

**Academic Planning and
Assessment
SACSCOC REPORT**

Academic Planning and Assessment

Effective And Efficient Administrative Practices

Goal Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will contribute to the creation and maintenance of effective and efficient administrative practices that support the mission of Sam Houston State University at large, and the Division of Academic Affairs in particular.

RELATED ITEMS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Create A Curriculum Plan For Academic Affairs

Performance Objective Description:

Develop a Curriculum Plan that incorporates strategic planning and budget.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Curriculum Plan

KPI Description:

Develop and complete the Curriculum Plan and develop budget spreadsheets and white paper forms to use with the plan.

Results Description:

The white paper template was reviewed and amended to include only those pertinent planning components that can be reasonably predicted 1, 2, or 3 years prior to a full proposal submission, depending on proposed degree level. Detailed cost and revenue projection requirements were eliminated as discussions revealed these items to be unreliable and not realistically predicted at the time of white paper submission. The detailed projections were replaced with a qualitative description of the necessary resources and impact to other programs. The new white paper template is currently being incorporated into the upcoming curriculum software, online curriculum guides, and resources. No progress was made with regard to incorporating a strategic budget analysis into the curriculum planning processes.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Curriculum Review and Approval Process

Performance Objective Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will work with the campus community to improve the curriculum review and approval process.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

CourseLeaf Implementation for Curriculum Planning

KPI Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will work with the campus community to implement the use of CourseLeaf to help facilitate the curriculum review and approval process. This software should be in place by summer, 2017.

Results Description:

The software and IT infrastructure was implemented in the spring of 2017. Much progress has been made on the implementation of the CourseLeaf Curriculum Module. All curriculum forms have been migrated from their previous Word or Adobe formats into the new online system, data has been integrated between Banner, CourseLeaf Catalog, and CourseLeaf Curriculum. OAPA staff are currently in the process of finalizing form content and functionality.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Curriculum Review and Approval Timelines

KPI Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will work with the campus community to develop and implement time lines and processes for curriculum review and approval that will then be implemented during the 2017-2018 academic year.

Results Description:

An ad-hoc Curriculum Process Review Committee was formed and met throughout the Spring 2017 semester. The Committee made the following recommendations for improvement to the curriculum process:

1. Increase Support Resources
 - a. Develop a user-friendly, informative curriculum website
 - b. Develop a curriculum handbook
 - c. Develop curriculum process flow charts
 - d. Provide training for curriculum proposal writers
2. Provide Additional Guidance to the University Curriculum Committee (UCC)
 - a. Develop a detailed and explicit charge to the UCC

- b. Provide additional guidance to the incoming UCC Chair
 - 3. Implement the use of a sub-committee structure within the UCC for purposes of enhancing the efficiency of the review process (specific structure to be determined by the UCC).
 - 4. Increase curriculum submission points from one to two per year
 - a. Allow curriculum submission points in March and September of each year for targeted inclusion in the August and February TSUS Board meetings, respectively.
 - b. Allow additional curriculum motions in May and November TSUS Board meetings by necessity (i.e., to be determined by volume of requests received in March and September).
 - c. Allow both course and program-related changes to be reviewed and submitted at both entry points and included in any relevant TSUS Board meeting (i.e., remove the existing Phase I and Phase II separation of curriculum review).
- As of August 1, 2017, work has commenced on altering the curriculum cycle to allow for two submission points per year. These new entry point has been identified and communicated to the academic colleges.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Development of Curriculum Process Training Materials

KPI Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will work to develop and implement necessary training materials related to the Curriculum Review process and new CourseLeaf Software. All necessary training materials will be created during the 2016-2017 cycle, for implementation during the 2017-2018 year.

Results Description:

Due to the continued implementation of the CourseLeaf Curriculum module, no training materials have been developed. This objective will be continued into the 2017-2018 academic year.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs

Performance Objective Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will work with the campus community (e.g., faculty, advisors, administrators, departments/programs) to help ensure that the information presented in both the undergraduate and graduate catalogs are up-to-date, accurate, and are published on schedule.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Catalog Software Training

KPI Description:

Office of Academic Planning and Assessment Staff will conduct necessary training sessions, annually, for new and returning users of the CourseLeaf Catalog training software.

Results Description:

Numerous trainings for the CoureLeaf Catalog software were held in the Fall 2016 term for new and returning catalog editors. Both open lab sessions and department specific trainings were offered. New users were able to successfully navigate and complete the necessary catalog edit functions as a result of the trainings.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Publish Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs

KPI Description:

After the successful test implementation of CourseLeaf in the 2015-2016 cycle for publishing the 2016-2017 Catalogs, the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will work with the campus community to fully implement and use the CourseLeaf Catalog software to create and publish an accurate and up-to-date 2017-2018 Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs on by March 15th, 2017.

Results Description:

OAPA successfully worked with the campus community in the use of the CourseLeaf Catalog software to publish the 20017-2018 Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs. Many improvements were made to the catalogs to include: more accurate degree plans and alignment with DegreeWorks and improved user experience functionality to include: revamp of the page navigation structure, the use of tabs within pages, scrolling tables, automated faculty lists, and visual enhancements of photos and color schemes. OAPA did not meet the publication target date of March 15. The catalog was not published until early May.

Promote An Environment That Encourages Continuous Improvement Of Assessment Initiatives

Goal Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will encourage and promote an environment of continuous improvement for all departments, offices, and programs within the various Colleges and Divisions at Sam Houston State University.

RELATED ITEMS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Ensure Quality Annual Assessment Processes

Performance Objective Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will ensure that members of the university community are conducting a quality, and effective annual assessment process.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Annual Meta-assessment Process

KPI Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will utilize a locally developed rubric designed to evaluate the overall quality of a program's annual assessment plans to facilitate an annual review of assessment plans stored within CampusLabs - Compliance Assist. The results of this evaluation should indicate that 80%, or more, of the reviewed assessment plans for each College/Division reviewed should be rated as “Acceptable” or better. Additionally 80%, or more, of the total number of assessment plans reviewed from across the University should be rated “Acceptable” or better. As meta-assessment has continued to evolve and mature across campus, some units are implementing a sampling process, so that all programs within the unit will be reviewed through meta-assessment within a set time frame. Therefore not all units within a College or Division may be evaluated in the same year.

Attached Files

[SHSU Meta-assessment Rubric - Revised](#)

Results Description:

During the 2016-2017 assessment cycle, the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment oversaw the Meta-assessment review of assessment plans from six of the seven Academic Colleges. One college did not complete the meta-assessment process, and the six remaining academic colleges conducted college-led meta-assessment reviews of their units.

A summary of the results are provided here for each college. Percentages represent the percentage of acceptable and exemplary assessment plans/elements from each college:

College #1 - Self-reviewed

Overall	62.50%
Goals	87.50%
Objectives	100%
Indicators	62.50%
Criterion	75.00%
KPIs	66.67%
Findings/Results	50.00%
Actions	25.00%
Plan for Continuous Improvement Update	75.00%
New Plan for Continuous Improvement	42.86%

College #2 - Self-Reviewed

Overall	68.75%
Goals	75.00%
Objectives	75.00%
Indicators	70.00%
Criterion	50.00%
KPIs	83.33%
Findings/Results	62.50%
Actions	56.25%
Plan for Continuous Improvement Update	68.75%
New Plan for Continuous Improvement	43.75%

College #3 - Not Reviewed

Overall	N/A%
Goals	N/A%
Objectives	N/A%
Indicators	N/A%
Criterion	N/A%
KPIs	N/A%
Findings/Results	N/A%
Actions	N/A%
Plan for Continuous Improvement Update	N/A%
New Plan for Continuous Improvement	N/A%

College #4 - Self-reviewed

Overall	50.00%
Goals	72.22%
Objectives	83.33%
Indicators	83.34%
Criterion	66.67%
KPIs	55.55%
Findings/Results	72.22%
Actions	50.00%
Plan for Continuous Improvement Update	55.55%
New Plan for Continuous Improvement	38.89%

College #5 – Self-Reviewed

Overall	11.11%
Goals	33.33%
Objectives	11.11%
Indicators	14.29%
Criterion	0.00%
KPIs	25.00%
Findings/Results	44.44%
Actions	22.22%
Plan for Continuous Improvement Update	22.22%
New Plan for Continuous Improvement	22.22%

College #6 - Self-reviewed

Overall	14.81%
Goals	100%
Objectives	88.89%
Indicators	25.00%
Criterion	21.05%
KPIs	36.36%
Findings/Results	44.45%
Actions	3.70%
Plan for Continuous Improvement Update	26.92%
New Plan for Continuous Improvement	14.81%

College #7 - Self-reviewed

Overall	46.34%
Goals	80.48%
Objectives	70.74%
Indicators	77.78%
Criterion	61.11%
KPIs	71.42%
Findings/Results	62.50%
Actions	30.00%
Plan for Continuous Improvement Update	56.10%
New Plan for Continuous Improvement	39.03%

Overall for all Academic Colleges

Overall	36.70%
Goals	81.65%
Objectives	76.14%
Indicators	57.96%
Criterion	49.42%
KPIs	56.71%
Findings/Results	55.56%
Actions	25.00%
Plan for Continuous Improvement Update	47.22%
New Plan for Continuous Improvement	32.41%

These results reveal several areas for institutional improvement. No individual college exceeded 80% for all assessment plan elements. Generally, the following elements saw the greatest weakness (i.e., percentages less than 70%):

- Overall Score
- Indicators
- Criterion

- KPIs
- Findings/KPI Results
- Actions
- PCI Update
- PCI

Despite these areas for improvement, the Meta-assessment processes has revealed a number of areas of encouragement as well. Six of the seven academic colleges have instituted their own, locally-led Meta-assessment processes. The effect of this has been to increase the importance and visibility of quality assessment practices within each of these colleges.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Provide Quality Assessment Support Resources

Performance Objective Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will provide quality assessment resources to the University community through its website, online resources, ongoing training sessions, and workshops.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

CampusLabs Training Evaluation Survey - Confidence

KPI Description:

Training session attendees will complete a brief survey, consisting of three Likert-scale questions and three open-response questions, which indicate their confidence in using CampusLabs Compliance Assist software. A copy of the survey is provided as an attachment. 90% of respondents will report a pre-to-post increase in their confidence using CampusLabs software. Additionally, 90% of respondents will report a post-score of 4 or 5, indicating they are now confident or very confident with the software.

Attached Files

[!\[\]\(35dc653d59570f8f891c312eeece91a2_img.jpg\) CampusLabs Survey](#)

Results Description:

CampusLabs surveys were distributed at three group training sessions during Spring 2017. A total of 23 surveys were returned, but 8 of the surveys had invalid responses for question 1 regarding confidence prior to the training session. The reason this question was invalidated is because it was asked after the training rather than prior to the beginning of the training session in order to measure pre- to post- feelings of confidence in using the system. Of the remaining 15 surveys, 1 person did not answer question 2 (confidence after training), 2 people indicated there was no change in their confidence, and 12 people (80%) reported an increase in confidence. Of all 23 surveys, 19 people (82.6%) reported being confident (Likert score 4) or very confident (Likert score 5) with the software at the conclusion of training.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

CampusLabs Training Evaluation Survey - Satisfaction

KPI Description:

Training session attendees will complete a brief survey, consisting of three Likert-scale questions and three open-response questions, which indicate their satisfaction with the CampusLabs Compliance Assist software training. A copy of the survey is provided as an attachment. The average response to the Likert-scale question related to participant satisfaction should be 4 or higher, indicating that they were satisfied with the training provided by our Office. Additionally, respondent comments from the three open-response questions should be generally positive.

Attached Files

[!\[\]\(f9f168a9979beed8b01f8750d577d508_img.jpg\) CampusLabs Survey](#)

Results Description:

CampusLabs surveys were distributed at three group training sessions during Spring 2017. Of the 23 completed surveys, 9 people reported being satisfied (Likert score 4), and the remaining 14 reported being very satisfied (Likert score 5) with the training session. The criterion was met with 100% of respondents indicating a 4 or higher in regards to satisfaction. The comments were also very positive overall regarding what they learned during the sessions. There were a few questions and suggestions that will be incorporated into actions for 2017-2018 (see attached document).

Attached Files

[!\[\]\(2cf6801d0ea3db56ed897b0c35d9ff86_img.jpg\) Summary of survey comments](#)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Number of CampusLabs Training Sessions Held

KPI Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will conduct at least 8 training sessions per academic year in the use of CampusLabs Compliance Assist Software. These sessions may range from large and small group workshops to individual training sessions.

Results Description:

Four CampusLabs training sessions were held during the 2016-2017 academic year. Two sessions were conducted during fall semester 2016, and two sessions were conducted during spring semester 2017. Of the 56 individuals who registered, 30 (54%) completed the training.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Website Tracking

KPI Description:

Utilizing Google Analytics, the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will track traffic coming to the department's website. Data from the 2015-2016 cycle will serve as a baseline for subsequent assessment cycles. Particular pages that will be examined include:

- OAPA Homepage
- Assessment Resources
- CampusLabs-Compliance Assist
- Core Curriculum Projects
- Core Assessment Results
- Assessment Mini-Grants

Monthly web traffic will be analyzed for each page, along with annual traffic totals. The expectation for this year is that traffic totals will meet or exceed any baselines established for 2015-2016.

Results Description:

Starting with the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment partnered with Computer Services to provide detailed Google Analytics reports regarding all of the various OAPA Webpages. This gives OAPA staff a much more detailed and robust picture of visits to, and usage of, OAPA websites and documents. The tables below contain an overview of the total number of pageviews OAPA webpages received combined for 2016-2017 compared to 2015-2016. A complete breakdown of each monthly, as well as an annual report, are provided in the attached documents. According to the total numbers for the year, there was a 66.2% increase in pageviews and a 67.7% increase in unique pageviews from 2015-2016 to 2016-2017.

Combined Number of Pageviews/Unique Pageviews

for all OAPA Webpages – 2016-2017

Month	Pageviews	Unique Pageviews
September	1495	1270
October	1340	982
November	2180	1724
December	979	814
January	1396	1086
February	1055	783
March	1234	1021
April	1166	981
May	1593	1234
June	1159	1029
July	1639	1345
August	1787	1491
Yearly Total	16182	13390

Combined Number of Pageviews/Unique Pageviews

for all OAPA Webpages - 2015-2016

Month	Pageviews	Unique Pageviews
September	877	760
October	517	460
November	593	463
December	548	465
January	658	550
February	627	541
March	523	441
April	785	578
May	526	442
June	1,086	817
July	1,586	1,333
August	1,410	1,133
Yearly Total	9,736	7,983

A further analyses of the data revealed the top 10 most visited OAPA websites:

Website	Pageviews	Unique Pageviews
http://www.shsu.edu/dept/academic-planning-and-assessment/index.html	5846	4908
http://www.shsu.edu/dept/academic-planning-and-assessment/assessment/campuslabs.html	3512	3080
http://www.shsu.edu//dept/academic-planning-and-assessment/idea-evaluations	3119	2362
http://www.shsu.edu/dept/academic-planning-and-assessment/about/index.html	762	667
http://www.shsu.edu/dept/academic-planning-and-assessment/assessment/index.html	407	336
http://www.shsu.edu/dept/academic-planning-and-assessment/assessment/resources.html	393	325
http://www.shsu.edu/dept/academic-planning-and-assessment/assessment/assessment-mini-grants.html	387	326
http://www.shsu.edu/dept/academic-planning-and-assessment/catalog/index.html	351	257
http://www.shsu.edu/dept/academic-planning-and-assessment/assessment/projects.html	344	280
http://www.shsu.edu/dept/academic-planning-and-assessment/assessment/results.html	141	109

Attached Files

- [_01- APA GA Sept 2016](#)
- [_02- APA GA Oct 2016](#)
- [_03- APA GA Nov 2016](#)
- [_04- APA GA Dec 2016](#)
- [_05- APA GA Jan 2017](#)
- [_06- APA GA Feb 2017](#)
- [_07 - APA GA March 2017](#)
- [_08 - APA GA April 2017](#)
- [_09 - APA GA May 2017](#)
- [_10 - APA GA June 2017](#)
- [_11 - APA GA July 2017](#)
- [_12 - APA GA Aug 2017](#)
- [_13 - APA GA 2016-2017](#)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Website Tracking - Email Effectiveness
KPI Description:

We will pilot the use of tracking website hits based on when certain emails are sent to campus constituents. Particularly, we will review website hits for the two weeks prior to and two weeks after the dates the following emails are sent:

- 1. Assessment Mini-Grant Call for Proposals
- 2. CampusLabs clean-up reminder emails

Results will be used to determine possible changes to our communication strategies. Depending on results, we may also make wider use of tracking dates/web hits of other emails sent from the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment.

Results Description:

The below tables represent unique pageviews of the Mini Grant website and the CampusLabs website during the week prior to and the week after reminder emails were sent out to campus constituents. The largest increase in views was after the initial email for both websites. For subsequent Mini Grant emails the number of pageviews tapered off dramatically, which implies that it may not be effective to send out more than 2-3 emails. Both of the CampusLabs emails that were tracked showed a very large increase in pageviews.

Date of Mini Grant email	Unique Pageviews during week prior to email	Unique Pageviews during week after email	Percent Increase
8/22/2016	5	42	740.0%
9/27/2016	7	20	185.7%
10/31/2016	14	20	42.6%
11/17/2016	11	13	18.2%
12/19/2016	0	0	0%

Date of CampusLabs email	Unique Pageviews during week prior to email	Unique Pageviews during week after email	Percent Increase
3/1/2017	18	128	611.1%
3/22/2017	15	84	460.0%

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Workshop Evaluation Survey - Confidence

KPI Description:

Training session attendees will complete a brief survey, consisting of three Likert-scale question and three open-response questions, which indicate their satisfaction with the services provided by the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment and their confidence with assessment practices. A copy of the survey is provided as an attachment. 90% of respondents will report a pre-to-post increase in their confidence with regards to implementing effective programmatic assessment. Additionally, 90% of respondents reporting a post-score of 4 or 5, indicating they are now confident or very confident.

Attached Files

 [Workshop Survey](#)

Results Description:

Workshop surveys were distributed at one group training session during Spring 2017. Of the 12 surveys that were returned, 4 people (33.3%) indicated there was no change in their confidence, and 8 people (66.7%) reported an increase in confidence. Of the 12 surveys, 4 people (33.3%) reported being between neutral and confident (Likert score write-in of 3.5), and 8 people (66.7%) reported being confident (Likert score 4) with the implementing effective programmatic assessment at the conclusion of the workshop.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Workshop Evaluation Survey - Satisfaction

KPI Description:

Training session attendees will complete a brief survey, consisting of three Likert-scale questions and three open-response questions, which indicate their satisfaction with the services provided by the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment. A copy of the survey is provided as an attachment. The average response to the Likert-scale question related to participant satisfaction should be 4 or higher, indicating that they were satisfied with the services provided by our Office. Additionally, respondent comments from the three open-response questions should be generally positive.

Attached Files
[Workshop Survey](#)

Results Description:
Workshop surveys were distributed at one group training session during Spring 2017. Of the 12 completed surveys, 10 people reported being satisfied (Likert score 4), and the remaining 2 reported being very satisfied (Likert score 5) with the workshop. The criterion was met with 100% of respondents indicating a 4 or higher in regards to satisfaction. The comments were also very positive overall regarding what they learned during the sessions. There were a few questions and suggestions that will be incorporated into actions for 2017-2018 (see attached document).

Attached Files
[Summary of survey comments](#)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Provide Quality Assessment Support Services - Brown Bag Lunch Series

Performance Objective Description:
The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will provide quality assessment support by conducting a series of Brown Bag Lunch sessions where, over lunch, members of the university community have the opportunity to share ideas and information and engage in discussions regarding best practices and various assessment related topics.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Brown Bag Lunch Session Evaluation Survey

KPI Description:
Brown Bag Lunch session attendees will complete a brief survey, consisting of three Likert-scale questions and three open-response questions, which indicate their satisfaction with the meeting. A copy of the survey is provided as an attachment. 90% of respondents will report an increase in confidence with regards to understanding and/or implementing effective programmatic assessment.

Results Description:
This KPI was not used for the 2016-2017 cycle and has been placed on hold. The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment plan on using this measure with the Brownbag sessions that will be held during the 2017-2018 cycle.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Number of Brown Bag Lunch Sessions Held

KPI Description:
The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will conduct at least 3 Brown Bag Lunch sessions each semester.

Results Description:
Five Brown Bag Lunch Sessions were held during the 2016-2017 academic year. Three were held during fall semester, and two were held during spring semester. Assessment topics discussed and attendee information for each session are as follows:

Date	Topic	Registered*	Attendees*
09-13-2016	Writing Good Goals and Objectives	15	15
10-14-2016	Best Practices in Survey Design	13	14
11-15-2016	Aligning Assessment with Practice	13	10
02-28-2017	Reliability and Validity in Assessment	15	14
04-05-2017	Assessment Potpourri	13	13

*Excludes OAPA staff members

Promote The Scholarship Of Assessment

Goal Description:
The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will promote the growing scholarship of assessment within SHSU, Texas, and the nation, through research, presentations, and publications.

RELATED ITEMS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Assessment Mini-Grants

Performance Objective Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will help promote the scholarship of assessment at SHSU through sponsorship of assessment mini-grants. These grants are available to faculty and staff at SHSU to help fund new or ongoing assessment practices within programs, offices, or departments; or to help fund travel to make assessment-related presentations at professional conferences.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Assessment Mini-Grant Awards For 2016-2017

KPI Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will award 10 \$1,000 Assessment Mini-Grants during the 2016-2017 assessment cycle. At the completion of each grant-funded project, each recipient will also complete and submit a follow-up report.

Results Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment received a total of 29 Assessment Mini-Grant applications and awarded 10 Assessment Mini-Grants for the 2016-2017 academic year, totaling \$10,000. Details regarding Assessment Mini-Grant awards for 2016-2017 are as follows:

- William Blackwell, Language Literacy & Special Populations, Developing Multi-Point Assessment Instruments for Measuring the Knowledge, Ethical and Professional Reasoning, and Growth of Educational Diagnostician Candidates
- Mae Cox, Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment of Teaching Post Bacc Students
- Sarah Fritsch, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Calculus Preparation Project
- Dana Grant, Residence Life, Annual Residence Life Student Satisfaction Survey
- Lisa Muftic, Criminal Justice and Criminology, Assessing Criminal Justice Living Learning Communities
- Jaron Rider, Recreational Sports, Student Staff Risk Management Knowledge and Skillm Assessment
- Michael Sproat, Sam Houston Memorial Museum, Sam Houston Memorial Museum Visitor Experience Assessment
- Ann Stiles, School of Nursing, Teaching Transcultural Self-Efficacy in Nursing Students
- Mary Williams, Department of Kinesiology, Assessing Inter-Professional Education in Healthcare Professions
- Kelly Zinn, School of Nursing, A Pilot Study Assessing the Impact of Virtual Simulation on Clinical Judgment and Confidence in Pre-Licensure BSN Students

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Scholarly Presentations And Publications

Performance Objective Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will make presentations and submit publications on various assessment related topics through state, regional, and national venues.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Scholarly Presentations

KPI Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will track the number of scholarly presentations conducted by members of its staff annually. The minimum target for success will be 4 presentations at state, regional, or national conferences or meetings. Additionally, at least 3 members of the OAPA staff will be involved in making a presentation.

Results Description:

For the 2016-2017 cycle, OAPA staff made 4 state, regional, or nation presentations:

- Roberts, J. (2017, February). *General education assessment: Differences in written communication skills as a function of demographic characteristics*. Paper presented at the Southwest Educational Research Association Conference, San Antonio, TX.
- Jones, B., Hamrick, T., & Roberts, J. (2017, February). *Assessing teamwork using student self-reflections: Efforts to design and pilot a locally developed instrument*. Presented at the 4th Annual LEAP Texas Forum, Dallas, TX.
- Roberts, J., & Sanford, G. M. (2017, February). *Expanding the use of an existing course/program-level critical thinking assessment to the institutional level*. Presented at the 4th Annual LEAP Texas Forum, Dallas, TX.
- Roberts, J. (2016, October). *Institutional assessment at Sam Houston State University*. Invited presentation at the Stephen F. Austin State University Assessment Workshop, Nacogdoches, TX

Three different members of OAPA Staff participated in these conference presentations (Jeff Roberts, Brandi Jones, Tama Hamrick). OAPA Staff also partnered with the Associate Dean of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences (Glenn Sanford) to conduct a presentation on a general education assessment that uses data from a critical thinking course taught by the Philosophy program.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Scholarly Publications

KPI Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will track the number of scholarly articles submitted and accepted for publication by member of its staff. The minimum target for success will be one article submitted and accepted for publication, per year.

Results Description:

During the 2016-2017 cycle, one scholarly work was officially published in the *New Directions for Institutional Research*. This publication had been accepted during the 2015-2016 cycle, but was not published until Summer, 2017.

- Flood, J. T., and Roberts, J. (2017). The evolving nature of higher education accreditation: Legal considerations for institutional research leaders. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2016*(172), 73-84. doi:10.1002/ir.20205

One article has been submitted to *Research and Practice in Assessment* by OAPA staff. This article is still currently out for review:

- Roberts, J., Nardone, C. F., & Bridges, B. (TBD). Differences in student writing ability as a function of student characteristics at one Texas university. Manuscript in Preparation.

One article has been submitted to several journals; however, has not been accepted. It has been decided to pull this article for now until such a time it can be revised and resubmitted at a later date:

- Roberts, J. (TBD). A systematic review of recent literature surrounding higher education performance funding systems. Manuscript in Preparation.

Support And Facilitate The Undergraduate Program Review Process

Goal Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will support and facilitate the Undergraduate Program Review Process as Sam Houston State University.

RELATED ITEMS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Design and Implement Quality Undergraduate Program Review Process

Performance Objective Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will work to design, and ultimately implement, a quality undergraduate review process. The first steps involved with this project will be to study examples of best practice from institutions around the country and to develop a straw-man process for presentation to the leadership at SHSU for feedback and approval.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines

KPI Description:

Office of Academic Planning and Assessment Staff will conduct a search for best practices relating to undergraduate program review, and compile examples from institutions from around the country. These will then subsequently be used to develop a straw man undergraduate program review process for SHSU.

Results Description:

The Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Director of Assessment, and Assessment Coordinator III met several times throughout the year to discuss and revise the UPR Self-Study and to create a UPR Manual. The first draft of the UPR Self-Study was revised several times, and a final draft is nearing completion. A UPR Manual was also created to address the timing of the process, roles and responsibilities, and a sample timeline of initial departments to go through the process. The manual has gone through a few revisions as well, and is nearing the final draft.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Undergraduate Program Review Pilot

KPI Description:

The straw man process (Self-Study instructions and manual) will be presented to the Provost and to the Council of Academic Deans (CAD) and accepted to pilot undergraduate program review in fall 2017 with a group of volunteer departments.

Results Description:

The UPR Self-Study and Manual have not yet been presented to the Provost and CAD, so the anticipated fall 2017 pilot will need to be postponed to a future semester/academic year that has not been determined at this time.

Support The Institution’s Ongoing Southern Association Of Colleges And Schools Commission On Colleges (SACSCOC) Accreditation Efforts

Goal Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will support the institution's ongoing efforts to respond to all SACSCOC requirements for maintaining accreditation.

RELATED ITEMS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Ensure Institutional Compliance With And Timely Submission Of Required SACSCOC Documentation

Performance Objective Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will work with the University administration to ensure that all required SACSCOC documents are submitted timely, and appropriately.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Address Functional Deficits In Faculty Credentials Reporting System

KPI Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment with work with the campus community to finish all necessary updates to the Faculty Credentials Reporting System to ensure that the system has regained full functionality in preparations for the 2019 SACSCOC Reaffirmation of Accreditation.

Results Description:

The Faculty Credentials Reporting System is fully functional with all updates being completed for course rosters, vitae, and syllabi. The faculty degree data is being pulled from the faculty database on demand. Work continues to automate the credentials system pulling live faculty degree data directly from Banner.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Appropriate Submission Of SACSCOC Required Documentation

KPI Description:

The SACSCOC liaison, and the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment, will ensure that all required SACSCOC documents, such as Institutional Profiles, Letters of Notification, Prospectuses, Institutional Profiles, etc., will be summited timely and appropriately to the SACSCOC.

Results Description:

All SACSCOC reports and requests for institutional information were submitted by specified due dates in the 2016-2017 academic year.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Facilitate Completion Of The SACSCOC 2019 Compliance Certification Report

Performance Objective Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will work with the University community to ensure the successful completion of the 2019 Compliance Certification Report for SHSU's reaffirmation of accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC). To this end, the Office will work to disseminate information and resources, provide necessary training, and complete and submit all required documents.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Establish Necessary Committees for 2019 SACSCOC Report

KPI Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will facilitate the establishment of both the SACSCOC Leadership Committee and the Ad-hoc Compliance Certification Committee, and will begin necessary work towards reaffirmation.

Results Description:

Both the SACSCOC Leadership Committee and the Compliance Certification Committees have been formed and work is currently underway upon SHSU's SACSCOC Compliance Certification Report.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

QEP for 2019 Reaffirmation

KPI Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will establish and facilitate a process for selecting a QEP Topic for SHSU's 2019 reaffirmation by SACSCOC.

Results Description:

The QEP selection process is currently underway. During the spring 2017 semester, SHSU held a series of campus meetings (President's Round Table, Campus Town Halls) to provide the campus with information about the QEP Process and to highlight available institutional data. A call was issued for QEP White Paper topics, of which 6 were ultimately submitted for consideration.

Support The Strategic Planning Process For The Division Of Academic Affairs

Goal Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will support the ongoing strategic planning process underway within the Division of Academic Affairs.

RELATED ITEMS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Provide Quality Strategic Planning Resources And Processes

Performance Objective Description:

The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will provide quality strategic planning resources and facilitate effective planning processes within the Division of Academic Affairs.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Begin Development Of A Comprehensive And Quality Academic Affairs Strategic Plan

KPI Description:

For the 2016-2017 cycle, the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment will work with the leadership within the Division of Academic Affairs to identify and hire a strategic planning consultant. Additionally, planning will be put into place to begin strategic planning retreats during the Spring 2017 semester.

Results Description:

A strategic planning consultant list was identified by the Academic Deans, however, a consultant was not hired. Strategic planning discussions have been placed on hold by the division administration.