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• Overview of Assessment
• Project Management Structure
• Institutional Research Structure
Philosophy, Values, and Beliefs of Assessment

• At Cleveland University- Kansas City, assessment is a collaborative process of improvement that is grounded on the values set forth in the mission statement, focused on the quality of the educational experience of students, and drives our institutional priorities and planning.

• We believe that assessment is “not an end in itself but a vehicle for educational improvement” (American Association for Higher Education).” As such, the culture of CUKC engenders collegiality, collaboration, and communication, directed by academic and professional judgement, that values research-based practices as we believe this is inherent to educational improvement and institutional effectiveness overall.

• As part of the management of institutional assessment, CUKC ensures the process is systematic, guides academic and non-academic departments for improvement, is well-documented, and peer-reviewed.
An Integrative Framework for Institutional Assessment

The framework for assessment at CUKC uses the strategic planning and resource allocation process as the foundation for triangulating three assessment processes: Review of Institutional Indicators of effectiveness; Academic Program Review; and non-academic departmental assessment, or Administrative Program Review.
Collaboration and Communication Structures for Reviewing

**Function**
- Advisory and Communication
- Gap Analysis and Holistic Reviewers
- Primary Information Processors and Reviewers

**Structure**
- HLC Steering Committee
- Criterion Leaders Team
- Criterion One Team
- Criterion Two Team
- Criterion Three Team
- Criterion Four Team
- Criterion Five Team
Collaboration and Communication Structures for Planning

- Executive Council
- Management Council
- Program-level Department-level
Linking Institutional Review and Planning

Conceptual Design

Executive Council
Faculty Council
CC Curriculum Committee
CHS Curriculum Committee
Academic Non-programs

Planning

Board of Trustees
Management Council

Objective

• To demonstrate mission-centered evaluation and shared governance practices (HLC Guiding Value #7 and 9)
CAS Standards to Assist with Departmental Review and Planning

- Design new programs and services
- Focus time, energy, and resources
- Devise staff development
- Guide strategic planning
- Develop learning and development outcomes
- Measure program and service effectiveness
• Academic Advising Programs**
• Adult Learner Programs & Services
• Alcohol & Other Drug Programs**
• Assessment Services
• Auxiliary Services Functional Areas
• Campus Activities Programs
• Campus Information & Visitor Services
• Campus Police & Security Programs
• Campus Religious & Spiritual Programs
• Career Services
• Civic Engagement & Service-Learning Programs**
• Clinical Health Services*
• College Honor Society Programs**
• College Unions
• Commuter & Off-Campus Living Programs
• Conference & Event Programs
• Counseling Services
• Dining Service Programs
• Disability Resources & Services
• Education Abroad Programs & Services**
• Financial Aid Programs**
• Fraternity & Sorority Advising Programs

• Graduate & Professional Student Programs & Services
• Health Promotion Services*
• Housing & Residential Life Programs**
• International Student Programs & Services
• Internship Programs*
• Learning Assistance Programs
• LGBT Programs & Services
• Master’s Level Student Affairs Professional Preparation Programs**
• Multicultural Student Programs & Services
• Orientation Programs**
• Parent & Family Programs
• Recreational Sports Programs
• Registrar Programs & Services
• Sexual Violence-Related Programs & Services**
• Student Conduct Programs**
• Student Leadership Programs
• Student Media Programs*
• Transfer Student Programs & Services
• TRIO & Other Educational Opportunity Programs
• Undergraduate Admissions Programs & Services*
• Undergraduate Research Programs
• Veterans & Military Programs & Services
• Women’s and Gender Programs & Services**

* New or revised since the release of the 2015 edition of CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education
** New or revised in the 2015 CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education
Twelve Parts of the General Standards

- Mission
- Program
- Organization and Leadership
- Human Resources
- Ethics
- Law, Policy and Governance
- Diversity, Equity, and Access
- Internal and External Relations
- Financial Resources
- Technology
- Facilities and Equipment
- Assessment
Understanding Standards & Guidelines

Standards
- Indispensable requirements
- Achievable by any and all programs of quality
- Appear in **bold** type
- Use **must** and **shall**

Guidelines
- Clarify & amplify Standards
- Guide enhanced practice beyond essential function
- Appear in light-faced type
- Use verbs **should** and **may**
Self-Assessment Guides (SAG)

- Provides an effective workbook/format for evaluation, self-assessment, and institutional reviews
- Translates standards into multiple criterion statements which can be measured
- Clusters of criterion measures focus on subsections of the standards, allowing raters to express detailed and targeted judgments
- Informs on program strengths and weaknesses
- Leads to an action plan to enhance programs and services that benefit student learning and development
Project Management Structure
Creating the Collaborative Workspace
## Creating the Collaborative Workspace Cont’d

#### Assurance Report Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Modified</th>
<th>Modified By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agenda and Meeting Minutes</td>
<td>October 9</td>
<td>Fiorella Penaloza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 1</td>
<td>September 14</td>
<td>Fiorella Penaloza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2</td>
<td>September 14</td>
<td>Fiorella Penaloza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 3</td>
<td>September 14</td>
<td>Fiorella Penaloza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4</td>
<td>September 14</td>
<td>Fiorella Penaloza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 5</td>
<td>September 14</td>
<td>Fiorella Penaloza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Review</td>
<td>October 9</td>
<td>Fiorella Penaloza</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Defining Parameters

- To simplify the self-study process for reviewers and planners by clearly defining the requirements and expectations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HLC Criterion</th>
<th>HLC Eligibility Requirements</th>
<th>HLC Assumed Practices</th>
<th>HLC Federal Compliance Review</th>
<th>HLC Institutional Update</th>
<th>Additional HLC Guidelines</th>
<th>CAS Standards (for reference, Appendix A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,2,3,7,9,14,16,17,18</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Team Report Worksheet C and D</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5,6,7,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,10,11,12,13,14,16,17,18</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Faculty Qualifications, Distance Education, Dual Credit, School of Record</td>
<td>2,7,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-19</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Last 3 years</td>
<td>Federal Compliance</td>
<td>3,4,9,10,11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Excel Spreadsheet*
Gaining Deeper insight by way of Word Clouds

HLC Criterion 1: Mission
Word Cloud Generator: https://www.wordclouds.com/
Institutional Research Structure
## Making the Most of the Institutional Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Composite Financial Indicator Score</strong></td>
<td>Private Institutions: 1.0 to 1.4 (in the zone); 1.5 to 3.0 (above the zone, good)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.52</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three-Year Default Rate</strong></td>
<td>Three-year student loan default rate of 30 percent or more for 2-year institutions or 25 percent or more for other institutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First-time, full-time students receiving Pell Grants</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average amount of Pell Grant aid received by these students</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>Three-year increase or decrease of 80 percent or more in enrollment for small institutions or 40 percent or more for large institutions.</td>
<td>477.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.52</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student to Teacher Ratio</strong></td>
<td>The number of undergraduate full-time equivalent students divided by the number of undergraduate full-time equivalent faculty is greater than or equal to 35. (See Grad Student Faculty Ratio Worksheet)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dual Credit</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degrees Conferred/Awarded Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Three-year increase or decrease of 75 percent or more in degrees awarded for small institutions and 65 percent or more for large institutions.</td>
<td>153.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>-9.38</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certificate Programs Offered</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weak Graduation/Persistence Rates Compared to Peers</strong></td>
<td>The number of full-time equivalent undergraduate students divided by undergraduate degrees awarded in the top percentages of the institution’s peers. Peer groups are either 2-year small or large undergraduate institutions or 4-year small or large undergraduate institutions. (See Grad Student Faculty Ratio Worksheet)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Further Analysis is needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance Education and Correspondence Education Programs</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-time Faculty Changes</strong></td>
<td>Three year decrease of 75 percent or more for small institutions or 50 percent or more for large institutions in the headcount of full-time faculty (not full-time equivalent).</td>
<td>36.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>-12.82</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimal Full-time Faculty (benchmark)</strong></td>
<td>The headcount of full-time faculty (not full-time equivalent) divided by the number of degree programs offered is less than one.</td>
<td>9.8125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Laddering Data to Gain Insight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Department-level Outcome</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Department-level Measurement Description</th>
<th>Primary Measurement Function</th>
<th>Secondary Measurement Function</th>
<th>Documentation of Data/Information Collection</th>
<th>Units of Measurement</th>
<th>Outcome-level: Direct (what are you measuring?)</th>
<th>Outcome-level: Indirect 1 (mediational)</th>
<th>Outcome-level: Indirect 2 (structural)</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>Compliance &amp; Accreditation Services</td>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A (status update)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>Compliance &amp; Institutional Reporting Services</td>
<td>Accreditation &amp; Institutional Reporting</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>Compliance State (KBOR) Services</td>
<td>Institutional Reporting</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A (status update)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The HLC has revised the accreditation process. Cleveland has chosen to proceed with the Open Pathway accreditation process. The Open Pathway follows a 5-year cycle. The new process will require the development of the Assurance Argument and the Evidence File with an Assurance Review in year 4 (2018), the development of the Quality Initiative in year 2 (2018), the quality initiative review in year 9, and finally the Assurance Review and Comprehensive Evaluation with a team visit in year 11 (2024-25). The Open Pathway is an opportunity for the University to focus on continuous improvement, challenges, and growth throughout the six-year cycle. The annual Institutional Update was filed with HLC on April 14, 2015.

The KBOE requires two annual online submissions. The Annual Data Collection Statutes is filed by the Director of Academic Records and Quality and the Renewal Application is filed by the Director of Institutional Reporting. Approval for CUSC to operate in the state of Kansas is effective for three years, November 20, 2015 – November 19, 2018, as well as registration of admission representatives. The Kansas Board of Regents Certificate of Approval, certificate number is 200710. The annual application to operate in the state of Kansas was submitted on September 16, 2015. The certificate of approval is issued annually in November. The KBOE also requires registration of all admission representatives.
Summary

1. Defined assessment philosophy
2. Defined the communication method(s) for review and integration with planning
3. Defining institutional research framework
THANK YOU
Word Clouds Generation Protocol

Word Clouds Generation: **https://www.wordclouds.com/**

Criterion 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Word Clouds:

- Zoom In = 35
- Size= 1024 x 768
- Shape = Circle
- Theme= Black and White
- Font= Times New Roman

Criterion 1-5 Word Cloud:

- Zoom In = -61
- Size= 800 x 800
- Shape = Circle
- Theme= Black and White
- Font= Times New Roman