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Introduction

The external reviewer team found the Internal Self Study Report (ISSR) to be an excellent review of the Center for Assessment and Research Studies (CARS) and its content was confirmed throughout the site visit interviews. The team noted many areas of strength in CARS and in particular identified the following as keys to the success of the center:

- JMU culture – the strong history and commitment to assessment
- The quality and dedication of CARS personnel
- The quality of the assessment program – recognition at national level
- The synergy between the graduate program and associated research, and the Center
- The physical location of the center with personnel grouped together
- The size of the budget and operation of the center

After review of the ISSR it was decided to divide the external reviewer report into four focus areas:

- Workload
- Communication/Outreach
- Use of Results
- Culture of Assessment

1. Workload

Overview

The ISSR identified workload management as one of CARS’s challenges. The external review team examined CARS’s workload concerns from three areas: boundary management, faculty, and graduate assistants (GAs). Additionally, workload management is interconnected with other concerns raised in the ISSR such as facilitating Assessment Day, the APT review, and use of results.

A. BOUNDARY MANAGEMENT

Strengths

- **CARS faculty possess and foster a service-oriented approach to their work.** CARS faculty demonstrate an unparalleled work ethic and a sincere desire to help JMU departments, units, and programs advance student learning and development through assessment. Throughout the site visit the review team heard phrases from the faculty such as “we don’t want to leave the department out in the cold” or “who else can help the department” and CARS faculty want to be “good citizens.”

- **CARS recognizes the dangers of mission drift and is actively engaged in preventing that drift from occurring.**
CARS faculty are receptive to, and actively generate, creative ideas to manage workload boundaries. The attitude of CARS faculty toward resolving workload management challenges is conducive to mitigating the concerns.

Challenges

- The service-oriented approach, attitude, and culture pervasive throughout CARS contribute to a blurring of boundaries. This is a situation where CARS’s strength can also be a challenge.
- The boundary where CARS’s consultation ends and department/program self-sufficiency begins is unclear in many cases. CARS faculty and GAs have difficulty “launching” academic and student affairs departments that have well-established assessment programs. Although these continuing consulting relationships can be mutually beneficial (i.e., producing scholarship and opportunities for CARS’s GAs), the end result is a gradual increase in workload since successful clients are not “set free.”

Recommendations

- Retain current mission and continue emphasis on student learning outcomes. The current CARS mission statement is supported by CARS faculty and university administration. During the site visit the mission was operationalized as “CARS assists units that have student learning outcomes.” This focus on student learning should be strictly maintained to ensure that CARS engages only in projects that are directly related to the Center’s mission.
- Encourage JMU administration to consider the value of an evaluation component and where that would reside on campus. Evaluations services for grant and other non-student learning related projects are not a component of the CARS mission, but there seems to be a need for such services on the JMU campus. Therefore, the external review team requests that JMU administration investigate this need further.
- Establish MOUs or “client agreements” with each department, unit or program receiving consultation. Clearly defined roles and expectations will help CARS faculty and GAs manage their workloads. Initially it may be awkward to develop such an agreement with units with whom CARS has a longstanding working relationship and defining those boundaries may be difficult in some cases. However, written MOUs are necessary to ensure each party understands their roles and expectations. CARS can review the MOUs to ensure that the overall workload is appropriate. CARS clients are amenable to establishing MOUs and want to understand what is expected of them. The process of establishing an MOU will positively contribute to the service-oriented ethos established by CARS by managing department/program’s expectations. MOUs will also make clear the multiple relationships that exist between CARS and the departments or units. For example, some consultation relationships develop into research opportunities, especially for CARS GAs. The consultation and research activities can be mutually beneficial, but each MOU should outline each component of the partnership.
• *Conduct time/effort analysis.* The Faculty Human Resource Reconfiguration document (showing the breakdown of time spent on activity) is an effort to capture how time is spent, but CARS could benefit from a more robust and detailed time/effort analysis to determine where effort is being spent, how much time is being spent in each area, and areas that could be reconfigured to contribute to greater workload balance.

**B. FACULTY**

**Strengths**
- *The stability provided by four faculty members having been at CARS for over a decade.*
- *The clear faculty evaluation, promotion, and tenure process.* The external review team initially expressed concerns about CARS’s faculty evaluation, tenure, and promotion processes and how those processes impact current, new, and prospective faculty members. In particular, the team was concerned about the dual reporting lines to CARS and the Graduate Psychology Department. However, it was clear the dual roles do not concern current faculty members and that this type of appointment is not unique to CARS. The materials provided on site including the description of the written FAAP and FAR assuaged the team’s concerns.

**Challenges**
- *The high turnover rate of newly-hired faculty.* Not every faculty member hired by CARS will remain at JMU for a decade or longer and in some cases a faculty member’s departure is difficult to prevent (e.g., a spouse’s job opportunity, competitive counter offer, etc.). However, the number of CARS’s vacant faculty positions adversely impacts workload management and CARS’s ability to fulfill its mission.

Although the review team’s concerns about dual reporting lines and dual evaluation, tenure, and promotion guidelines were allayed, this structure could be a barrier to attracting and retaining faculty if not clearly explained. Additionally, the inability to manage workload effectively may also be a contributing factor to faculty turnover. The lack of work life balance may create an unwritten set of expectations that are considered to be unrealistic by new faculty and may be a contributing factor to poor “fit”.

Faculty turnover also adversely impacts CARS’s relationship with academic and student affairs units. Departments that worked with different liaisons in a short period of time expressed some displeasure with their consulting experiences and indicated each year was like starting over because the new liaison led the unit in a slightly different direction.

**Recommendations**
- *Communicate the evaluation, tenure, and promotion criteria clearly to prospective faculty.* Although CARS recently concluded two searches, the external review team recommends that CARS communicate the expectations of faculty members clearly and completely to prospective faculty. This includes an honest description of the service-oriented ethos and
strong work ethic of CARS as well as the dual reporting structure. Careful communication and consideration of these requirements should assist CARS and prospective faculty in the decision making process to ensure that the fit is good for both parties.

- **Engage in a robust orientation/transition process with newly hired faculty.** CARS should consider the possibility that newly hired faculty lack a sense of “fit” because they observe and experience a lack of boundary management. New faculty may have legitimate concerns about their ability to maintain the CARS service level and work ethic without sacrificing their personal lives. An orientation or transition program, including mentoring by CARS senior faculty, can help new faculty develop their roles within CARS. Part of the transition period should ensure all new faculty receive consultation assignments that include programs with advanced assessment practices as well as programs in early stages of developing their assessment efforts.

- **Ensure consistency between the written faculty evaluation process and the execution of that process.** Implementation fidelity is needed for the careful and consistent use of the FAAP and FAR over time.

C. **GRADUATE STUDENTS**

*Overview*

Graduate students play a substantial role in supporting the mission of CARS, through consulting with departments, developing instruments, analyzing data, and discussing results. From reading the self-study, reviewers were initially concerned that the heavy reliance on graduate students would result in decreased quality of service for the clients served by CARS. However, after our interviews with a variety of campus stakeholders and the students themselves, these fears were alleviated. The use of graduate students to support the mission of CARS is an appropriate practice that should be continued. Further, the graduate students provide a tremendous service to campus while receiving powerful opportunities to learn and develop their skills and abilities in the work of assessment.

*Strengths*

- **The graduate assistantships in CARS allow graduate students to have a tremendous learning experience while supporting the mission of CARS.**

- **The GAs provide a very high quality of service.** The use of graduate students increases the depth and breadth of services that can be provided. Without using graduate students, CARS would not be able to provide its current high quality level of support to campus stakeholders.

- **The graduate students share their extraordinary measurement and statistical skills in ways that contribute to the work of assessment.**

*Challenges*

- **Tuition for out-of-state students and for summer classes is increasingly expensive.** This may
limit expansion of the work of graduate students by limiting the number of students that
CARS can afford to support.

- **Turnover of GAs was expressed as a concern by some campus units.** This concern did not
appear to be widespread and the number of graduate students who leave the program for any
reason except graduation is small.

- **Students are in high demand and internships and other opportunities take students away
from campus at the time when they are the most prepared.** However we do not recommend
eliminating the internship program as this is a powerful learning experience for students and
was mentioned by several students as one of the primary reasons they chose to enroll in the
graduate programs.

- **Workload for the GAs can be high, particularly around assessment day.** Several students
mentioned inconsistencies in workload between different types of assistantship assignments.

- **Since the GAs have a strong service ethic and strong skills, it can be easy for consulting
relationships to turn into long-term dependency on the services of CARS to support
assessment.** The goal of consulting should be to develop the capacity of units to engage in
assessment and limit the long-term dependency on CARS doing assessment “for” campus
units.

**Recommendations**

- **Start graduate assistantships early in the summer to allow new students to become
acclimated to CARS and begin developing their assessment skills.**

- **Identify opportunities for students who wish to serve as teaching assistants (TAs).** When
asked, about half of the students expressed an interest in working in an academic setting in
the future. To be fully prepared for academic positions that require teaching, these students
should have the opportunity to teach or at least serve as a TA. Allowing upper-level doctoral
students to teach would also increase the capacity of CARS to provide courses for students in
other departments.

- **Increase attention to balancing the workload of GAs across the different appointments
offered by CARS.** While we recognize projects ebb and flow and some positions may have
different demands than others, unevenness in appointments can breed resentment between
GAs and decrease the quality of services provided.

- **Students noted that they do not have much formal preparation in teaching pedagogy or
curriculum design.** Opportunities to learn about these two important areas will help all of the
graduate students in their future positions and will inform their assessment work in CARS.

**D. PROGRAMS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO WORKLOAD**

**Overview**
The ISSR identified a number of project areas that contributed substantially to the workload of
CARS faculty, staff, and GAs. The external team focused on four of the major project areas
during their interviews and discussions and offers the recommendations below.

Recommendations for Assessment Day

- **Continue Assessment Day.** It is a powerful component of JMU’s commitment to student assessment and is deeply ingrained in the campus culture.
- **Rotate between monitoring and target years, as recommended in the ISSR.** This will allow some “breathing room” for reflection and using results. It also would simplify some of the work of Assessment Day freeing up time of CARS faculty, staff, and GAs for other projects.
- **Pilot one or more of the strategies suggested in the ISSR for simplifying assessment day, such as using technology tools or alternative structures.** In our limited time we were not able to identify a readily available solution to the substantial logistical issues identified in implementing these solutions. One strategy that has shown promise in the placement testing area is at-home testing using students’ own computers. Although strategies will need to be developed to ensure students are on task and taking the exams or surveys seriously, such systems have shown promise.

Recommendations for the Assessment Progress Template (APT)

- **Continue the APT process.** It is a powerful tool in providing feedback to degree programs on their program assessment activities.
- **Move most degree programs to a biennial reporting schedule with a reflection and action year following each reporting year.** Programs not meeting minimum standards (set somewhere below the “exemplary” standard) should be kept on an annual reporting process until assessment matures.
- **Split campus degree programs into two groups (even year reviews and odd year reviews) so APT reviews would occur every year.** Programs could choose to go up for review in their reflection and action year if they wish or if there is a need for feedback due to accreditation requirements.
- **Name the years to be clear that data should be collected every year and the non-reporting year should be focused on reflecting upon and using assessment results.** The biennial reporting schedule should provide additional “breathing room” for programs to reflect upon and use their assessment results. Perhaps naming the years “APT Reporting Year” and “APT Reflection and Action Year,” or something similar, would make these expectations clear.
- **Add a section to the APT on reflection and use of results from general education assessment for the degree programs that offer courses that are part of the general education program.** This may increase interest in the results from the general education assessment process and increase the likelihood that general education assessment results will be used.

Recommendations for the Assessment Fellows program

- **Continue the Assessment Fellows program.** It is a very powerful program. Past participants spoke very positively about their experiences. Modifications are recommended below to
address the heavy demands the program puts on CARS faculty, staff, and GAs.

- **Move some of the lectures to an online format.** Participants can view the lectures on their computers prior to the start of the program.
- **Modify the format of the face-to-face meetings to take on a stronger workshop format, since most of the lectures will be done outside of “class.”**
- **Consider using past Assessment Fellows to take on some of the teaching and mentoring role in the program in future semesters.**
- **Suggest to individuals who are interested in such higher study that they participate in the online certificate program instead of developing a new program.** Several past assessment fellows asked about developing an upper-level program for more advanced study.
- **Require Assessment Fellows to develop or agree to a set of expectations for how they will use their new skills and abilities to build the capacity of their home units to implement assessment to ensure that JMU and CARS make the most of this investment.** The Assessment Fellows program is a substantial investment of CARS resources.

**Recommendations for Tests and Tools**

- **Explore vendor relationships when deciding whether or not to develop future exams and assessment tools in-house.** A very high proportion of the exams and assessment tools (rubrics, APT software, etc.) used by CARS are developed in-house. This approach has the benefit of having custom-designed tools with specific features that fit well with the needs of JMU and CARS. However, the downside is that custom-creation of such a large number of exams and assessment tools require a substantial commitment of time and resources. While vendors may not be able to provide the same level of customization available when compared to in-house development, the decrease in workload, allowing CARS faculty, staff, and GAs to focus on mission critical activities, may be worth the trade-off.

**2. Communication/Outreach**

**Strengths**

- **CARS has a great reputation both at JMU and beyond.** The entire university is known for its assessment efforts, such that faculty, graduate students, and others come to JMU to experience the assessment culture.
- **CARS has communicated to the JMU community that it is here to help and it is service oriented.** CARS has identified that its reputation of “being there to help with anything” can’t be sustained as the assessment culture grows. This was identified in the ISSR and confirmed during assessment committee’s data gathering.

**Challenges**

- **CARS has some reputation as “assessment police” (CARS is making us do this).**
- **CARS’s has focused on the assessment process rather than using the results/closing the loop.**
The roles of CARS and roles of CARS’s clients are unclear.

CARS stated focus is on “learning outcomes” but some of CARS marketing seems to indicate focus on broader services such as program evaluation (see website: “we can prove it”).

**Recommendations**

Donna Sundre said it best, “communication is never done.”

- **Enhance communication of the CARS mission and story, following the current focus on student learning and learning outcomes, and using exemplars in academics and student affairs to tell the story to the JMU community in a variety of venues.** Many other departments in both academics and student affairs are your best supporters and are capable of, and willing to tell, your story. Use this resource to reinforce the focus on learning outcomes and how assessment has led to changes based on results. Some departments that are clear fans of CARS: History, Social Work, Orientation, and Judicial Affairs.

- **Manage expectations in an ongoing process with all CARS’s clients using written MOUs.** “Expectations” refers to the occasional lack of clarity about the role of CARS and the roles of CARS’s clients (see earlier section). A focus on only working with learning outcomes will help start the expectation discussions and lead to some positive changes.

- **Continue development and use of SAUP assessment council.** Lay out expectations and have the SAUP council determine student affairs vision and how they will make use of the resources CARS can offer them. We also recommend that this council addresses the issue of how assessment will be rewarded and recognized by the division of student affairs. This committee could also play the “heavy” in terms of SAUP’s expectations of what assessment efforts are not being done.

- **Focus CARS communication from the beginning and throughout the process on “use of results.”** Keeping this end in mind can further create clear expectations from clients.

- **Develop the website to reflect student learning outcomes and use of results.** Remove symbols, statements, etc. that don’t reflect this in all communication material.

- **Initiate more proactive discussions with departments on the use of results.**

- **Use Assessment Day as a communication tool and include faculty and staff as fully as possible.** This could include university wide recognition of the value of assessment (poster sessions, discussion groups, awards for faculty and staff, use of results discussions, etc.). Assessment Day is already deeply ingrained in the JMU culture and would thus be a great opportunity to celebrate on a university wide level. This would also add to the institution’s positive assessment reputation and could attract further allies.

- **Communicate clear expectations of Assessment Fellows.** “We invested this time in you and here is what we expect.”

- **Communicate to new faculty the focus of student learning outcomes and using results (e.g. through New Faculty Orientation).**

- **Partner with CFI to train faculty on using results.**
3. Use of Results

Challenges

- **The use of assessment results for program improvement is a nationwide challenge and CARS is not alone in facing it.** Two surveys by the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (Kuh and Ikenberry*, 2009; Ewell, Paulson, and Kinzie*, 2011) show use of results as one of the top challenges facing Provosts and Department Chairs, and a recent working paper on using information in higher education notes that college faculty and staff are most likely to use results when they have been involved in creating the data collection instruments that generated them.

- **Both the self-study and the team’s interviews reveal a particular pattern of challenge with respect to using assessment results for CARS.** First, the problem is most apparent for the general education clusters using results generated through Assessment Day—an activity in which teaching faculty are not much involved. Second, use of results varies by program as shown by their APT ratings on Criterion 6a; some are rated highly and some are not, so the challenge is not apparent everywhere. Third, the pattern of use in Student Affairs involves close contact between CARS and staff to collect data tailored to address particular “presenting problems”—a situation which tends to promote greater use. Finally, these challenges are occurring despite CARS’s staff strengths of proactive attitudes and behaviors, and the significant investment made in data collection and reporting.

Recommendations

- **Revise the General Education Cluster Reports.** The reports are very “numbers heavy,” making interpretation a challenge for those not schooled in statistics. A bullet-pointed executive summary of key findings could set up an action oriented conversation between CARS and cluster faculty. The lengthy Technical Report, which is currently an integral part of the document, should be provided separately or kept on file in case it is needed. Most important, the team believes the data would be more useful to readers and increase faculty engagement if disaggregated appropriately by demographic groups (gender, race/ethnicity, intended field of study, etc.), by particular general education courses,¹ and by particular dimensions of performance (sub-scores or item analyses). We realize that the technical properties of sub-scores may limit their reporting, but the objective here is to inform discussion, not ground scholarly research, so the price is probably worth paying. Finally, we recommend a pre-conference between CARS and cluster faculty before any data are collected to determine what faculty expect to find and what they would do if particular results occur.

¹ Example: explore providing a utility for faculty to view results on their own students on a voluntary “opt-in” basis.


• Modify the APT process. The team notes with favor that the APT rubric has a dimension for rating use of results. For programs rated poorly on this dimension, the feedback provided by CARS appears appropriate and well directed. But the team believes that this feedback would be even more useful if the APT explicitly asked cluster faculty to report the challenges they face in using results so that CARS could provide specifically tailored feedback. The Team also believes the recommended change in the timing of the APT review to provide a full year for reflection will help faculty to use results because it will give them more time to consider the results without the press of annual data collection and because the data will be more current. Third, the team believes that CARS could showcase exemplary stories of utilization on its website with an explanation of how the program accomplished this.²

• Include in the APT process consideration of the program/department’s contribution to general education where this is appropriate. Doing so might also help address the challenge of using general education assessment results because the faculty will be closer to the contributions of their own department.

• Amend training of Assessment Fellows to include a section on use of assessment results. Fellows could put this training to work immediately in their home departments or units by focusing more explicitly on helping colleagues use the instrument or process they developed during the Fellowship itself. As noted earlier, moreover, more systematic follow up of former Fellows to ensure that they are developing capacity for their home departments or units might prove beneficial.

• Increase links with CFI. The team was happy to hear that the CFI is moving toward providing advice to programs in addition to consultation with individual faculty members. If this is indeed the case, it opens up the possibility of cooperation in developing workshops and consultation on using assessment results. This might be especially attractive if results of techniques like classroom assessment that are already familiar to faculty are included.

4. Culture of Assessment

Strengths

• Assessment has been a vibrant and visible part of JMU for more than twenty-five years. With few exceptions, it has been accepted by faculty as part of the institution’s culture and it is part of the university’s self-image and reputation. A particular strength is the distinctive integration of assessment across academic and student affairs.

• The CARS staff is unmatched from a technical standpoint, constructing nationally competitive instruments as well as producing a strong body of assessment research.

Challenges

• Technical prowess is, of course, a very good thing. But the team believes that it has tended to create an assessment culture that is more “measurement centered” than it is centered on

² A good example of such an approach is the “featured institutional website” that rotates on the website of the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (www.learningoutcomesassessment.org).
working with faculty to improve the day-to-day process of teaching and learning. One manifestation of this is that CARS staff constantly strive for measurement “perfection” instead of working with faculty to collect results that are sufficiently precise to inform meaningful action, albeit not good enough to include in a journal article. As noted earlier, it has also led to CARS staff developing its own instruments and techniques instead of adopting those developed by others, perhaps at lesser cost. Finally, the team believes that the assessment practices fostered by CARS, though technically unmatched, to be atypical of those in place at most counterpart institutions. For example, few institutions use such approaches as an Assessment Day anymore, with the majority employing curriculum-embedded approaches like signature assignments, senior capstones, and student maintained portfolios. This atypical condition is far from a bad thing, because approaches like Assessment Day generate an enormous amount of sound and valuable data. And, to be sure, curriculum-embedded approaches do characterize the assessment work of many academic programs. The team simply believes that some reflection by CARS staff about how to get closer to academic practice through assessment would be beneficial.

Recommendations:

- **Create a National Advisory Committee.** This could help bring perspective to CARS’s assessment efforts, help it manage workload and improve utilization of assessment results. This need not be expensive and could meet virtually, if required. Resources appear to be available to support such an effort.

- **Socialize faculty and staff.** Keeping new and current staff up to speed on assessment is a constant challenge for any campus. Furthermore, many faculty and staff perceive assessment as a mechanical activity, not well connected to the everyday work of teaching and learning. As noted earlier, CARS should be given a conspicuous place in the orientation of new faculty to advise them of what services are available. In partnership with CFI, CARS should work directly with departments to inculcate assessment approaches that emphasize assessment as an ongoing philosophy of improvement that goes beyond just measurement as an integral part of the scholarship of teaching and learning.

- **Re-examine role of CARS through the JMU strategic planning process.** CARS should capitalize on the opportunity provided by the current planning process to re-examine its role. In doing so, it should emphasize work that goes beyond just “supplying sound data” to serving more actively as partners in the continuous improvement of teaching and learning.

The external team would like to thank all the members of the Center and the JMU administration for their outstanding efforts to provide us with an excellent ISSR, and additional information we needed, and for their assistance during our review, and to Jeanne Martino-McAllister we offer much appreciation for facilitating the site visit process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload: Boundary Management</th>
<th>Workload: Faculty</th>
<th>Workload: Graduate Assistants (GAs)</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Use of Results</th>
<th>Assessment Day</th>
<th>APT</th>
<th>Assessment Fellows</th>
<th>Assessment Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish client MOUs.</td>
<td>Engage with SAUP to manage workload.</td>
<td>Engage with SAUP to manage workload.</td>
<td>Establish client MOUs.</td>
<td>Establish client MOUs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fellows facilitate assessment efforts in their units.</td>
<td>Establish client MOUs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage with SAUP to manage workload.</td>
<td>Communicate P&amp;T criteria clearly to prospective faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>Continue, but modify A-day</td>
<td>Biennial APT reporting schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explore vendor relationships for assessment tools.</td>
<td>Provide a robust orientation process for new CARS faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage with SAUP to manage workload.</td>
<td>Offer TAs Balance workload Offer instruction in pedagogy and curriculum design.</td>
<td>Revise General Education Cluster Reports</td>
<td>Revise General Education Cluster Reports</td>
<td>Continue, but modify A-day</td>
<td>Biennial APT reporting schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish client MOUs.</td>
<td>Website should reflect emphasis on student learning outcomes and use of results.</td>
<td>Focus communication on use of results.</td>
<td>Include faculty/staff in A-day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish client MOUs.</td>
<td>Socialize faculty and staff</td>
<td>Include faculty/staff in A-day</td>
<td>Outline and communicate expectations for Fellows.</td>
<td>Socialize faculty and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload: Boundary Management</td>
<td>Workload: Faculty</td>
<td>Workload: (GAs)</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Use of Results</td>
<td>Assessment Day</td>
<td>APT</td>
<td>Assessment Fellows</td>
<td>Assessment Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Website should reflect emphasis on student learning outcomes and use of results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mission                        |                  |                 |               |         | Strategic Planning Process  
Retain current mission and continue emphasis on student learning outcomes. |                |     |                   |                  |
| Use of Results                 | Establish client MOUs. | Socialize faculty and staff | Website should reflect emphasis on student learning outcomes and use of results. | Cooperation with CFI | Revise General Education Cluster Reports  
Include faculty/staff in A-day | Biennial APT reporting schedule |     | Fellows facilitate assessment efforts in their units. |                  |
| Assessment Day                 |                  |                 |               |         | Investigate technology tools or alternative structures to improve A-day logistics |                |     | Continue, but modify A-day |                  |
| Assessment Culture             |                  |                 |               |         | Fellows can facilitate, teach, and mentor future Fellows. |                |     | Create National Advisory Committee |                  |