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INTRODUCTION

History

Since the 2008 Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) Self-Study and subsequent team visit, Morgan State University (MSU) has demonstrated a strong commitment to systematic and sustainable assessment of its effectiveness, as required under the MSCHE Criteria for Excellence accreditation standards, and under similar standards among the professional and discipline-based associations through which the University is currently accredited. Morgan considers the assessment of, and accountability for, achieving its mission and goals to be one of the most important measures of its success, and has made ongoing assessment a pivotal aspect of the University’s life, the rewriting of its new Strategic Plan, and the implementation and evaluation of that plan. At Morgan, assessment is a University-wide responsibility and involves all segments of the institution. It calls for ongoing, systematic and regular assessment of how well the University is fulfilling its mission in all respects and with special emphasis on the assessment of student learning and success, which is foremost in its mission.

Guiding Principles

As outlined in the 2008 MSU Comprehensive Assessment Plan (CAP), assessment at Morgan is guided by a set of principles that touch all segments of the University community. These principles are outlined below:

1. That the University will have a strong culture of assessment that supports the assessment of institutional effectiveness as a major part of its function as an institution and that ensures that assessment is embedded in its institutional mission, goals, and objectives;
2. That assessment of how well it achieves its mission, objectives, and goals is everyone’s responsibility and involves everyone from the top to the bottom, with significant leadership provided at the top of the administration, faculty, student body, and staff;
3. That assessment is comprehensive and focuses on all areas of the University, including the total range of educational offerings, services, and processes;
4. That assessment grows out of collaboration between faculty and administration and utilizes input from students, staff and other key stakeholders;
5. That the total range of educational offerings, services and processes are firmly grounded in and effectively achieved through the University’s mission;
6. That the University’s assessment plan is realistic and based on measurable objectives, goals, and expectations;
7. That everything that the University does is guided by clearly stated goals, objectives, and measurable outcomes and expectations;
8. That assessment is systematic, thorough and formalized; uses multiple qualitative and quantitative measures to generate data and information; is periodic and regular; is conducted in a variety of settings and situations; and reflects the total picture of what the University does;
9. That assessment of student learning is a major focus of the CAP and that assessment of all other areas reflects a commitment to student success;
10. That assessment of student learning benefits from the value-added approach that diagnoses where students are academically upon entry and measuring their level of achievement over time till graduation;
11. That assessment aims not only at enhancing student learning, but also at improving institutional planning and resource allocation, institutional processes, and the assessment process itself;
12. That assessment results are incorporated into institutional planning and decision making;
13. That the University commits the resources and provides the administrative structure to make effective and comprehensive assessment possible; and
14. That the assessment process is subjected to periodic review, assessment, and reaffirmation.

**Expected Outcomes**

Assessment of institutional effectiveness, with an emphasis on student learning, has had a tremendous impact on Morgan, its administration and staff, faculty, students, alumni, and other key stakeholders. Assessment is a test and a reflection of the institution’s integrity and of how well it is carrying out its mission. Accordingly, Morgan’s CAP has benefitted the institution and has led to greater:

1. Compliance with, or adherence to, and overall effectiveness in achieving institutional mission, goals, and objectives;
2. Success in measuring and charting student learning progress;
3. Success in determining program effectiveness;
4. Effectiveness in institutional processes;
5. Effectiveness of institutional services;
6. Customer and provider satisfaction with institutional processes and services;
7. Responsible allocation and efficient use of resources;
8. Appropriate administrative structures and services that support learning;
9. Effective strategic planning;
10. Self-renewal and institutional integrity; and
11. Compliance with educational and professional accreditation standards.
ASSESSMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

The University encourages and ensures institutional effectiveness and renewal through a strong commitment to assessing student learning, to fulfilling its educational mission, and to planning processes and resource allocation to support the mission. Morgan has a broad array of ways in which it assesses its overall institutional effectiveness. This section provides a broad sketch of the scope of these assessment methods.

ASSESSMENT OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN

On August 2, 2011 the Board of Regents approved the University’s new strategic plan. Entitled *Growing the Future, Leading the World: The Strategic Plan for Morgan State University, 2011-2021*, the new plan replaced the previous plan that covered the period 2008-2012. The University enlisted broad participation in the development of the new plan. The steering committee comprised of members of the Board of Regents, faculty, students, staff, alumni, administrators, deans, and representatives from the neighborhood and local business communities. The Plan includes new vision, mission, and core values statements for the University.

**Vision Statement**

Morgan State University is the premier public urban research University in Maryland known for its excellence in teaching, intensive research, effective public service, and community engagement. Morgan prepares diverse and competitive graduates for success in a global, interdependent society.

**Mission Statement**

Morgan State University serves the community, region, state, nation, and world as an intellectual and creative resource by supporting, empowering and preparing high-quality, diverse graduates to lead the world. The University offers innovative, inclusive, and distinctive educational experiences to a broad cross section of the population in a comprehensive range of disciplines at the baccalaureate, master’s, doctoral, and professional degree levels. Through collaborative pursuits, scholarly research, creative endeavors, and dedicated public service, the University gives significant priority to addressing societal problems, particularly those prevalent in urban communities.

**Core Values**

The core values below guide the promotion of student learning and success, faculty scholarship and research, and community engagement at Morgan:
• **Excellence.** Excellence in teaching, research, scholarship, creative endeavors, student services, and in all aspects of the University’s operations, is continuously pursued at Morgan to ensure institutional effectiveness and efficiency.

• **Integrity.** At Morgan, honest communications, ethical behavior, and accountability for words and deeds are expected from all members of the University community.

• **Respect.** Each person at Morgan is to be treated with respect and dignity and is to be treated equitably in all situations.

• **Diversity.** A broad diversity of people and ideas are welcomed and supported at Morgan as essential to quality education in a global interdependent society. Students will have reasonable and affordable access to a comprehensive range of high quality educational programs and services.

• **Innovation.** Morgan encourages and supports its faculty, staff, and students in all forms of scholarship including the discovery and application of knowledge in teaching and learning and in developing innovative products and processes.

• **Leadership.** Morgan seeks to provide rigorous academic curricula and challenging co-curricula opportunities to promote the development of leadership qualities in students and to facilitate leadership development among faculty, staff, and students.

Five broad goals represent the foundation of this strategic plan. Over the next ten years, these goals will guide programs, services, and budgets that are designed to grow Morgan’s future by implementing the strategic initiatives for each goal. The goals include:

**Goal 1: Enhancing Student Success**

Morgan will create an educational environment that enhances student success by hiring and retaining well qualified, experienced, and dedicated faculty and staff, offering challenging, internationally relevant academic curricula, and welcoming and supporting a diverse and inclusive campus community.

**Goal 2: Enhancing Morgan’s Status as a Doctoral Research University**

Morgan will enhance its status as a Doctoral Research University through its success in securing grants and contracts and its faculty’s achievements in basic and applied research, professional expression, artistic creation, and creative inquiry. Additionally, initiatives will be designed to enhance doctoral achievement in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematical (STEM) and non-STEM disciplines for underrepresented students of color.
Goal 3: Improving and Sustaining Morgan’s Infrastructure and Operational Processes

Morgan will enhance its infrastructure and processes by improving the efficiency and efficacy of its operating procedures, by focusing on the environmental sustainability of its facilities, and by meeting the technological customer service needs of its students, faculty, staff and community.

Goal 4: Growing Morgan’s Resources

Morgan will expand its human capital as well as its financial resources by investing in the professional development of faculty, staff, and students, seeking greater financial support from alumni, the State and federal governments, private and philanthropic sources, and establishing collaborative relationships with private and public entities. The issue of indirect costs associated with contracts and grants will be revisited.

Goal 5: Engaging with the Community

Morgan will engage with community residents and officials in the use of knowledge derived from faculty and student research, the sharing of mutually beneficial resources, and the appropriate and timely dispatch of University experts and professionals to collaborate in addressing community concerns.

Key Performance Indicators

Each goal has accompanying objectives, anticipated outcome, measure or benchmark, assessment method, and specific responsibility. As a means of tracking the implementation of its new strategic plan, Morgan has developed metrics representing a wide range of data both qualitative and quantitative from every division on campus; and a scorecard or dashboard that permits University board members and campus personnel to monitor some two dozen key performance indicators (KPIs). The interactive dashboard, which can be accessed via the University’s web page by campus personnel, will permit users to drill down to obtain additional data concerning each KPI. For each KPI, supporting data, trends, goals and benchmarks are available. Examples of the KPIs for each of the strategic goals of the institution are listed below:

Goal 1: Enhancing Student Success
- Enrollment
- 1st Year Retention Rate
- Number of Degrees Awarded
- Value Added (education)

Goal 2: Enhancing Morgan’s Status as a Doctoral Research University
- Grants and Contracts
- Doctorate Degrees Awarded
- STEM Awards
- Average Faculty Salary
- Library Adequacy
Goal 3: Improving and Sustaining Morgan’s Infrastructure and Operational Processes

- Student Satisfaction
- Affordability
- Cost per FTE
- Average Grad Debt

Goal 4: Growing Morgan’s Resources

- Private Funds Raised
- Size of Endowment
- Resource Ratio
- State Funding
- Average Age of Facilities

Goal 5: Engaging with the Community

- Partnerships
- Public Courses/Events
- Carnegie Standard 7 (or best practices in public and community service)

Level of Planning, Assessment, and Responsibility

The University uses a multi-level system of planning and assessment to ensure institutional effectiveness. The four levels of planning and assessment at Morgan State University are listed below:

1. **University-Wide Strategic Planning and Assessment Level:** Under the leadership of the President and the Strategic Planning Committee, key stakeholders conducted SWOT analyses (i.e., review of internal strengths and weaknesses and external opportunities and threats) to address a number of strategic plan questions and issues about Morgan with the students including What is Morgan’s (i.e., the institution’s) mission? What are the core values? What does the data (i.e., institutional research) tell us who we are? What does a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis reveal about us? Who are our peers? Who are we? What is it that we “say” we do? What is it that “in fact” we do? What is/are the most important thing(s) (i.e., values) that define us (i.e., without which would not be true to MSU)? In 5 or 10 years (i.e., the length of your strategic plan) will the answers to these questions be sufficient? Members of the strategic planning committee (e.g., Board of Regents, Provost, Vice Presidents, Deans, student representative, etc.) monitor KPIs, peer group comparative data, and other institutional assessment information annually. The committee also conduct progress checks of key initiatives outlined in the strategic plan, recommend continuance, adjustments, or discontinuance. As a means of helping to ensure that funding is distributed consistent with campus plan as well as other priorities, the University formed a **Budget Advisory Committee (BAC)**. This committee is broadly representative of the campus with strong representation from academic departments. This group is provided with briefings on a wide variety of pertinent topics in order to ensure its deliberations are well informed; and hold budget request hearings with each vice president to discuss their needs and their performance outcomes.
2. **University Divisions/College/Institute and School Levels:** Planning and assessment at this level is conducted under the leadership of the provost, vice presidents or directors and deans. Strategic planning at this level responds to the University-wide strategic goals as well as specific goals of the respective University division and each of the colleges and library. Each college has its own strategic planning committee that oversees and monitors the strategic initiatives of the colleges and academic departments. The colleges, library, and University offices/divisions prepare annual reports and assessment plans that detail the planning and assessment initiatives within their respective areas. Morgan’s CAP requires that all units and sub-units assess their effectiveness on an annual basis, in the context of the University’s mission and goals, and using the same model/process as the academic departments and programs. Morgan’s assessment of institutional effectiveness focuses on the MSCHE standards while adhering to other tenets of best practice such as external accrediting standards and quality improvement criteria such as the Baldrige. In these terms, assessment of institutional effectiveness at Morgan ensures that each unit:

a. Has a mission, objectives and goal that guide the unit’s assessment processes and plans
b. Engages in planning, resource allocation and renewal informed by assessment information and results;
c. Uses rational and consistent policies for the allocation of resources and a budgeting process aligned with mission, goals, and outcomes;
d. Has leadership and structure that includes a well-defined process for assessment and use of assessment results for improvement
e. Has administrative structure and staff that facilitate assessment, analysis of assessment results and use of results for improvement; and
f. Has a unit-based assessment plan and reporting process.

3. **Departmental/Program Level:** Planning and assessment is conducted under the leadership of chairpersons or directors of academic departments/student support programs/campus offices, with all plans and corresponding assessments subject to review and approval by deans and the Assistant Vice President for Assessment and Operations (AVPAO). The Annual Report Guidelines, and the Annual Assessment Report Template (see Appendix A) are used to document planning and assessment activities (i.e., establishing and prioritizing programmatic goals, tracking student learning outcomes and key performance indicators, evaluating progress toward goals, using results to develop and implement action plans to make programmatic improvements, monitoring the effects of planning initiatives on the enhancement of student learning, and providing documentation of the continuous process of improvement).

4. **Course/Unit Level:** Planning at this level is the responsibility of faculty/instructors/lecturers that are performing the duties and tasks that fulfill the commitment of educating and serving undergraduate and graduate students. For academic programs, the assessment of learning outcomes is embedded in the coursework. A syllabus checklist offers guidelines for the basic
course components or course design, e.g., statement of course purpose, expected learning outcomes, course requirements/assignments, required readings and other course materials, grading policy or measurement criteria such as a rubric used to assess student learning, expectations for student engagement, and class decorum. All instructors at Morgan are expected to review their respective end-of-course student performance results to inform future improvements in teaching/learning strategies.

Collaboration with the Division of Planning & Information Technology

The Division of Planning and Information Technology is responsible for coordinating campus data collection activities, carrying out research and analysis in support of campus decision-making and assessments, and campus computer operations. This division supports institutional planning and assessment processes that guide the University in fulfilling its mission, and determining how well it is achieving its strategic goals. The Office of Institutional Research is responsible for compiling and disseminating information to the University community and external groups on many aspects of Morgan State University, including student enrollment and demographics, student credit hours, degrees awarded, and faculty and staff characteristics. The Office prepares periodic reports on a variety of issues and plays a major role in responding to the annual IPEDS data collection and questionnaires from external organizations. The Division of Planning and Information Technology is a resource to all members of the University and partners in the community on matters pertaining to assessment, improvement, and institutional effectiveness. Examples of surveys, data, and reports produced by this division and the Office of Institutional Research are listed below:

- Institutional Research Data
- University KPIs
- Higher Education Data for Maryland
- Student Course Evaluations
- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
- Freshman Survey
- Exit Survey of Graduate Students
- Survey of Employers
- Alumni Surveys
- Student Satisfaction Inventory
- Student Satisfaction Inventory (Honors Students)
- Annual Program Support Pages

Sample Tools/Resources Available for Assessment

While tools of assessment vary across units, there are some commonalities. The following are some of the more common resources from the Division of Planning and Information Technology available to units, sub-units and programs interested in institutional effectiveness:
Banner

Banner is an administrative software application developed by the Ellucian Software and Services Company specifically for higher education institutions. Banner serves as Morgan's official database system and the source for most of the University's data and reporting needs. Student, human resources, and financial records are all integrated and maintained in one centralized database.

Oracle Application Express

Oracle Application Express (APEX) is Morgan's official reporting tool. APEX is reserved for cyclical data and reporting needs. APEX uses data from Banner to provide faculty and staff with a myriad of student, financial, and personnel data files and reports. From a list of reports, APEX users can select parameters, filter data within interactive reports, and export results to a spreadsheet. Once data files are exported, users can perform further filtering, data manipulation, and statistical analysis.

Campus Labs

In 2001, Campus Labs (formerly Student-Voice) was developed to collect information from students that could be used to impact program and services. This cutting-edge software platform allows customers to build comprehensive programs with expert consultation and superior resources. Since 2001, Campus Labs has evolved from the one member campus to over 650, as more institutions embrace assessment on every level of their campus. Today, Campus Labs is the only specialized, comprehensive assessment program that combines data collection, reporting, organization, and campus-wide integration. In addition, Campus Labs connects the assessment community with a newly renovated member website which includes access to an on-line forum featuring best practices, national benchmarking surveys and latest research based on years of collective higher education experience.

Blackboard

Blackboard, Morgan's Learning Management System, provides teaching and learning solutions that support the needs of students, faculty, and staff. Classroom, fully online, and blended are all supported using collaborative environments and digital content. Beginning spring 2013, Blackboard will be integrated with Banner for a more seamless student, faculty, staff, and course enrollment process. Additional features such as E-Portfolios, course templates, and standard content (master courses) will also be made available campus wide in spring 2013. Blackboard course templates provide a clear starting point for course development and consistent experiences for students. Each template is set up into learning modules that can be used in a variety of course types (i.e., fully online, blended, etc.).

EAC Outcomes

In fall 2011, the College of Liberal Arts, School of Education & Urban Studies, and the School of Architecture & Planning piloted Educational Assessment Corporation Outcomes (EAC
Outcomes) software to facilitate online course evaluations. EAC Outcomes provides students access to online course evaluations for each of their participating courses via Blackboard. Instead of waiting for hand-tallied feedback, EAC Outcomes provides real time response rates by student or by course. Response data can be analyzed more quickly allowing for early intervention and dissemination of results. Course evaluation questions can be connected to program and accreditation standards. Evaluation responses serve as components of continuous improvement for participating programs.

**Smarthinking**

Smarthinking is an online tutoring service offered to Morgan students free of charge. Students can connect and interact with a tutor via a live chat. Alternatively, students can submit their question(s) directly to a tutor. Smarthinking also has an Online Writing Lab that allows Morgan students to submit papers for feedback from a Smarthinking specialist.

**Collaboration with Office of Student Success and Retention**

The purpose of the Morgan State University Office of Student Success and Retention is to work in collaboration with the College of Liberal Arts, the School of Engineering, the School of Computer, Mathematical and Natural Sciences, the School of Business and Management, the School of Education and Urban Studies, the School Community Health & Policy, the School of Architecture and Planning, the School of Social Work, and the various academic support programs of the University to provide continuous, quality support for undergraduate students from matriculation to graduation. The goal of this comprehensive program is to increase student retention rates and persistence to graduation with a focus on academic success and achievement through early intervention and systematic tracking of undergraduate students. Listed below are examples of Campus-Wide Retention Initiatives:

- Placement Testing (ACCUPLACER) – proctoring, scoring & disseminating 1,200–1,600 tests per academic year
- Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) – participating in the nation-wide longitudinal cohort of institutions
- Early Alert & Response System--assisting faculty with intervention for students performing below expectations
- Retention Research & Student Surveys – participating in national benchmarking & campus research/surveys

**Placement Testing and Report**

The Office of Student Success and Retention proctor Placement Testing via the ACCUPLACER placement test. The purpose of ACCUPLACER is to provide useful information about students' academic skills in mathematics, English, and reading. ACCUPLACER is an adaptive test. Questions are chosen on the basis of students' answers to previous questions. This technique selects just the right questions for students' ability level. Results of the placement test provides the University with a level of individual student adaptability, systematic accuracy, and flexibility
in an effort to appropriately place new students in freshman courses consistent with their level of preparation and skill. All first-time freshmen at Morgan State University are required to take a placement examination to determine their course placement. See the College Board for more information on the ACCUPLACER. As mentioned earlier, The Office of Student Success and Retention proctors, score and disseminate 1,200—1,600 tests per academic year.

**Key Review and Planning Committees**

University-wide planning and assessment related to institutional effectiveness is also the responsibility of several standing committees at Morgan State University. Each committee has its particular focus, review criteria, and procedures and protocols:

- Executive Committee
- Strategic Planning Committee
- Curriculum Committee
- University Assessment Committee
- Program Review Committee
- Finance and Facilities Committee
- Graduate Council Committee
- Faculty Institute Committee
- Academic and Student Affairs Committee
- Audit Committee

**Summary and Model of Institutional Effectiveness**

In summary, institutional effectiveness at Morgan State University is an ongoing, integrated and systematic set of institutional processes that include planning, the evaluation of programs and services, the identification and measurement of learning outcomes in the context of the University’s mission and strategic goals, the use of data and assessment results for decision-making that results in improvements in programs, service and institutional quality. Each college/institute and school has its own strategic planning committee that oversees and monitors the strategic initiatives of the academic programs. The colleges, library, and University offices/divisions prepare annual reports and assessment plans that detail the planning and assessment initiatives within their respective areas. Morgan’s CAP requires that all units and sub-units assess their effectiveness on an annual basis. All units and sub-units use assessment results to inform annual budget requests. At Morgan institutional effectiveness is a continuous quest for quality, efficiency, effectiveness and innovation. The model that follows depicts the components of the University’s planning and assessment process.
ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

Introduction

The assessment of student learning is at the core of the Comprehensive Assessment Plan because all that takes place at the University has some impact on student learning, student success, and the processes that make student learning possible. The University therefore has committed a large portion of its resources and of its effort to the effective assessment of student learning as a major aspect of institutional effectiveness. The format for this assessment has been the model for the successful implementation of assessment of non-academic units as well. The assessment of student learning under the CAP focuses on assessment within the major, and includes a separate track for assessing student competency in the core requirements as well as the impact of out of classroom learning on the student experience.

Leadership for the Comprehensive Assessment Plan

To facilitate the effective and efficient working of Morgan’s Comprehensive Assessment Plan for student learning and institutional effectiveness, the University implemented, in 2008, an administrative structure and services charged with coordinating the process. Leadership of
assessment on campus rests with the Office of the Assistant Vice President for Assessment and Operations in partnership with the Center for Performance Assessment (CPA) directed by the General Education Assessment Coordinator and with the University Assessment Committee (UAC), a University-wide advisory group that provides guidance in the direction and scope of assessment across campus as well as feedback on the annual assessment reports that all units must submit. Within each academic department and administrative unit, a local assessment coordinator is responsible for overseeing the assessment work of faculty and staff within each area. The Office of the AVPAO and the CPA is responsible for collating information from the departments and units and compiling that information as feedback to the University through the UAC. Requirements for assessment results to be submitted with all resource requests and budget requests, as well as within each area’s Annual Report, ensure a concurrent link between assessment and resource allocation. An annual data collection, analysis, improvement and reporting cycle for all areas within the Comprehensive Assessment Plan

University Assessment Committee

The University Assessment Committee is charged with strengthening the University assessment and program review process to ensure cogent and disciplined self-assessment of institutional effectiveness. The umbrella goal of the UAC is to create an environment of empirically-based continuous improvement. The committee collaborates with University leaders and committees to fulfill its charge and goals. The goals of the UAC are:

1. Align the outcome-based assessment processes with the strategic plan;
2. Strengthen assessment processes that include: updating assessment review format, planning assessment training, and establishing and maintaining an assessment webpage;
3. Create and maintain an archive of assessment reports and reviews;
4. Evaluate and recommend assessment instruments and software systems;
5. Review assessment documentation to ensure that it meets the requirements of external accreditation bodies and serves University goals for institutional effectiveness;
6. Ensure that assessment results are analyzed and used for continuous improvement in a fair, ethical, and responsible manner;
7. Verify that timetables for assessment cycles are meaningful and meet the schedules of both University and external stakeholders;
8. Ensure that the status and progress of University assessment efforts are widely and effectively communicated;
9. Serve as an internal consulting entity in the areas of academic and non-academic assessment; and

10. Align assessment processes with budgeting and resource allocation systems.

In addition to faculty members with expertise in assessment from each of the colleges and schools, four sub-committees are strategically designed to support the charge and goals of the UAC and implementation of the Comprehensive Assessment Plan for Institutional Effectiveness. A description of each sub-committee is listed below:

1. **The Academic Affairs Subcommittee (AAS)** support the MSU Comprehensive Assessment Plan by helping faculty design and implement assessment program, guiding the collection of information on undergraduate and graduate assessment activities, and helping the University share and recognize best practices of assessment in academic programs. AAS is designed to receive, review and provide feedback on the Annual Assessment Reports for all MSU academic programs. The Chair of AAS is a member on the University Assessment Committee. At least one representative on AAS from each college or school as well as the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, support AAS subcommittee members;

2. **The General Education Assessment Subcommittee (GEAS)** support the MSU Comprehensive Assessment Plan by helping faculty design and implement assessment programs, guiding the collection of information on general education assessment activities, and helping the University share and utilize assessment data for decision making, resource allocation, and improvement. The Chair of GEAS is a member on the University Assessment Committee. At least one representative on GEAS from each college or school, a representative from the MSU General Education Committee as well as the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, support GEAS subcommittee members;

3. **The Student Affairs Assessment Subcommittee (SAAS)** support the MSU Comprehensive Assessment Plan by helping faculty and Student Affairs staff design and implement assessment programs for co-curricular learning, guiding the collection of information on Student Affairs assessment activities, and helping the University share and utilize assessment data for decision making, resource allocation, and improvement. The Chair of SAAS is a member on the University Assessment Committee. There will be at least one representative on SAAS from each major unit in the Division of Student Affairs; and

4. **The Administrative Unit Assessment Subcommittee (AUAS)** support the MSU Comprehensive Assessment Plan by helping staff in administrative and student support
areas design and implement assessment programs to evaluate effectiveness and impact on the student experience guiding the collection of information on assessment activities in these areas, and helping the University share and utilize assessment data for decision making, resource allocation, and improvement. The Chair of AUAS is a member on the University Assessment Committee.

Generally, the University Assessment Committee meets every third Monday, from 1-3pm as an entire committee. Alternate Mondays are typically used by subcommittees to meet, review documents, and/or generate solutions to issues of assessment; program reviews, accreditation, and other topics related to institutional effectiveness.

In summary, The Office of the Assistant Vice President for Assessment and Operations (AVPAO) supports the strategic initiatives of Morgan State University by directing the implementation of the Comprehensive Assessment Plan and overseeing the operation of the Center for Performance Assessment, the Office of General Education, and the University Assessment Committee. The Office of the AVPAO collaborates with all divisions at Morgan to collect, analyze, report on and use data related to institutional effectiveness, accreditation; student success, satisfaction and retention; and campus performance against key benchmark indicators.

**Figure 1: Organizational Structure of the University Assessment Committee**

Assessment of Student Learning as a Paradigm

The assessment of student learning is the hub and linchpin of the Comprehensive Assessment Plan for Institutional Effectiveness. Virtually all that takes place at the University has some impact on student learning or the processes that make student learning possible. The University commits a large portion of its resources (human and fiscal) to effective assessment of student
learning. Enhancing Student Success at the undergraduate and graduate levels is the first goal of the new strategic plan (2011-2021). Assessment of student learning extends beyond the academic divisions as well. All non-academic departments such as Enrollment Services, Advancement, Finance, Student Life, Information Technology, Public Relations, Institutional Research, Library, etc., assess their effectiveness on an annual basis, in the context of the University’s mission and strategic goals (i.e., student learning and success).

Organization of Student Learning Outcomes

Student Learning Outcomes are explicit statements describing knowledge, skills, abilities, values, and attitudes that a student will be able to demonstrate at the end (or as a result) of a particular lesson, course, program, or collegiate experience. Student Learning Outcomes at Morgan State University are defined at the following levels: Institutional, Program, Course, General Education Program, and Other University Requirement. Learning outcomes are evaluated through a number of direct measures (e.g., standardized tests, exams, portfolios, research projects, written assignments, etc.), and indirect measures (e.g., course evaluations, student surveys, alumni surveys, completion rates, etc.).

Institutional Level

The vision and mission of the University and strategic goals have been widely communicated throughout the strategic planning process. The strategic planning process has provided a cyclic and systematic approach to linking assessment, budget, and resource allocation. This process guides individual unit efforts in such a way that University goals are achieved by the collective achievement of the individual units. While each of the five strategic goals has implications for student learning, there are four which directly relate to educational experience and student learning outcomes. They are:

- To enhance student success through support of high quality teaching, research and service;
- To create an educational environment that enhances student success by: hiring and retaining well qualified, experienced, and dedicated faculty and staff;
- To offer a challenging, internationally relevant academic curricula, and welcoming and supporting a diverse and inclusive campus community; and
- To enhance infrastructure and process by improving the efficiency and efficacy of operating procedures, by focusing on the environmental sustainability of facilities, and by meeting the technological customer service needs of students, faculty, staff and the community.

Specific strategies associated with these goals emphasize the importance of conducting program reviews, building outcome assessment plans, and using data on an annual basis to improve student learning, and dimensions of institutional effectiveness. The University's mission calls for on-going, systematic and regular assessment of how well the University is fulfilling its mission in all respects and for special emphasis on the assessment of student learning, which is foremost
in its mission. At Morgan State University, assessment is a University-wide responsibility and involves all segments of the University.

The Office of Institutional Research administers the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). Morgan has participated in this indirect measure of student learning for the past six years. Survey results indicate that while Morgan freshmen are on par with their counterparts at the University's Carnegie peers and nationally on the benchmark comparison of the level of academic challenge, Morgan seniors experience greater academic rigor than their counterparts at peer institutions and nationally. The Level of Academic Challenge is defined as "challenging intellectual and creative work is central to student learning and collegiate quality. Colleges and universities promote high levels of student achievement by emphasizing the importance of academic effort and setting high expectations for student performance." Items on the survey that address this include (1) preparing for class; (2) number of assigned textbooks, books or book-length packs of course readings; (3) number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more; number of written papers or reports of between 5 and 19 pages and number of written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages; (4) coursework emphasizing analysis of the basic elements of an idea, experience or theory; (5) coursework emphasizing synthesis and organizing of ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships; (6) coursework emphasizing the making of judgments about the value of information, arguments or methods; (7) coursework emphasizing application of theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations; (8) working harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor's standards or expectations; and (9) campus environment emphasizing time studying and on academic work.

The University participates in the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA). The CLA is a nationally-normed examination that provides colleges and universities with information about their students' ability to think critically, reason analytically, solve realistic problems and write clearly. As such it embodies the majority of competencies required by Middle States. The Collegiate Learning Assessment is a direct measure of student learning that uses a sample of freshmen and seniors on a three hour examination. This assessment allows universities to measure the "value added" by the campus to student academic achievement. The examination consists of performance tasks requiring students to use "an integrated set of critical thinking, analytic reasoning, problem solving, and written communications skills to answer open-ended questions about a hypothetical but realistic situation." The examination also includes two types of analytic writing tasks; (1) "Make an Argument" which requires students to support or reject a position, and (2) "Critique an Argument" which requires students to evaluate the validity of an argument. The University's actual CLA score is compared to its expected CLA score. Expected scores are derived from the relationship of the University’s average SAT score and its average CLA score.

The University also uses the Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP) to assess student learning at the institutional level. The MAPP integrates general education skills by assessing four core skill areas: critical thinking, reading, writing and mathematics. The MAPP test is statistically equated to the former Academic Profile assessment, so that prior Academic Profile scores may be used to conduct longitudinal or cross-sectional studies. It is intended for use by colleges and universities in assessing the outcomes of their general education programs to
improve the quality of instruction and learning. The test focuses on the academic skills developed through general education courses rather than on the knowledge acquired about the subjects taught in these courses. The MAPP does this by testing college-level reading, writing, critical thinking, and mathematics in the context of humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences.

**Program Level**

The goal of creating a program assessment plan is to establish a culture of assessment and facilitate continuous program level improvement. Each program at the undergraduate and graduate levels at the University is expected to develop and implement a comprehensive assessment plan on an annual basis. The plan is evaluated by the University Assessment Committee, using the *Annual Student Learning Assessment Report Feedback Template* (Appendix C). Numeric results as well as comments from the committee members are submitted to AVPAO. The AVPAO discusses results of the assessment plan with each academic program and monitors efforts to incorporate the feedback into the assessment process to support program-level change and accomplishments.

**Program Review Process**

Assessment at the program review level varies across the University. Several programs have a strong history of assessment via external accrediting process that are tied to rigorous professional standards; for example, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE); the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB International); the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET), etc. The external program review cycle of programs with external accrediting processes are aligned with their professional association's standards (5-7 years). Program review cycle for programs without external accrediting process is 5 years in accordance with University's strategic planning process. The latter programs can use an established external or discipline specific reviewer and/or collaborate with the AVPAO to conduct a rigorous internal self-study to demonstrate how the curriculum supports student learning outcomes, how outcomes are assessed and how assessment results are used to improve practice. Program reviews require the signatures of the dean of the college in which the program resides and the Provost. The process is overseen by the Office of the AVPAO.

**Course Level**

Course level assessment of student learning is the responsibility of the instructor teaching the course. Methods vary according to the type of course (e.g., project-based, information rich, online, or skill development). Student learning is assessed on the skills, values, and knowledge that students are expected to know upon completion of a course. At this level, faculty members summarize and use assessment results to improve courses and teaching effectiveness. They report their results to department committees, assessment coordinators and chairs, as part of coordinating education within degree programs, schools, and the wider University mission.
General Education Program

Morgan's General Education Program embraces the areas of competency specified in the Middle States Association's Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education, and it incorporates its emphasis on assessing student learning and institutional effectiveness. Morgan’s General Education program is a broad network of courses, tests and extra-curricular experiences aimed at ensuring a common core of liberal arts knowledge, skills and collegiate experiences for all Morgan students. The courses which are part of the General Education Requirements have seventeen discreet objectives, which are based on the principle that General Education is one of the most significant components of undergraduate education. The program also sets a number of clearly defined learning goals for students that reflect the five competencies in Standard 12 of the Middle States Association accreditation criteria (Morgan State University Catalog, 2010-2013, pages 61-64).

Morgan State University defines competency in written communication as (1) being able to write multi-paragraph essays with a properly constructed introduction, including a clear thesis; no fewer than three paragraphs in the body of the essay; a definite method of development; a conclusion; and demonstrated mastery of grammar, punctuation, mechanics and sentence structure; and (2) being able to write a documented paper (long essay) based on research in the library and other technology-based information resources and following the proper research and composition procedures, inclusive of choosing and limiting a subject; preparing a bibliography; taking notes; drawing reasonable conclusions; organizing notes; preparing a rough draft and allowing for several stages of revision; constructing a précis; successfully incorporating outside research sources in proper style; preparing a works-cited page; and preparing and editing the final document. Morgan State University defines competency in oral communication as (1) correctness in articulation, including pronunciation, enunciation, tone, rate, emphasis and audience contact; (2) effectiveness in oral reading; and (3) effectiveness in extemporaneous speaking.

Morgan defines competency in scientific and quantitative reasoning as understanding and employing the philosophy of science and the problem-solving scientific method; understanding the fundamental concepts of the disciplines (biology, chemistry, mathematics, physics), and being able to employ college-level mathematical skills in reasoning through problem solving. Morgan State University defines critical analysis and reasoning competency as: (1) being able to analyze arguments' logical validity, (2) being able to compose logically valid arguments; (3) being able to understand the nature, classes and forms of propositions; (4) being able to understand the nature and forms of deductive and inductive reasoning; and (5) being able to understand formal and informal fallacies. Morgan defines technological competency as the understanding of the basics of computer operations, the broad-based use of technology in learning and living, the impact of technology on society and social behavior, and the challenges that technology presents to human values. Its approach is interdisciplinary, not just technical, and it embraces students’ use of technology in their majors. Morgan State University defines information literacy as the ability (1) to seek out and retrieve information, whether from the library or from other sources made possible by modern technology; (2) to decode that information through reading, listening, viewing, or a combination of these methods; (3) to reflect critically and analytically, sometimes scientifically and quantitatively, on the information; and
(4) to express that information, along with ideas, interpretations of it and reflections about it, effectively in written and spoken standard English.

The General Education program at Morgan is currently undergoing a year-long evaluation and revision designed to ensure that core requirements fully support Morgan’s mission as well as student learning and success within a global society. However, although general education requirements are evolving and changing in response to evolving student needs and expectations, Morgan has implemented a comprehensive assessment of student learning for the core competency areas that centers on the use of standardized testing, course and program based assessments, and student perceptions of their learning derived from nationally-normed instruments. Examples of direct and indirect measures utilized to assess the General Education are listed below:

- Quizzes and examinations;
- Portfolios;
- The Writing Proficiency Examination;
- The Speech Proficiency Examination;
- The Collegiate Learning Assessment;
- The National Survey of Student Engagement; and
- The Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress Tests of reading, mathematics, writing and critical thinking skills.

The General Education Task Force, The General Education Assessment Coordinator, AVPAO, and faculty committees in departments offering general education courses form the General Education Advisory Council and are responsible for the assessment of the general education program. The aforementioned council monitors, gathers data on, and gives feedback to the departments about student performance and efficacy of the general education program. An annual report is developed by the General Education Assessment Coordinator. Action plan(s) is/are developed to address gaps and improve dimensions (e.g., content and delivery) of the General Education Program.

Other University Requirements

Other University-wide requirements, which do not fall under the General Education Program, include developmental courses in reading and mathematics which are required of students testing into them, the required courses in physical education (1 credit) and freshmen orientation (1 credit), the Writing Proficiency Examination and the Speech Proficiency Examination. The developmental courses in physical education and freshmen orientation have the same assessment requirements and follow the same assessment procedures as the general education courses outlined above. However, the University gives special attention to student performance in developmental courses and to ensuring that they do not proceed to follow-on courses until they have demonstrated proficiency in those fundamental areas.

The Writing Proficiency Examination is required of all Morgan students once they complete four-courses of freshmen English-humanities sequence, and the Speech Proficiency Examination is required of all students at the end of the sophomore year. Both are capstone experiences that
assess students’ proficiency in written and oral communication, respectively. In order to ensure that students understand what is expected of them on these examinations and the criteria used to assess their performance, the University will require that both examinations have a published statement that includes:

- A clear set of published objectives;
- A published list of skills in which students are expected to demonstrate proficiency;
- A published description of the format of the examinations (length, duration, etc.);
- A scoring chart or rubric which assesses student proficiency in the learning; and expectation areas and gives them feedback on strengths and weakness in their performance.

Annual reports are utilized to communicate student performance in developmental courses and on the Writing Proficiency Examination and the Speech Proficiency Examination. The reports include statistics on overall performance records by college/institute/school and by major. The reports contain comparative data on areas of weakness and strengths demonstrated by the students. These data are reviewed and discussed annually by appropriate committees and department faculty in the departments that offer the courses and administer the score the examination and also by the college/institute/school faculties. These data are discussed periodically at University-wide events (e.g., University-wide Faculty Institute). Feedback from the orientation and physical education courses are provided in the same manner as that from general education courses, with particular emphasis placed on student performance in freshmen orientation, the all-important high-school-to-college transition course. For the Writing Proficiency Examination and the Speech Proficiency Examination, feedback is also very important for the students taking the examinations. Accordingly, departments administering those two examinations score them using rubrics that can be shared with students and give them some guidance for improvement or for registering for courses that can assist them in improving their skills.

**Format of the Annual Assessment Plans**

The Comprehensive Assessment Plan of Morgan State University requires that all units and sub-units assess their effectiveness on an annual basis, in the context of the mission and strategic goals of the University. Each program is required to have an approved Assessment Plan in which the program learning outcomes, assessment measures, corresponding rubrics, and time frame for data collection and review are described in detail. Program data are collected and analyzed on an annual basis according to the schedule included in the plan. The assessment plan also articulates the responsible entity and review processes associated with the plan. Units are expected to seek approval of any modifications or improvements to their assessment plans.

Assessment Plans are submitted to the University Assessment Committee for review in January or June of each academic year. The UAC use the *Annual Student Learning Assessment Report Feedback Template* to provide feedback to all units and sub-units (Appendix C). Numeric results as well as comments from the committee members are submitted to the AVPAO. The AVPAO discuss results of the assessment plan with each program and monitor efforts to incorporate the feedback into the assessment process to support change and improvements.
Alignment with Middle States Framework

Assessment, whether at the course, program, division, or University-wide level, can be viewed as a four-step cycle:

1. Defining clearly articulated goals in accordance with institutional mission and strategic goals;
2. Implementing strategies to achieve those goals;
3. Assessing achievement of those goals; and
4. Using the results of those assessments to improve programs and services and inform planning and resource allocation decisions.

The effectiveness of the University rests upon the contribution that each of the institution’s programs and services makes toward achieving the goals of the institution as a whole. Morgan’s Comprehensive Assessment Plan is aligned with the Middle States Framework of Student Learning Assessment. See Appendix A for components of the assessment plan for the academic programs and Appendix B for the non-academic units. The areas that must be included in each assessment plan are listed below:

I. Basic Information
II. Mission of the Department/Education Unit
III. Alignment of Mission with Strategic Goal(s) of the University
IV. Alignment of the Mission with Strategic Goal(s) of the College/School/Institute
V. Student Learning Outcomes
VI. Opportunities to Achieve Learning Outcomes
VII. Assessment Tools for Measuring the Learning Outcomes
VIII. Timeline of the Assessments
IX. Communication Plan
X. What Were Your Primary Findings From Your Assessments?
XI. How Did These Findings Differ from Last’s Year’s Results?
XII. To What Extent Did You Complete the Action Steps for Improvement Identified in Last Year’s Report?
XIII.  How Do You Plan to Use This Year’s Assessment Results for Improvement within Your Department?

XIV.  Please Describe Any Additional Resources That Will Be Required to Fully Implement These Improvements? Address How You Will Use Your Assessments Results to Inform Your Decisions about Resource Allocation and Use?

XV.  Required Signatures

Format and Timeline of the Program Review Process

In 2007, the University adopted a policy and procedure document guiding “Periodic Program Review.” The process was developed by the Graduate Council for Graduate Programs and then adopted for use for all programs. The AVPAO and the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies collaborated to develop a schedule for program review on a five-year cycle. Those programs that have professional accreditation cycles were placed in the review cycle to match the external accreditation process. Morgan is in its second year of the cycle. From the program review document: “program review seeks to: (a) evaluate the relationship between programs and the University, School, and Departmental missions; (b) document program strengths and weaknesses; (c) nurture program improvement, based upon data, rather than anecdote; (d) articulate strategies for improvement, especially with regard to student competencies and in light of both institutional goals and national standards; (e) demonstrate institutional accountability; and (f) identify programs which may need to be placed on probation, reduced, suspended from operation for a specified time, merged, or discontinued” (Morgan State University Periodic Review of Programs: Policies and Procedures, October 2007, pp. 1-2).

See Appendix E for the timeline of the program review process. The following sections are included in your Academic Program Review Self-Study Report.

Goals
- List the major learning outcomes for students in the program.
- List your overall program goals and how you expect to/are achieving these goals.

Quality

Describe and analyze:
- Evidence that students are achieving each major learning outcome (Your department assessment report/results)
- The curriculum’s effectiveness in helping students achieve the major learning outcomes (Data from course matrix included in assessment report)
- The effectiveness of faculty teaching methods and out-of-class interactions and support in helping students achieve the major learning outcomes (Course evaluation results and course based assessment results)
- The technological skills that students develop in the program
- The program’s effectiveness in meeting the needs of a diverse student population and preparing students to function in a diverse society
- How students benefit from faculty scholarly activities. For example, to what extent are students actively involved in faculty scholarship and/or research? How has faculty scholarship helped improve the curriculum and/or teaching methods?
- Other programs—both at Morgan and elsewhere—with which the program competes for students. How does your program compare with peer or competing programs and/or with professional standards? What makes your program distinctive?

**Demand**

Describe and analyze:
- Past and anticipated enrollment trends in the program (five years).
- Regional and/or national trends in this discipline and their impact on this program.
- The curriculum’s effectiveness in addressing the needs of graduates and their employers.

**Cost-Effectiveness**

Analyze the cost-effectiveness of the program. Depending on their relevance and availability, you may wish to consider such factors as class size, budget, credit enrollments, student/faculty ratio, cost per credit hour, and space utilization.

**Other Information**

Describe and analyze any other information essential to understanding the program and planning its future.

**Summary Analysis of Major Strengths and Weaknesses**

Summarize the major strengths and weaknesses of the program, as evidenced by your self-study and the external reviewer’s report.

**Action Plan**

Outline substantive changes planned over the next five years (e.g., in courses and curricula, teaching methods, faculty, institutional support) in response to this program review and strategies for achieving those changes. An action plan must be provided for each identified program weakness.
LINKING ASSESSMENT, BUDGET, AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION

Introduction

The University encourages and ensures institutional effectiveness and renewal through a strong commitment to assessing student learning, to fulfilling its educational mission, and to planning processes and resource allocation to support the mission and strategic goals (Appendix G). Morgan’s CAP requires that all units and sub-units assess their effectiveness on an annual basis. All units and sub-units use assessment results to inform annual budget requests. At Morgan institutional effectiveness is a continuous quest for quality, efficiency, effectiveness and innovation.

Assessment, Planning, and Resource Allocation

The results of outcome assessment from all units and sub-units provide empirical data for the academic and non-academic units to develop annual and long-range plans. At the institutional level, this information, as well as information from assessment of institutional outcomes, is analyzed and coordinated within the scope of the University’s mission and its projected resources and priorities to develop its recommendations for resource allocation and long-range planning. Assessment results provide empirical support for decisions regarding allocation of resources and annual and long range planning at all levels of the University.

Budget Process

The Division of Finance and Management is designed to function as an effective conduit for the planning, securing and expenditure of the necessary operating and capital resources to achieve the wider mission and strategic plan of the University. Further, the division provides a variety of administrative, business and financial support services to assist faculty and staff in the delivery of the best living/learning environment possible.

Morgan State University utilizes a participatory budget process and will do so even during periods of budget reductions to maintain communications and an understanding of the finances among relevant segments of the University. The University uses incremental budget practices for the allocation of additional resources. Each year, Vice Presidents are asked to present their resource needs to the President’s Budget Advisory Committee. The Budget Advisory Committee assembles, deliberates the requests and makes recommendations to the President for consideration. Below is an eighteen month timeline as it relates to the budget process:

Calendar

March – Request resource needs from Vice Presidents

April - Budget discussions with Vice Presidents
May – Provide institutional needs to the President

June – Develop tentative prioritized needs

July – Discuss draft prioritized needs with VPs and departments

August – Submit to Board for approval

September – Submit request to the State

October – Presentation to the Maryland Higher Education Commission

November – Hearing(s) with Department of Budget and Management

December – Governor’s decision

January – Governor submit budget to the Legislature

February/March – Legislative Session

April – Budget approved by the Legislature

April/May – Budget Advisory Committee Recommendations

May/June – Discussion with the Vice Presidents and Board; President finalizes prioritized needs with involvement of Vice Presidents and Board

July – Preliminary allocation

September – Budget adjustments in consideration of enrollment

**Role of Senior Administrators**

Senior Administrators (President, Provost, Vice-Presidents, Deans, Chairpersons, Program Directors, etc.) are primarily responsible for institutional planning and resource allocation. The aforementioned leaders are key supporters of institutional assessment and consumers of the information generated by assessment activities and reports. They use results of institutional assessment to determine how effectively the University is fulfilling its mission. These analytical roles are associated with a creative process of planning and budgeting in such a way as to continuously strengthen the educational mission of the institution. The Provost and AVPAO ensure that the University Assessment Committee has the resources necessary to carry its charge and functions.
Resources for Outcome Assessment and Integrated Planning

All assessment efforts on campus and will be accessible to all areas. As a means of tracking the implementation of its new strategic plan, the campus developed a scorecard/dashboard that permits University board members and campus personnel to monitor some two dozen key performance indicators. An interactive dashboard, which can be accessed via the University’s web page by campus personnel, will permit users to drill down to obtain additional data concerning each KPI. Morgan is committed to sustaining the assessment process. During the past five years the University funded assessment tools such as Banner, PLATO, Smarthinking, Campus Labs, and Blackboard. In addition, resources (human and fiscal) were allocated to the following assessment instruments and processes: NSSE, CLA, MAPP, and ACCUPLACER. The Office of the Assistant Vice President for Assessment and Operations (AVPAO) supported strategic plan initiatives associated with student learning outcomes and institutional effectiveness.

Morgan has embraced many integrated planning principles as enrollment has increased. Facility planning is integrated with institutional goals and objectives, as well as with capital budgets and operating budgets, all of which are linked with the strategic goal of student success. The campus master plan and facility building programs are examples of an inclusive, participatory, and integrated planning process, which empowers end users, operational service providers, and external stakeholders to provide the input. Faculty and support staff resource requests associated with growth are assessed by departments, colleges, and the Provost’s Office and generally allocated on an annual basis. Facility and support resources are allocated on an annual basis with additional resources provided on an as-needed basis.

SUMMARY AND NEXT STEPS

In summary, the University encourages and ensures institutional effectiveness and renewal through a commitment to assessing student learning, to fulfilling its educational goals and objectives, and to planning processes and resource allocation to support the mission. To that end, the University has adopted a comprehensive plan for integrating assessment into the structural and procedural fabric of the University.

Under the leadership of the AVPAO, the Provost, and the UAC, significant progress in the assessment of academic and administrative outcomes has been accomplished since the last decennial visit. Below is a summary of some of the many assessment accomplishments that the University has implemented since its decennial accreditation visit:

- Re-examined and revised the Comprehensive Assessment Plan to include mission-based assessment goals for student learning, academic programs, services, and administrative processes;
- Implemented the revised Comprehensive Assessment Plan;
- Shared the results of the Comprehensive Assessment Plan with all constituents, and promote understanding of the use and impact of assessment results on planning and resource allocation;
- Developed and implemented institutional assessment plans;
- Developed and disseminated annual Progress Reports; and
- Developed professional development opportunities on best assessment practices for staff, faculty, and administrators.

Significant progress in the assessment of academic and administrative outcomes has been accomplished; however the University is committed to improve its efforts in developing assessment plans with valid and reliable methods that yield useful data for improving programs and services. Below are several next steps that the University and UAC plans to pursue:

- Demonstrate utilization of assessment findings to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness;
- Continue to implement Institutional Assessment Plan;
- Continue to develop and disseminate annual progress reports;
- Implement the program review process;
- Continue to develop professional development opportunities on best assessment practices for staff, faculty, and administrators; and
- Adopt a software application to guide and provide alignment of multiple processes, including assessment, planning, accreditation, budgeting and institutional priorities.
APPENDIX A: ACADEMIC UNIT ASSESSMENT REPORT TEMPLATE

The following are areas that must be included in each assessment plan:

I. Basic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Department:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report Semester/Year:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Coordinator:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specialized Accreditation

- NO ☐
- Yes ☐

Specialized Agency/Organization & Date:

II. Department Mission

III. Which Morgan State University Strategic Goal(s) Does This Mission Support?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC GOALS</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT MISSION SUPPORTS THIS GOAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Enhancing Student Success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Enhancing Morgan’s Success as a Doctoral Research University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improving and Sustaining Infrastructure and Operational Processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Growing Morgan’s Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Engaging with the Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Which College/School Strategic Goal(s) Does This Mission Support?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE/SCHOOL/INSTITUTE STRATEGIC GOALS</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT MISSION SUPPORTS THIS GOAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Department Student Learning Outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. What Opportunities Did Students Have This Year to Achieve These Outcomes?  
(Please Attach or Insert Copies of Instruments, Assignments, Etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course, Internship, Comp, Thesis, Project, Surveys, Etc.</th>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>Outcome 2</th>
<th>Outcome 3</th>
<th>Outcome 4</th>
<th>Outcome 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VII. **What Assessment Tools Did You Use to Measure These Outcomes?** *(Please Attach or Insert Copies of Instruments, Assignments, Etc.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tools</th>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>Outcome 2</th>
<th>Outcome 3</th>
<th>Outcome 4</th>
<th>Outcome 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VIII. **When Did You Conduct These Assessments?** *(Please Check All That Apply)*

- [ ] During the Semester
- [ ] At the Beginning of the Semester
- [ ] At the End of the Semester
- [ ] At the Beginning and End of the Major Program
- [ ] In the Capstone Course
- [ ] During the Senior Year
- [ ] Post-Graduation
- [ ] Other (Please Specify):

IX. **With Whom Will You Share Assessment Information?** *(Please Check All That Apply)*

- [ ] Faculty in the Department
- [ ] Students in the Program
- [ ] Campus Administrators
- [ ] Alumni
- [ ] Employers
- [ ] External Community Members
- [ ] Other (Please Specify):

X. **What Were Your Primary Findings From Your Assessments?** *(Please Attach or Insert Copies of Data Analyses, Summaries, Reports, ETC.)*
XI. How Did These Findings Differ from Last’s Year’s Results?

XII. To What Extent Did You Complete the Action Steps for Improvement Identified in Last Year’s Report? Please Address Each Action Step Identified in Last Year’s Report.

XIII. How Do You Plan to Use This Year’s Assessment Results for Improvement within Your Department? Please Attach an Action Plan or Timeline for Implementing Improvements Based on Assessment Results

XIV. Please Describe Any Additional Resources That Will Be Required to Fully Implement These Improvements? Address How You Will Use Your Assessments Results To Inform Your Decisions About Resource Allocation And Use. Attach Any Additional Information As Needed.

XV. Required Signatures

Assessment Coordinator: _____________________ ________________

Department Chair: _____________________ ________________

Dean: _____________________ ________________

AVP Academic Affairs: _____________________ ________________

Chairperson, SLA Committee: _____________________ ________________
APPENDIX B: NON ACADEMIC UNIT REPORT TEMPLATE

Morgan State University
Non Academic Unit Assessment Report

Unit/Office: ______________________ Report Year: ____________________

Division: ____________ Assessment Coordinator: ______________________

Unit Mission

Which Morgan State University Strategic Goal(s) does this mission support?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morgan State University Strategic Goals</th>
<th>Unit Mission Supports this Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Enhancing Student Success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Enhancing Morgan’s Success as a Doctoral Research University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improving and Sustaining Morgan’s Infrastructure and Operational Processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Growing Morgan’s Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Engaging with the Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which Division Strategic Goal(s) does this mission support?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division Strategic Goals (Please List)</th>
<th>Department Mission Supports this Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit Outcomes: (Please List)

1. 

2. 
3.

4.

5.

**What opportunities do your staff have to achieve these outcomes? (Please attach copies of instruments, assignments, etc)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>Outcome 2</th>
<th>Outcome 3</th>
<th>Outcome 4</th>
<th>Outcome 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**When did you assess each outcome?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Outcome</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Spring 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Which assessment tools do you use to measure these outcomes? Please attach copies of instruments, criteria, etc.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>Outcome 2</th>
<th>Outcome 3</th>
<th>Outcome 4</th>
<th>Outcome 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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When did you conduct these assessments? (Please check all that apply)

☐ During the semester  ☐ At the beginning and end of the course  ☐ At the end of each academic year
☐ At the beginning and end of the major program  ☐ In the capstone course
☐ During senior year  ☐ Post-graduation  ☐ Other (please specify)

With whom will you share your assessment information? (Please check all that apply)

☐ Staff  ☐ Students  ☐ Campus administrators
☐ Alumni  ☐ Employers  ☐ External community members
☐ Other (please specify)

What were your primary findings from your assessments? Please attach copies of data analyses, summaries, reports, etc.

How did these findings differ from last’s year’s results?

To what extent did you complete the action steps for improvement identified in last year’s assessment report? Please address each action step identified in last year’s report.
How do you plan to use this year’s assessment results for improvement within your unit? Please attach an action plan or timeline for implementing improvements based on assessment results.

How will you alter/revise your unit outcomes for the coming academic year based on this year’s assessment results? Please attach a copy of revised goals, if appropriate.

Please describe any additional resources that will be required to fully implement these improvements? Address how you will use your assessment results to inform your decisions about resource allocation and use. Please attach any additional information as needed.

Required Signatures

Assessment Coordinator: _____________________ ________________  
Unit Director: _____________________ ________________  
AVP Academic Affairs: _____________________ ________________  
Chairperson, SLA Committee: _____________________ ________________  

Date
APPENDIX C: ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT FEEDBACK TEMPLATE

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
ANNUAL STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT REPORT FEEDBACK

Program/Department: Assessment Coordinator:

Reviewed by: Date of Review:

DEPARTMENT MISSION

☐ Undeveloped: there is no mission statement listed, or the mission is vague and provides no insight into the goals and direction of the program.
☐ Developing: the mission statement provides cursory insight into the goals and direction of the program.
☐ Established: the mission statement provides clear insight into the goals and direction of the program.
☐ Exemplary: the mission statement provides clear insight into the goals and direction of the program AND links to the MSU mission statement.

Comments:

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

☐ Undeveloped: there are no student learning outcomes listed, or the outcomes are vague and/or unclear.
☐ Developing: there are clear student learning outcomes listed but they may be difficult to measure.
☐ Established: there are student learning outcomes listed that are clear and measureable.
☐ Exemplary: there are student learning outcomes listed that are clear and measureable AND connect to the mission of the department.

Comments:
OPPORTUNITIES TO ACHIEVE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

- Undeveloped: there are no opportunities provided to achieve student learning outcomes or only one opportunity per outcome.
- Developing: there are one or two opportunities provided for students to achieve each learning outcome.
- Established: there are more than two opportunities for students to achieve each learning outcome.
- Exemplary: there are more than two opportunities for students to achieve each learning outcome AND at least two of the opportunities provide for achievement of more than one outcome.

Comments:

ASSESSMENT TOOLS

- Undeveloped: there are no assessment tools linked to outcomes or only one tool per outcome.
- Developing: there are one or two assessment tools for each learning outcome.
- Established: there are more than two assessment tools for each learning outcome.
- Exemplary: there are more than two assessment tools for each learning outcome AND at least two of the tool will measure more than one outcome.

Comments:

ASSESSMENT TIMELINE AND SHARING OF INFORMATION

- Undeveloped: there is no assessment timeline or indication of how/with whom information will be shared.
- Developing: an assessment timeline is given but there is no indication of how/with whom information will be shared.
- Established: an assessment timeline and a plan for sharing information are provided.
- Exemplary: an assessment timeline is provided with two or more assessment times noted as well as a plan to share assessment information with two or more groups.

Comments:
USE OF RESULTS

- **Undeveloped**: there is no evidence of a plan to systematically use assessment results for improvement.
- **Developing**: there is evidence of a plan to use assessment results for improvement but the plan is not systematic.
- **Established**: there is evidence of a systematic plan to use assessment results for improvement.
- **Exemplary**: there is evidence of a systematic plan to use assessment results for improvement that INCLUDES assessment of the improvements.

Comments:

LINKING RESULTS TO BUDGET AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION

- **Undeveloped**: there is no evidence of a plan to systematically link assessment results to budget and resource allocation.
- **Developing**: there is evidence of a plan to link assessment results to budget and resource allocation, but the plan is not systematic.
- **Established**: there is evidence of a systematic plan to link assessment results to budget and resource allocation.
- **Exemplary**: there is evidence of a systematic plan to link assessment results to budget and resource allocation that INCLUDES assessment of the impact of allotted resources.

Comments:

ITEMS IN THE REPORT THAT THE DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM SHOULD WORK TO IMPROVE:

Signature of Reviewer___________________________________   Date Reviewed_________________

Date Reviewed_________________
# APPENDIX D: LIST OF UAC MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UAC Members</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Alao</td>
<td>Education &amp; Urban Studies</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Solomon.alao@morgan.edu">Solomon.alao@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicassia Belton</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nicassia.belton@morgan.edu">nicassia.belton@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Garrison</td>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark.garrison@morgan.edu">mark.garrison@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Gunnett</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ann.gunnert@morgan.edu">ann.gunnert@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Gwynn</td>
<td>Residence Life</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Douglas.Gwynn@morgan.edu">Douglas.Gwynn@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrya Hatton</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:garrya.hatton@morgan.edu">garrya.hatton@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo Howell</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Ricardo.Howell@morgan.edu">Ricardo.Howell@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda James</td>
<td>Academic Success</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brenda.james@morgan.edu">brenda.james@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petronella James</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td><a href="mailto:petronella.james@morgan.edu">petronella.james@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bickram Janak</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Management</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Bickram.Janak@morgan.edu">Bickram.Janak@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis Keys</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td><a href="mailto:phyllis.KEYS@morgan.edu">phyllis.KEYS@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemi Ladeji-Osias</td>
<td>School of Engineering</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jumoke.ladeji-osias@morgan.edu">jumoke.ladeji-osias@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Littlefield</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td><a href="mailto:melissa.littlefield@morgan.edu">melissa.littlefield@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinetta McCullough</td>
<td>Business &amp; Auxiliary</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vinetta.mccullough@morgan.edu">vinetta.mccullough@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Mendoza-Robinson</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cynthia.mendoza@morgan.edu">cynthia.mendoza@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany Mfume</td>
<td>Student Retention</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tiffany.mfume@morgan.edu">tiffany.mfume@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Noonan</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Allan.Noonan@morgan.edu">Allan.Noonan@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandip Patel</td>
<td>Information Science</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sandip.patel@morgan.edu">sandip.patel@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrol Perrino</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Carrol.Perrino@morgan.edu">Carrol.Perrino@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Perry</td>
<td>Education &amp; Urban Studies</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Evelyn.Perry@morgan.edu">Evelyn.Perry@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenda Prime</td>
<td>Education &amp; Urban Studies</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Glenda.Prime@morgan.edu">Glenda.Prime@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Rollins</td>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Cheryl.Rollins@morgan.edu">Cheryl.Rollins@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Rubinstein</td>
<td>Technology Training Services</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karen.rubinstein@morgan.edu">karen.rubinstein@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Rush</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tanya.Rush@morgan.edu">Tanya.Rush@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Scott</td>
<td>School of Engineering</td>
<td><a href="mailto:craig.scott@morgan.edu">craig.scott@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddhartha Sen</td>
<td>Architecture and Planning</td>
<td><a href="mailto:siddhartha.sen@morgan.edu">siddhartha.sen@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Sydnor</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kim.sydnor@morgan.edu">kim.sydnor@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Voos</td>
<td>Architecture and Planning</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paul.voos@morgan.edu">paul.voos@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrietta Wright</td>
<td>Education &amp; Urban Studies</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Henrietta.wright@morgan.edu">Henrietta.wright@morgan.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E: TIMELINE FOR THE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer prior to review</td>
<td>The Assistant Vice President for Assessment and Operations (AVP) sends you a reminder about your upcoming program review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The AVP meets with you to review the program review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You identify three potential external reviewers, confirm their willingness to serve, and submit their credentials to your Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Dean notifies you of his/her choice for external reviewer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By September 30</td>
<td>You design your program review process:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop a calendar to ensure that the review is completed on schedule and submit it to your dean and the Assistant Vice President for Assessment and Operations (AVP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Schedule the external reviewer’s visit and complete necessary paperwork.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By December 15</td>
<td>You obtain and analyze information and draft the program review report. To ensure that the vision developed during the program review process is feasible, keep your Dean informed of your work and thinking throughout the program review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By April 15</td>
<td>You host the external reviewer’s visit and receive the external reviewer’s report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By May 15</td>
<td>You finalize the program review (self-study) and draft the two-page summary report to be submitted to the Dean and Provost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By June 15</td>
<td>You submit your program review report, including the external reviewers report and your response, to your Dean for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You meet with your Dean to discuss the report and receive the Dean’s signature on the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By July 15</td>
<td>You submit all program review materials (program review report, external reviewer’s report, two-page summary report, and signed signature form) to the AVP for processing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By August 15</td>
<td>The AVP reviews the report for compliance with guidelines, contacting the Dean, Chair, Director, or Coordinator for information or clarification if needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By September 15</td>
<td>The AVP submits the report to the Academic Program Review Committee for substantive review and comment. These comments, the summary report, and the signature form are then sent from the Committee to the Provost for review and signature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By September 30</td>
<td>The Provost will meet with the Dean to discuss the review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By October 15</td>
<td>The Provost submits the Program Review to the President.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F: COVER PAGE OF THE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COVER PAGE FOR PERIODIC PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPLETE THIS COVER PAGE FOR EACH PROGRAM REVIEW AND SUBMIT TO YOUR DEAN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALONG WITH A COPY OF THE SELF-STUDY REPORT, EXTERNAL REVIEWER’S REPORT, AND</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT ACTION PLAN.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCHOOL/COLLEGE:**
**DEPARTMENT:**
**PROGRAM(S) REVIEWED:**
**YEAR OF PROGRAM REVIEW:**
**ACCREDITING BODY (IF APPLICABLE):**
**EXTERNAL REVIEWER(S):**

**SUMMARY OF THE INTERNAL SELF-STUDY REVIEW (INCLUDE FINDINGS AND**
**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION):**

**SUMMARY OF THE EXTERNAL SELF-STUDY REVIEW (INCLUDE FINDINGS AND**
**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTIONS):**
**Enrollments and Degrees Awarded for Each of the Past Five Years in This Program:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees Awarded 2007-2011</th>
<th>Bachelor's</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Enrollment 2007-2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bachelor's</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Department Action Plan(s) for Addressing Recommendations, Including Resource Requirements and Methods for Assessing Progress on Plan:**

Action plan will follow the AACSB Maintenance of Accreditation Handbook recommendations for steps to increase faculty expertise and interaction with the local business community. Action steps will also be developed as part of the School's new Strategic Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Chair (Print Name)</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean (Print Name)</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVP Assessment (Print Name)</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Program Review Committee</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President and Provost (Print Name)</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President (Print Name)</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G: FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

**Finance and Management Developed Goals and Objectives**

In addition to the budget process, the Finance and Management Division has worked with the Assessment Committee to develop goals and objectives and engage in periodic assessment of how well it is achieving them. See the matrix below:

Unit/Program Mission: To effectively and efficiently provide a variety of financial, administrative and construction management support services to faculty, staff and students. Further, the Division strives to ensure an attractive, safe, and functional environment to facilitate quality teaching, learning, research, and public service activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSU Strategic Goal</th>
<th>Unit/Program Goal</th>
<th>Methods to Accomplish Goal</th>
<th>Methods to Assess Goal</th>
<th>Anticipated Outcomes</th>
<th>Timeline for Assessment</th>
<th>Responsibility for Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing Student Success</td>
<td>1. Expanded food service options for faculty, staff and students</td>
<td>1. Expansion of facilities</td>
<td>1. Increased value of sales</td>
<td>1. Improved customer satisfaction</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Business Services Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Improve employee morale</td>
<td>2. Updating HR manuals and making web access convenient</td>
<td>2. Employee surveys</td>
<td>2. Better appreciation and understanding of decisions</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>HR Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Improve student safety awareness relations and safe pedestrian travel</td>
<td>3. Community outreach, institute safe walk orientation program</td>
<td>3. Customer satisfaction survey</td>
<td>3. Improved relationship w/ community and students and to provide crime prevention education</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Director of OCPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Provide in-person services to non-traditional students</td>
<td>4. Extended hours of operation</td>
<td>4. Schedule modifications and surveys</td>
<td>4. Increased satisfaction of non-traditional students</td>
<td>1/1/14</td>
<td>Bursar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enhancing MSU Status as Doctoral Research University

7. Develop ten-year facilities master plan aimed at defining capital infrastructure

8. Development and submittal of facility programs

7. Assessment of historical and current trends; meet with faculty, staff and students; understanding current and future teaching

7. Completion and approval of master plan by President and Board of Regents, submittal of plan to State controlling agencies

7. Ten-year capital plan with schedule for implementation of individual projects and inclusion of projects in annual five-year CIP request to the State for support

8. Additional capital funding

1 year | Facilities Planner

Annually | Facilities Planner / Design &
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>to obtain State funding to design and construct state-of-the-art buildings that will meet the needs of faculty and students as well as various disciplines</strong></td>
<td>pedagogies</td>
<td>8. Completion and submittal of programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improving and Sustaining Infrastructure and Operational Processes</strong></td>
<td>9. Increase student housing</td>
<td>9. Signing of contract</td>
<td>1/1/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Enhance payment processes online</td>
<td>10. Work with I.T. and Touchnet to ensure connectivity and compatibility</td>
<td>7/1/11 – 6/30/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Obtain accreditation from the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Executives for the Police Department</td>
<td>11. The Police Department will adhere to the latest practices and standards in higher education</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Maintain a healthy, safe and clean learning environment</td>
<td>12. Physical inspections, assessments and maintenance by contractor(s)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growing Morgan’s Resources</strong></td>
<td>13. Expand use of one card (I.D./debit card) to several retail operations</td>
<td>13. Number of additional units/operations</td>
<td>1/1/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Evaluate operations for increased efficiencies</td>
<td>13. Increased convenience for students</td>
<td>1/1/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Continue to update the community on planned development activities on</td>
<td>14. Reallocation opportunities</td>
<td>1/1/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engaging with the Community</strong></td>
<td>15. Community outreach – ongoing meetings and various other</td>
<td>15. Feedback from surrounding community organizations</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Improved relationship with the community and increased support for future campus projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>Design &amp; Construction Director / Community &amp; Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus, forging mutually beneficial development opportunities</td>
<td>Forums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Provide businesses in the community with crime prevention information and security assessments</td>
<td>16. Provide security assessments to businesses in the Northeast Baltimore area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Written security surveys that will allow business owners to see how to prevent crimes and decrease product shrinkage</td>
<td>16. Businesses will have fewer crimes and loss less merchandise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Director of OCPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AACSB: Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business

AAS: Academic Affairs Subcommittee

ABET: Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology

Accountability: justifying the investment of resources by providing substantive evidence and analysis for demonstrating that the investment yields significant results.

Action Plan: a description of activities to be undertaken for achieving objective(s), including implementation details, scheduled date(s) of completion, and the required financial commitment.

Activity: an event designed to affect a specified outcome. Activities occur as components of courses in instructional programs and as extracurricular events in non-instructional programs; or they can occur independently from programs.

APEX: Oracle Application Express

Assessment: the ongoing process of establishing clear expected goals and outcomes with measurable objectives; ensuring that there are sufficient opportunities for affected areas to achieve the outcomes and objectives; and systematically gathering, analyzing, and interpreting evidence to determine the degree to which outcomes and objectives match expectations

AUAS: Administrative Unit Assessment Subcommittee

AVPAO: Assistant Vice President for Assessment & Operations

BAC: Budget Advisory Committee

CAP: Comprehensive Assessment Plan

CLA: Collegiate Learning Assessment

Closing the Loop: using assessment results for program change & improvement. Direct and Indirect Measures of Learning – a direct measure is one by which students demonstrate what they have learned (exam, project). An indirect measure provides second hand information about student learning (a student questionnaire about what they’ve learned).

Course: an organized series of instructional and learning activities, dealing with specified subject-matter, designed to affect specified learning outcomes.

Data: factual information, such as observations or measurements—especially such information organized for analysis or used to reason or make decisions.
Evaluation: 1) the part of the assessment process that uses professional judgment to form conclusions about the data. 2) Using assessment information in combination with professional judgment to make appropriate decisions about what has been assessed.

GEAS: General Education Assessment Subcommittee

Goal: a broad institutional, unit, or program aim (e.g., to enhance student success or to provide community service), deriving from the institution, unit, or program’s mission and effectuated for a given period of time through a planning process.

Institutional Effectiveness: the ability of an institution to achieve its stated mission and goals, i.e., its expanded statement of institutional purpose.

KPIs: Key Performance Indicators or quantifiable goals that measure performance. These goals are well-defined, critical to an organization's success, and reflect the organization's mission and goals. KPIs are usually measured against benchmarks.

MAPP: Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress

MSCHE: Middle States Commission on Higher Education

MSU: Morgan State University

NCATE: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

NSSE: National Survey of Student Engagement

Nichols Assessment Model: A widely used Assessment Reporting Model designed by James O. Nichols of Institutional Effectiveness Associates.

Objective: a specific operational or strategic, measurable aim derived from an overarching goal or outcome. Objectives add a specificity to outcomes that allows for measurement. Achieving any outcome generally requires fulfilling a number of objectives. Well-constructed objectives identify an Agent who will be performing a behavior, the nature of the Behavior to be exhibited, any pertinent Conditions under which the behavior will occur, the Degree that defines acceptable performance of the behavior, and an Endpoint, the time by which the behavior will be demonstrated (or ABCDE) approach.

Program Review: Periodic self-studies in which departments are asked to present their mission statements; resources, including the number of faculty, faculty qualifications and productivity, teaching load, curriculum, and technology; learning outcomes and assessment measures; the ways in which departments have shared assessment results and used those results to inform departmental decision-making; and plans for improving learning.
**Rubric**: A criteria-based scoring guideline that can be used to evaluate performance. Rubrics indicate the qualities the judge/reviewer will look for in differentiating levels of performance and assessing achievement.

**SAAS**: Student Affairs Assessment Subcommittee

**Standards**: Requirements of competency from an accrediting body. Standards set a level of accomplishment that students are expected to meet or exceed. Meeting assessment standards does not imply standardization of programs, rather that students were able to learn certain required skill sets through multiple pathways in a program before graduation.

**STEM**: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics

**Strategic Goals**: goals based on a prediction that current circumstances will not prevail in the future, i.e., that there will be new trends, changes, or surprises.

**Strategic Plan**: a document that articulates the institution’s strategic goals and identifies the best approaches for achieving them.

**Strategic Planning**: a systematic and ongoing activity that an organization uses to anticipate and respond to its predicted needs and the predicted needs of its constituents for a three- to five-year period and beyond.

**Student Learning Outcome**: Criteria for determining whether overall program goals are being successfully met and whether students are learning a program’s curriculum to a satisfactory level.

**UAC**: University Assessment Committee
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