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**Background**

Staff in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Assessment developed the Institutional Effectiveness Resource Manual (“the Manual”) through broad consultation with the Chancellor, vice chancellors, deans, department chairs, and faculty from the schools of Math Science & Technology, Business & Economics, Education & Psychology, and Arts & Humanities. The overall goal of the Manual is to guide and enable a strong, integrated, campus-wide effectiveness and assessment process that adds to quality of teaching, learning, and institutional effectiveness. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Assessment intends for the Manual to help faculty, department chairs, deans, academic administrators, and administrative unit directors to develop, hone, and use effectiveness and assessment plans at every level within ECSU. Furthermore, this Manual will assist those responsible for assessment in developing their annual assessment reports.

ECSU School of Education and Psychology assessment methods and instrumentation served as benchmarks for establishing the academic portion of this plan. From their general assessment processes, The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Assessment developed a standard operating procedure (SOP) that guides the assessment process for all schools and departments. Just as programmatic goals differ across the university, the specific plans for each unit within the University will differ somewhat, while retaining the overall structure presented in the Manual. The Manual also provides a list of steps for developing a unit assessment plan.

The Manual serves as an update to the *Policies and Procedures Manual for Institutional Effectiveness*. The final draft of this manual was approved by the University Administrative Council in their March 2010 meeting. Questions about the Manual should be directed to Dr. Damon R. Wade, Director of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Assessment; (252) 335-3036, phone; drwade@mail.ecsu.edu, e-mail. Electronic copies of the Manual are available on the ECSU website, [http://www.ecsu.edu/academics/offices/iera/docs/InstitutionalEffectivenessResourceManual.pdf](http://www.ecsu.edu/academics/offices/iera/docs/InstitutionalEffectivenessResourceManual.pdf)
SECTION I: Introduction

Institutional Effectiveness (IE) at Elizabeth City State University (ECSU) has five key elements:
(a) Executing a clearly defined mission statement and vision statement;
(b) Developing educational and administrative goals and outcomes consistent with the mission of the institution;
(c) Implementing institution-wide planning and assessment of those goals and outcomes;
(d) Implementing institution-wide planning and budgeting; and
(e) Using the results of evaluations to improve programs and services.

ECSU’s institutional effectiveness process integrates the institutional mission with planning and assessment, and with planning and budgeting cycles (Appendix B & C). A primary purpose of ECSU’s IE process is to assure that plans are developed based on institutional goals consistent with the institution’s mission, as well as an annual systematic process of planning and evaluation that guides decision making. An additional goal of the IE process is to assure that the planning and budget development process incorporates evidence cited in the annual assessment reports. The diagram below illustrates the main goal of the Institutional Effectiveness Model (IEM): Institutional Effectiveness is guided by a focus on ECSU’s mission, the development and refinement of goals and outcomes, an ongoing cycle of planning and assessment, planning and budgeting, and use of results for continuous improvement.

Institutional Effectiveness Model

The University Administrative Council reviews these five elements periodically and modifies them as necessary. Once the goals have been established, ECSU measures and evaluates the level to which it meets goals regarding student learning outcomes, administrative and educational support services, research, and community and public service relevant to the mission.
The university demonstrates its use of planning and assessment processes in its daily operations and through such long term planning documents as its 1999-2004 Strategic Plan and the 2004-2009 Strategic Plan, as well as the 2009-2014 Strategic Plan. In addition, various external groups influence ECSU’s overall planning and assessment activities. These groups include the North Carolina legislature, the University of North Carolina-General Administration, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), federal agencies, and other organizations and accrediting bodies. The planning and assessment process establishes an internal system through which institutional self-examination becomes a continuous process rather than a periodic event. Self-examination documents institutional effectiveness at all levels of the academic and non-academic enterprise; focuses on areas that extend beyond institutional resources and processes; and generates findings for institutional improvement.

As envisioned by SACS Core Requirement 2.5 Institutional Effectiveness,

The institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes; result in continuing improvement in institutional quality; and demonstrate the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission.

ECSU Mission

Elizabeth City State University, a constituent institution of the University of North Carolina, offers baccalaureate, graduate, and professional programs for a diverse student body. The institution’s rich heritage provides a firm foundation for its educational endeavors, as well as its role in serving the needs and aspirations of individuals and society.

Through teaching, research, and community engagement, Elizabeth City State University provides a student-centered environment, delivered in a manner that enhances student learning, while preparing its graduates for leadership roles and lifelong learning. The University is also a leader in facilitating sustainable economic growth, while safeguarding the unique culture and natural resources of the region.

Approved: Board of Governors for the University of North Carolina, November 2009

Vision Statement

ECSU will be the premier public institution serving northeastern North Carolina, providing affordable academic programs and services of exceptional caliber in a nurturing environment. The university will attract and retain a diverse and highly qualified faculty that will educate and lead our students to become productive members of a global and increasingly interdependent society. ECSU will continue to be a leading partner in enhancing educational and cultural opportunities and improving the economic strength of the region.
Institutional Goals

According to the 2009-2014 Strategic Plan, the goals of the university are as follows:

1. **Global Readiness:** ECSU will offer high-quality degree programs in a student-centered environment and will deliver them in a manner that enhances student learning and prepares graduates to be globally competitive leaders in the 21st century.

2. **Higher Education Access:** ECSU will, through its outreach programs and retention efforts, provide access to higher education for all citizens of North Carolina. ECSU recognizes that learning is a life-long process and thus provides opportunities for developing more joint and shared degree programs while making education more accessible and affordable.

3. **Public Education:** ECSU will remain actively engaged in supporting the 21 county school systems of northeastern North Carolina through initiatives and programs to improve classroom instruction, curriculum development, and K-12 professional development.

4. **Our Communities and Their Economic Transformation:** ECSU will foster collaborative relationships with regional partners to facilitate sustainable economic growth in the region.

5. **Our Environment:** ECSU will be proactive in collaborating with its community partners to improve the quality of life for current and future generations in northeastern North Carolina by addressing climate change, sea-level rise, and other environmental issues critical to the region.

6. **Our University’s Outreach and Engagement:** ECSU will integrate outreach and engagement into its academic and support services to enrich the students, faculty, staff, and citizens of northeastern North Carolina.

7. **Our Health:** ECSU will work to reduce disparities in health by strengthening the health services and available resources for citizens in northeastern North Carolina.

8. **Our Diversity:** ECSU will be committed to creating diversity in all aspects of University life.

9. **Our Graduates:** ECSU will produce graduates that are prepared for leadership roles and lifelong learning in a global society.
The strategic plan for 2009-2014 further identifies objectives that each division is to meet with respect to each of the goals relevant to that division. The plan includes targets for evaluating those elements regularly. Recognizing the need to ensure continuous improvement, the current plan feeds into the Institutional Effectiveness report. While creating a large amount of annual data, these data provide useful information to evaluate changes and to ensure that necessary changes are not forgotten between assessment cycles. This additional accountability helps the University to strive to meet its goals and objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Goal 1</th>
<th>Goal 2</th>
<th>Goal 3</th>
<th>Goal 4</th>
<th>Goal 5</th>
<th>Goal 6</th>
<th>Goal 7</th>
<th>Goal 8</th>
<th>Goal 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION II: Executing the Mission

The university executes its strategic plan using a coherent process. While the mission statement, vision, and goals are set from the top down and different units oversee various elements of the mission, the execution filters up from the lowest levels of the organization. As noted in the prior section, the strategic plan of the University identifies the goals to be fulfilled by each division of the institution. It further identifies objectives to be met by each of those divisions. Each division and unit within ECSU creates its mission statement and goals in line with its charge. That charge is based on the goals and objectives of the larger division to which the unit belongs. A unit’s mission statement must reflect the unit’s role in achieving the university’s overall mission statement. The divisions and units use their mission statements to identify specific university goals.

As ECSU’s mission changes, the units are expected to update their mission statements to reflect the role that each plays in achieving the university mission. Members of the Institutional Effectiveness Planning Council (IEPC) evaluate the mission statements annually to ensure compliance with university goals.

The divisions within the institution set the goals and objectives that they need to meet in order to achieve the institution’s goals. Those goals and objectives, in turn, need to be served by the units under the purview of that division. Division heads inform unit leaders of the University’s goals and objectives and the unit’s role in achieving those goals. They create unit goals and objectives reflective of ECSU’s mission.

In some instances, several divisions are responsible for achieving goals and objectives at the university level. In those cases, each division is responsible for ensuring that the appropriate objectives are tasked to the relevant units within the division. To ensure that all of the objectives set forth in pursuit of the university goals are being served, the IEPC evaluates the data submitted by each unit to ensure that the units are gathering appropriate data. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Assessment further facilitates this process by gathering research at the institutional level by administering various standardized measurements, such as the National Survey of Student Engagement.
SECTION III: Preparing Educational and Administrative Goals Consistent with the Mission

Each unit within the University enters its goals annually into a web-based assessment management system (WEAVE Online) maintained by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Assessment (OIERA). The OIERA then evaluates the goals against the Institutional Effectiveness Rubric for Evaluating Department/Administrative Unit Plans (Appendix G). The Vice Chancellors and/or the Program Assessment Coordinators for each division evaluate the mission, goals, objectives, measures, findings, and action plans of each unit annually. Those evaluations are recorded and analyzed over an assessment cycle (Appendix B).

The OIERA uses the rubric in Appendix G to evaluate each unit’s mission statement for its level of comprehensibility, its brevity, its comprehensiveness, and the extent to which it is aligned with ECSU’s mission and the division mission. The goals are evaluated for their specificity, measurability, ease of assessment, relevance, and timeliness. The OIERA enters the scores on these elements into an excel spreadsheet that identifies specific areas that need resolution in the development and performance of the mission. Each unit then receives a report that specifies any issues that have been identified in its mission statement, goals, and objectives. The units must rectify these issues as soon as possible. The OIERA submits a list of units with issues of missing mission, goals, or objectives to the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors for further action.

As part of the strategic planning process, each of the first-level units within the institution creates an annual assessment plan that identifies annual goals and objectives and delineates plans to meet those goals and objectives. These plans also include action plans to address gaps in meeting the mission identified in prior strategic planning cycles, along with the costs of those activities. Those budgets are then aggregated into the budget of the supervisory units. The University presents those aggregated budgets in public budget hearings held every spring. During the budget hearings, the supervisory units within the University have the opportunity to discuss how they intend to fulfill their parts of ECSU’s mission and to request the financial resources they believe they need. This public accountability is a key element in executing the mission. These hearings also indicate the institution’s commitment to shared governance, since they open the financial decision-making process to key constituencies both inside and outside the university community.

Role of Shared Governance

The strategic planning structure of ECSU is grounded in the philosophy of shared governance. Shared governance suggests a general commitment by students, faculty, staff, administrators, and trustees to work jointly to improve the university. Shared governance embodies mutual respect and collegiality in the university community for support by all members. The campus community values shared governance, trusting that the collective intellect enables ECSU to make sound decisions and that consensus about decisions enhances unity, creating a stronger institution and helping campus leadership to achieve established goals.

Likewise, ECSU’s councils, committees, and advisory boards play an essential role in the success of the University. The membership of these groups constitutes a cross-section of
constituencies — faculty, staff, students, alumni, and community volunteers—, who evaluate, discuss, amend, and/or recommend university procedures and policies.
SECTION IV: Institutional Planning and Assessment Processes and Measures

Assessment is a means for focusing our collective attention, examining our assumptions, and creating a shared culture dedicated to continuously improving the quality of higher learning. Assessment requires making expectations and standards for quality explicit and public; systematically gathering evidence on how well performance matches those expectations and standards; analyzing and interpreting the evidence; and using the resulting information to document, explain, and improve performance. (Thomas A. Angelo, AAHE Bulletin, April 1995, p.11).

Outcomes assessment is critical to the success of institutions of higher learning. Outcomes assessment refers to documenting student learning and activities, goals, and expectations (Banta, Lund, Black, & Oblander, 1996). As the quote from Thomas A. Angelo above suggests, an assessment plan does more than merely document items being used to evaluate students’ progress toward stated learning goals. A valuable campus-wide assessment plan will help maintain and improve academic programs, will support and coordinate research, and will strengthen student services.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Assessment designed the Assessment Plan for ECSU to guide the institutional assessment process and to contribute to our understanding of how well we are accomplishing the academic, administrative, and strategic goals of the University. Schools and departments act as a focal point in the assessment process. Appendix B shows the importance of input from various campus stakeholders. The underlying belief about assessment at ECSU is that only through school and departmental involvement and their resulting commitment to a continuing assessment process can the educational goals and missions of the institution be accomplished. This culture of assessment is faculty driven, in line with SACS comprehensive standard 3.4.10. The assessment report (Appendix F) provides an example of the breadth and depth of assessment annual planning at ECSU. It provides guidelines for documentation of student performance that enable faculty and students to decide if learning objectives are being achieved and, if not, to guide discussion of suggested program changes (Banta, 1991). This practice is consistent with the standards of professional accreditation of academic programs and regional accreditation agencies, both of which increasingly emphasize the importance of documenting student outcomes.

Assessment provides evidence of how well a university is fulfilling its mission, and it helps identify areas for improvement. Three major assessment criteria are addressed by our annual assessment reports: (a) program improvement; (b) accountability; and (c) the satisfaction of campus stakeholders. A comprehensive institutional assessment program supports continuous improvement of programs and services of the university, containing studies related to accreditation, program reviews, and direct assessment of outcomes from major areas of institutional interest. These activities may include developing and conducting surveys or focus groups of students, faculty, staff, alumni, employers, and community members. Assessment is intended to help a university carry out its educational mission. Units of assessment range from individual academic and service programs to the overall university. In academic programs, student learning outcomes assessment provides evidence of what students know and are able to
do at specific points in the curriculum compared to program-defined learning objectives (Nichols, 1995).

At the academic program level, each department is expected to develop and complete an annual report to assess student learning outcomes. These outcomes should flow coherently from the stated program goals. These goals and objectives further need to flow from the mission of the campus as a whole, and should reflect the overarching mission of and vision for the institution. The operation of those goals must then be turned into measures of success and stated standards against which student achievement will be measured. The measures will further be fleshed out with methodologies for assessment that will include documentation supporting the measurement. The measures’ quantitative and qualitative data should provide both direct and indirect evidence of student learning outcomes. The documentation must be gathered in a coherent manner, using both direct and indirect measures to evaluate the success of each program in meeting the goals and objectives.

Upcraft and Schuh (1996) argue that student and administrative service programs can use indirect measures to assess student behavior and opinion of outcomes generated by attending the University. Direct measures such as availability of services and waiting time for services, usage of services, and satisfaction with services provide valuable measures of the effectiveness of those programs. To be sure, the evaluation of these programs is important, since their successful implementation bears directly on the ability of students to focus on their learning.

Purpose of the Assessment Report

The purpose of assessment is to give unbiased feedback to the department and school as to how well its students are meeting the goals and objectives of the programs. This feedback provides the basis for continuous improvement in student learning outcomes. While the annual assessment report also allows outside evaluators to see that learning is taking place, the primary focus of the report is to accomplish three things: ensure that the learning taking place serves the mission of the institution; improve the institutional learning outcomes by identifying the levels of learning taking place; and focus the work of the institution further on its mission. Faculty and staff use educational outcomes assessment, such as the process described in this plan, to identify the most suitable objectives for specific programs (for example, general education, undergraduate and graduate majors). Evaluators use various measurements to discover as precisely as possible whether the department and the institution are achieving their stated objectives.

Assessment presents evidence of the knowledge, skills, and abilities that our students have gained as a result of their education at ECSU. Accrediting bodies mandate evidence that assessment plans are in place and being used effectively (WASC, 2007). To address requirements imposed by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), the assessment process at ECSU must be systematic and continuing (SACS, 2008). The institutional assessment plan also meets the accreditation standards of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). To comply with SACS core requirements and comprehensive standards and federal requirements, a systematic and ongoing evaluation process for all academic and
administrative programs/units must be present to demonstrate institutional effectiveness. These standards set the following expectations:

SACS expects that the institution operates in line with a mission that fosters teaching and learning and supports research and public service as focused in its mission.

“The institution has a clearly defined, comprehensive, and published mission statement that is specific to the institution and appropriate for higher education. The mission addresses teaching and learning and, where applicable, research and public service.” Principles of Accreditation, Core Requirement 2.4 (Institutional Mission)

SACS expects that the mission and goals of the institution are a living document. The institution must review it regularly and amend it as appropriate to ensure continuous improvement in institutional quality and achievement of mission.

“The institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that (1) incorporate a systematic review of instructional mission, goals, and outcomes; (2) result in continuing improvement in institutional quality, and (3) demonstrate that the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission” Principles of Accreditation, Core Requirement 2.5 (Institutional Effectiveness)

SACS expects that outcomes assessment not only takes place, but includes the evaluation of student learning outcomes, administrative and educational support services, research, and community and public service relevant to the mission.

“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:

Education programs, to include student learning outcomes, administrative support services, educational support services, research within its educational mission, if appropriate, and community/public service within its educational mission, if appropriate” Principles of Accreditation, Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1 (Institutional Effectiveness)

SACS expects institutions to assess their general education core.

“The institution identifies college-level general education competencies and the extent to which graduates have attained them.” Principles of Accreditation, Comprehensive Standard 3.5.1 (College-level competencies)

SACS further expects the institution to have a plan to include continuous improvement in the quality of the education offered.

“The institution has developed an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) that (1) includes a broad-based institutional process identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment, (2) focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment
supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution, (3) demonstrates institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP, (4) includes broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the QEP, and (5) identifies goals and a plan to assess their achievement.” Principles of Accreditation, Core Requirement 2.12 (Quality Enhancement Plan)

SACS expects academic programs to assess student learning.

“The institution demonstrates that each educational program for which academic credit is awarded (a) is approved by the faculty and the administration, and (b) establishes and evaluates program and learning outcomes.” Principles of Accreditation, Comprehensive Standard 3.4.1 (Academic program approval)

SACS expects that the effectiveness of the institution is not something assessed by a few administrators. Rather, SACS expects that faculty members take primary responsibility for ensuring that the curriculum is effective. This indicates that faculty members need to take primary responsibility for the creation and implementation of the institutional effectiveness plan.

“The institution places primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty.” Principles of Accreditation, Comprehensive Standard 3.4.10 (Responsibility for curriculum)

SACS expects the institution to use both direct and indirect measures in evaluating its institutional effectiveness.

“The institution evaluates success with respect to student achievement including, as appropriate, consideration of course completion, state licensing examinations, and job placement rates.” Principles of Accreditation, Federal Requirement 4.1 (Student achievement)

The assessment process elaborates on the gathering and interpreting of information with the intent of discovering whether a program is meeting established goals, and using that information to improve the program. Assessment is concerned principally with student learning both inside and outside the classroom. Assessment at ECSU must highlight the quality of teaching and learning that occurs on the campus. In addition, assessing student learning outcomes will help ECSU expand, preserve, advertise, and, improve its unique learning environment.

Assessment Report Development

Historically, ECSU has used a variety of measures to document the extent to which it achieves operational goals. Professors, administrators, and students have asked such questions as: What are our students learning? Are we achieving what we set out to achieve? Are we using our resources efficiently? Are we using the results of our findings to improve institutional
effectiveness? These questions take on a new urgency in responding quantitatively and qualitatively.

Pressures for institutional accountability continue to come from many directions, especially from state and federal agencies, state and federal legislation, and accrediting agencies requiring colleges and universities to submit detailed documentation concerning the educational results of their programs. As a consequence of these pressures, ECSU’s planning and assessment processes, for the purpose of continuous institutional effectiveness, must be on-going and systematic, emphasizing student learning outcomes and strategies for measuring those outcomes. We must then use the results to enhance the university.

The development of processes and measures is the purview of the individual units being measured, within certain guidelines. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Assessment (OIERA) require each unit to designate an assessment coordinator. That assessment coordinator works with the unit head and any other individuals designated to create an assessment plan. That assessment plan takes the goal-linked objectives and identifies ways of measuring the unit’s success in accomplishing these objectives. Planning and assessment at ECSU establishes university-wide procedures that integrate and provide for a systematic, broad-based, inter-related process. The planning and assessment process provides the following basic outline:

1. The institution has a clearly defined statement of purpose regarding institutional effectiveness, planning, and assessment (Appendix A).
2. Each level of a program at ECSU, academic and non-academic, has a documented planning and assessment process, and the process contains five major components:
   a. Educational and administration goals consistent with institution’s mission;
   b. Strategies to achieve these goals;
   c. Expected educational/administrative outcomes;
   d. Assessment procedures that document the extent to which goals have been achieved over a predetermined time period;
   e. Use of assessment findings to improve institutional effectiveness.
3. Division heads and unit directors assign specific personnel for initiating, coordinating, and reporting assessment activities.
4. Division heads and unit directors develop a system for continuous updating, refining, and adjusting of planning procedures.
5. Division heads and unit directors determine specific procedures for monitoring progress and for reviewing and updating plans.

**Expected Outcomes**

The planning and assessment components enable ECSU to have an orderly process (Appendix B). In addition, the process allows each campus unit involved in the planning and assessment structure to provide for the following:

a. A comprehensive and continuous planning and assessment process;
b. Integration of planning and assessment efforts into a university-wide systematic effort;
c. A participatory process involving representation from various constituent groups;
d. Quantitative and qualitative data to document institutional effectiveness;
e. An enhanced use of institutional effectiveness data/information in institutional planning,
budgeting, and program review.

Planning and assessment at ECSU involve: (a) a statement of the institution’s mission, and a focus on the goals articulated in the strategic plan; (b) development of assessment plans including unit mission statements; (c) clearly articulated goals and expected outcomes at the unit level; (d) means for assessing the achievement of goals; and (e) processes for using the results for academic and administrative improvement. All units must provide written assessment criteria for each objective under each goal, and the criteria should be measurable in terms of time and minimum level of achievement. The OIERA recommends the following planning and assessment criteria and accompanying suggestions as a guide to planning and assessment for all campus units (Consistent with the assessment management components in WEAVE Online):

- **Mission:** Planning should begin with a review of the unit’s current mission statement. A useful mission statement should be operational, clear, and concise. A unit should review and revise its mission statement periodically to reflect the institution’s mission statement.
- **Goals/Outcomes/Objectives:** These are the student learning outcomes or process improvement objectives that must be identified in a unit’s assessment report as well as the objectives associated with program, faculty, and student goals.
- **Measures and Achievement Targets:** These are the measurement tools that have been identified to evaluate student learning outcomes.
- **Findings:** These describe the results in enough detail so that useful conclusions may be drawn from the exercise.
- **Action Plans:** After describing your findings and conclusions, decide what new actions are necessary and ongoing, and which actions are finished.
- **Analysis:** The analysis suggests a comprehensive summary of the results examining the effectiveness of a program in helping students achieve anticipated learning outcomes.
- **Budgeting:** Unit directors consult with staff to discuss the budget year’s goals, opportunities, and challenges. The unit directors prepare budget planning documents and submit them to their respective division heads. Assessment data anchor the unit budgeting process at all levels of the institution.

**Planning Schedule**

The University has several planning schedules: five-year, biennial, annual, semi-annual, and quarterly; the latter is primarily for grant reporting.

- **Five-Year:** This schedule is dedicated to the design and publication of the University’s Strategic Plan. This plan is revised every two years.
- **Biennial:** The University’s two-year budget is prepared for the biennium schedule. In addition, any modifications to the University’s mission, vision, goals, or priorities are reviewed and, if necessary, revised.
- **Annual:** While all cycles are important, this is the most active cycle, with ECSU’s Institutional Planning and Assessment Cycle (Appendix B) and Planning and Budgeting
cycle (Appendix C). The ECSU Fact Book is produced annually. It includes any resultant strategies and functions as a resource for planning. ECSU also conducts faculty and administrative evaluations annually.

- Semi-Annual: Relevant data are collected to aid in the analysis and determination of course planning. Brief summaries of activities outlined for implementation are documented showing the extent to which the expected outcomes are on target for achievement.

Outcomes Assessment

In developing and performing outcomes assessment strategies, academic units should seek to improve student learning, to prove the effectiveness of their methods (Banta et al, 1996). The results of an assessment should provide information which can be used to decide whether intended outcomes are being achieved and how the programs can be improved. An assessment process should also be designed to inform departmental faculty, unit directors, and other decision-makers about relevant issues that can impact the project and student learning (Banta et al, 1996). The University of Wisconsin-Madison (2008) process delineated below serves as a template for the activities undertaken to create the specific unit assessment plans at ECSU.

STEP 1: Define educational/programmatic goals and objectives for the major or program.
A department’s instructional goals and objectives serve as the foundation for assessment planning. Program assessment provides information on how well students are performing relative to the educational goals and objectives established by the department.

STEP 2: Identify and describe instruments or methods for assessing student achievement at important stages in the program.
Once educational goals and objectives have been identified, assessment methods for collecting student data are chosen. These methods reflect the programmatic objectives defined in the first step.

STEP 3: Decide how the results will be disseminated and used for program improvement.
Units use assessment results and information in a timely fashion to promote continuous programmatic improvements. The feedback process is essential to all assessment plans because it gives faculty the opportunity to use recent findings to incorporate curricular changes necessary to prepare students with the skills and knowledge to advance in their respective majors.

STEP 4: Develop a timetable for carrying out the previous three steps. Each academic unit will establish a schedule for selecting, implementing, and using the results of assessment strategies.
To meet external demands for assessment implementation and to incorporate assessment into ongoing curricular planning, departments devise timetables for developing and executing assessment programs.

STEP 5: Submit assessment objectives, methods, and timetable to school Academic Planning Councils.
Each school decides its specific procedures for approval of unit plans and review of assessment activities. While program or unit mission statements may not be reviewed annually, student
learning outcomes are reviewed each academic year. Faculty members are responsible for documenting all of the assessment activities embedded in their courses. In addition, programs are responsible for documenting all indirect measures used to evaluate the objectives created. Most critically, each unit, whether programmatic or administrative, must document the ways in which the results of these assessments will be used to improve the institution.

**STEP 6: Carry out assessment plans and revise as needed.** Once approved by the programs, faculty members should implement assessment strategies. When early program feedback from assessment practices becomes available, units should use the results for programmatic improvement or to revise objectives or plans, if necessary. By following this six step process, the complexities associated with developing effective and efficient assessment plans, especially for those devising assessment strategies for the first time, can be made less difficult and time-consuming (University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2008).

In sum, academic programs have developed mission statements, program goals, and anticipated student learning outcomes that support the institutional goals which are based on the University’s mission statement. Academic program units identify assessment methods for determining the attainment of student learning outcomes and areas for improvement. Faculty members meet throughout the year to discuss student learning, assessment results, and strategies to enhance learning. At the end of the academic year, the department chairs and their program assessment coordinators submit an assessment report to their respective schools’ deans describing the linkage between the unit, division, and institutional mission statements; the unit assessment process; a summary of findings; the use of results leading to program improvements; and samples of the assessment tools. The respective vice chancellors and the OIERA receive the unit assessment. Each division develops an executive summary of these reports and submits it to the Chancellor.

**Types of Assessment Instruments**

Assessment of student learning can be conducted using an assortment of accessible instruments and methods. Researchers, scholars, and practitioners suggest that a combination of assessment approaches can be the most effective way to measure student learning (Banta et al, 1996; Nichols, 1995). The following are direct and indirect measures of learning that academic and administrative units at ECSU can use.

1. **Capstone Course Evaluation**
   Capstone courses integrate knowledge, ideas, and skills associated with an entire sequence of study in a program. This method of assessment is unique because the courses themselves become the instruments for assessing student teaching and learning. Professors’ evaluation of students’ work in these courses is a means of assessing student outcomes. For academic units where a single capstone course is not possible or desirable, a department may label a small group of courses to use in measuring the competencies of graduating majors (Upcraft & Gardner, 1989).

2. **Tests and Examinations**
   Usually, a test will be one part of a fully developed assessment plan. Professors use tests in association with cognitive goals to review student achievement with respect to a program or
discipline’s common body of knowledge. Departments have traditionally used tests to assess programming to measure whether students have gained a certain process- and content-related knowledge (Priestley, 1992). Many departments use nationally standardized multiple-choice tests to identify programmatic strengths and weaknesses when compared to other programs and national data. Compilations of data on performing students who voluntarily take national examinations such as the GRE and the MCAT enable faculty to discover useful data that often leads to programmatic improvements (Booker, 1996). Departments with a successful history in using commercial tests and examinations include many general education, mathematics, chemistry, biology, computer science, geology, physics, psychology, sociology, education, engineering, foreign languages, music, exercise science, and literature programs. These measures include ACT - COMP (College Outcome Measures Program), GRE (Graduate Record Examinations), and Major Field Achievements Tests (Priestley, 1992).

3. Portfolio Evaluation

Portfolios used for assessment purposes are most commonly characterized by collections of student work that show to the faculty and the student the student's progress and achievement in given areas. The portfolio may include research papers and other process reports, multiple-choice or essay examinations, self-evaluations, personal essays, journals, computational exercises and problems, case studies, audiotapes, videotapes, and short-answer quizzes. This information may be gathered from in-class or as out-of-class assignments (Belanoff, 1991; Forrest, 1990).

4. Pre-test/Post-test Evaluation

Pre-test/post-test assessment is a method used by academic units where locally developed tests and examinations are administered at the beginning and at the end of courses or academic programs. These test results enable faculty to check student progress and learning over prescribed periods of time. The results are often useful for determining where skills and knowledge deficiencies exist and develop. Academic departments at other research institutions currently using this form of assessment to measure student learning include communications, economics, geography, linguistics, theater, and dance (Belanoff, 1991; Forrest, 1990).

5. Thesis Evaluation

A senior or graduate student thesis, research project, or performance paper that is structured by the department to give students an opportunity to show an understanding of an array of skills and knowledge suitable to the major can be a useful assessment instrument. Thesis evaluation has been used effectively for program improvement in such disciplines as foreign languages, literature, and the sciences (Belanoff, 1991; Forrest, 1990).

6. Videotape and Audiotape Evaluation

Videotapes and audiotapes have been used by faculty as a kind of pre-test/post-test assessment of student skills and knowledge (Belanoff, 1991; Forrest, 1990).

7. External Reviewers

Peer review of academic programs is a widely accepted method for assessing curricular sequences, course development and delivery, and the effectiveness of faculty. Using external reviewers is a useful way of analyzing whether student achievement correlates properly with
departmental goals and objectives. Often, recommendations initiated by skilled external reviewers have been instrumental in identifying program strengths and weaknesses leading to substantial curricular and structural changes and improvements (Fong, 1987).

8. Student Surveying and Exit Interviewing

Student surveying and exit interviews have become increasingly important tools for understanding the educational needs of students. When combined with other assessment instruments, many departments have successfully used surveys to produce important curricular and co-curricular information about student learning and educational experiences. During this process, students are asked to reflect on what they have learned as majors to produce information for program improvement. Through this method, universities have reported gaining insight into how students experience courses, what they like and do not like about various instructional approaches, what is important about the classroom environment that helps or hinders learning, and the nature of assignments that foster student learning (Banta, 1996; Riess & Muffo, 1993).

9. Alumni Surveying

Surveying of alumni is a useful assessment tool for generating data about student preparation for professional work, program satisfaction, and curriculum relevancy. As an assessment supplement, alumni surveys provide departments with information that can highlight program areas that need to be expanded or improved. Usually, alumni surveying is an inexpensive way to gather data and for reestablishing relationships with individuals that want to help the program continually improve (Dyke & Williams, 1996).

10. Employer Surveying

Employer surveys can provide information about the curriculum, programs, and students that other forms of assessment cannot produce. Through surveys, departments traditionally seek employer satisfaction levels with the abilities and skills of recent graduates. Employers also assess programmatic characteristics by addressing the success of students in a continuously changing job market. The advantages in using employer surveys include getting external data that cannot be produced on campus, and using the responses to help students detect the relevance of educational experiences and programs (Dyke & Williams, 1996).

Institutional effectiveness means assessing academic educational programs and administrative support services and using the findings to improve the quality of the University. ECSU has assessment processes at all levels, including academic, student services, business and finance, institutional advancement, and other administrative and service areas (Appendix I). As required, ECSU must document its use of specified assessments not only to ascertain their effectiveness, but also for compliance with such external agencies as the UNC system and SACS. All areas should be assessed: undergraduate curriculum and instruction, faculty, administration, service personnel, library, student development, admissions, student support services, and when appropriate, alumni and the Board of Trustees.

Undergraduate Curriculum and Instruction

The impact of the freshman and sophomore years in General Education should be assessed at or near the completion of the General Education curriculum. Each academic field and support area should have pre- and post- evaluations, as well as a diverse array of regularly
utilized evaluation tools to measure progress toward established outcomes. The academic areas should administer student assessments that measure students’ mastery of the major’s learning outcomes. Each area, where applicable, should consider measures such as (a) student grade point average; (b) student scores on pre- and post-tests; (c) student mastery of general education core courses; (d) program statistics including enrollment, retention rate, and number of graduates; (e) employment success of graduates; and (f) surveys of students, alumni, employers, and selected community agencies.

Faculty

University policy requires that each faculty member be evaluated annually by the immediate administrative superior (Faculty Handbook). Faculty members should also engage in annual self-assessment and peer evaluation. Data should be collected from a wide variety of sources, including self-evaluations, student ratings, colleague ratings, and student achievement.

Administration

University policy requires that administrators be evaluated annually by their superior(s) and, where applicable, by their staff.

Data Collection

The annual planning and assessment process creates an inventory of available data that may reveal the need for additional information. This cycle enables the development of a list of in-house and national instruments appropriate to ECSU’s purpose. Additionally, the OIERA administers UNC-General Administration mandated surveys that assess the institutional effectiveness of the faculty, educational support services, and student support services. The findings of data collection are not only used to effect change but to make constituencies aware of the university’s commitment to continuous improvement and accountability. The OIERA disseminates assessment results to the university community by distributing a fact book and posting them on the university website.

The OIERA uses the Rubric for Evaluating Department/Administrative Unit Plans (Appendix G) to evaluate the identified objectives with respect to the apparent reliability of the measurement criteria, the validity of the evaluation, and whether the measurement criteria are being used. The OIERA encourages units to develop several ways of measuring their objectives. In particular, the OIERA strongly encourages academic units to include pre-tests, mid-tests to be taken during matriculation, and post-tests to be taken at the time of graduation. Nationally validated assessments of the disciplines offer a comparative opportunity necessary to fulfill our institutional goal of global competitiveness.
SECTION V: Summary

ECSU has an integrated process for institutional effectiveness and assessment that derives from its mission statement. That process utilizes information from a variety of constituencies and allows for shared governance in the definition of university goals. Those goals are translated into objectives for the institution. One or more divisions within the university are assigned to ensure the achievement of each goal and objective through their units. The units individually generate mission statements that reflect their specific role in achieving ECSU’s mission statement. From these mission statements and with reference to the goals and objectives of the University, each unit develops its own goals and objectives. Units implement and assess these goals and objectives, and they create action plans to address any gaps identified. The OIERA reviews these evaluations annually and gives feedback to the units. This process ensures that the units remain focused on the goals of the institution and on the continuous improvement necessary for ECSU’s continued success.
APPENDICIES
APPENDIX A:
University Policy on Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment

I. Preamble

The purpose of this policy is to present a formal statement concerning institutional effectiveness and assessment at Elizabeth City State University (ECSU). It establishes a comprehensive university-wide program of institutional effectiveness and assessment. Consistent with standards established by the University’s accrediting body, through enacting these principles and processes, ECSU engages in on-going, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that incorporate a systematic review of programs and services and that promote continuous improvement in those programs and services.

II. Policy Statement

ECSU’s policy is to develop and maintain an institutional effectiveness process for campus-wide, systematic, on-going collection of institutional data to assist units of the University to create action plans which will achieve the goals and outcomes they have set according to the University mission. Institutional effectiveness results from the planning and assessment process that each academic and administrative unit at ECSU undertakes to measure and improve its quality.

The Institutional Assessment Advisory Committee and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Assessment are responsible for producing the guidelines for initiation, review, approval, and publication of the policies, practices, and management of data related to such a program.

It is the responsibility of ECSU to: (a) assess student learning outcomes to validate the curricula in order to ensure that students are well prepared for the 21st century workforce; (b) assess the academic and social environment to improve retention and graduation rates; (c) assess academic and administrative support services to increase student learning and satisfaction in order to improve institutional efficiencies; and (d) assess community involvement activities across the campus.

III. Procedure

Under the Chancellor’s leadership, the administration, faculty, and staff of ECSU participate in on-going planning and assessment for both student learning outcomes and administrative services outcomes. The Institutional Assessment Advisory Committee and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Assessment developed a four part comprehensive institutional effectiveness process comprised of: (a) Academic and
Administrative Unit Assessment (Students Learning Outcomes), (b) General Education Outcomes Assessment, (c) University Assessment (Academic and Administrative Support Services), and (d) Community Outreach Assessment.

1. **Academic and Administrative Unit Assessment** *(Student Learning Outcomes)*

   a. Academic and Administrative unit assessment of student learning outcomes at ECSU is a campus-wide process to verify and validate unit effectiveness.

   b. Assessment of a unit is the responsibility of the Program Assessment Coordinator (academic programs), Administrative Assessment Coordinator (non-academic programs), department chairs, and/or unit directors.

   c. The Program Assessment Coordinator, in collaboration with faculty and staff, has primary responsibility for the development, implementation, and on-going use of assessment activities for continuous quality enhancement.

   d. Assessment activities at the school/division level are coordinated by a designated program or unit assessment coordinator. The School/Division Assessment Coordinators are appointed by the respective vice chancellors and deans.

   e. The vice chancellors, deans and department chairs or directors ensure that appropriate assessment of unit effectiveness is occurring in all of the University’s programs and administrative support units.

   f. In implementing unit assessment, all academic programs and administrative support units submit assessment reports electronically and in writing on an annual basis to their respective division heads and to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Assessment.

   g. Assessment reports demonstrate each unit’s ability to collect reasonable information from appropriate constituencies regarding the unit’s effectiveness and to use that information for continuous unit improvement.

   h. Data sets or raw data from assessment activities remain with the unit and are archived.

2. **General Education Outcomes Assessment** *(Student Learning Outcomes)*

   a. The General Studies Advisory Board oversees the assessment of core competencies and makes appropriate modifications to the General Education (GE) core to ensure the curriculum is relevant to the educational needs of our students and comparable to the requirements of other institutions in the UNC system. Modifications of GE core requirements are properly vetted through the following bodies:

   - General Studies Advisory Board
   - University Curriculum Committee
   - Academic Affairs Planning Council
   - Administrative Council
   - Board of Trustees
b. The Office of Academic Affairs oversees the assessment of core competencies through the General Studies Advisory Board.

c. The General Studies Advisory Board is comprised of faculty representatives from the degree granting programs and a representative from the following areas:
   - Honors Program
   - Library
   - Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Assessment
   - Registrar
   - Retention

d. Members are appointed by the Provost and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.

e. The General Studies Advisory Board meets at least twice each semester to coordinate assessment efforts and develop strategies and procedures to improve faculty instruction and student performance on core competency assessment.

f. Students’ competencies in: (a) written communication, (b) reading & critical thinking, (c) oral communication, (d) scientific reasoning, (e) mathematical reasoning, and (f) computer & information literacy are assessed during the academic year.

3. University Assessment *(Academic and Administrative Support Services)*

   a. University assessment includes assessment of indirect measures of performance and satisfaction such as:
      - Student satisfaction with the university experience
      - Student satisfaction with the quality of instruction and academic/administrative support services
      - The UNC-General Administration mandated Graduating Senior, Sophomore, and Alumni surveys, the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE), the College Student Inventory (CSI), the Student Satisfaction Inventory, and the Institutional Priorities Survey, all are examples of assessment instruments used by ECSU.

   b. Campus-wide assessment activities are implemented in a cooperative manner by several campus units.

   c. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Assessment coordinates the analysis of survey data, facilitates the distribution of the results, and provides any necessary training in utilizing assessment information and implementing processes for continuous quality enhancement and institutional effectiveness.

   d. Community engagement/outreach
APPENDIX B:
ECSU Planning and Assessment Cycle

- University Mission Statement
- 2009-2014 Strategic Plan
- Institutional Goals
- Policy on Institutional Effectiveness & Assessment
- Chancellor’s Cabinet
- University Planning & Assessment Committee

**July**
Vice Chancellors develop or refine their Divisional Mission Statement, Goals, and Objectives. University Planning Meeting.

**August**
Schools, departments, administrative units develop or refine their Mission Statements, Goals, Objectives, and Means of Assessment. Division Planning Meeting. Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Related Workshops. Institutional Effectiveness Report is developed and presented to the Chancellor’s Cabinet and disseminated campus-wide for use in the planning process.

**September**
Divisions, Schools, Departments, and Administrative Units enter Goals, Outcomes, Measures, and Achievement Targets into WEAVE Online (Sept 30th Deadline).

**April**
Academic and Administrative Units utilize assessment findings to substantiate budget requests (Linked to budget process).

**Dec - Apr**
Conduct program and unit assessments to measure the extent to which goals are being achieved. Document findings.

**May**
Academic departments and administrative units submit annual assessment reports to their respective division or division program coordinator and to the OIERA.

**June**
Vice Chancellors submit Division Assessment Report to the office of Institutional Effectiveness (June 30th Deadline).

**June - July**
Division Planning Retreats
University Planning Meeting.
APPENDIX C:
ECSU Planning and Budgeting Cycle

- University Mission Statement
- 2009-2014 Strategic Plan
- UNC-Tomorrow
- Chancellor’s Cabinet
- Division of Business and Finance
- University Planning & Budgeting Committee

**July**
Beginning of State Budget Cycle.

**August**
Chancellor’s Cabinet reviews strategic plan to prioritize budget needs based on institutional mission, goals, and objectives.

**September - October**
The Vice Chancellor for Business & Finance disseminates finalized (FY) budget information to the respective Vice Chancellors who communicate budget priorities to their respective divisions.

**February**
Division heads send the appropriate portions of the budget packages to their respective departments/units and schools for their input into the budget request.

**January**
The Division of Business and Finance sends budget request instructions to the university’s division heads.

**November - December**
Vice Chancellors review budget with department/unit directors to determine if any changes are needed for funding for spring semester.

**March**
Departments/units (and schools where applicable) prioritize their requests and send the budget requests (*linked to assessment outcomes*) to their respective division heads.

**April**
Division heads determine and prioritize their requests and send the completed packages to the budget office.

**May**
Division heads present their budget requests to the Chancellor at a specially called meeting of the Administrative Council. All faculty and staff are invited to attend the budget hearings.

**Jun – July**
Division budgets are finalized after the legislature takes any actions that it may deem appropriate which may affect the University of North Carolina’s budget.
APPENDIX D:
Integrated Model for Institutional Assessment

Strategic Plan

Chancellor

Provost/VC AA

Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Assessment

Program Level Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

University-Wide Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

Center for Teaching Excellence

Library Services

Faculty Senate

Program Assessment Coordinators

General Studies Advisory Board

University Curriculum Committee

Faculty Senate

Academic Deans and Department Chair s

Administrative Support Units

Human Resources and Payroll

Institutional Advancement

Academic Affairs

Business and Finance

Student Affairs
### APPENDIX E:
**Institutional Effectiveness Matrix (Example)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Goals &amp; Outcomes</th>
<th>Mapped to Goals &amp; Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessable Measures</th>
<th>Assessable Methodology (not entered in WEAVE)</th>
<th>Realistic Findings</th>
<th>Trackable Action Plans</th>
<th>Year N+1 Improvements Made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apply critical thinking skills to understand role of evidence in discipline-based knowledge.</td>
<td>Graduating majors will be able to draw and evaluate conclusions appropriately based on evidence.</td>
<td>1. 70% of student senior projects will receive a good or excellent rating in their Problem Statement and Lit Review for “Development of the Problem” from evaluators not connected with the course. 2. 70% of student senior projects will receive a good or excellent rating in their Problem Statement and Lit Review for “Justification of Problem” from evaluators not connected with the course.</td>
<td>1. This assessment was embedded in the senior thesis requirement. Specifically, the following thesis rating criteria were used: – statement of problem – Independent &amp; Dependent variables – Justification of problem – Relate findings to previous research (Senior Thesis Rating Rubric is provided in the Assessment Instruments section.)</td>
<td>1. **% of students received good or excellent ratings on “Development of the Problem”, a **% increase. Overall, greater focus on this idea in senior project class. 2. **%, a **% increase, received good or excellent ratings on “Justification of Problem.”</td>
<td>Continue the increased emphasis on empirical evidence in introductory courses. Include assignments that reinforce this concept in early courses, providing a Pre-Mid-Post assessment, and reinforcing the importance of the skill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G:
Rubric for Evaluation Department/Administrative Unit Plans

Divisional Unit:
Divisional Unit Location:
Divisional Unit Director:
Director email:
Academic Year:

Purpose
This rubric is an assessment tool used to measure ECSU’s Department/Administrative Unit Plans. It is a holistic instrument that will aid in the evaluation of unit performance based on a full range of criteria. This tool takes the initial rubric that evaluated the mission statement, goals/objectives and assessment of goals/objectives with single items to the next level by providing detailed feedback on the key elements of the strategic planning process. Evaluators must determine the extent to which each institutional unit meets each of the scoring criteria established in the rubric. Explanatory comments must be provided for any section that has a rating below satisfactory. (NOTE: If there is incomplete or missing information on a unit plan, it CANNOT be evaluated. The OIERA will give the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors a list of units that have not made substantial progress toward refining or completing their assessment plan).

Mission Statement:
Good mission statements should be comprehensive, clear, and concise (75 words or less), should make sense to someone who is not familiar with the unit, and should be compatible with both the university mission statement and the divisional mission statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensible</th>
<th>□ Exceptional = 3</th>
<th>□ Satisfactory = 2</th>
<th>□ Underdeveloped = 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mission statement states the unit’s purpose and function in a manner that is clear to an outsider.</td>
<td>The mission is clear to those in the field, but needs some clarification for those outside the field.</td>
<td>The mission reflects a general statement of the purpose of the unit or division, but is not clear OR The mission statement is not clear to those inside or outside the field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brevity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>□ Exceptional = 3</th>
<th>□ Satisfactory = 2</th>
<th>□ Underdeveloped = 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The unit’s mission statement is 50 words or less.</td>
<td>The unit’s mission statement is 75 words or less.</td>
<td>The unit’s mission is lengthy and/or rambling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comprehensive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>□ Exceptional = 3</th>
<th>□ Satisfactory = 2</th>
<th>□ Underdeveloped = 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mission statement encompasses all of the activities of the unit.</td>
<td>The mission statement relates to some of the activities of the unit, but others are clearly missing.</td>
<td>The mission statement does not refer to the activities of the unit in any but the most general terms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aligned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>□ Exceptional = 3</th>
<th>□ Satisfactory = 2</th>
<th>□ Underdeveloped = 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mission statement is aligned with that of the university and division.</td>
<td>Parts of the mission statement appear to be aligned with that of the university and/or division. OR The mission is aligned with that of the division, but is not aligned with that of the university.</td>
<td>The connection between the mission statement of the unit and those of the university and division is not apparent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goals of the unit:
The goal identifies specific knowledge, skills, and abilities that students ought to gain or improve through engagement in the academic program, or it describes the desired quality and outcomes of specific services for administrative units. The goals of the unit must be specific, measurable, assessable, realistic, and timely. Note that this section will be completed for each goal for the unit.

Specific – A specific goal describes the intended outcomes of the unit based on its mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Underdeveloped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The goal clearly states what is intended to be achieved and is tied to the mission.</td>
<td>The goal states what is intended to be achieved or is tied to the mission.</td>
<td>The goal does not give guidance as to what is to be achieved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurable – This is measured using the measures listed in TaskStream

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States Measures</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Underdeveloped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The goal includes a statement of how compliance with the goal can be judged.</td>
<td>The statement sets general goals but does not specify what compliance will be.</td>
<td>The goal is insufficiently specific to be measured.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Underdeveloped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of measures and freedom from bias clear to outsiders.</td>
<td>Reliability of measures clear, but potential for bias not addressed.</td>
<td>No evidence of reliability of measures, or bias in evaluations exists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures used</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Underdeveloped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The unit demonstrates that measurement of goals has taken place in the manner anticipated.</td>
<td>The unit demonstrates that measurement has taken place, but that the measurement does not follow the intended plan.</td>
<td>No measurement has taken place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Validity</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Underdeveloped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The measures display adequate validity.</td>
<td>The measures may display validity but sample too small to check for validity.</td>
<td>Measures not connected to the mission of the unit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessable – This is measured against the Objectives in TaskStream.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessable</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Underdeveloped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures have been written that evaluate whether the goal has been complied with. Multiple measures evaluate whether the outcome has been achieved.</td>
<td>Measures have been written that evaluate whether the goal has been complied with.</td>
<td>Measures developed are not assessable or no measures have been developed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relevant – Relevant measures are connected to the mission and goals of the unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Underdeveloped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The goals identified are connected to the mission and goals of the institution.</td>
<td>The goal identifies general areas tangentially connected to the mission and goals of the institution</td>
<td>The goals are not connected to the mission and goals of the institution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timely – The goals need to be addressed at that time, and can be addressed (or be begun to be addressed) over the time frame stated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timely</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Underdeveloped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The goal is appropriate for completion at this time.</td>
<td>The goal is appropriate for completion, but the unit cannot complete it in</td>
<td>The goal is not appropriate at the current time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Action Plans
Areas in which compliance has not been achieved or areas in which target goals have been raised for the next year, including SMART action plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>□ Exceptional = 3</th>
<th>□ Satisfactory = 2</th>
<th>□ Underdeveloped = 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned actions are specific with respect to what must be done and by whom.</td>
<td>Planned actions are specific with respect to what must be done or by whom.</td>
<td>Planned actions are not specific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable</th>
<th>□ Exceptional = 3</th>
<th>□ Satisfactory = 2</th>
<th>□ Underdeveloped = 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with planned actions can be measured using stated measures.</td>
<td>Action plan includes a stated goal, but does not suggest ways of measuring whether the action has taken place.</td>
<td>Completion of action plans is not measurable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessable</th>
<th>□ Exceptional = 3</th>
<th>□ Satisfactory = 2</th>
<th>□ Underdeveloped = 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned actions can be evaluated for success.</td>
<td>Planned actions are clear enough to allow assessment of compliance of pieces of the goal, but level of success cannot be determined.</td>
<td>Planned actions are not clear enough to allow assessment of compliance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant</th>
<th>□ Exceptional = 3</th>
<th>□ Satisfactory = 2</th>
<th>□ Underdeveloped = 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned actions are clearly connected to the issue identified.</td>
<td>Planned actions are relevant to the mission of the unit, but are not connected to the issue identified.</td>
<td>Planned actions are not connected to either the mission of the unit or the issue identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timely</th>
<th>□ Exceptional = 3</th>
<th>□ Satisfactory = 2</th>
<th>□ Underdeveloped = 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned actions can be completed in appropriate time frame.</td>
<td>Planned actions may address the issues identified, but may not resolve the issues in a timely fashion (i.e., referred to committee to discuss further).</td>
<td>Planned actions cannot be completed in the appropriate time frame.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H:
Overall Process for Goal Setting

This chart illustrates the flow of information for the creation and assessment of mission statements, goals, and objectives:
**APPENDIX I:**
List of Direct and Indirect Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Evaluation Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Computing</td>
<td>IT Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>Departmental Evaluation Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>Athlete Exit Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation Science</td>
<td>FAA Private Pilot Written Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Peer Teaching Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tracking of Graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Office (Purchasing and Accounting)</td>
<td>Audit Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Office</td>
<td>Financial Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police</td>
<td>University Police Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Teaching Excellence</td>
<td>New Faculty Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Research and Evaluation</td>
<td>Number of Grants Submitted / Number of Grants Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Projects Begun / Number of Projects Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling and Testing</td>
<td>College Student Inv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mental Health Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Placement Testing Satisfaction Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depression Screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discover (careers) CSI Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and Construction</td>
<td>Facilities Inventory Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Database Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>PRAXIS I and II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Accounting</td>
<td>ETS MFT Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Math and Computer Science</td>
<td>ETS MFT Math and Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semester Grade Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pass / Fail Rates per Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funded Grants / Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrollment Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Management and Marketing</td>
<td>ETS MFT Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Music</td>
<td>Graduate Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recital Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Recital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Composition Recital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ETS MFT Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher-Constructed Tests / Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy and Health Professions</td>
<td>PCAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC/ECSU Doctor of Pharmacy Partnership Program</td>
<td>OSCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Chemistry and Physics</td>
<td>ETS MFT Chemistry and Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of History and Political Science</td>
<td>ETS MFT History and Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History 200, 397, 499 Evaluation of Research Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POLS 200, 311, 499 Evaluation of Research Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exit Interviews with Graduating Seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning and Assessment Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Psychology</td>
<td>Faculty Evaluation Forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Evaluations of Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Social Sciences</td>
<td>ACAT Test Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Technology</td>
<td>Certified Technology Manager Certification Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance and Continuing Education</td>
<td>Course and Instructor Evaluation (online courses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuing Education Evaluation Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Human Resources and Payroll</td>
<td>Assessment of the Effectiveness of all Training and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. Talent Search/McNair Scholars Program</td>
<td>Student Activity Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Evaluation / Faculty Mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IECP Exit Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS Progress Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transcripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>System Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>User Comments Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Advancement</td>
<td>Raised-to-Date Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Solicitations Made / Proposals Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni Participation Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Grades Education</td>
<td>Senior Portfolio and Exit Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Services</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Teacher Education</td>
<td>Conceptual Framework Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCDPI Satisfaction Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Teacher Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field Experience Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multicultural Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of Univ. Supervisor by Cooperating Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live Text Portfolio (Electronic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual Framework Survey by LEA Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual Framework Survey by Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement and Materials Management</td>
<td>Evaluation of Applications, including GPA for Admission, Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Life</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyceum</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar's Office</td>
<td>Registration Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Command Climate Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contract vs. Commission Ration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Fitness Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commander's Situation Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education and Psychology</td>
<td>Live Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Exp.</td>
<td>Faculty Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCDPI</td>
<td>IHE Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Satisfaction</td>
<td>Candidate Disposition Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Evaluation</td>
<td>Student Evolutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praxis I and Praxis II</td>
<td>Departmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>Follow Graduates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial Aid and Scholarships

| Fund Reports | Web Survey |
| Verification Reports | Application Reports |

G.R. Little Library

| Student and Faculty (in-house) Surveys | LibQual |

Health and Physical Education

| PE Evaluation Forms | PE Conference Forms |
| Physical Evaluation Forms | |

Honors Program

| Senior Honor Thesis | Exit Survey |

Internal Audit

| List of Audits Submitted to General Administration and Board of Governors | Plan of the Year |
| Assessments of Audits | |

Language, Literature and Communication

| ACAT English Exam | ACAT Exam for Mass Communications |

Legal Affairs

| Administrators Perception of Legal Affairs Survey | |

Office of Alumni Relations

| Participation Logs | Exit Survey |

Office of Graduate Education

| Online Needs Assessment | Verbal Feedback |

Office of Field Experience

<p>| Exit Interview | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planetarium</td>
<td>Final Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business and Technology Development</td>
<td>Formative Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Center</td>
<td>Final Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programs</td>
<td>Attendee Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Upward Bound</td>
<td>Survey sent out once a year by headquarters in Raleigh, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student Support Services</td>
<td>Annual Work Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Annual Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Student Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Pre- and Post- Tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Grade Point Averages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Exit Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Teacher Education Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Goals and Objectives by Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>College Student Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Alcohol Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Evaluations of NSO, Placement Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Mocktail Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Customer Satisfaction Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Results Tabulated Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer School</td>
<td>Student Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Statistics (OIERA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Budget Recon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Glossary of Terms

**Assessment**: an ongoing process aimed at understanding and improving student learning. It involves making our expectations explicit and public; setting appropriate criteria and high standards for learning quality; systematically gathering, analyzing, and interpreting evidence to determine how well performance matches those expectations and standards; and using the resulting information to document, explain, and improve performance. When it is embedded effectively within larger institutional systems, assessment can help us focus our collective attention, examine our assumptions, and create a shared academic culture dedicated to assuring and improving the quality of higher education (Thomas A. Angelo, *AAHE Bulletin*, 1995, p. 7).

**Assessment Cycle**: refers to the calendar cycle of planning and assessment that includes annual submittal of plans from academic and administrative units and the follow-up assessment review. It also includes the calendar cycle review of the university’s mission statement, strategic plan and Institutional Effectiveness process.

**Attrition**: loss of students through means other than graduation.

**Benchmark**: a criterion-referenced objective; “performance data that are used for comparative purposes.”

**Bloom's Taxonomy of Learning Levels**: six levels in which cognitively related objects can be categorized by levels of increasing complexity; the levels are: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.

**Closing the Loop**: using assessment results for program change & improvement. Direct and Indirect Measures of Learning – a direct measure is one by which students demonstrate what they have learned (exam, project). An indirect measure provides second hand information about student learning (a student questionnaire about what they’ve learned).

**Commission on Colleges (COC)**: The regional body for the accreditation of degree-granting higher education institutions in the southern states that award associate, baccalaureate, master’s and doctoral degrees. The COC accredits universities in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Latin America. (SACS)

**Continuous Improvement**: Most accrediting bodies require institutional commitment to the concept of quality enhancement through continuous assessment and improvement. The assessment process is considered cyclic. (SACS)

**Core Requirements**: Basic, broad-based, foundational requirements that an institution must meet to be accredited with the Commission on Colleges. (SACS)

**Course Level Assessment**: Often based on grades resulting from completed course assignments, but also includes reflection on how well the class as a whole achieves the stated outcomes.
Criteria: Standards by which student performance is evaluated; help assessors maintain objectivity and inform students about expectations.

Evaluation: To determine the value of an instructional program, educational support service, or student learning outcome; interchangeable with assessment (Nichols).

Formative Assessment: The repetitive gathering of information about student learning throughout a course or program with the purpose of improving student learning from the beginning to the end of the course or program in real-time.

Goal: A statement about general aims or purposes that are broad, long-range intended outcomes.

Objective: A specific, measurable step in the plan to accomplish a goal.

Outcomes: The desired results of instruction expressed as intended cognitive affective gains from the instructional experience. Outcomes may be expressed at the course, program, or division level. A specific type of performance that students are expected to demonstrate at the end of instruction.

Mission Statement: The statement of philosophy and purpose for an organization. The mission answers the question: Why do we exist?

Nichols Assessment Model: A widely used Assessment Reporting Model designed by James O. Nichols of Institutional Effectiveness Associates.

Program Level Assessment: Goals and assessments which are broader than those of individual courses but are comprised or built by the courses in which the program encompasses.

Qualitative Assessment: Comprised of collected data that are not easily quantified mathematically, but is subjective in nature and relies on interpretive criteria.

Quantitative Assessment: Comprised of collected data that can be analyzed using objective, mathematical methods.

Rubric: A table or grid used in assessment evaluation by comparing actual performance to expected performance standards.

Standards: Requirements of competency from an accrediting body. Standards set a level of accomplishment that students are expected to meet or exceed. Meeting assessment standards does not imply standardization of programs, rather that students were able to learn certain required skill sets through multiple pathways in a program before graduation.

Student Learning Outcome: Criteria for determining whether overall program goals are being successfully met and whether students are learning a program’s curriculum to a satisfactory level.
**Summative Assessment:** The gathering of information at the conclusion of a course or program to improve learning or to meet accountability demands. The results are applied to the next cohort in the course or program.

**Vision Statement:** Articulates the organization’s values and intended contribution to society and shares how the organization should look in the future by presenting the ideal, or an ambitious, long term goal.
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