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Institutional Overview

Central Washington University (CWU) is one of six publicly supported baccalaureate institutions in the state of Washington and one of the state’s three regional comprehensive universities. Central was established in 1890 as Washington State Normal School by the first legislature to fulfill the intent of the 1889 Enabling Act for Statehood. In 1891, doors opened for classes. Ellensburg Normal School became Central Washington College of Education in 1937, Central Washington State College in 1961, and Central Washington University in 1977. CWU’s purpose is specified in Section 28B.35.050 of the Revised Code of Washington which states, “The primary purposes of the regional universities shall be to offer undergraduate and graduate education programs through the master’s degree, including programs of a practical and applied nature, directed to the educational and professional needs of the residents of the regions they serve; to act as receiving institutions for transferring community college students; and to provide extended occupational and complementary studies programs that continue or are otherwise integrated with the educational services of the region’s community colleges.” It should be noted that CWU was granted authorization by the state of Washington in 2013 (see State of Washington RCW28B.35.202) to offer graduate education programs through the Specialist level.

Central Washington University has entered its fourth decade as a regional comprehensive university and currently offers 96 undergraduate and 36 graduate degrees within four colleges: Arts and Humanities, Education and Professional Studies, Sciences, and Business. Undergraduate and graduate degrees, minors, and certificate programs are offered on both the Ellensburg campus, seven teaching sites and online for a total university enrollment of 11,287 during the 2013-2014 academic year. Undergraduate enrollment makes up approximately 92 percent (n=10,423) of the total enrollment while graduate enrollment is eight percent (n=864). The student body is approximately 51 percent female, 63 percent white non-Hispanic, and eight percent non-identifying in terms of ethnicity. The minority student population has grown from approximately 13 percent in Fall Quarter 1998 to 27 percent in Fall Quarter 2013. In addition, a large percentage of students (35 percent) are first generation. International students make up approximately four percent (n=415) of total student enrollment.

Central Washington University’s seven teaching sites outside Ellensburg offer upper-division and graduate coursework leading to certificate, minor and degree programs appropriate to the needs and demands of the locale and its students. Four sites are in the population dense Puget Sound area, and three are in rural central Washington. Degree programs offered at each teaching site generally fall into five areas: business and accounting, teacher preparation, electrical and industrial technology, information technology and administrative management, and social and behavioral sciences. The percent of total university enrollment at all non-Ellensburg teaching sites ranged from 11.5 percent (n=888) in 2001-2002 to 15 percent (n=1,539) in 2010-2011 and decreasing to 8.3 percent (n=811) in 2013-2014.

Online enrollment and programs have grown exponentially in the past few years. While online courses have been offered at CWU since 2000, program growth, student interest, and substantial support and infrastructure has greatly increased since 2007. Currently, more than 2,500 students are enrolled in at least one online class (Fall, 2014). In addition, there are now over 1,000 students (2013-2014) completing one of eight undergraduate or seven graduate fully online programs.

CWU’s workforce is made up of three primary groups of employees: classified staff, exempt, and faculty. During 2013-2014, CWU employed 262 exempt, 462 faculty, and 538 classified staff employees. The faculty includes tenured and tenure-track faculty, non-tenure track full-time faculty, and part-time faculty. The classified staff includes clerical, custodial, and trades personnel. In Fall Quarter 2010, 9.9 percent of all employees were minorities. In 2013, 11.8 percent of all employees were minorities. A workforce profile (see http://www.cwu.edu/hr/affirmative-action-plan) provides detail about the gender, age, and racial/ethnic breakdown for these job groups and about CWU’s affirmative action plan.
Central Washington University uses shared governance and open and collaborative processes to establish a learning-centered atmosphere for organizational and student success. Dr. James L. Gaudino became the President and chief executive officer of the university in January 2009 and has organized the university around four major divisional areas: Academic and Student Life, Business and Financial Affairs, Operations, and the President’s division. A Board of Trustees (BOT), which is appointed by the governor, hires and evaluates the president who reports to them and is the formal point of contact between the board and the university. Through its committees, the board also maintains close contact with each division of the university. Four vice presidents and a chief of staff report directly to the president.

All faculty, staff, exempt employees, and students participate in institutional governance through participation on committees and through their representative groups: the Faculty Senate (FS), the Employee Council (EC), the Exempt Employees Association (EEA), the United Faculty of Central (UFC), and the Associated Students of Central Washington University (ASCUW). Specifically, faculty take major responsibility in the development and the quality of the curriculum, formulate academic policies, and provide substantive input to the retention, advancement, and tenure of their colleagues. Staff advise both faculty and administrators on various policies and procedures while administrators implement policies, conduct initiatives, evaluate and improve operations, and comply with the directives of the Board of Trustees, legislature, and Governor. Student government and student groups advocate for student interests and provide opportunities for leadership on campus and significant engagement with the community. A student with voting rights is appointed by the Governor each year to sit on the Board of Trustees. Other constituents participate through service on advisory councils, foundation boards, and associations.

Response to Previous Recommendations from Commission

NWCCU Recommendation Resulting from the Year One Evaluation Report (September 2011) – Recommendation 1. The Evaluation panel recommends that Central Washington University continue to make improvements in the percentage of programs participating in annual reporting of student learning achievements, particularly at the graduate level (Standard 2.C.2).

Central Washington University Response. Assessment of student learning is an essential function of Central Washington University’s efforts to evaluate student knowledge, skills, and dispositions as well as overall academic and institutional effectiveness. Academic assessment at CWU occurs in two integrated ways: the annual Assessment of Student Learning and the five-year Program Review processes. The assessment of student learning is reported each year for each degree program through the assessment of student learning report (see Appendix A for report format and analysis rubric). The report is based on an analysis of programmatic learning goals. All assessment reports are reviewed administratively and a feedback report or response provided (see http://www.cwu.edu/associate-provost/yearly-review for copies of assessment reports and administrative feedback).

Central Washington University offered 92 undergraduate and 33 graduate degree programs during the 2012-2013 academic year in four colleges (Education and Professional Studies, Business, Sciences, and Arts & Humanities). All degree programs are expected to provide annual documentation of programmatic student learning outcomes achievement. This type of assessment reporting has been occurring since 2008. One hundred percent (125/125) of academic programs submitted a report or revised plan for the past three academic years and assessment cycles during 2010-2013 (see http://www.cwu.edu/associate-provost/yearly-review for assessment executive summary and table of results). These results suggest a more developed institutional culture for assessment as the percentage of submitted reports has increased substantially (from 75 % in 2007-2008 to 86 % in 2008-2009 to 91% in 2009-2010 to 100% during the 2010-2012 academic years). Graduate level reporting has improved from 40% in 2007-2008 to 100 % during the 2010-2012 academic years.
Recommendation 2. The Evaluation panel recommends that Central Washington University include indicators of quality and impact of research and creative expression activities to effectively assess core theme 3, scholarship and creative expression and mission fulfillment (Standard 1.B).

Central Washington University Response. Central Washington University is committed to the creation, dissemination, and preservation of knowledge through research, scholarship, and creative expression. These activities engage students, faculty, and staff in activities that expand knowledge of the natural and physical world, explore human behavior and culture in the past and present, develop organizational practices and technological innovations that support human and economic development, and improve the quality of life through cultural enrichment. CWU places a high value on the full spectrum of scholarship and creative expression, including but not limited to basic and applied research, creative expression in all its forms, and the scholarship of teaching and learning. The question of scholarship quality and impact are at the heart of CWU’s mission of “preparing students to produce research, scholarship, and creative expression” and “serving as a resource to the region.”

The University has actively worked to integrate evaluation activities for scholarship and creative expression (core theme 3) in terms of quality and impact. Indicators were adapted in 2012 in two ways to address both areas (see strategic plan outcome 3.1.1 at http://www.cwu.edu/strategic-planning/current-strategic-plan-and-previous-versions). Quality was addressed by measuring whether completed scholarship and creative expression was peer reviewed or not. Peer reviewed scholarship and creative works (publications, presentation, performances, showcases, etc.) was deemed important in terms of quality as it requires an evaluation of work and acceptance by professional colleagues within the field or profession in which the activity occurs. The peer review process and results thereof assures a level of quality, improves performance, and provides credibility to published and presented work. Scholarly and creative expression “impact” was addressed by the level of interaction and/or dissemination of the work. Level of impact was based on whether the completed scholarship and creative expression was disseminated at the local, regional, national, and/or international levels. Dissemination at the national and international levels was believed to have greater potential scholarly impact than that which was local and/or regional. Thus, the overall logic would be that peer reviewed and nationally and internationally disseminated scholarly and creative expression activities would reflect greater quality and impact than that which was non-peer reviewed and locally disseminated. It is understood that both indicators are dichotomous and somewhat simplistic. While more complex methods (i.e., citation analysis, etc.) are continuing to be considered, there inherent delay in informing, lack of sensitivity to emerging electronic resources, and heavy work effort to implement campus-wide have paused consideration. Also, it is believed that the current indicators (peer review; national and international dissemination) provide reasonable, relevant, and actionable information as related to impact and quality for scholarship and creative expression activities for the university.

In analyzing the 2012-2013 academic year via CWU’s faculty workload and reporting system (i.e., Data 180), 232 out of 360 tenure-track faculty (64%) provided documentation of 815 scholarly and creative expression contributions (including presentations, books, exhibits, journal articles, and performances). Faculty that provided documentation averaged 3.5 scholarly and creative expression contributions each. Quality was reflected by 528 of the 815 scholarly and creative contributions (65%) being peer-reviewed. Thus, a significant number (two-thirds) of all scholarly and creative contributions were considered of quality. Impact was reflected by 492 of the 815 scholarly and creative contributions (60%) being disseminated at the national and/or international levels. The significant number of scholarly and creative contributions disseminated at the national and international levels demonstrates reputable scholarly impact. It is believed that this baseline and initial analysis provides a means for future trend and cross-institutional comparison.
Part One
Mission, Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability

Mission Statement

The mission of Central Washington University is “to prepare students for enlightened, responsible, and productive lives; to produce research, scholarship, and creative expression in the public interest; and to serve as a resource to the region and the state through effective stewardship of university resources.”

The mission is clearly interpreted through the Central Washington University strategic plan approved by the Board of Trustees in July, 2011 (see http://www.cwu.edu/strategic-planning/current-strategic-plan-and-previous-versions). The mission statement is reflected by five major components (i.e., effective teaching and student learning, inclusiveness and diversity, scholarship and creative expression, public service and community engagement, and resource development and stewardship) and serves as the foundation of all institutional level outcomes. Teaching and learning reflects an approach to educating students to be “enlightened, responsible, and productive” through accessible, diverse learning environments characterized by distinctive and learning centered curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular programs. Inclusiveness and diversity also relates to the promotion of respect and enlightenment and the promotion of an atmosphere of support as a means to achieving individual and collaborative excellence. Scholarship and creative expression reflects an institutional approach to engaging students, staff and faculty in the creation, dissemination, and preservation of knowledge through research and creative expression activities. Public service and community engagement reflects an institutional commitment in collaborating with larger communities (local/ regional/ state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of service, knowledge, and resources. Resource development and stewardship reflects the development and sustaining of human, financial, physical and environmental, and technological resources to support the mission of the university. The five major components of the Central Washington University mission statement reflect the institution’s aspirations, areas of focus, and ideas of accomplishment.

Process for Assessing Mission Fulfillment

The examination of whether institutional mission and outcomes are being met should be at the core of an institution’s continuous improvement effort. Central Washington University’s mission, themes, and outcomes help establish priorities through planning, budgeting, and assessment processes that anticipate needs and focus efforts and resources for mission fulfillment. CWU is an institution driven by planning and prioritization, and this planning and prioritization requires evidence provided by assessment. The examination of institutional assessment evidence (i.e., performance indicators), performance levels, and initiatives and strategies for goal attainment are necessary in guiding institutional decision-making and gauging mission fulfillment and progress. Specifically, CWU’s institutional mission fulfillment is assessed formally each year through a behaviorally anchored meta-analytic system (i.e., institutional report card). The report card evaluates all core themes that are reflective of mission against three variables: performance indicator quality; assessment performance level; and institutional strategies & initiatives and as compared to three levels of achievement (low, sufficient, strong). It would be determined that “mission fulfillment” was met by scoring “sufficient” as related to each of the three variables examined for all core themes. Generic descriptions of sufficiency are provided for each variable in Table 1. A detailed explanation of the entire CWU mission evaluation meta-analytic system can be reviewed in Appendix B.
Table 1. Mission Fulfillment Variables and Sufficiency Rating Explanation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator Quality</th>
<th>Assessment Performance Level</th>
<th>Institutional Strategies &amp; Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment indicators are comprehensive and integrated to provide information in monitoring goal attainment. Multiple assessments are used with little if any sources of bias. Efforts are made to ensure and establish assessment fairness, accuracy, and consistency.</td>
<td>Assessment data suggests that the institutional goal is being met and that current status or direction of change is either at an acceptable level or clearly heading in the right direction.</td>
<td>Goal strategies and initiatives may be appropriate, efficient, effective, and based on some previous data, but may need some change in course of action, funding, and/or number needed to provide sustainable momentum in this goal area. Most strategies are based on and supported by data collection conclusions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance indicator quality relates to the quality, quantity, and variety of the indicators used to determine institutional outcome attainment within any theme. Examining the meaningfulness of the information and data generated is important. Assessment measures (i.e., performance indicators) need to be appropriate for and aligned to stated institutional outcomes. Appropriateness implies that consistent categories of information appear in both the assessment and its corresponding outcome(s). In addition, assessment quality should be measured by examining its congruency with the complexity and requirements of the corresponding institutional outcome(s). Moreover, there is a need to apply multiple performance indicators at various times to examine institutional outcomes that are generally complex and broad in nature.

Assessment performance level relates to the examination of specific assessment data to an institutionally established criterion. Comparison of data to a set criterion allows for the determination of specific institutional objective and core theme achievement. Data trends and peer comparisons may be relevant in terms of specific established criterions. Also, these comparisons allow understanding in terms of whether any direction of change is acceptable or not.

Institutional strategies and initiatives relate to whether institutional activities, processes and initiatives are actually helping to meet institutional outcomes. In other words, are the strategies CWU employing the most effective, efficient, innovative, and cost-effective? This information provides a guide as to whether specific actions are working and whether specific initiatives or approaches should be added, continued, adjusted, or deleted.

A director of strategic planning has been tasked since March, 2013 with overseeing institutional strategic planning implementation, assessment, and refinement and in coordinating institutional analysis and documentation as to mission fulfillment. The director leads an institutional strategic planning guiding
coalition that meets regularly during the academic year to review and evaluate all institutional theme and outcome progress. An in-depth evaluation of every theme each year has been established to allow for concentrated analysis, transparency, and encourage greater university-wide involvement and feedback in its continuous improvement and mission-related efforts. Ratings, corresponding explanations, and recommendations for all areas are contained in a final written report (i.e., institutional report card) that is completed by the end of a given academic year. This report is submitted to the President’s cabinet for review and finally to the Board of Trustees. Indeed, all 2013-2014 Board of Trustee meetings were focused partly on reviewing each strategic theme and in discussing associated indicator performance data, and strategies (see http://www.cwu.edu/trustees/ for meeting minutes). Data and associated reports are disseminated for greater university and community discussion and input through email and website interaction (see http://www.cwu.edu/strategic-planning/). Regular updates are also provided by the director of strategic planning across divisions, departments, and student groups through meetings and forums. In addition, cross-institutional “core theme teams” (including administrators, faculty, staff, and students) are formed cross-divisionally and work together to focus on specific university objective and outcome areas that are deemed in need of work or attention. These teams assure continued emphasis, enlightenment, and responsiveness from the general campus community in terms of core theme discussion, focus, and strategy advancement. An explanation of these teams can be reviewed at http://www.cwu.edu/strategic-planning/latest-developments.

Although the development and analysis of strategic objectives and themes is important at the institutional level, CWU has actualized this planning and assessment across all units within the university. Each Academic and Student Life (ASL) unit (i.e., college, and department) has developed and defined their own key activities, strategies, and initiatives where applicable and linked them to institutional objectives through individual unit strategic plans (USP). Non-academic units (Business and Finance; President) have similarly developed and defined their own USPs. While not every university objective is reflected in every unit’s USP, many objective(s) from most themes are included. All plans and their associated outcomes are unique to the individual unit (e.g., department, college) and related to the University Strategic Plan themes and objectives. Note that unit level outcomes, approaches, and indicators are unique to those individual units and as such may differ between unit levels (e.g., college to department). However, since all unit outcomes are connected to university level objectives, they are as such all interrelated. For example, an academic department might be focused on enhancing student success (see Core Theme 1-Teaching and Learning, Objective 1) through a department level peer mentoring program. At the same time, the college may be addressing the same objective through increased faculty workload assignment funding for faculty advising. While both strategies differ, both assist in institutional focus and overall objective achievement (e.g., student success and retention). Of course, all plans that are developed at one level (i.e., departments) are shared and approved at progressively higher levels within the organization (i.e., college). This assures activity and funding coherence in terms of objective achievement. Also, while academic departments (i.e., units) are expected to develop strategic outcomes for the department, they are also expected to develop specific student learning outcomes for each degree program offered by the department. Student learning outcomes provide information as to what students will know, do, and value at the end or completion of the degree program. Individual student learning assessment plans include the student learning outcomes, methods of assessment, who/what assessed, when assessed, and standard of mastery/performance expectation. Unit level strategic plans can be reviewed at http://www.cwu.edu/strategic-planning/current-strategic-plan-and-previous-versions while
programmatic student learning plans across all colleges and programs (n = 125) can be reviewed at http://www.cwu.edu/associate-provost/assessment-plans.

Mission Fulfillment Assessment & Preliminary Results

Institutional mission fulfillment is assessed each year through a formal evaluation of each theme to allow for concentrated analysis, transparency, and to encourage greater university-wide involvement and feedback in its continuous improvement efforts. The assessment for 2011-2012 was assessed by a Strategic Operations Team in November, 2012. With the hiring of a full-time director of strategic planning and the reconstitution of the Strategic Operations Team in 2013 into a guiding coalition, mission fulfillment for 2012-2013 was assessed in June, 2014. In both examinations, the groups met regularly to collect, analyze, review, and evaluate all institutional theme, objective, and outcome progress. The groups also provided suggested improvements in terms of outcomes, indicators and associated criterion levels, strategies and activities, and budget for each of the five themes. Both institutional report cards (2011-2012; 2012-2013) can be reviewed at http://www.cwu.edu/strategic-planning/strategic-objective-results. The following table provides a summary of all core theme ratings for both academic years.

Table 2. Strategic Outcomes Evaluation Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Theme</th>
<th>Performance Indicator Quality</th>
<th>Assessment Performance Level</th>
<th>Institutional Strategies &amp; Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be gathered from the table, Teaching and Learning was the only core theme rated “sufficient” for all three assessment variables (performance indicator quality; assessment performance level; and institutional strategies & initiatives) both examination years. This is positive since student success is the highest priority of the university and the achievement of programmatic student learning outcomes is the prime measure of that priority.

All core themes were rated “sufficient” in relation to performance indicator quality for both examination years. This is positive and reflective of multiple and related indicators and associated data points for all theme areas. In some instances, data was both direct (achievement or performance oriented) and indirect.
considered indirect. Both types of data are important as they provide a more comprehensive view of strategic objective obtainment than either source by itself.

Assessment performance level was rated “sufficient” for four out of five core themes in 2011-2012 and for all five themes in 2012-2013. This is significant as it suggests that CWU is meeting expected performance levels and positively trending for most indicators and themes across multiple measures (i.e., NSSE, Major Field Tests) and peers (Western states, Carnegie classification, National). However, CWU has some work to do to be considered “strong” for any theme. This is because CWU demonstrates performance for some indicators (e.g., graduation rate; specific and related questions on the National Survey of Student Engagement; diversity; percentage of peer review scholarly works) less than the expected performance criterion. Also, the availability and examination of key data sets will need to continue to improve to assure complete information and accurate interpretation of results for all themes. While one theme (i.e., inclusiveness and diversity) was rated low with regards to performance in 2011-2012, it improved in 2012-2013. It should be noted that the low rating in 2011-2012 for inclusiveness and diversity had more to do with missing data or an incomplete measurement process than actual low indicator performance. In other words, data was simply not available to ascertain trends and/or overall performance. Specific assessment reports for all indicators can be reviewed at [http://www.cwu.edu/strategic-planning/strategic-objective-results](http://www.cwu.edu/strategic-planning/strategic-objective-results).

Institutional strategies & initiatives were rated “low” for four out of five core themes in 2011-2012. This improved in 2012-2013 as evidenced by four out of five themes being rated “sufficient.” While themes have specific strategies and initiatives that have either been started or will soon be under way, there remains a need to define specific funding and dollar amounts in terms of personnel, goods and services, equipment, and/or technical requirements associated with those strategies. In addition, there is still a need to refine the list of institution-wide strategies to those that may have the most impact on outcome performance.

Overall, it can be surmised that CWU is on its way to fulfilling its mission. However, there is room for improvement. This is particularly true in relation to the availability and examination of key data sets and well defined and impactful strategies. CWU mission fulfillment is defined as being met by scoring “sufficient” in relation to each of the three variables examined (performance indicator quality; assessment performance level; and institutional strategies & initiatives) for all core themes. In other words, applying appropriate indicators, meeting institutional standards and expectations of performance, and focused effort in improving strategies reflect positively on CWU’s claim of educational and societal impact and achievement. It is expected that continued yearly analysis will allow a definitive evaluation of mission fulfillment by the NWCCU institutional “Year Seven – Self-evaluation Report.”

**Core Theme Content Changes**

Central Washington University has been guided by a statement of mission, vision, and associated goals since its inception. Although its mission and goals have changed as institutional scope has expanded and through periodic review and refinement, the university has remained true to its focus on student learning and achievement, discovery and creative expression, and serving as a resource for advancing the social, economic, and educational health of the region and state. The current mission, vision, and core themes were created by the university community and adopted formally by the Board of Trustees in July 2011 and serve as the basis of the university’s strategic plan (see [http://www.cwu.edu/strategic-planning/current-strategic-plan-and-previous-versions](http://www.cwu.edu/strategic-planning/current-strategic-plan-and-previous-versions)). This initial plan included 5 themes, 16 objectives, 31 outcomes, and 51 indicators. Based on the mission fulfillment assessment process, 91 adaptations were suggested and approved (additions, deletions, and edits) over the past three years (2011-
by the strategic operations team or core team and by the President and cabinet in relation to the core theme objectives, outcomes, and indicators. It should be noted that while the process has been robust over the course of three years, most changes and adaptions were made the first year (2011 to 2012). As of 2014, the strategic plan includes the same 5 themes but now reflects 14 objectives, 30 outcomes, and 62 indicators. In terms of core themes, “Resource Development & Stewardship” was the core theme most adjusted. Also, “indicators” were adapted (i.e., added and edited) more than objectives and outcomes. There are more indicators in 2014 than in 2011. This increase was a result of both expanding and sharpening the comprehensive nature of the institutional mission fulfillment examination. This expansion and sharpening are also a direct result of recent expansion of the capability, size, and capacity of the Organizational Effectiveness unit at CWU. This unit now has the technology and human resources necessary to access data sources that it could not previously and create dash boards for reports and studies that were unattainable a few years ago. The unit’s ability to employ predictive and comparative modeling, extraction translations, report design and customizations has the potential to better drive decision-making and strategic initiative implementation and examination. Thus, while the number of indicators has increased over the past three years, the institution’s ability to access related data and make use of the information will also substantially increase.

Table 3 provides a summary as to the number of changes made from 2011 to 2014 for each specific core theme. Specific changes and corresponding explanations are reflected in comparative grids and updated historical versions of strategic plans found at http://www.cwu.edu/strategic-planning/current-strategic-plan-and-previous-versions.

Table 3. Core Theme Objective, Outcome, and Indicator Changes During 2011 to 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Theme</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add Delete Edit</td>
<td>Add Delete Edit</td>
<td>Add Delete Edit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusiveness &amp; Diversity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship &amp; Creative Expression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service &amp; Community Engagement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Development &amp; Stewardship</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part Two

Operational Examples

Core Theme 1: Teaching and Learning

Achievement of programmatic student learning outcomes is at the heart of defining high quality and effective academic programs at CWU. The on-going and yearly programmatic reporting of student learning outcome attainment through both direct and indirect measures, irrespective of location (campus) or modality (online, face-to-face), is a necessary and important indicator of achievement for this theme. Post-graduation job and graduate school placement rates are other measures that indicate preparation and learning quality as based from outside evaluators. Summative self-report data obtained through senior and alumni surveys (e.g., NSSE) also provides indirect evidence as to programmatic, general education and institutional goal importance and achievement. Student persistence, degree production, and time-to-degree efficiency help illustrate institutional success at meeting student needs (e.g., advising, learning style) and in fostering success both in and out of the classroom. Student and faculty engagement represents a critical feature of the CWU educational experience. Therefore, the type and amount of interaction between students and faculty as well as the time and effort students put into their studies and other educationally purposeful activities reflects an institutional ability to support students’ academic, physical, emotional, and social needs. Student usage, impact, and satisfaction of support services are also critical in measuring and determining the efficacy of various support service approaches. Thus, the thirteen indicators associated with this core theme provide comprehensive and integrated information to ascertain strategic plan objective (n = 3) and outcome (n = 5) success. The following two representative examples (Online Learning: Student Success Unit Creation and Operation) reflect how CWU has operationalized its mission and core theme (i.e., Teaching and Learning) progressing from objectives to indicators to outcomes for mission fulfillment.

Online Learning – The highest priority of CWU’s human, physical, and financial resources is the success of its educational programs. Building on the long history of delivering interactive television (ITV) courses to higher education sites across Washington State, CWU has recently and significantly increased the number of online courses, minors, and programs it offers. Indeed, the number of online course sections being delivered has increased from 131 in 2007-2008 to more than 600 in 2013-2014. While the first fully online degree program was offered in 2009 with fewer than 30 students, CWU currently offers 14 undergraduate and graduate online degree programs with slightly more than 1,000 student enrollments. Overall, online participation has increased from approximately 2,000 enrollments during the entire 2007-2008 academic year to more than 2,500 enrollments in fall, 2013 alone. While this increase has positively and significantly impacted student learning access, flexibility, and enrollment for place- and time-bound students (see core theme 5: resource development & stewardship - objective 5.2), it has also created the necessity to examine associated implications in terms of teaching and learning outcomes achievement, persistence, engagement, and the need and effectiveness of support services. It is important that the university ensure institutional standards of quality and best practice regardless of instructional modality (face-to-face, and online). Table 4 provides a description as to how online program quality is assessed and denotes the finding and results (2011).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome and Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Results*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes Achievement – (Outcome 1.1.1 and Indicator 1.1.1.1)</td>
<td>DFW rates</td>
<td>DFW rates were between 10% and 13% for face-to-face and online modalities during the regular 2010-2011 academic year. DFW rates for online courses tended to be slightly higher in comparison to face-to-face courses, particularly in the summer. For comparable courses (courses with both face-to-face and online sections), DFW rates tracked very closely, although online tended to be higher in comparison to face-to-face courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention – (Outcome 1.1.2 &amp; Indicator 1.1.2.3)</td>
<td>Retention Rates</td>
<td>Retention rates for undergraduate students in online majors ranged between 89% to 92% on a quarter-to-quarter basis from Spring 2011 to Spring, 2012. While the results were slightly less than overall university retention for each quarter except one, it tracked closely with university retention rates for all undergraduate students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement &amp; Support Services – (Outcome 1.1.3; Outcome 1.2.1 and indicators 1.1.3.3; 1.2.1.1)</td>
<td>Noel Levitz: Priority Survey of Online Learners (PSOL)</td>
<td>PSOL reported that online students were generally satisfied with most elements related to institutional, academic, instructional, enrollment, and student services. In comparing results from multiple years (2009 and 2010), questions related to technical assistance and response, information availability, and course availability improved from 2009 to 2010. The lowest rated areas for both 2009 and 2010 were student services. The greatest decrease in satisfaction between years related to the registration process. Also, there were decreases in satisfaction as related to instruction and design (student to instructor interactions, student to student interactions, variety of instructional approaches).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome and Indicator</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Results*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Review –</strong></td>
<td>Teaching Effectiveness Rubric</td>
<td>Seventy-one online courses were developed and evaluated between 2008 and 2011. All courses were rated highly. An examination of course syllabi between similar face-to-face and online course sections revealed similar levels of cognitive demand and skill requirements. Online courses tended to have a higher expectation in terms of grade for discussions, writing assignments, and projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEOI) –</strong></td>
<td>SEOI Survey</td>
<td>CWU students rate instruction highly for all delivery modalities—online, face-to-face, and interactive video (ITV). However, the average SEOI rating tended to be higher for students enrolled in face-to-face courses compared to online.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*see [http://www.cwu.edu/associate-provost/reports](http://www.cwu.edu/associate-provost/reports) to review associated 2011 & 2014 online program comprehensive evaluation reports

**Assessment was not included as an institutional outcome indicator.**

Based on the results of the various indicators and measures and in an effort to positively impact the teaching and learning process, particularly for online learning, the following institutional strategies and activities were initiated (starting in the quarter denoted below):

- Providing faculty training workshops for using learning management system (LMS) Backboard®. (Fall, 2011)
- Enhancing faculty and student support resources (readiness indices, tutorials, course examples, assessment tools) on open website. (Fall, 2011)
- Providing release time for a faculty member (i.e., faculty fellow) to deliver professional development support, mentorship, and peer review for faculty teaching online (Fall, 2011).
- Providing online student tutoring through Smarthinking® platform and Skype with access to CWU Writing Center (Fall, 2011).
- Establishing “learning communities” of practice (LC) to provide support for faculty based on relative experience and expertise in teaching online (Vanguard group for the more experienced; Explorers group for beginners). LC meetings address topics as: effective and engaging online discussion, group collaboration using GoogleDocs, fair use and Teach Act, streaming video,
mobile learning, reducing faculty workload in online courses, best practices for online course
development, and web conferencing tools (Fall, 2011).

- Providing tier-one technical support provided for students and faculty through phone/chat/web for
  both Blackboard and Canvas learning management systems (Fall, 2012).
- Providing tier-two assistance (phone/in-person/email) provided from CWU onsite instructional
  technologists (Fall, 2012).

After initiating the strategies mentioned above, the following was revealed in a 2013 online program
comprehensive evaluation (see http://www.cwu.edu/associate-provost/reports to review associated
report):

- Retention Rates – Retention rates for undergraduate students in online majors ranged between
  92% to 94% on a quarter-to-quarter basis from Spring, 2012 to Spring, 2013. The results were
  slightly higher than overall university retention for each quarter except one. Also, while online
  retention improved from previous year, there was some decrease when examining overall
  university retention rates.
- DFW rates – DFW rates were between 9% and 11% for face-to-face and online modalities during
  the 2012-2013 regular academic year. This is a slight improvement from previous year. Also,
  DFW rates were fairly similar between modalities, except for summer. For comparable courses
  (courses with both face-to-face and online sections), DFW rates tracked very closely again with
  online having a lower DFW rate in Spring and Summer of 2013.
- Noel Levitz: Priority Survey of Online Learners (PSOL) – The Noel-Levitz PSOL 2013 report
  demonstrated that online students were generally satisfied with most elements related to
  institutional, academic, instructional, enrollment, and student services, although less so than when
  comparing results in 2011. Again, student services was area rated lowest. Questions related to the
  registration process, availability of financial aid, and other enrollment services seemed to generate
  largest differences and decrease between last survey administration and this one. Academic
  advising and feelings of affiliation saw significant decreases in satisfaction. However, student-to
  student interaction increased the greatest in terms of satisfaction. In examining the results closer,
  online degree majors tended to report greater satisfaction in their online experiences compared to
  those students merely taking online classes.
- Course Review – Twenty online courses were developed and evaluated between 2011 and 2013.
  All courses were rated highly.
- Analysis of Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEOI) – CWU students rate instruction highly for
  all delivery modalities—online, face-to-face, and interactive video (ITV). However, the average
  SEOI ratings tended to be higher for students enrolled in online courses as compared to face-to-
  face, although lower than ITV. This is a marked improvement from 2011 analysis.

Based on the results reported in 2013 and in an effort to continue the positive progress made in terms of
impacting the teaching and learning process, the following strategies and activities were initiated (starting
in the quarter denoted below):

- Hiring of 1.5 FTE advisor/retention counselors to provide online student orientations, general
  academic advising, and initiate retention efforts (Fall, 2013).
- Hiring an online instructional designer to offer workshops, training and individual faculty
  consulting (Fall, 2013).
- Hiring an online tutoring coordinator to develop a tutor training curriculum, hire online tutors for
  English and Math, and implement an online tutoring platform using Canvas and Collaborate. The
  CWU Learning Commons now assumes full responsibility for online tutoring. (Spring, 2014).
- Establishing a new Multimodal Education Center (MEC) to provide upgraded technologies and facilities to enhance online and hybrid teaching and learning. The MEC was designed to provide faculty and students with technology for the 21st Century, including technology training and production labs, audio/video recording studios, lecture capture classrooms, and a tech-flex collaborator space (Fall, 2014).

- Initiating a Master Online Teacher Certification program to allow CWU faculty to achieve a “teaching effectiveness” related certification. Faculty participants complete an in-person institute, attend selected training workshops, participate in faculty learning community meetings, develop an online course with peer feedback, and submit the course for a quality assurance review (Fall, 2014).

Overall, the online learning example illustrates how CWU is utilizing data through various institutional indicators related to Core Theme 1: Teaching and Learning to improve processes and approaches and meet broader institutional objectives and outcomes. This is particularly important as online delivery and enrollment at CWU continues to increase. Positively, implemented strategies seem to be having beneficial impact on various educational processes and related student success measures including student retention, outcome attainment, and relative student satisfaction with various services. While there is progress, there is more to do. However, CWU’s commitment to engaging in continuous improvement efforts will ultimately assist in institutional mission fulfillment and sustainability.

Student Success Unit Creation and Operation – As a means to impact student success and improve retention, a Retention Task Force was formed in 2009 and based on their recommendations, a more holistic Student Success Council was formed. With the subsequent integration in 2010 of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs and Enrollment Management divisions into the current Academic and Student Life Division (ASL), a student success model began to be developed. The current Provost and Vice President for Academic and Student life (i.e., Dr. Marilyn Levine) developed a Student Success Implementation Task Force that was charged with creating the details and time line of a new configuration and unit for student success. However, before assigning the task force, she believed it was necessary to have an acceptable framework and a foundational leadership configuration that supported six main goals:

- clarify and strengthen pathways and support systems for student achievement;
- assess entering student’s skills and abilities to match needed support services and areas to enhance overall educational experience; improve general and professional advising;
- enhance co-curricular and extracurricular learning and living experiences (i.e., residence life, engagement centers, leadership, research, and other service opportunities);
- develop upper and graduate pathways (i.e., career counseling, graduate school entry, alumni preparation activities)
- increase opportunities for the integration of curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular experiences.

The organizational structure included creating a Dean of Student Success (permanent Dean hired in 2012) with three associate deans (Student Development; Student Living; Student Achievement). The Associate Dean of Student Development was assigned overall responsibility for student campus life experiences and the development and promotion of student leadership, empowerment and diversity aspects of student life and success. The Associate Dean for Student Living was tasked with responsibility for university housing, student residential life, student conduct issues, wellness, and student orientation. The Associate Dean for Student Achievement was assigned responsibility for advisement and helping to weave academic achievement into the fabric of student life whether residential, at an off-campus teaching sites (University Centers), online, transfer, exploratory, or non-traditional.
While the integration of the Academic and Student Life Division (ASL) and creation of a Student Success unit was strategic, there is a necessity in examining the associated effects in terms of Core Theme 1: Teaching and Learning objectives (see Objective 1.1 and 1.2) and outcomes (see Outcome 1.1.2; 1.1.3; 1.1.4; 1.2.1 - persistence, engagement, and the need and effectiveness of support services). In terms of results, the following was revealed in a 2011 evaluation (note that most evaluative information was collected before changes were fully implemented):

- First year persistence/retention rate (77%) remains below goal level (80%).
- Six-year graduation rate (55.9%) remains below goal level (62%).
- Time to degree was better (4.5 years) than goal (4.6 years).
- NSSE results revealed higher engagement levels for CWU seniors than first year students when compared to national participant groups (Far West Public Peer, Carnegie Class, National).
- FSSE results revealed that faculty tended to spend proportionally more time per week engaging with upper division students than lower division in and outside the classroom.
- Academic Achievement Programs provided tutoring, supplemental instruction, and other support services (Math & Writing Center) to more than 12% of student population. Tutored students (72%) received at least a C- in courses with low course grade averages.

Based on the results reported in 2011 and in an effort to continue the positive progress made in terms of impacting the teaching and learning process, the following strategies and activities were initiated (starting in the quarter denoted below) within Student Success unit and across CWU:

- An Academic and Research Commons (ARC) was developed in the Library as a significant step toward holistic student academic success, including writing and math tutoring, career counseling and other academic assistance. The ARC area provides spaces for academic group work and is outfitted with significant computing and technology support for students. The ARC has been deemed a significant and successful collaboration between the Library staff and Student Success. (Fall, 2012)
- Specific university center areas have reorganized to streamline operations and provide more intentional focus. Specifically, the Center for Excellence in Leadership has been combined with the Civic Engagement Center to create the Center for Leadership and Community Engagement (CLCE). Also, the Center for Student Empowerment and the Diversity Education Center have been combined. (Fall, 2012)
- Academic advising has been funded ($450,000) to provide full-time professional academic advisors for upper division students, lower the advising load for undeclared majors (300 students per advisor), and continue intensive advising support for at-risk students. (Fall, 2014)

Overall, the development of the ASL Student Success unit and examination of its progress will be a key in CWU meeting its strategic objectives and outcomes as related to Core Theme 1: Teaching and Learning. It is expected that additional strategies will be planned and implemented shortly. At the same time, outcomes and indicators have been and will continue to be refined to best reflect those areas and measures most meaningful for continuous improvement.

Part III
Future Initiatives

Institutional mission is manifested across all unit levels to assure coherence and single-mindedness in direction, soundness, and course. However, there is still more work to be done to demonstrate institutional mission fulfillment and sustainability. Specifically, there is a need to focus greater attention on the distinctive institutional strategies and initiatives that have either been started or will soon be under
way to positively impact strategic objective and outcome attainment. There also remains a need to define specific funding and dollar amounts in terms of personnel, goods and services, equipment, and/or technical requirements associated with those strategies. The need and effort to more seamlessly integrate budgeting and resource development with unit planning and assessment processes will support institutional sustainability and mission achievement.

In response to these challenges the Strategic Planning Core Team has begun assembling “core theme teams” to focus specific attention on improving and honing specific strategies and initiatives for outcome and objective achievement. These teams are made up of administrators, faculty, staff, and students and charged with three basic purposes: research best practices; develop and propose institutional level strategies for implementation; and engage the campus community in strategic initiative work. A description of the teams and their progress can be reviewed at http://www.cwu.edu/strategic-planning/latest-developments. The deployment of core theme teams will occur over the course of the 2014-2015 year as needed. Most of the teams that support Core Themes One and Two were deployed in the spring, 2014. The remainder of the core theme teams are intended to be deployed during the fall, 2014, quarter. Following is a brief description of the core theme teams developed and to be formed:

Core Theme 1—Teaching and Learning. Three teams are attached to this core theme. Two of the three teams met during the spring quarter, 2014 and the third will hold its inaugural meeting in September, 2014.

- Team one is exploring ways to encourage greater use of assessment results of the student learning outcomes, as well as assure student outcomes are met.
- Team two will recommend strategies to support student retention and graduation.
- Team three will focus on student and faculty engagement in and out of the classroom.

Core Theme 2—Inclusiveness and Diversity. Three teams are attached to this core theme. Two of the three teams met during spring quarter, with the third planning a fall start date.

- Team one will suggest strategies to increase and improve shared governance within the institution. The team will look at aspirational peers and institutions across the country, recommend strategies to meet this objective, and involve the greater campus community in this work.
- Team two will explore ways of assuring institutional diversity. This focus will not only be within faculty, staff, and students, it will also span international partners.
- Team three will focus on the area of inclusion and diverse perspectives in the curriculum and in international programming.

Core Theme 3—Scholarship and Creative Expression. Three teams are attached to this core theme. Only one of the three teams has been formed. The remaining two teams will be created sometime during the fall, 2014 quarter.

- Team one will focus on sustaining and enhancing scholarship among faculty and students.
- Team two will focus on sustaining and enhancing research, scholarship, and creative expression within the curriculum offered.
- Team three will begin exploring additional ways to support a growing scholarship agenda, keeping in mind the reciprocal relationships and gains to be leveraged across all entities.
Core Theme 4—Public Service and Community Engagement. Three teams are attached to this core theme. All of these teams will be shaped in the fall, 2014.

- Team one will make recommendations to optimize the many events that are held on campus, and still involve CWU’s myriad of communities.
- Team two will explore how CWU can support the lifelong learning needs of our communities.
- Team three will recommend strategies to increase support for economic development via CWU processes.

Core Theme 5—Resource Development & Stewardship. Four teams are attached to this core theme. These teams will be deployed during the fall, 2014 term.

- Team one will recommend strategies to maximize financial resources to the university via stewardship. Specifically, this team will explore revenue and expense forecasting, economic processes, and philanthropic gifting.
- Team two will explore enrollment and marketing plans.
- Team three will explore relationships that surround the human resources available to the institution.
- Team four will recommend strategies to meet objectives surrounding facilities and technology/information services.

Each of these strategic core theme teams will make prioritized recommendations in terms of institutional strategies and initiatives for outcome and objective achievement to the Strategic Planning Core Team. These will be collected and prioritized as a whole, and presented to the President’s Cabinet for funding and support.

Budgeting for strategic initiatives in general is finalized each fall for the next academic year by the core theme teams and through other institutional enterprise level and focused committees. Initiative impacts or needs from other units and potential end strategies if the initiative is judged unsuccessful are made clear in any proposals. Budgetary requests for strategic initiatives and operations are due, categorized, ranked, and sent to the President’s cabinet by beginning of January. The cabinet decides on funding requests between March-May of each year (based on timing of legislative session). Decisions related to funding are then communicated to all units soon thereafter to assure logistical and organizational needs are completed prior to following academic year. The interconnecting of the university budgeting process with institutional level strategic planning and assessment initiatives is intended to help close the loop and assure institutional sustainability.

Funding of strategic initiatives within units (departments, colleges, etc.) is supposed to be determined by the affiliated Dean or Associate Vice President (AVP). Yearly unit strategic reports document positive implications for sustainability of the institution (e.g., increased student credit hours, recruitment potential, and retention, etc.) and/or possible cost savings (e.g., overload savings, implications for non-tenure track assignments, etc.). Decisions regarding funding requests and initiatives at the unit level are generally made between March-May of each year for the following year.

**Summary**

Central Washington University has a clear mission, a strategic process for achieving its mission, and a defined methodology for evaluating mission fulfillment. The institution and its various units are actively engaging in planning, implementing strategies, and assessing the five major components (i.e., effective teaching and student learning, inclusiveness and diversity, scholarship and creative expression, public
service and community engagement, and resource development and stewardship) for institutional mission fulfillment. The institution is clearly learning from its processes and findings as evidenced from the improvements made relative to various outcomes, indicators, and strategies. With continued dedication to improvement processes and explicit focus across the institution through core theme teams and the like, it can be assured that the achievement of mission fulfillment and institutional sustainability is high.
Appendix A

Central Washington University
Assessment of Student Learning
Department and Program Report

Please enter the appropriate information concerning your student learning assessment activities for this year.

Academic Year of Report: ___________ College: ________________
Department: _______________ Program: _________________

1. **What student learning outcomes were assessed this year, and why?**
   In answering this question, please identify the specific student learning outcomes you assessed this year, reasons for assessing these outcomes, with the outcomes written in clear, measurable terms, and note how the outcomes are linked to department, college and university mission and goals.

2. **How were they assessed?**
   In answering these questions, please concisely describe the specific methods used in assessing student learning. Please also specify the population assessed, when the assessment took place, and the standard of mastery (criterion) against which you will compare your assessment results. If appropriate, please list survey or questionnaire response rate from total population.

   A) What methods were used?
   B) Who was assessed?
   C) When was it assessed?

3. **What was learned?**
   In answering this question, please report results in specific qualitative or quantitative terms, with the results linked to the outcomes you assessed, and compared to the standard of mastery (criterion) you noted above. Please also include a concise interpretation or analysis of the results.

4. **What will the department or program do as a result of that information?**
   In answering this question, please note specific changes to your program as they affect student learning, and as they are related to results from the assessment process. If no changes are planned, please describe why no changes are needed. In addition, how will the department report the results and changes to internal and external constituents (e.g., advisory groups, newsletters, forums, etc.)?

5. **What did the department or program do in response to last year’s assessment information?**
   In answering this question, please describe any changes that have been made to improve student learning based on previous assessment results. Please also discuss any changes you have made to your assessment plan or assessment methods.

6. Questions or suggestions concerning Assessment of Student Learning at Central Washington University:
Central Washington University  
Assessment of Student Learning Report: Target Levels  
Department Feedback

1. What outcomes were assessed this year and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Guidelines for Assessing a Program’s Reporting of Student Learning Outcomes (Target = 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Outcomes are written in clear, measurable terms and include knowledge, skills, and attitudes. All outcomes are linked to department, college and university mission and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Outcomes are written in clear, measurable terms and include knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Some outcomes are linked to department, college and university mission and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outcomes are written in clear, measurable terms and include knowledge, skills, or attitudes. Outcomes may be linked to department, college and university mission and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Some outcomes may be written as general, broad, or abstract statements. Outcomes include knowledge, skills, or attitudes. Outcomes may be linked to department, college and university mission and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Outcomes are not identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Reports that obtain higher scores are characterized by increasingly specific student learning outcomes that relate to multiple domains of student development (knowledge, skill, and attitudes). In addition, higher scored reports will clearly articulate the relationship between program outcomes and department, college and university mission and goals.

2. How were they assessed?
   a. What methods were used?
   b. Who was assessed?
   c. When was it assessed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Guidelines for Assessing a Program’s Reporting of Assessment Methods (Target = 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A variety of methods, both direct and indirect are used for assessing each outcome. Reporting of assessment method includes population assessed, number assessed, and when applicable, survey response rate. Each method has a clear standard of mastery (criterion) against which results will be assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Some outcomes may be assessed using a single method, which may be either direct or indirect. All assessment methods are described in terms of population assessed, number assessed, and when applicable, survey response rate. Each method has a clear standard of mastery (criterion) against which results will be assessed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some outcomes may be assessed using a single method, which may be either direct or indirect. All assessment methods are described in terms of population assessed, number assessed, and when applicable, survey response rate. Some methods may have a clear standard of mastery (criterion) against which results will be assessed.

Each outcome is assessed using a single method, which may be either direct or indirect. Some assessment methods may be described in terms of population assessed, number assessed, and when applicable, survey response rate. Some methods may have a clear standard of mastery (criterion) against which results will be assessed.

Assessment methods are nonexistent, not reported, or include grades, student/faculty ratios, program evaluations, or other “non-measures” of actual student performance or satisfaction.

Comments: Reports that obtain higher scores are characterized by increasingly clearer information in determining how the assessment took place and the use of a standard of mastery. In addition, higher scored reports will include a greater number of methods in assessing each outcome.

3. What was learned (assessment results)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Guidelines for Assessing a Program’s Reporting of Assessment Results (Target = 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Results are presented in specific quantitative and/or qualitative terms. Results are explicitly linked to outcomes and compared to the established standard of mastery. Reporting of results includes interpretation and conclusions about the results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Results are presented in specific quantitative and/or qualitative terms and are explicitly linked to outcomes and compared to the established standard of mastery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Results are presented in specific quantitative and/or qualitative terms, although they may not all be explicitly linked to outcomes and compared to the established standard of mastery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Results are presented in general statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Results are not reported.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Reports that obtain higher scores are characterized by increasingly clearer information about what was learned from the assessment, particularly in relation to a standard of mastery.

4. What will the department do as a result of that information (feedback/program improvement)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Guidelines for Assessing a Program’s Reporting of Planned Program Improvements (Target = 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Program improvement is related to pedagogical or curricular decisions described in specific terms congruent with assessment results. The department reports the results and changes to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
internal and external constituents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Guidelines for Assessing a Program’s Reporting of Previous Feedback (Target = 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Discussion of feedback indicates that assessment results and feedback from previous assessment reports are being used for long-term curricular and pedagogical decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Discussion of feedback indicates that assessment results and feedback from previous assessment reports are acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>This is a first year report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>There is no discussion of assessment results or feedback from previous assessment reports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Reports that obtain higher scores are characterized by specific curricular and pedagogical improvement information. In addition, the department reports the results and changes to internal and external constituents.

5. How did the department or program make use of the feedback from last year’s assessment?

*Target Levels are bolded for each area.*
Appendix B

CWU Institutional Mission Evaluation System

Assessment should be at the core of an institution’s continuous improvement efforts and should allow the examination of whether institutional mission and outcomes are being met (Banta, 1999). The mission, themes, and outcomes of Central Washington University (CWU) help establish priorities through planning, budgeting, and assessment processes that anticipate needs and focus efforts and resources in mission fulfillment. Central Washington University is an institution driven by planning and prioritization, and this planning and prioritization requires evidence provided by assessment. The examination of institutional assessment evidence (i.e., performance indicators), performance levels, and initiatives and strategies for goal attainment are necessary in guiding institutional decision-making and gauging progress. The following rating system (i.e., report card) is designed to evaluate CWU institutional mission fulfillment across its five themes and as related to three variables: performance indicator quality; assessment performance level; and institutional strategies & initiative success.

A director of strategic planning oversees institutional strategic planning implementation, assessment, and refinement and in coordinating institutional analysis and documentation as to mission fulfillment. The director leads an institutional strategic planning guiding coalition that meets regularly during the academic year to review and evaluate all institutional theme and outcome progress. An in-depth evaluation of every theme each year has been established to allow for concentrated analysis, transparency, and encourage greater university-wide involvement and feedback in its continuous improvement and mission related efforts. Ratings, corresponding explanations, and recommendations for all areas are contained in a final written report (i.e., institutional report card) that is completed by the end of a given academic year. This report is submitted to the President’s cabinet for review and finally to the Board of Trustees. It would be determined that “mission fulfillment” was met by scoring “sufficient” as related to each of the three variables examined (performance indicator quality; assessment performance level; and institutional strategies & initiative success).

Areas of Institutional Outcome Assessment

Performance Indicator Quality: The examination of the quality, quantity, and variety of the performance indicators used to determine institutional outcome attainment within any theme is important in examining the meaningfulness of the information and data generated. Assessment measures (i.e., performance indicators) need to be appropriate for and aligned to stated institutional outcomes and outcomes. Appropriateness implies that consistent categories of information appear in both the assessment and its corresponding outcome(s). In addition, assessment quality should be measured by examining its congruency with the complexity and requirements of the corresponding institutional outcome(s). Also, there is a need to apply multiple performance indicators at various times to examine institutional outcomes that are generally complex and broad in nature.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
<th>Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment indicators are not comprehensive and/or integrated to provide information in monitoring goal attainment. Assessment indicators may have sources of bias with little to no effort having been made to establish fairness, accuracy, and/or consistency in procedures.</td>
<td>Assessment indicators are comprehensive and integrated to provide information in monitoring goal attainment. Multiple assessments are used with little if any sources of bias. Efforts are made to ensure and establish assessment fairness, accuracy, and consistency.</td>
<td>Assessment indicators are comprehensive and integrated to provide information in monitoring goal attainment. Multiple assessments are used at various times and steps are taken to eliminate sources of bias. Thorough investigation and/or supportive data exists that establishes fairness, accuracy, and consistency of the assessment procedures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Performance Level: How did CWU do in attempting to meet institutional outcomes within themes? The answer to this question can be determined by criterion and/or normative comparison. These indicators help guide how well CWU is doing in meeting institutional outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
<th>Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment data suggests that the institutional goal is not being met and that current status or direction of change is undesirable or not improving as quickly as desired. Immediate, high priority actions should be taken to address this area.</td>
<td>Assessment data suggests that the institutional goal is being met and that current status or direction of change is either at an acceptable level or clearly heading in the right direction.</td>
<td>Assessment data suggests that institutional goal is clearly met and that current status or direction of change is at a qualitatively high and advanced/mature level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional Strategies & Initiative Success: It is important to know whether institutional activities, processes and initiatives are actually helping to meet institutional outcomes. Is what CWU is doing really an institutional priority? Is what CWU is doing the most efficient, innovative and cost-effective approach? This information will guide whether specific actions are working and whether specific initiatives or approaches should be continued, adjusted, or deleted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
<th>Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal strategies and initiatives may be inadequately or inappropriately funded, not based on previous data, limited in number and/or scope, inefficient, or ineffective to reach an acceptable level or desired rate of improvement. Immediate, high priority actions should be taken to address this area. Strategies may not be supported by data collection conclusions.</td>
<td>Goal strategies and initiatives may be appropriate, efficient, effective, and based on some previous data, but may need some change in course of action, funding, and/or number needed to provide sustainable momentum in this goal area. Most strategies are based on and supported by data collection conclusions.</td>
<td>No immediate change in strategies and initiatives is required. However, continuing support should be provided to sustain achievement in this goal area. Strategies are clearly supported and driven by data sources and collection conclusions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>