



[HOME](#) [FIFTH-YEAR INTERIM REPORT](#) [QEP](#) [DOCUMENT DIRECTORY](#)

[OPTIONS](#)

[Previous](#)

[Next](#)

3.3.1.1

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

Judgment

Compliant Non-Compliant Not Applicable

Narrative

Since its last reaffirmation, Angelo State University (ASU) has made progress in the assessment of student learning on two fronts:

1. Some departments (as outlined below) have made attempts to institute a coordinated approach to student learning assessment within their programs;
2. The university faculty recently approved a set of undergraduate institutional **LEARNING GOALS**, designed to serve as a foundation for overall efforts to consistently and thoroughly assess student learning, both within the undergraduate core curriculum and the majors.

However, ASU is not in full compliance with Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1.1. Although all departments work conscientiously to improve their programs, actual assessment is not documented thoroughly enough to be used as evidence. In short, no organized, comprehensive approach to the ongoing assessment and improvement of student learning in educational programs is currently in place.

Background

Before its 2002 reaccreditation, Angelo State University implemented a process of institutional effectiveness reporting, defined locally to mean the annual collection and review of progress reports from both academic and non-academic units in response to pre-established goals. By extension, "IE reporting" was designed to include the results of ongoing student learning assessment. Full implementation of a comprehensive program of institutional effectiveness has been hampered by a lack of continuity in direct administrative responsibility. ASU has had two IE directors--one who retired in December 2003 and the other who was hired in fall 2004 and who retired in summer 2007--and one interim volunteer from fall 2007 to the present. During the eight months between the two directors, no one was responsible for IE reporting.

Academic Degree Programs

All academic degree programs have been expected to participate in the institutional effectiveness process. The **Chart of IE Results** provides an overview of the academic programs and their compliance with ASU's IE process from 2003 - 2007. For the 2008 fiscal year, all academic departments filed goals and objectives for their programs and as of 2/6/09, 24 academic programs (77.5%) had filed results: **IE Reporting FY08**.

These charts, however, do not reflect the level to which academic departments assess student learning; rather, they indicate their compliance with the administrative requirements of the university's IE reporting procedure. Although in a given year most academic departments at ASU identify expected outcomes (i.e., establish learning goals and initiate

specific assessments for those goals), fewer formally assess the extent to which they achieve these outcomes (see examples below). Generally, all academic departments do improve their programs through traditional methods of departmental review and adjustment based on test scores, etc. However, in ASU's process of IE reporting, no academic department has consistently completed the assessment cycle: i.e, identified learning goals, reported on progress, identified measures to improve student learning based on assessment results, and then followed up on the success of the changes made as a result of the initial assessments.

Examples of IE reports from each college are provided below. Reports cover the last three years.

College of Business

[2005-2006R aef BBA FIN](#), [2005-2006R MBA MPAC](#)

College of Education: (Until fall 2007, the college had only one education department. In fall 2007 the department split into Teacher Education and Curriculum and Instruction.) [Kinesiology IE Report Fall 08](#), [ResultsTEd2007-08](#)

College of Liberal and Fine Arts

[2005-2006R english MA](#), [2005-2006R spanish](#), [2006-2007R gov BA](#), [Art and Music IE Goals FY08](#), [Government BA Goals 2008](#)

College of Sciences (including Nursing and Physical Therapy which formed a new college in fall 2008)

[2006-2007R math](#), [2006-2007R physics and applied](#), [Ag bs results 07 08](#), [Baccalaureate Math 2007-08 Assessment](#).

Core Curriculum (general education requirements)

ASU uses Educational Testing Services' (ETS) MAPP (Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress) test to assess several main parts of its core curriculum: critical thinking, reading, writing, and mathematics in the context of social and natural sciences and the humanities.

The most recent report on student achievement in general education, [Core Curriculum Report 2004 reformat \(Page 1\)](#), was submitted to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board in 2004. Starting in the fall of 2006, assessment of the core was put on an every-other-year assessment cycle--first-time students tested one fall are retested two years later--using value-added methodology. A value-added study subtracts the proficiency students have in core areas when they arrive at ASU from what they acquire over the next two years. In fall 2008 first-time students from 2006 were retested. Results will be available in early summer of 2009.

The MAPP test assesses all areas of the core curriculum which SACS stipulates in Core Requirement 2.7.3 as well as approximately two-thirds of ASU's total core curriculum. However, no evidence exists that the results of the MAPP tests have been used to improve student learning within the core curriculum. In addition, there has been no formal, direct assessment of the other areas of ASU's core: computer literacy, speaking, and physical activity.

Every semester, all areas of the core, as well as other courses throughout the department, are formally though indirectly assessed via IDEA course evaluations in which students self-reflect on how much progress they have made in learning relevant objectives as established by the instructor. For example, for computer literacy courses, the Progress on Relevant Objectives score in fall 2007 was 4.1 on a 5-pt scale with 31% of the students judging that they made substantial progress. [Core Curriculum Report 2004 reformat \(Page 12\) through page 17](#) contains a thorough discussion of the IDEA system and ASU's level of achievement. However, no evidence currently exists that information received through the IDEA responses has been or is used in any organized and evaluative manner to improve student learning.

Sources



-  2006-2007R physics and applied
-  Ag bs results 07 08
-  Art and Music IE Goals FY08
-  Baccalaureate Math 2007-08 Assessment
-  Chart of IE Results
-  Government BA Goals 2008
-  IE Reporting FY08
-  Kinesiology IE Report Fall 08
-  LEARNING GOALS
-  ResultsTEd2007-08
-  Core_Curriculum_Report_2004 reformat (Page 1)
-  Core_Curriculum_Report_2004 reformat (Page 12)
-  Core_Curriculum_Report_2004 reformat (Page 22)

Powered by **Compliance Assist!**