



**Academic Programs
Institutional
State of Assessment
Report
2013-2014**

**UNM Office of Assessment
Academic Affairs
Office of the Provost**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW	1
ACADEMIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT MATURITY (APAM) RUBRIC	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
ANDERSON SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT (ASM)	2
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES (A&S)	4
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION (COE)	7
COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS (CFA)	9
COLLEGE OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES AND LEARNING SCIENCES (CULLS)	12
GRADUATE STUDIES (GS)	14
HONORS COLLEGE (HC)	16
SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE AND PLANNING (SA+P)	18
SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING (SOE)	21
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (SPA)	24
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE (UC)	26
COLLEGE OF NURSING (CON)	28
COLLEGE OF PHARMACY (COP)	29
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE (SOM)	30
SCHOOL OF LAW (SOL)	33
APPENDIX A: ORIGINAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT MATURITY RUBRIC	36
APPENDIX B: REVISED ACADEMIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT MATURITY RUBRIC	37
APPENDIX C: STATE OF ASSESSMENT REPORT TEMPLATE	38
APPENDIX D: OVERALL ASSESSMENT MATURITY AVERAGES BY LEVEL	39

Overview

The Academic Program Assessment Maturity Rubric was developed and piloted for the first time in Spring 2014 with a focus on the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 academic years/assessment cycles. Initially, it was used to review the status of academic program assessment practices college-by-college on a cyclical basis. The scores from the rubric were used by the Office of Assessment to monitor as well as conduct an analysis of where individual academic programs and colleges/schools/branches were in the maturity of their assessment processes regarding the continuous improvement of student learning along a continuum from planning (i.e., just starting) to full implementation (i.e., sophisticated routine established and ongoing).

However, during the 2013-2014 academic year, the Academic Program Assessment Subcommittee (APAS) of the Provost's Committee on Assessment (PCA) focused on streamlining and standardizing the assessment reporting process at UNM in order to improve the process, maintain consistency and establish accountability of academic program assessment reporting university-wide. This included redefining the College Assessment Review Committees (CARCs), or the equivalent, as the governing body at the college/school/branch level for monitoring, collecting, reviewing, evaluating and analyzing their academic programs' assessment practices. These changes resulted in the revision of the original Academic Program Assessment Maturity Rubric as well as the development and implementation of the State of Assessment Report at the college/school/branch level (i.e., Appendices A, B, and C respectively).

The two key documents that are used to record and track the assessment practices of each academic program across 15 colleges and schools and four branch campuses are the assessment plan and annual assessment report, with accompanying evidence. This institutional report focuses on the utilization of the Academic Program Assessment Maturity Rubric to evaluate and analyze academic programs' assessment plans and assessment reports including accompanying evidence. Although, starting at the end of the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, each CARC, or the equivalent, is responsible for evaluating its academic programs' assessment practices, this institutional report only discusses the assessment maturity scores and analysis of the Office of Assessment.

Academic Program Assessment Maturity (APAM) Rubric

The original APAM rubric was used to evaluate academic program assessment documentations associated with the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles. It consisted of six categories that targeted both academic program assessment plans and assessment reports on a five-point level scale (i.e., Appendix A). The Level 0 was the lowest assessment maturity level and the Level 4 was the highest.

In the 2012-2013 Institutional State of Assessment Report, the overall percentages that were reported for each college and school were based solely on the academic programs that submitted assessment documentation for evaluation. In other words, assessment maturity percentages recorded for each level were based only on the academic programs that submitted assessment documentation and not on all of the active academic programs associated with a college or school. Academic programs that were offered at the UNM branch campuses were not reported in the 2012-2013 Institutional State of Assessment Report.

In the 2013-2014 Institutional State of Assessment Report, the overall percentages that are reported are based on the number of the active academic programs that are offered by each college, school, and

branch campus. Therefore, academic programs that do not submit any assessment documentation for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle are evaluated by the Office of Assessment at a Level 0 for each relevant category. Please note that some colleges, schools, and branch campuses may elect to include a listing of the degree and certificate academic programs by concentration, which will result in a higher number of assessment plans and annual academic program assessment reports.

The progress and improvements made within each college, school and branch regarding the collection, reporting, review and/or evaluation of its academic programs' assessment practices are discussed in the following sections. Refer to Appendix D for a comprehensive of the overall assessment maturity averages by level for each college, school, and branch campus.

Executive Summary

A 2013-2014 State of Assessment Report was submitted by all colleges, schools, and branch campuses except for Graduate Studies and the Colleges of Nursing and Pharmacy.

Academic program assessment maturity scores, along with accompanying assessment plans, annual assessment reports, and/or other pertinent program assessment-related and institutional effectiveness-related documentation associated with the 2013-2014 assessment cycle were submitted by deans, associate deans, and/or CARC chairs by all colleges, schools, and branch campuses except for the Colleges of Nursing and Pharmacy.

Anderson School of Management

Similar to the 2012-2013 academic year, the Anderson School of Management (ASM) consisted of a total of four active academic degree and certificate programs during the 2013-2014 academic year. The number of each type of degree and certificate program that is offered by ASM follows:

ASM Degrees/Certificates	No.
Business Administration (B.B.A.)	1
Accounting (M.Acct.)	1
Business Administration (M.B.A.)	1
Post-Master's Certificate in Management (MGTCP)	1

Concerns/Issues

The following are a few assessment-related issues that should be addressed within ASM.

- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, ASM provided an assessment plan for its undergraduate program. However, the language of several of the student learning outcomes would need to be reworded for measurability. Also, the undergraduate assessment plan vaguely referenced the course-level assessment measures associated with the graduate programs instead of program-level assessment measures that would be appropriate for the undergraduate program.

- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, ASM provided one overall assessment plan for its graduate programs. The learning goals and student learning outcomes for these programs were not distinguished based on their purpose, focus, and expectations. The language of a few of the student learning outcomes would need to be reworded for measurability. Also, the graduate assessment plan vaguely referenced the course-level assessment measures instead of program-level assessment measures.
- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, ASM did not provide an assessment plan or reference to learning goals, student learning outcomes, and program-level assessment measures that particularly focused on its graduate certificate program.
- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, the assessment reports that were provided for the undergraduate and graduate academic programs overall assessment results for each goal instead of the assessment results for each student learning outcome/objective.

Assessment Maturity Scores

Similar to the 2012-2013 Institutional State of Assessment Report, the 2013-2014 Institutional State of Assessment Report includes a listing of all four academic programs.

For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, ASM submitted a set of course-level assessment documentation for each degree program based on course-level assessment measures instead of a program-level assessment report based on program-level assessment measures. Consequently, the Office of Assessment was unable to adequately administer the original APAM rubric to evaluate the submitted assessment documentation.

Tables 1 and 2 below provide an overview of the percentages of the academic programs performing at each assessment maturity level for the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles, which are based on the maturity average score (rounded up where relevant) received by each program.

Table 1: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2012-2013					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
Anderson School of Management (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (4)	0% (0)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2013-2014					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
Anderson School of Management (4)	25% (1)	75% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, based on the original APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that one of the four academic programs associated with ASM did not submit an assessment plan and/or assessment report for this assessment cycle. For the 2012-2013 assessment cycle, all four academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher whereas none of the four programs submitted assessment documentation for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher.

The overall assessment maturity average for ASM, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, decreased from 3.3 for the 2012-2013 assessment cycle to 1.0 for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. In other words, due to the concerns/issues outlined above, the School decreased from the equivalent of a Level 3 assessment maturity average to the equivalent of a Level 1 assessment maturity average based on the original APAM rubric.

Areas of Improvement

Of the 20 core courses in which student learning is assessed through a formal process, instructors from six of the courses documented their formal review process using ASM's "Closing the Loop" form. Assessment occurs in all of these courses on an annual, and often per semester basis. However, improvements in formally documenting and reviewing assessment results at the program-level for each academic program base on program-level assessment measures are needed.

In addition, formalization of a structure and process that effectively support and maintain a culture of continuous assessment at the program-level for each of the four academic programs is expected after the School completes its current strategic plan. Pending completion of the School's strategic plan, the next step to enhancing student learning assessment activities is to complete a review of all student learning goals, outcomes, and assessment activities in order to determine where improvements are needed. This step will be guided by UNM's student learning goals (i.e., Knowledge, Skills, and Responsibility) and the new AACSB standards to include aligning UNM's student learning goals with the 2013 AACSB standards in order to identify and address gaps or vulnerabilities ASM's assessment structure.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The revised APAM rubric will be administered to evaluate the assessment documentation that are submitted for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle and thus, will provide a new baseline for improvement and progress. Consequently, goals for continuous improvement have not been articulated for the 2014-2014 assessment cycle.

In addition, the School was tasked with developing and/or revising its assessment webpage/website to display the assessment plan of each of its academic programs as well as provide program assessment-related and/or student performance information for ASM faculty, staff, and students and external constituents. The purpose of this task was to demonstrate compliance in ensuring that current and accurate information regarding academic programs' learning goals, student learning outcomes, assessment measurements and/or other pertinent program assessment-related information are publicly available and easily accessible to faculty, staff, students, and the UNM community.

College of Arts and Sciences

Similar to the 2012-2013 academic year, the College of Arts and Sciences (A&S) consisted of a total of 108 active academic degree and certificate programs during the 2013-2014 academic year. Out of the 108 academic programs offered by A&S, four of them are interdisciplinary degree programs that are shared with the School of Engineering. The number of each type of degree and certificate program that is offered by A&S follows:

A&S Degrees/Certificates	No.
Bachelor of Arts (B.A.)	40
Bachelor of Science (B.S.)	13
Master of Arts (M.A.)	16
Master of Science (M.S.)	10
Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)	19
Certificate (Cert.)	5
Master of Fine Arts (M.F.A.)	1

Concerns/Issues

The following are a few assessment-related issues that should be addressed within A&S.

- For the 2013-2014 academic year, the A&S CARC reported that the Asian Studies B.A., European Studies B.A. and Family Studies B.A. programs have been sunsetted. However, all three of these programs are still listed as degrees offered at UNM in the 2013-2014 academic catalog.
- The assessment plan of several programs are not listed on the A&S assessment webpage located at <http://artsci.unm.edu/departments/assessment/program-assessment.html>.
- Although, the Psychology M.S. degree is awarded at UNM, the Department of Psychology does not recognize this degree, and therefore has not provided an assessment plan or assessment report for this degree. Because this degree program is listed in the 2013-2014 academic catalog as a degree offered at UNM, the University will be held responsible, particularly by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), for overseeing and documenting the continuous improvement of student learning in this degree program.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2012-2013 Institutional State of Assessment Report includes a listing of all 108 programs. Since the School of Engineering is responsible for reporting on the four interdisciplinary degree programs during the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, the 2013-2014 Institutional State of Assessment Report includes a discussion of the evaluation and analysis of the remaining 104 academic degree and certificate programs associated with A&S.

Overall, A&S has demonstrated progress and improvement between the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles in its collection, reporting, review and/or evaluation of the assessment practices of its academic programs.

Tables 1 and 2 below provide an overview of the percentages of the academic programs performing at each assessment maturity level for the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles, which are based on the maturity average score (rounded up where relevant) received by each program.

Table 1: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2012-2013					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
College of Arts and Sciences (108)	83% (90)	8.3% (9)	2.8% (3)	0.93% (1)	4.6% (5)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2013-2014					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
College of Arts and Sciences (104)	32% (33)	28% (29)	27% (28)	8.7% (9)	4.8% (5)

For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, based on the original APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicates that 33 of the 104 A&S academic programs did not submit an assessment plan and/or assessment report for this assessment cycle. However, compared to the 2012-2013 assessment cycle, more programs in A&S submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. For the 2012-2013 assessment cycle, only nine (8.3%) academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher whereas 42 (40%) programs submitted assessment documentation for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher.

The overall assessment maturity average for A&S, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, improved from 0.38 for the 2012-2013 assessment cycle to 1.53 for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. In other words, the College progressed from the equivalent of a Level 0 assessment maturity average to the equivalent of a Level 2 assessment maturity average based on the original APAM rubric.

Areas of Improvement

In order to improve the assessment reporting process in A&S, for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, the College began increasing its assessment outreach efforts through individual meetings as well as workshops for academic programs that were new to the assessment efforts as well as those that were more established in this regard.

The College also introduced the Learning Improvement Awards program, which awarded selected academic programs up to \$1,000 for using assessment data to make significant program improvements to their assessment process or curricula.

In addition, in order to increase participation in the assessment reporting, review and evaluation process at the program and college level for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, A&S implemented the following initiatives.

- The College has tied some department funding to active participation in assessment processes, including the submission of annual program assessment reports.
- The College has been working to make existing work public and provide additional resources to departments by dedicating a section of its website to assessment.

- The College has moved to a more formal CARC structure, which meets monthly for the entire academic year and engages in strategic planning in addition to the more basic function of evaluating assessment reports and assessment plans. Members are provided with stipends in exchange for their service.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The revised APAM rubric will be administered to evaluate the assessment documentation that are submitted for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle and thus, will provide a new baseline for improvement and progress. Consequently, goals for continuous improvement have not been articulated for the 2014-2014 assessment cycle.

In addition, the College was tasked with developing and/or revising its assessment webpage/website to display the assessment plan of each of its academic programs as well as provide program assessment-related and/or student performance information for A&S faculty, staff, and students and external constituents. The purpose of this task was to demonstrate compliance in ensuring that current and accurate information regarding academic programs’ learning goals, student learning outcomes, assessment measurements and/or other pertinent program assessment-related information are publicly available and easily accessible to faculty, staff, students, and the UNM community.

College of Education

The College of Education (COE) consisted of a total of 53 active academic degree and certificate programs, including concentrations, during the 2013-2014 academic year. Five of the 53 programs either did not have students enrolled or were no longer enrolling student due to the programs being sunsetted. Two of the remaining 48 programs were newly activated certificate programs and, as of yet, had not collected program assessment data. The number of each concentration and type of degree and certificate associated with the remaining 46 active COE academic program follows:

COE Degrees/Certificates	No.
Bachelor of Arts in Education (B.A.Ed.)	2
Bachelor of Science in Education (B.S.Ed.)	5
Bachelor of Science (B.S.)	6
Master of Arts (M.A.)	13
Master of Science (M.S.)	5
Master of Arts + Licensure (M.A.+Licensure)	1
Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)	10
Education Specialist (Ed.S.)	1

Education Doctorate (Ed.D.)	2
Certificate (Cert.)	1

Concerns/Issues

There are no known assessment-related issues for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle that should be addressed within COE.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2012-2013 Institutional State of Assessment Report includes a listing of 42 active academic programs whereas the 2013-2014 Institutional State of Assessment Report includes a listing of 46 active academic programs.

Overall, COE has demonstrated progress and improvement between the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles in its collection, reporting, review and/or evaluation of the assessment practices of its academic programs.

Tables 1 and 2 below provide an overview of the percentages of the academic programs performing at each assessment maturity level for the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles, which are based on the maturity average score (rounded up where relevant) received by each program.

Table 1: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2012-2013					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
College of Education (42)	81% (34)	2.4% (1)	2.4% (1)	4.8% (2)	9.5% (4)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2013-2014					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
College of Education (46)	11% (5)	0% (0)	0% (0)	22% (10)	67% (31)

For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, based on the original APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicates that only five of the 46 COE academic programs did not submit an assessment plan and/or assessment report for this assessment cycle. However, compared to the 2012-2013 assessment cycle, more programs in COE submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. For the 2012-2013 assessment cycle, only seven (17%) academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher whereas 41 (89%) programs submitted assessment documentation for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher.

The overall assessment maturity average for COE, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, improved from 0.56 for the 2012-2013 assessment cycle to 3.2 for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. In other words, the College progressed from the equivalent of a Level 1

assessment maturity average to the equivalent of a Level 3 assessment maturity average based on the original APAM rubric.

Areas of Improvement

There was evidence of overall progress toward a culture of continuous assessment among the College of Education academic programs for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. Many programs included multiple assessments (direct and indirect) for their student learning outcomes. Overall, academic programs did a better job than in previous academic years of analyzing and reflecting on their program assessment data as well as providing recommendations and action items for how to make improvements based on the assessment results. Regarding weaknesses or challenges that were revealed by the program assessment maturity evaluation, although overall participation in the process was good, with some programs embracing a proactive culture of assessment, there were still several programs where the depth of analysis and reflection on assessment data indicated significant areas in need of improvement.

To address these issues for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, there will be close monitoring and consultation at the associate dean level with program coordinators and faculty in programs where the assessment maturity average was below 3.0.

Strategic planning efforts also are in progress for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. As part of restructuring efforts in the College of Education to better support and maintain a culture of continuous assessment and improvement, two associate deans will be assigned the role of monitoring program assessment outcomes across the College--one for educator preparation programs and one for non-educator preparation programs. This change is not only intended to provide more focus on creating a culture of continuous improvement in the College but also to support proactive assessment practices and reflective dialogue among program faculty across the College.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The revised APAM rubric will be administered to evaluate the assessment documentation that are submitted for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle and thus, will provide a new baseline for improvement and progress. Consequently, goals for continuous improvement have not been articulated for the 2014-2014 assessment cycle.

In addition, the College was tasked with developing and/or revising its assessment webpage/website to display the assessment plan of each of its academic programs as well as provide program assessment-related and/or student performance information for COE faculty, staff, and students and external constituents. The purpose of this task was to demonstrate compliance in ensuring that current and accurate information regarding academic programs' learning goals, student learning outcomes, assessment measurements and/or other pertinent program assessment-related information are publicly available and easily accessible to faculty, staff, students, and the UNM community.

College of Fine Arts

During 2012-2013 academic year, the College of Fine Arts (CFA) consisted of a total of 18 active academic degree and minor programs whereas during the 2013-2014 academic year, CFA consisted of a

total of 20 active academic degree and minor programs. The number of each type of degree and minor program that is offered by CFA follows:

CFA Degrees/Certificates	No.
Bachelor of Arts (B.A.)	7
Bachelor of Fine Arts (B.F.A.)	2
Bachelor of Music (B.M.)	1
Bachelor of Music Education (B.M.A.)	1
Master of Arts (M.A.)	2
Master of Fine Arts (M.F.A.)	3
Master of Music (M.Mu.)	1
Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)	1
Minor (Undergrad. and Grad.)	2

Concerns/Issues

The following are a few assessment-related issues that should be addressed within ASM.

- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, some of CFA’s academic programs did not provide measurable student learning outcomes.
- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, some of CFA’s academic programs utilized course-level assessment measures instead of program-level assessment methods.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2012-2013 Institutional State of Assessment Report includes a listing of 18 active academic programs whereas the 2013-2014 Institutional State of Assessment Report includes a listing of 20 active academic programs.

Overall, CFA has demonstrated progress and improvement between the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles in its collection, reporting, review and/or evaluation of the assessment practices of its academic programs.

Tables 1 and 2 below provide an overview of the percentages of the academic programs performing at each assessment maturity level for the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles, which are based on the maturity average score (rounded up where relevant) received by each program.

Table 1: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2012-2013					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
College of Fine Arts (18)	56% (10)	28% (5)	11% (2)	5.6% (1)	0% (0)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2013-2014					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
College of Fine Arts (20)	5% (1)	0% (0)	10% (2)	50% (10)	35% (7)

For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, based on the original APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicates that only one of the 20 CFA academic programs did not submit an assessment plan and/or assessment report for this assessment cycle. However, compared to the 2012-2013 assessment cycle, more programs in CFA submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. For the 2012-2013 assessment cycle, only three (17%) academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher whereas 19 (95%) programs submitted assessment documentation for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher.

The overall assessment maturity average for CFA, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, improved from 0.69 for the 2012-2013 assessment cycle to 3.0 for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. In other words, the College progressed from the equivalent of a Level 1 assessment maturity average to the equivalent of a Level 3 assessment maturity average based on the original APAM rubric.

Areas of Improvement

The College of Fine Arts has begun to take continuous assessment as a reality. Numerous factors indicate this new “normal.” For instance, the Department of Art and Art History has introduced a new course – a capstone to address program outcomes for the entire art studio program. All CFA departments have agreed to review and realign program outcomes with course syllabi. Additionally, the associate dean have met continuously with chairs and assessment coordinators in each department throughout this past academic year. There is a new sense of the significance of role of assessment as a tool (rather than as a weapon).

The associate dean has instituted quarterly meetings with Chairs with Assessment coordinators. The CFA CARC meetings take place four times per academic year. All academic programs have mapped their student learning outcomes and learning goals in TK20. This was an enormous step for the College. Most of the programs have baseline data; but they need to work on mid-point and end point data collection.

The College has two programs (i.e., Arts Management and Interdisciplinary Film and Digital Media) that are working to start participating the College’s continuous assessment process. Both programs have been represented in the CFA CARC for the first time in Fall 2014. The program assessment for Arts Management program for Spring 2014 is in the process of being added to Tk20. Due to a family illness involving the program’s assessment report writer, it is not available yet. The CFA CARC is having a

retreat in Spring of 2015 to work on reviewing and/or updating program assessment plans for the 2014-2015 assessment reporting cycle.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The revised APAM rubric will be administered to evaluate the assessment documentation that are submitted for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle and thus, will provide a new baseline for improvement and progress. Consequently, goals for continuous improvement have not been articulated for the 2014-2014 assessment cycle.

In addition, the College was tasked with developing and/or revising its assessment webpage/website to display the assessment plan of each of its academic programs as well as provide program assessment-related and/or student performance information for CFA faculty, staff, and students and external constituents. The purpose of this task was to demonstrate compliance in ensuring that current and accurate information regarding academic programs' learning goals, student learning outcomes, assessment measurements and/or other pertinent program assessment-related information are publicly available and easily accessible to faculty, staff, students, and the UNM community.

College of University Libraries and Learning Sciences

Similar to the 2012-2013 academic year, the College of University Libraries and Learning Sciences (CULLS) consisted of a total of four active academic degree and certificate programs during the 2013-2014 academic year. The number of each type of degree and certificate program that is offered by CULLS follows:

CULLS Degrees/Certificates	No.
Bachelor of Science (B.S.)	1
Master of Arts (M.A.)	1
Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)	1
Certificate	1

Concerns/Issues

There are no known assessment-related issues for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle that should be addressed within CULLS.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Institutional State of Assessment Reports include a listing of four active academic programs.

Overall, CULLS has demonstrated progress and improvement between the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles in its collection, reporting, review and/or evaluation of the assessment practices of its academic programs.

Tables 1 and 2 below provide an overview of the percentages of the academic programs performing at each assessment maturity level for the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles, which are based on the maturity average score (rounded up where relevant) received by each program.

Table 1: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2012-2013					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
College of University Libraries and Learning Sciences (4)	0% (0)	50% (2)	50% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2013-2014					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
College of University Libraries and Learning Sciences (4)	0% (0)	25% (1)	25% (1)	50% (2)	0% (0)

For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, based on the original APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that none of the four CULLS academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report for this assessment cycle. For the 2012-2013 assessment cycle, 50% of the academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher whereas three (75%) of the four programs submitted assessment documentation for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher.

The overall assessment maturity average for CULLS, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, improved from 1.0 for the 2012-2013 assessment cycle to 2.1 for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. In other words, the College progressed from the equivalent of a Level 1 assessment maturity average to the equivalent of a Level 2 assessment maturity average based on the original APAM rubric.

Areas of Improvement

During the last academic year, the OILS program began the transition from mapping student learning outcomes (SLOs) to individual classes to aggregating data from key milestones. The OILS program: (1) lifted the moratorium on admitting new students to the Technology & Training bachelor degree program and developed a process for aggregating data their culminating practicum; (2) developed a process for aggregating data from master students' portfolios from their capstone internship portfolios; and (3) developed a process for aggregating data from doctoral student core courses, comprehensive examinations, and dissertations proposals and defenses. The OILS program began collecting data on master graduate students during Fall 2013 and on doctoral graduate students during Spring 2014. The OILS program's faculty decided to delay the evaluation of the Education Specialist Certificate program until the 2015-2016 academic year since there are no students currently enrolled in the program.

For the B.S. OILS has established a three-year assessment plan for the OILS 2+2 Technology & Training (B.S.) program. The 2014-2015 assessment cycle is the first year of the assessment plan. The OILS

program will collect assessment data during 2014-2015 academic year. The assessment data will be collected and aggregated from the student portfolio associated with the required culminating 100 hour practicum. Assessment measures will be administered during 2015-2016 academic year. Recommendations for program changes will be implemented during the 2016-2017 academic year.

Once the B.S. program was revitalized and the moratorium was lifted, CULLS added a faculty member to its 2014-2015 hiring plan who will serve as a program coordinator with the charge to lead, administer, coordinate, and take primary responsibility for reinvigorating the 2+2 program. Among other duties, the 2+2 program coordinator will assess the curriculum and student learning outcomes and make modifications that will best serve New Mexico workforce needs. That position is currently being advertised for an intended hire for the 2014-2015 academic year.

For the M.A. program, the OILS program has established a three-year assessment plan. The OILS program's faculty will continue to score and aggregate student data from the portfolios. Further assessment will be conducted during the 2014-2015 academic year. Recommendations for program changes to be implemented during the 2015-2016 academic year.

For the Ph.D. program, the OILS program has established a three-year assessment plan. The OILS program's faculty will continue to score and aggregate student data from the portfolios. Further assessment will be conducted during the 2014-2015 academic year, along with changes in feedback that are given on student writing, which is a result of and in response to one assessment data finding. Other recommendations for program changes will be made during the 2014-2015 academic year and implemented during the 2015-2016 academic year.

The OILS program's faculty will review the Education Specialist Certificate program for future viability during the 2015-2016 academic year.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The revised APAM rubric will be administered to evaluate the assessment documentation that are submitted for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle and thus, will provide a new baseline for improvement and progress. Consequently, goals for continuous improvement have not been articulated for the 2014-2014 assessment cycle.

In addition, the College was tasked with developing and/or revising its assessment webpage/website to display the assessment plan of each of its academic programs as well as provide program assessment-related and/or student performance information for CULLS faculty, staff, and students and external constituents. The purpose of this task was to demonstrate compliance in ensuring that current and accurate information regarding academic programs' learning goals, student learning outcomes, assessment measurements and/or other pertinent program assessment-related information are publicly available and easily accessible to faculty, staff, students, and the UNM community.

Graduate Studies

Similar to the 2012-2013 academic year, Graduate Studies (GS) consisted of a total of one active academic degree program during the 2013-2014 academic year. The degree program that is offered by GS is the Water Resources (M.W.R.) academic program.

Concerns/Issues

The following are a few assessment-related issues that should be addressed within GS.

- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, the academic program did not collect assessment results for analysis.
- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, the rubric for the Professional Project need to be revised to address feedback provided by Tom Roots during the previous assessment cycle.
- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, no State of Assessment Report was submitted by GS.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Institutional State of Assessment Reports include a listing of one active academic program.

Tables 1 and 2 below provide an overview of the percentages of the academic programs performing at each assessment maturity level for the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles, which are based on the maturity average score (rounded up where relevant) received by each program.

Table 1: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2013-2014					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
Graduate Studies (1)	0% (0)	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2013-2014					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
Graduate Studies (1)	0% (0)	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, based on the original APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that the GS academic program did submit an assessment plan and/or assessment report for this assessment cycle. For both the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles, the academic program submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report that received an assessment maturity average below a Level 2.

The overall assessment maturity average for GS, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for its academic program, stayed the same at 1.08 for the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles. In other words, GS maintained the equivalent of a Level 1 assessment maturity average based on the original APAM rubric.

Areas of Improvement

A State of Assessment Report was not submitted for GS for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. Therefore, the Office of Assessment was unable to provide a summary of the GS culture of continuous assessment or other areas of improvement at the college level. However, the following areas of improvement were highlighted in the program's assessment progress report.

- A new program director for the M.W.R. program was designated in August 2013.
- There is only a 0.5 faculty hire in the M.W.R. program. Approximately 70% of semester credit hours are taken in classes outside of the program's core which are spread across five colleges/schools. The new Director met with participating faculty to discuss broad learning goals for the program, curriculum, concerns with pedagogy, etc. With respect to the program's 2009 assessment plan, no specific discussion occurred, and no actions were taken.
- As of February 2015, after some effort, the original assessment plan that was approved in 2009 was located. The program has started entering all program assessment data collected since 2010 up to March 2015 into a spreadsheet.
- Statistical summaries and analyses of program assessment data garnered from the program's scoring rubrics will be performed. This will be shared with the Associate Director, key participating faculty and the Program Committee, and then reported in the program's 2014-2015 annual assessment report.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The revised APAM rubric will be administered to evaluate the assessment documentation that are submitted for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle and thus, will provide a new baseline for improvement and progress. Consequently, goals for continuous improvement have not been articulated for the 2014-2014 assessment cycle.

In addition, Graduate Studies was tasked with developing and/or revising its assessment webpage/website to display the assessment plan of its academic program as well as provide program assessment-related and/or student performance information for A&S faculty, staff, and students and external constituents. The purpose of this task was to demonstrate compliance in ensuring that current and accurate information regarding academic programs' learning goals, student learning outcomes, assessment measurements and/or other pertinent program assessment-related information are publicly available and easily accessible to faculty, staff, students, and the UNM community.

Honors College

Similar to the 2012-2013 academic year, the Honors College (HC) consisted of a total of one active academic degree program during the 2013-2014 academic year. The degree program that is offered by HC is the Interdisciplinary Liberal Arts (B.A.) academic program.

Concerns/Issues

The following are a few assessment-related issues that should be addressed within HC.

- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, some of HC's program student learning outcomes (SLOS) needed to be reworded for measurability.
- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, HC's academic program utilized course-level assessment measures instead of program-level assessment methods.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Institutional State of Assessment Reports include a listing of one active academic program.

Tables 1 and 2 below provide an overview of the percentages of the academic programs performing at each assessment maturity level for the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles, which are based on the maturity average score (rounded up where relevant) received by each program.

Table 1: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2012-2013					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
Honors College (1)	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2013-2014					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
Honors College (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)

For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, based on the original APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that the HC academic program submitted an assessment plan that required revising for this assessment cycle. For the 2012-2013 cycle, the academic program submitted an assessment plan that received an assessment maturity average below a Level 2 whereas for 2013-2014 assessment cycle, the academic program submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report that received an assessment maturity average at a Level 2.

The overall assessment maturity average for HC, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for its academic program, improved from 0.5 for the 2012-2013 assessment cycle to 2.3 for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. In other words, the College progressed from the equivalent of a Level 1 assessment maturity average to the equivalent of a Level 2 assessment maturity average based on the original APAM rubric.

Areas of Improvement

The Honors College is new considering that it was created in 2012.

At that time, the HC was approved to grant a B.A. and to offer Core courses. Part of the development of the B.A. program and the Core courses was a very in-depth consideration of learning goals and student learning outcomes (SLOs) and program assessment methods, which was a new concept for the HC faculty.

The HC Assessment Coordinator faculty member has worked to bring the faculty up-to-speed on the program assessment process with great success. The HC faculty, as a whole, serve as the HC CARC, since it is such a small college. They have worked hard to comply with the assessment policies, to include assessing nearly half of the program's SLOs in the first year.

In addition, with the assistance of the UNM Director of Assessment, the College administered the CLA+ to more than fifty freshmen this year, and an outside evaluator was brought in mid-semester to evaluate progress on identified SLOs in select courses. The Dean of the HC characterizes the culture of continuous assessment as being very proactive and involved in program assessment practices.

The weakness of HC is its newness. It has no history; and therefore, no historic program assessment data against which to compare. As a new college, HC is on the steep portion of its program assessment learning curve. The College has an aggressive plan in place to quickly come up-to-speed with its program assessment practices and has been proactive in refining program rubrics and SLOs. HC has devoted significant resources to this effort. Because the HC CARC consists of the entire HC faculty, program assessment is a part of faculty meetings. It is also an element of the College's annual retreat. Faculty have discussed refinements to the program's SLOs in response to assessment results from last year; and they have instituted writing workshops for freshmen, the need for which was revealed in 2013-2014 assessment results.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The revised APAM rubric will be administered to evaluate the assessment documentation that are submitted for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle and thus, will provide a new baseline for improvement and progress. Consequently, goals for continuous improvement have not been articulated for the 2014-2014 assessment cycle.

In addition, the College was tasked with developing and/or revising its assessment webpage/website to display the assessment plan of its academic program as well as provide program assessment-related and/or student performance information for HC faculty, staff, and students and external constituents. The purpose of this task was to demonstrate compliance in ensuring that current and accurate information regarding academic programs' learning goals, student learning outcomes, assessment measurements and/or other pertinent program assessment-related information are publicly available and easily accessible to faculty, staff, students, and the UNM community.

School of Architecture and Planning

Similar to the 2012-2013 academic year, the School of Architecture and Planning (SA+P) consisted of a total of eight active academic degree and certificate programs during the 2013-2014 academic year. The number of each type of degree and certificate program that is offered by SA+P follows:

SA+P Degrees/Certificates	No.
Bachelor of Arts in Architecture (B.A.A.)	1
Bachelor of Arts in Environmental, Planning, & Design (B.A.E.P.D.)	1
Master of Architecture (M.Arch.)	1
Master of Science (M.S.)	1
Master of Community and Regional Planning (M.C.R.P.)	1

Master of Landscape Architecture (M.L.A.)	1
Certificate	2

Concerns/Issues

The following are a few assessment-related issues that should be addressed within SA+P.

- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, SA+P submitted program assessment plans but did not submit annual program assessment reports. However, since the original APAM rubric focused mainly on the aspects of the program assessment plan and not on the aspects of the annual assessment report, the Office of Assessment was able to administer the APAM rubric to evaluate the programs' assessment plan. However, the revised APAM rubric will focus on specific aspects of the annual program assessment report, with the exception of the first row of the rubric, which will require that an annual program assessment report, with accompanying evidence, is submitted for each academic program.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Institutional State of Assessment Reports include a listing of eight active academic programs.

Overall, SA+P has demonstrated progress and improvement between the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles in its collection, reporting, review and/or evaluation of the assessment practices of its academic programs.

Tables 1 and 2 below provide an overview of the percentages of the academic programs performing at each assessment maturity level for the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles, which are based on the maturity average score (rounded up where relevant) received by each program.

Table 1: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2012-2013					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
School of Architecture and Planning (8)	0% (0)	25% (2)	50% (4)	25% (2)	0% (0)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2013-2014					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
School of Architecture and Planning (8)	0% (0)	13% (1)	25% (2)	13% (1)	50% (4)

For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, based on the original APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicates that none of the eight SA+P academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report for this assessment cycle. For the 2012-2013 assessment cycle, six (75%) of the eight academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher whereas seven (88%) of the eight programs submitted

assessment documentation for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher.

The overall assessment maturity average for SA+P, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, improved from 2.07 for the 2012-2013 assessment cycle to 2.83 for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. In other words, the School progressed from the equivalent of a Level 2 assessment maturity average to the equivalent of a Level 3 assessment maturity average based on the original APAM rubric.

Areas of Improvement

Unfortunately, no annual program assessment reports were submitted for any of the SA+P academic programs for this assessment cycle; so the Office of Assessment was unable to access the annual program assessment report for each SA+P program.

The SA+P academic programs continuously evaluate their curricular activities and make improvements every semester. The M.Arch. program is reviewed annually and any major changes to the program are reported to the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), program's accrediting body. Other professional accredited programs in SA+P follow the same process: Community and Regional Planning (CRP) program reports any major changes to the Planning Accreditation Board (PAB) and the Landscape Architecture (LA) program reports any major changes to the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB).

The M.S. in Architecture program was revised to reflect current attitudes in these types of programs throughout the country. These revisions were submitted for approval to the Faculty Senate via the UNM Curriculum Workflow Process. The Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Planning and Design (BAEPD) degree programs and one of the graduate certificate programs (i.e., Urban and Regional Design (URD)) have focused program efforts on improvement in enrollment.

Program curricular issues are discussed in faculty meetings and if necessary, faculty retreats are conducted to discuss major program curricular changes. In fact, the School is having an architecture program retreat on February 28, 2015. Also, the School has created the new position of Special Assistant to the Dean for Outcomes Assessment and Quality Measurements in order to support and enhance program improvement as well as to advance the assessment maturity of programs' assessment practices for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The revised APAM rubric will be administered to evaluate the assessment documentation that are submitted for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle and thus, will provide a new baseline for improvement and progress. Consequently, goals for continuous improvement have not been articulated for the 2014-2014 assessment cycle.

In addition, the School was tasked with developing and/or revising its assessment webpage/website to display the assessment plan of each of its academic programs as well as provide program assessment-related and/or student performance information for SA+P faculty, staff, and students and external constituents. The purpose of this task was to demonstrate compliance in ensuring that current and accurate information regarding academic programs'

learning goals, student learning outcomes, assessment measurements and/or other pertinent program assessment-related information are publicly available and easily accessible to faculty, staff, students, and the UNM community.

School of Engineering

For the 2012-2013 academic year, the School of Engineering (SoE) consisted of a total of 27 active academic degree and certificate programs. For the 2013-2014 academic year, 30 active academic degree and certificate programs including concentrations. The number of each type of concentration and degree and certificate program that is offered by SoE follows:

SoE Degrees/Certificates	No.
Bachelor of Science (B.S.)	9
Master of Science (M.S.)	10
Master of Engineering (M.Eng.)	1
Master of Manufacturing Engineering (M.E.M.E.)	1
Master of Construction Management (M.C.M.)	1
Doctor of Philosophy in Engineering (Ph.D.) for seven concentrations	7
Certificate	1

Concerns/Issues

The following are a few assessment-related issues that should be addressed within SoE.

- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, some of SoE’s academic programs should review and reword their student learning outcomes (SLOs) for measurability.
- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, some of SoE’s academic programs utilized course-level assessment measures instead of program-level assessment methods.
- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, SoE’s academic programs did not utilize the University’s approved and required annual program assessment reporting template. As a result, it was difficult for the Office of Assessment to administer the original APAM rubric to evaluate assessment practices and assessment maturity of SoE’s academic programs.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2012-2013 Institutional State of Assessment Report includes a listing 27 active academic programs whereas the 2013-2014 Institutional State of Assessment Report includes a listing of 30 active academic programs.

Overall, SoE has demonstrated progress and improvement between the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles in its collection, reporting, review and/or evaluation of the assessment practices of its academic programs.

Tables 1 and 2 below provide an overview of the percentages of the academic programs performing at each assessment maturity level for the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles, which are based on the maturity average score (rounded up where relevant) received by each program.

Table 1: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2012-2013					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
School of Engineering (27)	0% (0)	15% (4)	85% (23)	0% (0)	0% (0)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2013-2014					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
School of Engineering (30)	3.3% (1)	0% (0)	67% (20)	30% (9)	0% (0)

For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, based on the original APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicates that only one of the 30 SoE academic programs did not submit an assessment plan and/or assessment report for this assessment cycle. For the 2012-2013 assessment cycle, 23 (85%) out of 27 academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher whereas 29 (97%) of the 30 programs submitted assessment documentation for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher.

The overall assessment maturity average for SoE, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, improved from 1.94 for the 2012-2013 assessment cycle to 2.33 for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. In other words, the School maintained the equivalent of a Level 2 assessment maturity average based on the original APAM rubric.

Areas of Improvement

The SoE has a very well developed culture of assessment and continuous improvement for all of its undergraduate academic programs as evidenced by their accreditation by ABET (i.e., engineering and computer science) and ACCE (i.e., construction management). Since the School's external accreditation is at the undergraduate level only, the culture of assessment is far less developed at the graduate level. However, the School has begun to strengthen the culture at the graduate level by charging the SoE Academic Council with the role of the SoE CARC, which oversees the further development and improvement of program assessment at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Although the SoE's program assessment plans have evolved over the years, its undergraduate programs have been using the same plan of assessment and continuous improvement since the late 1990s. Due to many factors such as turnover of faculty responsible for assessment, changes in department leadership, etc., the program assessment structure for each academic program is not always carried out exactly

every year as stated in the programs' assessment plan. However, overall, the culture of assessment and continuous improvement is mature.

Because only the undergraduate programs were professionally accredited, previously, there was no culture of assessment for any of the School's graduate programs. Starting with the preparation for the next UNM accreditation review by the HLC, SoE began to review, improve, and/or develop the assessment structure and processes for each graduate program. Although a school-wide graduate program assessment structure was established, the administration of the graduate level assessment measurements was left up to each individual department. As a result, the level of rigor in administering and implementing graduate assessment measurements varied among the SoE departments; and there were virtually no discussions of graduate program assessment data within any of the departments.

Starting in the 2013-2014 academic year, the SoE Academic Council took over the role of the SoE CARC and started to discuss ways to create a stronger culture of assessment at the graduate program level similar to that at the undergraduate level.

During 2013-2014 academic year, all of the program rubrics used for assessment at the graduate level were updated and improved by the SoE CARC. Also, graduate program assessment plans were updated and strengthened. This involved strong leadership and supervision of the assessment process by the SoE CARC, including the discussion of undergraduate and graduate program assessment results for the School, as a whole, in meetings of the SoE CARC.

The administration and implementation of new graduate program rubrics and assessment plans are targeted for the 2014-2015 academic year. Going forward, the SoE CARC will monitor the graduate programs progress towards improving their culture of assessment during the current academic year in order to make recommendations to the relevant departments for strengthening their graduate programs' assessment structure.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The revised APAM rubric will be administered to evaluate the assessment documentation that are submitted for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle and thus, will provide a new baseline for improvement and progress. Consequently, goals for continuous improvement have not been articulated for the 2014-2014 assessment cycle.

In addition, the School was tasked with developing and/or revising its assessment webpage/website to display the assessment plan of each of its academic programs as well as provide program assessment-related and/or student performance information for SOE faculty, staff, and students and external constituents. The purpose of this task was to demonstrate compliance in ensuring that current and accurate information regarding academic programs' learning goals, student learning outcomes, assessment measurements and/or other pertinent program assessment-related information are publicly available and easily accessible to faculty, staff, students, and the UNM community.

School of Public Administration

Similar to the 2012-2013 academic year, the School of Public Administration (SPA) consisted of a total of two active graduate academic degree programs during the 2013-2014 academic year. The number of each type of degree and certificate program that is offered by SPA follows:

SPA Degrees/Certificates	No.
Master of Public Administration (M.P.A.)	1
Master of Health Administration (M.H.A.)	1

Concerns/Issues

The following are a few assessment-related issues that should be addressed within SPA.

- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, SPA’s academic programs should review and reword some of their student learning outcomes (SLOs) for measurability.
- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, some of SPA’s academic programs mainly utilized course-level assessment measures instead of program-level assessment methods.
- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, SPA’s academic programs did not utilize the University’s approved and required annual program assessment reporting template. As a result, it was difficult for the Office of Assessment to administer the original APAM rubric to evaluate assessment practices and assessment maturity of SPA’s academic programs.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Institutional State of Assessment Reports include a listing two active graduate academic programs.

Tables 1 and 2 below provide an overview of the percentages of the academic programs performing at each assessment maturity level for the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles, which are based on the maturity average score (rounded up where relevant) received by each program.

Table 1: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2012-2013					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
School of Public Administration (2)	50% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	50% (1)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2013-2014					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
School of Public Administration (2)	50% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	50% (1)	0% (0)

For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, based on the original APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicates that one of the two SPA academic programs did not submit an assessment plan and/or assessment report for this assessment cycle. For both the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles, 50% of the academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher.

The overall assessment maturity average for SPA, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, decreased from 1.96 for the 2012-2013 assessment cycle to 1.42 for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. In other words, the School decreased from the equivalent of a Level 2 assessment maturity average to the equivalent of a Level 1 assessment maturity average based on the original APAM rubric.

Areas of Improvement

As public administration specialists, the School's regular faculty is well versed in continuous program assessment and improvement methods; and two of the faculty specifically are recognized for their expertise in program evaluation and performance measurement. SPA faculty work together with staff toward this end, and a culture of assessment has in-fact become strongly established at the School over at least a decade. However, in order to be able to demonstrate that the evaluation of student learning and continuous program improvement have become an integral part of the School's organizational culture, the assessment plan for the programs will need to be implemented a few more assessment cycles.

SPA faculty are expected to include the assigned program student learning outcomes (SLOs) in their syllabi for core courses, measure student performance using best-practice methods, and report aggregate student performance results to the University as well as to regional and national accrediting organizations. In addition, program evaluation data is derived from the administration of program surveys to current students, graduating students, alumni, and employers as well as from students' feedback and evaluations of courses each semester. SPA now has an integrated framework of performance indicators through which to measure and report corresponding SLOs, creating a more coherent accountability system that will continue to be strengthened over time. A regular forum for such continuous improvement is the SPA annual faculty strategic retreat, which is customarily scheduled in early January each academic year.

The overall state of assessment for the SPA is very good for the M.P.A. program. With the addition of two new faculty for the M.H.A. program, it is now time to begin the review of the program's curriculum, develop learning goals and SLOs for assessment, and implement an assessment plan to capture and record of program assessment data to inform continuous program improvement. With regard to the M.H.A. program, the restructuring of the M.H.A. program with newly designated program coordinator is being discussed by the SPA faculty. If approved, this function or responsibility will be added to the portfolio of the new coordinator.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The revised APAM rubric will be administered to evaluate the assessment documentation that are submitted for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle and thus, will provide a new baseline for

improvement and progress. Consequently, goals for continuous improvement have not been articulated for the 2014-2014 assessment cycle.

In addition, the School was tasked with developing and/or revising its assessment webpage/website to display the assessment plan of each of its academic programs as well as provide program assessment-related and/or student performance information for SPA faculty, staff, and students and external constituents. The purpose of this task was to demonstrate compliance in ensuring that current and accurate information regarding academic programs' learning goals, student learning outcomes, assessment measurements and/or other pertinent program assessment-related information are publicly available and easily accessible to faculty, staff, students, and the UNM community.

University College

Similar to the 2012-2013 academic year, the University College (UC) consisted of a total of three active academic degree and certificate programs during the 2013-2014 academic year. The number of each type of degree and certificate program that is offered by UC follows:

UC Degrees/Certificates	No.
Bachelor of Arts (B.A.)	1
Bachelor of Liberal Arts (B.L.A.)	1
Bachelor of Integrative Studies (B.I.S.)	1

Concerns/Issues

The following are a few assessment-related issues that should be addressed within UC.

- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, some of UC’s academic programs mainly utilized course-level assessment measures instead of program-level assessment methods.
- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, an assessment plan was not provided for the B.I.S. program.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Institutional State of Assessment Reports include a listing three active academic programs.

Tables 1 and 2 below provide an overview of the percentages of the academic programs performing at each assessment maturity level for the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles, which are based on the maturity average score (rounded up where relevant) received by each program.

Table 1: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2012-2013					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
University College (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2013-2014					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
University College (3)	33% (1)	67% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, based on the original APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that one of the three UC academic programs did not submit an assessment plan and/or assessment report for this assessment cycle. For the 2012-2013 assessment cycle, all three academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher whereas none of the three programs submitted assessment documentation for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher.

The overall assessment maturity average for UC, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, decreased from 1.83 for the 2012-2013 assessment cycle to 1.67 for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. In other words, the College maintained the equivalent of a Level 2 assessment maturity average based on the original APAM rubric.

Areas of Improvement

The B.L.A. and B.I.S. academic programs offer highly individualized degrees, and so UC struggled with identifying uniform program-level learning goals and student learning outcomes (SLOs). In addition, these programs do not have program-specific faculty designated to them. Students enrolled in the B.L.A. and B.I.S. academic programs take courses offered throughout UNM. However, efforts are being made to assess students’ ability to articulate their degree program, but learning in these degrees is so highly dispersed that UC is challenged in determining a realistic way to systematically address students’ successes and deficiencies.

Except for N.A.S. program, the College’s programs are quite young. However, undergraduate education is core to the College’s mission, and so program assessment is taken very seriously. Because UC’s programs are difficult to assess neatly with rubrics, the College is concerned that, on paper, it seems that it is not “on board” with program assessment and participating in continuous program improvement, when it actually is in practice.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The revised APAM rubric will be administered to evaluate the assessment documentation that are submitted for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle and thus, will provide a new baseline for improvement and progress. Consequently, goals for continuous improvement have not been articulated for the 2014-2014 assessment cycle.

In addition, the College was tasked with developing and/or revising its assessment webpage/website to display the assessment plan of each of its academic programs as well as provide program assessment-related and/or student performance information for UC faculty, staff, and students and external constituents. The purpose of this task was to demonstrate compliance in ensuring that current and accurate information regarding academic programs’ learning goals,

student learning outcomes, assessment measurements and/or other pertinent program assessment-related information are publicly available and easily accessible to faculty, staff, students, and the UNM community.

College of Nursing

Similar to the 2012-2013 academic year, the College of Nursing (CON) consisted of a total of five active academic degree and certificate programs for the 2013-2014 academic year. The number of each type of degree and certificate program that is offered by CON follows:

CON Degrees/Certificates	No.
Bachelor of Science (B.S.N.)	1
Master of Science (M.S.N.)	1
Nurse Practitioner (D.N.P.)	1
Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)	1
Certificate	1

Concerns/Issues

The following are a few assessment-related issues that should be addressed within CON.

- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, no program assessment plan or annual program assessment report was submitted for any of the CON academic programs for this assessment cycle.
- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, no State of Assessment Report was submitted for CON.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Institutional State of Assessment Reports include a listing five active academic programs.

Tables 1 and 2 below provide an overview of the percentages of the academic programs performing at each assessment maturity level for the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles, which are based on the maturity average score (rounded up where relevant) received by each program.

Table 1: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2012-2013					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
College of Nursing (5)	20% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	40% (2)	40% (2)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2013-2014					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
College of Nursing (5)	100% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, based on the original APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that none of the five CON academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report for this assessment cycle.

The overall assessment maturity average for CON, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, decreased from 2.73 for the 2012-2013 assessment cycle to 0 for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. In other words, the College decreased from the equivalent of a Level 3 assessment maturity average to the equivalent of a Level 0 assessment maturity average based on the original APAM rubric.

Areas of Improvement

A State of Assessment Report was not submitted for CON for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. Also, program assessment plans and annual program assessment reports were not submitted for the CON academic programs for this assessment cycle via OneDrive as required by the Office of Assessment. Therefore, the Office of Assessment was unable to provide a summary of the US culture of continuous assessment or other areas of improvement at the college or program level.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The revised APAM rubric will be administered to evaluate the assessment documentation that are submitted for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle and thus, will provide a new baseline for improvement and progress. Consequently, goals for continuous improvement have not been articulated for the 2014-2014 assessment cycle.

In addition, the College was tasked with developing and/or revising its assessment webpage/website to display the assessment plan of each of its academic programs as well as provide program assessment-related and/or student performance information for CON faculty, staff, and students and external constituents. The purpose of this task was to demonstrate compliance in ensuring that current and accurate information regarding academic programs’ learning goals, student learning outcomes, assessment measurements and/or other pertinent program assessment-related information are publicly available and easily accessible to faculty, staff, students, and the UNM community.

College of Pharmacy

Similar to the 2012-2013 academic year, the College of Pharmacy (COP) consisted of a total of three active academic degree and certificate programs for the 2013-2014 academic year. The number of each type of degree and certificate program that is offered by COP follows:

COP Degrees/Certificates	No.
Pharmacy (Pharm.D.)	1
Master of Science (M.S.)	1
Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)	1

Concerns/Issues

The following are a few assessment-related issues that should be addressed within COP.

- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, no program assessment plan or annual program assessment report was submitted for any of the COP academic programs for this assessment cycle.
- For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, no State of Assessment Report was submitted for COP.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Institutional State of Assessment Reports include a listing three active academic programs.

Tables 1 and 2 below provide an overview of the percentages of the academic programs performing at each assessment maturity level for the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles, which are based on the maturity average score (rounded up where relevant) received by each program.

Table 1: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2012-2013					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
College of Pharmacy (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	67% (2)	33% (1)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2013-2014					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
College of Pharmacy (3)	100% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, based on the original APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that none of the five COP academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report for this assessment cycle.

The overall assessment maturity average for COP, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, decreased from 2.50 for the 2012-2013 assessment cycle to 0 for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. In other words, the College decreased from the equivalent of a Level 2 assessment maturity average to the equivalent of a Level 0 assessment maturity average based on the original APAM rubric.

Areas of Improvement

A State of Assessment Report was not submitted for COP for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. Also, program assessment plans and annual program assessment reports were not submitted for the COP academic programs for this assessment cycle via OneDrive as required by the Office of Assessment. Therefore, the Office of Assessment was unable to provide a summary of the US culture of continuous assessment or other areas of improvement at the college or program level.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The revised APAM rubric will be administered to evaluate the assessment documentation that are submitted for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle and thus, will provide a new baseline for improvement and progress. Consequently, goals for continuous improvement have not been articulated for the 2014-2014 assessment cycle.

In addition, the College was tasked with developing and/or revising its assessment webpage/website to display the assessment plan of each of its academic programs as well as provide program assessment-related and/or student performance information for COP faculty, staff, and students and external constituents. The purpose of this task was to demonstrate compliance in ensuring that current and accurate information regarding academic programs' learning goals, student learning outcomes, assessment measurements and/or other pertinent program assessment-related information are publicly available and easily accessible to faculty, staff, students, and the UNM community.

School of Medicine

For the 2012-2013 academic year, the School of Medicine (SOM) consisted of a total of 23 active academic degree and certificate programs. For the 2013-2014 academic year, SOM consisted of a total of 20 active academic degree and certificate programs. The number of each type of degree and certificate program that is offered by SOM follows:

SOM Degrees/Certificates	No.
Bachelor of Science (B.S.)	4
Master of Science (M.S.)	5
Master of Occupational Therapy (M.O.P.)	1
Master of Public Health (M.P.H.)	1
Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)	1
Doctoral Professional Practitioner (D.P.T., D.M., and D.M./Ph.D.)	3
Certificate	5

Concerns/Issues

There are no known assessment-related issues for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle that should be addressed within SOM.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2012-2013 Institutional State of Assessment Report includes a listing 23 active academic programs whereas the 2013-2014 Institutional State of Assessment Report includes a listing 20 active academic programs.

Overall, SOM has demonstrated progress and improvement between the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles in its collection, reporting, review and/or evaluation of the assessment practices of its academic programs.

Tables 1 and 2 below provide an overview of the percentages of the academic programs performing at each assessment maturity level for the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles, which are based on the maturity average score (rounded up where relevant) received by each program.

Table 1: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2012-2013					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
School of Medicine (23)	100% (23)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2013-2014					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
School of Medicine (20)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (20)

For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, based on the original APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that all of the 20 SOM academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report for this assessment cycle. For the 2012-2013 assessment cycle, all 23 academic programs did not submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher whereas all 20 programs submitted assessment documentation for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher.

The overall assessment maturity average for SOM, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, progressed from 0 for the 2012-2013 assessment cycle to 3.83 for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. In other words, the School improved dramatically from the equivalent of a Level 0 assessment maturity average to the equivalent of a Level 4 assessment maturity average based on the original APAM rubric.

Areas of Improvement

Academic programs in SOM were asked to review their three-year assessment plan to make sure it was current. All programs complied. Through this process, SOM faculty mentioned that they were amazed at

the difference in the assessment plan since they had not reviewed it for a few years. All SOM faculty agreed that the review process was useful.

A culture of continuous assessment is a staple for all of SOM professional degrees on the Health Sciences Campus. The only challenge the School has faced is in finding the time to analyze and evaluate the program assessment data that are collected from our students and then implementing important program improvement every academic year. For this academic year, SOM faculty have decided use the University's Tk20 platform to store and manage its programs' learning goals, student learning outcomes (SLOs), and assessment data in order to help monitor and support a culture of outcome assessment in SOM. This will involve the training of all of the SOM staff by the Office of Assessment on how to use Tk20. In addition, to help emphasize student learning and program assessment, SOM has instituted meetings every quarter to support this culture as well as to keep SOM faculty and staff aware of the importance of program assessment. Because SOM consists of professional programs that are educating and training students who go directly into the healthcare workforce or field, SOM faculty are obligated to make sure that students are ready to be competent employees,

Over the past five years, SOM has succeeded in bringing all of its programs to a very high level of program assessment. One important area that the SOE CARC realized this academic year is that following up on suggestions to the programs need to be better captured and explained in programs' annual assessment report. Therefore, quarterly meetings with programs to provide ongoing feedback will be a priority for the School during the next academic year.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The revised APAM rubric will be administered to evaluate the assessment documentation that are submitted for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle and thus, will provide a new baseline for improvement and progress. Consequently, goals for continuous improvement have not been articulated for the 2014-2014 assessment cycle.

In addition, the School was tasked with developing and/or revising its assessment webpage/website to display the assessment plan of each of its academic programs as well as provide program assessment-related and/or student performance information for SOM faculty, staff, and students and external constituents. The purpose of this task was to demonstrate compliance in ensuring that current and accurate information regarding academic programs' learning goals, student learning outcomes, assessment measurements and/or other pertinent program assessment-related information are publicly available and easily accessible to faculty, staff, students, and the UNM community.

School of Law

Similar to the 2012-2013 academic year, School of Law (SoL) consisted of a total of one active academic degree program during the 2013-2014 academic year. The degree program that is offered by SoL is the J.D. academic program.

Concerns/Issues

There are no known assessment-related issues for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle that should be addressed within SoL.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Institutional State of Assessment Reports include a listing of one active academic program.

Tables 1 and 2 below provide an overview of the percentages of the academic programs performing at each assessment maturity level for the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles, which are based on the maturity average score (rounded up where relevant) received by each program.

Table 1: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2013-2014					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
School of Law (1)	100% (1)	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2013-2014					
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3	Lvl 4
School of Law (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (1)	0% (0)

For the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, based on the original APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that the SoL academic program did submit an assessment plan and/or assessment report for this assessment cycle that received an assessment maturity average a Level 2 or higher.

The overall assessment maturity average for SoL, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for its academic program, progressed from stayed 0.33 for the 2012-2013 to 2.67 for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. In other words, SoL improved from the equivalent of a Level 0 assessment maturity average to the equivalent of a Level 3 assessment maturity average based on the original APAM rubric.

Areas of Improvement

The culture of continuous assessment at the SoL is strong in terms of the nationally recognized traditional program assessment measures of student learning that are used by law schools (i.e., bar exam pass rate; LSSSE survey data; and employment outcomes). The School’s faculty and administration take program assessment data seriously and explore opportunities to enhance students’ performance on assessment measures as well as to address problems revealed by these measures. However, the current program assessment measures are too blunt--failing to reveal opportunities and problems with any specificity. This explains why the School’s annual program assessment report for this assessment cycle is somewhat vague on the program assessment results, including the SoL faculty’s reaction to the results.

SoL relies on its committee structure and broad faculty discussions to monitor, support, and maintain a culture of continuous assessment. For example, the School's Curriculum Committee is currently engaged in curricular mapping that utilizes the program's SLOs. And the School's Assessment and Teaching Committee (our CARC) is exploring the development of new program assessment measures that will provide more specific results (e.g., standard student portfolios; course level pre- and post-testing). Finally, the School's Colloquium Committee brings in speakers who engage the faculty in discussions of teaching methodology and assessment.

The School needs to develop measures that provide more specific, direct program assessment data for each student learning outcome (SLO). The School also needs to develop a more defined process for considering the results of assessment measures and for revising and improving the program of legal education based on the results. This process will involve both committee and full law faculty discussions and deliberation.

As for efforts to improve the maturity of the School of Law's assessment practices for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, the School's Assessment and Teaching Committee has been asked to take the lead in developing direct, specific measures of student learning and in formulating a process for faculty discussion, deliberation, and implementation of revisions. The Committee is beginning its work by discussing and considering the development of student portfolios that allow for assessments at critical points in the course of students' legal education. The Committee is also working with the administration to encourage faculty to engage in rigorous assessment of student learning at the course level.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The revised APAM rubric will be administered to evaluate the assessment documentation that are submitted for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle and thus, will provide a new baseline for improvement and progress. Consequently, goals for continuous improvement have not been articulated for the 2014-2014 assessment cycle.

In addition, the School was tasked with developing and/or revising its assessment webpage/website to display the assessment plan of each of its academic programs as well as provide program assessment-related and/or student performance information for SoL faculty, staff, and students and external constituents. The purpose of this task was to demonstrate compliance in ensuring that current and accurate information regarding academic programs' learning goals, student learning outcomes, assessment measurements and/or other pertinent program assessment-related information are publicly available and easily accessible to faculty, staff, students, and the UNM community.

Appendix A: Academic Program Assessment Maturity Rubric

	Evidence of exemplary full implementation	Evidence of completed implementation/ revisions	Evidence of initial implementation/ revisions	Evidence of planning	Evidence not included
	4	3	2	1	0
Broad Learning Goals & Student Learning Outcomes	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs that are clearly and specifically stated, and are linked to program broad learning goals and UNM Learning Goals	Program has developed at least 2 SLOs, but they show some lack of clarity or specificity; may not be linked to UNM Learning Goals	Program has stated some SLOs, but they are too many/too few/too vague and/or immeasurable to be useful.	Program has not solidified SLOs and may still be in the planning/discussion stages. Some/all broad learning goals lack SLOs	Program Learning Goals not enumerated. No indication that the program has considered or even begun drafting SLOs
Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments)	Program has adopted/used multiple assessment measures (both direct and indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has identified/used at least one direct assessment measure for each SLO.	Program has identified at least one assessment measure (direct or indirect) for each SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO.	Assessment methods/measures are not identified or inadequately described.
Timeline for Assessment Implementation	Program has outlined a clear plan for assessment implementation over each of the next 3 years.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation, but that plan is out of date/in need of revision.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation for a three year cycle.	Some parameters have been established but a clear timeline is not evident.	There is no stated implementation timeline.
Data Collection & Analysis	The process for interpretation, presentation, and discussion of assessment results data is clearly described, including who was involved and timing.	Analysis of results data for measured SLOs is described. Faculty findings are described, including SLOs met, partially met, not met, and strengths and weaknesses relative to faculty standards scale/rubric.	Results are reported for at least one SLO relative to a faculty standards scale or rubric. Assessment data is made accessible to the unit and administration.	Results are stated very generally for one or more SLOs, and may not be stated in terms relative to faculty standards and/or the scoring rubric(s) used. Evidence of planning for data collection.	No apparent current/recent data collection. There is no clear statement of assessment results
Implementation of Program Revision	Program clearly shows how assessment findings have been used in recent program revisions, and has identified a plan for further program improvement.	Program has shown evidence of having linked assessment findings to program improvement, but has not yet completed those improvements, and the program may have a plan for doing so in upcoming years.	Program has not sufficiently shown the link between program revisions and assessment findings. Program may lack complete plan to implement improvements based on current data.	Program/assessment changes are recommended, but not clearly linked to assessment results/findings.	Program shows no current evidence of using assessment findings for program/assessment improvement.
Periodic Reporting	Separate report for each program, submitted at least once every three years, includes evidence of faculty discussion of what has been learned about student learning, receives peer review and feedback.	Reports apparently complete and thorough may not have been submitted for peer review and feedback and may or may not advance the latest assessment plan.	Report for a program may include all key elements including acceptable learning outcomes but may lack a strategy for improvement of student learning, program standards, etc.	Report submitted combines multiple programs, may lack key elements (SLOs assessed, measures used, results, findings, recommendations etc.) and/or clarity about which elements apply to which program.	No program assessment report in last three years.

Appendix B: Academic Program Assessment Maturity Rubric - REVISED

	Evidence of Exemplary Implementation	Evidence of Developed Implementation	Evidence of Emergent Implementation	Evidence not Included	COMMENTS/ FEEDBACK
	3	2	1	0	
Assessment Plan	The program has a fully-articulated, sustainable, one-to-three-year assessment plan that includes at least one program goal and three program SLO statements, describes specifically when and how each SLO will be assessed, includes a thorough process of analysis, and outlines how improvements, based on findings, will be implemented. The plan is posted publicly and has been examined and revised within seven years.	The program has a reasonable one-to-three-year assessment plan that includes at least one program goal and three program SLO statements, identifies how each SLO will be assessed and indicate how analysis and implementation of improvements will be conducted. The plan is posted publicly.	Some or no parameters have been established. Assessment plan may still be in the planning/discussion stages. It is under-review or in the pilot stage. A draft of the plan should be posted publicly.	No formal program assessment plan for assessing program learning goal(s) and each program SLO is available and/or posted publicly.	
Measurable Program Student Learning Outcomes	Each targeted SLO statement is clearly measurable, describes how students can demonstrate their learning, and explicitly indicates a level and type of performance or competence (e.g., “Graduates will demonstrate mastery in writing a report in APA style” or “Graduates will demonstrate innovativeness by developing an original product that contributes to biological knowledge.”).	Each targeted SLO statement is clearly measurable and describes how students can demonstrate learning (e.g., “Graduates will write reports in APA style” or “Graduates will make original contributions to biological knowledge.”).	Some of the targeted SLO statement(s) are not clearly measurable and do not identify what students can do to demonstrate learning. Statements such as “Students understand scientific method” do not specify how understanding can be demonstrated and/or assessed.	Most or all of the targeted SLO statement(s) are unclear, not measurable, and/or inadequate.	
Alignment of Program Learning Goals, Student Learning Outcomes, & UNM Learning Goals	The targeted SLO statement(s) are clearly measurable and explicitly stated, and the SLO(s) are appropriately aligned to the program goal(s) and UNM Learning Goals (K, S, and R).	The targeted SLO statement(s) are appropriately aligned to the program goal(s) and UNM Learning Goals (K, S, and/or R).	Some or all of the targeted SLO statement(s), program learning goal(s), and/or UNM Learning Goals (K, S, and/or R) are inappropriately aligned.	The targeted SLO statement(s) have not been aligned to the program goal(s) and/or UNM Learning Goals (K, S, and/or R).	
Program Assessment Methods (Measures/ Instruments)	Program has reported the use of more than three direct program level assessment measures and at least two indirect program level assessment measures to assess its targeted SLOs. Each targeted SLO is assessed using more than one program level assessment measure. Relevant evidence is included.	Program has reported the use of at least two direct program level assessment measures and one indirect program level assessment measure to assess its targeted SLOs. Relevant evidence is included.	Program has reported the use of only one direct and/or indirect program level assessment measure to assess its SLO(s) and/or program reported use of direct and/or indirect assessment measures that are not program level. Relevant evidence is not included.	Reported assessment methods/measures are not clearly identified and/or are inadequately described.	
Data Collection & Analysis	A clear, complete, and succinct analysis, interpretation of and reflection on the assessment results is reported, and it is readily apparent that conclusions were drawn through collaboration and consensus of appropriate stakeholders. Aggregated data is included as evidence.	A clear presentation and interpretation of assessment results is provided for the targeted SLO(s). Aggregated data is included as evidence.	Results are stated very generally or not clearly. Aggregated data is not provided as evidence.	No evidence of data results is provided. No clear analysis of assessment results is reported.	
Implementation of Program Improvements/ Revisions	Specific improvement(s)/change(s) (in assessment process, curriculum, and/or student learning) has been implemented and is clearly responsive to specific needs identified in reported analysis and interpretation of assessment results. Relevant evidence is provided.	Clear and actionable plan(s) for improvement/change (in assessment process, curriculum, and/or student learning) is provided, and for the most part, appear to be appropriate given reported analysis and interpretation of assessment results. Relevant evidence is provided.	Some indication of a need for improvement/change is provided but burden for improvement was placed primarily upon students (students need to do more/be more), or a plan(s) has been reported that is overly broad or generalized. Relevant evidence is not provided.	A plan for improvement of the assessment process, curriculum, and/or student learning is not articulated.	

Appendix C: State of Assessment Report Template

[PLACE Name of College/School/Branch HERE] State of Assessment Report

[PLACE Academic Year HERE] Assessment Period

Instructions: Each academic year, Deans and/or Associate Deans are responsible for 1) evaluating and scoring the assessment maturity of their programs (*Maturity Rubric Scoring Excel Template*) and 2) using the scores to develop a State of Assessment Report for their college/school/branch (*State of Assessment Report Template*).

Overview: Provide a brief overview (approx. 3-6 sentences) of the college/school/branch by addressing questions like the following:

- How would you generally describe the culture of continuous assessment in your college/school/branch (i.e., challenges, weaknesses, strengths, and/or improvements)?
- What structure(s) and/or processes does your college/school/branch have or plan to implement to monitor, support, and maintain a culture of continuous assessment (i.e., quarterly meetings, CARC, professional development workshops, etc.)
- The college/school/branch consists of how many active departments and programs?

Academic Program Maturity Rubric Scoring and Evaluation

Provide a description of your college/school/branch's state of assessment by addressing questions like the following:

- Bases on the maturity scores of the programs, how would you describe the overall state of assessment for your college/school/branch?
- What college/school/branch level plans are in place to advance/improve the maturity of your programs' assessment practices for the 2014-2015 assessment period?

NOTE: Please provide the completed *Maturity Rubric Scoring Excel Template* for your college/school/branch with this report. Email the report and template to Neke Mitchell at assess@unm.edu.

Appendix D: Overall Assessment Maturity Averages by Level

