

## Ohio University, OH

### Assessment Culture

---

**Participation Start:** 09-01-2016

**Participation End:** 08-31-2024

**Date Completed:** 08-04-2017

Team Leader: Joni Wadley

Team Member(s): Michael Williford

This Results Report reflects the activity of Ohio University in the Action Project Collaboration Network. It is not an official document of the Higher Learning Commission.

## Declaration

---

Q:

**Briefly describe the project in less than 100 words. Be sure to identify the key organizational areas (departments, programs, divisions, units, etc.) and key organizational processes that this action project will affect, change, and/or improve.**

A: This Action Project revises our previous Action Project on Academic Assessment. During our Strategy Forum in April 2015, we were encouraged to focus our Action Project to include activities that could be completed within nine months. Ohio University has a long history with academic assessment, beginning in the 1980's. With encouragement from the most recent Systems Appraisal, the University recognizes the need to revitalize its academic assessment efforts. The overall vision of the project is to recognize, develop, support, and share existing, proven practices among Ohio University faculty for improving student learning and expanding opportunities for student success.

Q:

**Describe your institution's reasons for initiating this action project now and how long it should take to complete it. Why are this project and its goals high among your institution's current priorities? Also, explain how this project relates to any strategic initiatives or challenges described in the institution's recent or soon-to-be submitted Systems Portfolio.**

A: The most recent Systems Appraisal identified a significant opportunity for improving assessment practices. In the work prior to the April 2015 Strategy Forum, we identified academic assessment as an area in which Ohio University needs to provide University-wide support for its decentralized and diverse academic colleges, schools/departments, and campuses. Ohio University desires to use AQIP and the newly-revised HLC Criteria for Accreditation to help it achieve its mission, which is the intellectual and personal development of its students, and its vision, to become the nation's best transformative learning community. The University is planning for a Comprehensive Quality Review and reaffirmation of accreditation in 2015-16, and is using the newly-revised Criteria for Accreditation, particularly Criteria Three and Four, to bring new energy and attention to its teaching, learning, and assessment efforts. The University desires to ensure that faculty have a systematic, faculty-centered approach to continuous improvement through a focus on learning objectives.

At the April 2015 Strategy Forum, we were encouraged to move all our Action Projects to the new staggered cycle (winter, spring, summer). This Action Project is being moved to the Spring cycle. Activities will begin in fall semester and will extend throughout the 2015-16 academic year. This Action Project is the first phase of what is expected to be a multiphase set of projects related to assessment.

Q:

**List the project goals, milestones, and deliverables along with corresponding metrics, due dates, and other measures for assessing the progress toward each goal. Be sure to include when you anticipate submitting the project for formal reviews.**

**A:** Ohio University desires to recognize, develop, support, and share proven practices for improving student learning and expanding opportunities for student success. There are two overarching goals of this Action Project. The first is to identify and profile existing work that faculty are doing related to SOTL, academic assessment, and student success. The second is to provide incentives and encouragement for new and innovative efforts to improve teaching and learning. Following is the Action Planning Template that was developed at the April 2015 Strategy Forum:

	<b>Action/Milestone/Deliverable</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Measure/Target</b>
New Faculty Profile	Profile design	UCM	8/15/2015	Ready to populate 30% returned by 10/1/2015
	Faculty information	EVPP	10/1/2015	
	Profiles up	UCM	AY 2015-16	75% Group I by 5/1/2016 50% Group II by 5/1/2016
1804 Grants for SOTL	Revise call for 1804 proposals to encourage SOTL-oriented projects	VPUE	8/15/2015	Posted
	Publicize 1804 revision	VPUE SVPII	3/1/2016	Increase the percentage of applications and awards with SOTL components
Inventory/Showcase	Inventory assessment and SOTL activities	SVPII	10/15/2015	Create spreadsheet

Communicat  
e range of  
assessment  
and SOTL  
activities

SVPII  
VPUE  
UCM  
OIT

11/15/2015

Website  
updated

**Q:**

**Describe how various members of the learning community will participate in this action project. Show the breadth of involvement by individuals and groups over the project's duration.**

**A:** All academic departments/schools, colleges, and regional campuses are expected to be involved in academic assessment activities. Key stakeholders are faculty; students; academic leadership; staff; Board of Trustees; and external stakeholders.

The Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Committee will coordinate the goals and objectives of this Action Project. Specific individuals and offices have been tasked with actions identified at the Strategy Forum. Referring to the Action Planning Template in #3 above, the Executive Vice President and Provost (EVPP) bears ultimate responsibility for delegating these activities to the most appropriate personnel. University Communication and Marketing (UCM) and the EVPP office will develop a way to gather information from incoming faculty on activities related to SOTL and profile these through UCM outlets throughout fall semester. The Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and the Senior Vice Provost for Instructional Innovation will work to set aside part of an existing internal grant (1804 Grants) to encourage SOTL-oriented projects, publicize the revisions, and solicit grant applications from faculty across the University. These vice provosts will also work with UCM and the Office of Information Technology to inventory existing, exemplary assessment and SOTL activities from current faculty, and showcase them throughout the University.

**Q:**

**Describe how the institution will monitor project progress/success during, and at the completion of this project. Be sure to specifically state the measures that will be evaluated and when.**

**A:** Referring to the Action Planning Template in #3 above, specific measures, targets, and dates have been identified. Some of the targets are determined simply by the completion of the actual activity. These activities include completion of the new faculty profile, the 1804 Grant RFP's being posted, the inventory spreadsheet of assessment/SOTL activities, and University Web sites being updated. Other activities will be measured by percentage of faculty involvement/response to requests for profile information and percent increase in 1804 Grant applications related to assessment/SOTL.

**Q:**

**Describe the challenges that may be encountered in successfully completing the project**

**or for institutionalizing the learning from the project's goals.**

**A:** We assume sufficient faculty interest and participation for success of the Action Project, particularly from new faculty. Current policies and incentives (e.g. existing promotion and tenure guidelines) may constrain the Action Project's degree of success. Resources (time and financial) are constrained. Effective communication across a large, diverse, and decentralized research university is challenging. Faculty already have many competing interests and duties. Sustained support and attention from the project's sponsor (EVPP) and collaborators is crucial. Financial stability, currently a major challenge for public universities, is crucial.

**Q:**

**Provide any additional information that the institution wishes reviewers to understand regarding this Action Project.**

**A:** We anticipate that this Action Project will take up to three years for all components to mature. The first phase, described above, is expected to occur during the 2015-16 academic year. As this project matures and evolves, additional activities will be carried out to expand Ohio University's capacity for an institution-wide culture of assessment (e.g., redesigning the new faculty orientation, creating an awards program to recognize specific faculty achievements in this area).

## Concluding Report

---

**Q:**

**What is the primary reason for closing this project?**

**A:** The identified goals of this action project have been met, including:

- Academic program review self-study guidelines have been revised to focus more on student outcomes than on inputs. University Curriculum Council (UCC) has fully implemented the revised [program review self-study requirements](#) and [program review process](#).
- Academic programs are updating their learning objectives and developing new, ongoing assessment plans. The Assessment Clearinghouse is built and continuing to evolve with program student learning outcomes and department and program assessment plans loaded and evidence of student learning and use of student learning evidence to be included by the end of fall semester 2017.
- eLearning Ohio is incorporating a quality assurance process in its distance learning programs. Due to academic restructuring of all online programs to their respective on-campus colleges this goal was not continued. Online programs follow the same assessment processes that their respective on-campus programs follow.
- Identify and profile existing work that new faculty are bringing to the University related to Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL), academic assessment, and student success, and to identify and profile existing work that current faculty are doing related to assessment. The Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (TLA) Committee and the Office of Instructional Innovation (OII) have made significant strides in recognizing teaching excellence and learning support across Ohio University through the [2017 Spotlight on Learning Conference](#), and the [Innovation Showcase](#).
- Provide incentives and encouragement for new and innovative efforts to improve teaching and learning. The objectives were to design, develop, and then publicize profiles of faculty work, and to redirect internal funding for proposals to encourage SOTL. The 1804 Undergraduate Fund (internal OU grant) advertised and granted priority consideration for the continuous improvement of student learning. OII also maintains an [inventory](#) of internal grants and awards that support teaching excellence.

---

Link 1: [program review self-study requirements](#)

<https://www.ohio.edu/facultysenate/committees/ucc/upload/Self-Study-Requirements-Approved-2.docx>

Link 2: [program review process](#)

<https://www.ohio.edu/facultysenate/ucc/upload/UCC-Program-Review-Process-Approved-2015.docx>

Link 3: [2017 Spotlight on Learning Conference](#)

<https://www.ohio.edu/instructional-innovation/ctl/events/sol-17.html>

Link 4: [Innovation Showcase](#)

<https://www.ohio.edu/instructional-innovation/stories/showcase/index.html>

Link 5: [inventory](#)

<https://www.ohio.edu/instructional-innovation/stories/innovation-support.html>

**Q:**

**What aspects of this project would you categorize as successful?**

**A:** In addition to meeting the goals of this project, the overall success of this project was a revitalization and growth in our teaching, learning and assessment processes. The revision of the academic program review process to include a review of a program's student learning outcomes assessment processes, the centralization of student learning outcomes assessment via the Assessment Clearinghouse and the recognition of teaching excellence and learning support across the University by the Teaching, Learning and Assessment Committee and the Office of Instructional Innovation contributed to the growth and revitalization of our teaching learning and assessment processes.

Another notable success of this project was faculty participation. The extent of faculty participation within this project was unintentionally understated in both previous reviews of this action project. The University Curriculum Council (UCC), which led the process for revising the academic program review guidelines and process, is a standing committee of Ohio University's Faculty Senate. Of the 52 member UCC committee, 30 are faculty. Ten of the 24 members of the Teaching, Learning and Assessment Committee are also faculty. Of the over 165 OHIO faculty and staff that attended the Spotlight on Learning conference 103 were faculty. Seventy percent (70%) of the presentations at the 23 breakout sessions were presented by faculty from various campuses. Despite competing interests for faculty time, at the core of the project's advancement of Ohio University's teaching, learning and assessment processes was faculty involvement.

It is also worth noting that during this action project's duration, the action project processes underwent significant and ongoing change at HLC. Likewise during this same time period, there was substantial change in organizational structure and leadership at Ohio University. Despite these obstacles the spirit of this project was maintained through these changes. While we received feedback that this project experienced scope creep, we feel that this project underwent less scope creep than recalibration to a changing standard and shifting leadership priorities. Regardless of both, the project nonetheless continued and made significant progress. The project's persistence despite significant challenges is yet another success.

**Q:**

**What aspects of this project would you categorize as less than successful?**

**A:** While the University Curriculum Council, Office of Instructional Innovation and the Teaching, Learning and Assessment Committee have anecdotal evidence that this project resulted in the growth of our teaching, learning and assessment processes, the lack of direct measures of cultural change resulted in a lack of direct evidence to support this growth. Numbers participating in the various action project activities such as Innovation Showcases, the Spotlight on Learning Event and those programs completing their Academic Program Review self-studies, can be tracked, but direct measures of cultural change was challenging to produce.

## Concluding Review

---

**Q:**

**Do you have any final thoughts or feedback for this institution in regards to this project? Enter N/A if not applicable.**

**A:** Good work in completing the project. The University has identified a challenge in direct measures of cultural change. The University is encouraged to continue its exploration as this a challenge for many.



## Project: Assessment Culture

---

### Version 2.0 - Project

**Q:**

**What is the current status of your project?**

**A:** Completed

**Q:**

**Please indicate the original project start date, original project end date, and anticipated completion date if project is not completed. Please list dates on separate lines.**

**A:** Original Start Date: June 30, 2015

Original End Date: June 30, 2016

Revised/Actual End Date: May 5, 2017

**Q:**

**Briefly describe the current status of the project. Explain how this project relates to any strategic initiatives or challenges described in the institution's most recent or soon-to-be submitted systems portfolio, if applicable.**

**A:** With encouragement from the most recent Systems Appraisal (2014) the University identified a significant opportunity for expanding a culture of assessment among our faculty and designed the action project. However, at the April 2015 Strategy Forum, we were encouraged to move all of our Action Projects to the new staggered cycle (winter, summer, fall). This Action Project, therefore, revises the original action project which was created in 2014. The University had a Comprehensive Quality Review and Reaffirmation of Accreditation in 2015-16 and the project was continued to further accomplish the visiting team's recommendation of a centralization of assessment initiatives.

The project concluded in May 2017 with the end of spring semester and the culminating Spotlight on Learning event for the campus. The Teaching, Learning and Assessment Committee is planning for future university-wide teaching and learning events. University Curriculum Council (UCC) has fully implemented the new program review process and guidelines, and will be performing a review of the new guidelines during the 2017-18 academic year. The Assessment Clearinghouse is built and continuing to evolve with program student learning outcomes and department and program assessment plans loaded and evidence of student learning and use of student learning evidence to be included by the end of fall semester 2017. While the action project has now reached completion, the

Teaching, Learning and Assessment Committee continues to further identify ways to mature the culture of assessment to assist the University in fulfilling its vision of being the “the nation’s best transformative learning community.”

**Q:**

**List the project goals as stated in the original project declaration along with the metrics/measures for assessing the progress for each goal.**

**A:** Stated Goals:

Even though Ohio University has a long history with academic assessment, this action project was initiated to restructure and mature its academic assessment efforts. Three distinct areas were included in the original action project to accomplish the efforts:

1. Academic program review self-study guidelines have been revised to focus more on student outcomes than on inputs.
2. All academic programs are updating their learning objectives and developing new, ongoing assessment plans.
3. eLearning Ohio is incorporating a quality assurance process in its distance learning programs.

After the April 2015 Strategy Forum, a revised action project was submitted with the following goals:

1. Identify and profile existing work that new faculty are bringing to the University related to Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL), academic assessment, and student success, and to identify and profile existing work that current faculty are doing related to assessment.
2. Provide incentives and encouragement for new and innovative efforts to improve teaching and learning. The objectives were to design, develop, and then publicize profiles of faculty work, and to redirect internal funding for proposals to encourage SOTL.

Despite the revision of these goals, Ohio University continued to work on the original goals, and therefore, we are including updates on our progress with those as well.

**Q:**

**Describe what has been accomplished with this project over the past year, specifically referring to quantifiable results that show progress. You may need to include a discussion clarifying how the original goals and anticipated outcomes may have shifted during the year.**

**A:** 1. Academic program review self-study guidelines have been revised to focus more on student outcomes than on inputs.

University Curriculum Council (UCC) has fully implemented the revised [program review self-study requirements](#) and [program review process](#). The first round of reviews under the new self-study requirements and review process were completed during the 2016-17 academic year with 16 programs receiving approval under the new self-study requirements and review process. UCC’s Program Review Committee will be performing a review of the revised program review process during the 2017-18 academic year.

2. All academic programs are updating their learning objectives and developing new, ongoing assessment plans.

Because student learning outcomes assessment has largely been a decentralized process

across colleges and campuses, it was recommended during our last CQR visit that Ohio University standardize the development and reporting of assessment of student learning outcomes across all programs and track assessment progress across the University. This tracking will enable us to provide necessary evidence of our commitment to maintaining this progress.

To ensure that the University has a standardized, central repository of these assessments, the Office of Institutional Research is developing the Assessment Clearinghouse, a central Web site, which will include for each department/program the following components:

1. Student Learning Outcomes
2. Assessment Plans
3. Evidence of Student Learning
4. Use of Student Learning Evidence

Over the past year, Assessment Liaisons have been designated for each academic college and the regional campuses. The Assessment Liaisons have worked collaboratively with the Teaching, Learning and Assessment Committee and the Director for Program Assessment Support Services to create the Assessment Clearinghouse. The Assessment Clearinghouse is built and continuing to evolve with program student learning outcomes and department and program assessment plans loaded and evidence of student learning and use of student learning evidence to be included by the end of fall semester 2017.

3. eLearning Ohio is incorporating a quality assurance process.

Due to academic restructuring of all online programs to their respective on-campus colleges this goal was not continued. Online programs follow the same assessment processes that their respective on-campus programs follow.

4. Identify and profile existing work that new faculty are bringing to the University related to Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL), academic assessment, and student success, and to identify and profile existing work that current faculty are doing related to assessment.

The Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (TLA) Committee and the Office of Instructional Innovation (OII) have made significant strides in recognizing teaching excellence and learning support across Ohio University. They organized the [2017 Spotlight on Learning Conference](#), an event focused on teaching and learning strategies to advance student academic success.

Through the [Innovation Showcase](#), OII is building a growing library of digital stories that serve as in-depth, media-rich examples of teaching excellence, faculty innovation, and exemplary practice. The five articles released to date demonstrate how to improve student comprehension using Team-Based Learning, create engaging experiences in Active Learning Classrooms, reach millennial learners, use storytelling in the classroom, and teach the arts online. An additional seven stories are planned to launch through June 2018.

5. Provide incentives and encouragement for new and innovative efforts to improve teaching and learning. The objectives were to design, develop, and then publicize profiles of faculty work, and to redirect internal funding for proposals to encourage SOTL.

The 1804 Fund was established by the Ohio University Foundation to support the

University's core mission of maintaining, strengthening, and enhancing a learning-centered community. The 1804 Undergraduate Fund (internal OU grant) advertised and granted priority consideration for the continuous improvement of student learning. In 2016-17, there were 10 Undergraduate Fund proposals, with two of them including continuous improvement of student learning:

- Boosting Nursing Students Confidence and Marketability with Pediatric Simulation – This proposal to fund pediatric simulation equipment for the nursing skills lab at the Southern Campus will provide undergraduate critical thinking and practice skills that are otherwise difficult or unattainable in the clinical setting. The proposed simulation equipment provides an opportunity for a new model to improve student learning and enhance achievement of behavioral learning outcomes for nursing students.
- Intelligent Lighting Equipment Package – It is important for theater students to be knowledgeable of the rapidly transitioning lighting equipment to LED sources and remotely-controlled devices in order for them to qualify for jobs in their field upon graduation. This proposal will ensure that theater students will leave Ohio University achieving learning outcomes and skills in the use of modern equipment and approaches to theatrical lighting.

OII also maintains an [inventory](#) of internal grants and awards that support teaching excellence. OHIO is known for its outstanding teaching, and this list highlights the opportunities that exist to recognize faculty for their inspiring instructional efforts. Faculty who use the inventory are connected to additional information about recent recipients, which provides them with examples of peers to emulate. They can leverage the opportunities available to improve student learning.

---

Link 1: [2017 Spotlight on Learning Conference](https://www.ohio.edu/instructional-innovation/ctl/events/sol-17.html)

<https://www.ohio.edu/instructional-innovation/ctl/events/sol-17.html>

Link 2: [Innovation Showcase](https://www.ohio.edu/instructional-innovation/stories/showcase/index.html)

<https://www.ohio.edu/instructional-innovation/stories/showcase/index.html>

Link 3: [inventory](https://www.ohio.edu/instructional-innovation/stories/innovation-support.html)

<https://www.ohio.edu/instructional-innovation/stories/innovation-support.html>

Link 4: [program review self study requirements](https://www.ohio.edu/facultysenate/committees/ucc/upload/Self-Study-Requirements-Approved-2.docx)

<https://www.ohio.edu/facultysenate/committees/ucc/upload/Self-Study-Requirements-Approved-2.docx>

Link 5: [program review process](https://www.ohio.edu/facultysenate/ucc/upload/UCC-Program-Review-Process-Approved-2015.docx)

<https://www.ohio.edu/facultysenate/ucc/upload/UCC-Program-Review-Process-Approved-2015.docx>

**Q:**

**Describe how various members of the learning community have participated in this action project. Show the breadth of involvement by individuals and groups over the project's duration, particularly during the past year.**

**A:** During the past year this project has involved many members from the learning community. The UCC's Program Review Committee, a Faculty Fellow for Program Review, and the Associate Provost for Faculty and Academic Planning have all worked over the period of this action project to implement the revised self-study requirements and academic program review process. The TLA Committee and the Director for Program Assessment Support Services worked directly with Assessment Liaisons representing every academic college and regional campuses to develop the Assessment Clearinghouse. Assessment Liaisons by turn worked with each academic department in their college to provide learning outcomes and assessment plans for the Assessment Clearinghouse. The TLA Committee and OII collaborated to organize the 2017 Spotlight on Learning event. Over 165 OHIO faculty and staff attended the conference, which included 23 breakout sessions presented by 40 faculty and staff from various campuses. Participants represented 10 academic colleges, 35 academic departments and 3 regional campuses as well as 8 different administrative support offices such as Institutional Research, Center for International Studies, Career and Leadership Development Center, Office of Information

Technology, Office of Instructional Innovation, Athletics and University Libraries.

OII and University Communication and Marketing (UCM) offices worked together to maintain and continue producing Innovation Showcase information from new faculty on activities related to SOTL and profile them through UCM outlets.

**Q:**

**Describe the effect that this project has had on the institution, students, and others in the learning community. What has the institution learned that can be identified as a good practice to use in other aspects of its quality work or from which other institutions might benefit?**

**A:** The main impact of this project was a revitalization and growth in our assessment processes. This was accomplished through several avenues. First, the revision of the academic program review process to include a review of a program's student learning outcomes assessment processes. Second, the centralization of student learning outcomes assessment via the Assessment Clearinghouse also matured our assessment processes. Third, was the Teaching, Learning and Assessment Committee and the Office of Instructional Innovation collaboratively making significant progress in recognizing teaching excellence and learning support across the University. For example, the 2017 Spotlight on Learning Conference was an event showcasing teaching, learning and assessment strategies that advance student academic success. Over 165 OHIO faculty and staff attended the conference, which included 23 breakout sessions presented by 40 faculty and staff from various campuses. Over 90% of participants that completed the conference evaluation agreed that the conference was relevant to their teaching or profession; 88% agreed they would recommend the conference to others. One person who completed the evaluation wrote, "As a new faculty member at a regional campus, today gave me the opportunity to meet other faculty from the various campuses. It was a positive experience that provided me with a number of strategies to improve my practice and the student experience." Also contributing to the recognition of teaching excellence are the efforts of OII as it continues to grow its Innovation Showcase. Showcase pieces have received more than 1,000 unique views since July 2016. Four of the stories include a video in addition to the written piece; the videos have received nearly 400 views since the series began. In learning about others' innovative strategies, faculty are inspired to experiment with new teaching methods, reimagine how to use learning environments, or adapt their practices to reach a new generation of learners.

Another impact of this project was the development of Assessment Liaisons within each Academic College and Regional Campuses. The Assessment Liaisons are a small group of assessment advocates who provide feedback and communication, regarding student learning outcomes assessment processes, to the Teaching, Learning and Assessment Committee from the academic departments within their colleges.

**Q:**

**Describe the anticipated challenges that may be encountered in successfully completing the project or for institutionalizing the learning from the project's goals.**

**A:** The primary challenge with this action project was developing appropriate metrics for measuring cultural change. Numbers participating in the various action project activities such as Innovation Showcases, the Spotlight on Learning Event and those programs completing their Academic Program Review self-studies, can be tracked, but direct

measures of cultural change is challenging.

Also challenging is the work to sustain the completeness of the inventories while making both the inventories and showcases even more visible. Continual updating of Web resources requires staff time, which can be limiting when personnel changes occur.

Finally a challenge to institutionalizing learning from this project is competing interests for faculty time. Resources (time and financial) are constrained. Faculty already have many competing interests and duties. For example, selecting a date to hold the Spotlight on Learning event was difficult. Selecting one day when all faculty have the opportunity to attend was not possible. Effective communication across a large, diverse, and decentralized research university is also challenging.

**Q:**

**In light of the project goals, current circumstances, institutional learning from this project, and anticipated barriers to success, list the next steps to be taken over the course of the next 12 - 24 months in order to complete or institutionalize the results of this action project. Provide a timeline for completing each next step.**

- A:**
- Assessment Clearinghouse will be published with all four reporting areas for each department and program by December 2017.
  - Teaching, Learning & Assessment Committee and OII will continue to organize and promote teaching, learning and assessment related conferences and learning opportunities for faculty: April 2018 and ongoing.
  - OII will continue to maintain and grow the Innovation Showcase. An additional seven stories are planned to launch through June 2018.
  - The revised Academic Program Review process is fully implemented, but a review is scheduled for academic year 2016-17.
  - TLA Committee will identify internal opportunities within each academic college to solicit Spotlight on Learning ideas from faculty or facilitate faculty discussion regarding teaching, learning and assessment. Various times academic year 2017-2018

**Q:**

**Provide any additional information, inquiries, or concerns that the institution wishes reviewers to understand regarding this Action Project. Enter N/A if not applicable.**

**A:** N/A

---

## Version 2.0 - Update

**Q:**

**I certify that this project is ready for review.**

**A:** I agree.

---

## Version 2.0 - Review

**Q:**

**Please comment on anything that is omitted or incomplete in the project status, dates and summary field. Enter N/A if not applicable.**

**Q:**

**Check for accuracy and completeness against the original Project Declaration. Are the right metrics or measures included for each goal? If not, what revisions to the metrics/measures would you suggest that the institution consider?**

**Q:**

**Has the institution acted in meaningful ways to pursue project success, making progress as anticipated in the original project declaration? If meaningful progress or project success has not been achieved, has the institution made appropriate revisions to the goals or anticipated outcomes for this project? • Are descriptions of resources, organization, concrete results, and reaching milestones included? • Make a statement of global judgment. (i.e. “The institution is making [excellent/good/satisfactory/acceptable/slow/ casual/no] progress in this action project.”).**

---

Link 1: [Project Charter](#)

**Q:**

**Are the appropriate people involved sufficiently for the nature and scope of the project?**

- **Is there sufficient breadth of involvement?**
- **Are the right people involved? • Emphasize the roles of those who can enhance the impact, success, or effectiveness of the project.**
- **Tactfully call attention to any people that appear to have been omitted or bypassed.**

**Q:**

**Does the institution show evidence of learning from what it did well?**

- **Acknowledge any practice that could be replicated internally in future projects.**
- **Encourage the sharing of best practices with other institutions.**

**Q:**

**Does the institution have a realistic understanding of what it needs to address in order to achieve progress and, ultimately, project success? Does it assess its internal and external environments, recognizing the potential forces that could hinder success? Is anything overlooked?**

**Q:**

**Does the institution understand the current status of its project and know how it intends to pursue project success?**

---

Link 1: [Assessment Academy](#)

**Q:**

**Overall, does the institution demonstrate a good faith effort in its pursuit of continuous quality improvement through this action project? Is there anything of concern that should be brought to the attention of AQIP via your mentor?**



## Project: Assessment Culture

---

### Version 1.0 - Project

**Q:**

**What is the current status of your project?**

**A:** In-progress

**Q:**

**Please indicate the original project start date, original project end date, and anticipated completion date if project is not completed. Please list dates on separate lines.**

**A: Original Project Start Date:** 6/30/2015

**Originally Projected End Date:** 6/30/2016

**Anticipated Completion Date If Not Completed:** 5/5/2017

**Q:**

**Briefly describe the current status of the project. Explain how this project relates to any strategic initiatives or challenges described in the institution's most recent or soon-to-be submitted systems portfolio, if applicable.**

**A:** With encouragement from the 2013-14 Systems Appraisal, the University recognized the need to expand its academic assessment culture. The purpose of the project is to implement projects designed to grow the faculty culture of assessment to improve teaching and learning. The University had a Comprehensive Quality Review and reaffirmation of accreditation in 2015-16, and used the newly-revised Criteria for Accreditation, particularly Criteria Three and Four, to bring new energy and attention to its teaching, learning, and assessment efforts.

The most recent Systems Appraisal (2014) and the most recent Strategy Forum (2015) identified a significant opportunity for expanding a culture of assessment among our faculty. Ohio University's vision is to be "the nation's best transformative learning community . . ."

**Q:**

**List the project goals as stated in the original project declaration along with the metrics/measures for assessing the progress for each goal.**

**A:** The first goal is to identify and profile existing work that new faculty are bringing to the University related to SOTL, academic assessment, and student success, and to identify and profile existing work that current faculty are doing related to assessment. The second goal is to provide incentives and encouragement for new and innovative efforts to improve teaching and learning. The objectives were to design, develop, and then publicize profiles of faculty work, and to redirect internal funding for proposals to encourage SOTL.

**Q:**

**Describe what has been accomplished with this project over the past year, specifically referring to quantifiable results that show progress. You may need to include a discussion clarifying how the original goals and anticipated outcomes may have shifted during the year.**

**A:** The following resources were designed, developed, and then publicized through Web sites:

*University Communications and Marketing (UCM) features Faculty profiles on the Ohio University front door. There is a video, etc.* <https://www.ohio.edu/supportive/index.cfm>

*New faculty webpage developed:* <https://www.ohio.edu/provost/apaa/newfaculty/index.cfm>

*New Faculty Toolkit developed:* <https://www.ohio.edu/provost/apaa/newfaculty/toolkit.cfm>

*For 2015-2016 new faculty with contact information by college is provided:* <https://www.ohio.edu/provost/apaa/newfaculty/ournewfaculty.cfm>

*New Faculty Welcome- updated for 2016:* <https://www.ohio.edu/provost/apaa/newfaculty/newfacultywelcome.cfm>;  
<https://www.ohio.edu/provost/apaa/newfaculty/nfwregister-form.cfm>

Other accomplishments include: 1) eight digitally enriched stories titled “*Teaching Matters: How we address the needs of Millennial and Post-Millennial learners*” (WOUB public radio interviews with faculty recognized for their exemplary teaching) to be broadcast locally and then made available internationally via a web aggregating public radio news site (website not yet live); and 2) a comprehensive listing of institution’s innovation support housed on the Office of Instructional Innovation (OII) Web site at:

<https://www.ohio.edu/instructional-innovation>. A considerable amount of resources, time and energy have been invested in the process of creating this OII website and insuring that the service environment is more visible across the institution. We anticipate metrics regarding consumption, i.e., web traffic analytics, to begin in August 2016.

The 1804 Fund was established by the Ohio University Foundation to support the University's core mission of maintaining, strengthening, and enhancing a learning-centered community. The 1804 Undergraduate Fund (internal OU grant) advertised and granted priority consideration for evaluating student learning. The revised 1804 Undergraduate Fund guidelines stated that “. . . proposals to the 1804 Fund for Undergraduate Learning that include a robust component for the evaluation and continuous improvement of student learning will receive additional consideration in recognition and support of the current year’s focus on AQIP.” Similar to the previous year, in 2015-16, there were 14 Undergraduate Fund proposals, with three of them including robust assessment components:

- Poverty Studies at Ohio University: Participation in the Shepherd Higher Education Consortium on Poverty – This proposal from the College of Arts and Sciences includes pre- and post-assessments of participating students' knowledge about poverty related program content. In addition, the consortium provides individual course rubrics, resources and learning-assessment instruments.
- Flame Photometers in the Undergraduate Chemistry Teaching Laboratories – These instruments will allow students to receive routine and accurate feedback on solution development in chemistry labs. This will lead to increased student competence and confidence in solution preparation and analysis. In addition, the instruments provide the faculty with robust evaluation data on student progress.
- Global Health Learning Outcomes and Program Evaluation – This proposal involves the development of an evaluation program for health sciences study abroad programs. One important aspect of the evaluation program includes the development of tools to assess student learning outcomes. The resulting evaluation program could provide a template for other colleges to employ in both study abroad and service learning programs.

In addition, about \$800,000 was distributed to faculty through a new Instructional Innovation Accelerator program. Details will be revealed when the Office of Instructional Innovation (OII) Web site goes live in August 2016.

---

Link 1: [Faculty profiles](https://www.ohio.edu/supportive/index.cfm)

<https://www.ohio.edu/supportive/index.cfm>

Link 2: [New faculty webpage](https://www.ohio.edu/provost/apaa/newfaculty/index.cfm)

<https://www.ohio.edu/provost/apaa/newfaculty/index.cfm>

Link 3: [New Faculty Toolkit](https://www.ohio.edu/provost/apaa/newfaculty/toolkit.cfm)

<https://www.ohio.edu/provost/apaa/newfaculty/toolkit.cfm>

Link 4: [New faculty contact information](https://www.ohio.edu/provost/apaa/newfaculty/ournewfaculty.cfm)

<https://www.ohio.edu/provost/apaa/newfaculty/ournewfaculty.cfm>

Link 5: [New faculty welcome](https://www.ohio.edu/provost/apaa/newfaculty/newfacultywelcome.cfm)

<https://www.ohio.edu/provost/apaa/newfaculty/newfacultywelcome.cfm>;

<https://www.ohio.edu/provost/apaa/newfaculty/nfwregister-form.cfm>

Link 6: [Office of Instructional Innovation \(OII\)](https://www.ohio.edu/instructional-innovation)

<https://www.ohio.edu/instructional-innovation>

**Q:**

**Describe how various members of the learning community have participated in this action project. Show the breadth of involvement by individuals and groups over the project's duration, particularly during the past year.**

**A:** University Communication and Marketing (UCM) and the Executive Vice President and Provost (EVPP) offices worked to gather information from new faculty on activities related to SOTL and profile them through UCM outlets. The Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and the Senior Vice Provost for Instructional Innovation repurposed internal grants (1804 Grants) to encourage SOTL-oriented projects, publicize the revisions, and solicit grant applications from faculty across the University.

The use of Digital Measures as a central repository for faculty profile data is being expanded across the Athens (main) campus to all academic colleges. Each participating academic college manages its faculty profile data. One central administrator, Associate Provost for Budget and Planning, coordinates the Digital Measures project. Each college can create its own faculty interest profiles.

New faculty received a Research and Creative Activity New Faculty Meet and Greet sponsored by the Vice President for Research office. This activity will occur again in September 2016.

The President and the EVPP hosted “Conversations over Coffee” with faculty groups. New

faculty were invited in the Fall Semester in mixed groups of 10 to 15 for informal one-hour gatherings.

All academic and college deans, assistant and associate deans, and directors of University award and grants programs were contacted for input in the assessment and SOTL inventories. We worked closely with WOUB Public Media and the interviewees for their digital stories, and consulted the Teaching, Learning and Assessment Committee (TLA), relying on, and engaging them, with planned work. Related work is continuing via the TLA Events Subcommittee, planning for various Teaching & Learning events, including but not limited to, teaching & learning mini-conferences, symposia, seminars and a major TEDx event planned for the end of AY 2016-17.

**Q:**

**Describe the effect that this project has had on the institution, students, and others in the learning community. What has the institution learned that can be identified as a good practice to use in other aspects of its quality work or from which other institutions might benefit?**

**A:** It is still too early to determine the impact of these projects with confidence. There has been a lot of excitement produced, not only with the stakeholders involved in the showcasing of the projects, such as the website launch yet to occur in August, but with the respective constituents and audiences targeted, e.g. academic units and programs. We expect that the enhanced presence of Web information and the additional faculty gatherings have supported faculty development in terms of teaching, learning, research, and interdisciplinary collaboration.

**Q:**

**Describe the anticipated challenges that may be encountered in successfully completing the project or for institutionalizing the learning from the project's goals.**

**A:** Generating sufficient faculty interest and participation for success of the Action Project, particularly from new faculty, is a challenge. Resources (time and financial) are constrained. Effective communication across a large, diverse, and decentralized research university is challenging. Faculty already have many competing interests and duties. Continual updating of Web resources requires staff time, which can be limiting when personnel changes occur. Developing appropriate metrics for measuring culture change are anticipated to be some of the biggest challenges these particular projects face. Another anticipated challenge is the work to sustain the completeness of the inventories while making both the inventories and showcases even more visible.

**Q:**

**In light of the project goals, current circumstances, institutional learning from this project, and anticipated barriers to success, list the next steps to be taken over the course of the next 12 - 24 months in order to complete or institutionalize the results of this action project. Provide a timeline for completing each next step.**

**A:** The OII Web site is expected to officially launch at the start of AY 2016-17. OII will continue to build upon the assessment and SOTL inventories and function as well as developing pages for new resources and services. OII's communication team currently is

exploring ways to enhance communication (i.e., various social media channels), while the larger OII staff works to create a sustainable capacity for development, such as more digital stories to showcase assessment and SOTL work for the future.

Another step is to utilize resources in updating and developing new Web materials related to new faculty. This opportunity occurs with each new academic year. Continual refinement of the new faculty orientation is made each year.

**Q:**

**Provide any additional information, inquiries, or concerns that the institution wishes reviewers to understand regarding this Action Project. Enter N/A if not applicable.**

**A:** Given the scope of the Action Projects and their relatively rapid deployment, there will need to be more time to explore their impact on the institution, and we are actively looking for ways to more effectively and efficiently do this. In the long run, we are very interested and committed to accomplishing the goals of these projects well beyond their original completion dates.

---

## Version 1.0 - Update

**Q:**

**I certify that this project is ready for review.**

**A:** I agree.

---

## Version 1.0 - Review

**Q:**

**Please comment on anything that is omitted or incomplete in the project status, dates and summary field. Enter N/A if not applicable.**

**A:** N/A

**Q:**

**Check for accuracy and completeness against the original Project Declaration. Are the right metrics or measures included for each goal? If not, what revisions to the metrics/measures would you suggest that the institution consider?**

**A:** The update is complete and appears to be accurate.

**Q:**

**Has the institution acted in meaningful ways to pursue project success, making progress as anticipated in the original project declaration? If meaningful progress or project success has not been achieved, has the institution made appropriate revisions to the goals or anticipated outcomes for this project? • Are descriptions of resources, organization, concrete results, and reaching milestones included? • Make a statement of global judgment. (i.e. “The institution is making [excellent/good/satisfactory/ acceptable/slow/ casual/no] progress in this action project.”).**

**A:** OU is making slow progress on this project. This project is now anticipated to be completed almost one-year behind schedule. Considering that this project was designed to address a "significant opportunity for expanding a culture of assessment among our faculty," being behind schedule raises concerns. Assessment of student learning is required by the Criteria for Accreditation, and a culture of assessment is critical to meeting these criterion. OU administration and faculty are urged to prioritize this project.

**Q:**

**Are the appropriate people involved sufficiently for the nature and scope of the project?**

- **Is there sufficient breadth of involvement?**
- **Are the right people involved? • Emphasize the roles of those who can enhance the impact, success, or effectiveness of the project.**
- **Tactfully call attention to any people that appear to have been omitted or bypassed.**

**A:** This project does not seem to have sufficient involvement by faculty. Assessment is a responsibility of faculty, therefore this project should have significant faculty involvement and leadership.

**Q:**

**Does the institution show evidence of learning from what it did well?**

- **Acknowledge any practice that could be replicated internally in future projects.**
- **Encourage the sharing of best practices with other institutions.**

**A:** OU has directed grant funds towards assessment activities, has provided resources for faculty, and has highlighted faculty assessment activities. While activities are occurring, it is unclear if any are having a positive impact, or if assessment is occurring.

**Q:**

**Does the institution have a realistic understanding of what it needs to address in order to achieve progress and, ultimately, project success? Does it assess its internal and external environments, recognizing the potential forces that could hinder success? Is anything overlooked?**

**A:** It is not clear if OU faculty understands how critical a culture of assessment is to future accreditation. Assessment has been a requirement for many years, so it seems that OU should be further along in its assessment journey.

**Q:**

**Does the institution understand the current status of its project and know how it intends to pursue project success?**

**A:** OU states that "It is still too early to determine the impact of these projects with confidence." This raises concerns due to the nature of the project, and since the project is behind schedule.

**Q:**

**Overall, does the institution demonstrate a good faith effort in its pursuit of continuous quality improvement through this action project? Is there anything of concern that should be brought to the attention of AQIP via your mentor?**

**A:** OU is exerting effort on this project, but more urgency seems to be needed. The culture of assessment is a critical component to accreditation, and assessment activities must be faculty led. Assessment activities must occur in all academic departments, must be documented, and must lead to documented improvement in student learning.