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CSUF CONTEXT

38,948 Students
2,100 Faculty
55 Undergrad Programs
54 Grad Programs

(as of Fall 2015)
HOW TO ENHANCE TRANSPARENCY OF QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESSES

1. Quality Assurance Process
2. Meta-Analysis
3. Organize Results
4. Present to Stakeholders

Benefits one program
Benefits campus
1. Standardize quality assurance process
2. Align process to support collection of information useful to campus
STEPS TO TRANSPARENCY

1. Aggregate results
2. Use process structure to drive analysis
3. Code into supporting themes
4. Anticipate questions
Organize Results

1. Align thematic results with campus Strategic Plan
2. Format results by function/audience
3. Identify how results inform campus
STEPS TO TRANSPARENCY

1. Identify stakeholder audiences
2. Present in format best suited to audience
3. Emphasize impact of results
4. Acknowledge all involved in the process
ASSESSMENT
TRANSPARENCY ENHANCEMENT

- 6-Step Assessment Process adopted by campus
- Developed rubric aligned with 6-Step Assessment Process
- Aggregated program level assessment activity
- Used results to inform progress to strategic plan goal attainment
- Shared with President’s Cabinet, Academic Senate, Council of Deans, Assessment & Educational Effectiveness Committee, Assessment Liaisons, entire campus, and assessment website
ASSESSMENT TRANSPARENCY ENHANCEMENT


Department/Program: ________________________________
Unit Number: ________________________________
Review Team: ________________________________

Step 1: Assessable Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Criteria</th>
<th>Simple Feedback</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Are the outcomes viable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Are the outcomes learner/customer centered?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Are the outcomes specific, clear, and concise?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Are the outcomes measurable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 2: Identify Methods & Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Criteria</th>
<th>Simple Feedback</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Are the outcomes assessed with Embedded Measures?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Are the outcomes assessed with Direct Measures?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Are the outcomes assessed with Indirect Measures?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Do the measures appear to be valid and reliable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 <em>(If provided)</em> Are the strategies to accomplish the outcome appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 3: Criteria of Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Criteria</th>
<th>Simple Feedback</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Does every method/measure have a predetermined criterion of success?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Are the criteria of success appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSESSMENT TRANSPARENCY ENHANCEMENT

AY14-15 Assessment Review Results

% of Units Completed the Step Appropriately*

Step 1, Step 2, Step 3, Step 4, Step 5, All Steps

*Includes all AY14-15 assessment reports (colleges & divisions)

96* PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORTS PEER-REVIEWED
Program Performance Review (PPR) Transparency Enhancement

- Standardized PPR Process adopted by campus
- Aggregated PPR activity summaries
- Organized results into Commendations, Recommendations and Resource Requests
- Used results to inform progress to strategic plan goal attainment and other campus concerns
- Shared with President’s Cabinet, Academic Senate, Council of Deans, and Assessment & Educational Effectiveness Committee
PROGRAM PERFORMANCE REVIEW
TRANSPARENCY ENHANCEMENT

Program Self Study → External Review Report → Chair’s Response to ERR → Dean’s Summary → Chair’s Response to Dean

PPR Meta-Analysis → Assess Annual PPR Process → PPR Documents Posted to Website → Culmination Meeting → PPR Summary

Share Results with Campus
Thematic Analysis 2013-14 PPR

- Based on PPR Summaries
- 19 programs went through Program Review
- Total # of documents read = 53
- Total # of pages read = 2,069
- Used Nvivo software
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commendations</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Resource Requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Impact Practices (45%*)</td>
<td>Curriculum Improvements (91%)</td>
<td>Faculty Hiring (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Collegiality (35%)</td>
<td>Assessment (64%)</td>
<td>Faculty Support (for Service, Curriculum Innovation, etc.) (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Scholarly Productivity (36%)</td>
<td>Advising (64%)</td>
<td>Space Addition &amp; Renovation (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Addition &amp; Renovation (35%)</td>
<td>Faculty Development (45%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reference frequency based on PPR summaries, which integrate the major discussion points of all PPR documents.*
IMPACT OF ENHANCING TRANSPARENCY THROUGH META-ANALYSIS

- Creates a positive culture.
- Harvests maximum data out of original work.
- Acknowledges participants’ time.
- Creates a virtuous cycle of participation through recognition.
- Creates dialog between program and administration.
- Highlights University strengths.
- Confirms progression of strategic plans.
- Identifies areas that need support.
- Helps University to allocate resources.
- Informs decision-making and policy development.
QUESTIONS, FEEDBACK & SHARING

Questions
THANK YOU!

Jyenny Babcock
Office of Assessment & Educational Effectiveness

babcockj@fullerton.edu
657-278-2015