This document describes the assessment plan for Mansfield University (MU). The first formal assessment plan for Mansfield was introduced by the University’s Assessment Committee in 1995 and has been revised periodically since that time. The former Mansfield University Strategic Plan: 2008-2013 emphasized the importance of linking assessment and planning as a means of continuous improvement. The proposed Mansfield University Strategic Plan: 2014-2020, builds upon the framework of the previous strategic plan, current assessment processes, and the feedback the University received from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) evaluation team in March 2012.

Guiding Policies

Several formal documents help guide our assessment efforts. The Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (PASSHE) Board of Governors Policy 1997-01 requires assessment of student learning outcomes. The University has been particularly attentive to standards 7 (Institutional Assessment), 11 (Educational Offerings), 12 (General Education), and 14 (Assessment of Student Learning), which were important elements of the 2009 revision of Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education, as well as the guidance offered in Assessing Student Learning and Institutional Effectiveness: Understanding Middle States Expectations (2005). Together these resources clarify expectations for assessing student learning and institutional effectiveness. The University has also encouraged the development of a campus culture that emphasizes assessment as a pathway to institutional effectiveness. MU strives to ensure that institutional leaders and members of the faculty and staff comprehend the principles and best practices that actively connect assessment with improved student learning and program effectiveness. The practices that follow describe expectations for an engaged campus culture that values assessment, continuous process improvement across all areas of responsibility, and enhanced student success as a consequence of our focus on student learning outcomes across academic, support, and residential programs.

Leadership for Assessment

Leadership for assessment is provided at the level of the University President, Provost and other Vice Presidents, the academic deans, and a full-time Director for Assessment, Institutional Effectiveness, and Compliance, who was originally appointed in March 2011. After a lapse of nine months, the position was reappointed in April 2013. As the description notes, this individual coordinates efforts closely with the Director of Institutional Research and Assessment Data, as well as the academic deans and other administrators. This position is a permanent full-time appointment that reports to the Provost.

Between 2008 and the end of 2010, coordination of academic assessment was assigned to a faculty member with .5 FTE workload reallocated to assessment. This individual worked closely with the academic deans to support assessment for academic programs. In some academic areas, for example Business and Education, other faculty had been given alternate work assignments to coordinate assessment and related accreditation efforts. Each academic department has
identified a faculty assessment coordinator to work with the department chairperson in support of assessment. Each coordinator also has a collaborative relationship with the Director of Assessment, Institutional Effectiveness, and Compliance.

Levels of a Comprehensive Assessment and Improvement Effort

Individual Assessment
Employees are bound by the statements set forth in their Collective Bargaining Agreements, or by other arrangements for non-union employees. Students are included in the assessment process by embedded practices and requirements in their curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance review for Managers</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Managers are reviewed annually using a PASSHE Management Performance and Development (MPED) process and required to achieve goals and outcomes in alignment with the strategic plan. Annual goals and objectives are reviewed by each manager and supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance review for pre-tenure faculty</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Faculty are reviewed annually at the pre-tenure level by the appropriate Dean and are expected to provide evidence of effectiveness that aligns with university standards, a collective bargaining agreement, and strategic and program goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance review and promotion processes for faculty</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Faculty are reviewed every 5 years (by requirement of the Collective Bargaining Agreement), or upon application for promotion, by the Dean and Provost and are expected to provide evidence of effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service that aligns with strategic goals. Faculty has been directed to include assessment of student learning outcomes as a part of the program review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student self-assessment</td>
<td>During capstone experience</td>
<td>Through portfolios, clinical or practicum observations, or other course or capstone experiences, the intended student learning outcomes and evidence are demonstrated at the student level. Best practices on campus, which are demonstrated across a variety of programs, require student involvement in reflective self-assessment of learning as part of a portfolio of accomplishments across courses. All academic programs must require a capstone project for alignment with the General Education Program student learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student exit or normed examinations</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Varies by program. The <em>ETS Proficiency Profile</em> is administered to samples of graduating seniors and to first year students at least every third year but may be administered more often if there is a need related to program changes. Education students are required to sit for the appropriate PAPA and PRAXIS examinations, and students in Nursing take the <em>NCLEX-RN licensing examination</em>. Other programs are encouraged to use the appropriate ETS Major Field Tests in conjunction with required 5-year program reviews.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Course Assessment**
Faculty are empowered to conduct self-assessments of their courses upon each offering. At this time, these results are not required to be documented within TracDat, though many course improvements are noted as pertinent to the program assessment process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty led course assessment</td>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>Each semester, faculty review their assessment results for improvements in their courses. Improvements are often discussed in program or department meetings, but it is the expectation that faculty will continually update the course material, delivery methods, or assessment methods, all with the goal of improving student learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Assessment**
Programs are assessed annually, cycling through the student learning outcomes (SLO) in such a manner that each outcome is assessed at least every third year. Many programs assess all their SLOs biennially. All programs housed under Academic Affairs have an individual identified as an assessment coordinator, who receives training on the requirements of program assessment and review, how to enter and retrieve data from TracDat, and has formal/structured contact with the Director of Assessment, Institutional Effectiveness, and Compliance at least once a semester. All programs housed under Student Affairs have either an assessment coordinator or the director of the unit also functions as the assessment coordinator. That individual, too, has formal/structured contact with the Director of Assessment, Institutional Effectiveness, and Compliance at least once a semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student support program review</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Student support units contribute to student learning and the student’s experience while at MU. These units participate in annual review and revisions to processes, procedures, or initiatives is documented in TracDat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-curricular program review</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Co-curricular units contribute to student learning and the student’s experience while at MU. These units participate in annual review and revisions to processes, procedures, or initiatives is documented in TracDat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic program review</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Academic programs use the Excellence in Higher Education model for assessment, planning, and improvement. This model sets the stage for better communication, engagement, and planning at department and program levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic assessment plan and review</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Academic programs review their assessment of learning outcomes on an annual basis, cycling through their learning outcomes in no more than three years. The plan, results, corrective actions, and follow-up activities are recorded into TracDat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education program assessment</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>The General Education program is governed by two bodies. Its assessment process is described later in this document. The program assessment has systematic rubric-based assessment of student artifacts as well as administration of the ETS Proficiency Profile to samples of first-year and senior students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programs assessment</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Academic programs of particular significance, such as the Honors Program, are assessed using the model applied to other academic programs to the degree appropriate. Each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
program is expected to submit an annual report to the Dean and Provost.

**Analysis of Revenue and Costs for Academic Programs**

- **Cycle**: Annual
- **Description**: Beginning with spring 2010, all academic programs were provided an analysis of the revenue generated by their programs relative to program costs. These analyses enable the academic deans to review cost effectiveness with department chairs and faculty and will be continued in the future.

**Program self-assessment of operational effectiveness**

- **Cycle**: Every three years
- **Description**: Programs rely on the *Excellence in Higher Education* (EHE) model for assessment, planning, and improvement, which has been implemented across all programs.

## Institutional Assessment

The University has several internal documents that provide beacons of guidance for institutional processes. Among those are: *University Strategic Plan: 2014-2020; Strategic Budgeting Plan; University mission, vision, and creed; program and unit plans; and this assessment plan.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan revision</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>MU completed a comprehensive revision of the University Strategic Plan in 2014. With the new program in place, continuous improvement is evaluated quarterly through assessment of progress on three strategic goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan implementation</td>
<td>Semi-annually</td>
<td>The Cabinet has accepted responsibility for implementing and monitoring the strategic plan with updates planned every three months. Some Cabinet members may construct teams of their staff to assist in directing the implementation and monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic Academic Program Review</td>
<td>Every 5 years or more often if needed</td>
<td>Mansfield periodically completes a comprehensive review of academic programs based on enrollment, numbers graduating, program need, and program quality. As a result of this review, programs may be required to revise their assessment processes, learning outcomes and curriculum, or even be recommended for placement in moratorium or closure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Narrative Annual Report on Strategic Goal Attainment</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>In conjunction with the Strategic Planning dashboard, the Cabinet authors a narrative describing the successes and challenges of the past year in regards to strategic goal attainment and assessment of the strategic plan itself. This narrative supports the President’s annual report to the Council of Trustees, University Senate, students, alumni, and employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Cabinet self-assessment of effectiveness</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>In addition to regular, reflective discussions about its effectiveness, the Cabinet uses the <em>Excellence in Higher Education</em> model for assessment, planning, and improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division self-assessment of operational effectiveness</td>
<td>Every three years</td>
<td>Divisions rely on the <em>Excellence in Higher Education</em> (EHE) model for assessment, planning, and improvement, which has been implemented across divisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## System Assessment

As an institution that is a member of PASSHE, the strategic plan and goals of the University support the strategic plan and goals of PASSHE. Alignment with PASSHE initiatives provides an additional opportunity for the University to critically review itself for continuous improvement and contribution to the PASSHE system.
Achievement of Strategic Goals as a Measure of Institutional Effectiveness

Strategic Goal assessment
All planning and assessment are tied directly to our University Strategic Plan: 2014-2020, which includes goals, outcomes and initiatives. The timing for implementation of the Strategic Plan will align with the start of the new fiscal year in July 2014. As an evolution from the previous plan, the 2014-2020 plan has multiple layers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Accountable to</th>
<th>Assessment methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Culmination of subordinate assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Individual Cabinet members</td>
<td>Culmination of subordinate assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Department or Director</td>
<td>As appropriate to the initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Method for assessing progress on the Strategic Plan
After a comprehensive and collaborative planning process, the 2014-2020 Strategic Plan will begin July 1, 2014. In tandem with the creation of the Plan, a process for monitoring progress quarterly toward completion of Plan objectives was created. Cabinet members will review and update targets, initiatives, or objectives as the environment of higher education evolves over time. Data will populate score cards prior to the President discussing outcomes with campus constituents. The President will report to the campus community, students, employees, alumni, Council of Trustees, and University Senate following the end of each fiscal year with a narrative summary detailing the University accomplishments, areas in which MU can improve, and any changes that were made to the plan. A summary of outcomes will be placed on the University website. This process will be more apparent as time passes.

All employees will align their daily and long-term responsibilities to elements of the 2014-2020 Strategic Plan. Goal to Goal cards (G2G) will be issued to every employee and will contain space to annotate what they are doing individually in their work areas to achieve success in each of the three goals. Employees and offices have been directly assigned to coordinate efforts in support of the goals. Progress toward goal attainment will be measured through annual performance reviews.
for staff, periodic faculty performance reviews as defined the CBA, MPEDs for Managers, and within TracDat.

The Excellence in Higher Education Model for Self-Assessment and Improvement of Effectiveness

In 2007 the University began using the NACUBO Excellence in Higher Education (EHE) model (Ruben, 2007) to guide a more integrated approach to assessment, planning, and improvement across all divisions and programs. The EHE model is guided by the assumptions of the Baldrige National Quality Program as adapted to higher education. Mansfield has had several faculty and professional staff trained to assist in facilitating the self-assessment and planning activities that are required to implement this process. Brent Ruben, who developed the model, presented workshops in December 2011 for the University. All academic and student support programs are expected to complete this process as a means of self-study and setting improvement goals and objectives. For academic areas, MU does not view the EHE model as sufficient for implementation of outcomes assessment. Instead, the EHE model helps departments and programs to better understand their leadership, mission, constituents, strengths and weaknesses, and to establish program goals and objectives, which set the stage for a more engaged process of assessing each program’s student learning outcomes.

Mansfield had all departments complete an EHE self-assessment and planning process as a foundation for improvement. Subsequently units have reported on their findings and actions for improvement. Working with their vice president or dean, they may choose to repeat the process annually if there is a need to do so. All departments will complete a revision of their EHE process and report at least every third year. Their resulting plans and outcomes are revised in TracDat.

Academic Program Assessment and Program Review Processes

Program Assessment Plan Guidelines

Program outcomes assessment is a process completed at the program level. It involves collecting, analyzing, and interpreting information regarding student learning and development within a program’s curriculum. MU completes program outcomes assessment for two reasons: (1) to evaluate the educational impact of our programs, and (2) to improve our programs.

Every MU degree program must have an assessment plan that describes the expected learning outcomes for the program and the methods used to evaluate the students’ achievement of those outcomes. These plans are housed within TracDat and are accessible to the program and department chairs, program assessment coordinators, deans, Provost, and the Director of Assessment, Institutional Effectiveness, and Compliance. When appropriate, the assessment plan may also include the expected learning outcomes at the course level for students who are non-majors. The assessment plan is reviewed annually, and updated when appropriate. The annual reports that a program submits describe the results for the implementation of their assessment plan.

The assessment plan includes the following items:

A. Program Name
Name of the program and the degree(s) included. If there are multiple programs within the department with distinct learning outcomes, a separate assessment plan for each program should be completed. If there are multiple programs within the department but the programs share the same core learning outcomes, only one plan is necessary.

B. Coordinators
Name of the program Chair, the program Assessment Coordinator, and any faculty participating in the preparation of the plan.

C. Mission, Vision, Values and Goals statements
Program’s mission, as well as any vision, values, or goal statements. These statements should align with the MU Mission and Creed, and guide the assessment process.

D. Student Learning Outcomes
The program’s primary student learning outcomes (SLO). A program student learning outcome is a statement that describes what faculty members expect students will be able to do once they have completed the program. Programs may have many student learning outcomes; include 5 - 7 of the most important, demonstrable student learning outcomes. A program may include more if a discipline-specific accrediting body requires more, but the outcomes that program faculty believe to be the most important should be listed first. Program assessment methods should reflect the relative importance of your outcomes. Note also that course objectives should be the basis for expected student learning outcomes at the course level.

E. Program Curricular Map or “Cross-Walk”
A curriculum map documents the intersection of program SLO to the specific courses where the students will be expected to demonstrate some level of competency in those areas. It includes: the student learning outcome, the course, and the assignments that the students will be asked to complete in order to demonstrate their competence. Within TracDat, the program denotes whether the SLO is introduced, reinforced, and assessed. It is the intent to add a category to include that the SLO is “mastered” by the end of the academic year 2013-2014.

F. Assessment Methods of Student Learning Outcomes
Methods used to gather evidence of student achievement of the learning outcomes. If a unit uses more than one measure of any outcome, each measure is described. Programs need to include at least one direct measure of student learning for each SLO (e.g. exams that may be internally or externally generated, capstone assignments or projects, field placement or internship related assessments, or a portfolio review). Indirect measures (e.g. satisfaction surveys) can provide helpful information but should not be the primary mode of assessment.

G. Timeline
Indicate the timeline for each assessment method (e.g., each semester, once a year). Not every learning outcome need be assessed every year; if a program wants to rotate between different learning outcomes, this process should be described and justified. While it is recommended that student evidence be collected annually, all SLOs need to be assessed at least once every three years.

H. Excellence in Higher Education
The unit denotes which area of the Excellence in Higher Education (EHE/Baldrige) process each SLO or program outcome supports. This narrative should include the unit’s action plan for the areas the department will focus on during the academic
year. At least every three years a program should complete a revision of its EHE process.

I. Assessment Training and Review of Assessment Plan
Indicate when faculty will engage in assessment activities (including training for new or interested faculty) and when the scheduled department reviews of the assessment plan and all of its components will be undertaken (e.g., every semester during University Days, department retreat at end of semester).

J. Continuous Process Review and Improvement
Describe who is responsible for organizing the assessment data. Describe a plan for reflecting on your assessment results and designing an action plan based on the results that will be used to improve your program over the coming year. Describe the process for sharing assessment results with the program faculty members and for implementing program improvements based on faculty members’ interpretations of the assessment data. For example, will you hold a planning retreat to address the implications of your assessment findings? When appropriate, describe the process for sharing assessment results with other programs, including the General Education program committee and other academic programs/departments.

It is assumed that self-assessment should be an integral part of all aspects of the university. Students should be encouraged to assess their own learning and plan for their own development. First-year course work should, wherever possible, introduce sound principles of assessment and encourage students to set appropriate goals based on their self-assessment. The First Year Experience course contributes to this knowledgebase as a part of the General Education program. Academic advisors as well as instructors should purposely encourage students to self-assess, set goals, and assume as much responsibility as possible for their own development. Members of the University community should seek out effective examples or models of student self-assessment and integrate such activities into Mansfield’s learning culture. Examples of self-assessment include reflective writing assignments in courses; portfolios of student work, in single courses or in a program, which contain reflective self-assessment; student goal plans and reflective analysis; benchmark program and student evaluations that require self-assessment.

Annual Reports for Degree Programs
Each degree program is required to prepare an annual report for the appropriate academic dean. The outline for annual reports is included above. Data for reporting purposes will be provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment Data. Reports must be entered into TracDat by June 30 of each year. Read-only reports based on the data submitted will be available to other department chairs as well as the Dean, Director of Assessment, and the Provost. Once submitted, reports will be reviewed by the Dean and the Director of Assessment who will schedule a meeting with the department Chair and Assessment Coordinator to review the findings and follow-up plans. If needed, a meeting to discuss the annual report will be scheduled with the department or program faculty as a whole. Deans may ask for revisions to an annual report if the report is found to be incomplete.

Academic Program Review
Numerous initiatives from as far back as 2000 and earlier continue to guide MU’s efforts to improve assessment planning and program review. Annual reports dating to the 2002-2003 academic year are maintained in hard copy files by the Academic Affairs Division. More recent reports are maintained in TracDat, which is all academic degree programs are required to prepare assessment plans, annual reports, and comprehensive five-year program reviews that demonstrate the assessment of student learning outcomes via multiple methodologies.
designated as the long-term electronic repository for assessment and program review reports. Standard formats for Department Assessment Plans, Annual Reports, and Five-Year Program Reviews are used to monitor developments and report on assessment and the programmatic improvements made as a result of these processes. Improvements are also made regularly to planning and reporting processes to ensure that they are effective in accomplishing our assessment goals. The university expects full compliance at the program level in the annual reporting process.

Student Learning Outcomes as a Focus of Course and Program Review
As an institution, MU expects clear goals and related learning outcomes at program and course levels. An MU checklist defines minimum, recommended, and best practice standards for all syllabi. These standards include a requirement that syllabi identify clearly stated student learning outcomes or objectives and describe the alignment of those outcomes to relevant University and program goals, inclusive of assessment measures. Through this effort, the institution supports its ability to track assessment via reviews of assignments in both general education and major areas of study.

The Academic Affairs office collects all course syllabi electronically each semester so that meeting the University expectations of syllabi can be monitored.

Five-Year Program Reviews
All academic programs that are not subject to periodic review by a CHEA-recognized accrediting agency are required by PASSHE and Mansfield University to complete a comprehensive program review every five-years. At least every tenth year, an external reviewer or review team is expected to participate in the process and submit an independent assessment of program effectiveness. The Dean may ask for revisions to any program review that is found to be incomplete. If the Dean and Provost decide that an interim or continuing review is required for any program, the Department Chairperson and Assessment Coordinator will be informed promptly so that a review process can be initiated within a reasonable timeframe.

General Education

General Education revision
Until 2009-2010 when the General Education (GE) program was revised, assessment of this program was completed through an annual faculty committee review of artifacts that represent learning outcomes across the various general education group requirements. Recent assessments found that the artifacts too frequently failed to relate with sufficient clarity to the general education goals that defined the general education program. This finding influenced both the development of learning outcomes and related expectations for a new GE approved by the University Senate in fall 2010. The GE model that emerged was based largely on the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) and the University’s goal of attaining membership in the Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges (COPLAC).

The General Education starting for fall 2011 was designed to avoid the assessment obstacles encountered in its last iteration. The program is composed of thirteen categories, each with its unique set of student learning outcomes.
Assessment of General Education

Walvoord’s “System of General Education Assessment,” (2010, p. 87) drove preliminary discussions related to General Education assessment at Mansfield University. Faculty members assess their students’ work through direct measures of learning outcomes using SLOs provided to them by the faculty General Education Assessment Team. These categorical data points coupled with institution-wide data compose GE assessment.

Faculty must present clear student learning outcomes (SLOs) and related assessment measures for new courses prior to obtaining GE status approval from the University Senate curricular review process and the President. Each time the course is taught during the academic year, they must demonstrate the extent to which students in the course met each of the related desired SLOs. All courses taught within each category must assess all relevant SLOs for the category.

Two faculty committees assist in the assessment of GE: General Education Subcommittee of the Academic Affairs Committee (GES) and the General Education Assessment Team (GEAT). As noted in the Faculty Senate Constitution, “The GE Subcommittee oversees the General Education Program. It leads the assessment of the GE program and GE Program Review. GES considers changes to the program and forwards program changes to AAC just as any other academic department would.” The GES has a central role in monitoring and improving the GE program, and the committee works with other groups to ensure the quality and continuous improvement of the program. To create better alignment with our new GE curriculum, the Faculty Assembly recently voted to change the General Education Subcommittee membership. Beginning in Fall 2014, GES will include any seven members of the teaching faculty elected by the Faculty Assembly with no two faculty members being from the same academic discipline; a student representative appointed by the Student Government Association; and the Provost or their designee, who will serve as an ex-officio, non-voting member. As noted in the Faculty Senate Constitution, the charge of the GES is as follows:

“2. Duties: The GE Subcommittee (GES) oversees the General Education Program. It leads the assessment of the GE Program and the GE Program Review. GES considers changes to the program and forwards program changes to AAC, just as any other academic department would.

a. to serve as the General Education Curriculum Committee of the University,
b. to review and recommend to the Academic Affairs Committee all General Education curriculum proposals.
c. to review and/or recommend to the Academic Affairs Committee matters relating to General Education policies and standards.
d. to conduct the General Education Program Review and recommend curricular changes to the Academic Affairs Committee based on that review.
e. to confer with other committees as appropriate
f. to carry out other activities approved by Senate or suggested by Senate Exec or Academic Affairs

3. Meetings: GES will meet a minimum of once a month.”

The faculty-run General Education Assessment Team (GEAT) supports the GES by scanning the assessment results of all approved general education courses every year. GEAT, whose members include senior faculty from a variety of disciplines informs GES of the assessment results of approved general education courses every year. Based on course assessment results which
have been entered into TracDat, GEAT will contact the chair of the department offering the course with suggestions to remedy any courses that have questionable results based on the following three criteria:

1. Data are non-existent,
2. Assessment method employed in the course appears inappropriate for measuring the general education outcome,
3. Criteria are not met and there is no action plan or follow up activity articulated in TracDat for the next course offering.

If, upon the next time the course is offered, the GEAT finds that the concern was not mitigated; the course may be either referred back to the department or forwarded to the General Education subcommittee of the AAC. The General Education subcommittee of AAC can act on courses that have been referred by the GEAT for non-compliance by removing the course from the list of general education courses.

This process will enable the GEAT to have a reduced workload by focusing on the non-compliant courses rather than re-approving every course into the General Education program. In light of the resource constraints under which the University is operating, it is no longer feasible to approach the General Education program as a complete re-approval of all courses every three years.

Additional Assessment Data Measures

Surveys and Standardized Measures of Student Engagement and Success
Among the highest priorities of the Strategic Plan: 2008-2013 were two goals focusing on student engagement and success. These developed into the three goals of the Strategic Plan: 2014-2020, which are student success, resource management, and strategic engagement.

Beyond the measurement of student learning outcomes, student engagement and satisfaction are measured through a variety of formal and informal instruments. Mansfield University includes a number of student surveys and standardized measures of engagement or student learning in its assessment process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAP-Works (Making Achievement Possible)</td>
<td>Annual (fall)</td>
<td>First-year students are surveyed during approximately their third week of enrollment to determine their adjustment to college and the need for early intervention or special support for successful adjustment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Survey</td>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>A Mansfield designed survey of satisfaction among senior students administered at the end of the fall and spring semesters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Survey</td>
<td>Periodically - PASSHE</td>
<td>A survey of alumni is administered periodically by PASSHE or by Mansfield University to determine their employment status and satisfaction with their academic experience at points between 1 and 5 years post-graduation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year Student Survey</td>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>A Mansfield-designed survey of satisfaction and engagement among first-year students completing their first-year seminar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Life Student Survey</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>A survey of students living in campus residence halls concerning satisfaction and engagement with their residence hall experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)

**Spring semester of alternate years**

Our administration of this instrument is part of a collaborative arrangement with PASSHE and also satisfies one expectation of our participation in the Voluntary System of Accountability.

### ETS Proficiency Profile

**Annual**

This instrument is administered to samples of first-year and senior students as a standardized measure of learning outcomes. In addition to providing the university with information about value added in student learning, it fulfills an expectation of our participation in the Voluntary System of Accountability.

### ETS Major Field Tests and other discipline-related assessments

**Annual**

The University encourages academic programs to undertake a periodic assessment of student learning using standardized assessments.

### Student Evaluations of Faculty Instruction and Faculty Advising

**Semester**

The University makes available to most students the opportunity to assess faculty instruction in their courses via an online process. Not all faculty members participate in the course evaluation process each semester because their collective bargaining agreement permits tenured faculty to opt out of the process unless it is a semester in which a performance review is scheduled. Nonetheless, fewer than 10% of faculty opt out most semesters, and nearly 50 percent of students complete evaluations when they are available online.

---

**Utilization of Assessment Data and Related Recommendations**

The collection and reporting of assessment data are unproductive or even burdensome activities unless the members of the MU community are focused on and have a shared sense of responsibility for assessment of learning and other measures of institutional effectiveness and for continuous improvement of all of the university’s processes. Standard 7 of the Middle States Characteristics of Excellence states that “A commitment to the assessment of institutional effectiveness requires a parallel commitment to ensuring its use. Assessment information, derived in a manner appropriate to the institution and to its desired outcomes, should be available to and used by those who develop institutional goals and carry out strategies to achieve them” (p. 42).

It is the responsibility of the President and senior members of the leadership team to:

a) demonstrate publically their commitment to assessing all goals, related objectives, initiatives, and essential functions of the University;

b) ensure that sufficient human and financial resources are committed to the assessment of student success and other aspects of institutional effectiveness

Moreover, it is important that members of the President’s Cabinet promote a commitment to continuous improvement that is likewise nurtured among all faculty, staff, and students with whom they work. This is an essential component of institutional leadership.

Not all faculty or staff are equally well prepared to participate in assessment processes. It is a responsibility of the University to ensure that both the institution’s senior leadership and its coordinators of assessment processes have access to appropriate training and development activities regarding assessment and institutional effectiveness. Further, it is important to arrange for a regular schedule of assessment and institutional effectiveness educational programs on campus.
While it is imperative to develop internal expertise that can be used to prepare others, it is also essential to periodically invite external presenters and consultants to campus to support institutional assessment and improvement goals. The chairs and coordinators of assessment for academic departments have a special need to understand outcomes assessment that must be addressed on a continuing basis if the University is to maintain a culture of assessment and improvement. Scheduled presentations focused on assessment are included in University Days programs. Consultations between the Director of Assessment, Institutional Effectiveness, and Compliance and individual academic and administrative units occur at minimum once a semester, and are often more frequent based on the particular needs of a particular program.

Specific steps that are a part of making certain that MU has both an effective assessment process and utilizes the data collected regarding student success and institutional effectiveness appropriately includes the documentation of data University-wide, and decisions based on those data. This documentation ensures the accessibility, integrity, and the transparency of evidence regarding student success and institutional effectiveness. This is completed via the posting of critical assessment data using various vehicles for dissemination:

a) In TracDat, which includes assessment plans and outcomes data from individual academic and administrative units of the university, and may be viewed by internal constituents, program review consultants, and accreditors;

b) The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment Data website, which includes a comprehensive Factbook and longitudinal data that academic programs need for planning and improvement purposes;

c) The Voluntary System of Accountability program.

Data collected for specific processes—for example, the National Survey of Student Engagement, the ETS Proficiency Profile, and the survey of graduating seniors and alumni—are organized by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment Data into reports that address the strategic and program goals of the University and shared via presentations to relevant constituent groups such as the President’s Cabinet, the Academic Affairs Leadership Council, the Council of Department Chairs, the University Senate, union groups at meet and discuss sessions, the Council of Trustees, and the Student Government Association, for each group’s reflection and, where appropriate, for the initiation of action plans. Data are also shared at larger events such as University Days programs and a variety of town hall style meetings open to all faculty and staff. For each specific set of data, the Directors of Assessment and Institutional Research work with the President, Provost, and other administrators or faculty leadership to determine a specific plan for analysis of the data and distribution of reports and recommendations to key constituent groups and members of the campus community.

Evidence of program and institutional effectiveness that is widely and regularly shared relates to the University’s enrollment, retention, and budget data. Beginning in August 2013, President Hendricks began a weekly update of the University budget situation, communicated to all University employees through an email. While stemming from the University’s financial situation for 2013-2014 and projected for 2014-2015, this frequent communication has been a critical element in communicating transparency with the decisions that are being made to maintain MU as the vibrant learning community that it become. Comprehensive budget updates and projections are provided regularly to key leadership groups, employees, and students through emails, personal meetings, and town hall forums. In spring 2010 the Vice President for Administration and Finance, at the request of the academic leadership team, developed the University’s first in-depth analysis of academic program revenue generation,
which was then shared with all academic departments and various faculty governance groups. The analyses enabled each program to understand their net revenue impact on the institution.

As a consequence of these analyses, many programs reorganized the delivery of their curricula to control faculty personnel costs. This program analysis is completed annually, enabling departments to assume more responsibility for managing their budgets. In conjunction with other State System universities, MU is working to improve its analyses of enrollment, retention, faculty productivity, and program costs. The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment Data and the Budget Office are charged with producing and distributing annual reports regarding net revenue at the program level to academic administrators and department chairs.

Summary
This assessment plan provides an overview of the history of assessment at Mansfield and describes in detail the current expectations and processes for assessment of learning and institutional effectiveness. Policies, practices, and leadership for ensuring assessment, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement are described in detail. Alignment of assessment with the achievement of strategic goals is emphasized. This plan should be reviewed in conjunction with the formats for reporting and data management at department levels, which ensure that assessment and improvement objectives are achieved.
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