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Guidelines for the Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness

I. Introduction

What is Institutional Effectiveness?

Institutional effectiveness is the systematic and ongoing process of collecting, analyzing and acting on data and information relating to the goals and outcomes developed to support the University's mission and purpose. Thus, institutional effectiveness is oriented towards measuring results and using these results to aid in decision-making and improvement.

Institutional effectiveness is not a one-time process, but rather a cyclical process in which continuous improvements and refinements on goals and methods are undertaken. Furthermore, institutional effectiveness, like the University itself, is not static, but rather an ever-changing and evolving process. Thus, it needs to be revisited continuously to ensure that the needs, purpose and mission of the University are being met.

In general, institutional effectiveness focuses on four main categories of organizational functions:

1. instructional/student learning outcomes,
2. research productivity outcomes,
3. administrative services outcomes, and
4. public service outcomes

When the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Commission on Colleges revised the Criteria for Accreditation (approved Dec. 2001), it made the assumption "that, for each institution, the procedures for evaluating educational effectiveness, including the quality of student learning, and using the results to improve programs, services, and operations are essential to the institution so as to view it as a continuous necessity rather than an episodic period of evaluation." (SACS, 2001 Commission on Colleges Annual Report, pg. 6). Furthermore, criterion 16 states "The institution identifies expected outcomes for its educational programs and its administrative and educational support services; assesses whether it achieves these outcomes; and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of those results."
The Institutional Effectiveness Cycle

The overall institutional effectiveness process includes an ongoing planning-assessment-improvement cycle that is applied to specific functions and outcomes at each level of the organization: institution, college, department, and program. Regardless of the organizational level, six primary phases are typically identified as essential to this process:

1. stating central or core expectations of program outcomes that are related to the program's/department's primary function;
2. identifying and/or developing specific assessment procedures appropriate for measuring each intended outcome;
3. systematically conducting assessment activities;
4. using assessment data to evaluate the extent to which outcomes have been accomplished and identifying possible explanations for results obtained (evaluative and diagnostic functions);
5. based on assessment findings, developing and implementing specific strategies for program enhancement and/or improvement; and
6. modifying program outcomes based on enhancements and starting the cycle over.

Principles of Good Assessment Practice

The American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) has developed nine "Principles of Good Practice for Assessing Student Learning." While these Principles were developed primarily for use in instructional assessment, many of them are also applicable to other types of assessment such as the evaluation of non-instructional units.

These Principles serve as the foundation for the development and maintenance of the Institutional Effectiveness program at Southeastern Louisiana University. The Principles are as follows:

1. The assessment of student learning begins with educational values.
2. Assessment is most effective when it reflects an understanding of learning as multidimensional, integrated, and revealed in performance over time.
3. Assessment works best when the programs it seeks to improve have clear, explicitly stated purposes.
4. Assessment requires attention to outcomes but also and equally to the experiences that lead to those outcomes.
5. Assessment works best when it is ongoing, not episodic.
6. Assessment fosters wider improvement when representatives from across the educational community are involved.
7. Assessment makes a difference when it begins with issues of use and illuminates questions that people really care about.
8. Assessment is most likely to lead to improvement when it is part of a larger set of conditions that promote change.
9. Through assessment, educators meet responsibilities to students and to the public.

Why Should Southeastern Assess Institutional Effectiveness?

There are two general purposes for institutional effectiveness: improvement and accountability. For institutions of higher education in the late 20th century and into the 21st century, both of these purposes are vitally important.

The issue of institutional effectiveness is recognized by the University as being integral to the standards that Southeastern has for its academic and service programs, as well as to SACS accreditation.

Southeastern Louisiana University has developed a full program of activities for assessment of all institutional outcome components. Instructional and student learning outcomes are evaluated through Major Field Assessment, General Education Assessment, and assessment of academic non-degree programs. Administrative services outcomes and performance standards are evaluated for all administrative units through a comprehensive program of continuous quality improvement. Research productivity outcomes and public service outcomes are measured longitudinally as part of the strategic planning and benchmarking process.

Assumptions Underlying Southeastern’s Program of Institutional Effectiveness

A. The main purpose of Institutional Effectiveness is program improvement. While Southeastern recognizes that the institution must be accountable to accrediting agencies, the legislature, the public, and students, accountability is secondary to program improvement.
B. Institutional effectiveness results are to be used for program/department/unit assessment and improvement only. They are not to be used for tenure and/or promotion review, merit review, or any other personnel decisions.

C. As a requirement for graduation, students are expected to complete all assessment procedures related to general education and/or major field assessment. The Southeastern General Catalogue contains a statement to this effect.

D. Major Field Assessment and General Education assessment activities should be embedded as much as possible into courses and program experiences. This linkage between assessment activities and courses will help to increase the amount of student participation as well as to emphasize the importance of assessment. Assessment activities should not be regarded as intrusive, extrinsic elements to teaching and learning.

E. In their 1994 reaffirmation visit, the SACS accreditation committee commended the University for "...the positive outlook demonstrated by members of the University community" (p. 9) in regards to institutional effectiveness. It is assumed that this positive outlook will continue, and faculty and staff will willingly engage in Institutional Effectiveness for the betterment of the University and its programs.
II. Major Field Assessment

Guidelines for Major Field Assessment

By definition, Major Field Assessment is the evaluation of program effectiveness for each degree subject area offered at Southeastern Louisiana University. The determination of program effectiveness is made by assessing student outcomes in the cognitive, affective, and performance domains. That is, a program is deemed effective if students have certain knowledge, values, and skills at the completion of the program. However, the University recognizes that major field assessment is not the same as the evaluation of students.

Major Field Assessment will be keyed to the University's general role, mission, and scope statement, and to the University's Strategic Goals. Because the programs at Southeastern Louisiana University are so diverse in nature and content, the methods used for Major Field Assessment will also be diverse.

Faculty input is essential to successful Major Field Assessment. Faculty are in the best position to identify program outcomes and the strategies to be used to measure those outcomes. Multiple measures of student learning including achievement, performance, and attitude measures are important in establishing an effective Major Field Assessment plan.

Major Field Assessment activities should be directly tied as much as possible to course and program experiences, thereby increasing the amount of student participation as well as to emphasizing the importance of assessment. Furthermore, the use of curriculum-embedded assessment will provide an important arena for obtaining authentic assessment data. For example, program level surveys could be part of non-graded course requirements in a senior level course for majors. Naturally, such assessments as senior projects, simulations, and portfolios should be part of advanced courses in the major.
General Procedures for Major Field Assessment

**Major Field Assessment Contact Person and Committee**
All programs will have identified a tenured or tenure-track faculty member as the Major Field Assessment contact person. This person will serve as the program's liaison for assessment and should be someone other than the department head. This individual will be the program’s contact with the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. In addition, this person will coordinate the assessment projects for the program and will be expected to participate in training activities associated with Major Field Assessment.

Each program will establish a Major Field Assessment committee to assist and provide input to the contact person. Along with faculty members, program alumni and professional in the fields appropriate to graduates may be included. Members of this group will take responsibility for developing and implementing an assessment plan and will work with all the program's faculty to complete the process. It should be noted that the Major Field Assessment committee need not be a separate committee; if a standing departmental committee for curriculum review or accreditation exists, then that committee could incorporate review of assessment results into their responsibilities.

While the Major Field Assessment committee will be responsible for each program's activities, all faculty should be kept informed of Major Field Assessment activities, and their input should be obtained before program and/or curricula changes are made. Faculty working on Major Field Assessment planning should be recognized for their contributions to the improvement of teaching and learning at the university. This recognition may come in the form of counting such service towards promotion and/or tenure.

**Major Field Assessment Plans**
Each program will have a Major Field Assessment plan on file with the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. This plan will include the following:

A. A *program purpose statement*. This statement will describe in general terms what the program provides for the student in terms of instructional outcomes. For example,

   The Department of Psychology attempts to foster among all students an understanding and appreciation of the scientific method in the study of behavior, and to stimulate interest in the field of Psychology. An undergraduate major and minor in Psychology are offered as preparation for either graduate study or careers in which the science of behavior is applicable.
This program purpose statement should be published in appropriate university publication such as the General Catalogue.

B. *Goal Statements.* Goal statements are more specific statements about what students will receive as a result of completing their major field courses. An example of a goal statement is:

To provide students with a broad body of knowledge representative of the current state of knowledge in psychology.

C. *Expected Outcomes.* For each goal statement the expected student outcomes must be stated. The outcomes express in specific terms what graduates of a program should know and be able to do. These statements are typically of three types: 1) cognitive or knowledge-based; 2) behavioral or performance-based; and 3) affective or attitudinal-based. For example:

Students completing the baccalaureate program in Psychology will compare favorably in their knowledge of general psychology with those students graduating from a national sample of psychology programs in institutions comparable to Southeastern.

The input of faculty in each program area in determining these outcomes is essential. In addition, each course in the curriculum must have well-defined objectives, written in terms of observable student behavior. The objectives are evidence that learning outcomes are addressed during the student’s course of study. There will often be multiple outcomes for a single goal statement.

D. *Assessment Procedure and Criteria.* A variety of methods for assessment is possible. Faculty should select those methods that are most appropriate for the program. Such methods might include but are not limited to:

- Standardized tests
- Locally-made objective tests
- Senior comprehensives (written/oral)
- Capstone courses/seminars
- Portfolios
- Senior projects
- Clinical/field experiences
- Internships
- Performances/exhibits/demonstrations
- Questionnaires and surveys
- Interviews
- Self-assessments
- External examiners/peer review
- Simulations
- Diagnostic protocols
Assessment methods must be reliable and valid, and multiple methods of assessment are encouraged.

The assessment statement will include the type of assessment to be utilized, who is to be assessed, when they are to be assessed, and what the criteria for meeting the expected outcome is. For example:

Southeastern graduating psychology majors will have an average total score on the ETS Major Field Achievement Test in Psychology that meets or exceeds the 50th percentile rank of a national sample of schools

A complete example of a Major Field Assessment plan can be found in Appendix D: Example of a Major Field Assessment Plan.

**Review of Major Field Assessment Plan**

Every three years departments are required to review their Major Field Assessment plan and to provide an updated plan to the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. These plans should be reviewed to ensure that goals and outcomes are still relevant and that all necessary areas are addressed.

If a department determines that a plan does not need to be updated, then a memo stating that the plan has been reviewed needs to be forwarded to the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Departments are encouraged to undertake a review of their plans more frequently, particularly at times of curriculum or program change.

**Major Field Assessment Testing**

Those departments which use standardized major field testing will work with the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment to coordinate the implementation of the standardized testing. At the beginning of each semester in which a department is scheduled for testing, the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment will provide a list of students in each program who have applied to graduate in that semester. While this list may not be complete or comprehensive, it should aid in identifying students who may need to take the test and to estimate how many students should be taking the test. At this time, departments will also be provided with the time frame for administration of the Major Field Assessment tests.

Departments will then be contacted by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment to arrange the exact dates and times for testing and to verify the number of tests that need to be ordered. The week prior to the test, a reminder memo will be sent which will contain the time and place of the testing as well as how many tests have been ordered.

**Role of the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment in Major Field Assessment**

The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment routinely collects data that may be used for Major Field Assessment. This includes the Southeastern Exit Survey, the
Southeastern Undergraduate and Graduate Alumni Surveys, and employer surveys. The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment will provide departments with the information collected from these surveys in a timely manner. A more detailed description of the role of the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment in Institutional Effectiveness can be found in Appendix B: The Role Of The Office Of Institutional Research And Assessment In Institutional Effectiveness.

The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment will also be available to provide technical expertise and other support as the departments undertake their assessment activities. Furthermore, the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment will maintain a library of resources and references on assessment. A list of references in that library can be found in Appendix A: Resources For Assessment.

**Review of Assessment Results: Documenting the Process**

Under SACS guidelines, documenting all assessment activities, results, and uses is extremely important.

Once Major Field Assessment activities have taken place, the resultant data must be synthesized and analyzed, and then documented. One way in which this can be easily done is through a Goal Attainment Framework. A Goal Attainment Framework can help develop a comprehensive picture of the health of the program. One of the strengths of the Goal Attainment Framework is that while it provides a consistent model across curricula, it can be individualized to the needs of each program. A Goal Attainment Framework is not required, however it is a useful tool to help a department synthesize and analyze data.

**Determining a Goal Attainment Framework**

For each expected outcome, each program's Major Field Assessment committee, in consultation with other faculty, will determine five levels of performance: Much Less than Expected, Less than Expected, Expected, More than Expected, and Much More than Expected. The Expected level will correspond with the assessment statement in the Major Field Assessment Plan.

Once these levels are determined, the Major Field Assessment committee will indicate students performance on each outcome. Areas of weakness which the program needs to address as well as areas of strength can then be identified. An example of a Goal Attainment Framework for a fictitious department can be found in Appendix E: Example of the Goal Attainment Framework.

**Documenting How Assessment Results are Used**

One of the most important parts of Major Field Assessment is using the assessment results for program and curriculum review and change. For documentation purposes,
each program must provide a report detailing how assessment results are used every two years. This report should contain any changes made on the basis of the assessments and how the program responded to previous changes.

The report should not be done in isolation but rather should also incorporate the previous reports. If changes to be implemented were discussed in the previous report, than the current year should include information on the effect of those changes. If a department determined in the previous report that more assessment results were needed before a change was made, then that area should be addressed in the current report. An example of a report can be found in Appendix F: Example of a Review of MFA Results and Report on Curricular Changes.
III. Assessment of General Education

Guidelines for General Education Assessment

General Education Assessment at Southeastern Louisiana University focuses upon those areas of knowledge, intellectual inquiry, motivations, and competencies that are necessary to foster lifelong learning. General education at Southeastern reflects the mission and purpose of the University in that it strives to meet the education and cultural needs of the area by providing an academic experience that enables students to live meaningful and productive lives.

General Education Assessment is undertaken for purposes of accountability and improvement of the overall program. The intent of this assessment is to measure the effects of the general education curriculum on student progress and to provide feedback on the performance of that curriculum. This affords faculty and staff the means to evaluate and improve the general education program in a systematic and effective manner.

The Louisiana Board of Regents Division of Academic and Student Affairs has mandated statewide general education requirements which are broad-based and appropriate to the mission and purpose of Southeastern Louisiana University. Therefore, effectiveness of the general education curriculum is identified by examining student progress in these goals:

- to communicate effectively in oral and written English;
- to read with comprehension;
- to reason abstractly and think critically;
- to understand numerical data and statistics;
- to understand the scientific method;
- to be familiar with key technological and informational applications;
- to learn independently;
- to recognize and appreciate cultural diversity;
- to understand the nature and value of the fine and performing arts;
- to develop a personal value system while retaining a tolerance for others; and
- to understand the American political system.
General Procedures for General Education Assessment

A General Education Subcommittee will be appointed from the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. Periodically (every 3-5 years), this subcommittee will review the Guidelines for General Education Assessment, gather relevant data, and issue a report on the status of general education. This subcommittee report will be sent to the Provost, who will then make recommendations and suggestions as necessary.
Guidelines for the Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness

IV. Assessment of Support Units

Guidelines for Assessment of Support Units

Support units are those non-degree granting units that play a substantial role in furthering the mission of the University. These units are typically not associated with a specific academic college or department (An exception to this are the departments/units in the College of Basic Studies which are non-degree granting and which do not undergo Major Field Assessment). These units are not typically part of an established accreditation process, although they may have some forms of external review.

General Procedures for Assessment of Support Units

Documentation on the unit's mission, objectives, and evaluation does not need to be centrally collected, nor does the unit have to submit a written report. Certification is be in the form of a memo that simply states whether or not the unit is in compliance with a copy going to the unit head's supervisor and Vice President (See Appendix G: Support Units Compliance Memo). If the unit is not in compliance, then the memo would further summarize how the unit expects to come into compliance.

The Characteristics of Effective Support Units is broken down into three sections. Characteristics 1 and 2 deal with mission, objectives, assessment, and the uses of assessment results. Characteristic 3 deals with management of the unit.

Characteristics of Effective Support Units

Characteristic 1.

*What the unit strives to accomplish supports the mission of the University.*

There is a documented mission statement for the unit that:

- Delineates the reasons for the unit's existence.
- Links the program to the mission of the University
- Identifies constituencies that are served.
- Is updated, revised and approved periodically.

**Characteristic 2.**

*How the unit goes about achieving its mission is well defined and regularly evaluated.*

**A.** There is a documented set of intended outcomes for the unit that:
- Are clear, concise, specific, and measurable.
- Define and pursue excellence.
- Are established or reviewed regularly.
- Are collaborative where possible, both within and beyond the University.
- Utilize results obtained from prior evaluation/assessment efforts.
- Recognize the role of diversity in forms appropriate to the mission and goals of the unit (e.g., in personnel, constituencies, programs, services, etc.)

**B.** There are documented regular assessment/evaluation efforts that:
- Include periodic reviews.
- Provide for external input into reviews.
- Determine satisfaction/dissatisfaction levels of constituents.
- Obtain and utilize comparative information on programs and services of peers as appropriate.
- Identify and determine targets for appropriate performance measures/benchmarks if appropriate.
- Determine the extent to which excellence is achieved.
- Are utilized in the allocation of program resources.

**Characteristic 3.**

*The unit is well managed in all aspects.*

**A.** There is an internal planning/budgeting process that:
- Is based on knowledge of the needs, expectations and perspectives of constituent groups.
- Emanates from the intended goals/objectives/outcomes.
- Provides opportunities for participation by personnel in the unit
- Provides long-term direction as well as short-term focus.

**B.** There is good management of human resources that is evident in:
- The creation, maintenance, and evaluation of an environment that fosters civility.
- The presence of performance standards for personnel.
- The conduct of annual written evaluations of personnel based on the standards of performance.
- The specification of professional development objectives for personnel.
- The recruitment, promotion, and retention of qualified personnel.
- The identification, design, and promotion of opportunities for the further education and training of personnel.
- The provision of opportunities for personnel to receive feedback from colleagues, supervised personnel, and constituents.

C. There are good communication practices within the unit that:
- Provide for appropriate sharing of information within the unit.
- Inform other units in a timely manner of decisions that may have an impact on them.
- Provide for sharing of information with constituent groups.

D. There is evidence of the management of finances that:
- Results in unit expenditures not exceeding the annual budget without prior authorization.
- Conforms to all state and university policy and procedures.
- Results in expenditures being directly related to unit goals/objectives.

E. There is evidence of the management of technology that:
- Insures that personnel have achieved necessary skill levels.
- Documents unit procedures relating to the use of technology.
- Provides appropriate security access to data.
- Conforms to all state and university policies and procedures.
- Provides cross training of personnel in critical/essential functions.

F. There is evidence of service to constituents that:
- Initiates and maintains positive relationships.
- Seeks out and responds to constituent needs.
- Is timely, accurate, and respectful of constituents.

G. There is evidence of unit practices that:
- Meet ethical standards of the profession.
- Comply with all federal, state, and local laws.

Review of Assessment Results: Documenting the Process

Documentation for Characteristic 1 should be centrally located within the unit in separate files that are specific to Institutional Effectiveness. These files should be well maintained and be available for review by University officials or accreditation reviewers.

Documentation for Characteristic 2 should also be centrally located within the unit and available for review. There is no prescribed documentation for Characteristic 2, however some examples of Institutional Effectiveness Plans are available at the end of this document (see Appendix I).

Documentation for Characteristic 3 (A through G) need not be centrally located in files specifically for Institutional Effectiveness, but unit directors must be able to produce documentation for review as appropriate. For example, documentation related to
management of human resources may be located within existing personnel records; documentation related to budget planning may be located within the unit’s financial records; while documentation related to internal communications might be in the form of staff meeting minutes or internal memos. In all cases, documentation should be well maintained, accurate, up-to-date, and consistent with any standards described in University, University of Louisiana System, Louisiana Board of Regents, state and/or federal policy. Documentation may be in electronic form.
Appendix A: Resources for Assessment


Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. CAS Self-Assessment Guides. CAS.


**Internet Resources for Higher Education Outcomes Assessment**
http://www2.acs.ncsu.edu/UPA/assmt/resource.htm (June 2002).
The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment has several major functions which are directly related to Institutional Effectiveness. They are as follows:

- Design, conduct and report on studies, surveys and analyses in support of decision-making, assessment, and planning for all university units.

- Provide helpful consultation to University personnel and committees concerning appropriate research design, effective survey development, test and measurement pedagogy and appropriate instrumentation for institutional assessment.

- Communicate information on the institution to members of the University community through a variety of media.

- In addition to these functions, the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment collects and store documentation on Institutional Effectiveness.
Appendix C: The Role of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee is a standing committee appointed by the Provost of the University. The committee is composed of faculty, staff and student representatives.

The charge of the committee is to develop, review and recommend policies and procedures for institutional effectiveness. On a periodic basis the committee reviews the University’s policies and procedures to determine what revisions, additions and clarifications are needed.
MAJOR FIELD ASSESSMENT PLAN
B. A. PSYCHOLOGY

The mission of Southeastern Louisiana University is to meet the education and cultural needs, primarily of Southeast Louisiana, to disseminate knowledge and to facilitate lifelong learning through quality instruction, research and service in a safe, student-centered environment.

The Department of Psychology attempts to foster, among all students, a grasp and appreciation of the scientific method in the study of behavior, and to stimulate interest in the field of Psychology.

Goal 1

To provide students with a broad body of knowledge representative of the current state of knowledge in Psychology

A. Expected Outcome

Students completing the baccalaureate program in Psychology will compare favorably in their knowledge of general psychology with those students graduating from a national sample of psychology programs in institutions comparable to Southeastern.

Assessment
Southeastern graduating psychology majors will have an average total score on the ETS Major Field Achievement Test in Psychology which meets or exceeds the 50th percentile rank on a national sample of schools. ETS provides not only a total scale score, but two subscores and several "assessment indicators" so that relative strengths and weaknesses of a program can be evaluated. It is expected that Southeastern graduating psychology majors will meet or exceed the 50th percentile in each of the following two subtests: Experimental Psychology and Social Psychology. In addition, it is expected that Southeastern graduating psychology majors meet or exceed the 50th percentile on each of the following "assessment indicators": Learning, Cognition & Perception; Sensory &
Physiological: Developmental; Clinical, Abnormal & Personality; Social; and Measurement & Methodology. The area of Ethology & Comparative Psychology is omitted because we do not currently offer a course in this area.

B. **Expected Outcome**

Students will have a positive opinion of the degree to which they have been exposed to a broad body of knowledge in Psychology.

**Assessment**

Selected Psychology 101 sections will be administered the "Students' Attitudes Towards Psychology" questionnaires at both the beginning and end of the semester. Students will have positive scores (i.e. an average score of above "3.0") on those items in which they rate their opinion of the degree to which they have been exposed to a broad body of knowledge in Psychology.

**Goal 2**

Psychology students should understand and appreciate the scientific method, and be able to apply it.

A. **Expected Outcome**

Psychology majors will demonstrate the application of the scientific method to an actual research question.

**Assessment**

In a required upper level research class (Psyc 333 or 334), psychology majors will produce a written manuscript of publishable quality from beginning to end that requires the student to be able to conceptualize the targeted phenomenon into scientific research terms, generate one or more testable hypotheses, and test the hypotheses.

B. **Expected Outcome**

Students completing the baccalaureate program in Psychology will compare favorably in their knowledge of research methodology with those students graduating from a national sample of psychology programs in institutions comparable to Southeastern.

**Assessment**

Southeastern graduating psychology majors will take the ETS Major Field Achievement Test in Psychology and meet or exceed the 50th percentile in the Experimental psychology subtest and on the Measurement and Methodology "assessment indicator".
C. **Expected Outcome**

Psychology majors will feel confident in their abilities to conduct psychological research.

**Assessment**
Based on the "Students Attitude Towards Psychology" instrument, at least 80% of those students taking Psychology 333 or 334 will rate themselves as being able to demonstrate the following skills with only minimal supervision—collect data, do background research, formulate a set of hypotheses, write up an Introduction section, write up a methods section, graph data, use statistics, write results section, and write discussion section.

D. **Expected Outcome**

Graduates will be able to critique a methodologically simple published experiment, be able to point out any obvious methodological errors, and offer reasonable suggestions for their correction in a follow-up experiment.

**Assessment**
In a required upper level research class (Psyc 333 or 334), psychology majors will produce written a manuscript of publishable quality from beginning to end. Such a project requires the student to be able to critique a methodologically simple published experiment, be able to point out any obvious methodological errors, and offer reasonable suggestions for their correction in a follow-up experiment.

**Goal 3**

Students graduating with a bachelor's degree in psychology should desire to and be qualified for graduate study in Behavioral Sciences.

A. **Expected Outcome**

The rate of admittance into graduate schools in the behavioral sciences will compare favorably with other students graduating from a national sample of psychology programs in institutions comparable to Southeastern, and who apply for graduate work in the field. Once in a graduate program, the level of academic performance will compare favorably with other students graduating from institutions comparable to Southeastern.

**Assessment**

a. In the Undergraduate Alumni survey, at least 25% of psychology majors will indicate that they are currently pursuing an advanced degree in the Behavioral Sciences.
b. Southeastern graduating psychology majors will have an average Total score on the ETS Major Field Achievement Test in Psychology which meets or exceeds the 50th percentile rank on a national sample of schools.

c. On the Southeastern Exit Survey, at least 25% of graduating Psychology majors will indicate they are accepted in graduate school, or intend to go to graduate school.

B. Expected Outcome

Psychology majors will feel that they are prepared to attend graduate school.

Assessment

a. Students administered the various "Students' Attitudes Towards Psychology" questionnaires in Psychology 333 and 334 will have significantly higher average positive scores than do the Freshmen and Sophomores taking Psychology 101 responding to those items in which they rate their opinion of how well-prepared they are for graduate school. In addition, the Psychology 333 and 334 students will have average scores equal to or higher than non-psychology majors who are Juniors or Seniors taking Psychology 101 who respond to these items. The Various "Students' Attitudes" questionnaires require students to state their current academic classification, therefore these latter analyses should be feasible to do.

b. On the Undergraduate Alumni survey, 80% of psychology majors who are attending graduate school will be satisfied with the instruction they received at Southeastern.
# Appendix E: Goal Attainment Framework

**B.A., Psycholinguistics**  
Department of Clinical Psychoanalysis  

Based on Fall 1995/Spring 1996 Data  
December 1, 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Much Less then Expected</th>
<th>Less than Expected</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>More than Expected</th>
<th>Much More then Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of students scoring an average of 3.5 or above on Practicum Evaluation</td>
<td>&lt;60%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>80-90%</td>
<td>&gt;90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of students scoring at the 50th percentile or above on the Freudian Assessment of Psychoanalytic Knowledge</td>
<td>&lt;20%</td>
<td>20-39%</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>60-80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of students scoring 3.0 or above on Evaluation of the Report on Psychoanalytic Experience</td>
<td>&lt;40%</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>60-74%</td>
<td>75-85%</td>
<td>&gt;85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Alumni rating the program as good or very good on the Alumni Survey</td>
<td>&lt;50%</td>
<td>50-59%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Rating on the Exit Survey in regards to Satisfaction with practicum, internship, clinical or other hands-on experiences outside of the classroom</td>
<td>&lt;3.0</td>
<td>3.50-3.99</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.01-4.50</td>
<td>&gt;4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Rating on the Exit Survey in regards to Opportunities to collaborate with other students on class projects.</td>
<td>&lt;3.0%</td>
<td>3.50-3.99</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.01-4.50</td>
<td>&gt;4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of students scoring ranked as satisfactory on their use of psychoanalytic terms in the Evaluation of the Report on Psychoanalytic Experience</td>
<td>&lt;70%</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>80-89%</td>
<td>90-95%</td>
<td>&gt;95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.A., Psycholinguistics  
Department of Clinical Psychoanalysis  

December 1, 1996

Reviewing the results of the 1995-96 assessment activities indicate areas of strengths and weaknesses within the BA in Psycholinguistics program. One of the areas of strength was the score of students on the Practicum Evaluation. This is an instrument completed by practicum supervisors. Two years ago we discovered that students did not score as well on this as expected, so we redesigned the class students were required to take prior to their practicum experience. We included more emphasis on professional behavior in the clinical setting and included more discussions on the therapy experience and less discussion on psychoanalytic theories. We believe the increase in the number of students scoring above 3.5 indicates the effectiveness of the new class, but will continue to monitor this over the next couple of years. Another indicator of the effectiveness of this class is that the average rating on the Exit Survey for the item asking about students' satisfaction with practicum, internship, clinical or other hands-on experiences outside of the classroom. Students' satisfaction is what we expected, thus indicating that students are not dissatisfied with the change.

Another area of perceived strength was in the score on the Evaluation of the Report on Psychoanalytic Experience. This is an instrument that was developed in-house to help evaluate a report all students must write on their own experience in psychoanalysis. This indicates how well our program has aided students' ability to write a clear, concise psychoanalytic report. Students performed much better than was expected on this indicator. Although we feel that this is positive, we are going to review the instrument to determine if it is indeed rigorous enough to adequately evaluate a student's writing ability.

One of the major weaknesses discovered in the program was that students do not use psychoanalytic terms in their writing. While overall, students scored high on the Evaluation of the Report on the Psychoanalytic Experience, when the item assessing their use of psychoanalytic terms was looked at separately, fewer students than expected scored satisfactorily. Faculty members in the department discussed this result,
and what could be done about it. In the discussion the faculty came to a consensus that the outcome seemed appropriate when the MFA plan was developed. However, the faculty realized that using psychoanalytic terms is something that is typically developed in graduate studies and is in fact more appropriate for students with advanced degrees. Therefore, we have decided to modify our MFA plan and delete the outcome.

Another area in which students performed at a level below expectation was in the Freudian Assessment of Psychoanalytic Knowledge. This is a standardized test which compares our students with other students in the nation. Because the overall scores were lower than expected, we looked more closely at the subscale scores. The area in which Southeastern students scored the lowest was in ethics. In the ensuing discussion, we discovered that faculty assumed this topic was being discussed in all classes. Due to this assumption, individual faculty would often gloss over ethics discussion. It was decided to add a special component on ethics to the Introduction to the Id, Ego, and Superego class which all majors must take. We also decided to include a component on ethics in the practicum preparation class. With these changes, it is probable that students will participate in multiple discussions of Psychoanalysis Ethics. We will monitor the future results of the ethics subscale to determine if these changes are sufficient to increase students knowledge of ethics.

Another weakness was in the area of opportunities to collaborate with other students on class projects. At this time, we do not believe we have sufficient data to warrant a change in the program. When more data are available, the outcome will be re-evaluated.
Appendix G: Support Units Compliance Memo

Date:

To: Dr. Hunter Alessi, Chair, Committee for Institutional Effectiveness

From: Name and Title of Unit Director

RE: Review of Compliance with the Characteristics of Effective Support Units

Name of Unit: ____________________________________________

Review Certification:

_____ Unit is in total compliance with the characteristics. Documentation for Characteristics 1 and 2 is located in _____________________________.

_____ Unit is in partial compliance with the characteristics. Documentation for Characteristics 1 and 2 is located in _____________________________. The following actions will be taken to bring the unit in compliance (state characteristic, problem, action to be taken, and date of expected completion):

cc: Unit Director's Vice President or the President
Unit Director's Supervisor (if applicable)
Support units are those non-degree granting units that play a substantial role in furthering the mission of the University. These units are typically not associated with a specific academic college or department (An exception to this are the departments/units in the College of Basic Studies which are non-degree granting and which do not undergo Major Field Assessment). These units are not typically part of an established accreditation process, although they may have some forms of external review.

- **Reporting to the President**
  - Athletics
  - Internal Auditing
  - Public Information

- **Academic Affairs**
  - Continuing Education
  - Honors Program
  - Technology
  - Admissions
  - Financial Aid
  - Records & Registration
  - Testing
  - Library
  - Institutional Research
  - Center for Faculty Excellence
  - Junior Division
  - Transitional Studies
  - CAP Center
  - Student Enhancement/Student Support Services
  - Center for Workforce & Economic Development
  - Sponsored Research & Programs
  - Fanfare/Columbia Theatre

- **Student Affairs**
  - Career Services
  - University Police
  - Auxiliary Services
  - Residential Services
  - Recreational Sports & Wellness
- University Counseling Center
- Student Judicial
- Leadership Development and Student Activities
- Student Organizations and Greek Affairs
- Multicultural and International Student Affairs
- Disability Services
- Student Publications

- **University Advancement**
  - Advancement
  - Alumni

- **Administration & Finance**
  - Budgets
  - Controller
  - Facility Planning
  - Human Resources
  - Physical Plant & Services
  - Purchasing & Property Control
  - Safety & Hazardous Materials Management
Appendix I: Example of Institutional Effectiveness Plan & Report for Support Units

Example 1

Unit Name: Human Resource Office
Unit Head: Jessie Roberts
Unit Area: Administration and Finance
Unit Type: Institutional Support
Reporting Period: 2001-2002

Mission Statement:
It is the mission of the Human Resource Office to enhance and provide Human Resource related support services for post-secondary education, research and service for the University community.

Objectives:

1. To maintain evidence that our strategic priorities are being met.
2. To achieve a satisfactory rating of 90% on customer service surveys.
3. To solicit adequate participation in our peer university assessment survey.
4. To achieve a satisfactory review by an external evaluator

Assessments:

1. On an annual basis, conduct a self-assessment review, which includes interviewing administrators and key users to ask how HR can improve current practices and procedures. Collect and review data on current services provided.
2. For each training class offered through HR, give participants a class evaluation form to complete and return.
3. On two-year cycles conduct a customer service surveys of HRO service users, which includes a representative sample of university employees.
4. On five-year cycles a survey of peer universities will be conducted to determine their staffing level, office budget, services provided, and their process for determining the effectiveness of HR services.
5. On five-year cycles, an external evaluator will be invited to review and report on programs and progress of institutional effectiveness

Results:

1. Self-audit activity is ongoing. A profile on the level of services offered is updated on an annual basis. Improvements have resulted from ongoing meetings with administrators and key users who have identified areas targeted for improvement.
2. Process Redesign Teams led by external consultants reviewed the hiring process and the payroll process in 1999-2000. These teams reviewed and flowcharted the existing processes and made recommendations for changes.
3. In spring 2001 a survey of a representative sample of supervisors and non-supervisors on training needs was conducted.
4. The Human Resource Office participated in several general surveys conducted by the Institutional Research and Assessment Office. Results from IR surveys are pending.
5. In spring 2002 a customer satisfaction survey will be conducted to determine the levels of satisfaction with service provided by the Human Resource Office

Use of Results:

1. Information gathered from the assessments is used to align the Human Resource Office's activities and services more closely with the identified needs of the university and the university's strategic plan.
2. A result of the recommendations from the process change teams was the hiring process was streamlined, and checklists, procedures and downloadable forms were put on the web.
3. Results from training survey were used to determine which classes to offer and in determining the priority of classes provided. Computer literacy classes were developed for Physical Plant employees to assist them in accessing email, and policies and procedures on the web.
4. The Director of HR meets with the Vice President for Administration and Finance to improve the plan for data collection and plan for the next external evaluation
Example 2

SOUTHEASTERN LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY
College of Basic Studies

Institutional Effectiveness Plan for
Career and Academic Planning Center (CAP)

Unit Name: Career and Academic Planning Center
Unit Head: Dorothy E. Burton
Unit Area: Academic Affairs
Unit Type: Educational Support
Reporting Period: 2001-2002

CAP Mission:
To help students explore career, occupational, and academic options, while enrolling in classes that will fit into the majority of curriculums and will offer a balance of courses to insure success. Information provided is current, accurate and geared to the needs of college students.

The CAP Center is especially designed for:

- Freshman/sophomore students deciding on college majors (juniors or seniors will benefit from visiting Career Services in the Student Union Annex, Room 241)
- Students experiencing academic difficulties or having concerns about continuing with a chosen major.
- Students needing academic or career assistance or referrals.
- Students are the number one concern at Southeastern and in the CAP Center. CAP is devoted to assisting students in making sound career and academic decisions.

CAP Objectives:

1. To clarify and blend life and career goals with educational programs at Southeastern.
2. To disseminate information on procedures involving academic advising, registration, course withdrawals, resignations, on-line courses, and declaring/changing a major.
3. To refer students to appropriate campus units for enhancing persistence and improving academic performance.
4. To provide distance and in-person services for student contact.
Program Goals:

- Maintain documentation of evaluation of 100% of services provided in the CAP Center
- Achieve positive satisfaction ratings from 95% of all participants in the Center (faculty, staff, students)

Assessment of Goals:

- Students are asked to complete an anonymous satisfaction survey of:
  - Counseling/advising sessions
  - On-line course scheduling.
- Counselors/advisors are asked to complete an anonymous satisfaction survey of:
  - Student case loads
  - Advising procedures during peak traffic periods
- CAP staff complete an annual evaluation of the Center's policies, practices, leadership, director.
- Director completes an annual evaluation of the CAP staff

Assessment Results:

1. Student Satisfaction of Counseling/Advising Sessions
   Fall 2000 - Fall 2001
2. Student Satisfaction of On-line Course Scheduling
   Fall 2000 - Fall 2001
3. Counselor/Advisor Satisfaction with Student Case Loads
   Fall 2001
4. Counselor/Advisor Satisfaction with Academic Advising Procedures During Peak Traffic Periods
   Fall 2001
5. Staff Satisfaction with CAP Center Practices
   Fall 2000 - Fall 2001

Use of Results:

1. Survey results will be discussed with CAP staff at the close of each month and semester. All staff members will be asked to give input for strategies to improve CAP services. Staffing will consist of student workers, graduate assistants, full-time staff and faculty advisors.
2. Survey will be moved from an e-mail location to the on-line course submission to ensure a greater percentage of student response. Survey will no longer be optional, but part of the final advising process. On-line form will continue to be streamlined and updated according to class/curriculum changes.
3. Request additional full-time counselor to accommodate the increase in student populations served. Goal is to limit private career counseling appointments (up to 45 minute sessions) to 4 clients:1 counselor per day. Goal is to limit academic advising appointments (during peak periods) to 15:1 per day, during non-peak times to 5:1 per day (during peak times, no career counseling appointments will be scheduled).

4. Request additional space and advisor-accessible computers (for privacy and confidentiality). Request that CAP faculty advisors have access to appropriate domains within Peoplesoft. Increase opportunity for faculty input into on-line systems and data use. Monthly staffing will include ALL CAP Center staff. Discussions will address supply needs, decisions made and impact on all staff (feedback), traffic flow, etc. Student workers, full-time staff, graduate assistants, will have input in practical decisions. A “grievance” procedure will be instituted for encouraging constructive criticisms.