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Enrollment (2013-2014): 42,656
The University of Cincinnati attracts students from all 50 of the United States and from 100 countries outside the U.S.

#1 Rec Center among the “25 Most Amazing Campus Student Recreation Centers”- Best College Reviews (2013)


Named one of only 286 “Green Colleges” by The Princeton Review (2010)

First co-operative education program- Herman Schneider, 1906

One of the nation's best institutions for undergraduate education for the seventh straight year, according to the Princeton's Review's 2014 edition of "The Best 377 Colleges." (2008-14)

Named one of “America’s Most Beautiful College Campuses” by Forbes Magazine (2010)

Among the top tier of the Best National Universities” – US News and World Report, (2013)
“Too often, higher education policy is made in reaction to the latest budget crisis rather than on the basis of long-term strategic goals. ...”

-Texas Representative Geanie Morrison (as cited in Malandra, 2008)
Learning Outcomes

• Participants will be able to:
  – apply outcomes-based assessment strategies to their programs and/or services.
  – identify at least one desired outcome that could be positively impacted by systemic assessment in their department.
  – identify one new initiative that could help them “tell the story” of their work.
  – develop an action plan for their department.
LAC- The Old Way

- Lacked clear assessment plan
- Collecting data but not analyzing
- Data storage not centralized
- Decisions not always evidence-based
- Not “telling the story”
Changing Our Ways

• Started slowly
  – Centralizing data storage
  – Data-driven decision making

• Adopting center-wide standard practices
“Most institutions conduct learning outcomes assessment on a shoestring: 20% have no assessment staff and 65% have two or fewer.”

“Four-fifths of all institutions indicated that a person or unit was charged with coordinating or implementing assessment campus-wide.”

Changing Our Ways (continued)

• Creating an Assessment Goal Team
  – Culture of assessment

• Establishing a working relationship with Institutional Research
  – Utilizing available resources
Following the Model

Assessment Cycle


The Iterative Systematic Assessment Cycle

Adapted from Peggy Maki, Ph.D. by Marilee J. Bresciani, Ph.D.

Gather Evidence

Interpret Evidence

Mission/Purposes

Objectives/Goals

Outcomes

Implement Methods to Deliver Outcomes and Methods to Gather Evidence

Make decisions to improve programs; enhance student learning and development; inform institutional decision-making, planning, budgeting, policy, public accountability

Evidence-Based Decision Making

“Evidence based management...is a way to regulate methods of gathering and assessing...to produce better standards and guidelines” (Baba & HakemZadeh, 2012)

Gather Evidence
– Multiple Sources
  • Basic data - TutorTrac (online system)
  • Complex data - Institutional Research (IR)
– Mix of quantitative and qualitative
  • End of appointment surveys
  • Quantitative from SIS, TutorTrac, and IR
## Focus on Retention and Graduation

### IR Requests

#### Older Data
- 2012-2013 - Retention rates (fall to fall) for Freshmen who receive first semester GPA below 2.0; broken out by colleges
- 2010 and forward - Given M#s of Supplemental Instruction participants of past years, retention and graduation rates of participants. Create cohorts of students starting with freshmen from 2010.
- DFW rates for Math Courses on Main Campus up to 3000
- 2008-2009 through 2012-13 DFW rates for technical writing courses: ENG3071, ENG4091, ENG4092
- 2012-2013 DFW rates for ENG1001, ENG2089 broken out by college, by semester and year
- 2012-2013 DFW rates for all online courses broken out by colleges, by semester and year
- 2012-2013 DFW rates for English Online courses broken out by college, by semester and year
- 2012-2013 Student retention by class (Fr, So, Jr, Sr)

#### Current Data
- DFW rates for Math Courses on Main Campus, specifically for those students in the SRS
- SRS student Math Course grades for 13FS; MATH1025, MATH1060, MATH1061
- General DFW rates for MATH1025, MATH1060, MATH1061

#### Future or Annual data
- Retention rates (fall to fall) for Freshmen who receive first semester GPA below 2.0; broken out by colleges
- Term to term retention rates for international students by class (Fr, So, Jr, Sr)
- Given M#s of BEARchats international students, term to term retention rates compared with general international students by class.
- Given M#s of Supplemental Instruction participants of past years, retention and graduation rates of participants. Create cohorts of students starting with freshmen from 2010. M#s would be sent at the end of the year.
- Student satisfaction data from international students and compare with BEARchats international students.
- DFW rates for Math Courses on Main Campus, specifically for those students in the SRS
- SRS student Math Course grades for 13FS; MATH1025, MATH1060, MATH1061
- General DFW rates for MATH1025, MATH1060, MATH1061
- DFW rates for English Online courses broken out by college, by semester and year
- Student retention by class (Fr, So, Jr, Sr)
- DFW rates for technical writing courses: ENG3071, ENG4091, ENG4092
- Annual fall-to-fall retention for CPG students
- Annual Fall-to-Fall retention for all Pell eligible students
- 6 year graduation totals for CPG students by cohort
- 6 year graduation totals for all Pell eligible students
- Percentage of CPG students who withdraw or receive a WX for at least one course during first and second semesters.
- CPG student retention and semester GPA by confirmation date.
Implementing the Model at the LAC

• Increased effectiveness and efficiency
  – Identify point person(s) to organize assessment
  – As an office what information should every program be collecting?

• Created an office-wide understanding of assessment; Minimum reporting
  – End of semester report
  – End of year report
  – Reports to stakeholders
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Scheduled Appointments/Sessions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (SI sessions offered)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Student No Shows</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tutor/Coach No Shows</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (Cancellations)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Contact Hours</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Online submissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Avg Visits/Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Avg Contact Hours/Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Appointment Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Appointment Reason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Student Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Unique Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Self-referral vs. Mandate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>by College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>by Class Standing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>by Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>by Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>by Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Program Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Pre/Post Semester GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pre/Post Semester GPA (mandate vs. all users)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Fall-to-Fall retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>6 yr Graduation Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Avg GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Fall-to-Fall GPA Comparisons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Ave Final Course Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Ave Final Course Grade (by # sessions attended)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Course Persistence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Helped Improve academic performance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Coach/tutor preparedness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Coach/tutor knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Coach/tutor helpfulness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Recommend to fellow student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Pre/Post Service Confidence Level (by Semester)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Pre/Post Service Confidence Level (by Appointment)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Student Preparedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Student Staff Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Average GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Closing the Loop

• Interpreting data
  – If a new program/assessment, what worked? What didn’t work?
  – If an annual review does the assessment show areas that could be improved?
    • What is needed to make these improvements?
    • Staff? Funding? Space?
    • How can your data provide the information to request additional resources?
“Most institutions have not built into their assessment plans effective channels of communication that share interpretations of student achievement with faculty and staff, as well as with members of an institution’s budgeting and planning bodies -- including strategic planning bodies.”

- Peggy Maki (2002)
Leveraging Data

Telling your story to sell your data:

• **Who:** grassroots, stakeholders, create buzz

• **Where:** various avenues;
  – newsletters (Fall and Spring)
  – reports (end of semester, end of year)
  – individual reports to stakeholders,
  – staff presentations on campus,
  – annual open house for faculty/staff
  – student-staff presentations.

• **When:** layering throughout the year
  – keep developments on the radar
Focal points

• Campus wide initiatives
  – Retention
  – Graduation rate
  – GPA and DFW impact

• How does your data fit into these? Are you pulling this data? If not, can you?

• Can you offer a collaboration to further your program’s goals?
Results After 3 Years

- **New staff positions**
  - Writing Center Coordinator
  - MASS Center Coordinator
  - Tutoring Coordinator
  - CPG Advisor/Academic Alert Coordinator
  - Graduate Assistant (revised)

- **Satellite locations**
  - Athletics

- **New initiatives**
  - Academic Writing Center
  - PALS
  - MASS Center
Small Group Work

Discuss:

– Your current data collection system?
  • Who is responsible?
  • Be specific, what are your data points?
– To whom and when do you present your data?
– What are urgent/pressing needs in your office?
– How are you using your data collection to address this need?
Action Plan

How are you...

• Implementing your program with data in mind?
• Gathering evidence to show program impact?
• Interpreting evidence systematically?
  – Each week, semester, year?
• Making decisions based on evidence?
• Presenting this evidence to leverage institutional gains?
• Using data and gains to make changes to programming?
Action Plan
Learning to Leverage Your Data for Institutional Gain
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How are you...

Implementing your program with data in mind?

Using data and gains to make changes to programming?

Gathering evidence to show program impact?

Presenting this evidence to leverage institutional gains?

Interpreting evidence systematically? Each week, semester, year?

Making decisions based on evidence?

Mission/Purpose
Objectives/Goals
Outcomes

Model based on The Iterative Systematic Assessment Cycle, by Marilee J. Bresciaian, Ph.D., which was previously adapted from Peggy Maki, Ph.D.’s original model. This model is to accompany a presentation for the 2014 SAARC conference.
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