

Section III: Institutional Effectiveness

Committee Members

Cody B. Scott
Department of Animal Science

Cheryl Hines
Department of Education

Sheryl Kanaga
Personnel Office

Mitzie Keeling
Admissions and Retention

J. Kelly McCoy
Department of Biology

Nolen Mears
Student Life

Shirley Morton
Office of the Vice President of University Relations and Development

Jerry Osburn
Department of Sociology

Kathleen Price
Department of Kinesiology

Jeffrey Schonberg
Department of English

Introduction

Angelo State University is committed to becoming one of the premier Master's I (Comprehensive) public universities in the Southwest. This commitment involves annual planning and assessment of academic and administrative goals through filing of institutional effectiveness reports. This process involves both the faculty and staff of each academic and administrative unit. Each unit assigns a contact person who is responsible for submitting plans and reports for review. Each faculty and staff member within each respective department is included in the process, particularly in the formation of the Departmental Purpose and Departmental Objectives.

One of four subcommittees of the Institutional Effectiveness Oversight Committee reviews each report to ensure compliance with the guidelines for institutional effectiveness. The Committee determines: (1) if each unit has a departmental purpose related to the University mission, (2) if there are three to five objectives stemming from the departmental purpose, (3) if the unit has identified two means of assessment per objective, (4) if results are collected, (5) if there is evidence that results are used to improve the program, and (6) if student performance was used to assess academic departmental objectives.

The Coordinator of Institutional Effectiveness sends a summary of the review to each department head. If significant problems arise, the Coordinator meets with the department head and discusses corrective measures. Insignificant problems are corrected in the following year's plan. Each department keeps a record book of Institutional Effectiveness Reports. Reports are also filed in the Self Study Office (EFA Room 108). Each report is also available for viewing at http://www.angelo.edu/publications/institutional_effectiveness/ (logon as "guest" username; no password).

Departmental assessment also occurs through the *Agency Strategic Plan* and through program review as specified in the *Academic Master Plan 2000*. In addition, several departments are assessed through external accreditation agencies.

History

Angelo State University formalized its institutional effectiveness program in January 1997, when the University appointed a Coordinator of Institutional Effectiveness. In April 1997, the University established the Institutional Effectiveness Oversight Committee. Prior to that time, each academic and administrative department carried out its own quality improvement measures. Performance measures mandated by the Legislative Budget Board controlled some operations of some departments. External accrediting agencies for some departments also supplied guidelines for assessment. For the most part, individual initiative by department heads accounted for assessment and improvement.

The first priority of the Institutional Effectiveness Oversight Committee was to revise the University's mission statement, which had not been examined since 1987. Two official statements, a "Mission Statement" and a "Statement of Purpose," described the University. Neither statement referred to the administrative or student service sectors of the institution. The Institutional Effectiveness Oversight Committee presented the revised mission statement to the University in April 1997 and requested each segment of the University to test the statement against its own purpose. Revisions suggested by several divisions were incorporated into the draft that was approved by the Board of Regents on August 9, 1997. The revised mission statement appears in all relevant University publications beginning with the *1999-2001 Bulletin*, *Faculty-Staff Handbook* revision of 2001, *Student Handbook* of 2001, and on the University web site at http://www.angelo.edu/publications/legal/mission_statement.htm.

Beginning in October 1997, the University instituted its cycles of planning and reporting for institutional effectiveness. During the first two cycles, all departments were required to submit two documents: a plan outlining the department's connection to the mission statement and the objectives it wanted to achieve, along with two separate means of assessing each objective; and a report, listing the results of assessment and how these results would improve unit quality. Either the Institutional Effectiveness Coordinator or the Director of Institutional Planning, Research and Assessment met with each department at least once to assist departments with identifying quality for their function. The first cycle for the administrative departments and for General Education was completed in the fall of 1997. The academic departments' first cycle was completed in the fall of 1998 after funds were made available for necessary standardized examinations and surveys.

In the summer of 1998, the University initiated a web-based reporting system. The system was revised during 1999 and 2000. Currently, all plans and reports are submitted on this system. By the end of January, each department develops its objectives for the year. Thereafter, departments submit reports to the Institutional Effectiveness Oversight Committee for review in July (Administrative Units) and October (Academic Units). The Committee returns suggestions to each department and presents a final report on Institutional Effectiveness, including a list of deficient departments, to the President of the University each January.

Strategic Planning at Angelo State University

Seven planning tools outline the objectives and the overall goal of the University to become one of the premier Master's I (Comprehensive) public universities in the Southwest. The seven planning documents consist of the following:

Agency Strategic Plan

The University submits this plan biennially to the Legislative Budget Board. This plan assesses the State's strategic budgeting priorities established for the previous period and projected for the next biennium.

Academic Master Plan 2000

Nine task forces consisting of ASU faculty and administrators completed this document in 2000. It identifies the University's most significant academic objectives for the years 2000 through 2005.

Campus Facilities Master Plan

ASU prepares this document every five years in accordance with the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's guidelines. This plan must include an inventory of all existing buildings, a description of existing conditions, a land-use survey (on and off campus), an academic plan, a deferred maintenance plan, and a financial plan for buildings and facilities cost estimates.

Information Technology Strategic Plan

This plan is Angelo State University's embodiment of the Statewide Information Technology Plan, which outlines technology goals for the State. Using the *Information Technology Strategic Plan*, the University develops a *Biennial Operating Plan* detailing how the plan will be carried out, including estimates for personnel, equipment, and capital expenditures. External validation is necessary for most information resource expenditures because the Legislative Budget Board must verify these expenditures' connection to the statewide plan and scrutinize the dollar estimates.

Institutional Effectiveness Plans and Reports

These plans embody each department's purpose, objectives, and assessment. The Institutional Effectiveness Oversight Committee reviews each report for appropriateness and quality of assessment. The University designed the Institutional Effectiveness process to assess administrative and academic quality at the level of individual units rather than for the University as a whole.

ASU Marketing Report

This plan, currently under development, is based on the results from a recruiting and marketing audit conducted by STAMATS Communications, Inc., in 2000. The results of the audit and the priorities determined by the marketing team will lay the groundwork for a recruitment and retention plan.

University Development and Relations Master Plan

This plan is also under development in 2001-2002. It will resemble the *Academic Master Plan 2000* but will concentrate on student support services.

Findings

The Self Study Committee on Institutional Effectiveness finds that Angelo State University is in full compliance with the standards in Section III of the *Criteria for Accreditation*. Suggestions to improve the efficiency of the process are placed at the end of this chapter.

3.1 Planning and Evaluation: Educational Programs

Institutional effectiveness is a central component of accreditation by the Commission on Colleges. The Commission expects each institution to employ a comprehensive system of planning and evaluation of all of its major aspects. Section 3.1 of the *Criteria for Accreditation* outlines the expectations for planning and assessing the effectiveness of educational programs. Table 3.1.a lists the organization of the academic departments at Angelo State University, and Table 3.1.b provides a summary of compliance with Section 3.1 of the *Criteria for Accreditation*.

Table 3.1.a

Academic Unit Organization at Angelo State University

School of Education	College of Liberal and Fine Arts	College of Business and Professional Studies	College of Sciences
Interdisciplinary Studies			
Interdisciplinary Studies (Child Development and Learning)	Art and Music	Accounting, Economics, Finance	Agriculture
Curriculum and Instruction	Communications, Journalism, Drama	Aerospace Studies	Biology
Educational Diagnostics	English	Management and Marketing (formerly Business Administration)	Chemistry and Biochemistry
Guidance and Counseling	Foreign Languages	Computer Science	Mathematics
Reading Specialist	Government	Kinesiology	Nursing
School Administration	History		Physics
	Psychology and Sociology		Physical Therapy

Table 3.1.b**Compliance with Section 3 of the *Criteria for Accreditation for 2000-2001***

Department	Number of Units*	Compliance	Noncompliance
Accounting Economics Finance	4	X	
Aerospace Studies	1	X	
Agriculture	3	X	
Art and Music	4	X	
Biology	4	X	
Chemistry and Biochemistry	2	X	
Communications Drama Journalism	6	X	
Computer Science	2	X	
Education	8	X	
English	3	X	
General Education	1	X	
Government	5	X	
History	4	X	
Interdisciplinary Studies (Graduate)	1	X	
Kinesiology	3	X	
Management and Marketing	4	X	
Mathematics	3	X	
Modern Languages	6	X	
Nursing	3	X	
Physical Therapy		Partial	
Physics	3	X	
Psychology and Sociology	4	X	

*Each academic program within a department with different expectations for students is considered a separate unit.

Overview

The Institutional Effectiveness Oversight Committee reviews each report annually and provides recommendations for improvement to the Department Heads. In addition, the Self-Study Institutional Effectiveness Committee also reviewed the process of institutional effectiveness to ensure compliance with each “must” statement in Section 3.1. The Committee concluded that all academic units were in full compliance, with the exception of Physical Therapy. The Physical Therapy program was initiated in the summer of 2000 and did not submit an Institutional Effectiveness report until the end of the 2000-2001 school year.

Some academic departments have reorganized and have added new programs to the curriculum. Some of the new units only recently began the Institutional Effectiveness process and suffer minor problems. Existing units began the Institutional Effectiveness process in 1997 with the formulation of departmental purposes and unit objectives. Units have continued to improve their reports since 1997.

Educational activities of an institution include teaching, research and public service. Planning and evaluation for these activities must be systematic, broad based, interrelated and appropriate to the institution.

The University is in compliance.

In 1997, a systematic approach to institutional effectiveness was approved and implemented for individual academic and administrative units. This process involves identification of annual objectives, assessment of objective success, and use of results for unit improvement. For the institution, a broad-based systematic system of planning and evaluation occurs through the *Agency Strategic Plan*. This broad-based approach to assessment was strengthened through the development of the *Academic Master Plan 2000*. The *Campus Facilities Master Plan* and the *Informational Technology Strategic Plan* serve as additional planning and evaluation tools that aid in the University achieving its overall commitment to education as described in the University mission statement (See Section II of this self-study report. Also at http://www.angelo.edu/publications/legal/mission_statement.htm.) These devices are interrelated in that each is directed toward Angelo State University's becoming one of the premier Master's I institutions in the Southwest. The planning and evaluation of individual academic and administrative units is linked to the overall mission of the University. Careful planning and development of each document ensures that each is appropriate to the institution. The assessment process of the institution, teaching, research, and service are described below in more detail.

General

For the University as a whole, academic planning is demonstrated through implementation of the *Academic Master Plan 2000* and the *Agency Strategic Plan*. The *Campus Facilities Master Plan*, *Information Technology Strategic Plan*, *ASU Marketing Report* (under development), and the *University Development and Relations Master Plan* (under development) serve as campus-wide administrative planning devices. The University's purpose is also outlined in the mission statement updated in 1987 and 1997. Before implementing the addition of new programs, budget increases, or construction of new facilities, ASU justifies them with one of these six planning devices. Moreover, curriculum and program changes must further the mission of the University.

Teaching

Each academic department annually develops an Institutional Effectiveness plan (purpose, objectives, means of assessment) and a report (results, use of results) for the academic programs within the department. For each program, the department develops a unit purpose linked to the University mission as well as three to five objectives directly related to the unit purpose. Annually, each objective is assessed through qualitative and quantitative means. The Institutional Effectiveness Oversight Committee reviews each plan annually. Emphasis is placed on ensuring that student performance measures like the Examination for Certification of Educators in Texas (ExCET) or the Major Field Achievement Test (MFAT), are used to assess at least one objective (*Institutional Effectiveness Checklist*). For some units, standardized examinations are not available. In lieu of a standardized exam, some departments have developed their own examination that covers the material appropriate to the academic unit. Other departments require students to complete a capstone course. These students complete work that is analyzed for adherence to departmental standards.

Several academic disciplines rely on standardized exams to assess student performance and objective outcomes. The following rely on the MFAT exam: Biology, Accounting, Economics and Finance, Management and Marketing, Chemistry, Computer Science, History, Literature, Mathematics, and Government. Disciplines that offer a specialization for secondary education rely on the ExCET exam. These include: Art, Music, Communication, Drama, Journalism, English, English as a Second Language, History, Composite Social Studies, Government, French, Spanish, German, Kinesiology, Physical Education, Biology, Life Earth Sciences, Physics, Physical Science, and Composite Science. In addition, all students seeking elementary-level teacher certification must pass the appropriate ExCET exam (*2001-2003 Bulletin*, pp. 350-351).

Departments use results from assessment for unit improvement. When departments achieve an academic objective, they must raise the standard, focus on reasons why some individuals did not meet the standard, or develop a new objective for the subsequent year. If a department does not meet an objective, it must analyze reasons for deficiencies and commit to potential improvements.

General Education, also referred to as the core curriculum, consists of courses required by all students completing an academic program at Angelo State University. Since 1997, the University has formally assessed General Education as a separate unit. Previous to that date, an ad hoc committee charged with redesigning the general education requirements assessed the Core Curriculum. This committee's efforts preceded the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's (THECB) mandated statewide core curriculum.

The original outline for institutional effectiveness called for a biennial cycle of General Education assessment. The first cycle was in 1997, prior to the development of the statewide core curriculum by the THECB. The second was in 1999, the first full year during which the mandated core was in effect.

The first cycle used a test of knowledge and skill that produced fragmentary results. The second cycle produced more robust results. This involved assessment of objectives cited by faculty teaching the core courses, the learning reported by the students, and the opinions of students and former students about the skills and knowledge acquired in the courses. The skills and knowledge of students were not directly assessed in the second cycle; instead, a structure for assessing the mandated statewide common core was established.

The first cycle used the Academic Profile from Educational Testing Services (ETS). Strenuous efforts were made to identify qualified students, invite them, and test them. Four hundred and forty students qualified (57-67 student credit hours), but only 59 students took the test. Consequently, the sample size was too small to draw any conclusive results.

The second cycle used non-intrusive measures. The Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA) course evaluation, initiated in 1999, uses faculty descriptions of course objectives as a key in evaluating what students have learned in each course. The core courses were classified into ten Local Codes for purposes of requesting group summary scores for the five areas of General Education as mandated by the THECB.

Students taking core curriculum classes fill out IDEA surveys toward the end of each semester. Their responses to questions related to the objectives of faculty for the core course are compared for consistency. Students indicated very strongly that their learning or skills had improved in the areas associated with the objectives (*Institutional Effectiveness Report for General Education*).

Since the summer of 1999, University-wide surveys of opinion are administered to alumni (three and five years post-graduation), to graduating seniors, and to students in representative classes. These surveys now include items on each of the seven core components (Communications, Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Humanities and Visual and Performing Arts, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Computer Literacy, and Physical Activity). Results from surveys are used as means of assessment for objectives for General Education and some individual units.

The Core Curriculum Committee continues to develop more accurate ways to assess student performance in general education.

Research

Research is an important component of the University's vision, according to the University's mission statement: "In order to promote strong educational opportunities, the University encourages programs of faculty research which add to the total body of knowledge, develop new and improved techniques of instruction, and maintain the competence of faculty members in their respective fields" (*2001-2003 Bulletin*, p. 45).

The Faculty Research Enhancement Grant program was established to encourage and provide support for research conducted by faculty members, with priority given to beginning researchers and projects with student involvement. Each year, between eight and twelve faculty receive funding for summer stipends and related research expenses in a competitive process directed by the Dean of the Graduate School/Director of Research. Each proposal is reviewed and ranked by a panel of nine reviewers, with the top-ranking proposals funded each year. The number of proposals funded each year depends on the ranking by the review panel and the amount of funds requested by the top-ranking proposals. At the end of the research period, each grant recipient submits a report on the outcomes of the research. These reports are on file in the Dean of the Graduate School/Director of Research's office.

Research is one of the requirements of faculty members for promotion and tenure and for post-tenure performance review (*Faculty-Staff Handbook*, IV-78). Applications for promotion and tenure outline teaching, research, and service activities of the respective faculty member. Department heads, administration, and the Committee on Tenure and Promotion assess these portfolios, thereby providing an assessment of teaching, research, and service activities of individual faculty members. In addition, department heads assess research activities yearly during faculty evaluations.

The only unit on campus designated as a research facility is the Management, Instruction, and Research (MIR) Center. This administrative unit has a recorded purpose and annually develops three to five Institutional Effectiveness objectives that directly address its research directive. These objectives are assessed annually and results are used for unit improvement. Means of assessment typically focus on the number of peer-reviewed publications, scientific presentations at local and international meetings, and other articles in local press. In addition, the MIR Center Advisory Board meets biennially to provide directives for improvement.

Since 1995, external research funding has grown from \$59,000 to over \$142,000. (See Survey of Research Expenditure reports, on file in the Fiscal Office and the Office of the Graduate Dean/Director of Research.) The coordination of all faculty research contracts and grants is the responsibility of the Dean of the Graduate School/Director of Research. The Vice President of Fiscal Affairs reviews proposals when the university will disperse research funds. As stated in the Revised *Faculty-Staff Handbook*, "It is the responsibility of the Dean of the Graduate School to review all research proposals to make certain that they are well prepared, that they conform to University policies, that they are consistent with the educational objectives of the University, and that the budget and related fiscal provisions of the proposals are accurate" (IV-48). Most agencies sponsoring research grants require a final narrative and expenditures report on the grant at the conclusion of the project. The Revised *Faculty-Staff Handbook* states, "It shall be the responsibility of the principal investigator to submit the final narrative and expenditures report to the Dean of the Graduate School and the Business Manager for review and approval before it is sent to the sponsoring agency") IV-50). Thus, external grants are reviewed internally before and after funding, as well as receiving peer review from the granting agency.

The Director of Institutional Planning, Research and Assessment conducts institutional research under the direction of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Section 3.3 of this *Report* addresses the University's compliance with “must” statements regarding Institutional Research.

Service

Several academic units participate in different aspects of service, including youth education, educational programs, and seminars for the public. In many cases, the service role of individual academic units is secondary, with primary responsibility held by academic deans, ad hoc committees, Vice Presidents, or other administrative units (e.g., Small Business Development Center, Guest Lectureships arranged by Academic Deans). In several other cases, service activities are the result of individual faculty and staff members. These are assessed through faculty/staff evaluations and through the tenure and promotion procedures.

Units with an emphasis on service are formally assessed each year through submission of Institutional Effectiveness Plans and Reports. These include the MIR Center, Educational Opportunity Services, Small Business Development Center, Continuing Education, and University Center (Table 3). In addition, other service activities including the Up and Coming Scholars Program and Lectureships undergo formal assessment. The Office of the President assesses the Up and Coming Scholars Program. The Dean of Sciences assesses the success of the Roy E. Moon Lectureship while the Dean of Business and Professional Studies assesses the Wells Fargo Distinguished Lectureship in Business. The Ralph Chase Humanities Lectureship is assessed by a committee of faculty and community members.

Other service activities are informally assessed because the subject matter and schedule varies annually (e.g., Arts at ASU, Foreign Language Festival, Drama Events). Assessment of these activities typically involves review of records of attendance and post priori committee meetings.

Other service activities are assessed formally through other means. The Natural Histories Collection in the Biology Department is assessed both formally and informally. The mammal collection is accredited by the American Society of Mammalogists. Other animal collections are assessed informally through review of programs and attendance. The Medical Lecture Series, presented by the Physical Therapy Department, conducts evaluations of each speaker and keeps records of speaker assessment. Other outreach programs are discussed more fully in Section 4.6 of this self-study report.

The following table lists the major service activities of the University. It is by no means an exhaustive list and does not include such communal volunteer service activities as Christmas in April or participation in State Employee Charitable Campaign (United Way).

Table 3. 1.c

Major Service Activities at Angelo State University

Academic Community Services	Formal Assessment	Informal Assessment	Department/Unit in Charge
Wells Fargo Distinguished Lectureship in Business	X		College of Business and Professional Studies
Roy E. Moon Lectureship	X		College of Sciences
Ralph Chase Lectureship		X	Community Committee
Medical Lecture Series	X		Department of Physical Therapy
Arts at ASU		X	Department of Art and Music; Department of Communications, Drama, and Journalism
Music Recitals	X		
Art Exhibits	X		
Drama Events		X	
Ceramic Symposium		X	College of Liberal and Fine Arts
Small Business Development Center Lectures	X		SBDC
International Trade Office	X		SBDC
University Symposium	X		University Center
Writers' Conference		X	Department of English
Foreign Languages Festival		X	Department of Modern Languages
Summer Band Camp		X	Department of Art and Music, University Center
Summer Livestock Judging Clinic		X	Department of Agriculture
Field Tours and Field Days for Livestock Producers	X		Management, Instruction, and Research Center
ASU Planetarium Programs		X	Department of Physics
Natural Histories Collection	X	X	Department of Biology
Up and Coming Scholars Program	X		President's Office
Mother-Daughter Program	X		Educational Opportunity Services

Most faculty members are involved in service activities for the institution (committee membership) and in public service. Department heads assess individual service activities through review of faculty activities and credentials during applications for promotion and tenure. The *Faculty-Staff Handbook* (IV-6-20) also outlines service expectations for all faculty members.

The institution must define its expected educational results and describe its methods for analyzing the results.

The University is in compliance.

The University outlines its expected institutional goals in the *Agency Strategic Plan*, the *Academic Master Plan 2000*, and in individual academic units' Institutional Effectiveness plans and reports. The *Agency Strategic Plan*, *Master Plan 2000*, and Institutional Effectiveness reports each describe the methods of assessment and expected outcomes. The *Agency Strategic Plan* relies on expected outcomes while Institutional Effectiveness reports rely on benchmarks of excellence or nationally normed tests of student achievement.

The institution must establish a clearly defined purpose appropriate to collegiate education.

The University is in compliance.

Angelo State University has a comprehensive mission statement that is reviewed and revised periodically. The last revision, with approval from the Board of Regents, The Texas State University System, occurred in 1997, with the THECB granting final approval in January, 2001. The mission statement includes all administrative, academic, research, and service aspects of the University (see Section II for a detailed review of the mission statement). Future review of the mission statement will occur every two years prior to publication of the University's *Bulletin*.

The mission statement outlines the purposes of academic programs with the following statements:

The University, through its programs, seeks:

- to provide students with a basis for making sound decisions and mature judgments which depend upon an understanding of the social, scientific, literary, artistic, political, and philosophic traditions of many cultures;
- to help each student reach maximum capability with respect to communications, effective reasoning, and analytical thinking, and to provide standards of physical and intellectual discipline which lead to optimal personal development and useful, responsible citizenship;
- to educate students for living and working in a competitive global society;
- to prepare interested, qualified students for graduate study and for scholarly occupations;

- to provide selected professional programs which supplement students' general education and enable them to become competent in fields requiring specialized training;
- to conduct research with the intention of engaging the student in independent study.

The purpose of the Graduate School is to provide advanced, specialized training which will strengthen the academic and professional competence of the students. The graduate programs are designed to develop students' capacities for independent study, to train students in the techniques of research, and to acquaint them with research in their fields of study.

Each academic unit has a departmental purpose that is linked directly to the mission statement (See Section II, Appendix A, *Institutional Effectiveness Integration 2000-2001 Reports*). Unit faculty, staff, and administrative personnel develop the departmental purpose and the objectives. Assessment of unit objectives occurs annually.

The institution must formulate educational goals consistent with the institution's purpose.

The University is in compliance.

Academic goals for the University are outlined in the *Agency Strategic Plan* and the *Academic Master Plan 2000*. Goals listed in the *Agency Strategic Plan* are based on a two-year cycle, and those in the *Academic Master Plan 2000* are longer-term goals for program, faculty, and facility development. Goals for the institution and for individual units must relate directly to the mission statement.

General Education's objectives are formulated and assessed biennially. In addition, each academic unit develops three to five objectives annually, and these are assessed through both student opinion and performance. Objectives are developed from the departmental purpose that is linked to the mission statement. The Institutional Effectiveness Oversight Committee reviews purpose statements and unit objectives for linkage to the mission statement. The Committee also determines if the methods of assessment appropriately evaluate the success of the objective.

The institution must develop and implement procedures to evaluate the extent to which these educational goals are being achieved.

The University is in compliance.

In 1997, ASU established a comprehensive system of review of academic units' purpose, objectives, means of assessment, results, and uses of the results. This process requires academic department heads to submit Institutional Effectiveness plans and reports to the Coordinator of Institutional Effectiveness for review by the Institutional Effectiveness Oversight Committee. These procedures

are described in the revised *Faculty-Staff Handbook* (III-61) and on the web at http://www.angelo.edu/publications/institutional_effectiveness. The Committee reviews each report and makes recommendations for improvement. These recommendations are recorded and returned to the academic departments. If substantial problems occur, the Coordinator of Institutional Effectiveness works with unit leaders to facilitate corrections on the report. Other recommendations are used to improve the following year's report.

The Institutional Effectiveness Oversight Committee reports its findings to the President of the University through an annual report submitted by the Coordinator of Institutional Effectiveness. The report notes any academic units with significant problems or academic units not in compliance. The President fully supports this process and is instrumental in encouraging compliance.

The institution must use the results of these evaluations to improve educational programs, services and operations.

The University is in compliance.

During the process of review of Institutional Effectiveness reports, the Committee reviews use of results and recommends changes to improve academic quality. In the past, some academic units reported "no action necessary" when an objective was achieved at a satisfactory level. This response is no longer acceptable. If the objective was met with no room for further improvement, the academic unit develops a new objective for the following year. Department heads may periodically review achieved objectives to determine if the unit is still meeting its goals.

Success of an objective is often reported as a percent of students achieving the desired result. Rarely do 100% of the students reach the objective. Thus, the Committee may recommend that academic units investigate why all students are not achieving the goal.

Assessment of academic goals must focus on student performance and educational quality. This process typically leads to changes in academic programs and curriculum, but occasionally recommendations are made to change other aspects of student services or operations to facilitate unit improvement. The University handles these changes separately through administrative channels. Section 3.2 discusses other aspects of services and operations.

The institution must develop guidelines and procedures to evaluate educational effectiveness, including the quality of student learning and of research and service.

The University is in compliance.

The Policy and Procedures Guide for Institutional Effectiveness, developed in 1998, outlines the guidelines for developing and submitting Institutional Effectiveness plans and reports. This guide

applies to educational-, research-, and service-oriented units. In addition, an electronic means of reporting institutional effectiveness was developed in 1998. The system allows all unit leaders to use a University web site (<http://cheetah.angelo.edu/assess/>) to enter and submit Institutional Effectiveness plans and reports.

The policy and procedures require academic units to rely on student performance (ExCET, MFAT, other comprehensive exams) for assessment. Research and service units must identify standards of quality (i.e., benchmarks) or use industry standards to assess research and service quality.

This evaluation must encompass educational goals at all academic levels and research and service functions of the institution.

The University is in compliance.

All departments submit Institutional Effectiveness plans and reports. The number submitted by a department depends on the number of academic programs within the department. Usually, departments produce separate reports for undergraduate and graduate programs because objectives for each differ. In some cases, one Institutional Effectiveness report may represent two or more degree programs within the same department if each relies on the same objectives.

The remaining academic levels including academic deans, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the President of Angelo State University who also submit Institutional Effectiveness plans and reports (the Vice Presidents' differ slightly in form). In addition, student support services and other administrative units (service and research) also submit reports annually. The Institutional Effectiveness Oversight Committee reviews all these plans and reports and returns them with suggestions for improvement. Section 3.2 of this document discusses assessment of research and service in more detail.

Each academic unit must have a purpose statement and three to five objective statements addressing quality of education. These are assessed both quantitatively and qualitatively, but at least one means of assessment must rely on student performance.

Research is assessed through submission of an Institutional Effectiveness report for the MIR Center. The Director of Institutional Planning, Research and Assessment submits an Institutional Effectiveness report for the Office of Institutional Planning, Research, and Assessment.

The University assesses public service through Institutional Effectiveness reports on the MIR Center, Small Business Development Center, Continuing Education, Educational Opportunity Services, and the University Center.

In a separate procedure, each academic and administrative department head submits a list of goals to the appropriate vice president at the beginning of the academic year. At the end of the year, the head submits a report on the status of goals. The goal statements of the vice presidents, which usually incorporate the goals of their departments, are used as their Institutional Effectiveness reports.

The institution must evaluate its success with respect to student achievement in relation to purpose, including as appropriate, consideration of course completion, state licensing examinations, and job placement rates.

The University is in compliance.

The Director of Institutional Planning, Research and Assessment (IPRA) annually compiles completion and graduation rates, and the administration reviews them. The University reports semester credit hours completed to the Legislative Budget Board after each semester. Alumni surveys also request information on employment rates and if employment was acquired in a timely manner. (Several academic units rely on this information as a means of assessing unit objectives.)

Some academic units produce graduates who seek state licensing. Graduates of the LVN and RN programs in Nursing must pass a professional examination before licensure as a nurse (*2001-2003 Bulletin*, p. 326). Passage rates on State exams in Nursing are used to assess the Nursing department, and this information is also used for external accreditation of the LVN, RN, BSN, and MSN programs. In addition, some graduates in Accounting take the examination to become Certified Public Accountants. These results from this examination are also used in assessing the Accounting program. Education majors must pass State ExCETs before receiving certification; this data is used for assessing units in the School of Education (*2001-2003 Bulletin*, p. 351). In the future, graduates of the Physical Therapy program will take a certification examination, and these results will serve as means of assessment for the Physical Therapy Department.

3.2 Planning and Evaluation: Administrative Programs

The University applies its expectations for institutional effectiveness to administrative programs, as outlined in Section 3.2 of the *Criteria for Accreditation*. Table 3.2.a lists the organization of the administrative units at Angelo State University. Table 3.2.b provides a summary of compliance with Section 3.2 of the *Criteria for Accreditation* for the 2000-2001 year.

Table 3.2.a

**Organization of Administrative Assessment Units at Angelo State University
2000-2001**

President	Vice President Academic Affairs	Vice President University Relations and Development	Vice President Fiscal Affairs
President's Office	Admissions and Retention	Alumni Relations	Accounting
Carr Foundation	Critical Thinking	Center for Career Development	Business Manager
Internal Auditor	Dean of Education	Counseling	Inventory
Sports Information	Dean of Liberal and Fine Arts	Dean of Student Life	Personnel
University News and Information	Dean of Business and Professional Studies	Development	Physical Plant
Vice President for Academic Affairs	Dean of Sciences	Health Clinic	Purchasing
Vice President for Fiscal Affairs	Dean of Graduate School	Intercollegiate Athletics	Post Office
Vice President for University Relations and Development	Continuing Studies	Financial Aid and Carr Scholarship Program	Print Shop
West Texas Training Center	Educational Opportunity Services	Residence Life	
Institutional Effectiveness	Information Technology	Risk Management	
	International Studies	University Center/Food Service	
	Institutional Planning, Research and Assessment	University Center Program Office	
	Library	University Police	
	Management, Instruction and Research Center		
	Registrar		
	Small Business Development Center		

Table 3.2.b: Compliance with Section III of the *Criteria for Accreditation*

Unit	Compliance	Partial	Noncompliance
Accounting (Business Services)	X		
Admissions	X		
Alumni Affairs	X		
Business Manager	X		
Carr Foundation		X	
Career Services	X		
Critical Thinking (new program)	X		
Dean of Student Life including Health Clinic	X		
Dean of College of Liberal and Fine Arts	X		
Dean of Professional Studies	X		
Dean of Sciences	X		
Dean of Graduate School	X		
Development	X		
Division of Continuing Studies	X		
Educational Opportunity Services	X		
Financial Aid Carr Scholarship Office	X		
Institutional Effectiveness	X		
Institutional Planning, Research, and Assessment	X		
Intercollegiate Athletics	X		
International Studies (new program)		X	
Internal Auditor	X		
Intramural Sports (new program)	X		
Inventory	X		
Library	X		
Management, Instruction, and Research Center	X		
Personnel	X		
Physical Plant	X		
Post Office	X		
President	X		
Purchasing	X		
Registrar	X		
Residence Life	X		
Risk Management	X		
Small Business Development Center	X		
Sports Information	X		
Telecommunications and Information Technology	X		
University Center and Food Service	X		
University Center Program Office	X		
University Counseling	X		
University News and Information Service	X		
University Police	X		
Vice President for Academic Affairs	X		
Vice President for Fiscal Affairs	X		
Vice President for University Relations Development	X		
West Texas Training Center	X		

Overview

Listed below is the synopsis of the University's compliance with the "must" statements found in Section 3.2 of the *Criteria for Accreditation*. The "must" statements from the *Criteria* ask for compliance of individual administrative units. Accordingly, the Committee reviewed each unit's overall compliance with each "must" statement. All units were in compliance with the "must" statements in Section 3.2 according to the 2000-2001 reports.

In addition to providing evidence of planning and evaluation in its educational program, the institution must demonstrate planning and evaluation in its administrative and educational support services.

The University is in compliance.

University-wide planning is demonstrated through implementation of the *Academic Master Plan 2000* and the *Agency Strategic Plan*. ASU carries out administrative planning through the *Campus Facilities Master Plan* and the *Information Technology Strategic Plan*. In addition, the *ASU Marketing Report* and the *University Development and Relations Master Plan* are under development.

The University justifies the addition of any new program, increase in budget, or construction of a new facility with one of the six planning devices prior to implementation. Changes to the University are compared to the mission statement for compliance by the President's cabinet.

The mission statement, last updated in 1997, outlines the University's purpose. In addition, each administrative unit, including vice presidents, deans, and each of the academic support units, must develop a purpose linked to the University mission as well as three to five objectives directly related to each unit's purpose. Annually, ASU assesses each objective through qualitative and quantitative means and uses these results for unit improvement.

For each administrative and educational support service unit, the institution must establish a clearly defined purpose which supports the institution's purpose and goals.

The University is in compliance.

The University's mission statement describes the specific purposes of administrative units through the following statements:

- Students are offered encouragement in their university lives through a variety of support services, such as financial aid, residence life, social, career development and counseling.

- Cultural and athletic programs supplement academic programs to increase students' awareness of healthy and complete lifestyles.
- Access to the University's physical and intellectual resources is provided to students of varying capabilities.
- Alumni are encouraged to maintain contact.
- Long-range planning, evaluation, and program assessment are part of the decision-making process at all levels.
- The University's commitment to improving quality extends to its administrative services and provides support to maintain infrastructure, expand information resources, develop technological equipment and programs for academic and administrative improvement, ensure fiscal responsibility and promote public safety and institutional advancement.
- Recognizing its responsibility to the community, the University offers many cultural opportunities and business, health, educational, and volunteer services to the region.

All administrative and educational support services have reported purpose statements since 1997. These services modify unit purpose statements periodically to reflect changes in unit structure, orientation, or objectives. Irrespective of changes of purpose statements, the purpose of each unit must remain linked to the University purpose as outlined in the mission statement.

For each administrative and educational support service unit, the institution must formulate goals which support the purpose of each unit.

The University is in compliance.

The University mission statement includes all aspects of the University. Each administrative and educational support service must identify the portion of the mission statement that describes its role in the overall purpose of the University. Unit purpose statements are developed from the University mission, and each unit develops three to five objectives related to its departmental purpose. Some objectives have changed from time to time as individual units accomplished goals or reached benchmarks.

For each administrative and educational support service unit, the institution must develop and implement procedures to evaluate the extent to which these goals are being achieved in each unit.

The University is in compliance.

All administrative and educational support services must follow the procedures for Institutional Effectiveness. The Institutional Effectiveness Oversight Committee reports whether each administrative and educational support services unit adequately assessed its respective objectives. Any suggestions made by the Institutional Effectiveness Oversight Committee are reported to the unit for incorporation during the following year. These problems are also reported to the University President in the Annual Report on Institutional Effectiveness, and to the Vice-Presidents by means of a performance history chart for their divisions.

The institution also carries out other periodic assessments. For example, the Internal Auditor completes a financial self-assessment for individual administrative units. The institution is also held to the National Association of College and University Business Offices (NACUBO) Standard. Administrative units are also assessed through the *Agency Strategic Plan*.

For each administrative and educational support service unit, the institution must use the results of the evaluations to improve administrative and educational support services.

The University is in compliance.

In early plans, units often reported “no action necessary” when the objective was reached. The Institutional Effectiveness Oversight Committee directed all units to (a) raise the objective standard if the objective was achieved, (b) replace the achieved objective with a new objective the following year and assess the achieved objective again in three to five years, or (c) focus on any remaining deficiency related to the objective.

When a unit does not reach an objective, the unit initiates actions to correct the problem. For instance, the Purchasing Agent discovered that several employees of Angelo State University did not understand procedures for purchasing using Historically Underutilized Businesses (HUB). In response, the Purchasing Agent held training sessions to discuss the importance of this action and to explain the procedures for submitting requisitions.

Each unit, in its planning and evaluation processes, should consider internal and external factors and develop evaluation methods which will yield information useful to the planning processes of that unit.

Most administrative and educational support services identify benchmarks (e.g., acceptable levels as determined by the unit) to evaluate their success at achieving a specific objective. For most units, few external factors are available for comparison. The Coordinator of Institutional Effectiveness and the Director of Institutional Planning, Research and Assessment assist units to identify external benchmarks. When applicable, units use industry or business standards as benchmarks for assessment.

3.3 Planning and Evaluation: Institutional Research

Overview

The Self-Study Institutional Effectiveness Committee concludes that the University is in compliance with the “must” statements found in Section 3.3 of the *Criteria for Accreditation*.

Institutional research must be an integral part of the institution’s planning and evaluation process.

The University is in compliance.

The University’s mission statement describes the role of Institutional Planning, Research, and Assessment in the administrative decision-making process through the following statement: “Long-range planning, evaluation, and program assessment are part of the decision-making process at all levels” (2001-2003 *Bulletin*, p. 45).

The Office of Institutional Planning, Research, and Assessment compiles data and develops statistical analyses used by a variety of administrative and academic units to assess unit effectiveness, develops demographic trends of students, and assesses overall educational quality. The office also files numerous reports to the Legislative Budget Board, and to the U.S. Department of Education.

The Director of Institutional Planning, Research and Assessment is a member of the Administrative Council, which serves as the decision-making council for ASU. The Director of Institutional Planning, Research and Assessment works directly with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President of the University to develop educational programs and opportunities for the institution. The Director’s main role is to provide useful, well-analyzed data for decision-making processes.

The Director of Institutional Planning, Research and Assessment is also an ex officio member on the Institutional Effectiveness Oversight Committee, the Teacher Education Council, and the University Technology Committee.

The Director of Institutional Planning, Research and Assessment is also an ex officio member of the Self-Study Steering Committee.

It must be effective in collecting and analyzing data and disseminating results.

The University is in compliance.

Administrative, faculty, and staff surveys reported favorably that the Office of Institutional Planning, Research, and Assessment was effective in collecting and analyzing data and disseminating results (*Institutional Effectiveness Report for Institutional Planning, Research, and Assessment*).

One of the responsibilities of the Office of Institutional Planning, Research, and Assessment is to ensure the accuracy of data in various University reports, both external and internal. It should be conceded, however, that this office has not always been the sole source of data. Thus, it is possible to find several different numerical descriptions of students, faculty, full-time teaching equivalents, and other important categories. Correcting this weakness would involve obtaining data from a source ultimately controlled by the Institutional Planning, Research, and Assessment Director.

An institution must regularly evaluate the effectiveness of its institutional research process and use its findings for the improvement of its process.

The University is in compliance.

The Director of Institutional Planning, Research and Assessment develops goals each year that originate from the Office of IPRA's purpose statement. These goals are self-assessed annually, and the results are used for improvement. The report is submitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs to solicit suggestions for improvement. The Director of Institutional Planning, Research and Assessment also submits an Institutional Effectiveness report each year. This report is held to the same expectations (three to five objectives, assessment of objectives, and use of results for unit improvement) as other administrative reports.

The institutional research process . . . should include the following activities: ongoing timely data collection, analysis and dissemination; use of external studies and reports; design and implementation of internal studies related to students, personnel, facilities, equipment, programs, services and fiscal resources; development of data bases suitable for longitudinal studies and statistical analyses; and related activities in support of planning, evaluation and management.

The statement above describes the annual duties of the Office of Institutional Planning, Research, and Assessment. Recent surveys of faculty, staff, and administrators reported a favorable opinion of the performance of the Institutional Planning, Research, and Assessment Office (*Institutional Effectiveness Report for Institutional Planning, Research, and Assessment*).

Institutions must assign administrative responsibility for conducting institutional research, allocate adequate resources, and allow access to relevant information.

The University is in compliance.

The Director of Institutional Planning, Research and Assessment and the office staff have the full-time responsibility of conducting institutional research. The office has an annual budget of \$69,000. The office consists of the director, a full-time secretary, and one part-time student employee. The office staff maintains numerous databases and uses statistical software to prepare documents for administrative and academic services. Each dataset and analysis is available for viewing in the Office of Institutional Planning, Research, and Assessment. Many items, including survey summaries, are dispersed across campus for use by administrative, faculty, and staff. Some items, including databases, are also maintained in an electronic format on the Angelo State University mainframe.

Strengths

1. The infrastructure of reporting, reviewing, and revising institutional effectiveness is well designed and effective.
2. The automated system of filing plans and reports continues to serve the University well.
3. The procedures for reporting institutional effectiveness are a direct reflection of the compliance statements in Section III of *The Criteria for Accreditation*.
4. The University assesses education, research, and service annually, and uses this assessment for unit improvement in compliance with the imperatives for accreditation.

Weaknesses

1. Some annual service activities are not formally assessed.
2. Some administrative units lack an external benchmark for verification of success.
3. Some academic units do not have a standardized exam for objective assessment.
4. New programs do not always submit Institutional Effectiveness plans and reports in a timely manner.
5. The Office of Institutional Planning, Research, and Assessment is not the ultimate source of Institutional Data, and discrepancies exist. The University has started to address this problem.

Recommendations

The Committee has no recommendations.

Suggestions

1. The Self-Study Steering Committee suggests that new programs may need assistance in developing institutional effectiveness plans and reports in minimal time. The Coordinator of Institutional Effectiveness, the Director of Institutional Planning, Research and Assessment, and the Institutional Effectiveness Advisory Committee should continue to work closely to assist administrative and academic units in identifying appropriate means of assessment to

measure the success of unit objectives. This may involve additional assistance with identifying external benchmarks.

2. Service components that do not occur annually or that change in scope and focus annually may not require formal assessment. However, the Steering Committee suggests that service activities that occur each year be included in some unit's institutional effectiveness plans and reports.
3. The Steering Committee suggests that the Institutional Planning, Research, and Assessment Office be assigned ultimate responsibility for validating and providing University data.

Section 3.1: Planning and Evaluation: Educational Program Compliance Grid

Must Statement.	Compliance Status	Documentation
<p><i>Educational activities of an institution include teaching, research and public service. Planning and evaluation for these activities must be systematic, broad based, interrelated and</i></p>	<p>In Compliance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Agency Strategic Plan</i> • <i>Academic Master Plan 2000</i> • <i>Campus Facilities Master Plan</i> • <u>Information Technology Strategic Plan</u> • <i>University Development and Relations Master Plan(2000-2001)</i> • <i>ASU Marketing Report</i> • Teaching: Institutional Effectiveness Reports for all Academic units • Research: Institutional Effectiveness Report for MIR Center • Service: Institutional Effectiveness Plans for MIR Center, SBDC, University Center, EOS, Continuing Education
<p><i>The institution must establish a clearly defined purpose appropriate to collegiate education.</i></p>	<p>In Compliance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Mission Statement</u>
<p><i>The institution must formulate educational goals consistent with the institution's purpose.</i></p>	<p>In Compliance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Agency Strategic Plan</i> • <u>Institutional Effectiveness Reports for academic units</u>
<p><i>The institution must develop and implement procedures to evaluate the extent to which these educational goals are being achieved.</i></p>	<p>In Compliance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Agency Strategic Plan</i> • <u>Institutional Effectiveness Reports for academic units</u> • <i>Financial Self-Assessment</i> • <i>Program Accrediting Agencies</i>
<p><i>The institution must use the results of these evaluations to improve educational programs, services and operations.</i></p>	<p>In Compliance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Agency Strategic Plan</i> • <u>Institutional Effectiveness Reports academic units</u> • <i>Academic Master Plan 2000</i>
<p><i>The institution must develop guidelines and procedures to evaluate educational effectiveness, including the quality of student learning and of research and service.</i></p>	<p>In Compliance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Policy and Procedures Guide for Institutional Effectiveness</u> • <u>Faculty Staff Handbook</u> • <i>ExCET Exams</i> • <i>MFAT Exams</i>
<p><i>This evaluation must encompass educational goals at all academic levels and research and service functions of the institution.</i></p>	<p>In Compliance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Institutional Effectiveness Reports</u>

Must Statement.	Compliance Status	Documentation
<p><i>The institution must evaluate its success with respect to student achievement in relation to purpose, including as appropriate, consideration of course completion, state licensing examinations, and job placement rates.</i></p>	<p>In Compliance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional Effective Reports • ExCET Exams • Board Certification Exams • MFAT Exams • Alumni Surveys

**Section 3.2: Planning and Evaluation: Administrative and Educational Support Services
Compliance Grid**

Must Statement	Compliance Status	Documentation
<i>In addition to providing evidence of planning and evaluation in its educational program, the institution must demonstrate planning and evaluation in its administrative and educational support services.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency Strategic Plan • Academic Master Plan 2000 • Campus Facilities Master Plan • Information Technology Strategic Plan • University Development and Relations Master Plan (2000-2001) • ASU Marketing Report (under development) • Institutional Effectiveness reports for administrative units
<i>For each administrative and educational support service unit, the institution must establish a clearly defined purpose which supports the institution's purpose and goals.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission Statement • Institutional Effectiveness reports for administrative units
<i>For each administrative and educational support service unit, the institution must formulate goals which support the purpose of each unit.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional Effectiveness reports for administrative units
<i>For each administrative and educational support service unit, the institution must develop and implement procedures to evaluate the extent to which these goals are being achieved in each unit.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency Strategic Plan • Institutional Effectiveness reports for administrative units • Financial Self-Assessment • Program Accrediting Agencies
<i>For each administrative and educational support service unit, the institution must use the results of the evaluations to improve administrative and educational support services.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional Effectiveness reports for administrative units • Agency Strategic Plan • Academic Master Plan 2000

Section 3.3: Institutional Research Compliance Grid

Must Statement	Compliance Status	Documentation
<i>Institutional research must be an integral part of the institution's planning and evaluation process.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASU Organization Chart • <i>Academic Master Plan 2000</i>
<i>It must be effective in collecting and analyzing data and disseminating results.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional Effectiveness report for Institutional Planning, Research, and Assessment • <i>Summary of Institutional Data</i>
<i>An institution must regularly evaluate the effectiveness of its institutional research process and use its findings for the improvement of its process.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Agency Strategic Plan</i> • <i>Academic Master Plan 2000</i> • Institutional Effectiveness report for Institutional Planning, Research, and Assessment
<i>Institutions must assign administrative responsibility for conducting institutional research, allocate adequate resources, and allow access to relevant information.</i>	In Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director of Institutional Planning, Research and Assessment is member of Self-Study Task Force, Committee for Institutional Effectiveness, and Administrative Council