Appendix A: Institutional (KPI) Dashboard (as of May 9, 2024)



Appendix B: Administrative Educational and Student Support Assessment Committee 2023-24 Annual Summary Report

Commonwealth University (CU) Year-end Summary Administrative, Educational, and Student Support Assessment Committee 2023-24

The Committee – Working Group – Commission Year-end Summary provides a high-level review the group's activities or initiatives during the year, outcomes of the group's efforts, and proposed actions or recommendations. Please provide responses to the following prompts and submit by May 31.

1. State the purpose of the group (1-2 sentences).

The Administrative, Educational, and Student Support Assessment Committee is responsible for providing oversight of assessment processes to ensure disciplined self-assessment of institutional effectiveness in administrative, educational, and student support (AES) programs and help the University share and utilize assessment data for decision making, resource allocation, and improvement.

2. Briefly summarize the key activities or initiatives implemented during the academic or fiscal year.

In collaboration with OIE staff, the committee has provided insight or support for numerous administrative, educational, and student support assessment initiatives. Those activities for 2023-24 include the following:

- Renamed the committee to the Administrative, Educational, and Student Support
 Committee to better represent the reporting units covered by the committee and process
- Reviewed the 2022-23 and Fall 2023 Administrative Assessment Summaries about strengths and opportunities for improvement regarding academic program assessment
- Reviewed CU's first Institutional Effectiveness Plan
- Provided input to revise the rubric and Nuventive Solutions Premier User Guide Administrative Units with updated screenshots and narrative and post to the web
- Reviewed OIE web pages and IR dashboards and offered feedback
- Provided guidance for the development and delivery of the 01 2024 Assessment Session
- Provided suggestions for the 2023-24 Administrative, Educational, and Student Support
 Assessment Summary to report meeting expectations—perhaps starting with the Nuventive
 analytics and highlights that show successes. These successes could be highlighted in the
 Triad or through marketing.
- Completed a brief survey to document committee suggestions for follow-up

3. Describe the most important 3-5 outcomes the group accomplished this year.

The feedback from the committee and collaborative efforts resulted in the following outcomes:

- Launched Nuventive Solutions Premier for administrative programs
- Revised the Nuventive Solutions Premier User Guide Administrative Units with updated screenshots and narrative; revised rubric to include a section on initiatives linked to results and account for whether units met goals/targets; and sent materials in an 11-20-23 email to unit points of contact and posted on the web
- Delivered a 1-16-24 and 04-30-24 assessment sessions, posted recordings on the web, and used Student Success (an exemplar plan) to highlight good practice in setting goals, targets, baselines, and multiple measures, etc.
- Added materials to Assessment and OIE Technologies web pages and included a link out to the Surveys web page (e.g., for First Destination) from the IR and Program Assessment web pages as suggested
- Collaborated with Nuventive representative to ensure better reporting capabilities and analytics for divisions/units and loaded Strategic Plan goals to show mapping between institutional, divisional, and unit goals

4. Offer 3-5 most influential recommendations that would advance the group's efforts to achieve its purpose.

Recommendations include:

- Revise administrative assessment structure as a result of the administrative reorganization to remove "division" designations and reorganize "Student Success and Campus Life Division" into two areas/two representatives including (1) Student Success (Amy Downes) and (2) Campus Life (TBD) and add in DEI
- Recognize units/points of contact that do excellent work and promote more broadly documented successes, which can occur after the 2023-24 administrative unit submission date in June 2024
- Ensure timely progress reports are submitted to vice presidents/associate vice presidents to allow follow-up in unit plan submissions for any units that do not submit by the due date
- Consider implications of the program review policy revisions on administrative units and recommend program review schedule for, at minimum, units that support the student experience and other relevant administrative units
- Adjust the outcomes/action plan submission date to July 15 and keep the next-year planning date as September 15 with implementation of change in 2024-25

5. Indicate which, if any, of the recommendations require additional resources or must be elevated to executive leadership for assistance with implementation.

- Adjust the outcomes/action plan submission date to July 15 and keep the next year planning date September 15 with implementation of change in 2024-25
- Recommend Program Review Schedule for, at minimum, units that support the student experience and other relevant administrative units

Appendices:

- A. Administrative Assessment Summary Report 2022-23
- B. Administrative Assessment Summary Report Fall 2023
- C. Administrative Assessment Committee Feedback Survey Results
- D. Administrative Educational and Student Support Assessment Rubric 2024
- E. Nuventive Solutions Premier User Guide Administrative Units
- F. Welcome to CU's Nuventive Solutions Premier Email
- G. Nuventive and Administrative Unit Assessment Reporting Training 01 2024
- H. Nuventive Administrative Unit Mentoring Session 04 30 2024

Appendix C: Academic Program Assessment Committee 2023-24 Annual Summary Report

Commonwealth University (CU) Year-end Summary Academic Program Assessment Committee 2023-24

The Committee – Working Group – Commission Year-end Summary provides a high-level review of the group's activities or initiatives during the year, outcomes of the group's efforts, and proposed actions or recommendations. Please provide responses to the following prompts and submit by May 31.

1. State the purpose of the group (1-2 sentences).

The Academic Program Assessment Committee is responsible for providing oversight and support of assessment processes to ensure disciplined self-assessment of institutional effectiveness in academic departments/programs and help the University share and utilize assessment data for decision making, resource allocation, and improvement.

2. Briefly summarize the key activities or initiatives implemented during the academic or fiscal year.

In collaboration with OIE staff and especially the Faculty Assessment Liaison, the committee has provided insight or support for numerous academic program assessment initiatives. Those academic program assessment activities for 2023-24 include the following:

- Reviewed the 2022-23 Academic / Academic Support Assessment Summary about strengths and opportunities for improvement regarding academic program assessment
- Provided insight about the PAR in Transition process and materials and made recommendations for revisions to the 2023-24 PAR process and user guide, templates (as presented now on Nuventive screens), and evaluation rubric
- Reviewed OIE web pages and IR dashboards and offered feedback to include updated materials on the web and minors and concentrations in the dashboards
- Provided guidance for the development and delivery of the 11-28-23 assessment session, especially to provide a user guide, give access to Nuventive prior to the session, and use exemplars during the trainings
- Provided suggestions for the 2023-24 Academic Assessment Summary report to provide year-over-year comparative data, especially at the college level, as well as interim reporting following the submission deadline to allow for follow up with programs on issues regarding compliance and quality of reporting
- Completed a brief survey to document committee suggestions for follow-up during the academic year; several suggestions were part of the feedback included in the aforementioned bullets and implemented

3. Describe the 3-5 most important outcomes the group accomplished this year.

The feedback from the committee and collaborative efforts resulted in the following outcomes:

- Launched Nuventive Solutions Premier for academic programs
- Delivered three assessment sessions this academic year, using exemplars (with faculty permission) for all sessions and sent an email in advance to provide faculty with login information to the new Nuventive platform and instructions about how to view the platform's screens. The second session focused on Nuventive. The faculty liaison/OIE offered office hours and a third session to address feedback that the Nuventive sessions were fast paced; some folks could not access the platform during the session; and participants felt they would need more help closer to the submission date
- Sent follow-up emails after the sessions to share materials and provide clarification about questions asked
- Revised the PAR in Transition process / materials which incorporated Nuventive Solutions Premier and renamed the process to the Annual Report PAR. Steps included the following:
 - User guide aligned the user guide with Nuventive screens including screenshots for each section; revised the schedule – evaluate section to involve deans and provide more reporting analytics/data; added BOG Policy definition of program to glossary; and posted the user guide on the web in addition to sending it via email
 - Templates (as now shown in Nuventive) removed the section related to table 2; established prompts to capture information that the evaluation of the PAR in Transition process revealed as opportunities for improvement (e.g., counts and percent of how many students met/did not meet expectations); made required field for all sections on the action plan; used M for Mastery on the curriculum map
 - Rubrics aligned rubrics with Nuventive Solutions Premier; removed section on table 2; revised the categories on assessment plan and action plan to focus more on quality; and added an evaluation category on assessment results
 - Web site revised the web page to include a section on the 2023-24 PAR process; added user guide and materials; ensured dashboards located there include concentrations, certificates, and minors; and created Brightspace module in the faculty training area for assessment with all materials, slide decks, and training videos
- Collaborated with Nuventive representative to ensure better reporting capabilities and analytics for institutional, college, and unit-level PAR summary results and added GE program goals to show mapping between institutional and program learning goals

4. Offer 3-5 of the most influential recommendations that would advance the group's efforts to achieve its purpose.

Recommendations include:

 Revise academic program assessment structure to retain the current members but rename committee positions based on the new college structure and potentially add a member on the academic support side depending on how the units are distributed in the divisional reorganization

- Ensure assessment committee meeting times are scheduled to give college coordinators an
 opportunity to review the Annual Report PAR assessment summary and consult with
 program coordinators to help inform future training sessions
- Recognize programs/faculty that do excellent work
- Identify new college and program coordinators and provide more intentional orientation about their roles and available resources; send coordinators suggestions about ways in which they can fulfill the committee's charge by providing outreach and assistance to faculty
- Provide professional development for assessment; develop web pages and communication to help disseminate information; and provide exemplars of assessment tools to guide faculty
- Ensure timely reports are submitted to the deans/associate deans to allow follow up
- Develop a program review template and scoring rubric in alignment with the BOG policy and procedures; strive also to align the annual and five-year reporting processes to efficiently parlay the annual report into the five-year report; and emphasize naming conventions (e.g., Annual Report PAR and Five-Year PAR)
- Consider adjusting schedule informed by committee, deans, associate deans, chairs, assessment coordinators, and faculty input

5. Indicate which, if any, of the recommendations require additional resources or must be elevated to executive leadership for assistance with implementation.

As it relates to additional resources, the following recommendations may require financial support:

- Recognize programs/faculty that do excellent work
- Provide professional development for assessment

Appendices:

- A. Academic Program Assessment Summary Report 2022-23
- B. Academic Program Assessment Rubric 2023-24
- C. Academic Assessment Committee and Council of Deans PAR Feedback Survey Results Fall 2023
- D. Access to Your Programs in Nuventive Solutions Premier Follow-up Email
- E. PAR in Transition User Guide 01 2023
- F. PAR -Nuventive Training (11-28-23) Survey Results
- G. Response to Nuventive Training (11-28-23) Survey Feedback Follow-up Email
- H. Spring 2024 Academic Program Assessment Session 04 19 2024

Appendix D: General Education Fall 2023 Assessment Executive Summary Report

General Education Fall 2023 Executive Summary Report of

Assessment Subcommittee of the General Education Council Commonwealth University of Pennsylvania

The subcommittee of the General Education Council, Dr. Rebecca Willoughby, Dr. Jamie Foor, Dr. Atika Benaddi, and Dr. Steven Granich with the assistance of Dr. Cori Myers and Mr. Shane Jones, analyzed data from the Fall 2023 assessment of General Education courses for all 16 General Education learning goals of Commonwealth University of Pennsylvania. Each General Education learning goal has 3-4 student learning objectives, and assessment data was submitted for each student learning objective.

GENERAL OVERVIEW

For each General Education learning goal, data on the number and percent of courses assessed was submitted and varied widely. Table 1 shows the total number of courses assessed, including 378 out of 749 potential General Education courses, which was a 50.5% submission rate. Differences in submission rates show that, with ethical reasoning, the percent of courses assessed was only 20.0% while, with diversity, there was 95.7% assessed. The number of courses assessed also varied from learning goal to learning goal ranging from 2 courses assessed for ethical reasoning and 42 courses assessed for creative. Future rounds of data collection may focus on improving this submission rate for all learning goals but especially for those learning goals with lowest rates (e.g., in ethical reasoning – 20.0%, natural world – 23.6%, history – 33.3%, first-year seminar – 36.80%, etc.).

Table 1: Number and Percent of Courses Assessed					
Row Labels	Assessed	Grand Total	Percent Assessed		
Arts	10	17	58.8%		
Citizenship	15	26	57.7%		
Creativity	42	52	80.8%		
Critical Reasoning	24	50	48.0%		
Diversity	22	23	95.7%		
Ethical Reasoning	2	10	20.0%		
First Year Seminar	35	95	36.8%		
Foreign Language	10	18	55.6%		
Global Perspectives	37	58	63.8%		
History	14	42	33.3%		
Literature	14	33	42.4%		
Natural World	33	140	23.6%		
Oral Communication	24	39	61.5%		
Quantitative	46	55	83.6%		
Technologies	30	45	66.7%		
Writing	20	46	43.5%		
Grand Total	378	749	50.5%		

The method of assessment was determined by the individual instructor and included the options of exam or quiz objective questions, exam or quiz essay questions, projects, essays, reports and written reflections, and other categories. The assessment method appears to depend on the nature of the General Education learning goal and types of learning activities and assessments that match well with the content and ways of demonstrating knowledge and skill.

For all learning goals and courses, Table 2 shows that the aggregate percent of students scoring competency at the Proficient or Mastery levels was 65.20%. In each General Education learning goal for each student learning outcome, the percentage of students who scored unsatisfactory, emerging, developing, proficient, and mastery differed. For each SLO, it was determined whether students met (i.e., scoring proficient or mastery on the SLO) or did not meet expectations. The competency data was provided overall and for each modality, if applicable. Then a two tailed t-test was conducted for each General Education learning goal to determine if mean differences between modalities were significantly different at the .05 level. In the assessment of various General Education learning goals, different modalities included F2F, online, 80-99% online, multi-modal, and blended. This allowed for a comparison of outcomes based on these different modalities.

Table 2: Number and Percent of Students Assessed and Meeting Expectations								
	Submissions	Students	Unsatis-	Emerging	Developing	Proficient	Mastery	Met and
		Assessed	factory					Exceeded
Totals	278	<mark>31589</mark>	1633	2911	6448	<mark>12324</mark>	<mark>8273</mark>	65.20%

Finally, for each General Education learning goal, faculty quotes described action plans to move General Education Assessment forward. Some faculty remarked that the results seem very consistent with their experience and were satisfied with the approaches used to deliver the course and assess it. Some faculty provided very specific ways in which they intended to improve student learning, including to emphasize or extend time spent on concepts or skills; conduct outreach to poorer performing students; offer additional practice opportunities, exercises, and activities; foster more student interactions; connecting students with library resources; and consider other texts / materials, as examples.

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The assessment subcommittee of the General Education Council documented observations on methods, observations about the results, and discussion and recommendations.

Methods Used

For Fall 2023, the Qualtrics platform was utilized to gather information from 16 General Education learning goals. The data-driven approach was used to evaluate student performance for each learning goal overall and, where applicable, across various instructional modalities. The submission process allowed faculty to report findings for multiple courses within a single entry, potentially impacting the accuracy of the data. Data was collected from a variety of assessment methods. The following list provides some recommendations that may improve data collection and methods used:

- 1. Require separate submissions for each section to accurately account for instructional modalities
- 2. Add a required field for modality to ensure completeness and clarity in data reporting
- Require submission of the faculty member's name for accountability and tracking purposes

- 4. Send reminders to faculty to complete all fields before submission, particularly emphasizing the prompts on how faculty use results to improve students' learning.
- 5. Determine what types of assessment may represent those methods entered in the "other" category, especially where it was used most heavily.

Results

The analysis of results of General Education learning goals provided understanding of student performance overall and by modality, e.g., F2F, online, and multi-modal, focusing on different SLOs. Table 3 shows the number of submissions (may include multiple sections) by learning goal, number of students assessed for each learning goal/SLO, and percent of the students that met or exceeded expectations. Not having a benchmark against which to compare results created difficulties in interpreting the assessment data. It would seem that 70% is a reasonable benchmark for competency as a baseline starting point. If 70% was used, overall results show that learning goals such as diversity, historical themes, literature, oral communication, critical analysis, and citizenship and society met expectations for all or most SLOs.

Based on Table 3, learning goals/SLOs that need special attention include foreign languages, ethical reasoning, the Arts, natural world, and written communication. These learning goals and SLOs appear to present the greatest opportunities for improvement.

Table 3: Percent of Students Meeting Expectations by Learning Goal / SLO					
Category	Submissions	Students Assessed	Met or Exceeded		
Arts - Descriptive Communication	9	877	52%		
Arts - Analysis and Context		947	52%		
Arts - Interpretation and Response		675	58%		
Creative - Creative Competencies	36	766	62%		
Creative - Problem Solving and Process		758	63%		
Creative - Creativity and Transformation		747	63%		
Diversity - Human Diversity	16	642	81%		
Diversity - Roots of Inequality		642	74%		
Diversity - Awareness		641	79%		
Ethical Reasoning - Conceptualization	2	62	29%		
Ethical Reasoning - Application		62	39%		
Ethical Reasoning - Comparison and Evaluation		62	27%		
Foreign Languages - Oral Communication	5	194	4%		
Foreign Languages - Written Communication		194	4%		
Foreign Languages - Cultural Awareness		194	34%		
Global Perspectives - Factors and Interactions	26	1146	58%		
Global Perspectives - Representation and Sources		1017	70%		
Global Perspectives - Perspectives		1136	69%		
Historical Themes - Knowledge and Understanding	10	444	80%		
Historical Themes - Sources and Evidence		455	80%		

Table 3: Percent of Students Meeting Expectations by Learning Goal / SLO					
Category	Submissions	Students Assessed	Met or Exceeded		
Historical Themes - Application of Language and Critical Thinking Skills in an Historical Context		451	87%		
Literature - Comprehension	14	177	77%		
Literature - Analysis		179	70%		
Literature - Interpretation and Significance		178	68%		
Natural World - Scientific Method	29	1208	58%		
Natural World - Scientific Principles		1316	53%		
Natural World - Data and Problem Solving		1221	60%		
Oral Communication - Organization	14	471	79%		
Oral Communication - Supporting Material		471	68%		
Oral Communication - Delivery		457	74%		
Quantitative Reasoning - Interpretation	34	930	70%		
Quantitative Reasoning - Analysis		928	63%		
Quantitative Reasoning - Communication		871	66%		
Critical Analysis and Reasoning - Conceptualization	13	763	86%		
Critical Analysis and Reasoning - Analysis		766	88%		
Critical Analysis and Reasoning - Evaluation		739	80%		
Citizenship and Society - Civil Rights and Civil Liberties	10	511	71%		
Citizenship and Society - Individual and Collective Action		462	79%		
Citizenship and Society - Responsibilities of Citizenship		519	73%		
Technology - Information Technology	20	803	71%		
Technology - Software and Systems		675	68%		
Technology - Appropriate Use		661	52%		
Written Communication - Logic and Order	13	311	60%		
Written Communication - Sources and Evidence		310	53%		
Written Communication - Control of Language and Syntax		308	61%		
First Year Experience - Cultivate Scholarly and Academic Success	27	871	61%		
First Year Experience - Engagement with the University Community		861	63%		
First Year Experience - Foster Personal Development and Wellness		824	62%		
First Year Experience - Promote Understanding of Diversity and Social Responsibility		873	70%		
First Year Experience - Forging Connections Between Course Content and Success Strategies		813	54%		
Totals	278	31589	65%		

Commonwealth University and its campuses have trended toward offering more distance education courses. Analyzing student performance by modality may provide faculty with a view and great opportunity to consider teaching strategies that align well with specific delivery modes. The Fall 2023 GE data permitted the committee to view the data with caution, especially in light of the smaller number of distance education courses offered and assessed, to determine if differences in modality pointed to insights that could be used to improve student learning. For some learning goals, there were

some significant findings using a two tailed t-test of assessment data comparing means of different modalities at the .05 level of significance; however, other learning goals showed no significance.

There were numerous conclusions and action plans based on the results of the data. For example, writing action plans pointed to a development process in working on writing skills. While faculty did articulate action plans for course-level adjustments, more longitudinal data will assist the GEC in considering potential changes to GE at the program level and certainly recommendations for various modalities. Such longitudinal analysis could provide clearer insights into the true impact of instructional methods on student learning outcomes.

Discussion and Recommendations

Although the data reveals that assessment results for several learning goals / SLOs were low (in some cases well below the 70%) and that mean differences exist based on modalities, results must be viewed in light of many underlying factors including the nature of the assessment, variation in student engagement, access to resources, or flexibility of learning environments in online settings. Based on observations and discussion, the following recommendations are offered for consideration.

- 1. Investigate the teaching approaches that lead to higher achievement rates
- 2. Explore factors like student engagement and material accessibility that impact student performance
- 3. Review and equalize assessment practice in F2F and online formats to ensure fairness of assessment

To establish an improved culture of assessment across CU, increased participation in the assessment process is essential, especially in the areas with fewer submissions as noted in Table 1. Certainly, CU needs to establish a broader data set and longitudinal data. As we continue to implement CU's General Education program, faculty may want to evaluate instructional strategies, assessment approaches, artifacts used to assess performance, and benchmark criteria for learning goals. Focus should be placed on learning goals where the majority of students are rated as unsatisfactory and emerging. While the subcommittee realizes that longitudinal data will be needed to truly inform change, the following recommendations may assist in the development of the GE assessment approach and process:

- 1. Send email reminders about the assessment deadline and submitting how to use results to improve learning
- 2. Revise data collection instrument to require separate submission of modalities, submitter name, and section number
- Share broad assessment results with instructional faculty in each assessment area for group/area informational purposes, especially to understand where students appear to struggle most with meeting expectations
- 4. Recommend benchmark criteria and whether expectations proficient and mastered are appropriate for all learning goals
- 5. Consider an open session or office hours to meet with faculty on the assessment process
- Hold an assessment session with faculty on rubrics within each learning goal or at least theme, but also discuss best practices on learning strategies for quantitative reasoning and MM/distance education course delivery, especially as it relates to particular learning goals
- Backward design of assignments based on foreknowledge of assessment structure

Appendices:

- A. GE Fall 2023 Assessment Summary Report Arts
- B. GE Fall 2023 Assessment Summary Report Citizenship & Society
- C. GE Fall 2023 Assessment Summary Report Creative
- D. GE Fall 2023 Assessment Summary Report Critical Analysis and Reasoning
- E. GE Fall 2023 Assessment Summary Report Diversity
- F. GE Fall 2023 Assessment Summary Report Ethical Reasoning
- G. GE Fall 2023 Assessment Summary Report Foreign Language
- H. GE Fall 2023 Assessment Summary Report FYS
- I. GE Fall 2023 Assessment Summary Report Global Perspectives
- J. GE Fall 2023 Assessment Summary Report Historical Themes
- K. GE Fall 2023 Assessment Summary Report Literature
- L. GE Fall 2023 Assessment Summary Report Natural World
- M. GE Fall 2023 Assessment Summary Report Oral Communication
- N. GE Fall 2023 Assessment Summary Report Quantitative Reasoning
- O. GE Fall 2023 Assessment Summary Report Technology
- P. GE Fall 2023 Assessment Summary Report Written Communication
- Q. Raw Data from Qualtrics and Banner