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Members

- Bea Babbitt, UNLV Office of Academic Assessment
- Patti Chance, Educational Leadership
- Cecilia Maldonado, Educational Leadership
- Lori Olafson, Educational Psychology
- Tawiee Rose, Special Education
- PG Schrader, Curriculum & Instruction
- Shannon Smith, Counselor Education
- Doris Watson, Sports Education Leadership
Challenge to COE Assessment

- Lack of a unified COE assessment system
- Lack of organizational & administrative structure for COE assessment
- Lack of ability to access COE data
  - Generate reports
  - Identify COE needs
  - Write grants
  - Publicize strengths

Charge

- Identify a COE framework for assessment
- Identify relevant data points for assessment
- Identify standards for alignment
- Identify challenges (issues, obstacles, etc.) to COE assessment
- Provide recommendations for implementation

COE Assessment Framework

- Aligns the following:
  - UNLV Office of Academic Assessment (NWCCU)
  - COE Principles & NCATE accreditation
  - Program standards & accreditation
- Provide data collection for:
  - Programs
  - Faculty
- Provide a system for:
  - Reporting
  - Improvement

NOTE: NWCCU = Northwest Commission on Colleges & Universities
Assessment Framework Components

- Component 1: Faculty
  - Standards Alignment (SA)
  - Assessment Data (AD)
  - Faculty Development (FD)
- Component 2: Program
  - Standards Alignment (SA)
  - Assessment Data (AD)
  - Program Improvement (PI)

Standards Alignment (SA)

- NCATE
- NWCCU
- COE Principles
- Program & Accreditation Standards

Assessment Data (AD)

- Faculty data
  - Teaching (e.g., awards, grants, innovations)
  - Research (e.g., publications, books, grants)
  - Service (e.g., awards, grants, innovations)
  - Other
- Program data
  - Admission
  - Midpoint
  - Exit
  - Follow-up
  - Other
Framework Outcomes

- Faculty Development (FD)
  - Assessment results
  - Recommendations
  - Steps for implementation

- Program Improvement (PI)
  - Assessment results
  - Recommendations
  - Steps for implementation
Remaining Challenges

- Varied data types, forms, etc.
- Lack of technical support for COE assessment
- Lack of technological platform for data collection, analysis, and report generation
- Lack of assessment coordinator & personnel

Recommendations

- Adopt the proposed COE assessment framework
- Institute a COE Assessment Coordinator & support personnel
- Must be a technological solution
- Implement the necessary technology to provide a platform for data collection, analysis, report generation, etc.
- Provide training to COE faculty
Recommendations

- Technological solution (Database)
  - Existing system integration (e.g., SIS)
  - Accommodate multiple data formats
  - Accommodate multi-level management
  - Platform independent interface (e.g., WWW)
  - Maintained and supported over time
  - Extensible design (room to grow with needs)
  - External, professional design

Recommendations

- COE Assessment & Planning Committee
  - Establish bylaws to govern the framework
  - Establish recommendations for implementation
  - Modify the above as necessary

Meetings

- November 29, 2007
- January 22, 2008
- February 28, 2008
- March 13, 2008