



**Academic Programs  
Institutional  
State of Assessment  
Report  
2015-2016**

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>OVERVIEW</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>ACADEMIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT MATURITY (APAM) RUBRIC</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>ANDERSON SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT (ASM)</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES (A&amp;S)</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>COLLEGE OF EDUCATION (COE)</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS (CFA)</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>COLLEGE OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES AND LEARNING SCIENCES (CULLS)</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>GRADUATE STUDIES (GS)</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>HONORS COLLEGE (HC)</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE AND PLANNING (SA+P)</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING (SOE)</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>SCHOOL OF POPULATION HEALTH (SPH)</b> .....	<b>22</b>
<b>UNIVERSITY COLLEGE (UC)</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>COLLEGE OF NURSING (CON)</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>COLLEGE OF PHARMACY (COP)</b> .....	<b>29</b>
<b>SCHOOL OF MEDICINE (SOM)</b> .....	<b>62</b>
<b>SCHOOL OF LAW (SOL)</b> .....	<b>32</b>
<b>APPENDIX A: ORIGINAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT MATURITY RUBRIC</b> .....	<b>34</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: REVISED ACADEMIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT MATURITY RUBRIC</b> .....	<b>35</b>
<b>APPENDIX C: STATE OF ASSESSMENT REPORT TEMPLATE</b> .....	<b>36</b>
<b>APPENDIX D: OVERALL ASSESSMENT MATURITY AVERAGES BY LEVEL</b> .....	<b>37</b>

## **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 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 assessment cycles. The administration of the revised APAM Rubric for the first time for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle provided a new baseline for determining the progress that was made in assessment maturity of each academic program and college/school/branch.

In the 2015-2016 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 graph of the overall assessment maturity averages by level for each college, school, and branch campus.

**Executive Summary**

A 2015-2016 State of Assessment Report was submitted by all colleges, schools, and branch campuses except for Graduate Studies, the School of Law, the School of Population Health, the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Pharmacy, and the University College.

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 2015-2016 assessment cycle were submitted by deans, associate deans, and/or CARC chairs by all colleges, schools, and branch campuses except for Graduate Studies, the School of Law, and the School of Population Health.

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, School of Population Health, 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**

The Anderson School of Management (ASM) consisted of a total of four active academic degree and certificate programs during the 2015-2016 academic year. The updated assessment structure for the graduate academic programs was reconfigured and distinguished based on the degree type and concentration(s). The number of each concentration and 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 (E.M.B.A., M.B.A.-Ed., & M.B.A./MGTCP)	3
Information Assurance (M.S.ISA)	1

### Concerns/Issues

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

- For the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, the newly developed M.Acct. assessment plan provide learning goals and student learning objectives that are not clearly aligned and/or labeled so as to indicate alignment between the learning goals and associated student learning objectives.
- For the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, the language of the student learning objectives in the newly developed E.M.B.A. assessment plan may need rewording for clarity and measurability.
- For the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, the learning goals and student learning objectives for the newly developed assessment plan for the M.B.A. graduate and MGTCP certificate programs were not distinguished at no point to highlight the shift in or transition between their purpose, focus, and expectations. For instance, as a post-master’s certificate program, the MGTCP may include one or more additional learning goals and/or student learning objectives than the M.B.A. graduate program required. However, if the focus of this assessment plan was on the MGTCP post-Master’s certificate program as a post-M.B.A. program, then this should be clearly indicated in the assessment plan.

### Assessment Maturity Scores

For the 2015-2016 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 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 assessment cycles, which are based on the maturity average score (rounded up where relevant) received by each program.

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

Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
Anderson School of Management (6)	17% (1)	67% (4)	17% (1)	0% (0)

For the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that one of the six ASM academic programs did not submit an assessment plan and/or assessment report during this assessment cycle. For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, none of the four academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report that received an assessment

maturity average of Level 2 or higher whereas only one of the six academic programs submitted assessment documentation for the 2015-2016 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, improved from 1.0 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle to 1.1 for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. In other words, the School maintained the equivalent of a Level 1 assessment maturity average based on the revised APAM rubric.

### Areas of Improvement

As of March 2016, two co-coordinators of AOL activities were designated. The creation of these positions were significant in enabling ASM to develop, support, and maintain a more comprehensive and coordinated approach to its programs' assessment activities. The AOL co-coordinators will work with the CARCs each year to review and discuss programmatic assessment activities and processes, collect, review, and analyze programmatic assessment data and help facilitate any necessary programmatic curriculum changes as they are identified. The ASM Chairs Council will collaborate with and advise the CARCs about the implications and impact of possible curriculum changes on available faculty resources and scheduling. The ASM annual faculty review meeting will be used to further discuss identified assessment issues, strengths, and needed changes at the programmatic level.

The AOL co-coordinators already have reviewed previous assessment activities by the academic programs and are spearheading the development of new assurance of learning assessment plans for each academic programs that which will be their first step in supporting a culture of continuous assessment in ASM and its programs. New programmatic goals and student learning outcomes/objectives have been developed and approved by the ASM faculty for the B.B.A., M.B.A./MGTCP, and E.M.B.A. programs. By appointing AOL co-coordinators, ASM has dedicated significant resources to support and maintain continuous improvement of its assessment activities.

The current AOL learning plans comprehensively outline the areas of targeted improvements and include timelines for addressing each of these items. This year's work has developed a process where the School is able to easily identify challenges, weaknesses, strengths and areas for improvement going forward.

Overall state of assessment within ASM has improved significantly in the last academic year. Strives have been made in the School's strategic efforts to developed a comprehensive process to easily identify challenges, weaknesses, strengths and areas for improvement going forward. New programmatic learning goals were approved for each program. A comprehensive assessment plan has been drafted for all programs. Each assessment plan provides a process and timeline for addressing targeted areas for improvements as well as the development of programmatic student learning objectives and/or rubric items within the next 1-2 years. Going forward, ASM intends to tackle the following tasks:

- In Fall 2016, an exit exam was administered to all enrolled B.B.A. and M.B.A. students to set a baseline for assessing programmatic core knowledge. In Spring 2017, data analysis of these results will be reviewed by the CARCs. Based on this review, the criteria for success for the following student learning objectives will be developed: B.B.A. 1.1, and 1.2; and M.B.A. /MGTCP A.1 and A.2.
- By the end of Summer 2017, the rubrics and criteria for success will be completed for assessing B.B.A. 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 3.1 student learning objectives.

- In Spring 2017, student learning outcomes will be developed for the M.B.A.-Ed. and M.S. ISA programs.
- In Spring 2017, individual course objectives will be mapped to the programmatic objectives for the B.B.A., M.B.A/MGTCP, and E.M.B.A. programs.
- In Spring 2017, the CARCs will identify the Fall 2017 classes that will be assessed.

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 1.2.

**College of Arts and Sciences**

Due to the addition of the two degree academic programs previously associated with the School of Public Administration and five other degree and certificate academic programs as well as the deactivation or sunset of three degree academic programs, the College of Arts and Sciences (A&S) consisted of a total of 108 active academic degree and certificate programs during the 2015-2016 academic year. 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.)	39
Bachelor of Science (B.S.)	14
Master of Arts (M.A.)	16
Master of Science (M.S.)	10
Master of Public Administration (M.P.A.)	1
Master of Health Administration (M.H.A.)	1
Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)	19
Certificate (Cert.)	7
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.

- The Creative Writing M.F.A., Astrophysics B.S., Public Administration M.P.A. and M.H.A., Professional Communication CERT, East Asian Studies, Law, Environment, and Geography GCERT,

Linguistics-Signed Language Studies B.A., and Physics and Astrophysics B.S. academic programs and their assessment plan currently are not listed on the A&S assessment webpage located at <http://artsci.unm.edu/assessment/program-assessment.html>.

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

### Assessment Maturity Scores

Overall, A&S has demonstrated progress and improvement between the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 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 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 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--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)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2015-2016				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
College of Arts and Sciences (108)	19% (21)	13% (14)	50% (54)	18% (19)

For the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that only 21 of the 108 A&S academic programs did not submit an assessment plan and/or assessment report during this assessment cycle. For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, 46 (44%) of the 104 academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher whereas 73 (68%) of the 108 academic programs submitted assessment documentation for the 2015-2016 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 1.0 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle to 2.0 for the 2015-2016 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 revised APAM rubric.

### Areas of Improvement

Once again, active academic program assessment reporting was completed by over half of the programs associated with A&S for the 2015-2016 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.

### Goals for Continuous Improvement

The following are the goals for the 2016-2017 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 83%; and
- increase the College's overall assessment maturity average to at least 2.2.

### **College of Education**

The College of Education (COE) consisted of a total of 54 active academic degree and certificate programs, including concentrations, during the 2015-2016 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 (B.A.)	1
Bachelor of Arts in Education (B.A.Ed.)	1
Bachelor of Science in Education (B.S.Ed.)	5
Bachelor of Science (B.S.)	6
Master of Arts (M.A.)	15
Master of Science (M.S.)	7
Master of Arts + Licensure (M.A.+Licensure)	1
Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)	10
Education Specialist (Ed.S.)	4
Education Doctorate (Ed.D.)	1
Certificate (Cert.)	3

### Concerns/Issues

There are no known assessment-related issues for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle that should be addressed within COE.

### Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2014-2015 Institutional State of Assessment Report includes a listing of 48 active academic programs whereas the 2015-2016 Institutional State of Assessment Report includes a listing of 54 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 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 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--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)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2015-2016				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
College of Education (54)	19% (10)	3.7% (2)	52% (28)	26% (14)

For the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that only ten of the 54 COE academic programs did not submit an assessment plan and/or assessment report during this assessment cycle. For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, 38 (79%) of the 48 academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher whereas 42 (78%) of the 54 academic programs submitted assessment documentation for the 2015-2016 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 1.76 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle to 1.84 for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. In other words, the College maintained the equivalent of a Level 2 assessment maturity average based on the revised APAM rubric.

#### Areas of Improvement

The strengths in the COE's State of Assessment as noted by the COE CARC include the following.

- The COE Assessment Portal is active and provides assessment resources for consumers internal and external to UNM COE.
- Programs now have published assessment plans located on the COE Assessment Portal.
- Out of 54 active academic programs, 38 programs demonstrated evidence of exemplary or developed implementation for program assessment methods.
- Out of 54 active academic programs, 34 programs provided evidence through meeting agendas and minutes to support their actionable plan for continuous improvement.
- The COE CARC Assessment Retreat provided all faculty an opportunity to interact with program assessment data, which in turn provided more detailed 2015-16 assessment reports submitted to the COE CARC for review
- Licensure programs in the COE are entering student key assessments in Tk20 HigherEd for faculty to aggregate and analyze program level student learning outcome data.

The weaknesses in the COE's culture of assessment include the following.

- Often the program coordinator works in isolation to complete the annual assessment report; COE needs more unit-wide time to foster discussions on assessment and the collection of evidence of how the program graduates are ready on Day 1 to improve the status of residents in New Mexico.
- Stronger assessment of student learning at the doctoral level would provide evidence of the quality of graduate that leaves COE programs to enter into the role of faculty member in higher education or the role of leader in the community.
- All academic programs need to evaluate their assessments and scoring rubrics for validity and reliability.
- COE CARC members had to provide feedback to a small number of programs about providing stronger alignment of assessment measures to the student learning outcome. Use of indirect measures such as course grades may be convenient, but not necessarily the best measure for student learning outcomes.
- CARC members recommend continuation of program documentation of data-informed decisions regarding curriculum and implementation of instructional strategies

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 1.9.

**College of Fine Arts**

During 2014-2015 academic year, the College of Fine Arts (CFA) consisted of a total of 18 active academic degree programs whereas during the 2015-2016 academic year, CFA consisted of a total of 20 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.)	8
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.)	3
Master of Fine Arts (M.F.A.)	3
Master of Music (M.Mu.)	1
Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)	1

### Concerns/Issues

There are no known assessment-related issues for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle that should be addressed within CFA.

### Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2014-2015 Institutional State of Assessment Report includes a listing of 18 active academic programs whereas the 2015-2016 Institutional State of Assessment Report includes a listing of 20 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 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 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--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)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2015-2016				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
College of Fine Arts (20)	0% (0)	0% (0)	45% (9)	55% (11)

For the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that none of the 20 CFA academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report during this assessment cycle. For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, 14 (78%) of the 18 academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher whereas all of the 20 academic programs submitted assessment documentation for the 2015-2016 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 1.78 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle to 2.49 for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. In other words, the College maintained the equivalent of a Level 2 assessment maturity average based on the revised APAM rubric.

### Areas of Improvement

All but one undergraduate academic program (i.e., B.A. in Theatre) has collected and reported data on at least one student learning outcome (SLO). This is a result of this degree currently being rebuilt from its learning goals and SLOS's and on up. It is expected that the program will have some preliminary data and annual assessment report submitted for 2016-2017 assessment cycle.

The difficulty across the board in CFA is the graduate programs. Since most of the master graduate programs are performance oriented as well as idiosyncratic to an individual advisor, getting traction in developing and accessing program-level SLOs has been limited. The department chairs are concerned and want to make changes but there are so many variables that impact student learning and various pathways

in individual graduate degree plans as well as much faculty resistance. However, there are some positive changes taken place in the department's culture of assessment; but it is still a slow-going process. The Music master graduate program has been collecting data from student work created in a research course. Also, a proposal for a uniform program measurement tool has been established for this program's final recital preview. This is positive improvement for this program. The uniform program measurement tool should be ready for piloting in Spring 2017. In addition, the M.F.A. in Dance program has created an endpoint program assessment rubric measurement. This is the first year this rubric has been administered; so data from this rubric should be discussed in the program's 2016-2017 annual assessment report.

For CFA, the focus has been on working with department chairs one-one one and helping them see the relevance of program assessment as it pertains to student learning. The associate dean will share the maturity rubric results with each program chair before the end of the semester in order to help the chairs see their program's baseline as well as to deepen the chairs understanding of the College's expectations regarding continuous assessment.

From an examination of SLOs and annual program assessment reports and program assessment plans, it is becoming clear that the three-year assessment plans are not being utilized by approximately half of the academic programs. This issue will be communicated and addressed by the associate dean with the programs in Fall 2017 during the one-on-one chair meetings. However, it will take some time for this issue to be addresses but, again, the current climate of assessment is continuously improving in CFA.

An assessment website has been developed to provide information about CFA's assessment processes and activities to faculty, staff, and students. To access the CFA assessment website, go to <http://finearts.unm.edu/college-of-fine-arts-outcomes-assessment/>.

### 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 2.6.

### **College of University Libraries and Learning Sciences**

Similar to the 2014-2015 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 2015-2016 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 2015-2016 assessment cycle that should be addressed within CULLS.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 Institutional State of Assessment Reports include a listing of four active academic programs.

Overall, CULLS has demonstrated progress and improvement between the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 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 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 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--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)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2015-2016				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
College of University Libraries and Learning Sciences (4)	0% (0)	25% (1)	25% (1)	50% (2)

For the 2015-2016 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. For both the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 assessment cycles, 75% of the four academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2.

The overall assessment maturity average for CULLS, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, improved from 1.5 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle to 2.25 for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. In other words, the College improved from the equivalent of a Level 1 assessment maturity average to the equivalent of a Level 2 assessment maturity average based on the revised APAM rubric.

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. In addition, the OILS program's faculty (4) conducted a comprehensive review of its masters and doctoral programs and made plans for improvement in program curriculum, procedures, instructions, and assessments. The OILS program's faculty had planned to evaluate the Education Specialist Certificate program, which had no students during the 2015-2016 academic year; but a decision was made to delay the evaluation of the program until the 2016-2017 academic year.

For the B.S. program, the 2015-2016 assessment cycle was the second year of a three-year assessment plan for the OILS 2+2 Technology & Training program. During the 2016-2017 academic year, the OILS program's faculty will analyze the program assessment data collected during the 2015-2016 academic year in order to make program changes to the SLOs as well as in how the internship program is assessed. For the 2017-2018 academic year, the OILS program will add a new course (i.e., OILS 102) to teach students knowledge and practice of online learning strategies.

For the M.A. program, the 2015-2016 assessment cycle was the third year of a three-year assessment plan. The OILS program's faculty conducted a comprehensive review of its master's program in order to make recommendations for improvement in program curriculum, procedures, instructions, and assessments. The OILS program's faculty held a strategic retreat incorporating assessment data as part of the process. The result of the comprehensive review was a decision to restructure the entire M.A. curriculum to provide concentrations so that students can specialize in a specific area as well as to offer an eight-week course schedule to align with the Learning Officer initiative. In addition, a capstone course will be added to scaffold students' communication skills and the integration of various concepts in the program. Programmatic changes were submitted and accepted through the UNM Curriculum Workflow Process. The new curriculum will be implemented at the beginning of Fall 2017.

For the 2016-2017 academic year, the OILS program will plan and begin a new three-year assessment plan for the M.A. program. The OILS program will assess the new program changes with the intention of revising the SLOs for both the portfolio and thesis options in order to make sure they complement the SLOs in the Ph.D. program.

For the Ph.D. program, the 2015-2016 assessment cycle was the third year of a three-year assessment plan. The OILS program's faculty conducted a comprehensive review of its Ph.D. program in order to make recommendations for improvement in program curriculum, procedures, instructions, and assessments. The result of the comprehensive review was to create and develop new research methods courses to better prepare students to plan and conduct scholarly work as well as to make the OILS 600 course an elective in order to ensure consistent data collection for performance benchmarks at comps and beyond. A new form was created to be completed and attached as other paperwork was completed. Programmatic changes were submitted and accepted through the UNM Curriculum Workflow Process. The new curriculum will begin implementation in Fall 2016.

In the 2016-2017 academic year, the OILS program will plan and begin a new three-year assessment plan for the Ph.D. program. Part of the revised assessment plan will include a holistic comprehensive assessment of individual doctoral students by all program faculty. In addition, the OILS program will

assess the program SLOs with the intention of revising the SLOs for the Ph.D. students as well as to make sure the SLOs complement the SLOs in the M.A. program.

The OILS program’s faculty will review the Education Specialist Certificate program for future viability during the 2016-2017 academic year. If the decision is made to keep the program, the OILS program will develop an assessment plan that includes SLOs that are aligned with the M.A. program. This will be done at the same time that the OILS program’s faculty develop the three-year assessment plan for the M.A. and Ph.D. programs in order to make sure all three programs complement each other.

An assessment website has been developed to provide information about CULLS’ assessment processes and activities to faculty, staff, and students. To access the CULLS assessment website, go to <http://libguides.unm.edu/c.php?g=416079&p=3286018>.

### 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 2.5.

### **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 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 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 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 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--2014-2015				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
Graduate Studies (1)	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
Graduate Studies (1)	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

For the 2015-2016 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 both the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 assessment cycles, SA+P academic programs received an assessment maturity average below a Level 2.

The overall assessment maturity average for SA+P, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, stayed the same at 0.29 for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. This assessment maturity average is the equivalent of a Level 0 on the revised APAM rubric.

#### Areas of Improvement

A State of Assessment Report was not submitted for GS for the 2013-2014 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.

An assessment website has been designated to provide information about GS' assessment processes and activities to faculty, staff, and students. To access the GS designated assessment website, go to <http://grad.unm.edu/resources/assessment.html>. However, the GS assessment website has not been developed and does not include any program assessment information.

#### 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 2016-2017 assessment cycle; and
- increase the GS' overall assessment maturity average to at least a 1.6.

#### **Honors College**

Similar to the 2014-2015 academic year, the Honors College (HC) consisted of a total of one active academic degree program during the 2015-2016 academic year. The degree program that is offered by HC is the Interdisciplinary Liberal Arts (B.A.) academic program.

#### Concerns/Issues

There are no known assessment-related issues for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle that should be addressed within HC.

### Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 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 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 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--2014-2015				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
Honors College (1)	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2015-2016				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
Honors College (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (1)	0% (0)

For the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that the HC academic program did submit an assessment plan and/or assessment report for this assessment cycle. For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, the HC academic program submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report that received an assessment maturity average below Level 2 whereas the academic program submitted assessment documentation for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle that received an assessment maturity average at Level 2.

The overall assessment maturity average for HC, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for its academic program, improved from 0.3 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle to 2.5 for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. In other words, the College improved from the equivalent of a Level 0 assessment maturity average to the equivalent of a Level 2 assessment maturity average based on the revised APAM rubric.

### Areas of Improvement

This year the HC Legacy Coordinator and Adjunct Faculty member, Renee Faubion, joined our Assessment Coordinator, Assistant Professor Sarita Cargas, to form an assessment team. This was done in response to the quite heavy assessment workload Prof. Cargas was experiencing and brought Renee's assessment expertise with the freshman series Legacy courses more front and center in the program and Core assessment process. Improvement in the HC culture of continuous assessment and program assessment practices is now well-established in the College. All HC faculty members participate in the process as the HC CARC, which supports Prof. Cargas' and Renee's efforts. It is believed that these efforts are improving pedagogy in B.A. program courses. The HC takes teaching very seriously, so the faculty spend significant time on assessment. The annual assessment reports will be shared and thoroughly discussed at the HC annual faculty retreat. Also, the HC faculty work throughout the academic year to refine program student learning outcomes (SLOs) and rubrics as evidenced by the annual assessment report for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle.

During the HC annual faculty retreat, faculty review the program assessment data on student achievement levels for the SLOs examined during the previous academic year. Also, refinement of program SLOs and the program rubrics used to assess them are discussed in faculty meetings throughout the academic year at the Legacy meetings, which is attended by all instructors in the Legacy series, and at the College’s “Coffee and Conversation” series, which is a monthly workshop attended by all full-time and adjunct faculty members. The HC faculty, as a whole, regularly discuss program curricular changes and approaches for SLOs for which students do not meet baseline expectations. For example, the faculty have been working on ways to improve student analytical writing by inviting the Director of Core Writing to the HC Coffee and Conversation series as well as by sharing writing pedagogical practices from their classes. In addition, the faculty are developing a curriculum map to more explicitly illustrate the scaffolding of the SLO skills over time from freshman to senior status.

Just a few years ago the HC was not submitting any program assessment reports. In just the few years, since becoming a College, the HC has fully embraced a culture of continuous assessment and has rigorously submitted program assessment results based on the program rubrics. The program’s faculty have systematically and regularly revisited the program SLOs, rubrics, and course content in an effort to continuously improve their teaching and their assessment of student learning. The Dean of HC has described the state of assessment in the College as being exemplary.

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:

- maintain the overall collection of the program’s assessment documentation at 100%; and
- increase the College’s overall assessment maturity average to at least a 2.6.

**School of Architecture and Planning**

Similar to the 2014-2015 academic year, the School of Architecture and Planning (SA+P) consisted of a total of eight active academic degree and certificate programs during the 2015-2016 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 2015-2016 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 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 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 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 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--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)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2015-2016				
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 2015-2016 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that all eight of the SA+P academic programs did submit an assessment plan but they did not submit an annual program assessment report for this assessment cycle. For both the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 assessment cycles, SA+P academic programs received an assessment maturity average below a Level 2.

The overall assessment maturity average for SA+P, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, stayed the same at 0.29 for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. This assessment maturity average is the equivalent of a Level 0 on the revised 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 as requested via OneDrive; so the Office of Assessment was unable to access the annual program assessment report for each SA+P program.

In Spring 2014, the M.C.R.P. program received a seven-year reaffirmation of its accreditation by the Planning Accreditation Board (PAB), which is the longest reaffirmation period granted. The M.C.R.P. program's faculty had a faculty retreat in August 2016 to focus on program courses and curriculum. In Fall 2016, this program underwent the UNM Academic Program Review Process. The APR Process was positive overall.

Also, the M.L.A. program underwent its accreditation review by the Landscape Architecture Accrediting Board (LAAB) in February 2016. This program received full accreditation for the next six years.

### Goals for Continuous Improvement

The following are the goals for the 2016-2017 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 2016-2017 assessment cycle; and
- increase the School's overall assessment maturity average to at least a 1.2.

### **School of Engineering**

For the 2015-2016 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 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.)	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 2015-2016 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 its graduate certificate program.
- For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, SoE's academic programs did not utilize 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.
- For the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, SoE submitted program assessment plans but did not submit annual program assessment reports and/or submitted the wrong/different report for some of its programs. As a result, the Office of Assessment was unable to access and review the assessment practices and assessment maturity for these programs for evaluation for this assessment cycle.

## Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 Institutional State of Assessment Reports include a listing of 34 active academic programs.

Overall, SoE has demonstrated progress and improvement between the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 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 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 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--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)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2015-2016				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
School of Engineering (34)	38% (13)	24% (8)	21% (7)	18% (6)

For the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that 13 of the SoE academic programs did submit an assessment plan and/or annual program assessment report for this assessment cycle. For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, six (18%) of the 34 academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher whereas 13 of the 34 (38%) academic programs submitted assessment documentation for the 2015-2016 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, progressed from 0.47 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle to 1.11 for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. In other words, the School improved from the equivalent of a Level 0 assessment maturity average to the equivalent of a Level 1 assessment maturity average based on the revised APAM rubric.

### Areas of Improvement

The overall state of assessment in the SoE seems to be mature at the undergraduate level, and is emerging at the graduate level. The School's undergraduate programs accreditation through ABET has required that they perform program assessment for continuous improvement for over the last 20 years. So, as evidenced by SoE's successful ABET accreditation throughout the years, it seems clear that its undergraduate programs' assessment practices are mature and are functioning well. All of SoE's undergraduate programs have used program assessment results to drive changes in the curriculum and to improved student learning and achievement.

Since ABET does not accredit both undergraduate and graduate programs, SoE does not have a long history with program assessment and continuous improvement at the graduate level. Indeed, the School's graduate assessment structure is only approximately four years old. All of the graduate programs have student learning outcomes (SLOs), and all have a process for assessing the SLOs. As the graduate programs gain experience with their assessment plan and assessment practices, it is expected that the graduate assessment structure will be refined to strengthen the usage of program assessment results to drive curricular changes.

However, the assessment plan and/or annual program assessment report, with accompanying evidence, for some of the SoE undergraduate and graduate programs were not submitted via OneDrive as required; so the Office of Assessment was unable to access the assessment plan and/or annual program assessment report for several of the SoE programs.

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

### Goals for Continuous Improvement

The following are the goals for the 2016-2017 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 65%;
- submit an assessment plan and annual program assessment report, with accompanying evidence, for each academic program for the 2016-2017 assessment cycle; and
- increase the School's overall assessment maturity average to at least a 1.3.

### **School of Population Health**

The School of Population Health (SPH) was newly established for the 2015-2016 academic year.

It consists of a total of two active academic and certificate degree programs and two active interdisciplinary graduate degree programs during the 2015-2016 academic year. The number of each type of degree and certificate program that is offered by SPH follows:

SPH Degrees/Certificates	No.
Bachelor of Science in Population Health (B.S.)	1
Master of Public Health (M.P.H.)	1
Master of Public Health (M.H.A.)/Master of Arts in Latin American Studies and Public Health (M.A.L.A.S.)	1
Master of Public Health (M.H.A.)/Doctor of Medicine (M.D.)	1

Concerns/Issues

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

- For the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, SPH 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 SPH 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.

Table 1 below provide an overview of the percentages of the academic programs performing at each assessment maturity level for the 2015-2016 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--2015-2016				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
School of Population Health (4)	100% (4)	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 four SPH academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report during this assessment cycle.

The overall assessment maturity average for SPH, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, was 0 for the 2015-2016 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 SPH for the 2016-2017 assessment cycle.

### Areas of Improvement

A State of Assessment Report was not submitted for SPH for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. Also, an assessment plan and annual program assessment report was not submitted for any of the four 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 SPH 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 SPH 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 25%;
- submit an assessment plan and annual program assessment report, with accompanying evidence, for each academic program for the 2016-2017 assessment cycle;
- submit a State of Assessment Report for SPH; and
- increase the School's overall assessment maturity average to at least a 0.8.

### **University College**

Similar to the 2014-2015 academic year, the University College (UC) consisted of a total of three active academic degree and certificate programs during the 2015-2016 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 2015-2016 assessment cycle, no annual program assessment report was submitted for the B.I.S. and B.L.A. academic programs for this assessment cycle.
- For the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, no State of Assessment Report was submitted for UC.

### Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 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 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 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--2014-2015				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
University College (3)	0% (0)	33% (1)	67% (2)	0% (0)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2015-2016				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
University College (3)	67% (2)	0% (0)	33% (1)	0% (0)

For the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that two of the three UC academic programs did not submit an assessment plan and/or assessment report during this assessment cycle. For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, two (67%) of the three academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher whereas one of the three (33%) academic programs submitted assessment documentation for the 2015-2016 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 1.78 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle to 0.89 for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. In other words, the College decreased from the equivalent of a Level 2 assessment maturity average to the equivalent of a Level 1 assessment maturity average based on the revised APAM rubric.

#### Areas of Improvement

A State of Assessment Report was not submitted for UC for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. Also, an annual program assessment report was not submitted for the B.L.A. and B.I.S. 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 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:

- increase the overall collection of academic programs’ assessment documentation to 100%;
- submit a State of Assessment Report for UC for the 2016-2017 assessment cycle;

- submit an annual program assessment report, with accompanying evidence, for all three UC academic programs; and
- increase the UC's overall assessment maturity average to at least a 1.9.

**College of Nursing**

Similar to the 2014-2015 academic year, the College of Nursing (CON) consisted of a total of five active academic degree and certificate programs for the 2015-2016 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 2015-2016 assessment cycle that should be addressed within CON.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 Institutional State of Assessment Reports include a listing of 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 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 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--2014-2015				
<b>Colleges, Schools &amp; Branches</b>	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
College of Nursing (5)	20% (1)	0% (0)	80% (4)	0% (0)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2015-2016				
<b>Colleges, Schools &amp; Branches</b>	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
College of Nursing (5)	0% (0)	20% (1)	0% (0)	80% (4)

For the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that all of the five CON academic programs submitted an assessment plan and/or assessment report during this assessment cycle. For both the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 assessment

cycles, four (80%) of the five 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 CON, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, progressed from 1.60 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle to 2.20 for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. In other words, the College maintained the equivalent of a Level 2 assessment maturity average based on the revised APAM rubric.

### Areas of Improvement

During the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, the Program Evaluation Committee (PEC) initiated semi-annual retreats with Program Directors, Concentration Coordinators and College administrators. These retreats served to keep all key faculty and administrators apprised of Higher Learning Commission (HLC) and professional nursing accreditation requirements and overall academic program progress. The retreats have increased faculty involvement in program evaluation, as well as provided a space for reporting curricular and/or program revisions across all degree programs. Additionally, periodic reports from the committee are provided to the CON full-time faculty and staff during monthly College meetings.

During this assessment period, CON completed its plans to improve the monitoring and support of a culture of continuous program assessment, which were identified in the 2014-2015 CON State of Assessment Report and included below:

- Re-alignment of the Program Evaluation Committee and membership;
- Meetings of the Program Evaluation Committee at least six times per year;
- Addition of a Strategic Support Manager to work with the committee on quality improvement measures;
- Active participation of the PEC chair in the College of Nursing Coordinating Committee, periodic reports to the full 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.

Plans regarding continuous improvement at the college and program level for the next academic year include but are not limited to:

- Development of accreditation reports for upcoming visits of the HLC in 2019 and the CCNE due in early 2020;
- Develop student and support services assessment plans and reports in accordance with new HLC requirements;
- Active participation of the PEC chair in the College of Nursing Coordinating Committee, periodic reports to the full faculty and teams, as well as the Provost's Academic Program Assessment Committee;

- PEC Chair to participate in on-going preparation for 2020 Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education accreditation visit; and
- Update the CON public assessment website.

### Goals for Continuous Improvement

The following are the goals for the 2015-2016 academic year that the Office of Assessment has established for CON 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 2.3.

### **College of Pharmacy**

Similar to the 2014-2015 academic year, the College of Pharmacy (COP) consisted of a total of three active academic degree and certificate programs for the 2015-2016 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 2015-2016 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 2015-2016 assessment cycle, no State of Assessment Report was submitted for COP.

### Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 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 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 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--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)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2015-2016				
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 2015-2016 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, stayed the same at 1.78 for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. In other words, the College maintained the equivalent of a Level 2 assessment maturity average based on the revised APAM rubric.

#### Areas of Improvement

A State of Assessment Report was not submitted for COP for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. 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 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 an program assessment plan and/or annual program assessment report, with accompanying evidence, for each COP academic program for the 2016-2017 assessment cycle; and
- increase the COP's overall assessment maturity average to at least a 1.9.

#### **School of Medicine**

Similar to the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, the 2015-2016 academic year, School of Medicine (SOM) consisted of a total of 18 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.)	2
Certificate	4

Concerns/Issues

There are no known assessment-related issues for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle that should be addressed within SOM.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 Institutional State of Assessment Reports include a listing of 18 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 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 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--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)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2015-2016				
Colleges, Schools & Branches	Lvl 0	Lvl 1	Lvl 2	Lvl 3
School of Medicine (18)	0% (0)	0% (0)	17% (3)	83% (15)

For the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that all 18 of the SOM academic programs submitted program assessment documentation during this assessment cycle. For the 2014-2015 assessment cycle, 16 (88%) of the 18 programs in SOM submitted an assessment plan and/or annual assessment report that received an assessment maturity average of Level 2 or higher whereas all 18 academic programs in SOM did submit 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 SOM, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, progressed from 1.89 for the 2014-2015 assessment cycle to 2.75 for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle. In other words, the School improved from the equivalent of a Level 2 assessment maturity average to the equivalent of a Level 3 assessment maturity average based on the revised APAM rubric.

### Areas of Improvement

Regular use of documented processes are in place for assessing and evaluating the extent to which all of the SOM academic programs' student learning objectives are being achieved. The SOE CARC is advised of regular external accreditation and identification of opportunities for program improvement. All SOM programs initiate and maintain regularly scheduled and documented curriculum committee meetings, where the regular use of evaluation of tools for assessing teaching effectiveness and student learning outcomes are reviewed and monitored by all programs. Program assessment results are monitored assuring systematic changes to curriculum for continuous improvement. In addition, all SOM programs hold monthly meetings from the Education Dean Level, down to the faculty and staff level to improve, inform, validate, and support a culture of continuous assessment.

Furthermore, the SOM is focused on the strategic planning process with positive steps continually placed on student learning and program assessment activities to meet the goals of both the Health Sciences Center and the School of Medicines. SOM will continue to monitor all programs and their assessment practices. The SOM CARC will be prioritizing the review and update of the B.R.E.P. and B.S.G.P. programs specifically in the area of program assessment methods (measures and instruments) in to assure that these programs have reported the use of at least two direct program-level assessment measures and one indirect program -level assessment measure.

### 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 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 2.9.

### **School of Law**

Similar to the 2014-2015 academic year, School of Law (SoL) consisted of a total of one active academic degree program during the 2015-2016 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 2015-2016 assessment cycle, no program assessment plan or annual program assessment report was submitted the SoL academic programs for this assessment cycle.
- For the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, no State of Assessment Report was submitted for SoL.

Assessment Maturity Scores

The 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 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 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 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--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)

Table 2: Percentages of Academic Programs Performing at each Assessment Maturity Level--2015-2016				
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 2015-2016 assessment cycle, based on the revised APAM rubric, the Level 0 assessment maturity level indicated that SoL academic program did not submit program assessment documentation during this assessment cycle.

The overall assessment maturity average for SOM, which was based on the assessment maturity score means for each academic program, stayed at 0 for this assessment cycle. In other words, the School maintained the equivalent of a Level 0 assessment maturity average based on the revised APAM rubric.

Areas of Improvement

A State of Assessment Report was not submitted for SoL for the 2015-2016 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 0.9.

**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	
<b>Assessment Plan</b>	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.	
<b>Measurable Program Student Learning Outcomes</b>	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.	
<b>Alignment of Program Learning Goals, Student Learning Outcomes, &amp; UNM Learning Goals</b>	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).	
<b>Program Assessment Methods (Measures/ Instruments)</b>	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.	
<b>Data Collection &amp; Analysis</b>	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.	
<b>Implementation of Program Improvements/ Revisions</b>	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:

- Based 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](mailto:assess@unm.edu).

### Appendix D: Overall Assessment Maturity Averages by Level

