UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO
STUDENT/ PROGRAMS ASSESSMENT

Program Review and Assessment Activities for the Year 2004

Annual Report, 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT, 2004

I. Assessment in 2004

The formal student/program assessment at UI was developed in the early 1990s with the enactment of the assessment policy of the State Board of Education/UI Board of Regents in the late 1980s. It states that the purpose of assessment is to enhance quality and excellence of teaching and learning programs, and is to focus on general education and the majors. The policy encourages the use of multiple assessment methods, tailored to each institution and its programs and students. In addition, assessment is not to be used to evaluate faculty or compare institutions, and confidentiality is to be protected.

The Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, the regional accrediting agency for Idaho, has promoted self-assessment and improvement of educational programs since its inception, but developed a policy statement and related standards content that became part of the NWCCU standards in 1991. The policy and standards recommend that assessment be responsive to the institution's mission and needs, that student outcomes be assessed in order to influence ongoing planning, and thereby improve the effectiveness of programs.

Departments and colleges at UI participate in specialized accreditation evaluations with 29 associations such as the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the Accreditation Board of Engineering Technology (ABET), the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), and the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) among others. Most of these have or are developing standards requiring self-evaluation and planning based on evidence of student learning and development. In addition, the University of Idaho established an external program review process in 2000, which includes assessment as one of its components.

Effective teaching and learning are essential to meeting the University of Idaho's long-held goal of producing responsible, well-prepared citizens and leaders in their professions. Our program of student outcomes assessment at the institutional level has been implemented to ensure that we continually improve the teaching and learning process and the programs that support that process. (Appendix A shows a History of Assessment at the University of Idaho.) The University of Idaho must work in the coming year to re-establish a solid assessment plan at the programmatic level.

Changes to Assessment in 2004

In 2004, a new President, Dr. Tim White was hired to lead the University out of its fiscal crisis. Dr. White eliminated the Office of Institutional Planning and Budget, moving the Budget Office to the Financial Administration area, and the Institutional Research and

Assessment Office into the Provost's area. The Director now reports directly to the Provost.

II. General Education/Core Curriculum

The University of Idaho Core program is a crucial part of the overall education UI graduates receive. It is the heart of the University's effort to ensure that UI graduates are broadly educated people.   All degree-seeking students must complete the general education core requirements (Core) to qualify for graduation. The new Core program, which became effective in 2003, is in accord with the UI Strategic Plan and emphasizes effective (e.g., collaborative-based) approaches to teaching and learning with a focus on critical reading, writing, reasoning, problem solving, and other selected competencies such as information literacy, diversity and international understanding. A salient feature of the revised core is that it provides a viable means for participation by all UI departments and colleges in the general education program.

At the center of this unique new program are the Core Discovery courses. These year-long freshman courses offer students a chance to investigate a topic from the perspectives of several disciplines.   Over two semesters, students and professors work together to synthesize information and ideas from a variety of sources. These courses are intended to enable students to:

- o Broaden their education by helping students learn to think independently and critically about a wide range of issues;

- o Gather and synthesize information and ideas from a variety of sources;

- o Communicate effectively orally and in writing;

- o Identify and analyze a variety of intellectual problems;

- o Gain insights into the methods and skills necessary for pursuing an in-depth study of a particular theme, which might carry over to the major;

- o Become acquainted with a wide variety of disciplines, connections among them, and how they complement each other in addressing a particular theme or topic;

- o Reflect more deeply on their own ideas and attitudes, and learn about, understand and appreciate those of others;

- o Develop a strong sense of community in the classroom with their peers and their instructor. For a list of the Common Core Discovery Objectives, see Appendix B.

Core Discovery courses are followed by clusters, another feature of the core curriculum. Clusters are groups of courses centered on a common theme or topic. They allow students to get an in-depth look from many perspectives of an area of interest to them. Students need to complete at least three courses in a cluster during their undergraduate studies, including an upper-division course.

Integrated Science courses satisfy the UI's Natural and Applied Sciences core requirements. Taught in small classes by some of our best science instructors, these courses, in addition to their science content, investigate the impacts of science on society.

Assessment in the Core

Assessment in the core continues to focus on the Core Discovery courses. Students are surveyed both at midterm and at the end of semester regarding their opinion of how well the Core Discovery (CD) courses are meeting the stated objectives. Student comments included the following:

"The most amazing aspect of the Core Discovery program is the environment. Here you have people from all over the state (perhaps country) entering into open discussion about topics that are contemporary. And random. Discussion can go in the blink of an eye from human rights to whether prayer should be allowed in schools. Not only that, but all view points are presented fairly and objectively. If you're looking for a class where you can freely and openly discuss any topic you have on your mind, the core program is definitely for you."

Remington Hanson

"This Core Discovery course has given me a chance to look at life and situations more critically. I would definitely say that the core has changed my perspectives on things I was blind to before."

Andrea Panozzo

"The participation of the whole class created an environment that left you comfortable speaking your mind. I would recommend the Core Discovery classes to all incoming freshmen who are looking for something new and like working with others."

Nathan Riskey

"Core was a great transition class for me as an incoming freshman."

Tony Crew

Additional evaluation of the core curriculum occurs in two ways; expected outcomes are evaluated through the Graduating Senior Survey, and through the survey of alumni who have been away from the university for three to four years.

The 2003-2004 Graduating Senior Survey, like the previous Graduating Senior Surveys, asked two questions addressing expected outcomes in the current core curriculum. One is a relatively detailed question (Q-5) with 16 elements, which asks seniors to rate how each capacity was enhanced by their UI undergraduate experiences. The item includes communication skills, technology use, critical thinking, and other intellectual capacities that are stressed in the core. This year the ratings were slightly lower than those in 2002-03, and have continued to decline since the survey's inception in 1992.

The other item, (Q-21) seeks the respondent's recommendations regarding the desired emphasis for the core subject-area groups, research experience, practica, and the major, as well as rating of the seniors' quality of experience at the UI in each area. While students' ratings of the needed emphasis was fairly consistent this year with last year's responses, their ratings of the quality of their experience declined in every area. The 2004 results for these two questions follow as Table 1 and 2, respectively. A narrative summary of the complete results of the 2003-2004 Graduating Senior Survey, which compares this year's responses with previous year's responses, appears in Appendix C.

Table 1: General Education Abilities and Knowledge:
Responses to Q-5 of the Graduating Senior Survey, Class of 2003-2004

Q-5 Some abilities and types of knowledge that may be developed in a bachelor's degree program are listed below. Please indicate the extent to which each capacity was enhanced by your UI undergraduate experiences.				
Ability to:	Not at all	A little	Moderately	Greatly
Write effectively	5	22	44	29
Communicate well orally	6	22	43	28
Apply scientific principles and methods	8	25	38	29
Use computers and other technologies	5	22	41	32
Participate as an informed and active citizen	14	29	36	22
Identify moral and ethical issues	13	28	37	21
Develop a sense of values and ethical standards	16	28	35	21
Make decisions and act ethically	14	27	38	21
Integrate learning across disciplinary lines	7	26	44	23
Think analytically and critically	3	17	44	37
Identify and solve problems	3	16	46	35
Formulate creative/original ideas and solutions	4	20	46	30
Organize my time effectively	10	23	38	30
Function independently, without supervision	6	15	39	40
Lead others, use effective group process skills	8	22	41	29
Care for my physical health and development	18	27	35	20

Table 2: Desired Emphasis and Quality of Experience
In General Education and Other Curriculum Areas:
Responses to Q-21 of the Graduating Senior Survey, Class of 2003-2004

Q-21 For each area below, please indicate your views regarding (a) the emphasis the area should have at the UI, and (b) the quality of your educational experience in it here.

a. Desired Emphasis for UI undergraduates	Less	Same	More	Don't Know
Written communication	3	50	38	9
Oral communication	3	41	47	9
Social Sciences	10	54	21	14
Literature	12	53	20	16
Philosophy/Ethics	14	48	19	19
Fine Arts	13	46	23	18
Physical Sciences	5	62	16	17
Biological Sciences	7	59	16	19
Mathematics	7	61	17	15
Statistics	11	58	15	16
Computer coursework or practice	5	41	44	10
Foreign Language and culture	6	40	36	17
Curriculum integration, interdisciplinary coursework	7	45	31	17
Required courses in major	11	59	22	8
Elective courses in major	8	49	35	8
Research experience	4	39	45	12
Practicum, internship experience	4	35	49	12

b. Quality of Experience at UI	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Not taken at UI
Written communication	4	22	50	14	10
Oral communication	6	25	41	11	17
Social Sciences	3	24	46	14	14
Literature	6	22	34	8	30
Philosophy/Ethics	7	20	29	7	37
Fine Arts	5	17	27	8	43
Physical Sciences	4	20	41	9	26
Biological Sciences	4	15	31	8	42
Mathematics	10	24	36	11	19
Statistics	9	25	32	8	26
Computer coursework or practice	8	23	36	8	24
Foreign Language and culture	5	13	22	7	53
Curriculum integration, interdisciplinary coursework	7	19	29	9	36
Required courses in major	4	18	51	25	3
Elective courses in major	5	20	48	23	4
Research experience	8	22	28	9	33
Practicum, internship experience	8	15	24	13	40

III. Annual Planning and Academic Assessment

Annual program planning occurred this year within the context of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities' ten year site visit (see Section VI for more detail.) Each department was required to update its Undergraduate Program Self-Study (copies are available on-line at http://www.webs.uidaho.edu/nwccu/new_page_3.htm). In addition, in the coming year with the hiring of our new President, Dr. Tim White, a new strategic plan for the institution will be designed.

Academic Assessment

Academic assessment currently occurs at the department and program level without a central reporting format. Following are excerpts from the departmental self-studies prepared for the Northwest Commission on College and Universities' accreditation visit.

Accounting
Internal measures for assessing the achievement of curriculum objectives are gathered as part of the curriculum development process and the annual evaluation process.

Advisory board members began, in the fall of 2002, evaluating major student project presentations. The board members attend the presentations or view videotapes of the presentations. Baseline evaluation tools will be provided to participating advisory board members. Participants then refine the evaluation tools.

The advisory board is taking a leadership role in developing and implementing an ongoing employer survey and assessment process. An *ad hoc* departmental advisory board committee is currently involved in the development of the survey instruments, follow up processes, and providing mock interviews. The project now includes coordinated internal (to the college) and external (advisory board and employer) participation in an overall process. The accounting and business departments are collaborating closely in coordinating the efforts of their respective advisory boards as well as the faculty in developing internal and external assessment tools.

Adult, Counselor, and Technology Education
Students are evaluated in the Business Education program through multiple ways. While knowledge is assessed through traditional means such as mid-term and final examinations, performance is evaluated through projects, portfolios, and systematic observations.

Currently assessment tools in the Business Education program are being revised to more fully incorporate academic standards.

Agricultural and Extension Education
The department's assessment program for its three undergraduate and graduate degree options have included (1) exit interviews by the department head with graduating seniors;

(2) a graduate placement survey conducted by the College; (3) input from the departmental advisory board; and (4) interaction with alumni.

Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology
The department's assessment program has included 1) exit interviews between the department head and graduating seniors, 2) a department administered survey that is completed by students at the time of graduation, 3) graduate placement survey conducted by the college, 4) input from the department advisory board, 5) interaction with alumni, and 6) success of our Agribusiness Quiz Bowl Teams in competition.

The exit interviews with graduating seniors typically provide the most useful assessment data. Students give an assessment of their advisor, instructors, class material, class sequencing, prerequisites to classes, classes required outside our department, extracurricular activities, preparation for the workplace, and anything else they want to comment on. This information has assisted us in our current curriculum revision. Students provided input regarding two classes taught within the department and one class taught outside the department where the students were not obtaining the skills they felt they should. This led to a change in curriculum and class content that corrected the situation.

We sponsor our students in an annual National Agricultural Economics Association Quiz Bowl Competition that occurs in conjunction with our national association meetings. Over the past three years our teams have placed in the top 10 nationally. This provides a good indication of the breadth and quality of our undergraduate program.

Our advisory board suggested that we survey alumni and their employers on a frequent basis and they have offered to assist us in this undertaking. This data is not yet available but will be used to determine the effectiveness of our program in preparing students for the workplace.

Animal and Veterinary Science
The department's assessment plan involves student surveys and retention, senior involvement, alumni involvement, national trends, currents industry needs, and long term assessments of the programs offered. The following is just one example of how this process works. Both Range Resources and the Animal Science Department offered a similar degree in Range Livestock Management. When students from these degree programs started an intercollegiate student club with common interest, they suggested the possibility of combining the degrees into a joint one offered by both departments. After several years of faculty cooperation, a joint degree B. S. RLM – Range Livestock Management was developed and approved.

This was the first time in our university's history where the same degree could be completed in two different departments of two different colleges. Without student involvement, this degree option would not be offered as it is today.

Architecture
The chief mechanism for assessment is the NAAB accreditation process. The culmination of an accreditation visit is the Visiting Team Report (VTR), which specifies program strengths and weaknesses and determines term of accreditation (i.e. the length of time before the next accreditation review). A five-year term is considered the maximum term. The Department currently holds the five-year term.

Art & Design
The quality of student learning is assessed in multiple ways. Art courses are graded stringently through portfolio presentations, quizzes, exams, papers, class discussions, and critiques. A portfolio review (including GPA, current work, and goals assessment) is required at the junior year before a student can enter the senior studio in the BFA program. Some students are advised to not pursue the professional degree. The senior BFA student is rigorously evaluated on their written thesis and exhibition. The College of Education has similar requirements to gain acceptance into the teacher certification program and rigorous assessment of the final internship experience.

In addition to the university conducted senior surveys, we conduct personal interviews with the graduating seniors. Each semester, students are given the option of evaluating each course in which they are enrolled. These evaluations are instrumental in course redesign by individual faculty and give students the opportunity to assess their learning and skills.

Indications of the success of our programs can be seen in the number of our students participating in regional and national juried competitions and winning local and national awards. Our fine art graduates have been well placed in graduate programs around the country, and our design and education majors have been successful in finding employment within their professional fields.

Biological and Agricultural Engineering
Among the assessment practices the Department uses to assess Programs Goals, Objectives and Outcomes are the following:

1. Nationally-normed subject content examinations. Agricultural Engineering students at Idaho exceeded the national average by nearly 20. Two outcomes associated with evaluation of the FE exam are: 1) Students scored lower than expected on the electrical and electronics portion of the FE exam. Material in our BAE 462, Electrical Power and Controls was revised with almost an immediate improvement in this area on the exam. 2) Students scored lower than expected on the ethics portion of the FE exam. Material in our BAE 491, Senior Seminar was added to strengthen our students understanding of ethical issues.

2. Student portfolios, including design projects. Casebooks on each of the departmental courses are available for inspection by our program evaluators, as are Senior Design projects from the last three years.

3. Departmental evaluation of senior design projects. These evaluations are part of the assessment process. This is done by a final presentation of student projects to faculty and invited guests. The evaluation process includes evaluation of projects by

faculty using a standard form. The results of that evaluation are tabulated, discussed in a faculty meeting, and specific suggestions formulated for improving design projects.

4. Alumni surveys documenting professional accomplishments and career development.

5. Advisory Board evaluation of senior design projects. These evaluations are also discussed at the meeting of our Departmental Advisory Board. The Advisory Board participates in the assessment process by: 1) evaluating the design projects using the form developed by the faculty; and 2) holding the advisory board meeting coincident with the design project presentations at the College of Engineering, Engineering Expo, so that their evaluation and subsequent discussion and recommendations can be more timely.

Specific outcomes from these evaluations and discussions included:

o Improvement in analysis related to the design process. In the next class, it is suggested that more emphasis be given to engineering analysis.

o Writing of the reports needs improvement. The reports have been turned in the last day of class; graduation is the next day, so little feedback is possible. It is suggested that the reports be required a week earlier to be graded and returned for improvement.

o The review pointed out that a lot is expected of students in capstone design. It is suggested that the department consider adding one additional credit in the fall semester, which would change BAE 478 from 1 credit to 2 credits. In this way, the instructional material and development of proposals, which have been taking the full semester, could be accomplished by the nine weeks. This would provide an additional half-semester for completion of the projects and would allow for setting earlier completion dates so that numbers 1 and 2, above could be incorporated into the course plan. This suggestion has been referred to the departmental curriculum committee.

Biological Sciences

Assessment includes monitoring of grades during advancement through the required and elective courses, analysis of scores on the Medical College Admission Test (MCAT), and exit surveys. Information collected over the past two years (2001 and 2002) shows that the national mean on the biology section of the MCAT is 8.3 while 8.5 is the UI mean.

The 2000-2001 University of Idaho Graduating Senior Survey (see Table 1) shows that the principal plan for 61% of students from the Department of Biological Sciences is to continue with either graduate school or other postgraduate professional or technical education to obtain a credential/professional certificate. 100% of students from the Department were either "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with their increased confidence in their knowledge and abilities. 92% of graduating seniors from throughout the university felt that the quality of their experience in the Biological Sciences Department was "good" or "excellent."

Business
Advisory board members began, in the fall of 2002, to evaluate major student project presentations. The board members actually attend the presentations or view videotapes of the presentations. Evaluation tools are being provided to participating advisory board members and tasked to enhance the faculty-provided evaluation tools.

The advisory board is taking a leadership role in developing and implementing an ongoing employer survey and assessment process. An ad hoc departmental advisory board committee is currently involved in the development of the survey instruments, follow up processes, and providing mock interviews.

The assessment project began in 2002–with one advisory board member surveying a limited number of firms to provide initial input on how to proceed in employer survey and follow up. The project now includes coordinated internal (to the college) and external (advisory board and employer) participation in an overall process. The accounting and business departments are collaborating closely in coordinating the efforts of their respective advisory boards as well as the faculty in developing internal and external assessment tools. During 2004, the assessment program will be placed on the web with video streaming of taped presentations, files containing term project papers and case studies, and survey instruments to provide organized assessment from all departmental advisory board members. The URL will be available in September 2004 and noted on the main College of Business and Economics web site.

Graduating seniors complete a comprehensive survey on a variety of academic and general university experiences, which are reviewed by college and university leadership following each semester.

Chemistry
Exit interviews are conducted with as many graduates as possible. Further, the chemistry capstone course, Proseminar, provides all senior Chemistry majors the opportunity to meet as a group and evaluate the degree program and courses. Most changes that have been made to our programs have been as a result of the discussion in Proseminar. Individual faculty give standardized end-of-course assessments allowing them to track the performance of students over several years. The ACS has a number of standardized exams in each subdiscipline. When these examinations have been used as the final examination for a given course, the average score is invariably above the national average.

Civil Engineering
Progress toward goals and objectives is assessed by student performance on the nationally administered Fundamentals of Engineering Exam, exit interviews with graduating students, surveys of graduated students and their employers, and by an external advisory committee composed of practicing civil engineers from the state and the region.

The department performs regular surveys of alumni and usually requests information about their academic experience at the University of Idaho, and how that experience relates to performance in their current position. Over the years, the department has implemented changes to the curriculum, such as the use of more computer software and new technologies, increased emphasis on writing skills, and more promotion of people skills through team collaboration.

Computer Science
Assessment of the department's program is viewed as a continuing process. Faculty are serious about their role in advising and monitoring the success of students both in the classroom and in industrial positions.

The senior capstone projects sequence, CS 480 and CS 481, provides the department a timely measure of the capabilities and abilities of our graduating students. Equally, the outcomes of projects completed by the students provide an insight into the strengths and weaknesses our degree program.

A graduating senior survey is administered each semester to obtain student feed back on their opinions of the degree program. This survey is followed up with an exit interview between the department chair and each individual student.

Academic measures that are applied take into consideration the number accepted into graduate computer science programs; research internships offered; scholarship opportunities; and (indirectly) the continued expansion of the department's participation in research and other scholarly activities as well as enhancement of cooperative projects with other departments and schools. Increased research dollars obtained by faculty have expanded opportunities for both undergraduate and graduate students in specific learning and research areas, interactions with industry, and internship possibilities.

Assessment of relevant job skills are based primarily on the department's strong linkages to industry and government including organizations such as Hewlett-Packard, Micron, Microsoft, Northern Telecom, Storagetek, Microsoft, NSA, Army Research Office, and the Department of Defense. This provides students with excellent contacts for internship and/or subsequent employment possibilities. The use of Industrial Liaison Board and the Alumni Liaison Board provides additional assessment tools that can be timelier in nature.

Personal interviews with industrial recruiting personnel provide a good measure of our students' capabilities.

Conservation Social Sciences
The program utilizes a wide variety of assessment methods, including, in-class examinations and class projects, evaluation of field practice via the internship, senior exit interviews, employment success of graduates and anecdotal evidence from employers and faculty teaching the senior-level courses. Many classes are sequentially structured, requiring that more basic knowledge and skills are mastered before students may enroll in upper division courses.

Near the completion of the degree, students must also complete a 400-hour, 10-week internship in which they practice the knowledge and skills acquired through their coursework. The extent to which this material is mastered and applied is determined via weekly reports and a final summary report along with a final Supervisor Evaluation. In addition, when our students participate in the senior "capstone" course, "Interdisciplinary Natural Resource Planning," we receive feed back from the instructors as to their preparedness.

Electrical and Computer Engineering
The department Outcomes Assessment Committee is responsible for the annual assessment activity and reports its results to the faculty each Fall. The faculty, and its various committees, consider the OAC's report each year and initiate the required changes in curriculum, policies, and procedures to ensure that program objectives are being met. Possible changes in program outcomes and assessment tools are also considered at this time. Every third year, coincident with the surveys of alumni and employers, program objectives are reviewed with the major constituency groups for possible changes.

A number of assessment tools are in use to measure progress toward program objectives and desired outcomes. It is the responsibility of the Outcomes Assessment Committee to select appropriate assessment tools, ensure that they are correctly applied, assemble the results, evaluate the degree to which objectives and desired outcomes are being met, and make recommendations for change to the faculty in an annual report. The assessment tools currently in place include those described below.

Upper Division Certification
Upper division certification is required before a student is allowed to take upper division courses in electrical or computer engineering. It requires a grade of C or better in all freshman and sophomore mathematics, science, engineering science, computer science, and engineering courses (the specific course list is maintained in the General Catalog), and a passing grade on the upper-division certification exam. The upper-division certification exam consists of a number of electrical circuit problems. All students are required to pass the exam, but it has been especially useful in detecting certain weaknesses in the background of transfer students. Failure to pass the requirements suggests some remedial action is required and students in this position are generally assigned a course of study to overcome their deficiencies.

Completion of the Capstone Design Course
The senior capstone design sequence, EE 480 and EE 481, provides the student with an opportunity to integrate many of the skills acquired in his or her program in a major design project, or set of projects. Satisfactory completion of this course sequence is an important measure of the degree to which a student has achieved a number of program objectives.

Graduating Senior Survey and Exit Interview
As a part of EE 481 and CoE 281 Senior Design, each graduating senior is required to complete a senior survey form prepared by the department. This survey provides an opportunity for the students to assess their own accomplishments and acquired skills over the course of their studies and to suggest improvements in the program.

Placement Statistics
Statistics on numbers of job offers, offer amounts, companies making offers, location, and offered positions are assembled by the university placement office and the department annually. The statistics provide a measure of the interest industry has in program graduates and value in which they are held.

Alumni Survey
A formal alumni survey is conducted every three years. The survey is intended to determine the progress of program alumni in industry or academia, and obtain their views on the adequacy of the program to prepare them for their initial and current positions. It is also intended to assess their involvement in continuing education and professional licensure.

Employer Survey
A formal employer survey is also conducted every three years. The survey is intended to assess the employer's view of how well graduates were prepared for initial and subsequent work in their company.

Fundamentals of Engineering (FE) Exam
Each student is strongly encouraged, though not required, to take the Fundamentals of Engineering (FE) exam. The results of the exam are analyzed annually to assess student's mastery of each of the subject areas covered by the exam.

Industrial Advisory Board Recommendations
Recommendations for program improvement are solicited from the Industrial Advisory Board at each semi-annual meeting. Since many advisory board members also employ program graduates, in-depth assessments of the graduates' performance are also obtained. The results of the discussion are recorded and are used by the Outcomes Assessment Committee in their annual report.

English
The department has recognized increasingly the value of assessment and has sought to integrate viable measurements of outcomes into its program. A comprehensive assessment program that will measure student outcomes through internal and external measurements, including alumni surveys and surveys that will take place throughout the students' tenure at the university, is nearly ready for departmental approval. If such approval is forthcoming, the assessment plan will implement capstone experiences and electronic portfolios. Moreover, the department will develop a more formal system for

archiving mail from alumni, for employer feedback on internships, and other information pertinent to assessment.

Until recently (we stopped with the development of the assessment plan) we have conducted surveys of both juniors and seniors in addition to the survey conducted by the college. These surveys indicate a high level of satisfaction with the faculty, who are overwhelmingly deemed to be excellent by the undergraduates. Students indicated a few years ago that they would like greater variety and rotation of courses, so we responded in these areas, as noted in other areas of this self-study. The college-level Senior Exit Survey confirms these results. We also study carefully information provided by the Alumni Survey and especially by the university's Graduating Senior Survey. These surveys indicate that, university-wide, students list writing and literature courses as among the most satisfying that they have taken. And while some alumni surveys indicate university-wide dissatisfaction with advising, we find that the English department's advising system gets high marks.

We also note that for the past few years our students have been very successful at getting into top tier or upper second tier graduate schools, to which they are encouraged to apply by their advisors. Students have been equally successful in pursuing law degrees. Anecdotal letters from alumni praise the skills they gained in their programs and indicate that they have initiated successful careers, no matter what the field.

Family and Consumer Sciences
Results from the UI Graduating Senior Survey are used to inform faculty deliberations on program quality, and supplemental information has been requested through alumni newsletter requests. An assessment plan was developed in Spring 1999 that included Student Learning Goals for each major.

UI Coordinating Program in Dietetics (CPD) faculty meet monthly to review student programs and current issues related to curriculum. When distributed by ADA, the new Foundation Knowledge, Skills, and Competency requirements were reviewed and courses were identified for modification and strengthening. In addition, our Advisory Board has made informal recommendations regarding challenges students face and preparation students need to be successful in the current professional environment. To assess graduate satisfaction with the CPD, surveys were mailed to classes from 1994 to 2001. Overall, graduates assessed their preparation as adequate or higher. The program also surveys employers, both formally and using anecdotal feedback. CPD graduates were consistently rated as very strongly or strongly prepared according to employer surveys.

FCS overall pass rate for the Registration Examination for Dietitians is 94% (national pass rate averages 71%-84%). Students seeking Idaho teaching credentials began taking the PRAXIS II exam Spring 2003. The pass rate for FCS Education is 100%. FCS students who have taken the Praxis II exam have scored significantly higher than the national pass rate.

Food Science and Toxicology
A variety of techniques were put in place to assess program outcomes, including:

- o *Annual meeting with current food science majors.* The department head invites all food science majors to a meeting during the spring semester. Students are invited to voice their opinions on course work, curriculum content, teaching proficiency, and any other issues/concerns about the food science program. Students are encouraged to talk openly and ask questions. Many improvements have been made to the food science curriculum and coursework as a result of these informal meetings.
- o *Student performance in internships.* Telephone interview by department head with each employer at completion of internship
- o *Alumni surveys every three years.* Alumni surveys are planned for three-year intervals. Questions are based on program outcomes and specific course competencies.
- o *Exit interviews with graduating seniors.* Face-to-face interviews between the department head and each graduating student contain a written set of questions used to guide the interview. Many questions are based directly on program outcomes.
- o *Meetings of FST External Advisory Board.* Annual meetings are planned with our eight-member External Advisory Board. The board reviews our curriculum. They discuss their current level of satisfaction with our graduates and present industry expectations of graduates
- o *Student performance.* We have developed a formal assessment plan to evaluate critical thinking across our major using a matrix. We have worked closely with the WSU Center for Teaching and Learning and WSU FSHN to develop and test this rubric.
- o *Other measures of student performance.*
    1) Average GPA of majors
    2) Number of students enrolled
    3) Number of students receiving national scholarships
    4) Number of student awards at national competitions
    5) Number of degrees awarded
    6) Placement of graduates

Foreign Languages and Literatures
The department has identified the following general learning goals for its major curricula. To ensure continued success on the part of the student and to maintain the overall quality of the program, students are required to demonstrate an acceptable minimum proficiency in the target language in conjunction with their first upper-division language course. These 'gateway' courses (e.g., Fren 301/302, Germ 301/302, and Span 301/302) are required before students continue in the program.

An intermediate indicator of the department's success in preparing its students linguistically can be seen in the success that FL&L majors continue to find in the university's several study abroad programs. Feedback from USAC (University Study Abroad Consortium) program sites in Europe and Latin America suggests that UI

students who have completed four semesters of basic language instruction are well prepared to enter upper-level language and culture studies during their year or semester abroad. An outside indicator of student achievement of program learning goals is provided in Classics by the continuing high level of student performance on the national Latin sight-reading examination.

In conjunction with study abroad, the department encourages students to sit for language qualification examinations when such examinations are available at the foreign institution. Similarly, students are encouraged to earn international language certificates that are available through France's *Alliance francaise*, Germany's *Goethe-Institut*, and similar institutions. The successful completion of such examinations provides an internationally accepted, independent measure of a student's advanced proficiency in their foreign language studies.

We are in the process of developing a senior capstone requirement and will reintroduce a departmental graduating senior survey and exit interview in 2005. In their evaluations of the department's instructors and courses, students continue to express strong satisfaction with the quality of instruction and with the qualifications and expertise of the faculty. Department ratings of student satisfaction with their courses and instructors consistently rank higher than both the college- and university ratings in these areas.

Lastly, the success of our recent graduates in gaining admission to and completing graduate programs provides another indication that FL&L is providing its strongest students with a solid undergraduate preparation for advanced studies in languages and literatures, business, education, area studies, and law.

Forest Products
The program is assessed using a wide variety of measures in individual classes, including in-class examinations and class projects. Senior exit interviews, employment success of graduates, and anecdotal evidence from employers and faculty teaching the senior-level courses are also used. Many classes are sequentially structured, requiring that basic knowledge and skills are mastered before students may enroll in upper division courses. All students take a final capstone course (either Forp 470 – Interdisciplinary Natural Resource Planning or ForP 490 – App. New Products and Process Develop) that provide an opportunity to assess students' integration of material across the curriculum, as well as critical thinking and problem-solving skills. All sources of feedback are used to make modifications and improvements to the curriculum as needed.

We encourage undergraduates to seek summer jobs related to their degrees to enhance their skills and understanding of potential career paths. As students gain summer employment experience, they bring back a better understanding of their role in their profession and a new perspective on the significance of their required courses. As a result, the students are more involved in their projects and participate more fully in the classroom. In addition, when our students participate in the senior "capstone" course, "Interdisciplinary Natural Resource Planning," we receive feed back from the instructors as to their preparedness.

Forest Resources

The program is assessed using a wide variety of measures in individual classes, including in-class examinations and class projects. Senior exit interviews, employment success of graduates, and anecdotal evidence from employers and faculty teaching the senior-level courses are also used. Many classes are sequentially structured, requiring that basic knowledge and skills are mastered before students may enroll in upper division courses. An example of this is the Math 143-Stat 251-FOR 274, 383, 474 sequence, which requires increasing quantitative skills. Quantitative skills are also included in several other classes. All students take the final capstone course in CNR (470) that provides an opportunity to assess students' integration of material across the curriculum and critical thinking and problem-solving skills. All sources of feedback are used to make modifications and improvements to the curriculum as needed.

Geography

Assessment is part of the curriculum at all stages. We have two main data sources for our program assessment. First, we monitor outcomes of each course each semester with the student evaluation process, which is online and a good vehicle for students to make numeric scale assessments of the important aspects of each course, and also to make comments about needed improvements. We include writing and oral presentations into most courses beginning with freshman courses (165, 180) and culminating in larger research presentations in the senior courses. These measure students' ability to integrate knowledge and analytical skills at each level in the curriculum and provide evidence of possible shortcomings which students can overcome prior to graduation.

The second level of assessment is based on continued contact with many students after graduation. We maintain an active e-list that invites commentary about the success of students in the job market and/or their graduate school experience after they leave UI. The feedback regarding curriculum and course content from alumni has been useful to us in our continued effort to improve our programs.   We know all our students and work to give each the best education that we and they are capable of accomplishing here. We are satisfied that our efforts are successful because our employment rate for graduates at all levels has been nearly 100% for many years, and the success of our graduates in graduate schools at other universities has also been good, as measured by the number who end up in good academic or industry jobs.

Geological Sciences

Assessment of the undergraduate program is accomplished in two principal ways. First, students evaluate teaching in every course. These evaluations are reviewed by the department chair and then distributed to individual faculty. Second, the university conducts a very thorough exit survey. The survey results indicate widespread satisfaction with our program. There are some minor issues that need to be addressed. For example, there is marginal dissatisfaction with the lack of use of computers across the curriculum. This dissatisfaction has been addressed by shifting of our computer-geology course to the sophomore year.

Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance
Each student is formally evaluated in the athletic training clinical setting at the end of each semester. The student completes a self-evaluation form, which asks questions regarding his/her athletic training abilities (strengths and weaknesses), areas for improvement, certified athletic training staff evaluations, and any other pertinent information regarding the student's experience. The student meets with the Athletic Training curriculum coordinator, Director of Athletic Training Services, and Assistant Athletic Trainer to discuss the student's clinical progress. Each student receives a copy of the evaluation form he/she has completed and one that the aforementioned individuals complete about the student's skills. The student and certified athletic training staff also establish clinical goals for the upcoming semester.

Evaluation tools are continuously being updated to evaluate the athletic training student, the certified athletic training staff members, the clinical settings, and the curriculum. As a result from alumni questionnaires, employer surveys, student evaluations, and national certification examination results, the athletic training major is able to update and revise policies, procedures, and curriculum requirements. These revisions are necessary to place athletic training graduates in the appropriate setting and to make the Athletic Training major stronger.

Journalism and Mass Media
The school's assessment tools are most clearly evidenced in course syllabi, which include course objectives and describe assessment measures. Other assessment tools include the senior exit survey, in which graduates are asked to describe the things in the program they found most (and least) valuable. Internship supervisors provide significant assessment information in their evaluations of students who complete for-credit internships. Less formal assessment measures include discussions between graduates and faculty members/school administrators.

In response to the school's 2003 external review, the director convened a series of meetings involving faculty who teach JAMM 121, Media Writing, one of four courses required for all degrees in the school. A senior faculty member was appointed course coordinator and asked to develop objectives, assignments and assessment standards that are consistent across all sections of the course. This process will be extended to 200-level writing courses in the school this year.

The school's faculty and administrative staff also consult regularly with JAMM Advisory Board members and other professionals who hire students as interns and in entry-level positions. The Pacific Northwest Newspaper Association completed a site visit and review of the journalism and advertising programs in the fall of 2001. Many of the school's majors participate in Student Media (newspaper, yearbook, radio station), where evidence of student success is evident in reviews and competitions conducted regionally and nationally. The school's Advertising Competition Team competes against students from other universities each year in a regional competition. The success of these enterprises provides the school with additional feedback on the growth of its students.

Landscape Architecture

Assessment is central to the department's tracking of the quality and effectiveness of its curriculum and takes many forms:

1. Participation in the ASLA National Survey of Graduating Students. ASLA forwards survey forms to the department each spring. The department receives a summary of annual national graduate responses.
2. The department generates alumni surveys every three years requesting information on alumni accomplishments, national exam passing rates, licensing and overall evaluation of the BLA degree curriculum.
3. Querying of regional employers of graduates.
4. Student success in national design competitions and national scholarships.
5. Bi-annual meetings with advisory board members who are alumni and/or successful practitioners.
6. Response to annual and five-year self-study accreditation reports.
7. Exit interviews with graduating seniors.

Recent assessment processes have resulted in changes to the use of technology in the program, the creation of a one-year MSLA degree for students focusing on community and regional planning, alumni involvement in establishing the creation of a summer studio-based program in Piedmont, Italy and greater collaboration with regional practitioners in teaching and outreach.

Martin School of International Affairs

The assessment is made through the senior capstone course, which uses the knowledge and experience gained throughout the student's program to develop a "real world" decision paper on a regionally oriented issue. This experience is additionally supported through an active Model United Nations program, which provides students with experience in negotiations, conflict resolution, and writing skills needed for post-graduate employment. The capstone class and Model U.N. have proven to be major means of evaluating growth in the IS students.

Materials Science and Engineering

Students in each undergraduate course taught in our engineering programs are asked to fill out a one-page survey form at the end of the semester. These survey forms are designed to be unique to each course and to address specific topics to help assess how well that course is meeting its objectives and contributing to the overall program outcomes. Results from the course surveys are tabulated and summarized each year and then included in a departmental report on program assessment and improvement. Individual faculty members also use these survey results to modify and upgrade course content and direction.

Mathematics

One of the main measures of the success of the mathematics programs is from the feedback from graduates, where they obtain employment, whether they are given the opportunities that they were expecting.

Microbiology, Molecular Biology, and Biochemistry
We monitor student success in securing employment or entry into professional/graduate schools by exit interviews and correspondence between faculty and graduates.

Natural Resources Ecology and Conservation Biology Program
The NRECB Program uses informal rather than formal assessment processes. We monitor the coursework needed to prepare students for jobs, and then we monitor job placement and student satisfaction. Responses from students on the CNR Employment Survey and the UI Senior Exit Survey along with faculty feedback provide input to the Coordinators and to the faculty to improve advising, curriculum, undergraduate research etc.

Through the senior, capstone Interdisciplinary Natural Resource Planning class, we can demonstrate that students develop desired competencies. For example, we note significant improvement over four years in writing skills, oral presentation skills, technical knowledge, ability to work in teams, and ability to synthesize and find information.

Philosophy
The Department of Philosophy is strongly committed to assessment as a mechanism for maintaining high program quality. We employ various assessment strategies, some of which have been adopted as institutionalized elements of our program. Below is a description of our departmental assessment practices as they pertain to course assessment, student performance assessment, and program assessment, in turn.

Course Assessment. Most instructors in our department distribute a course-specific instrument designed to generate particular information that can be used to improve the course. The chair discusses the information gleaned from the university instrument with each professor. In addition, many instructors distribute midterm course evaluation instruments designed to give students the opportunity to supply feedback that can be used to improve the course midstream.

Student Performance Assessment. Within courses, students are assessed primarily through evaluation of their written work and the philosophical paper remains the primary vehicle of assessment in most of our other offerings. Two exceptions are Phil 201: *Critical Thinking* and Phil 202: *Symbolic Logic*, both of which depend on examinations.

Outside of coursework, we assess student performance in philosophy in terms of the following measures:
- o Honors and Awards Received. Philosophy majors receive academic awards and recognition quite regularly and at a disproportionately high rate for the overall student population.
- o Graduate and Professional School Admissions. A large number of our students have gained admission to graduate schools and law schools over the years.

Program Assessment. We assess the program through a variety of means:

- o Senior Seminar. The high quality of performance by senior students in this course is an indication that our students regularly improve their performance from degree selection.
- o Evaluation of Graduation Surveys.
- o Survey of Alumni. In fall 1995, a cross-section of living graduates in philosophy from all years was surveyed for satisfaction with the quality of education they received in Philosophy at the UI.
- o Longitudinal Essay Assessment. Papers are collected from majors that represent performance in early coursework and in the Senior Seminar. This data exists and can be examined for evidence of improvement over the course of the degree.

Physics

The physics department assessment plan is based on the success of our graduates in graduate school and the work place. Through our departmental newsletter and other feedback mechanisms we stay in touch with our graduates. Based on their feedback, we modify the program occasionally to keep the program current. The evidence of success for this approach is the quality of our graduates (very high) and the success they experience upon graduation.

Plant Soil and Entomological Science

For most of our degree programs there is no formal mechanism established to assess a degree other than exit interviews with graduating seniors. Information on placement of graduates in graduate studies or the job market is gathered during these interviews. Occasionally, feedback is received from students after leaving the University and working for a period of time. Input from employers is also received sporadically and is used in evaluating degree programs. All soil science students are required to take an examination at the end of their program that will qualify them for certification as Associate Professional Soil Scientists through the Federation of Certifying Boards in Agriculture, Biology, Earth, and Environmental Sciences (ARCPACS). Student performance on this exam is used to assist in guiding changes that strengthen our program.

Political Science

As a small department, all curriculum changes are arrived at through faculty discussion and consensus building. The department has paid close attention to its annual survey of graduating seniors, other comments from students, and general curriculum developments in the University and the discipline of political science.

Psychology

The department has not had a formal assessment procedure for its undergraduate degree program. We have informally tracked undergraduate successes in gaining admission to post-graduate programs, and we have casually tracked the GRE Advanced test score in psychology for some of our graduates. However, the sampling has likely been unrepresentative of all of our graduates.

We are still in the planning phase with assessment, and are looking at the following assessment tools: The MFAT (the Major Field Achievement Test from ETS; it provides comparison data with majors from other universities); a test comparable to the MFAT generated at Austin-Peay State University; a more careful sampling of GRE-Advanced test scores; and, additional items that we might add to university graduation surveys. We are also evaluating whether we have the resources to add a senior capstone course to our curriculum. Such courses not only provide an interesting "finishing" experience for majors, but they give faculty an opportunity to evaluate each cohort of graduating seniors.

Finally, we are undertaking a more careful procedure for following our graduates into the next phase of their professional and/or educational lives. Students who choose to enter post-graduate training programs upon graduation can usually tell us of their plans while they are still here. However, more and more often students are waiting before they settle into a job or a graduate training program. It is these students that we need to follow more carefully. Many of them end up having spectacular successes two, four, six, etc. years later, though our current records system shows they did "nothing" upon graduation.

Rangeland Ecology & Management
A formal evaluation of the curriculum is gained annually through exit interviews held with all graduating students at the BS level. Part of the interview deals with their evaluation of all courses taken in the department, on a course-by-course basis. The individual range courses are rated as an overall experience, that is, the students are asked for a retrospective impression of the course – their long-term memory of it – from the vantage of a graduating senior. The system does not treat all courses equally of course because the seniors are being asked to remember courses taken at different times over four or more years. But the system works on the basis of being an overall impression, rather than a specific accounting, because impressions tend to last much longer in memory than do specific points, either positive or negative.

Because courses change over time in response to many different factors, including this form of evaluation, averages of student responses are calculated over a rolling five-year span. Results of the last five calendar years ending with the December 2000 graduation show that in all but one of the nine central rangeland courses, a composite score of 4.0 or better was attained, with an overall average of 4.2 with the scale used. Thus, the score translates to 84% or in academic parlance a good solid B. Given the nature of the system, that is strong approval from the students, and a vote of confidence in continuing efforts to present timely and effective instruction in the ecology, uses, and management of rangeland everywhere.

Sociology/Anthropology/Justice Studies
The department utilizes many different forms of assessment to aid in the improvement of teaching, research, and the needs of the students, community, and state. To evaluate and improve teaching, the department utilizes student teaching evaluations, a random critique of lectures by department and non-department faculty, fall teaching forum, DIMS

workshops, and patterns in enrollment. To improve research, the department uses computer-service workshops and services, University Research Office, and grant-writing seminars. To improve student advising, the department utilizes student advising evaluations and the peer-mentor advising program.

Teaching, Learning and Leadership Elementary, Secondary, and Special Education
Assessment methods are multiple and varied within the elementary and special education programs. They include multiple choice examinations, focused free writes, essay exams, projects, presentations, self-evaluations of progress toward professional goals, and more. Across the program area, students are assessed in relation to their content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and professional dispositions toward teaching and learning.

To be admitted to upper division coursework in Teacher Preparation, students must have a minimum GPA of 2.75, 100-hours of documented time with children/youth, demonstrated competence in basic skills including math, composition and oral communication, and basic competence in computer technology. Assessments for the basic skills are being finalized, while the basic competence in computer technology is assessed by the Idaho Technology Performance Assessment (ITPA).

Continuation in the program requires students to maintain the 2.75 GPA, while completing course-based assessments and projects sufficiently well to meet the minimum grade point average. There is no minimum letter grade requirement in special methods courses, other than those students must repeat any course failed.

To qualify for entry into the internship (EDTE 484; EDSP 484) student must complete all the methods course work in Blocks A and B and have a GPA of 2.75 or higher. Upon achieving these assessments and with advisor recommendation, candidates are accepted into the internship.

To successfully exit the internship and complete the program, all candidates must achieve the knowledge and skills in the pedagogy courses in elementary education and, if appropriate, in the special education coursework also. They must complete their area of content concentration, the five one-credit methods courses, EDTE 466, ED 401, and have a cumulative GPA of 2.75 or higher. Advisors, university supervisors, and mentor teachers assess a candidate's content and pedagogical knowledge, as well as his or her disposition toward teaching and his or her interpersonal skills. Upon the advisor's recommendation, candidates are recommended for completion of the program.

Theatre and Film
The department uses a variety of mechanisms to assess the effectiveness of its degree programs. Informally, we use feedback from graduates and alumni, professional guest artists, and faculty who serve as guest artists at other institutions with theatre degree programs. We also use a more formal process of assessment as a participating school in the Kennedy Center/American College Theatre Festival (ACTF). The aims of this national theatre education program are to identify and promote quality in college-level theatre production.

To this end, each of our theatre productions receives a critique by a regional KC/ACTF representative. Since each production brings together all major components of our degrees in performance, design/tech, and directing, these critiques are a useful measure of our teaching effectiveness. UI enjoys a solid track record of having students selected to participate in the KC/ACTF competition for awards, scholarships, and special grants for actors, playwrights, designers, and critics at both the regional and national levels. UI theatre faculty are a part of the governing board of KC/ACTF Region VII; the chair of our department is currently the vice chair of this organization and will take over a two-year term as chair next year.

College of Law Assessment

As a part of its assessment efforts, the College of Law at the University of Idaho participated in the first national administration of the Law School Survey of Student Engagement (LSSSE). This on-line survey is designed to assist law schools in improving legal education, enhancing student success, informing accreditation efforts, and facilitating benchmarking efforts. More than 13,000 JD students at 42 law schools participated in the first administration of this survey, with an average response rate of about 53%. The University of Idaho College of Law response rate was 66%, with 40% of respondents female, and 93% Caucasian.

There were several areas in which the UI College of Law received more favorable responses than other LSSSE 2004 Law Schools of a similar size.
- o A higher number of UI students plan to participate in a clinical internship or field experience;
- o UI students spend more time reading assigned textbooks, online class readings, and other course materials than their peers;
- o UI students spend more time preparing for class and clinical courses (other than reading);
- o UI law students report higher quality relationships with other students;
- o UI law students expect to have less debt when they graduate than do their peers.

There were two areas in which the UI College of Law received less favorable responses than other LSSSE 2004 Law Schools of a similar size: the areas of career services and technology. The UI College of Law hired a full-time professional Career Services Director shortly before the survey was conducted. The Director is the first full-time Director of Career Services in the College's history. Over the past year the Director has begun to develop numerous programs for students, including interview and resume workshops, and professionalism training. She also has actively recruited employers to interview UI College of Law students.

In addition, the administration has worked with the technology staff in the College of Law to improve student services. The College has added wireless Internet access throughout the building and improved the availability of power in the classrooms. Finally, the College has commissioned Courtroom 21 to provide the College with advice on upgrading our courtroom to be a technologically state of the art courtroom, classroom

and public meeting space. The College has taken the initial recommendations and is consulting with the University Information Technology experts on the next steps in realizing this goal. The College expects more favorable responses in the areas of Career Services and Technology with the next administration of the LSSSE this spring. (To view the Means Comparison Report see Appendix D.)

Distance Learning Assessment

The Engineering Outreach program delivers courses appealing to a variety of students in both technical and nontechnical fields seeking graduate degrees, certificates, and courses for professional study. Over 80 courses are offered in 8 graduate degree programs each semester and are delivered on DVDs with Web-support to more than 350 students worldwide. The program conducts a formative evaluation before the 8th week of each Fall and Spring semester. Students are e-mailed with information regarding the evaluation, and provided with a link to an online form that can be completed and submitted directly to Engineering Outreach. The student's name is optional, and if not provided, the response is anonymous. During the last two years, more than 50% of the Engineering Outreach students have responded to each survey.

The information gathered pertains to the services provided by Engineering Outreach and any improvements the students would like made to their outreach courses. In an effort to retain students, the evaluation is conducted early in the semester to help make necessary changes before the last date to drop courses. Engineering Outreach staff members review all responses and prepare and implement action plans to correct problems and improve services for the students.

Enriched Learning Environment Project

Members of the College of Engineering, in conjunction with colleagues from Washington State University and partially supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation, have established the Enriched Learning Environment (ELE) Project. The purpose of the ELE Project is transformational change of engineering education from the present system to a new system in which the vast majority of people are learning with meaning, connection and passion. The faculty involved are seeking way to integrate assessment methods into their instruction to improve their courses. The tools provided measure students' teamwork, design, communication, use of knowledge and essential resources, and development of expertise and self-growth. Further information is available on the web at **www.webs1.uidaho.edu/enrich**.

IV. University Level Assessment

The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment assists the university, colleges, and departments in the goal of improving services by offering a variety of institutional level surveys to our students and alumni, as well as to our faculty and staff. Data from these activities are disseminated throughout the institution and are available on the web.

CIRP Freshman Survey

As in previous years, the University of Idaho administers the UCLA-HERI Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshman Survey, in order to better understand our incoming class of students. The freshman survey was administered early in the fall semester to all students enrolled in English 090, 101 or 102 courses, and 1,226 full-time new frosh responded. There were 1,600 full-time new frosh in the fall of 2004. Response rates were thus seventy-eight percent (78%) of the incoming class, a six percent (6%) increase over last year. This survey has been administered on campus each fall since 1992. The data are used to plan and improve academic programs and student services. The survey yields information on student demographics, study patterns and social activities in the senior year of high school, academic self-assessment, career goals, ways of financing college education, and objectives of college study.

Each year, freshmen are asked to rate themselves on a list of skills and abilities "compared with the average person your age". UI students tend to rate themselves lower than their peers at public universities. Those items with the greatest difference in ratings between UI and public universities were "academic ability," "mathematical ability," "writing ability," "time management," "drive to achieve," and "computer skills," with differences ranging from thirteen percent (13%) to six percent (6%). The top five areas in which UI students reported they rated "above average" or in the "highest 10%" were "kindness" (72%), "cooperativeness" (67%, down 3%), "compassion" (67%), "drive to achieve" (66%, up 1%), and "generosity" (65%). Three of those items were new to the CIRP Freshman Survey this year. The top five areas reported by public universities were the same as those report by UI with the exception of "academic ability" falling into the top five rather than "compassion".

Nearly three-quarters of UI respondents reported that the highest academic degree they intend to obtain "at any college" was either a bachelor's or master's degree, with twenty-three percent (23%) reporting they plan to obtain a higher degree. Ninety percent (90%) of UI students reported they intended to obtain their bachelor's or master's degree "at this college". However, when asked specifically if students "expect to complete your degree at UI", only sixty percent (60%) responded "yes", while twenty-two percent (22%) reported, "I don't know."

It is interesting to note that UI students are spending slightly more time studying than in the previous year, with three quarters of them studying between one and ten hours per week during their senior year in high school (slightly less than students from all public universities.) In addition, UI students are spending slightly more time than the previous year in socializing with friends, exercising, in household/childcare duties, watching TV, and in prayer/meditation. Conversely, students spent slightly less time partying, and with student clubs or groups. A larger number of students spent time playing video and computer games, however, they spent slightly less time in the activity than did students in previous years. (See Appendix E for the Narrative Summary and Historical Charts from the 2004 CIRP Freshman Survey.)

College Student Survey

The University of Idaho administered the UCLA Higher Education Research Institute College Student Survey (CSS) for the first time in the spring of 2004. This national study is designed to provide valuable feedback on students' academic and campus life experiences. The UI will use these data to improve student experiences, expand student opportunities, and help faculty better understand UI students; as well as for student assessment activities, accreditation reports, campus planning, and policy analysis.

A portion of the College Student Survey compared the responses of students from the 2001 CIRP Freshman Survey with their responses to the same questions in 2004. Highlights from those responses included:

o While seventy-six (76%) of freshmen reported their grade average as 3.74 to 4.0 on the CIRP, only forty-nine percent (49%) reported the same on the CSS, a decrease of over twenty-seven percent (27%).

o The number of students reporting they "occasionally" or "frequently" "felt bored in class" has decreased by twelve percent (12%) since the freshman survey.

o Overall, students reported they spent about the same amount of time "socializing with friends" as they reported on the Freshman Survey, but slightly less time "exercising", "working (for pay)", doing "volunteer work", participating in "student clubs/groups", "watching TV", doing "housework/ childcare", "reading for pleasure", "playing video/computer games", and in "prayer/meditation."

o Student reported spending slightly more time in "studying/homework" and "partying" than in their freshman year.

o When asked about general activities in which they engaged "occasionally" or "frequently", students reported a decrease in "socialized with someone of another racial/ethnic group" (down 23%), and "attended a religious service" (down 25%). However, they reported increases in "felt overwhelmed by all you had to do" (up 15%), "drank beer" (up 16%), "drank wine or liquor" (up 20%), and "overslept and missed class or an appointment" (up 28%).

o When asked to rate their abilities as "above average" or "highest 10%" compared with the average person of his/her age, those areas with largest amount of change since the Freshman Survey were: "initiative" (down 17%), "self-confidence (intellectual)" (up 11%), "writing ability" (up 9%), "computer skills" (up 9%), and "drive to achieve" (down 8%).

For a complete look at the frequency response analysis from the 2004 CSS Longitudinal Reports, as well as the total responses in the 2004 CSS Institutional Profile, see http://www.webs.uidaho.edu/ipb/surveys.htm. (The narrative summary can be found in Appendix F.)

Graduating Senior Survey

The University of Idaho has conducted the Graduating Senior Survey annually since 1992. The main purpose of the survey is to assess students' satisfaction and opinion with their experiences at the University of Idaho. Results are used to plan improvements to our degree programs to enhance learning, as well as to provide feedback to faculty and student service units.

Potential respondents included the 1,633 baccalaureate degree recipients for August and December 2003 and May 2004. This year 1,452 (89%) completed the surveys in time for them to be included in the data entry and analysis. Forty-seven percent (47%) of respondents were female, down three percent (3%) from last year, and eighty-seven percent (87%) were Caucasian American (down 1%). Ninety-six percent (96%) of respondents took most of their UI coursework on the Moscow campus. Forty-three percent (43%) indicated they first entered UI as transfer students (up 2%). Thirty-four percent (34%) responded that they had changed colleges or departments within the university, up five percent (5%) from the previous year.

In general, students seem to be less satisfied with the academic side of the undergraduate experience, though they are slightly more satisfied with service and support areas. When asked to indicate their views regarding the quality of particular areas within the core curriculum, those items with the largest decline in student satisfaction this year were "computer coursework or practice" (down 14% to 44%), "mathematics" (down 10% to 47%), "physical sciences" (down 9% to 50%) and "curriculum integration, interdisciplinary coursework" (down 8%, to 38%).

Conversely, two items asked seniors to rate their level of satisfaction with a variety of support services, facilities, and activities available to students. In all cases but one, satisfaction ratings of services and facilities increased. In addition, in most cases, more students reported using the facilities and services than in the previous year. Interestingly, this year sixty-five percent (65%) of responding seniors reported they had an opportunity to participate in research during their undergraduate coursework. This is a significant increase (17%) from the forty-eight percent (48%) reported last year, which was the lowest in the survey's history. To view the complete results of the 2004 Graduating Senior Survey see Appendix C.

Alumni Survey

The Survey of Graduates was designed to study our alumni's perception of the impact of University of Idaho undergraduate degree programs and curricula on their subsequent lives. The content of the survey reflects elements of the strategic plan including the goals of enhancing undergraduate education, expanding the outreach service mission of the university, and increasing the availability and use of technology. In addition, the survey assesses general education as well as the major department. In an attempt to reduce costs, we have begun conducting this survey approximately every three years, with alumni who

graduate within three or four years of the survey's administration date. The next administration is planned for spring 2005.

Graduate Alumni Survey

The content of the Graduate Alumni Survey reflects elements of the strategic directions for the UI including the goals of developing high-quality research and graduate degree programs, enhancing the outreach service mission of the university, and enhancing the availability and use of technology. The survey includes questions about major curriculum, quality of research experiences, the relationship of the graduate program to subsequent success in employment or further advanced study, and satisfaction with program quality and services. The survey is administered every three years, most recently in 2003.

Additional IRA Assessment Activities

Faculty Survey
In addition to those efforts listed above, assessment office personnel coordinate the UCLA Higher Education Research Institution (HERI) Faculty Survey, which occurs every three years on campus, and is currently being administered. This is a national study of faculty and administrator attitudes, job satisfaction, professional activities and experiences. This survey allows us to compare how our faculty attitudes and perceptions differ from our staff, as well as how we differ from faculty at other institutions across the country.

Staff Survey
A survey of the university staff is conducted approximately every three years. The last administration of the University of Idaho Staff Survey, a locally developed survey, was in 2003. The University of Idaho Staff Survey is intended to help identify issues of concern among a broad spectrum of staff members and generate discussions to determine and meet the needs of staff. The survey includes questions on job satisfaction, working environment and conditions, and organizational communications.

Strategic Enrollment Management
IRA staff are involved in the strategic enrollment management process at the University of Idaho by providing historical data and serving as resources for the Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) Committee. The Assistant Director of Program Review and Assessment serves as the Co-Chair of the SEM Committee on Undergraduate Student Success. A Five-Year Strategic Enrollment Management Plan is being updated to improve recruitment and retention for academic years 2004-2008. The goals are expected to remain relatively stable, but the action strategies will be adjusted on a regular basis to meet changing needs and constraints.

V. Assessment in Service/Support Programs

The Academic Champions Experience

IRA staff are on the Board of Advisors for the Academic Champions Experience. In 2003, Michael Griffel, Director of University Residences, won a three-year FIPSE grant to improve student retention and program completion. To achieve an increase of five percent (5%) in student graduation rates, the project will develop an easily replicable program called Academic Champion's Experience (ACE-it). The project goal is to demonstrate that the ACE-it Social Norms Model can increase retention and the 6-year college graduation rate by improving the accuracy of student's perceptions of the frequency of their peers' engagement in academic success behaviors by 10%; increase the frequency of student engagement in academic success behaviors by 10%; increase the average semester GPA of students by .3, from 2.8 to 3.1; increase the freshman-to-sophomore year retention rate by 7%; increase the 6-year college graduation rate by 5%.

Currently, the project has administered a survey to UI students and three control groups from Central Washington University, Washington State University, and Western Washington University, and will be administering a second survey in the near future. While the response rates to the surveys were somewhat disappointing (30%), the project has developed a campaign to educate the campus community with the social norms messages, including the following:

- 3 out of 4 UI students use free student services like AAP, the Dean of Students office, the Counseling Center, and Student Activities.
  - *You're not alone when it comes to worrying about getting your homework done and doing it well! They're here to HELP!*

- 9 out of 10 UI students go to their professors' office hours regularly.
  - *Professors really DO want to get to know their students! They're here because they ACTUALLY like teaching students!*

- 4 out of 5 UI students go to campus events and activities.
  - *Support your fellow VANDALS and go see what they've got going on for YOU!*

- 9 out of 10 UI students think getting good grades is important.
  - *No one starts a new semester in hopes of failure!*
  - *Set personal goals that you can achieve!*

- 4 out of 5 UI students plan to get their Bachelor's degree at UI.
  - *What're your future goals? Share them with others who may not know about your program!*

- 4 out of 5 students attend class regularly.
  - *Staying healthy and getting enough sleep will help you to feel refreshed for class…at any time of the day!*

o UI students study 15 or MORE hours per week.
  o *The time you spend studying is directly related to your grades.*
  o *Studying in groups keeps the pizza companies in business!*

o UI students attend class 90% of the time.
  o *Staying healthy and keeping a day planner will increase your likelihood of getting to class on time!*

o UI students visit with their professors 9 times per semester.
  o *You never know what your professors might say next...you might just be inspired!*

o UI students study more per week than the national average.
  o *Think of how you spend your study time and congratulate yourself on your "national accomplishment"!*

o Most UI students say their GPA is about 3.0.
  o *Actively pursue the Best grades you Can and Don't stress about Failing yourself!*

o 9 out of 10 UI students work hard for their grades.
  o *No one said this was supposed to be easy, but you're here because you believe in yourself and what you will achieve!*

o 9 out of 10 UI students get to know their professors.
  o *They really want to get to know you! Professors need friends too!*

o On average, UI students attend 8 campus events / semester.
  o *Having fun on campus is a part of the COLLEGE experience! Go see what's out there waiting for you!*

Student Affairs Programs

Assessment in Student Affairs continues to occur through a variety of programs:
- Annual UI Housing Benchmarking Study. This study is conducted late fall semester and extensively asks to students to evaluate their experience in the residence halls. Data collected is used to make decisions about the kind of services and programs that are offered.
- New Freshman Orientation. The ULCA-HERI Freshman Survey is used to guide decisions forming new student orientation programs and recruitment activities. The Dean of Students specifically uses these data in presentations to faculty, student service staff and student leaders, and this spring used information from the study in a presentation to campus ministers.
- The CORE Alcohol Survey. This instrument is used semi-annually to monitor alcohol and drug use of our students. Information from the survey is used to guide policy and program formation.

- The Commons and Student Activities area completes a services and satisfaction survey each year. This survey is distributed to students to measure benefits of student activity programs. It is conducted by an outside agency.
- Grant-based programs are carefully assessed. The assessment activities are built into grant agreements. Major grant programs include CAMP, Student Support Services and the Sexual Assault Prevention Grant from the US Department of Justice.

Freshman Calling Program

The Freshman Calling Program is led by the Dean of Student's Office, and designed to provide meaningful contact with new students at a midpoint in their first semester. New students who were living in residence halls and off campus were contacted by e-mail and then by phone. New student who were living in Greek living groups were contacted by staff who met with them in small group discussion setting in their chapter houses. The project is designed for several purposes, to express faculty/staff interest in the adjustment of new students to the university; to assess the needs of new students and possibly changes in new student orientation; to refer students to resources such as their academic advisor, academic support services and the Counseling Center; and to convey information about upcoming academic activities, academic advising for the coming semester, course registration preparation and making decisions about dropping courses before the deadline. For a complete report on the program see Appendix G.

Counseling and Testing Center

The mission of the University of Idaho Student Counseling Center is to advance the academic mission of the University by fostering the personal, career and academic development of students in order to promote their success and persistence in the university community. This mission supports the UI Strategic Plan by enhancing the undergraduate and graduate experiences, helping to make the UI the residential campus of choice in Idaho and the West.

The center provides crisis intervention services, as well as services to assist students in overcoming problems, and defining and achieving their educational, vocational and personal goals. Each year there are large numbers of students seeking assistance at the Student Counseling Center and the nature of the problems that they present have followed a trend toward increasing pathology and complexity. Results of measured activities include:
- The total number of contacts increased 10% in 2003-04;
- The total number of emergency appointments decreased 6% in 2003-04;
- The total number of individual interview hours increased by 27% and total number of clients increased 9%;
- The number of group sessions decreased by 28% while the number of students seeking group counseling decreased 21%;
- Outreach activities increase 7%;
- Total number of students screened during National Mental Health Screening Days significantly increased nearly 300%. This program was very successful and has

been nominated for an award by the Northwest Association of Student Affairs Professionals.

o   The total number of clinical tests administered in conjunction with counseling increased 16%;

o   The total number of undergraduate tests administered increased 4%, graduate tests increased 100%, placement tests increased 18%, and other tests administered increased 47%. Computer-Based tests decreased 14%.

Academic Assistance Programs

The Academic Assistance Program's mission is to assist students in reaching their educational goals at the University of Idaho. It has three unique programs designed to provide students with academic services in an accessible, supportive environment, Tutoring and Learning Services (TLS), Disability Support Services (DSS), and Student Support Services (SSS). Students who need a tutor, a study skills class, or a study skills refresher workshop, can access the TLS. Students who are first generation or from limited-income families or have a disability with an academic impact can receive support through SSS. Students with a temporary or permanent disability receive support through DSS. Additional services and one-on-one assistance can make a difference in student success.

Assessment of the program has identified the fact that over 50% of the students who seek tutoring through TLS are students who have a cumulative GPA of over 3.0. In addition, TLS has expanded our services (within TLS) to offer drop-in tutoring in the residence halls, and is hoping to partner with faculty more the coming year. SSS exceeded all of its objectives this past year. In fact, SSS met or exceeded objectives in each of the past four years. DSS continues to offer quality services to all students seeking accommodations.

Summer Programs

In an effort to increase student satisfaction and improve academic services, Summer Programs administered a survey to a randomly selected group of UI students representing undergraduate, graduate, non-degree and law students. The survey asked students about factors that might influence their decision to attend summer session, reasons they might or might not take summer coursework, and scheduling preferences.

Both students who have taken summer courses and those who would consider taking summer courses commented that the availability of courses they need, particularly in their major, was the most important factor influencing their decision. Students reported the second most important factor influencing summer attendance is financial aid, coupled with concern for increasing fees.

Based on survey results, the Director of Summer Programs has reallocated the budget to support the development of six new on-line courses, which will give UI students located outside of Moscow more opportunity to take courses during the summer. Providing these courses through the web should increase summer enrollment and widen the audience for summer programs as well. (For complete results of the survey see Appendix H.)

Other Student Services and Programs

Additional programs and services offered at the University of Idaho to improve student learning include:

- The University Honors Program, which offers a course of study and an enriched learning community for exceptional students from all colleges and majors;
- Mathematics and Statistics Assistance Center accessible to students, faculty, and staff researchers, in design and complex data analysis as well as tutoring assistance and a variety of other resources (practice placement exams, test files, seminars, and information about math courses offered on campus);
- Statistical Consulting Center, which provides statistical support and expertise for students, faculty and staff;
- English Computer Writing Laboratory, which provides support for students in developing their writing abilities;
- National Student Exchange Program providing students the opportunity to attend other colleges or universities throughout the U.S.;
- Study Abroad Program enabling students to enhance their education, cultural understanding, and future employability by studying overseas;
- Cooperative Education Office, which places both graduate and undergraduate students in internships;
- Career Services Office, which maintains placement files and assists students in finding employment opportunities;
- Student computer labs at various locations on campus providing a wide variety of general-use, state-of-the-art software to networked labs and classrooms.

V. External Program Review

The UI conducts comprehensive and thorough External Program Reviews (EPR) of all of its academic and service/support programs for the purposes of improving the quality of those programs, providing accountability data for strategic planning, and enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of the institution as it fulfills its mission. These EPRs are conducted on a seven-year cycle (with variations planned to correlate with specialized accreditation practices, see Appendix I for the current schedule).

In the EPR process, the unit faculty and staff conduct a self-study of the program(s) relative to the goals of the program(s) and according to defined criteria, gathering both qualitative and quantitative data for this purpose. Each self-study includes descriptions of areas in which the program(s) excel, areas in which the program(s) needs improvement, and program development considerations. A review team then assesses the program quality with respect to the questions and criteria provided, as well as the role of the program in the UI environment relative to UI's mission, and goals. The composition of each review team is tailored to each unit, integrating external peers, UI faculty and administrators, and others. The team conducts site visits, sometimes traveling statewide, conducts numerous interviews with faculty, staff and students, and ultimately submits a written review and evaluation for the programs under consideration. The unit

administrators then reflect on the perceptions and recommendations of the review team, and provide a written response to the recommendations, which includes proposed actions. These recommendations are forwarded with the review team's report to the Office of the President and the Provost, with copies to Institutional Research and Assessment.

To-date, twenty-three departments/units (30%) have completed the External Program Review process, an additional 5 units (7%) have External Program Reviews underway, and forty-eight units (63%) have been or will be scheduled during the coming three years. Copies of all of the self-studies and evaluator reports for each completed External Program Review are available in the Institutional Research and Assessment office.

The EPR guidelines include a one-year follow-up report on actions taken in response to the review process. These follow-up reports address recommendations from the external reviewers, the actions that have been taken to address those recommendations, factors that have assisted or hindered achieving the desired changes, as well as plans for the next several years. Ten units have submitted one-year follow-up reports, with three additional units in the process of preparing their one-year follow-up reports.

Throughout this process, the focus is on sincere examination of the unit goals and objectives, thorough examination of what is working and what needs improvement, specific recommendations for change with defined measures and timelines. A key aspect of this process, as distinguished from program accreditation, is communication with the higher-level dean, director, or vice president during the self-study, site visit, and throughout the following year. While accreditation can be viewed as "passing a test," the external program review has been designed primarily for program improvement.

VI. Northwest Commission on College and Universities

In October of 2004 the University of Idaho participated in its 10-year full-scale accreditation visit by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU). In preparation for the visit an Executive Director was hired to coordinate the self-study, and twelve committees and sub-committees were created to critically examine the institution according to the standards outlined by NWCCU. Institutional Research and Assessment staff played an integral role in all aspects of the self-study and the accreditation evaluation, including assisting in designing the self-study process, collecting data required by committees, participating in committee deliberations, and planning the logistics of the on-site visit.

While the accreditation of the University of Idaho was reaffirmed on the basis of the fall 2004 comprehensive evaluation, the Commission requested two focused interim reports and site visits. The first report and visit will occur in the spring of 2006 and the second in the fall of 2007.

The evaluating team made the following recommendations:
  o A full review of the mission statement to ensure accuracy and currency;

- o The development of an inclusive process of strategic planning that identifies priorities, consistent with the mission statement, to guide organizational shifts and budgetary decisions;
- o Self-evaluation by the State Board of Education/Regents of its performance;
- o Evaluation and revision of policies and procedures to ensure integrity and public trust;
- o Ensure an appropriate number and quality of faculty to maintain quality and support student achievement;
- o Find solutions to the ongoing and cumulative deficits in operating and capital budgets;
- o Identify an action plan that will eliminate the deficit;
- o Incorporate into future budget planning the University's liquidity position and lack of operating reserves;
- o Implement a comprehensive and adequate system of checks and balances on spending, with regular review by audit personnel of the State Board of Education/Regents;
- o Develop a well-functioning internal audit system;
- o Identify long-term solutions to the issue of deferred maintenance;
- o Correct the discrepancy between the general education mathematics requirement for transfer students and that for entering freshmen;
- o Align the mission and strategic enrollment management to reflect institutional, academic, and fiscal priorities;
- o Complete the development of a comprehensive, university-wide assessment program to be integrated into the overall planning of the university;
- o Fill positions currently held by interim appointments;
- o Ensure that core library collections are sufficient to support graduate education and research.

The evaluating team commended the university for:
- o Completing capital improvement projects aimed at serving students more effectively and enhancing their experiences;
- o Creating an innovative general education program that focuses on critical thinking and interdisciplinary learning;
- o Faculty and staff dedication to the institution and their commitment to improving student learning, scholarship and research;
- o Providing exceptional access to computing equipment and resources;
- o Winning the 2004 CASE Wealth ID Award for Education fundraising, which honors superior fundraising programs across the country.

More information on the accreditation self-study and site visit is available on the website at http://www.webs.uidaho.edu/nwccu/.

Prepared by Jane Baillargeon
Institutional Research and Assessment
jane@uidaho.edu

VII. **Appendix**

    A. History of Assessment at the University of Idaho
    B. Common Core Discovery Course Objective
    C. 2003-2004 Graduating Senior Survey Summary
    D. Law School Survey of Student Engagement
    E. 2004 CIRP Freshman Survey
    F. 2004 College Student Survey
    G. Freshman Calling Program Report
    H. Summer Survey 2004 Results Summary
    I. External Program Review Schedule