4.B - The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

Assurance Evidence
1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.

Clearly Stated Goals for Student Learning
Learning goals are clearly stated for the general education core, known as the All University Core Curriculum (AUCC) (described in Component 3.B). All undergraduate degree programs list their program learning outcomes in the General Catalog. In Phase 2 of new program proposals, specific goals for the program must be stated and an assessment plan must be proposed to assure that the program performs to the expected level of quality. The University Curriculum Committee (UCC) requires all course proposals to present a course outline that includes "Course Objective(s) written as student capabilities: (Student will be able to ... )."

Effective processes for assessment of student learning
HLC's guiding values for accreditation define student learning as being inclusive of "every aspect of students' experience" from "how they are recruited" to "what happens to them after they leave the institution." CSU uses many approaches to accomplish effective assessment of student learning as comprehensively summarized in an assessment processes report to the Board as well as the annual report of assessment outcomes to the Board. The range of processes extends from course level summative assessments to national benchmarking of general education and co-curricular learning, including program-specific diagnostic assessments of strengths and weaknesses. Together, these processes provide a data rich background to inform continuous improvement decisions.

Summative course assessment of student learning is performed by instructors in each course with the assignment of a letter grade for student performance. Letter grades are based on a 4.00 grading scale with the optional use of plus/minus grading. Each year, all course grades are reported to the Board by academic subject and course level for submission to the Colorado Department of Higher Education (CDHE) in partial fulfillment of the requirements of our performance contract.

CSU faculty members are world-class leaders in discovery of new knowledge as evidenced by their competitive success in research and scholarship (Component 3.B.5). Therefore, they are well qualified to make both direct and indirect assessments of curriculum content and student learning of newly discovered knowledge and its application within the curriculum. As a result, hundreds of curricular course changes (range of 500-1100 formal requests per year to the UCC) are implemented each year, and an average of four new academic degree programs are approved each year as part of the cycles of assessment and continuous improvement.

The Student Course Survey was adopted by the Faculty Council in Spring 2010, replacing a survey developed in the late 1990s. The current survey, developed with input from students, faculty, and staff, has a stronger focus on learning issues and allows students to provide ratings of the instructor, the course, and teaching strategies. These surveys are primarily for use by instructors for self-reflection and improvement of teaching. Some departments use them as part of the instructor's performance evaluation and to guide the development of mentoring activities.

Assessments of learning goals within programs are part of the decentralized responsibilities of departments. Most programs assess achievement of their program goals near the end of the degree program by using embedded demonstration platforms for students’ products or performances of learning, such as capstone courses, internships, and defenses of dissertations. Undergraduate general education is often a component of program assessments, mainly within the capstone experiences. However, these decentralized measurements of general education have not used standardized metrics, resulting in limited analysis and institutional strategic use of the data. The roles of program reviews and special accreditation in assessment of student learning outcomes are described in Components 4.A.1 and 4.A.5.

Colorado State University
The Plan for Researching Improvement and Supporting Mission (PRISM) was established in 2003 as a website to facilitate learning assessment within programs by bringing more visibility to the process, coordinating data gathering and reporting, encouraging use of best practices, and facilitating participation. PRISM proposed to connect multiple evaluative systems, including annual learning assessment, Institutional Research data, six-year program reviews, and institutional strategic planning. Programs using PRISM are expected to develop a minimum of three measurable outcomes that can serve as diagnostic plans capable of identifying strengths and weaknesses in student learning and inform changes to curriculum and instructional design. Departments participating in PRISM are encouraged to develop assessments for all their programs, both undergraduate and graduate degrees. Currently, graduate level assessments account for 50-60% of the learning outcomes monitored in PRISM. PRISM also encourages distance education assessment in its program review template section on student learning.

The Academic Planning and Evaluation Council (APEC), representing all eight colleges, reviews the assessments posted in PRISM based on a set of standards intended to refine planning and evaluation processes. Dialogues among faculty about the student learning assessment tools and results are recorded on the website to facilitate learning by other programs. Annual APEC review of assessment plans in PRISM and feedback over the past 10 years has emphasized the use of direct learning assessments. Nearly all of these plans use learning rubrics or evaluation forms for scoring student performance. The uploaded tools are accessible on the website as interactive reports for campus users, e.g., critical thinking rubrics or internship assessment forms. Annual PRISM activity reports classify and tabulate profiles of student learning assessment processes, and the number and type of program improvements originating from PRISM activity. APEC reviewers also identify examples of best practices for direct learning assessment to serve as exemplars to other units. For example, the Teacher Preparation Program assesses its student teaching component using a tool developed within PRISM. It provides website access for 15 to 20 supervisors, working with cooperating teachers in the field, to evaluate student teaching performance. Interactive student learning rubrics enable supervisors to rate 70 to 100 students’ performance and write feedback comments to students online. The application produces reports that inform the Teacher Preparation Program of the strengths and weaknesses of students’ performance.

Several programs use other systems for documenting program learning assessment that support their specific needs, often in association with special accreditation expectations. For example, the College of Business (see Component 3.A.3) and the College of Engineering have separate learning assessment processes that they have found to be effective for sustaining program accreditation.

**University-wide assessments**

CSU participates in nationally benchmarked data collection processes that include the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), Educational Benchmarking Incorporated surveys (EBI), and the Higher Education Research Institute’s (CIRP) Your First College Year and Senior surveys. The criterion-referenced CLA is used for university-wide evaluations of higher-order learning skills such as analytical reasoning, problem solving, and critical thinking. NSSE provides norm-referenced indirect assessments of learning achievement and improvement. For general education assessment (AUCC), the University triangulates primarily NSSE, CLA, and program level assessments, as well as other specialized assessments as appropriate.

**Survey activity.** Many units construct a variety of surveys for assessment and planning purposes. In 2012, the Campus Labs Baseline application was used to administer 437 surveys to more than 53,000 responders. Projects include surveys of incoming students, current students, program exits, alumni, employers, and many other stakeholders.

We are continuously seeking to expand and improve assessment processes to better inform decision-making and identify how to improve programs. For example, The College of Liberal Arts is developing an innovative student learning assessment for researching the CDHE gPathways writing content criteria. A faculty committee is creating a writing rubric that both students and graduate teaching assistants will use in AUCC courses that are located in multiple disciplines. Students will self-rate their learning performance using rubric traits, such as: (1)
critical thinking, (2) communication organization, (3) resources, (4) readability/mechanics, and (5) instructor feedback. Graduate assistants will rate the writing performance of students based on this rubric. The use of both direct and indirect assessment will generate data that faculty members can use to improve the AUCC curriculum.

2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.

Assessment of co-curricular learning is described in detail in Component 3.E. Therefore, this subcomponent discussion focuses primarily on providing evidence of achievement discovered through academic program learning assessments.

General Education achievements:
The institutional CLA reports (2009-10 and 2010-11 reports) are developed by the Collegiate Learning Assessment organization (Council for Aid to Education). CSU also receives raw data that allows Institutional Research to disaggregate (to the extent we have adequate numbers of observations) by college, gender, and some other factors.

- CSU students are consistently performing “near expectation,” meaning that the value-added learning in assessed areas is estimated to be between -1.00 and +1.00 on a standardized (z-score) scale. In other words, our students are making the progress and gains that would be expected, after controlling for preparation levels upon entry to the University (using ACT and SAT scores as a proxy for preparation).
- Percentile rank for the overall CLA scores have varied between 71 in 2009-10 and 57 in 2010-11. Subscores have been relatively stable for the Performance Task subcategory, while the variation in overall percentile rank has been a reflection of the differences in Analytic Writing Task scores.
- Scores have varied considerably by college, but substantial cross-college differences in the numbers of student participants has made it difficult to reliably interpret the meaning of those results.
- The results from the 2008-2009 administration of the CLA showed that – after adjusting for entering academic ability – the four-year “value added” in the areas of analytical reasoning, critical thinking, problem solving, and written communication was higher than 66% of comparison institutions.
- The results from the 2009-2010 administration show an increase in the ranking of CSU’s four-year-value-added score (among comparable institutions after adjusting for entering ability) from 66% to 71%.
- The results from 2010-2011 showed a drop below the preceding two years. Since the rankings vary with the schools that participate, it is possible that some of this drop is the result in a change in the performance of the other schools who participated in this reporting cycle. We are also examining possible internal sources for this decline.

National Survey of Student Engagement
NSSE yields data that we can use to improve the undergraduate experience both in and out of the class room by making both internal and external comparisons. NSSE measures student satisfaction, active learning and engagement by asking students about their study habits, how they spend their time, satisfaction with the campus environment, satisfaction with faculty and curriculum, and their educational plans or experiences. The survey also asks students to report how much their experiences at CSU have contributed to civic, social, and academic gains they may have made. These particular questions offer CSU an additional, albeit indirect, measure of educational achievement and improvement.

The NSSE collects information from first-year and senior undergraduates during the first five weeks of the spring semester at hundreds of universities about student participation in programs and activities relevant to their learning and personal development. We know these factors influence their success and can be used as an indirect measure of student engagement in learning and development.

The following table contains results from NSSE as selected for display by the College Portrait of the Voluntary System of Accountability. The questions have been grouped together in categories that are known to contribute to student learning and development. The results reported below are based on the responses of seniors who participated in the survey.

---

Colorado State University
In 2012 65% of seniors spent at least 6 hours per week participating in co-curricular activities such as student organizations and intramural sports.

Data Findings
A variety of gap analyses including both main and interaction effects. 87% of seniors discussed readings or ideas with faculty members outside of class.

Retention and Success
Of students admitted to doctoral programs complete their program of study within 10 years. However, when first conceived, it was hoped that SSI would be fully funded over a relatively short period but the process of learning assessment within programs should encourage use of a diversity of learning assessments.

Institutional Commitment to Student Learning and Success
95% of seniors believe this institution provides support for student success. 67% rated the quality of academic advising at this institution as good or excellent. 65% of seniors reported that this institution provided help in coping with work, family and other non-academic responsibilities.

Student Interaction with Campus Faculty and Staff
47% of seniors believed that the campus staff were helpful, considerate, or flexible. 72% of seniors believed that faculty are available, helpful, or sympathetic.

Experiences with Diverse Groups of People and Ideas
62% of seniors reported their experience at this institution contributed to their understanding of people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds. 77% of seniors often had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity.

Student Satisfaction
84% of seniors would attend this institution if they started over again. 84% of seniors rated their entire educational experience as good or excellent. 80% of seniors reported that other students were friendly or supportive.

The most critical NSSE items are used to build five "Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice" that are believed to reflect student behaviors and institutional features that are powerful contributors to student learning and personal development. Therefore, NSSE offers a measure of institutional progress in engaging students in learning.

Change (by percentage points) in NSSE Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice at CSU, 2007 to 2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level Of Academic Challenge</th>
<th>Student-Faculty Interaction</th>
<th>Active And Collaborative Learning</th>
<th>Enriching Educational Experiences</th>
<th>Supportive Campus Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-Year</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>+17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Snapshot NSSE reports and the complete NSSE reports allow us to quickly see how we compare to our peers and how our results have changed over time. Additional, more in-depth, analysis allows us to make internal comparisons, for example, between colleges, demographic groups, student class, etc., and to begin to understand the contributions of high-impact programs such as study abroad, learning communities, service learning, internships, etc. An example of an internal analysis of NSSE data for the Journalism and Technical Communication program is provided. Most importantly, NSSE results have informed internal discussions related to campus and curricular improvements. Dissatisfaction with NSSE results in 2004 and earlier was a major driving force in the design of the SSI. Data from Institutional Research show that while NSSE scores for both freshmen and seniors showed little movement from 2001-2006, substantial increases have been evident over the 2007-2012 period, coinciding with the implementation of a significant portion of the SSI. The gains are most impressive for first-year students.

Program achievements:
For 2010-11, assessment plans in PRISM listed a total of 1,012 measures (723 direct and 289 indirect) for about 500 outcomes. The overwhelming majority of the 500 student learning outcomes share a common format for defining student achievement. Over 90 percent of programs’ learning outcomes met their expected performance levels, demonstrating that students are achieving the learning outcomes.

Highlights from the 2004-05 and the 2010-11 PRISM Activity Reports include:
- The four most frequent types of learning assessed as recorded in PRISM were information management, knowledge content, communication skills, and critical thinking; they support the University’s general education effort.
• The five most frequently used direct assessment measures reported in PRISM were oral presentations, experiential learning (internships), exams, juried performances, and projects.

3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.

We have found that improvement of student learning, and ultimately student success as evidenced by moving them toward graduation, requires assessment of student behaviors and the learning environment. A recent Leading Indicators study revealed strong associations between a number of student behaviors and subsequent retention and graduation. These findings provided the basis for a series of actions, including changes in advising and increases in composition course capacity, aimed at influencing students’ course-taking behaviors in relation to first-year credit enrollment and completion of foundational math and composition. These and other assessments that have improved overall student learning as evidenced by increased retention and graduation are discussed in detail in Component 4.C.

In the 2004-05 and again in the 2010-11 PRISM Activity Reports, the four most frequent types of improvements included assessment methods, curriculum, faculty research, and faculty outreach. The continuing trend for high rates of assessment process refinement compared to curriculum improvement reflects what might be perceived as an undue emphasis in PRISM on process at the expense of strategic program evaluation and improvement. UCC activities document that many program improvements (up to 10-fold more) are processed each year than tabulated in PRISM. The following two PRISM examples illustrate how assessments have led to improvements in student learning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BS In Natural Resource Recreation And Tourism Assessment Leading To Improvements In Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Natural Resource Recreation and Tourism (NRRT) assessment plan illustrates the common template design. As shown on the General Information page of this plan, all program plans describe the relationship of planning to the University mission and Strategic Plan. The plan contains three learning goals:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Students will demonstrate written and oral communication skills, with a focus on writing skills. Students writing and speaking will embody characteristics that represent attention to high quality communication skills, including substance of the issue addressed, organization of the paper or presentation, mechanics, and evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Students will demonstrate critical thinking and the ability to apply knowledge related to the key concepts, issues, tools and management techniques fundamental to the discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Students will demonstrate planning skills. This will involve an ability to implement the planning process, including setting goals and objectives, acquiring relevant background information, synthesizing information, conceptualizing ideas, constructing alternative courses of action, making recommendations and considering ways of evaluating decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment data was collected by using two primary evaluative methods: (1) Each student was evaluated by his/her supervisor in an internship with a professional or business organization, using a standardized evaluation form containing criteria related to the outcomes. (2) In capstone courses, students are required to produce a final development / management / communications plan as a part of a team. When these plans are presented at the NRRT Symposium, three faculty members from the NRRT program evaluate the oral and written presentations of the plans using an evaluation rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Evaluations by employers showed that students did not do as well on their public speaking skills in the work place as desired. Students scored well for “Problem solving” and “Understanding current issues facing field” as evaluated by their internship supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Students performed at the expected level on the following assessment items by faculty teams: clear statement of goals and objectives, thoroughness of the background information, quality of the background information, quality of the synthesis of the background information, feasibility of recommendations, overall comprehensiveness of project, and overall understanding of planning process. Weaknesses included: tools of the discipline, research skills, and professionalism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, there is evidence of continual improvement over the two previous cycles of assessment. Faculty will place more emphasis on development of public speaking skills and professional attire for presentations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BS In Computer Science Assessment Leading To Improvements In Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Computer Science (CS) assessment outcome illustrates a program’s strengths and weaknesses:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The expected outcome is: To provide graduates with a thorough grounding in the key principles and practices of computing, and in the mathematical and scientific principles that underpin them. Students will demonstrate proficiency in the areas of software design and development, computing systems, and theory and mathematics of computer science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To identify student strengths and weaknesses as they move through the required 100 and 200-level CS courses, three important problem areas that students seemed to have the most trouble grasping were identified in each of the three threads in the CS curriculum: math/theory, programming, and computing systems. Standardized exam questions were included in 100-level courses each semester to use for outcomes assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over time, slight improvements in student performance are being realized in programming and data structures, which shows that efforts to improve this area are succeeding. It is, however, clear that the weaknesses measured in the last assessment in combinatorics/counting and propositional logic section of the theory exam were not anomalies and need attention. The areas of weakness indicated by this year’s assessment (and last year’s) have been targeted by faculty teaching lower division required courses. Through meetings of the CS Undergraduate Committee and instructors who are teaching these courses, they continue to reassess the manner in which particular topics are presented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.
**Good practices**
The University strives to adopt best practices in assessment throughout the institution. The use of nationally standardized tools such as CLA and NSSE are examples of good practices used by many peer institutions. Recently, on the advice of NSSE researchers and after review of data stability over time, we have adopted a three-year administration cycle. As discussed below, more evaluation and refinement of assessment processes is indicated to enhance the ability of these activities to strategically inform the institution and guide improvements. Some of the assessment processes demonstrated on the PRISM website have received external recognition as best practices in alignment with the purposes of entities such as NILOA and the Education Advisory Board.

**Substantial participation**
Program participation. The University has demonstrated a substantial and enduring commitment to program learning assessment activities through the maintenance of a full-time Director of Assessment position and support of the PRISM assessment technology for more than 10 years. All academic programs have developed assessment plans with outcomes in PRISM, with slightly over 50% of academic programs maintaining their assessment plans on an annual basis. The PRISM website holds assessment plans in timelines that indicate if programs and departments are currently using PRISM (see PRISM participation report). As indicated above, some programs use processes other than PRISM for managing their assessment activities rather than participate in a single universal process. As with most large research institutions, we continue to strive for a culture that universally embraces assessment activities as a valued process to document and inform continuous improvement rather than as a compliance task.

Faculty and staff participation. Faculty members are the primary participants who define expected learning goals for programs and subsequently construct assessment plans. Collectively, faculty members work together through department, college and university curriculum committees to facilitate peer review of rigor and relevance throughout the academic programs. For co-curricular learning, highly qualified professional staff members in the Division of Student Affairs are involved in all steps of assessment planning, data collection, analysis, and program planning (as described in Components 3.D and 3.E). Institutional Research (IR) staff members collect and analyze a wide range of information from academic and student records that contributes to learning assessment. IR also administers, analyzes, and disseminates assessment data obtained from NSSE, CLA, and other surveys. As an example of the scope of participation, in PRISM there are 948 approved users (Fall 2012), with each one assigned to various roles, e.g., editing plans, reviewing plans, and viewing plans. An additional 70 to 90 faculty members are temporarily added annually to complete program review tasks.

Student participation. The PRISM process encourages student participation in assessment as one of its criteria for a well-developed assessment plan, primarily to ensure transparency of the processes. Instructions on how to engage students in PRISM are included in the template section. The four most frequent types of student participation in PRISM are (1) self-assessment using rubrics, (2) program shares assessment findings, (3) student peer review using rubrics, and (4) engaging students in outcome analysis. The number of programs that are using assessment as an instructional method, e.g., outcomes that share program-level learning rubrics with students for peer-review of their performances or for self-reflection, doubled in 2011 over 2005.

**Evaluation and improvement of assessment processes**
In addition to analyzing assessment data, we also actively assess the quality of the assessment tools and processes. For example, the quality of the NSSE data has been examined by looking at response rates, sampling error, and proportional representation. Overall, the quality of CSU’s NSSE data is good with above average response rates and reasonable sampling error in the most recent administration. The institutional sample is proportionally representative of the student population across a variety of demographics sectors. The samples are not a perfect representation of CSU’s population because female and full-time students are over represented. However, it does appear to be representative of first-generation students, Pell Grant recipients, and minority students. Thus, the sample is not proportionally representative in some expected ways, but overall is a useful data source.

---

**Colorado State University**
In 2009, APEC developed a survey to assess the ease of using the PRISM website. An electronic survey was sent to 134 assessment plan coordinators (PRISM users) in all colleges and Student Affairs with a 35% response rate. Based on the survey feedback, APEC recommended the following improvements: (1) simplify the time line format, (2) make data entry for reporting findings/improvements simultaneous with revising planning for next cycle, (3) install formatting functions to text boxes, and (4) expand flexibility of data presentations for PRISM assessment reporting. These improvements, focusing on mechanical details of website utility, became operational in Spring 2011. Comparable formal surveying to evaluate the strategic usefulness of the website to assure achievement of learning goals and to inform program improvements has not been undertaken.

In Summer 2012, an Assessment System Evaluation Ad Hoc Committee was charged by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and the Vice President for Information Technology with conducting a preliminary investigation of assessment software applications, including PRISM and commercial alternatives. The committee concluded that the commercial products offer enhanced functionality, lower cost, a more intuitive interface, more robust reporting, and greater sustainability than PRISM; and it recommended that a more in-depth analysis of assessment systems be conducted by a group with broad campus representation. During the 2012-13 cycle of program reviews, a commercially available application (Campus Labs Program Review (CLPR) module) was tested as the website host by three departments. The CLPR application was found to be an “excellent system,” “user-friendly,” and “superior to PRISM” in a variety of ways that are important to the end-user including navigation, import of text/data from multiple sources and/or in a variety of formats, in-tool editing, and export/printing options. The document directory feature was described as “one of the strongest features” of the tool. Following the recommendation of the committee, the Provost/EVP decided in March 2013 to switch support from PRISM to CLPR and has initiated discussions for refining the program evaluation process using this tool.

In 2012, an initiative was launched in the College of Business to develop an enhanced assessment process that will use direct and indirect assessment measures to facilitate comparison of on-campus cohorts with distance cohorts within its Assessment of Learning system. The MBA program received $25,000 from the Provost and another matching commitment by the college for a total award of $50,000. The MBA program is a University leader in developing highly effective and successful distance education programming. It expected that its assessment process will become a model for other distance programs.

**Recommendations for improving the processes and uses of student learning assessment**

Although significant progress has been made over the past 10 years to institutionalize a process of learning assessment, the effectiveness and strategic value of assessment efforts need to continue maturing, and may benefit from the following adjustments:

1. The purpose of learning assessment within programs should be clearly articulated by the institution to be a two-fold process of (1) assuring quality and (2) informing continuous improvement.
2. Each program should be encouraged to develop four (or more) specific measurable learning goals that cover the breadth and depth of the degree program to assure that quality goals are attained.
3. The processes of learning assessment within programs should encourage use of a diversity of methods and measures to solve perceived needs and inform improvement of student learning in the broadest sense. Frequently repeated and increasingly detailed assessment of documented quality performance may be an inefficient use of resources and should be reconsidered.
4. Assessments within programs should be designed to be informative to the crafting of institutional initiatives and for demonstrating institutional effectiveness, in addition to informing improvement within the specific program, e.g., general education curriculum, diversity efforts, learning environments, co-curricular programs, student services, institutional enrollment management, etc.
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