



Office of the
Vice Chancellor for
Academic Affairs
106 Spilman
919-757-6241

MEMORANDUM

TO: Institutional Assessment Committee:
Donald Bailey, Associate Vice Chancellor and
Dean of the General College
Carson Bays, Chair, Arts and Sciences Unit
Planning Committee
Myra Cain, Assistant to the Vice Chancellor,
Academic Affairs
Erwin Hester, Acting Dean, School of Art
Sue Hodges, Director, Planning and
Institutional Research
Diane Jacobs, Associate Vice Chancellor and
Dean of the Graduate School
James Joyce, Chair of the Faculty
David McDonald, Director, Institutional
Advancement
Christa Reiser, Chair, Teaching Effectiveness
Committee
Donald Sexauer, Chair, Unit Code Screening
Committee
Ron Speier, Dean of Students
James LeRoy Smith, Director SACS Self-Study

FROM: Marlene Springer *ms*
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

DATE: January 26, 1990

SUBJECT: The UNC-GA Request for an Institutional
Assessment Plan

The University of North Carolina General Administration, responding to legislation passed by the General Assembly last year, has requested that each campus develop an institutional assessment plan by April 15, 1990. I would appreciate your serving on the committee to develop such a plan. Clearly this plan will be valuable not only as a response to the legislative mandate, but also as preparation for our Southern Association self study and as a part of our university strategic plan. I have asked Myra Cain to chair the committee; James LeRoy Smith and Sue Hodges will serve on the committee in order to maintain maximum coordination with the SACS self-study and the strategic planning efforts. Vice Chancellor Connell will suggest two representatives from the Division of Health Sciences to be appointed to the committee.

The responsibility of the Institutional Assessment Committee will be to develop a plan to address the three areas outlined in the legislation: student learning and development, faculty development and quality, and progress toward the institution's mission. For each area, the plan should describe

- standards of achievement
- methods of evaluation
- schedules for evaluation (annual, biennial, quadrennial)
- procedures for analysis and reporting of results to improve effectiveness

In some cases, we need only compile and report existing activities. (For example, the standards, policies, and procedures for faculty evaluation are already well established.) However, I recognize that the comprehensive charge of this committee is weighty and the deadline is near. I would like to speak to you briefly at the first meeting at 8:00 a.m. Friday, February 2 in Spilman 203. If you are not able to meet with us at that time, please inform Myra Cain, #6242.

Thank you for contributing your time and expertise for this very important project.

/dch

Enclosures: Raymond H. Dawson memo "Institutional Assessment Plans"
Senate Bill 44, Section 94
"Accountability"
SACS Criteria for Accreditation, Section III
Statement of Principles on Student Outcomes Assessment (NASULGC)
Unit Program Evaluation (from East Carolina University Code)
Assessment Activities in the University of North Carolina (Dawson, April 1989)
Current Assessment Activities of East Carolina University (Springer, November 1989)

cc: Richard R. Eakin
Vice Chancellors
Council of Deans

Fy1x
[Handwritten signature]

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
GREENVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA 27858-4353

GENERAL COLLEGE

Telephone (919) 757-6001

MEMORANDUM

RECEIVED

JAN 15 1990

VICE CHANCELLOR
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

TO: ✓Dr. Caroline Ayers, Chemistry Department
✓Dr. George Bailey, Philosophy Department
✓Professor Madge Chamness, Clinical Laboratory Science
Dr. John Childers, Psychology Department
✓Professor Stella Daugherty, Mathematics Department
✓Professor Art Haney, School of Art
✓Dr. James Holloway, Finance Department
✓Dr. Larry Hough, Political Science Department
✓Ms. Carla Jones, Residence Education
✓Dr. Douglas McMillan, Graduate School

FROM: Donald E. Bailey *[Handwritten signature]*

DATE: January 16, 1990

SUBJECT: Task Force for Assessing General Education Effectiveness

Thank you for agreeing to serve on the Task Force for Assessing General Education Effectiveness. The charge of the task force is to formulate recommendations for the assessment of general education effectiveness and to report these recommendations by the end of the 1990 spring semester; however, some earlier reporting may be required.

The task force may identify as usable for its purposes assessment activities currently in place or in the planning stage in departments that offer general education courses, or it may wish to recommend assessment activities which are not in use but which it has identified as especially promising. The final report should include a variety of techniques, perhaps including, but not limited to, objective testing.

Through the work of this task force, the University should be able to assess the effectiveness of its general education program and to respond to assessment requirements of the General Administration and of accrediting associations.

After examining the schedules of all members, Dr. Larry Hough, who has agreed to chair the task force, has scheduled an initial meeting for 3:00 p.m. on January 24, 1990, in Brewster B104. In the time before the meeting, he has requested that you begin to identify in your area assessment activities which the task force may consider for use in assessing the effectiveness of general education components.

I am confident that you will propose an appropriate program for assessing general education effectiveness. I look forward to receiving your report.

DEB/sr

cc: ✓Vice Chancellor Marlene Springer

Section III Institutional Effectiveness

The quality of education provided by member institutions is the primary consideration in the decision to confer or reaffirm accreditation. The evaluation of educational quality is a difficult task requiring careful analysis and professional judgment. Traditionally, accreditation has focused attention almost exclusively upon institutional resources and processes. It has usually been assumed that, if an institution has certain resources and uses certain processes, effective education will occur. A comprehensive approach to accreditation, however, takes into account not only the resources and processes of education (such as faculty and student qualifications, physical plant, fiscal resources and other elements addressed in the *Criteria*) but also the evaluation of the results of education and plans for the improvement of the institution's programs.

The level of institutional quality depends not only on an institution's educational processes and resources but also on the institution's successful use of those processes and resources to achieve established goals. Institutions have an obligation to all constituents to evaluate effectiveness and to use the results in a broad-based, continuous planning and evaluation process.

3.1 PLANNING AND EVALUATION

To focus attention on the effectiveness of the educational program, the institution must establish adequate procedures for planning and evaluation. The institution must define its expected educational results and describe how the achievement of these results will be ascertained. Although no specific format for this planning and evaluation process is prescribed, an effective process should include:

1. broad-based involvement of faculty and administration,
2. the establishment of a clearly defined purpose appropriate to collegiate education,
3. the formulation of educational goals consistent with the institution's purpose,
4. the development of procedures for evaluating the extent to which these educational goals are being achieved, and
5. the use of the results of these evaluations to improve institutional effectiveness.

In addition to establishing procedures for evaluating the extent to which their educational goals are being achieved, institutions should ascertain periodically the change in the academic achievement of their students. Procedures used to evaluate instructional programs may include: peer evaluation of educational programs; structured interviews with students and graduates; changes in students' values as measured by standard instruments or self-reported behavior patterns; pre- and post-testing of students; surveys of recent graduates; surveys of employers of graduates; student scores on standardized examinations or locally constructed examinations; performance of graduates in graduate school; performance of graduates of professional programs on licensure examinations; or, the placement of graduates of occupational programs in positions related to their fields of preparation.

Institutions with research or public service missions must develop and implement appropriate procedures for evaluating their effectiveness in these areas.

The appropriateness of any evaluation procedure depends upon the nature of the institution and the institution's goals for instruction, research and public service. The Commission on Colleges prescribes no set of procedures for use by an institution and recognizes that an effective program to evaluate institutional effectiveness will usually require the use of a variety of procedures.

3.2 INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Because institutional research can provide significant information on all phases of a college or university program, it is an essential element in planning and evaluating the institution's success in carrying out its purpose. The nature of the institutional research function depends on the size and complexity of the institution and may vary from a part-time

operation to an office staffed by several persons. All institutions, however, must engage in continuous study, analysis and appraisal of their purposes, policies, procedures and programs. Institutions should assign administrative responsibility for carrying out institutional research. Institutional research should be allocated adequate resources, and those responsible for it should be given access to all relevant information. Institutions regularly must evaluate their institutional research function.