessments. Additional reports are attached to summarize outcomes for programs that have completed the annual cycle with corrective actions and for programs that have completed the annual cycle but required no corrective actions (Undergraduate Assessment Reports 2009-2012, Graduate Assessment Reports 2009-2012). Also attached are examples of non-student-learning-outcome planning objectives to support compliance of academic programs with the whole of Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1.1. All attached reports are organized alphabetically by department.

College of Graduate Studies

The College of Graduate Studies governs all graduate programs across all departments. The college has set its own graduate learning goals that are supported by all departments. The respective departments delivering the course material for the degree programs assess the student learning in each of those programs.

- **Management and Marketing**—In the College of Business' Department of Management and Marketing, student learning for the Master of Business Administration (MBA) degree program in 2009–2010 was assessed using scores on the Graduate Major Field Test (GMAT) for Business Administration. A correlation was run between entering GMAT scores and Major Field Test (MFT) results, both to assess student learning and to make decisions about entrance requirements for the program. Although the internal goal was reached on the mean score, it was noted that the number of students who had individual scores that did not meet the target for the mean was growing. It was also noted that there was a strong correlation between students who had lower entering GMAT scores and those scoring below the mean target on the Graduate MFT. Therefore, the decision was made to raise the GMAT score required for entrance to the program. The effect of this change will not be seen in 2010–2011, but should be evident in 2011–2012. This circumstance is compounded by the fact that in 2010–2011, similar student performance for this same assessment yielded a decision to change the measure used from the MFT to the Ivy Software MBA Exam. Post-test scores for the Ivy exam for AY2012, when compared with other schools accredited by the Accreditation

Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP), revealed that ASU students outperformed other institutions in all functional areas tested except corporate finance. Within the next two years, pre- and post-Ivy test results from the same students will enhance this measure (see MBA Assessment Reports).

- **Nursing and Rehabilitation Sciences**—In the College of Health and Human Services, in the Department of Nursing and Rehabilitation Sciences, the Physical Therapy program houses our only doctoral level degree, the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT). The Master of Physical Therapy (MPT) was transitioned to the DPT between AY 2010 and AY 2011. In 2009, the MPT program assessed the learning of its students based on performance on each unit of the National Physical Therapy Licensure Board Exam. In AY 2010, the content area met the criterion, however it was decided to add additional content on patient examination in cardiopulmonary, musculoskeletal, and neuromuscular areas and provide additional coursework in differential diagnosis as the program transitioned to the DPT. Again, in AY 2011, despite meeting the criteria, adjustments were made to the curriculum to garner higher rates of performance in patient examination. Improvements were also made in the areas of clinical application, patient intervention, and professional roles in patient management. Curriculum changes and the implementation of student portfolios are among the actions taken to improve student learning in the DPT program. In AY 2012, patient examination was assessed using a locally developed exam and practicum. All students were successful at attaining the 80% mastery goal. As a result, it was decided to continue with delivery of instruction as-is (see DPT Assessment Reports).

College of Arts and Sciences

- **Mathematics**—In 2009, the Mathematics department set out to assess student learning in their developmental math courses. This was done through simple assessment of the success (pass) rate of students remediated prior to taking MATH 1302 (an entry level math course) versus those who were not. Based on the observations from that year, a pre-test was implemented to help instructors better understand the comprehension level of their students to better serve their needs while in remediation so that they might be more successful as they continued to upper-level courses. Likewise, in 2010–2011, a computer-aided tool was implemented in the MATH 130A (Developmental Math) course to help improve students' learning prior to advancing. Results were no different for developmental students in courses employing the Assessment and Learning in Knowledge Spaces (ALEKS) tool than for those in traditional developmental courses. However, the response from both students and faculty was very positive. This prompted developmental math professors to make improvements to the computer program. The revised program was piloted to remedial students in MATH 130B in Fall 2011. Developmental math instructors are optimistic the changes will improve these outcomes. In AY 2012, assessment efforts in Mathematics shifted towards traditional course assessments and those of outgoing student preparedness. An evaluation of student preparedness to enter post-baccalaureate programs or professional fields based on performance on two end-of-program standardized exams yielded pleasing results. Though overall targets were met, future attention will be given to geometry topics in the capstone course to better prepare students for this portion of the TExES exam and, therefore, for entry into the teaching profession. Overall results were also favorable for the MFT exam with four of five assessment

indicators reaching all-time highs. However, the applied math indicator was significantly low. An increased focus on applied problems in both MATH 1561 and MATH 2513 is planned for AY 2013 (see Math Assessment Reports).

- **Computer Science**—In 2009, the Department of Computer Science assessed student learning in computer programming using the Major Field Test (Educational Testing Service) for Computer Science. After analyzing the results, it was discovered that the portion of the test on which students performed poorly concerned discrete structures and use of algorithms. In 2010, in an effort to address this weakness and ultimately improve student performance, a newly hired faculty member with specialized experience in the field was assigned to implement a new course in algorithms. In addition, the department began requiring a course in discrete math as part of the BS in Computer Science degree program. Although the new algorithms course was not officially offered until Fall 2011, course assessments performed elsewhere within the department in 2010–2011 resulted in curriculum revisions to the algorithms course prior to its implementation to include material previously covered in another course. In AY 2012, assessment of students' proficiency designing and programming applications by selecting and coding algorithms yielded favorable results using multiple rubrics. In early Fall 2012, the department plans to explore the rubrics themselves to determine if the progress seen was actual or the result of weak rubrics (see Computer Science Assessment Reports).

College of Health and Human Services

- **Psychology, Sociology and Social Work**—The Psychology, Sociology and Social Work Department implemented a locally developed exit exam in 2009–2010 for the BS and BA degrees in Psychology. The purpose of this exam was to assess student learning in ten foundational areas of psychology. Results from the inaugural year of the exit exam indicated that students were exceeding expectations (for first attempt pass rate), and the department concluded that a higher target must be set for the following year. In addition, in 2010–2011, passing the exit exam was made a requirement for graduation instead of a somewhat voluntary exercise. Results from the 2010–2011 cohorts taking the exit exam for Psychology missed the newly set targets. It was deduced that students may not have been prepared for the new requirement regarding the exit exam, as a result of not being informed earlier in their career of its contents. This prompted additional information regarding the exam being provided to students through both the departmental website and course syllabi. The effectiveness of this approach was examined in 2011–2012. Exam scores, though they met the 60% passing requirement on average, did not meet the programmatic expectation of 65% and, therefore, indicated that students were still performing below expected levels. In AY 2013, students will be provided with additional learning aids to help them consolidate and remember information about the foundational areas in the field (see Psychology Assessment Reports).

College of Education

- **Curriculum and Instruction**—The Department of Curriculum and Instruction assessed student learning by evaluating the expectation that students should be able to master the teacher

competencies for the state of Texas by use of pass rate data on the TExES Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Exam for a composite of the following areas: (1) Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities EC–4, (2) Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities 4–8, (3) Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities 8–12, and (4) Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities EC–12. In both AY 2010 and AY 2011, the department noted achievement of their 80% pass rate target. However, lower than projected scores in individual sections of the exam prompted curriculum changes. In 2009–2010, videos and special assignments were included to address issues with classroom management, and a focus on student engagement was implemented in all preparatory courses. In 2010–2011, sample assignments, lesson plan tutorials, and practice lessons were added, and assignments in ED 4322 were reorganized to more clearly reflect needs of today's teachers and to ensure students are presented with more opportunities to create and implement lessons through field work in the secondary program. These interventions were put into play to address deficiencies illustrated in Domain I (designing effective instruction) and Domain III (implementing effective instruction) of the PPR 8–12 exam (see Curriculum and Instruction Assessment Reports). In the 2011–2012 academic year, the decision was made to migrate all undergraduate pedagogy instruction from the department of Curriculum and Instruction to the department of Teacher Education to align teaching responsibilities more appropriately for purposes of both course delivery and funding allocation. Assessments began being conducted in Undergraduate Pedagogy in the department of Teacher Education in AY2012 as this transition began. Exam scores for the TExES Exam for AY 2011–2012 are not available until October 2012; however, initial formative assessments show potential improvement (see Teacher Education Assessment Reports).

College of Business

- **Accounting, Economics and Finance**—In 2009–2010, the College of Business' Department of Accounting , Economics and Finance assessed student learning in the accounting major by using the Major Field Test. Accounting undergraduate students (BBA) achieved the 85th percentile overall mean score on the undergraduate Major Field Test, which exceeds the goal of the 75th percentile. However, a weakness was identified in international topics. Faculty agreed to find ways to increase coverage of international topics in their courses. In 2010–2011, scores fell in the 75th percentile on the overall mean. This time, it was proposed that emphasis be placed on integration of business disciplines. In AY 2012, scores improved, but the overall MFT score still proves a challenging measurement to improve. Accounting majors score very well on the accounting potion of the exam but seem to fall short overall for the entire business discipline concept, which may only be addressed to students in related courses. To address this, the accounting faculty will attempt to couch accounting decisions in the overall context of decisions of the firm, thus relating the parts to the whole. This will hopefully yield improved scores in AY 2013 (see Accounting Assessment Reports).

Conclusion

All educational programs at ASU complete an annual cycle of assessment using SPOL. SPOL serves as the common repository for documentation related to planning, budgeting, and assessment of student learning and thereby integrates these practices on campus. The student learning outcomes assessment examples in this narrative serve to demonstrate the institutional commitment to the assessment process and provide evidence of the types of assessment being conducted. ASU is in compliance with this standard, and, as the university moves forward, is motivated by a spirit of continuous improvement. The university is working not only to make improvements based on the results of current assessment procedures but to continue to improve the assessment processes as well. This dedication to assessment is evident in reports supplied by ASU's academic programs since SPOL's implementation in 2009. Participation in academic departments has increased from 83% in 2009 to 100% at present with continued process refinement. Integration of student learning assessment with strategic planning and budget allocation intensifies the assessment process and ensures its completion on a yearly basis.

3.3.1.2 ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES

Administrative support services at ASU are coordinated through the Finance and Administration division (F&A), which develops an annual operations plan that includes annual goals, strategies, and assessment measures for administrative support services (Facilities and Administration Operations Plan, FY 2011). The Vice-President of Finance and Administration, in conjunction with the division's associate and assistant vice presidents and directors, is responsible for developing administrative support goals and associated assessment plans. Each goal in the F&A operations plan is designed to support the goals and mandates in the ASU strategic plan and in the campus master plan (Centennial Master Plan 2028 Update 2011). The goals are reviewed and modified annually, and new goals are added as necessary, based on the results of assessment. This ongoing cycle of assessment ensures that F&A goals support the university's mission and strategic initiatives and address targeted interventions for continuous improvement of administrative support services.

Each department within F&A establishes planning-unit objectives that align with the F&A operations plan and are tracked and assessed annually. The planning-unit objectives, together with associated tasks, assessment measures, intended results, actual results, and use of results, are documented in SPOL. Based on results from one year, a unit can choose to continue working on a particular objective for the next year, continue to work on a refined /restated objective, or move on to a different objective. Examples of reports from FY 2011 and FY 2012 for several administrative-support units follow. Additional examples can be found in the 3.3.1.2 Planning Objective Reports AY11-AY12.

Environmental Health, Safety and Risk Management (EHSRM)—In 2010 the EHSRM director developed the multi-year objective to manage resources efficiently. He included tasks and intended results in the place of assessment measures. The director resigned in November 2011 before completing the report. When the incoming director took over in March 2012, he developed assessment measures and completed the tasks. He also was able to demonstrate results and to use results to outline recommendations to implement improvements (see Planning Unit 3400 EHS and Risk Management Office Planning Objective Reports).

- **Institutional Technology Project Office**—The IT Project Office operational effectiveness outcome to provide an environment that fosters communication is a multi-year objective. Several problems discovered in FY 2011 (e.g., that the unit could not tell if someone was contacted within 3 days [objective T4]) were resolved and reported in the Actual Results section of the FY 2012 report (see Planning Unit 32370 IT Project Office Planning Objective Reports).
- **Facilities Management**—In order to ensure that Facilities Management provides courteous and timely services, the unit chose an objective regarding staff training. In FY 2011, the unit held monthly meetings to discuss efficiencies and to make changes based on those discussions. For FY 2012, the unit continued the meetings but increased the meetings to once a week and extended the scope of the discussions to concentrate on operations planning (see Planning Unit 3500 Facilities Management Planning Objective Reports).
- **Medical Clinic**—In FY 2011 the Medical Clinic's objective was to increase students' positive perceptions and satisfaction with the clinic. Many tasks were undertaken and projects implemented in FY 2011 to support progress towards reaching that objective. By the end of FY 2011 most tasks had been completed. The remaining task—getting direct evidence of students' increased positive perceptions—was still in progress. In FY 2012, results (June 27, 2012 entry 3) showed that the unit had improved its Administrative Services Survey score (see Planning Unit 3220 Medical Services and Counseling Planning Objective Reports).
- **University Police (UPD)—**The UPD's objective to promote emergency management and preparedness is a multi-year objective. The assessment measure was whether the project was completed or not. In FY 2011, the unit identified a number of tasks that needed to be accomplished in support of the objective. All tasks for the year were completed on or before August 31, 2011. In SPOL, tasks for multi-year objectives are shown as a running total. Therefore, tasks for each year appear in both years' lists. Due dates delineate to which year a particular task belongs. In FY 2012, a number of tasks were added and completed before the due date of August 31, 2012. The use of results from FY 2011 centered on the opportunities for the UPD to interact with the campus to promote safety initiatives. In FY 2012, the use of results was the outcome of now having even better preparedness because the campus's ability to respond had been tested (see Planning Unit 390 University Police Planning Objective Reports).

3.3.1.3 ACADEMIC AND STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

Each academic- and student-support services unit at ASU engages in a systematic annual assessment process to promote continuous quality improvement, and each unit documents the assessment process, outcomes, and corresponding improvements in the SPOL system. Unit leaders, such as directors, deans, or appropriate designees, define the objectives for their respective areas. The two objective types used by academic and student support services planning units are operational effectiveness outcomes and student learning outcomes, as appropriate. These objectives support the ASU mission and are tied to institutional goals and to the planning priorities of the university as defined in Vision 2020.

ASU provides a wide variety of academic and student support services, which are housed in the departments of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs/Enrollment Management. These support units are

committed to student success and continuous quality improvement, as evidenced by the assessment activities documented in SPOL. Following are several specific examples demonstrating how assessment planning is leading to improved academic and student support services:

- **Tutoring Center, Supplemental Instruction**—The primary objective of Supplemental Instruction (SI) is to increase successful grades and reduce D/F/W rates in targeted courses. In September 2009, the SI Office determined an appropriate assessment measure would be the creation of a Discretionary Report including various qualitative and quantitative data pulled from various internal reports, including the following: GPA, SAT/ACT scores, the SI attendance database that documents student attendance in SI sessions, enrollment for SI-supported classes divided into those who used and those who did not use SI, a Faculty Survey and Student Survey evaluating the SI Program and SI Leaders, and final course grades. This report was completed in November 2010 and showed that students using SI are more likely to earn from one half to a full letter grade higher than students who choose not to use SI and are far less likely to withdraw from a difficult class when academic assistance is available (see SI and Tutor Center 2009–2010). In response to this information, the decision was made in November 2010 to continue support for traditionally difficult courses, to expand support in HIST 1301/1302, and to support new difficult courses, such as BIO 1480. This course addition is part of a gradual expansion in the number of courses supported by SI, which in Spring Semester 2012 supported a total of 15 courses. In 2011, SI program data indicated that students who use SI on a regular basis (as little as once a week) receive from one half to a full letter grade better than students who do not use SI. Based on these data, SI is planning to add more support for courses in physics, economics, chemistry, and nursing, when feasible (see Supplemental Instruction Planning Objective Reports).
- **Porter Henderson Library**—In the 2011 spring semester, the library conducted a systematic survey of student opinions concerning the services and resources of the library. The results provided valuable baseline data regarding student satisfaction with the library, including the new Learning Commons. Student reactions, suggestions, and comments have already been used to make immediate improvements. For example, in the summer of 2011, the library replaced benches in the Learning Commons with office chairs and provided additional networked PCs. In addition, beginning in the 2011 fall semester, IT and the library began keeping the Learning Commons open in the long semesters (fall and spring) from 1 pm on Sunday to 9 pm on Friday in an effort to provide nearly continuous operation. IT adjusted the hours of the Mathematics and Computer Science computer lab so that the lab now closes at midnight on Monday through Thursday and at 8 pm on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday evenings (see Library Planning Objective Reports).
- **Housing and Residential Programs**—The Housing and Residential Programs Office moved to an online payment system for miscellaneous housing charges and fees in early 2011. The success of this system is shown by the elimination of the long lines at the housing office as students waited to submit their fee payments and secure reapplication for housing as well as by the diminishing amount of cashiering in the Housing and Residential Programs Office. The success of this project has led to using a similar online payment process for the Student Orientation, Advising, and Registration (SOAR) program, including processing payments for SOAR housing requests. This process is now far more cost effective and efficient because the number of rooms is known in advance, saving money on room setup and custodial labor (see Residential Programs Planning Objective Reports).

Additional examples can be found in the 3.3.1.3 Planning Objective Reports AY11-AY12.

3.3.1.4 RESEARCH

The ASU mission statement identifies research as an integral part of the institution's focus, and Vision 2020 addresses research under Master Goal 4, Objective 4, as follows: "Members of the faculty conduct research and coordinate a wide variety of sponsored projects." The type of research conducted at Angelo State University is largely for educational benefit of our students and is not conducted with a "publish or perish" expectation for our faculty. Within the College of Graduate Studies, the Office of Sponsored Projects (OSP) exists to promote research programs and initiatives by providing assistance and guidance in finding, obtaining, and managing external sources of funding. The Director of Sponsored Projects is responsible for defining operational effectiveness objectives for both graduate- and undergraduate-level research in terms of numbers of proposals, extent of funding, and scope of participation. The OSP engages a systematic and ongoing annual assessment process in which it identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results. This process is documented in the SPOL system (see 3.3.1.4 Planning Objective Reports AY11-AY12).

In AY 2010, the OSP set out to track the number of submitted proposals, with the longterm goal of increasing the number of submissions for research and sponsored programs. The goal of thirty-six submitted proposals was exceeded by one, presumably because of the implementation of a monthly e-Funding Alert notifying faculty of upcoming funding opportunities. However, it was determined that increasing the number of proposals submitted in the future would require the OSP to work with departments and individual faculty members to assess needs and find appropriate sources of funding for research and other projects. The OSP must also assist faculty in using ASU's recently acquired Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) status to apply for funding opportunities open only to HSIs. In AY 2011, the number of proposals held steady at thirty five. Upon meeting with faculty to assess funding needs and interests, several faculty indicated they were interested in submitting proposals and had even found competitions that would be appropriate. However, they struggled to find the time needed to prepare their proposals prior to the deadlines; approximately three to five promising proposals were not submitted because of this challenge. In AY 2012, the OSP is working to find ways to help these faculty carve out time to complete proposals well ahead of submission deadlines so adequate review and revision can take place, resulting in the targeted increase in proposal submissions.

In AY 2011, the OSP identified a need to address research compliance by providing assistance to those participating in research by offering workshops and training, conducting weekly reviews of compliance literature, and having the director of OSP serve as an ex-officio member of both the Institutional Review Board and the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee. Compliance was improved, with 100% of effort reports being completed. However, not all of these were completed within the thirty-day submission window. In AY 2012, the OSP worked with administrators to develop a plan for handling late reports.

3.3.1.5 COMMUNITY/PUBLIC SERVICE

In order to ensure that the university accomplishes its mission with regard to community/public service, ASU has established five departments that focus on serving the community. Each of these community/public service units engages in a systematic annual assessment process to promote continuous quality improvement and documents the assessment process, outcomes, and corresponding

improvements in the SPOL system. Unit leaders, such as directors, deans, or appropriate designees, define the objectives for their respective areas. The two objective types used by community/public service units are operational effectiveness outcomes and student learning outcomes, as appropriate. These objectives are tied to institutional goals and to the planning priorities of the university, as defined in Vision 2020. Following is a brief description of each public service unit, including a specific example of an improvement the unit made based on assessment results. Additional examples can be found in the 3.3.1.5 Planning Objective Reports AY11-AY12.

Center for International Studies

A primary objective of the Center for International Studies is community engagement, which is accomplished through several programs, including the ASU Host Family Program, National Passport Day, the Homestay Program, and International Education Week. The ASU Host Family Program exists to match international students with host families and to promote participation with members of the San Angelo community. In Spring 2011, assessment measures listed for the success of this program were the ability to match all international students with a San Angelo Host Family and to have well attended annual parties to welcome them and to help them settle into their new lives in the United States. The unit reported that these Host Family events were well attended and that all international students were matched with host families. The two improvements suggested in light of these results were to make sure there was enough food for guests and to organize a single e-mail address book to make sure all host families and students are invited to all events (see Center for International Studies Planning Objective Reports).

Extended Studies

Through fall 2011, the Office of Extended Studies (OES) offered courses to fulfill the professional, vocational, personal, and workforce educational needs of West Texas residents. The office also operated the testing center, proctoring a variety of standardized tests, including the Law School Admission Test (LSAT), ACT, residual ACT, GRE-subject area tests, tests for ASU students who needed someone to proctor an exam for work they are doing at another institution, College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) exams, ACCUPLACER tests, ETS Major Field Tests, ATI Test of Essential Academic Skills Version V (TEAS V), and the Texas Examinations of Educator Standards (TExES). Historically, all students who were enrolled in a course through Extended Studies or are tested through the testing center were surveyed regarding the department's services and service delivery. However, turn-over at the director level over the past two years has resulted in a gap in the reporting and collecting of these surveys. The last known results reported for 2008–2009 indicated that customers of the OES were satisfied with the services provided by both office staff and class instructors. Furthermore, these reports indicated that the results of these assessments would be included in the annual performance evaluations of OES personnel (see Extended Studies Planning Objective Reports).

The most recent director of the OES chose to conduct assessments based on the productivity of the office. Targets were set for numbers of tests administered by the Testing Center as well as revenue generation for the continuing education portion of the OES. At the time of the departure of the director of the OES,

neither of the targets had been attained. The Testing Center has since been made its own entity reporting to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. Extended Studies, as a stand-alone program, is now under review with a full-scale analysis being conducted by the Director of Special Projects in conjunction with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Vice President for Finance and Administration. Extended Studies courses are not being offered during the review period.

Small Business Development Center

The Small Business Development Center (SBDC) has been in operation for approximately 20 years and has helped hundreds of clients create jobs for the community. The SBDC offers business advising, training seminars, and rural business advisory services. For example, during the first two quarters of 2011, the SBDC advised 362 clients (both new and existing) and conducted 51 business seminars with 432 people in attendance. Written client success statements show that 192 new jobs were created from these business startups and expansions and that nearly six million dollars in new capital infusion was made by these businesses. Furthermore, the SBDC is partnering with seven other entities in the creation of the Business Resource Center (BRC), first envisioned in 2007. The BRC will consolidate several of San Angelo's economic development efforts into a single facility. The BRC will eventually house the SBDC, with an opening date currently planned for 2012. The SBDC has assessed the effectiveness of the BRC concept and the progress toward completion and is using this information to measure and facilitate completion of the BRC project (see SBDC Planning Objective Reports).

Center for Community Wellness, Engagement, and Development

The Center for Community Wellness, Engagement, and Development (WED Center) opened to the public on May 14, 2010. The WED Center is an umbrella organization overseeing the following four interdisciplinary initiatives:

- Family, Adolescent and Child Engagement Services (FACES), the administrative arm of the WED Center
- Caregiver Research Institute
- Community Development Initiatives (CDI)
- Laura W. Bush Institute for Women's Health

Ambitious planning in its first year included plans for the WED Center to collaborate with community agencies on projects to fulfill its mission (WED Center Mission). The assessment measure was set at a minimum of three major projects. This objective was exceeded in 2010 through collaboration on the 2010 Census, the End Hunger Initiative, the sponsoring of a lecture on management of childhood aggression, and co-sponsoring the inspirational speaker Sean Carter during Alcohol Awareness Month. During the 2010–2011 planning year, the WED Center sought to increase the numbers of students and community members engaged in WED-Center-sponsored activities and programs. It was reported in November 2011 that 1,000 ASU students and 3,000 community members had participated in WED Center activities and programs (see WED Center in the College of Health and Human Services Planning Objective Reports).

San Jacinto Clinic

The San Jacinto Clinic provides immunizations, sick child care, well child care, head start physicals, sports physicals, behavioral health care, and referrals for special needs for San Angelo schoolchildren younger than 18 years of age. In order to better fulfill its mission and goals, plans were made for an increase in service from 10 months per year to 12 months per year and for an increase in patient visits. As of 2010, the Clinic is now open all year. The clinic saw 4,873 patient visits in fiscal year 2010 and 5,764 in fiscal year 2011, which resulted in an increase in funding and increased clinical training opportunities for nursing students rotating to the clinic for pediatric experiences. In Fall 2011, the practice at the clinic was reorganized after the physicians decided to retire/leave the practice. A full time Family Nurse Practitioner was hired and several part-time. Summer 2012 it was decided to change the focus of the clinic to behavioral health services based on the needs of the community and the San Angelo Independent School District (see San Jacinto Clinic in the Department of Nursing and Rehabilitation Sciences Planning Objective Reports).