



**Academic Programs
Institutional
State of Assessment
Report**

2014-2015

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)	5
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)	15
SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE AND PLANNING (SA+P)	17
SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING (SOE)	19
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (SPA)	21
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE (UC)	22
COLLEGE OF NURSING (CON)	24
COLLEGE OF PHARMACY (COP)	26
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE (SOM)	28
SCHOOL OF LAW (SOL)	30
APPENDIX A: ORIGINAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT MATURITY RUBRIC	32
APPENDIX B: REVISED ACADEMIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT MATURITY RUBRIC	33
APPENDIX C: STATE OF ASSESSMENT REPORT TEMPLATE	34
APPENDIX D: OVERALL ASSESSMENT MATURITY AVERAGES BY LEVEL	35

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.

The revised APAM Rubric consists of six categories in which five of the categories specifically target key components of the annual assessment report. It is based on a four-point level scale (i.e., Appendix B). The Level 0 is the lowest assessment maturity level and the Level 3 is the highest.

Because the APAM Rubric was revised between the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 assessment cycles, the scores from the original APAM Rubric, which was administered for the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 assessment cycles, cannot be compared with the scores from the revised APAM Rubric, which was administered for the first time for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. The administration of the revised APAM Rubric for the first time provided a new baseline for determining the progress that was made in assessment maturity of each academic program and college/school/branch.

In the 2014-2015 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 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 2014-2015 State of Assessment Report was submitted by colleges, schools, and branch campuses except for Graduate Studies, the School of Public Administration, the University College, the Honors College, the School of Law, and the College of 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 2014-2015 assessment cycle were submitted by deans, associate deans, and/or CARC chairs by all colleges, schools, and branch campuses except for Graduate Studies and the School of Law.

An assessment webpage/website has been developed and/or revised to display the assessment plan academic programs as well as to provide program assessment-related and/or student performance information for faculty, staff, and students and external constituents at all colleges, schools, and branch campuses except for the College of Pharmacy, College of Fine Arts, School of Engineering, School of Law, and Graduate Studies. 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.

Anderson School of Management

Similar to the 2013-2014 academic year, the Anderson School of Management (ASM) consisted of a total of four active academic degree and certificate programs during the 2014-2015 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 2014-2015 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 2014-2015 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 2014-2015 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 2014-2015 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 2013-2014 Institutional State of Assessment Report, the 2014-2015 Institutional State of Assessment Report includes a listing of all four academic programs.

For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, ASM submitted assessment reports for its undergraduate and graduate academic programs that included the overall assessment results for each goal instead of the assessment results for each student learning outcome/objective.

Tables 1 and 2 below provide an overview of the percentages of the academic programs performing at each assessment maturity level for the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 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
Anderson School of Management (4)	25% (1)	75% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
Anderson School of Management (4)	25% (1)	75% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)

For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that one of the four ASM academic programs did not submit an assessment plan and/or assessment report during this assessment cycle. None of the four programs submitted assessment documentation for the 2014-2015 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, was 1.0 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. This assessment maturity average is the equivalent of a Level 1 on the revised APAM rubric. It will serve as the new baseline to track the progress of ASM for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle.

Areas of Improvement

Of the 20 core courses in which student learning is assessed through a formal process, instructors from 12 of the courses documented their formal review process using ASM’s “Closing the Loop” form. This is a 50% increase from the previous assessment cycle. 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. Most of the courses that provided assessment results have not aligned their course goals and objectives to the School’s programmatic goals and objectives. The School needs to establish a CARC and review the current Assurance of Learning (AOL) process to establish a consistent and integrated process for developing and administering programmatic level assessment.

For 2014-2015 academic year, ASM was primarily focused on updating its strategic plan. This was prioritize due to feedback from the AACSB accrediting body during its preliminary accreditation review and UNM Academic Program Review (APR) Process, which was completed in Spring 2014. In the APR Self-Study Report, the APR review team found that ASM’s AOL process was acceptable. However, completion of an updated strategic plan was necessary to guide review of the School’s AOL process.

Now that ASM has completed updating its strategic plan, the next step is to complete a thorough review of current assessment activities and processes associated with its undergraduate program in order to develop and formalize a new program-level undergraduate assessment structure and continuous assessment review process. For 2015-2016 academic year, the School will initiate a review of the programmatic learning goals, student learning objectives, and assessment practices for its undergraduate program. The School will develop a more formalized continuous review assessment process that will include a CARC, or the equivalent, to govern this process. In addition, ASM has designated AOL coordinators to manage the School’s assessment activities and processes for each of its academic programs. These assessment activities will be guided by UNM’s student learning goals (i.e., Knowledge, Skills, and Responsibility) and the new AACSB standards.

An assessment website has been developed to provide information about ASM’s assessment processes and activities to faculty, staff, and students. To access the ASM assessment website, go to <https://www.mgt.unm.edu/assessment/default.asp>.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The following are the goals for the 2015-2016 academic year that the Office of Assessment has established for ASM in order to encourage and monitor its progress of the assessment maturity, assessment process, and assessment reporting practices of its academic programs at the program and college level:

- increase the overall collection of academic programs’ assessment documentation to at least 80%; and
- increase the School’s overall assessment maturity average to at least a 1.1.

College of Arts and Sciences

Similar to the 2013-2014 academic year, the College of Arts and Sciences (A&S) consisted of a total of 108 active academic degree and certificate programs during the 2014-2015 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 2014-2015 assessment cycle, 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 both the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 academic catalogs.
- The Creative Writing M.F.A. and Astrophysics B.S. academic programs and their assessment plans are not listed on the A&S assessment webpage located at <http://artsci.unm.edu/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 and 2014-2015 academic catalogs 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

Tables 1 and 2 below provide an overview of the percentages of the academic programs performing at each assessment maturity level for the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 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
College of Arts and Sciences (104)	32% (33)	28% (29)	27% (28)	9% (9)	5% (5)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2014-2015				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
College of Arts and Sciences (104)	45% (47)	11% (11)	39% (41)	5% (5)

For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that 47 of the 104 A&S academic programs did not submit an assessment plan and/or assessment report during this assessment cycle. However, over half of the 104 academic programs (57) in A&S did submit assessment documentation for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. Out of the 104, 46 (44%) academic programs received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle.

The overall assessment maturity average for A&S, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, was 1.0 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. This assessment maturity average is the equivalent of a Level 1 on the revised APAM rubric. It will serve as the new baseline to track the progress of A&S for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle.

Areas of Improvement

Active academic program assessment reporting was completed by over half of the programs in A&S for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle.

In addition to the Learning Improvement Awards program, the College’s primary goal is to continue building departmental engagement with assessment, which involves providing incentives, workshops, and additional resources to develop effective assessment plans. A&S anticipates a continued increase in participation for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle as it continues to invest resources in improving assessment as well as offer grants that tie departmental funding to active participation in assessment processes, including the submission of annual program assessment reports.

An assessment website has been developed to provide information about A&S' assessment processes and activities to faculty, staff, and students. To access the A&S assessment website, go to <http://artsci.unm.edu/assessment/program-assessment.html>.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The following are the goals for the 2015-2016 academic year that the Office of Assessment has established for A&S in order to encourage and monitor its progress of the assessment maturity, assessment process, and assessment reporting practices of its academic programs at the program and college level:

- increase the overall collection of academic programs' assessment documentation to at least 52%; and
- increase the College's overall assessment maturity average to at least a 1.2.

College of Education

The College of Education (COE) consisted of a total of 48 active academic degree and certificate programs, including concentrations, during the 2014-2015 academic year. The number of each concentration and type of degree and certificate program that is offered by COE 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.)	14
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.)	1
Certificate (Cert.)	3

Concerns/Issues

There are no known assessment-related issues for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle that should be addressed within COE.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2013-2014 Institutional State of Assessment Report includes a listing of 46 active academic programs whereas the 2014-2015 Institutional State of Assessment Report includes a listing of 48 active academic programs.

Overall, COE has demonstrated progress and improvement between the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 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 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 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
College of Education (46)	11% (5)	0% (0)	0% (0)	22% (10)	67% (31)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2014-2015				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
College of Education (48)	19% (9)	2.1% (1)	52% (25)	27% (13)

For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that only nine of the 48 COE academic programs did not submit an assessment plan and/or assessment report during this assessment cycle. However, approximately 81% of the 48 active academic programs in COE did submit assessment documentation for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. Out of 48, 38 (79%) academic programs received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle.

The overall assessment maturity average for COE, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, was 1.76 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. This assessment maturity average is the equivalent of a Level 2 on the revised APAM rubric. It will serve as the new baseline to track the progress of COE for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle.

Areas of Improvement

The strengths in COE's state of assessment noted included 21 programs that had measurable student learning outcomes (SLOs) rated as exemplary; 30 programs that demonstrated evidence of developed implementation or exemplary implementation for program assessment methods. While the majority of these methods were direct measures, some programs did utilize indirect methods to assess certain student learning outcomes. For example, all educator licensure programs had access to candidate, field

experience supervisors, and employer surveys as a means of evidence. However, because of the previous emphasis on direct assessments, not all educator preparation programs identified these surveys as a mean of triangulating evidence on their students' progress. Additionally, many programs provided more than two assessment measures for their SLOs. All but four programs received an assessment maturity score of 2 or better for "Data Collection & Analysis" category, which indicated to the COE CARC that programs conducted a satisfactory or better analysis of the data. The assistance provided to programs by the COE Data Team may be considered as a resource to better support and maintain programs' assessment practices and continuous improvement efforts in the COE.

A weakness noted by the COE CARC was a lack of evidence to show how programs utilized assessment data for program improvement. Few programs attached meeting minutes or other evidence to demonstrate implementation of program improvements or revisions. Rather, most programs provided anecdotal evidence within the Tk20 CampusWide platform. A recommendation in preparation for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle was made to programs on their assessment maturity evaluation to include evidence and relevant attachments in the Tk20 CampusWide platform in order to demonstrate how they used the assessment data to inform program improvements. Another weakness that was found was with some of the Ph.D. programs in which a few SLOs had evidence of administering only one assessment measure.

The Associate Dean of Assessment, Accountability & Accreditation and the COE CARC members will work with program coordinators to identify additional SLO assessment measures that align with the assessment plans posted on the COE assessment website. Furthermore, the COE CARC and Associate Dean will host an Assessment Data Retreat on the morning of April 1, 2016. At this retreat, faculty will discuss the quality of assessment measures and the use of valid and reliable rubrics to assess student learning outcomes.

An assessment website has been developed to provide information about COE's assessment processes and activities to faculty, staff, and students. To access the COE assessment website, go to <http://coeassessment.unm.edu/>.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The following are the goals for the 2015-2016 academic year that the Office of Assessment has established for COE in order to encourage and monitor its progress of the assessment maturity, assessment process, and assessment reporting practices of its academic programs at the program and college level:

- increase the overall collection of academic programs' assessment documentation to at least 83%; and
- increase the College's overall assessment maturity average to at least a 1.8.

College of Fine Arts

During 2013-2014 academic year, the College of Fine Arts (CFA) consisted of a total of 20 active academic degree and minor programs whereas during the 2014-2015 academic year, CFA consisted of a total of 18 active academic degree programs. The number of each type of degree 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

Concerns/Issues

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

- For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, some of CFA’s academic programs utilized course-level assessment measures instead of program-level assessment methods.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2013-2014 Institutional State of Assessment Report includes a listing of 20 active academic and minor programs whereas the 2014-2015 Institutional State of Assessment Report includes a listing of 18 active academic programs.

Overall, CFA has demonstrated progress and improvement between the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 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 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 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
College of Fine Arts (20)	5% (1)	0% (0)	10% (2)	50% (10)	35% (7)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2014-2015				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
College of Fine Arts (18)	0% (0)	22% (4)	78% (14)	0% (0)

For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that none of the 18 CFA academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report during this assessment cycle. However, all 18 of the active academic programs in CFA did submit assessment documentation for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. Out of 18, 14 (78%) academic programs received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle.

The overall assessment maturity average for CFA, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, was 1.78 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. This assessment maturity average is the equivalent of a Level 2 on the revised APAM rubric. It will serve as the new baseline to track the progress of CFA for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle.

Areas of Improvement

CFA added an undergraduate bachelor's and graduate master's program in Art Education in Fall 2015. The assessment documentation for the undergraduate Art Education program for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle was reported by the College of Education. The CFA will begin reporting on the Art Education graduate program for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle.

Currently, the College's assessment structure is primarily based on CFA College Assessment Review Committee (CARC) meetings which meet six times per year as well as individual meetings with the chair of each department and program. The CFA CARC meets as a group early in the fall to discuss assessment and/or program challenges and then I work closely with individual departments to facilitate data collection and analysis and assessment reporting.

Two CFA representatives were sent to the institution's first assessment connections retreat, the 2015 UNM Assessment Connections Retreat, in June. Also, representatives from each of the programs met with the UNM Director of Assessment in Fall 2015 for guidance on preparing and submitting programs' annual assessment reports.

The culture of continuous assessment in the College continues to progress. All departments and programs have submitted learning goals and student learning outcomes. In addition, there is an assessment plan in place for each academic program. The College will launch its assessment webpage by June 1st, 2016 to include all assessment plans.

However, while the academic program assessment reporting process has been streamlined in CFA, program-level student outcomes assessment measures are still not fully embedded into the day-to-day instructional plans that encompass all faculty. Starting in Spring 2016, the associate dean plans on adding program area leaders (usually senior faculty) to the CFA CARC as well as schedule to attend faculty meetings in all program areas in order to answer program assessment-related questions and help clarify departmental assessment goals.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The following are the goals for the 2015-2016 academic year that the Office of Assessment has established for CFA in order to encourage and monitor its progress of the assessment maturity,

assessment process, and assessment reporting practices of its academic programs at the program and college level:

- maintain the overall collection of academic programs’ assessment documentation at 100%; and
- increase the College’s overall assessment maturity average to at least a 1.8.

College of University Libraries and Learning Sciences

Similar to the 2013-2014 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 2014-2015 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 2014-2015 assessment cycle that should be addressed within CULLS.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 Institutional State of Assessment Reports include a listing of four 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 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 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
College of University Libraries and Learning Sciences (4)	0% (0)	25% (1)	25% (1)	50% (2)	0% (0)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2014-2015				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
College of University Libraries and Learning Sciences (4)	0% (0)	25% (1)	50% (2)	25% (1)

For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, based on the revised 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 during this assessment cycle. However, all four of the active academic programs in CULLS did submit assessment documentation for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. Out of four, three (75%) academic programs received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle.

The overall assessment maturity average for CULLS, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, was 1.5 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. This assessment maturity average is the equivalent of a Level 1 on the revised APAM rubric. It will serve as the new baseline to track the progress of CULLS for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle.

Areas of Improvement

The OILS program collects and aggregates data about student learning outcomes (SLOs) from key milestones. The OILS program: (1) collected and aggregated data on the Technology & Training bachelor degree program from the student culminating practicum; (2) collected and aggregated and analyzed data from master students' portfolios from their capstone internship; and (3) collected and aggregated and analyzed data from doctoral student core courses, comprehensive examinations, and dissertations proposals and defenses. Program assessment data was analyzed in order to make changes to improve courses and the curriculum and to intervene with students who need help. The OILS program's faculty will evaluate the curriculum of the Education Specialist Certificate program, which currently has no students, during the 2015-2016 academic year.

For the B.S. program, the 2014-2015 assessment cycle was the first year of a three-year assessment plan. During the 2015-2016 academic year, The OILS program will analyze the data collected during the 2014-2015 assessment cycle and changes will be implemented for this program for the 2016-2017 academic year. CULLS hired a faculty member responsible for the Instructional Technology & Training 2 + 2 program who began work in Fall 2015 and who will lead the assessment of the program.

The OILS program also plans to revise the SLOs for the B.S. program.

For the M.A. program, the 2014-2015 assessment cycle was the second year of a three-year assessment plan. Preliminary analysis suggested including more authentic projects and evaluations in the instructional design class as well as improving scaffolding during the internship to better guide students as they integrated key concepts of the program. The OILS program will conduct a comprehensive review of its masters and doctoral programs during the 2015-2016 academic year in order to make recommendations for improvements in program curriculum, procedures, instructions, and assessments. Changes will be implemented for the 2016-2017 academic year.

The OILS program also plans to revise the SLOs for the M.A. program.

For the Ph.D. program, the 2014-2015 assessment cycle was the second year of a three-year assessment plan. Faculty will continue to evaluate and monitor student progress and will intervene with individual students as indicated by scores. A new evaluation form will be produced and benchmarks will be adjusted as a consequence of the evaluation. Additional changes will be made as suggested by evaluation results. Assuming approval throughout the curricular process, faculty will implement the new research methodology requirements. The OILS program will conduct a comprehensive review of its masters and doctoral programs during the 2015-2016 academic year in order to make recommendations for improvement in program curriculum, procedures, instructions, and assessments. Faculty made changes to the doctoral program based on upon the assessment maturity evaluation, including:

- the addition of a new research methods course and the initiation of a curricular Form C to add requirements for more research methodology;
- intervening with students who score low in communication and writing, including providing consistent feedback on writing and referring students to GRC for training; and
- incorporating active listening skills training in OILS 601.

These changes will be implemented for the 2016-2017 academic year.

As part of the comprehensive review of its masters and doctoral programs, the OILS program's faculty will review the Education Specialist Certificate program for future viability during the 2015-2016 academic year. Changes will be implemented for the 2016-2017 academic year.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The following are the goals for the 2015-2016 academic year that the Office of Assessment has established for CULLS in order to encourage and monitor its progress of the assessment maturity, assessment process, and assessment reporting practices of its academic programs at the program and college level:

- maintain the overall collection of academic programs' assessment documentation at 100%; and
- increase the College's overall assessment maturity average to at least a 1.8.

Graduate Studies

Similar to the 2013-2014 academic year, Graduate Studies (GS) consisted of a total of one active academic degree program during the 2014-2015 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 2014-2015 assessment cycle, no annual program assessment report was submitted for the M.W.R. program.
- For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, no State of Assessment Report was submitted for GS.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 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 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 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--2014-2015				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
Graduate Studies (1)	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that the GS academic program did have an assessment plan on record for this assessment cycle but it did not submit an annual program assessment report. For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, GS academic program 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, was 0.33 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. This assessment maturity average is the equivalent of a Level 0 on the revised APAM rubric. It will serve as the new baseline to track the progress of GS for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle.

Areas of Improvement

A State of Assessment Report was not submitted for GS for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. Also, an annual program assessment report was not submitted for the M.W.R. program for this 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 or program level.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The following are the goals for the 2015-2016 academic year that the Office of Assessment has established for GS in order to encourage and monitor its progress of the assessment maturity, assessment process, and assessment reporting practices of its academic program at the program and college level:

- review and update the M.W.R. program assessment plan;
- submit an annual program assessment report with accompanying evidence for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle; and
- increase the GS' overall assessment maturity average to at least a 1.5.

Honors College

Similar to the 2013-2014 academic year, the Honors College (HC) consisted of a total of one active academic degree program during the 2014-2015 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 2014-2015 assessment cycle, no annual program assessment report was submitted for the B.A. program.
- For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, no State of Assessment Report was submitted for HC.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 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 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 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
Honors College (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2014-2015				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
Honors College (1)	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that the HC academic program did have an assessment plan on record for this assessment cycle but it did not submit an annual program assessment report. For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, HC academic program received an assessment maturity average below a Level 2.

The overall assessment maturity average for HC, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for its academic program, was 0.33 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. This assessment maturity average is the equivalent of a Level 0 on the revised APAM rubric. It will serve as the new baseline to track the progress of HC for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle.

Areas of Improvement

A State of Assessment Report was not submitted for HC for the 2013-2014 assessment cycle. Also, an annual program assessment report was not submitted for the B.A. program for this assessment cycle.

Therefore, the Office of Assessment was unable to provide a summary of the HC culture of continuous assessment or other areas of improvement at the college or program level.

An assessment website has been developed to provide information about HC's assessment processes and activities to faculty, staff, and students. To access the HC assessment website, go to <http://honors.unm.edu/for-faculty/Assessment.html>.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The following are the goals for the 2015-2016 academic year that the Office of Assessment has established for HC in order to encourage and monitor its progress of the assessment maturity, assessment process, and assessment reporting practices of its academic program at the program and college level:

- submit an annual program assessment report with accompanying evidence for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle;
- submit a State of Assessment Report for UC for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle; and
- increase the HC's overall assessment maturity average to at least a 1.5.

School of Architecture and Planning

Similar to the 2013-2014 academic year, the School of Architecture and Planning (SA+P) consisted of a total of eight active academic degree and certificate programs during the 2014-2015 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 2014-2015 assessment cycle, SA+P submitted program assessment plans but did not submit annual program assessment reports. As a result, the Office of Assessment was unable to access and review the assessment practices and assessment maturity of each SA+P academic program for evaluation for this assessment cycle.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 Institutional State of Assessment Reports include a listing of eight 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 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 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 Architecture and Planning (8)	0% (0)	13% (1)	25% (2)	13% (1)	50% (4)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2014-2015				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
School of Architecture and Planning (8)	100% (8)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that all eight SA+P academic programs did not submit an annual program assessment report during this assessment cycle.

The overall assessment maturity average for SA+P, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, was 0.29 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. This assessment maturity average is the equivalent of a Level 0 on the revised APAM rubric. It will serve as the new baseline to track the progress of SA+P for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle.

Areas of Improvement

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

SA+P reduced the total required degree credit-hour requirements for the M.Arch. and B.A.A. programs to 120 in order to meet the University’s mandate. Also, the M.C.R.P. program is developing a concentration in Indigenous Planning, which will be the first of its kind in the nation. Proposed curriculum changes to this program were submitted to the UNM Curriculum Workflow Process for review and approval by the Faculty Senate.

An assessment website has been developed to provide information about SA+P’s assessment processes and activities to faculty, staff, and students. To access the SA+P assessment website, go to <http://saap.unm.edu/academic-programs/assessment-overview.html>.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The following are the goals for the 2015-2016 academic year that the Office of Assessment has established for SA+P in order to encourage and monitor its progress of the assessment maturity, assessment process, and assessment reporting practices of its academic programs at the program and school level:

- increase the overall collection of academic programs’ assessment documentation to 100%;
- submit an annual program assessment report with accompanying evidence for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle; and
- increase the School’s overall assessment maturity average to at least a 1.0.

School of Engineering

For the 2014-2015 academic year, the School of Engineering (SoE) consisted of 34 active academic degree and certificate programs including concentrations. The number of each type of concentration and type of degree and certificate program that is offered by SA+P follows:

SoE Degrees/Certificates	No.
Bachelor of Science (B.S.)	9
Master of Science (M.S.)	11
Master of Engineering (M.Eng.)	1
Master of Manufacturing Engineering (M.E.M.E.)	1
Master in Construction Management (M.C.M.)	1
Doctor of Philosophy in Engineering (Ph.D.) for ten concentrations	10
Certificate	1

Concerns/Issues

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

- For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle and similar to the 2013-2014 assessment cycle, SoE should be responsible for collecting, reviewing, and evaluating the program assessment plan and annual

assessment report, with accompanying evidence, for the four interdisciplinary degree programs it shares with A&S as well as the for its graduate certificate program.

- For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, some of SoE’s academic programs should review and reword their student learning outcomes (SLOs) for measurability.
- For the 2014-20145 assessment cycle, SoE’s academic programs did not utilized SoE’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 2013-2014 Institutional State of Assessment Report includes a listing of 30 active academic programs whereas the 2014-2015 Institutional State of Assessment Report includes a listing of 34 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 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 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 Engineering (30)	3.3% (1)	0% (0)	67% (20)	30% (9)	0% (0)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2014-2015				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
School of Engineering (34)	71% (24)	12% (4)	15% (5)	2.9% (1)

For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that 24 of the 34 SoE academic programs did not submit an assessment plan and/or assessment report during this assessment cycle. Only ten (29%) out 34 of the active academic programs in SoE did submit assessment documentation for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. Out of 34, six (18%) academic programs received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle.

The overall assessment maturity average for SoE, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, was 0.47 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. This assessment maturity average is the equivalent of a Level 0 on the revised APAM rubric. It will serve as the new baseline to track the progress of SoE for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle.

Areas of Improvement

Overall, program undergraduate assessment structure is a mature process. Occasionally, a program may fail to completely implement the assessment plan for a given academic year. But, overall, the program

assessment plans are followed; and as a result, the faculty is provided with good program assessment data for making meaningful and well-informed program changes. However, the assessment plan for each undergraduate program was not submitted via OneDrive as required; so the Office of Assessment was unable to access the assessment plan and annual program assessment report for most of the undergraduate programs.

At the graduate level, the assessment structure is still fairly new; so a culture of assessment is still emerging. However, all graduate programs have an assessment plan; and program assessment data is being collect for each graduate program. But, the level of discussion by the faculty and the level of awareness of the graduate assessment structure are not where they should be as of yet. During Spring 2016, the SoE Academic Council will discuss this issue to determine what improvements might be warranted. However, the assessment plan for each graduate program was not submitted via OneDrive as required; so the Office of Assessment was unable to access the assessment plan and annual program assessment report for most of the undergraduate programs.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The following are the goals for the 2015-2016 academic year that the Office of Assessment has established for SoE in order to encourage and monitor its progress of the assessment maturity, assessment process, and assessment reporting practices of its academic programs at the program and school level:

- increase the overall collection of academic programs’ assessment documentation to at least 31%;
- submit an assessment plan and annual program assessment report, with accompanying evidence, for each academic program for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle; and
- increase the School’s overall assessment maturity average to at least a 1.0.

School of Public Administration

Similar to the 2013-2014 academic year, the School of Public Administration (SPA) consisted of a total of two active graduate academic degree programs during the 2014-2015 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 2014-2015 assessment cycle, SPA’s academic programs should review and reword some of their student learning outcomes (SLOs) for measurability.

- For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, some of SPA’s academic programs mainly utilized course-level assessment measures instead of program-level assessment methods.
- For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, SPA did not submit its academic programs’ assessment plan, annual assessment report, with accompanying evidence, or a State of Assessment Report. As a result, the Office of Assessment was unable to access and review the assessment practices and assessment maturity of each SPA academic program for evaluation for this assessment cycle.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 Institutional State of Assessment Reports include a listing of two 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 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 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 Public Administration (2)	50% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	50% (1)	0% (0)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2014-2015				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
School of Public Administration (2)	100% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that none of the two SPA academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report during this assessment cycle.

The overall assessment maturity average for SPA, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, was 0 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. This assessment maturity average is the equivalent of a Level 0 on the revised APAM rubric. It will serve as the new baseline to track the progress of SPA for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle.

Areas of Improvement

A State of Assessment Report was not submitted for SPA for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. Also, an assessment plan and annual program assessment report was not submitted for the any of the two academic programs for this assessment cycle. Therefore, the Office of Assessment was unable to provide a summary of the SPA culture of continuous assessment or other areas of improvement at the school or program level.

An assessment website has been developed to provide information about SPA’s assessment processes and activities to faculty, staff, and students. To access the SPA assessment website, go to <http://spa.unm.edu//about-spa/outcomes-data.html>.

University College

Similar to the 2013-2014 academic year, the University College (UC) consisted of a total of three active academic degree and certificate programs during the 2014-2015 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 2014-2015 assessment cycle, no State of Assessment Report was submitted for UC.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 Institutional State of Assessment Reports include a listing of 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 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 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
University College (3)	33% (1)	67% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2014-2015				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
University College (3)	0% (0)	33% (1)	67% (2)	0% (0)

For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that none of the three UC academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report during this assessment cycle. However, all three of the active academic programs in UC did submit assessment documentation for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. Out of three, two (67%)

academic programs received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle.

The overall assessment maturity average for UC, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, was 1.78 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. This assessment maturity average is the equivalent of a Level 2 on the revised APAM rubric. It will serve as the new baseline to track the progress of UC for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle.

Areas of Improvement

A State of Assessment Report was not submitted for UC for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. Therefore, the Office of Assessment was unable to provide a summary of the UC culture of continuous assessment or other areas of improvement at the school level.

An assessment website has been developed to provide information about UC's assessment processes and activities to faculty, staff, and students. To access the UC assessment website, go to <http://ucollege.unm.edu/academic-programs/assessment/index.html>.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The following are the goals for the 2015-2016 academic year that the Office of Assessment has established for UC in order to encourage and monitor its progress of the assessment maturity, assessment process, and assessment reporting practices of its academic program at the program and college level:

- maintain the overall collection of academic programs' assessment documentation at 100%;
- submit a State of Assessment Report for UC for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle; and
- increase the UC's overall assessment maturity average to at least a 1.9.

College of Nursing

Similar to the 2013-2014 academic year, the College of Nursing (CON) consisted of a total of five active academic degree and certificate programs for the 2014-2015 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

There are no known assessment-related issues for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle that should be addressed within CON.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 Institutional State of Assessment Reports include a listing of 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 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 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
College of Nursing (5)	100% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2014-2015				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
College of Nursing (5)	20% (1)	0% (0)	80% (4)	0% (0)

For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that one of five CON academic programs did not submit an assessment plan and/or assessment report during this assessment cycle. Out of five, four (80%) academic programs received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle.

The overall assessment maturity average for CON, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, was 1.60 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. This assessment maturity average is the equivalent of a Level 2 on the revised APAM rubric. It will serve as the new baseline to track the progress of CON for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle.

Areas of Improvement

During the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, there have been leadership changes within the CON Program Evaluation Committee (PEC) as well in administrative leadership. This created a gap in continuity for the program assessment processes. However, stability in leadership and in the committee was achieved during Spring 2015. Subsequently, all CON academic programs have been reviewed; their assessment plan has been updated; and/or they have provided annual assessment reports for the current period.

Plans for further program assessment review and program improvement are currently being undertaken by the committee and team chairs. Plans to improve the monitoring and support of program assessment practices that strengthen continuous assessment include:

- Re-alignment of the PEC and membership meetings of the PEC at least six times per year;
- Addition of a Strategic Support Manager to work with the committee regarding statistical monitoring and analysis;
- Active participation of the PEC chair in the College of Nursing Coordinating Committee, periodic reports to CON full-time faculty and teams, as well as the Provost's Academic Program Assessment Committee; and
- Educational plans for team chairs and program directors regarding the assessment and evaluation processes and their roles and responsibilities.

It should be noted that all of degree granting programs and the P.M.C. in CON are full accredited by the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE).

An assessment website has been developed to provide information about CON's assessment processes and activities to faculty, staff, and students. To access the CON assessment website, go to <http://nursing.unm.edu/about/accreditation-and-assessments/assessments.html>.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The following are the goals for the 2015-2016 academic year that the Office of Assessment has established for UC in order to encourage and monitor its progress of the assessment maturity, assessment process, and assessment reporting practices of its academic program at the program and college level:

- maintain the overall collection of academic programs' assessment documentation at 100%; and
- increase the CON's overall assessment maturity average to at least a 1.8.

College of Pharmacy

Similar to the 2013-2014 academic year, the College of Pharmacy (COP) consisted of a total of three active academic degree and certificate programs for the 2014-2015 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 2014-2015 assessment cycle, no program assessment plan or annual program assessment report was submitted separately for each of the COP academic programs using the

University's approved and required program assessment plan and annual program assessment report templates for this assessment cycle.

- For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, no State of Assessment Report was submitted for COP.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 Institutional State of Assessment Reports include a listing of 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 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 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
College of Pharmacy (3)	100% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2014-2015				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
College of Pharmacy (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (4)	0% (0)

For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that all three of the COP academic programs submitted program assessment documentation during this assessment cycle. Program assessment documentation was submitted for all three COP programs, which received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle.

The overall assessment maturity average for COP, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, was 1.67 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. This assessment maturity average is the equivalent of a Level 2 on the revised APAM rubric. It will serve as the new baseline to track the progress of COP for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle.

Areas of Improvement

Assessment, evaluation, and continuous quality improvement are integrated throughout the COP and begin with the College's Organizational or Strategic Plan, which articulates the COP faculty's long-term vision, mission, goals, and objectives for the college in the areas of education, research, pharmacy practice/service, advancement, and administration.

Two of the three COP degree programs are accredited by different professional accreditation agencies. The Doctor of Pharmacy (PharmD) degree is accredited nationally by the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education (ACPE). Accreditation by ACPE is required for PharmD graduates to be eligible to take the national and state board of pharmacy licensure examinations.

Since October 2012, program assessment activities have focused on: (a) continuing annual assessment activities for the Doctor of Pharmacy Program; (b) revising the Doctor of Pharmacy Competency Statements based on the Center for Advancement Pharmacy Education 2013 Outcome Statement; and (c) critically evaluating the Doctor of Pharmacy Curriculum in preparation for a major curricular revision which is anticipated to launch in Fall 2017 and (d) preparing for the November 2015 ACPE Accreditation Self-Study and Site Visit.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The following are the goals for the 2015-2016 academic year that the Office of Assessment has established for COP in order to encourage and monitor its progress of the assessment maturity, assessment process, and assessment reporting practices of its academic program at the program and college level:

- maintain the overall collection of academic programs’ assessment documentation at 100%;
- submit an program assessment plan and/or annual program assessment report, with accompanying evidence, as well as a State of Assessment Report for COP for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle; and
- increase the COP’s overall assessment maturity average to at least a 1.8.

School of Medicine

For the 2013-2014 academic year, School of Medicine (SOM) consisted of a total of 19 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	4

Concerns/Issues

There are no known assessment-related issues for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle that should be addressed within SOM.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 Institutional State of Assessment Reports include a listing of 19 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 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 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 Medicine (20)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (20)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2014-2015				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
School of Medicine (19)	5.3% (1)	11% (2)	74% (14)	11% (2)

For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that only one of the 19 SOM academic programs did not submit program assessment documentation during this assessment cycle. However, 18 (95%) of the 19 academic programs in SOM did submit assessment documentation for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. Out of 19, 16 (84%) academic programs received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle.

The overall assessment maturity average for SOM, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, was 1.89 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. This assessment maturity average is the equivalent of a Level 2 on the revised APAM rubric. It will serve as the new baseline to track the progress of SOM for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle.

Areas of Improvement

In SOM, there are a number of processes that we follow to implement, monitor and support a culture of continuous assessment. These include:

- Monthly meetings of the department heads
- Quarterly meetings focusing on assessments
- Establishment and support of the CARC by Health Science Center

Overall, state of assessment in SOM is strong. All SOM programs except the B.R.E.P. program (which has no outside accrediting agency) has succeeded in obtaining the maximum accreditation time for each written and site-visit inspection within the last three years.

SOM will continue to monitor the assessment practices of all of its programs with special attention to the B.R.E.P. program. With the help of the administrative assistant and a new director of the program, SOM intends submit annual assessment report for this program for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle.

With the help of the UNM Office of Assessment, SOM faculty and staff intend to participate in a number of training sessions that focus on employing the Tk20 software in order to monitor and ensure the development and uniformity of program assessment reports for the next assessment cycle.

An assessment website has been developed to provide information about CON’s assessment processes and activities to faculty, staff, and students. To access the CON assessment website, go to <http://som.unm.edu/leadership/education/ume/outcomes/>.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The following are the goals for the 2015-2016 academic year that the Office of Assessment has established for SOM in order to encourage and monitor its progress of the assessment maturity, assessment process, and assessment reporting practices of its academic program at the program and school level:

- maintain the overall collection of academic programs’ assessment documentation at 100%; and
- increase the SOM’s overall assessment maturity average to at least a 2.0.

School of Law

Similar to the 2013-2014 academic year, School of Law (SoL) consisted of a total of one active academic degree program during the 2014-2015 academic year. The degree program that is offered by SoL is the J.D. academic program.

Concerns/Issues

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

- For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, no program assessment plan or annual program assessment report was submitted the SoL academic programs for this assessment cycle.
- For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, no State of Assessment Report was submitted for SoL.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 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)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (1)	0% (0)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2014-2015				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
School of Law (1)	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that the SoL academic program did not submit an assessment plan and/or annual assessment report.

The overall assessment maturity average for SoL, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for its academic program, was 0 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. This assessment maturity average is the equivalent of a Level 0 on the revised APAM rubric. It will serve as the new baseline to track the progress of SoL for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle.

Areas of Improvement

A State of Assessment Report was not submitted for SoL for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle. Also, an assessment plan and annual program assessment report was not submitted by the School 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 SoL culture of continuous assessment or other areas of improvement at the school or program level.

Goals for Continuous Improvement

The following are the goals for the 2016-2017 academic year that the Office of Assessment has established for SoL in order to encourage and monitor its progress of the assessment maturity, assessment process, and assessment reporting practices of its academic programs at the program and school level:

- submit an assessment plan and annual program assessment report, with accompanying evidence, for the SoL academic program for the 2016-2017 assessment cycle;
- submit a State of Assessment Report for SoL; and
- increase the School's overall assessment maturity average to at least a 0.8.

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

