

University of Minnesota, Crookston (UMC)
Progress Report on Assessment of Student Learning
Submitted to the Higher Learning Commission
June 30, 2003

INTRODUCTION

Historical Context of the Progress Report

In July 1992, following the Board of Regents resolution directing the University of Minnesota, Crookston to provide selected baccalaureate degrees, the Chancellor formally requested NCA to make a change in the Educational Programs section of the Statement of Affiliation Status to include the offering of the Bachelor's Degree. In conformity with Commission policy on institutional change, a Focus Visit to confirm the institution's self-assessment on readiness to offer baccalaureate degrees occurred in February 1993, with the resulting recommendation from the Focus Visit Team that the Statement of Affiliation Status be amended to include the requested baccalaureate level accreditation. The Commission approved this in August 1993. The Comprehensive Evaluation was delayed by one year and re-scheduled for the 1994-95 academic year.

A comprehensive evaluation visit took place in February 1995. The Team recommended continuation of the accreditation with the next comprehensive visit scheduled in six years. The Team noted that the six year period would be two years after the institution was expected to reach the enrollment goals and one year after it was to meet the qualitative goals established by the University of Minnesota central administration. After consideration of the Team report the Chancellor requested a Review Committee, evaluation process and that the next comprehensive visit be scheduled in ten years. A Review Committee process was initiated and in August 1995 UMC was notified that

After careful review of the materials provided by the University and by the team, the Commission concluded that a focused visit rather than a report (as recommended by the Review Committee) would be the most appropriate form of monitoring.

In March of 2000 a focused visit was conducted by a team of three consultant/evaluators from the North Central Association. In addition to many positive findings on the progress of the University of Minnesota, Crookston, the team indicated the following concern:

1. Assessment of student learning has been given little attention. Before the next NCA visit in 2004-2005, UMC should:
 - a. develop an assessment plan that incorporates student learning across general education and the majors;
 - b. document the results of its assessment activities;

- c. document what changes have occurred in the assessment plan, procedures, process, and in the improvement of student learning as a result of those changes; and,
- d. document that UMC has formally integrated the use of assessment results into its planning, budgeting, and decision-making process. *

*From the Report of a Focused Visit to University of Minnesota-Crookston, March 26-28, 2000.

This concern has framed the assessment work of the University of Minnesota, Crookston and has helped focus assessment planning and implementation activities. This concern also provided additional background and support for the revision and refining of UMC's mission statement. There is specific reference within the mission statement to "*Continually improving student learning through meaningful assessment;*".

UMC MISSION STATEMENT

The University of Minnesota, Crookston (UMC) is integral to the University's statewide land grant mission. The college provides its unique contribution through polytechnic programs that combine theory, practice, and experimentation in a technologically rich environment. UMC connects its teaching, research, and outreach to serve the public good.

INSTITUTIONAL PURPOSES

To provide quality teaching and learning by:

- *Committing to excellence in education;*
- *Maintaining a focused curriculum incorporating three core components – communication, critical thinking, and working with others;*
- *Developing lifelong learning skills;*
- *Requiring applied field experiences, laboratory instruction, and internships;*
- *Emphasizing technology experiences for careers in the information-age;*
- *Continually improving student learning through meaningful assessment; and*
- *Providing support services and activities that enhance students' personal and cultural development.*

To promote a strong and diverse community of learners and teachers by:

- *Expecting the highest in personal and professional integrity, civility and tolerance;*
- *Encouraging teamwork, professional growth, acceptance of responsibility, and recognition for achievement;*
- *Providing a caring environment with personal attention and frequent faculty-student interaction;*
- *Upholding individual rights to freedom of expression and association; and*
- *Valuing shared governance among faculty, administrators, staff and students.*

To create an educated citizenry by:

- *Preparing students to be actively engaged responsible citizens and leaders committed to democracy and community;*
- *Providing opportunities for all students to participate in student and campus governance; and*
- *Offering students professional, social, cultural, and civic events that extend the learning environment and lead to a fulfilling life.*

To develop civic engagement by:

- *Responding to the changing needs of agriculture, manufacturing, business, health care and other industries and professions;*
- *Collaborating with business, industry, schools, colleges, and other organizations; and*
- *Seeking to improve the quality of life, the economy and the environment.*

UMC submitted a Monitoring Report on Assessment to the Higher Learning Commission on September 28, 2001. The Staff Analysis of the report stated:

Since the focused visit, UM-C has developed an assessment plan that addresses student learning across general education, core components, and the program major. The plan for assessing general education outcomes is to develop a common set of learner outcomes and to assess these using an “Assessing General Education” questionnaire and a standardized test such as the ACT COMP. At the time of this report, each general education area had developed one broad “program” outcome and discussions were continuing on the cost, time and fit of a standardized test.

Core components are communication, critical thinking, and working with others skills. These skills are to be integrated into the general education core and program specific courses. UM-C has identified performance indicators for these components and the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal was administered to 250 students. Discussions on assessing the remaining core components are ongoing.

Assessment in the program major has begun with the development of program outcomes, followed by the development of learner outcomes for each program outcome, source(s), and assessment activity. UM-C reports that programs have completed the first review of program outcomes.

Conclusion. A framework for the assessment plan is in place at UM-C, however, several pieces remain to be addressed. Among these are:

- *Establish the connection between assessment results and institutional decision-making*
- *Demonstrate levels of faculty involvement*

- *Demonstrate that assessment of student learning is occurring across academic programs or disciplines (beyond the level of the individual classroom or course) and that*
- *Direct measures of student learning are employed*

In addition, the Evaluation Team identified the following areas for documentation

- *Document the results of assessment activities*
- *Document the changes that have occurred in procedures, processes, and student learning*
- *Document the integration of assessment results in the University's planning, budgeting, and decision-making processes*

The progress report on the implementation of the assessment plan is due May 31, 2003. It should respond to the team's concerns, demonstrate that assessment is an ongoing activity of the institution and document the implementation of assessment plan.

***STAFF ACTION:** Accept the report focused on the plan to assess student learning. A progress report on assessment of student learning is due 5/31/03.** The institutions next comprehensive evaluation is scheduled for 2004-2005*

From the Higher Learning Commission's Staff Analysis of Institutional Report dated October 15, 2001

** A one month extension of this deadline was granted by the commission with the report due 6/30/2003.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

This progress report is organized into four sections. The first section contains general information on the activities of the UMC campus in the area of assessment and updates of activities mentioned in the monitoring report and the staff analysis document. This will include specific references to activities carried out as directed by the various sections of the assessment matrix which is the basic guide for the UMC Assessment Plan (Assessment Matrix and planning documents are located in Appendix A of this report).

The second section of the report will provide documentation and information regarding the "pieces" of the plan that remained to be addressed according to the Staff Analysis of the monitoring report previously submitted.

- *Establish the connection between assessment results and institutional decision-making*
- *Demonstrate levels of faculty involvement*
- *Demonstrate that assessment of student learning is occurring across academic programs or disciplines (beyond the level of the individual classroom or course) and that*

- *Direct measures of student learning are employed*

A third section utilizes the Assessment Culture Matrix developed by the Higher Learning Commission and last revised in April of 2003. UMC continues to use this matrix as a system for marking our progress in developing a meaningful campus wide approach to assessment. Updates to our self analysis of our progress are provided in this section.

The fourth section contains several appendices that provide documentation and are referenced throughout the report.

SECTION ONE

General Information and Updates

Assessment Coordination

The Assessment Plan and the ongoing revision and up-dating of assessment activities are being coordinated by a UMC Assessment Committee composed of the following individuals:

Wendell Johnson, UMC faculty member
Marsha Odom, Director, Center for Learning Foundations
Richard Nelson, Director, Center for Agriculture and Natural Resources
Susan Brorson, UMC faculty member
Paul Aakre, UMC faculty member
John Loegering, UMC faculty member
Soo-Yin Lim-Thompson, UMC faculty member
David Crawford, UMC faculty member
Lynnette Mullins, UMC faculty member
Sharon Stewart, UMC faculty member
Doug Knowlton, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Assessment Committee coordinator
Bill Peterson, UMC faculty member, ex-officio for statistical analysis

This committee meets on a regular basis to review assessment activities and monitor the Assessment Plan. Each meeting the matrix is reviewed and up-dated. The committee has broken the assessment task into components and also meets in sub-committees to address different areas with additional faculty joining to help. Each sub-committee plans, implements, sets timelines, and reports procedures for accomplishing their tasks. Currently the sub-committees are:

1. Internships
2. Critical Thinking
3. Communication
4. Employer Survey
5. PIAC Reports
6. Service Learning

7. Learner Outcomes and Program Outcomes
8. Portfolios (being formed)
9. Capstone/Senior Seminar (being formed)
10. Student Self Assessment (being formed)
11. Other as yet unidentified areas

In addition the Assessment committee will begin coordinating activities with UMC's Higher Learning Commission Self-Study committee which has been designated in preparation for UMC's comprehensive evaluation scheduled for April of 2005.

General Education

In 2001 general education faculty developed one broad learner outcome for each area of communication, humanities, math/natural science and social science. Since that time faculty have had numerous meetings to discuss whether the expressed outcomes were appropriate and how would they be measured. During 2002-2003 UMC compared its general education outcomes with the general education competencies of the Minnesota Transfer Curriculum (MTC) competencies. In departmental and program meetings some faculty recognized that it would be advantageous to students and to the institution if the UMC general education course requirements were better aligned with the MTC competencies. As a result, the general education faculty has proposed revised outcomes for each area with a different configuration of the distribution of courses among disciplines. This proposal for change will be extensively discussed with faculty across the disciplines and presented to the Campus in Fall 2003.

Biological and Physical Sciences (minimum of two courses, including one course in physical science with a laboratory, and one course in biological science with a laboratory)

Graduates will demonstrate skills in scientific reasoning and application of critical thinking skills and integrate scientific information in laboratory settings.

Communication (minimum of 12 credits)

Graduates will apply listening, reading, speaking, and writing skills and will use appropriate computer technology to communicate in their career disciplines.

***Communication (using technology – minimum of 3 credits: additional CA credits will not meet general education requirements)

History, and the Social Science and Behavioral Sciences (a minimum of 9 credits from at least two departments)

Graduates will demonstrate knowledge of individual and group behaviors and their impact on social institutions. Graduates will demonstrate an understanding of the role of a world citizen with a global future.

Humanities –the Arts, Literature, and Philosophy (6 credits from at least two departments)

Graduates will demonstrate an awareness of the evolution of human cultures and a diverse heritage of ideas, values, and their expressions.

Mathematical Thinking (minimum of 3 credits)

Graduates will demonstrate skills in mathematical reasoning and application of critical thinking skills to analyze, raise questions, and to develop methods of proof.

Having UMC's general education outcomes aligned with other Minnesota colleges and universities will encourage UMC to collaborate with other institutions in ways to assess general education outcomes. Science and Math faculty have examined their syllabi as a

group and are creating a department matrix to display examples of student achievement in the broad outcome.

Communication faculty agreed upon the common learner outcomes for three courses required for every student, Composition I, Composition II and Public Speaking. The Composition faculty also pre and post assessed all students in Composition I and II using Criterion Online Writing, an ETS product that evaluates students' writing skills. It was determined that the rubrics used for grading by Criterion are similar to the rubrics the department uses for grading in Composition One. The average score on Criterion for students completing Composition I was one rubric level higher than the pretest score. The faculty was pleased with the overall score, but is considering the factors that might have led to the poorer performance of those who did not show progress. The August department meeting will focus on adjustments and reinforcements in instruction that may be indicated. The faculty decided that Criterion is not an effective tool for student achievement in Composition II and is searching for another.

The Speech faculty developed a pre and post multiple choice test delivered through Web CT. Initial review of the results indicate a significant growth in knowledge. Each of the course's seven learner outcomes is tied to the test questions. Student responses are pointing out which subject areas need to be taught differently and adjustments are planned in the fall 2003 syllabus.

Core Component Assessment

Building on the work of an original Core Components Task Force established in 1993, UMC has revised and endorsed the following curriculum core components; **communication, critical thinking** and **working with others**. These components are concepts and skills emphasized in the teaching and learning process, not necessarily content taught in specific courses. The intent is that they be integrated into both the general education and program-specific courses. As defined by the institution, the core components are dominant themes, transferable skills and abilities essential to an individual's success in any occupation or life setting.

UMC has advisory committees for each degree program called Program Improvement Audit Committees (PIAC) which were also included in the identification of the curriculum core components. Last year the PIAC members were surveyed to determine the degree of importance, the level of skill needed, and examples of ways used for each of the core components in their business or organization. There was very good participation in the survey and many comments were contributed by the PIAC members. The survey results were provided to faculty as part of the participation process for PIAC. There is evidence that faculty discussed and reacted to the information from the survey.

Critical Thinking – The original planning for assessing the institutions impact on the development of critical thinking skills involved the administration of a standardized evaluation instrument – the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal. An original

group of 250 students were administered this evaluation during the computer applications course that all new students must take. After additional analysis and consideration, a decision was made to modify this process by changing to the California Critical Thinking Skills Test and to administer the instrument to all incoming first year students during their orientation week activities. The students continuing at UMC would also be assessed at the end of their second year and just before graduation at the end of 4 years. Two cohorts of first year students have been assessed with the first cohort of second year students were assessed and the data are being analyzed. Following this first sequence of evaluation results, recommendations for faculty development and curricular changes will be considered. It is evident that a plan must be developed to gain more participation from students for re-testing. Ongoing assessment of critical thinking skills by individual faculty has also been the focus of regular faculty development efforts. (Please refer to Appendix D for examples) Twenty faculty participated in evening sessions on such topics as which questions draw students into thinking critically, how to get students into a questioning frame of mind, and using mind mapping as a tool.

As a part of a faculty development workshop held on the campus on October 18,2002, Douglas Eder, Associate Professor of Neuroscience and Director, Undergraduate assessment and Program Review, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, did a review of 30 programs of study in the UMC catalog. This review provided an analysis of the identified student outcomes and their correspondence to Bloom's Taxonomy. Through that analysis a recommendation was made for additional emphasis on curricular activities that will promote student's understanding and skills for performing more critical analysis and synthesis activities. This feedback will be utilized by the Assessment committee to formulate an approach that will promote these specific skills.

Communication – The faculty within the communications department are piloting interviews with program faculty to identify the unique and common written and oral communication skills in their disciplines. The faculty will work with the gleaned information to determine what changes could be made in the communication courses and how to help program faculty reinforce good communication skills among their students. They have developed an on-line assessment tool for pre and post testing of all UMC students enrolled in the required Speech 1101 Public Speaking course. (See additional detail in the General Education section of this report) This is an evaluation of basic concepts related to communication. A procedure for evaluating actual student performance of verbal communication skills (direct measure) is currently under development. In addition, the faculty within the Composition and Communications departments are cooperating in the use of an online writing analysis project and a potential writing assessment to be used across disciplines is being developed.

Working with Others – Acknowledged as the most difficult of the core components to directly assess, some faculty have developed rating instruments that help students assess themselves and others when engaged in team activities within a class.

A significant amount of the team building skills and other learning related to this core component is integrated in the very significant service learning aspects of UMC's

curriculum. UMC was recently selected by the Minnesota Campus Compact for a study of exemplary service learning institutions in Minnesota and for a special project funded by the PEW Charitable Trust as one of four campuses nationally to be presented as case studies for the implementation of service learning. As a part of this national study a research team conducted multiple focus groups for students, faculty and staff regarding the impact of the service learning currently being conducted at UMC. The results of this study and the case study presentations are due to be published in August of 2003 and should provide significant data regarding the impact of our service learning activities and also provide information that can direct further development to facilitate student learning with regard to the “Working with Others” core component.

Imbedded within the Working with Others core component is the ability to understand and appreciate individuals from other cultures and races, as well as diverse social and ethnic backgrounds. UMC has developed a Diversity Committee to advocate for multicultural and other activities that promote a campus climate that welcomes and celebrates individual differences. As a part of the Diversity Committee activities in 2003, a survey was conducted of faculty with regards to their views of diversity and their inclusion of the topic of diversity within their teaching. The results of the survey will be used to direct campus activities and frame discussions regarding curriculum development. The results of the survey are scheduled to be shared with the campus in September 2003. (Quantitative results of the survey are included in Appendix C)

Program Major Assessment

In conjunction with the development of program outcomes, UMC adopted a system of degree program review (suggested by the Focused Visit Team) titled Degree Program Improvement Study. UMC’s Faculty Assembly adopted the plan for this review process in April 2002. A copy of the plan is attached in Appendix B. To date six of UMC’s degree programs have completed the process with all 19 degree programs scheduled to have completed the first of their studies in time for the April 2005 Higher Learning Commission comprehensive evaluation. Sample copies of learning outcome sections from some of the program studies are also attached as a part of Appendix B.

SECTION TWO

Progress on Assessment Issues Identified in Staff Analysis of Monitoring Report

- Connection between assessment and institutional decision-making

The development of assessment data that will be utilized for continuing institutional decision-making is clearly in the beginning stages. Core component assessment data will be available within the next few months to inform and direct curricular development. Processes for measuring Program Major learner outcomes are being developed and implemented and will be utilized by the Program Improvement Audit Committees (UMC’s Program Advisory Committees) to recommend and monitor changes in curriculum and student learning experiences. Listed below are a few examples of

assessment activities and the institutional responses that have resulted from the information gained from these assessments.

Advising Survey – A student survey of their experiences of the advising process at UMC was conducted in the spring of 2003. Appendix C contains the quantitative data from this survey and a list of surveys conducted by the office of Student Affairs. The results of all these studies are available online at:

<http://webhome.crk.umn.edu/~nelson/surveys.htm>

Ongoing surveys of student satisfaction have indicated that while students are overwhelmingly pleased with the education they are receiving they are relatively less happy with the advising support they have received. Thus, as a result of this information, specific faculty training on the use of online supports for the advising process was incorporated in the in-service activities conducted during UMC's spring in-service day. In addition, a special UMC taskforce on Recruitment and Retention has been developing a set of recommendations to improve advising as a part of the retention activities of the campus.

Diversity Survey – A survey of faculty conducted by the UMC Diversity committee will guide recommendations for the inclusion of diversity issues within new curriculum initiatives. The development of a specific course and or the inclusion of specific subject matter will be brought to the UMC Curriculum Committee in the fall of 2003. A copy of the quantitative results of the Diversity Survey is located in Appendix C.

Analysis of the Success of Students Admitted on Probation – Specific data on the rates of success (moving off probation) of students admitted to UMC have been developed and are currently being reviewed and analyzed. As a result of preliminary review, new policies for the inclusion of required tutoring are being considered, a new mentoring curriculum for students within UMC's Gen Ed 1000 course will be piloted this fall, and procedures for increasing enrollment in the UMC Student Support Services program are being incorporated in the orientation process for new students.

- Demonstrate levels of faculty involvement

The University of Minnesota has received a major grant from the Bush Foundation to support ongoing faculty development activities. As a coordinate campus of the University of Minnesota, UMC has developed a strategy for improving teaching and learning through the delivery of a series of faculty development activities focusing primarily on the topic of assessment. Included in these ongoing activities have been the development and support of cohorts of faculty that meet regularly to explore creative and innovative assessment activities. Appendix D contains an extensive summary of these activities and examples of individual reports of work done by faculty as a part of this process.

During the summer of 2002 four members of the UMC faculty and administration attended the American Association for Higher Education's Annual Assessment

conference in Boston, MA. Information from the conference has been shared with the Assessment Committee and in other forums.

The University of Minnesota, Crookston is a participating member of a regional faculty development consortium, the Collaboration. Dr. Marsha Odom, director of the Center for Learning Foundations and a UMC faculty member was nominated and will now participate as a member in the Collaboration's newly formed Regional Colloquium on Assessment.

- Demonstrate that assessment of student learning is occurring across academic programs or disciplines

Please refer to the previous sections on General Education and Core Components for information on the assessment across academic programs that is occurring in these two areas.

Internships

Given that UMC has been designated as the polytechnic campus of the University of Minnesota and that application of learning is a central feature of a polytechnic mission it is not surprising that all students graduating from UMC must complete at least one internship experience. As the Assessment Committee developed the assessment plan, it became clear that direct and effective measurement of student learning outcomes should and could be incorporated into that internship experience. A subcommittee of the Assessment Committee has been developing and piloting a process for possible adoption as a campus wide evaluative process. Please see Appendix E for a report of this subcommittee and a current outline of the process.

- Direct measures of student learning are employed

Three specific examples of these direct measures at the institutional level are 1) the incorporation of the California Critical Thinking Skills Test as markers of student learning (See section on critical thinking in the Core Components section of this report), 2) the use of competency assessment procedures within the Computer Applications 1010 course, UMC's introduction to information technology which is required of all students, and 3) the development and use of pre and post testing of all students enrolled in Speech 1101 Public Speaking as a part of the communications requirement in UMC's general education core. Other direct measures being utilized by individual faculty are referenced in the Bush Faculty Development section of the report and examples are provided in Appendix D.

SECTION THREE

Up-dated Levels of Implementation at UMC

Utilizing the HLC's Assessment of Student Academic Achievement: Assessment of Culture Matrix/ Levels of Implementation guidelines as revised April 1, 2003, the following is an up-dated (from the Monitoring Report submitted in September 2001) summary of UMC's self-assessed status at this time.

I. Institutional Culture:

a. Collective/Shared Values

While UMC continues to function primarily at level two (Making Progress in Implementing Assessment Programs) there has been significant progress toward level three (Maturing Stages of Continuous Improvement) as more degree programs and units incorporate assessment activities and findings in their decision making. Continuous questions are posed regarding our documentation of student learning and growth is seen in the development of questions and analyses included in the curricular development components of the campus.

b. Mission

Just prior to the submission of the Monitoring Report in 2001 the campus developed a revised mission statement. This statement was approved by the University of Minnesota Board of Regents and it clearly affirms the high value UMC places on student learning with a specific reference to assessment. UMC will be focusing very closely on its mission and providing additional documentation of the activities associated with this mission as it proceeds with the HLC self study in preparation for the HLC comprehensive evaluation in 2005. UMC continues to move toward level three as the "characteristics described in Level Two are continued, sustained, and where appropriate, enhanced."

II. Shared Responsibility:

a. Faculty

From the development of a faculty directed assessment committee to the individual commitment of program managers, UMC has progressed to many of the activities outlined in level two and is very strategically moving into level three. Faculty participation in the numerous activities outlined in this report has been outstanding (refer to Appendix D on the Bush Faculty development activity). The faculty cohort support process that has been utilized by the Bush faculty development program has provided numerous opportunities for faculty to present their individual work on assessment. A few individual examples of this impact on the work of the faculty are presented in Appendix D.

b. Administration and Board

The University of Minnesota Board of Regents governs UMC and reports of UMC's progress on assessment have been reported to this body. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (CAO) currently coordinates the assessment committee. Evidence of progress toward level three in this category includes the provision of resources by senior administrators to "enhance assessment practices and improve faculty's understanding of assessment principles and use of assessment results". Funding has been provided to supplement the Bush Faculty Development initiative and to support faculty participation in national and regional conferences on assessment. The Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs office routinely provides support (surveys etc. See Appendix C) needed to carry out assessment activities.

c. Students

Student involvement in assessment groups has been achieved and information sessions for students have been delivered. A broader level of student involvement will be needed to move to level three. Information sessions for students as they participate in the HLC self study process will also supplement these activities. UMC needs to add more active student participation to the Assessment Committee.

III. Institutional Support:

a. Resources

Initial allocation of financial resources for the development of the Assessment Plan provided for consultation services. Ongoing funding and a regular budget line has now been established which meets one of the criteria for level three of the matrix. Cut backs in state funding to the institution have had some impact on the funding available for assessment but it continues to be a priority in the special funding requests that are a part of UMC's planning process with the central administration of the University of Minnesota. UMC is clearly at level two with significant movement toward level three.

b. Structures

On a relatively small campus such as UMC, structures some times available at larger campuses are subsumed by other offices. For example the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and UMC's Enrollment Management office provide most of the institutional analysis support for the campus and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs coordinates (chairs) the assessment committee. Data collection support is also provided by central administrative functions located within the University of Minnesota system. UMC is functioning at level two with some movement toward level three. This area of support requires the most systematic analysis and change as the institution progresses.

IV. Efficacy of Assessment

As a part of the Monitoring Report previously submitted UMC reported that our functioning on these criteria was at level one. There have been significant movement toward level two with faculty members “increasingly engaged in interpreting assessment results, discussing their implications, and recommending changes in academic programs and other areas to improve student learning”. In addition through the Degree Program Improvement Study process “Assessment findings about the state of student learning are beginning to be incorporated into reviews of the academic program and into the self-study of institutional effectiveness”. There is beginning evidence of some movement into level three with more evidence of faculty and administrative “commitment to excellent teaching and effective learning”. UMC understands that additional major efforts will be needed to move the assessment process into a central position within the decision making structures of the institution.