



2008-09 Annual Assessment Report (AAR) and Action Plan (AP) Guidelines Academic Programs and Administrative Units

NOTE: The AAR and AP present results and planned actions per 2008-09 Annual Assessment Plan (AAP) on record in AMOS for each program. Submission of the AAR and the AP constitutes Phase III, the closing phase of the ASU Outcomes Assessment Cycle for any given academic year. Upon submission and IAC approval of all three documents, OIPRA will certify programs and organizational units with compliance with the assessment cycle as mandated by University policy.

DEADLINE FOR AAR/AP ENTRY IN AMOS: SEPTEMBER 30, 2009

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. Accessing and completing the 2008-09 AAR/AP Document Template

- 2008-09 AARs/APs are located in the CAMPUS Shared Drive (H).
 - Click > OIPRA Folder
 - Click > (your) College and Department or VP-Office and Organization
- The 2008-09 AAR is pre-filled with the exact information contained in **Part III (Objectives, Assessment Method(s) and Target Outcome(s) of the 2008-09 AAP.** This facilitates completion of the AAR/AP by requiring only entries of the narratives discussing assessment data results/findings and checking the appropriate box stating whether the target outcome(s) was/were met, not met, or partially met. Pre-filled information cannot be changed. **Please refer to Specific Instructions for Reporting Data Findings and Action Plans.**

2. Entering the information (type in) in the 2008-09 AAR/AP (Word Template)

- **For each stated Target Outcome**, type in your narrative detailing your findings and interpretation of results in the space provided.
- SAVE your entries using the “Save” icon and close the document. Please DO NOT USE THE “Save As” option.
- **Notify your designated AMOS person that your completed AAR and AP are ready for entry into AMOS.**

3. Entering the AAR/AP in AMOS (Designated Faculty or Staff)

- Pull the completed 2008-09 AAR/AP from the CAMPUS Share Drive (H).
- SAVE a copy of your AAR/AP back to the CAMPUS (H) drive, save a copy in your hard drive, and PRINT a copy for your records
- Follow the instructions as they appear in the AMOS Training Manual
- E-mail OIPRA at assessment@athens.edu and notify that the 2008-09 AAR is in.
- Send a copy of any new/revised or missing assessment instruments (survey, exam, rubric) to assessment@athens.edu

A sample page of the AAR, AP, and Checklist are included in these guidelines.

SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS FOR REPORTING DATA FINDINGS & ACTION PLANS

I. ASSESSMENT DATA SOURCE(S)

A. Data obtained through indirect methods of assessment (University-wide and Point of Service (POS) surveys) received from OIPRA

OIPRA is responsible for the statistical analysis of university-wide and POS surveys implemented through AMEE. Academic programs and administrative units will receive their data reports by **August 28, 2009**. These findings **must be reported and discussed in the AAR narratives** as appropriate.

OIPRA will provide faculty and program officers with data results from the following surveys:

- Graduating Senior Exit Survey
- Faculty Course Evaluation
- POS Surveys (from all Administrative Units)

B. Data obtained through direct methods of assessment at the course, program, or administrative unit level:

- **Academic Programs: Course or Program Assessment Instruments**
 - Academic programs will report results in the narrative statement via their AAR.
 - Programs will complete form AAP Direct Datasheet (1610- 0915) to submit summary data from course/program assessments to OIPRA at assessment@athens.edu
- **Administrative Organizational Units:**
 - Administrative organizational units that collect data from program internal records to document program operational outcomes will report results via their AAR.
 - Units will submit copies of reports, logs or any other forms with summary data for each direct method under the appropriate control number to OIPRA at assessment@athens.edu

II. TARGET OUTCOME(S) (under each objective and corresponding assessment method)

- For **EACH ONE** of your **TARGET OUTCOME(S)**
 - Place an 'X' in the appropriate box to choose one of the following: "Met"; "Partially Met", or "Not Met".
 - "**Met**" means that the data findings show that the target outcome was achieved or exceeded (i.e. \geq stated quantified target outcome)
 - "**Partially Met**" means that the data findings show that the target outcome was "close" to achievement. Given the complexity of making a determination on "how close", program officers are welcome to use their own judgment. As a guideline, a range of between 1%-5% below the stated quantified target outcome may be reasonable.

- **"Not Met"** means that the data findings show that the target outcome deviated "considerably" below expectations. Given the complexity of making a determination on "how considerable" below expectations, program officers are welcome to use their own judgment. As a guideline, findings greater than 5% below the expected target outcome may be reasonable.
 - Place an "X" in the appropriate box to choose one of the following:
 - Action Plan Developed: **"Yes"** (Use **only** for Target Outcome(s) that were either "Partially Met" or "Not Met".)
 - Action Plan **"Not Required at This Time"** (Use **only** for Target Outcomes that were "Met").
 - All "Partially Met" or "Not Met" Outcomes will require action plans detailing strategies for improvement. **Please see specific instructions below on writing your Action Plan.**
 - Move down to the next box to enter your narrative statement for each Target Outcome.

- **NARRATIVE STATEMENT**

The narrative statement makes the case for the extent to which outcomes were met, partially met, or not met based on the assessment findings. It specifies that an annual assessment of your program was conducted and the **specific** source(s) or instrument(s) used as stated in the AAP.

- **Components of the Narrative Statement (please do not submit a bulleted list):**
 - Assessment instrument(s) used to collect the data (i.e. exit exam; POS Survey)
 - Data findings expressed quantitatively (i.e. 82% of students scored at 75 or above; 90% of x number of eligible students applying for financial aid were awarded financial assistance).
 - Data interpretation (what happened and what does it mean?)
 - Program or Office Next Step (intent to address identified weaknesses via the AP)

Note: Please ensure the accuracy of the instruments used in that particular academic year. Every assessment tool used by the program **must be on record and coded** for identification via a unique **control number** in OIPRA. Any supporting document (survey instruments, exit exams, rubrics, etc.) missing from OIPRA's records will appear highlighted in **RED**. If the control number is in red, please send an electronic copy of the document to Assessment@athens.edu OIPRA cannot certify compliance with the assessment cycle until all major and supporting documents are identified, coded, and uploaded in AMOS.

- For each Expected Target Outcome under a specific assessment method (already filled-in the AAR) provide a Narrative Statement supporting whether the outcome was "Met", "Partially Met", or "Not Met". (See guidelines above.)
 - **Missing and/or Modified Assessment Methods**
 - If any of the assessments (i.e. surveys, capstone exam, senior research project, etc.) stated in the 2008-09 AAP were not conducted, please state so and provide a brief justification as to why your program did not implement this assessment.

Resources: Funding/time/people/material. **Please note:** Complete only when regular/routine resources are either not available or are not sufficient.

Timeline: When will the tasks/actions be fully implemented?

Example: Fall 2009

Performance Indicator (Target Outcome): State the performance indicator against which the objective was measured (i.e. the one stated in the Annual Assessment Plan (AAP). The objective of this update is to document that Action Plans are implemented and monitored and new information from findings/results is used in program planning/review decisions.

SAMPLE NARRATIVE STATEMENTS AND ACTION STRATEGIES FOR DATA FINDINGS

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS (Learning Objectives)

Outcome "Met"

A. Ninety-eight percent of our graduates took the [State] Test for Teacher Certification in Biology. Eighty-nine percent of those passed the test and were certified. This represents 9 percentage points over our expected outcome of 80% success rate. No new action required at this time.

Action(s): *Benchmark those areas that drive student performance for continued use and assessment overtime.*

B. Overall, 82% of the students enrolled in the capstone course achieved assignment scores considered within “target” or “acceptable” levels of performance as defined in the scoring rubric. Lower levels of performance were identified for those areas of the assignments asking the student to discuss the advantages /disadvantages of the particular scientific methodology used.

Action(s): *Although the objective was met and technically no further action was required, the program decided to reinforce concepts dealing specifically with scientific methodology in all of its courses. Strong areas driving student performance were benchmarked for continued use and assessment overtime.*

C. As expected, 80% of the students achieved “target” or “acceptable” levels of performance as defined in the scoring rubric used for this purpose. In addition to the basic communication skills (i.e. spelling, grammar) and the ability to understand and organize the information presented, the use of technical language appropriate to a Biology graduate fell overwhelmingly within the “target” level of performance.

Action(s): *Although the objective was met and technically no further action was required, the program decided to continue reinforcing proficiency in written communication in all courses. Strong areas driving student performance were benchmarked for continued use and assessment overtime.*

Outcome "Partially Met" (Academic)

A. Capstone course exams indicate that of the five fundamental areas of biology, 22% to 27% of the students tested had some level of difficulty with concepts specifically related to cell biology (BIO XYZ). Overall student performance in all the other fundamental areas was relatively strong with exam scores ranging from 79% to 91%. Other course assignments aimed at evaluating knowledge of biology and ability to apply such knowledge resulted in individual scores ranging from 76% to 94%. Combining all assessment mechanisms used in the capstone course to measure this objective, 76% of the students obtained individual combined scores of 75% or higher. This represents 4 percentage points below expected outcome of 80%. See Action Plan for specific strategies to achieve improvement in this area.

Action(s): *The Biology faculty has been made aware of these findings. A revision of the content of the Cell Biology core course (BIO XYZ) resulted in added material and a strong emphasis on those topics that were identified as weaker areas in terms of student performance. Accordingly, a revised course syllabus is currently in use. Added focus on the practical uses of biology has been placed in all courses representing the core fundamentals of the discipline (BIO XXX, BIO XXX, BIO XXX) to strengthen students' ability not only to understand the concepts but their practical application as well.*

B. An analysis of the GRE Biology Test scores revealed overall lower scores in those questions related to genetics, specifically DNA. Overall 78% of the students scored at or above the 75th percentile. This represents two percentage points below expected outcome of 80%.

Action(s): *B. The Biology faculty has been made aware of these findings. A revision of the content of the Genetics course (BIO XXX) and corresponding laboratory (BIO XXX) resulted in added material and a strong emphasis on the topic of recombinant DNA techniques and applications, identified as a weaker area in terms of student performance. Accordingly, a revised course/lab syllabus is currently in use.*

Outcome "Not Met" (Academic)

A. An analysis of the Graduating Senior Exit Survey revealed that 71% of the students reported an increase in their communication skills when compared with their entering competency level. This represents 9 percentage points below expectations of 80%.

Action(s): *Additional written assignments and oral presentations will be implemented in all courses throughout the curriculum.*

ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS (Program Operational & Service Delivery Objectives)

Outcome "Met" (Administrative)

A. A thorough analysis of financial aid awards indicated that all available financial aid money was successfully distributed to eligible/qualified students that applied for assistance. The average award of \$4,727 covered approximately 72% of approved educational expenses (mostly tuition, fees and books). Ninety six (96) percent of eligible students obtained an award, representing 60% of the student body. This represents 1 percentage point above expected outcome of 95%

Action(s): No action required

B. Target/expected outcomes were met (M) or exceeded in the following areas:

- 82% of students used online tools at some point in their application/award process (7 percentage points above expectations of 75%)
- 36% decrease in financial aid processing time with increased use of online tools (6 percentage points above expectations of 30%, attributable to higher than expected student use of online tools, i.e. 82% vs. 75%).
- 83% student satisfaction with the financial aid services (3 percentage points above expectations of 80%).

Action(s): Areas where objectives were met are being benchmarked for continued use and assessment overtime.

Target/expected outcomes were met (M) or exceeded in the following areas:

- **Timeliness:**
 - ✓ 29.6% decrease in overall processing time for both situations where online tools were used or not used. (although slightly short from expected overall reduction of 30%, time reduction achieved by use of online tools exceeded expectations 36% vs. 30% compared with time reduction with no use of online tools of 24% vs. 30%).
 - ✓ 23% decrease in average wait time for in phone and in-person assistance.
 - ✓ 24.7% increase in accuracy of aid packages resulting in a reduction in the average number of needed revisions from 3 to 2.
 - ✓ 43% average decrease in federally-mandated materials verifications processing time from 45 days in 2005 to 26 days in 2006.
 - ✓ 77% student satisfaction with the timeliness of their financial aid awards.
- **Communication and Information Quality**
 - ✓ 94.9% information accuracy
 - ✓ 91% of eligible students received full information of the entire financial aid process previous to their initial submission of their application.
 - ✓ 100% availability of financial information in both print and electronic versions.
- **Staff Courtesy and Understanding of Financial Aid Programs and Overall Service Delivery**
 - ✓ 91.3% student satisfaction with staff assistance
 - ✓ 85.7% student satisfaction with overall financial aid service delivery

Action(s); *No action required. (Although these objectives were met and technically no further action was required, the program decided to benchmark current practices, shown to be drivers of increased office productivity and student satisfaction, and continued monitoring of administrative procedures to guide continuous improvement.)*

Outcome "Partially Met" or "Not Met" (Administrative)

A. Target/expected outcomes partially met (PM) or not met (N):

- *81% successful routing of students to advisors (although a major improvement from previous cycles, results are 9 percentage points below expectations of 90%) (PM)*
- *77% accuracy of system's responses to student questions (18 percentage points below expectations of 95%) (N)*
- *2.4 average number of office staff to complete a transaction (.4 percentage points below expectations of 2.) (PM)*

Action(s): *The following corrective actions are being implemented to address weaknesses found:*

- *A major system analysis and redesign to correct flaws in the response structure followed by retesting.*
 - *Review of the routing process to identify specific factors causing misrouting of students.*
 - *Refreshing training program for office staff to eliminate inefficiencies in the processing of applications.*
-

ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT Academic Year: 2008-2009

Organization: Office of Vice President Academic Affairs Unit: College of XXXXXXX Sub Unit: Department of XXXXXXX Program Officer: Title: Department Chair Phone No:	Organization Category: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academic <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative/Support Degree(s) Awarded by Department: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BS <input type="checkbox"/> BA <input type="checkbox"/> BSEd Degree(s) Covered By this Plan: BS XXXX	CIPC Code: XXXXXX <input type="checkbox"/> Academic/Extracurricular <input type="checkbox"/> Non Academic/Student Support <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative <input type="checkbox"/> Other
--	--	---

I. Objectives		
Objective 1: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Learning <input type="checkbox"/> Program/Operational <input type="checkbox"/> Service Delivery	Knowledge of fundamental concepts of XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	Budget Item [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Assessment Method 1.1:	Exit Exam Aggregated scores from capstone course exams (Course Number) Critique Reports and Oral Presentations Senior Research Project	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Direct <input type="checkbox"/> Indirect	Control Number 16xx-0510 16xx-0513 16xx-0511 16xx-0512	Multiple assessment tools are designed to measure the student's overall knowledge of <i>[subject matter]</i> and their applications. Performance and knowledge objectives will be evaluated and added to a database each time the course is taught. All students entering prior to fall 2007, assessment will consist only of an exit exam. For students entering fall of 2007 and thereafter, the capstone course XX 499 must be taken the last semester of their senior year. The implementation of the capstone course was a departmental decision to enhance the integrity and efficiency of the curriculum and to better prepare our students. Note: The same scoring rubric is used to evaluate the Critique Reports and the Senior Research Project.
Target Outcome(s):	At least eighty (80) percent of the students will have an individual combined score of 75% or higher.	
RESULTS - ASSESSMENT METHOD 1.1		
TARGET OUTCOME(S): [<input type="checkbox"/>] MET <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PARTIALLY MET [<input type="checkbox"/>] NOT MET		ACTION PLAN DEVELOPED: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES [<input type="checkbox"/>] NOT REQUIRED AT THIS TIME
NARRATIVE <p style="color: red;">Exit Exam: An analysis of the test scores revealed overall lower scores in those questions related to XXXX, specifically XXXX. Overall 68% of the students scored at or above the 75th percentile. This represents two percentage points below expected outcome of 80%.</p> <p style="color: red;">Aggregated scores from capstone course exams (Course Number): 76% of the students enrolled in the capstone course achieved aggregated exam scores considered within "target" or "acceptable" levels of performance. Lower levels of performance were identified for those questions related to XXXX.</p> <p style="color: red;">Critique Reports and Oral Presentations & Senior Research Project: 80% of the students achieved "target" or "acceptable" levels of performance as defined in the scoring rubric used for this purpose. In addition to the basic communication skills (i.e. spelling, grammar) and the ability to understand and organize the information presented, the use of technical language appropriate to a Biology graduate fell overwhelmingly within the "target" level of performance.</p>		



Office of Vice President Academic Affairs
Office of Institutional Assessment

ACTION PLAN

Department Name and College: Program Name (A minor is required.), College of XXXXX

Degree(s) Awarded: BS in Appropriate Program (A minor is required.)

Date: 9/9/2009 (automatically updated, no need to fill in)

Objective 1: Knowledge of Fundamental Concepts of Mathematics and its Applications. (Already inserted directly from the AAR)			
Improvement Strategies: (State the approach that will be used to address the identified weakness. For example: Increase student experience developing written material and oral presentations)			
Tasks/Action Steps (What will be done?)	Responsibilities (Who will do it?)	Resources (Funding/Time/Personnel/Materials)	Timeline (By when? Mon./Yr.)
<p>Specific actions taken to implement the improvement strategy.</p> <p>A revision of the content of the XXXX course (XXX) and corresponding laboratory (XXX) resulted in added material and a strong emphasis on the topic of XXXX techniques and applications, identified as a weaker area in terms of student performance. Accordingly, a revised course/lab syllabus is currently in use.</p>	<p>Course Faculty</p>	<p>Funding/time/people material. Please note: Complete only when regular/routine resources are either not available or are not sufficient.</p>	<p>When will the tasks/actions be fully implemented? Fall 2008</p>
<p>Performance Indicator (Target Outcome): State the performance indicator against which the objective was measured (i.e. the one stated in the Annual Assessment Plan (AAP)). At least eighty (80) percent of the students will have an individual combined score of 75% or higher.</p>			

ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT Academic Year: 2008-2009

Organization: Office of Vice President of Unit: Sub Unit: Program Officer: Title: Phone No:	Organization Category: <input type="checkbox"/> Academic <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Administrative/Support Degree(s) Awarded by Department: <input type="checkbox"/> BS <input type="checkbox"/> BA <input type="checkbox"/> BSEd Degree(s) Covered By this Plan: _____ CIPC Code: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Academic/Extracurricular <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non Academic/Student Support <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative <input type="checkbox"/> Other
--	---

I. Objectives

Objective 1: <input type="checkbox"/> Learning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Program/Operational <input type="checkbox"/> Service Delivery	Increase the number of online tools available to students, families and other stakeholders to facilitate the financial aid process.	Budget Item <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--	--------------------------------------

Assessment Method 1.1: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Direct <input type="checkbox"/> Indirect	Control Number xxxx-0600 Analysis of internal office records and log systems Senior Exit Survey Financial Aid Services Survey
--	--

Target Outcome(s):	75% of students applying for financial aid use online tools 90% system's successful routing of students to advisors. 95% accuracy of system's responses to questions related to financial aid. 30% decrease in financial aid processing time with increased use of online tools. Two office staff maximum requirement per completed award transaction. 80% of those reporting high levels of satisfaction with the system.
---------------------------	---

RESULTS - ASSESSMENT METHOD 1.1

TARGET OUTCOME(S): <input type="checkbox"/> MET <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PARTIALLY MET <input type="checkbox"/> NOT MET	ACTION PLAN DEVELOPED: <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOT REQUIRED AT THIS TIME
--	---

NARRATIVE Target/expected outcomes partially met (PM) or not met (N): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ 81% successful routing of students to advisors (although a major improvement from previous cycles, results are 9 percentage points below expectations of 90%) (PM) ✓ 77% accuracy of system's responses to student questions (18 percentage points below expectations of 95%) (N) ✓ 2.4 average number of office staff to complete a transaction (.4 percentage points below expectations of 2.) (PM)



ACTION PLAN

Department Name and College:

Degree(s) Awarded:

Date:

Objective 1 Increase the number of online tools available to students, families and other stakeholders to facilitate the financial aid process.			
Improvement Strategies:			
Tasks/Action Steps (What will be done?)	Responsibilities (Who will do it?)	Resources (Funding/Time/Personnel/Materials. . . Please note: <i>Complete only when regular/routine resources are either not available or are not sufficient.)</i>	Timeline (By when? Mon./Yr.)
<p>1. A major system analysis and redesign to correct flaws in the response structure followed by retesting.</p> <p>2. Review of the routing process to identify specific factors causing misrouting of students.</p> <p>3. Refreshing training program for office staff to eliminate inefficiencies in the processing of applications.</p>	<p>Director of Student Financial Services and Director of Information Technology (IT)</p> <p>Director and Staff of Student Financial Services</p>		<p>2008-09</p>
<p>Performance Indicator (Target Outcome): 90% system's successful routing of students to advisors. 95% accuracy of system's responses to questions related to financial aid. 30% decrease in financial aid processing time with increased use of online tools.</p>			



ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT (AAR) SCORING SHEET

Department: _____ **College:** _____
Degree Program: _____
Point of Contact (POC) Name: _____ **POC Phone #:** _____
Date: _____

Yes	No	Overall Report
___	___	a. The report demonstrates that assessment methods were implemented as described in Section IV of the Annual Assessment Plan (AAP).
___	___	b. If changes were made to the assessment methods stipulated in the AAP, are they been noted and briefly explained in this report (AAR)?
___	___	c. The report provides a summary of the data from each of the assessment methods in <u>quantitative</u> form.
___	___	d. The report clearly references the expected/target outcome <u>quantitatively</u> as stated in Section IV of the AAP.
___	___	e. The report demonstrates that assessment findings were measured against expected/target outcomes to determine whether objectives were “Met”, “Partially Met”, or “Not Met”.
___	___	f. Is there evidence of validity and reliability concerns from the data findings, and if so, have they been noted and briefly explained in this report?
___	___	g. The report demonstrates how the findings are/will be used to improve the program or service by addressing identified areas in need of improvement via action plan(s).
___	___	h. The report includes an Action Plan(s) with defined tasks, responsibilities, resources, and timeframes.
___	___	i. If a proposed assessment method required a scoring rubric, is a copy of the rubric used attached to this report? (Not applicable to Administrative/Support Functions Plans)

Notes/Comments