ED 400 760 HE 029 600

AUTHOR Derlin, Roberta; And Others
TITLE An Academic Department's Response to Outcomes Assessment.
PUB DATE Feb 96
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the New Mexico Higher Education Assessment Conference (Albuquerque, NM, February 22-23, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accountability; Accreditation (Institutions); *College Outcomes Assessment; Curriculum Based Assessment; Departments; *Educational Assessment; *Educational Quality; Higher Education; Instructional Effectiveness; Outcome Based Education; *Program Effectiveness; State Universities; Student Educational Objectives
IDENTIFIERS *New Mexico State University

ABSTRACT

Institutions of higher education are responding to increasing demands for accountability at all levels of government. The demands are also coming from regional accrediting associations in the form of a call for institutions to document their efforts in the areas of effectiveness and outcome assessment. This paper describes briefly this accreditation requirement. It presents one instructional department's response to outcomes assessment and student academic achievement and the direction it has taken for self assessment and improvement. Several models of outcomes assessment are discussed as are the detractors to self improvement in teaching that are presented by the mission of a research institution. The Department of Educational Management and Development at New Mexico State University has begun charting departmental goals, student learner outcomes, and assessments in relation to external standards. The faculty will identify how the evidence of student learning outcomes will be connected to instructional strategies and a review is being made of syllabi, assigned individual student and group activities, and assessments of all departmental courses. The process of outcomes assessment provides the identification of areas for self-improvement and the prioritization of items for immediate and future action which suggest that one of the promises of this assessment, continuous self improvement, will result in time. (Contains 19 references.) (Author/JLS)

An Academic Department's Response to Outcomes Assessment

Presented by:

Dr. Roberta Derlin

Dr. Enrique Solis

Tammie Aragon-Campos

Nidelia Montoya

New Mexico Higher Education Assessment Conference

February 22-23, 1996

An Academic Department's Response to Outcome Assessment

Abstract

Institutions of higher education are responding to increasing demands for accountability at all levels of government. The demands are also coming from regional accrediting associations in the form of calls for institutions to document their efforts in the areas of effectiveness and outcomes assessment. This paper describes briefly this accreditation requirement. It presents one instructional department's response to outcomes assessment and student academic achievement and the direction it has taken for self assessment and improvement. Several models of outcomes assessment are discussed as are the detractors to self improvement in teaching that are presented by the mission of a research institutions.

Accreditation Agencies and Outcomes Assessment

In the very recent past we have heard in an increasingly louder voice the call for "accountability" of educational systems at all levels. Demands for accountability by higher education have found their way into the requirements of all of the regional accrediting bodies.

The Manual of Criteria for Accreditation of the Commission on Colleges for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools lists over 120 "must" statements, prescribing very specifically the requirements that a college or university must demonstrate in order to achieve or maintain accreditation. Section III of the Criteria speaks totally to institutional effectiveness. This section states, "the institution must establish adequate procedures for planning and evaluation. The institution must define its expected educational results and describe how the achievement of these results will be ascertained" (SACS, p. 16). This section has lent some confusion, incidentally, to the issue of accountability and how we measure what we do. The confusion stems from the word effectiveness. That is, are we doing what we say we are supposed to do, i.e., graduating students, doing research, and providing public service, which are measures of effectiveness fairly easy to quantify, or are we imparting knowledge, which is sometimes harder to determine. Continuing with the Southern Association, this confusion in purpose is somewhat cleared up. Later, the criteria specify, "... institutions should ascertain periodically the change in the academic achievement of their students" (SACS p. 16).

The Middle States Association Commission on Higher Education has incorporated the outcomes assessment issue into its self-study program for accreditation.

The Western Association of Senior College has made institutional effectiveness a standard for accreditation.

In October, 1989, our own North Central Association of College and Schools began to document its initiative on outcomes assessment, or as it is referred in NCA documents, student academic achievement. The issue of student academic achievement is addressed in the third and fourth criteria: "The institution is accomplishing its educational and other purposes" and "The institution can continue to accomplish its purposes and strengthen its educational effectiveness" (NCA, 1994, p. 34-5).

Finally, the federal government has made its own foray into student academic achievement, or outcomes assessment; at least, accrediting bodies are sensing this intrusion. Goal five of the National Education Goals calls for "all citizens to be literate and able to exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship" (Rodriguez and Nettles, 1993). This goal, to some, poses an interface between institutional effectiveness, outcomes assessment, and national priorities. One possible outcome of this interface can be increased mandates for accountability by state agencies. One example of such a trickle down effect can be found in Florida. In 1992 the Florida state legislature directed that an accountability study be undertaken to assess the status of outcomes assessment in Florida institutions of higher education. This assessment resulted revised state statutes that specify effectiveness and accountability (Florida State Postsecondary Education Planning Commission).

Prior to 1985-89, regional accreditation associations judged institutions for accreditation on the basis of input. That is, if colleges and universities had adequate classroom space, suitable facilities and laboratories, the proper number of books in the library, faculty with the right credentials, and a financial base sound enough to stay in business, they were judged to be accomplishing their missions. The push for accountability at all levels moved accreditation into the institutional effectiveness model. Whether the associations called it effectiveness or outcomes assessment, the issue was student academic achievement. Astin (1992) hails this departure from the resource model of excellence toward a student outcomes assessment as a positive move. He states, "it directs attention away from mere resource acquisition and more toward the talent development process" (p. 305).

To a casual spectator outside the education arena, this move toward outcomes assessment would appear to have created a whole new industry. We have new books on the topic, consultants willing to help, conference themes and entire conferences on the subject, and last but not least, for those of us struggling with it, new opportunities to write on the subject and add publications to our credit. This last is somewhat ironic in that while outcomes assessment gives us at universities an imperative to focus on teaching, we see it more as an enhancement of opportunities to do research. Therein lies a dilemma in the making. On the one hand we have an accountability systems that demands that much more attention be placed on teaching and on the assessment of the effectiveness of that teaching. On the other, by its time and energy requirements, it creates conditions fostering its mediocrity by competing with research requirements in a reward system that lends more weight to research than to teaching.

Outcomes Assessment Models and Quality Measurement

As outcomes assessment techniques are increasingly applied in higher education environments, each institution must address several basic issues: what model of outcomes based assessment to apply; how quality will be defined and measured; and how the results of the assessment process will be used at various organizational levels within the university. As in any large complex university, the outcomes assessment process and guidelines had been filtered through several organizational levels prior to being submitted to our faculty for consideration and action. In developing our department's outcomes assessment process, we considered the various perspectives that could be utilized in the development of an institutional outcomes assessment plan, attempted to place our university's choices indicated by the guidelines we received within a frame of reference familiar to us, and reflected on how the university guidelines could be most meaningfully applied in our own department setting and within our program mission, goals, and objectives. More simply stated, we tried to figure out what we were being asked to do and how to relate these tasks to familiar concepts.

In 1987, Ewell discussed four main functions or purposes for outcomes based education:

> mission review and analysis, including specification of the kinds of instructional outcomes intended;
>
> evaluation of the effectiveness of general education programs;
>
> evaluation of the outcomes of individual degree programs;
>
> evaluation of student satisfaction and individual goal attainment; and
>
> utilization of assessment results in institutional decision making processes. (p.5)

Within this broad spectrum, however, various models may be applied and quality measures may also be variously defined. While models for outcomes assessment may be viewed as discrete conceptual frames, in reality it is common for multiple models to be simultaneously utilized by a single institution. The choice of model and the manner of its application reflects the management preferences or leadership styles of central administrators at the institution, the history and tradition of student and faculty involvement in programmatic decision-making, the audience receiving the information, its intended use, and the analytical sophistication of staff supporting the outcomes assessment effort.

The outcomes assessment models that had been most commonly applied in our department were the connoisseurship and the responsive models. The responsive model is most commonly used in program effectiveness reviews (Conrad and Wilson, 1986, p.2). This model focuses attention on the issues and concerns of those involved in the program and had been the model most commonly applied in our department. Periodically, we applied some form of survey technique to consult with recent graduates of our program and solicited their opinions about the appropriateness of our program and the usefulness of the program in their applied professional settings. We also consulted with hiring authorities regarding their perceptions of the success of program graduates. Specifically, administrators in the public schools, community colleges, and universities who had worked with our graduates were asked to rate our program's effectiveness.

The connoisseurship model is most commonly associated with accreditation reviews and incorporates concepts of expert power and peer review applied from an external source of accountability. While periodic reviews by accrediting bodies are common, they are not particularly welcome occasions because of the negative consequences that can result from loss of accreditation and national recognition. Despite the emphasis on the peer review concept and its implied tie to collegiality, it is often difficult to create an atmosphere of community and improvement in such a high-stakes environment.

In our department, both the responsive and connoisseurship models had been combined with the decision-making assessment model that links the results of the assessment process with departmental decision making about academic program development.

A fourth model, the goal-based model, assures systematic attention to the perceived performance of a given program when compared to the original programmatic intention (Conrad & Wilson, 1986). The goal-based model also is popular because it focuses on the learner by relating outcomes to program goals and individual student performance. As is common in academic settings, our department utilizes a variety of means to assess individual students; grading student work as courses are completed, applying examinations of various types, conducting comprehensive examinations both oral and written to provide the student with an opportunity to demonstrate knowledge acquired through the program overall, and supervised internship/field experiences. However, the relationship of assessment strategies to programmatic goals was previously ill-defined.

In addition to attempting to determine what model of outcomes assessment should be applied to the process we were developing, the faculty also examined how quality should be defined. We considered four main perspectives: reputational, resources, outcomes, and value-added.

The reputational perspective on quality had been commonly implemented in the application of the connoisseurship model. Quality from the reputational perspective is achieved when an external expert affirms its existence. Although by tradition the reputational perspective of quality is highly regarded, skepticism is now emerging. Critics have begun to make accusations of "cronyism" within a discipline or professional field.

The resources perspective on quality focuses on input analysis. The physical, human, and financial assets are examined by internal or external reviewers. If, in the reviewers' judgment, the students are excellent demonstrated by rigid admission criteria, the facilities and equipment are modern and in working order, and the faculty are well-paid, have appropriate credentials, and are well-published, quality has been achieved. A limitation of the resources perspective is that there is no determination as to whether or not the inputs are put to good use. Essentially the resources perspective of quality focusing on the presence of inputs avoids the issue of outcomes entirely. A limitation that has not escaped higher education critics who are increasingly demonstrating unwillingness to improve inputs through increased financial support to educational institutions at all levels.

The outcomes perspective on quality focuses on the students who emerge from the educational experience. Quality within this view is most closely related to productivity analysis; the product being the student after graduation. Commonly, the outcomes perspective has been utilized in conjunction with the responsive model with the measure of quality being level of satisfaction among graduates and employers. Quality is achieved if high levels of satisfaction among graduates and employers is demonstrated. An obvious limitation of the outcomes perspective is in its operationalization. Highly satisfied graduates may not be highly able ones. A graduate that is highly satisfactory to an employer may be so for reasons that are utterly unrelated to prior academic experience.

The value-added perspective of quality applies an industrial production model to student learning. In the value-added perspective of quality, student learning outcomes are re-conceptualized and an attempt is made to avoid the limitations of the satisfaction-equals-quality operationalization. Value-added tied to student learning outcomes is the difference between a student's knowledge and skills at admission and their knowledge and skills at the time of graduation. It is a measure of the increase in student knowledge that has occurred during the academic program. While the value-added perspective of quality enjoys present popularity, the pre-test and post-test design that is implicit in the definition is difficult to apply with rigor in university settings.

Outcomes Assessment and Faculty Evaluation and Reward Mechanisms

The information we had obtained from our university suggested to us that a goal-based model of outcomes assessment combined with a value-added perspective on the definition of quality was intended. We were encouraged to review our mission, goals, and objectives and to relate these programmatic facets to individual student learning outcomes. The process had been identified to us as essentially formative in nature; the outcome assessment effort was to be designed to assist us in achieving continuous internal self-improvement and was to be divorced from the processes of individual faculty evaluation, promotion, and tenure.

While the outcomes assessment process we are developing is centering on internal self-improvement, it can not be denied that much of the pressure for improvement at our institution and in higher education generally has been externally generated and is often targeted at faculty. "Much of the recent condemnation of higher education centers around the belief that professors receive high pay for little work." (Murray, 1995, p.82) and "Parents are not at all sure that the effectiveness of instruction warrants the high costs of college education." (Centra, 1979, p.2) "Today, faculty members are asked more and more frequently to demonstrate the ways in which they are investing themselves in their institutions and professions and thus the ways in which they are fulfilling society's investment in them." (Braskamp and Ory, 1994, p. xiii) In this environment, it is feasible that the effort to assess student learning outcomes will blend into the pool of other academic accountability requirements. Although our university is striving to separate the outcomes assessment process and the evaluation process, Centra (1979) suggests that this distinction is neither necessary nor desirable, "Faculty members are evaluated in order to decide whether they should be promoted or rewarded and to improve their performance - two purposes that need not be mutually exclusive." (p.1)

Envisioning a process of internal self-improvement of our program that is tied to student learning outcomes necessitates instructional improvement. It is difficult for us to envision improved instruction without imagining that more attention to the person who is teaching will also result. "The teacher or professor has, for hundreds of years, been the center of the instructional process,..." (Bryant, 1994, p.20) and as a faculty we are committed to improved instruction.

However, as individuals we are also required to achieve a balance among teaching, research and service activities within evaluation, promotion, tenure and reward mechanisms that have become increasingly summative in nature over time and that are not evenly balanced among the varied responsibilities of the faculty. In addition, institutions are limited in their ability to provide monetary incentives for good teaching since faculty monetary rewards compete with other priorities for limited resources.

The effectiveness of monetary rewards to enhance faculty performance, even if resources were available, can also be limited by faculty perceptions about the evaluation system. Braskamp and Ory (1994) used the results of a 1989 survey by the Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching, to show that a majority of faculty members are uncomfortable with current methods of performance evaluation. (p. 5) These authors state, "It's administratively unwise to ignore the fact that a significant number of faculty are dissatisfied with the current system." (p.7)

While initially institutions focused on formative or developmental features of faculty evaluation, legal decisions that have created constraints on this purpose and the desire to achieve consistency in personnel decisions have both resulted in the process becoming increasingly summative in nature. (Mc Gee, 1995) As universities use the faculty evaluations process more for summative purposes than formative purposes, faculty may focus on workload functions for which they receive the greatest rewards to enhance their likelihood of achieving promotion and tenure. In most institutions this is for independently performed research. As a result, it is difficult to achieve the increased emphasis on instructional functions necessitated by the self-improvement orientation of outcomes assessment when faculty continue to be pressured to produce research funding and publications to survive within the overall faculty evaluation and promotion processes. The unanswered questions remains - how can faculty be encouraged to embrace the process and value student learning outcomes assessment when their promotion and tenure depend more heavily on their research activities than on teaching?

The criterion-based faculty evaluation form used in the department of Educational Management and Development at New Mexico State University awards 3 points for each three credit hour course taught, while faculty receive 9 points for a single independently produced article in a refereed journal. Faculty futures are more dramatically influenced on the evaluation by concentrating effort on solitary research activity than devoting time to cooperative efforts to improve instruction.

New Mexico State University, a Carnegie I research university, is not unique in its environment of "publish or perish" and the university does offer recognition and monetary awards to support faculty teaching efforts as do other high-quality oriented universities. The University of California at Berkeley, widely recognized for it academic excellence was recently ranked 4 out of 229 universities on academic reputation (U.S. News and World Report , September 18, 1995) and is considered proactive in their efforts to award quality instruction.

In a recent article, Swartz, (1992) interviewed award winners from the past decade of the Distinguished Teaching Award at UC-Berkeley to determine whether there was a correlation between the award and faculty advancement, such as promotion or merit increase in salary. Swartz focused on the perception of the awardees and he found that teaching awards had very little or no positive affect on faculty advancement. From his observations, Swartz suggests that faculty may well conclude that it is in their own best interests - at least financially - to devote their energies more to research than to teaching.

Swartz (1992) recorded the comments made by the Distinguished Teaching Award at UC-Berkley and they are revealing about the realities of devoting effort to instruction within the current faculty evaluation, promotion, and tenure processes. One recipient commented, "I would imagine that the award has only influenced advancement or merit increase in a minor way . . .. My own take is that if someone is a bad teacher, it will hurt them more than being a good teacher will help them."

Another recipient remarked on the pressure to produce and publish research results, "I find an almost negative correlation. Research is rewarded, not teaching, and one is well advised not to become known as a 'brilliant' teacher unless one already has tenure. This sounds cynical, but I think it is realistic." (Swartz, 1992,p. 34) Another recipient remarked on efforts to solicit support for self improvement, "After receiving the award and starting a quite successful term as chair, I requested: (1) an acceleration; (2) a computer; (3) supplementary support for my sabbatical.

All three were refused. When I complained about the last, the dean informed me that teaching and service *do not count at all* on such decisions."

Swartz's (1992) findings demonstrate a reality of faculty work-life that can in the long run influence the good intentions inherent in outcomes assessment defined as continuous self improvement tied to student learning outcomes. The difficult question remains - how can faculty be encouraged to accept the self improvement purpose of student learning outcomes assessment when the faculty evaluation process rewards research more than teaching? As faculty continue to strike a balance in teaching, research and service - will the reward systems at higher education institutions be transformed to ensure that faculty can devote the time and effort required to consistently improve quality in classroom instruction?

Transforming Outcomes Assessment Into Meaningful Practice

As we examined the varied outcomes assessment models that been previously used by our department, the requirements of external accrediting agencies and professional organizations, the various perspectives on how quality should be defined and measured, and the most recent institutional requirements for outcomes assessment that is goal-based, student learning focused, and centered on continuous self improvement, we realized that we were confronting "a new animal". To an extent our prior reliance on the connoisseurship and responsive models of assessment constrained our thinking. At times in our discussion we found ourselves trying to beat square pegs into round holes. We would fall back to familiar models that could not further our efforts to tie goals to student learner outcomes with existing assessment strategies. While frustrated by trying to fit square pegs into round holes, the process has helped us to identify areas for future improvement in our program construction, course content, field experience and supervision, and assessment techniques. While resolution of these matters can not all be accomplished in the short-term, the identification of areas for self-improvement and the prioritization of items for immediate and future action suggest that one of the promises of outcomes assessment, continuous self improvement, will be realized over time.

We also recognized that there were familiar and complementary tools available to us as we attempted to address the task of transforming a different outcomes assessment model into meaningful practice. While we could no longer rely on the connoisseurship and responsive assessment models we had previously applied, prior work related to departmental mission, goals, and objectives facilitated our effort to tie existing student assessment practices more directly to programmatic goals. In addition, our departmental efforts were facilitated by our own competence and expertise in program planning, analysis, and evaluation. To an extent, this new challenge provides an opportunity for us to practice what we preach in our professional and academic practice as educational administrators, consultants, and teaching faculty.

To evaluate student learner outcomes related to programmatic goals, we are conducting a review of syllabi, assigned individual student and group activities, and assessments for each of our courses. Recognizing the continuing influence of accrediting agencies, legal entities, and professional organizations, we are also charting departmental goals, student learner outcomes, and assessments in relation to applicable external standards. While this task is time-consuming, it has facilitated our efforts to identify desirable additions to course content, unnecessary content duplication among courses, desirable alternative assessment strategies and ways in which more consistent instructional strategies and academic standards among our courses and varied faculty can be achieved.

There continue to be unresolved tensions and conflicts as we pursue our work. It is a struggle to retain student learning outcomes as a central concept not to be confused with traditional institutional analysis of faculty productivity and program effectiveness.

While the promise of continuous self improvement is emerging, it is not yet clear that the promise will be fulfilled. To a large extent routine, bureaucratic challenges dominate our process. We are actively engaged in producing documents that we believe are desired by the institutional outcomes assessment process. While we are actively engaged in identifying areas for improvement, whether we as a faculty can realize outcomes assessment goals ultimately improving the number of students meeting the student learning outcomes we have identified through improved classroom and advising strategies is uncertain at this time.

It is not yet clear how the institution will utilize the outcomes assessment process and the resulting information. While the institution has identified internal self-improvement goals, the possibility that additional levels or types of information analysis might result in future negative consequences for individuals and/or departmental programs creates ambiguity about future commitment. If information gathered to foster formative purposes is put to summative use, defensive reaction could circumvent the self improvement process.

It is not yet clear how the department will utilize the information realized from the process. As a faculty, we will have to identify for ourselves how the evidence of student learning outcomes will be connected to our own and each others instructional strategies. The uneasy and perhaps unresolvable tension between formative and summative assessment applies to the department level just as it does to the overall institution.

As an academic department responding to the challenges of a new vision of outcomes assessment, we are attempting to respond to institutional/centralized demands for what is ultimately a decentralized process of improvement. In the reality of academic life, self improvement is not only a decentralized process - it is an intensely personal process. As individuals within our department, each of us must achieve a balance among the service, research, and teaching functions of our position. Despite our individual and collective commitment to quality instruction, the tension between an outcomes assessment process that is intensely focused on instruction and faculty evaluation, promotion, and tenures processes that are focused on independent research may also circumvent future improvement.

While our progress in responding to the new challenges of outcomes assessment is very promising, our ability to predict the future is severely limited. It is uncertain that the tensions and conflicts between outcomes assessment and faculty evaluation, promotion, and tenure processes will, or even can, be resolved to assure that the promise of continuous self improvement will be fulfilled. Despite this uncertainty, our outlook remains positive. Self improvement in our departmental program and instructional activities will occur. The unanswered question concerns the magnitude of improvement we can achieve and for how long.

References

Altieri, G. (1990). A structural model for student outcomes: Assessment programs in community colleges. Community College review, 17, no. 4, Pages 15-21.

Astin, A. (1992). Values, Assessment, and Academic Freedom: A Challenge to the Accrediting Process. NCA Quarterly, 67, no. 2, Pages 295-307.

America's Best Colleges. U.S. News and World Report, September 18, 1995. Pages 126 - 141.

Blum, A. (1991). Education as emulation. College Teaching, 39, no. 2. Pages 76-79.

Braskamp, L. and Ory, J. (1994) Assessing faculty work: Enhancing individual and institutional performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Ins..

Bryant, D. (1994-95). The battles of instructional effectiveness. Community College Journal, 65, no. 3. Pages 16-22.

Centra. J. A. (1979). Determining faculty effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Conrad, C. And Wilson, R. (1986). Academic Programs Reviews. ERIC Digest. Association for the Study of Higher Education. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington D.C. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service Number ED 284 422)

Ewell, P. (1987). Assessment, accountability and improvement: Managing the Contradiction. National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.

Ewell, P. And Jones, D. (1994). Pointing the way: Indicators as policy tools in higher education. Education Commission of the State. Charting Higher Education Accountability, Denver: ECS.

Florida Postsecondary Education Planning Commission. Report 5. (1992).

Outcomes assessment in postsecondary education: Report and recommendations. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service Number ED 344 559).

Handbook of Accreditation 1994-6. North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission of Institutions of Higher Education. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service Number ED 376 786).

Kern, R. (1990). A model for addressing institutional effectiveness: Preparing for regional accreditation. Community College Review, 18, no. 2. Pages 23-27.

Mc Gee, R. (1995). Faculty evaluation procedures in 121 western community colleges. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 19, no. 4. Pages 341-348.

Pickering, J. and Bowers, J. (1990). Assessing value-added outcomes assessment. Measurement and evaluation in counseling and development, 22, no. 4. Pages 215-221.

Rodriguez, E. and Nettles, M. (1993). Achieving the national education goals: The status of minorities in today's global economy. A Policy Report of the State Higher Education Executive Officers Minority Student Achievement Project. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service Number ED 360 443).

Swartz, C. (1992). Is good teaching rewarded at Berkeley: College Teaching, 40, no. 1. Pages 33-36.

Murray, J. (1995). The power of portfolios. College Teaching, 43, no. 3. Page 82.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. (1992). Manual of Criteria for Accreditation. Decatur, Ga.

spring96\oa.alboa21496.wp

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC®

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: An Academic Department's Response to Outcomes Assessment
A paper presented at the New Mexico Education Assessment Conference

Author(s): Dr. Roberta Derlin, Dr. Enrique Solis, Tammie Aragon Campos, & Nidelia Montoya

Corporate Source:	Publication Date:
Department of Educational Management & Development New Mexico State University	February 22-23, 1996

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following options and sign the release below.

☐ Sample sticker to be affixed to document		Sample sticker to be affixed to document ☐	
Check here Permitting microfiche (4"x 6" film), paper copy, electronic, and optical media reproduction	"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."	"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."	**or here** Permitting reproduction in other than paper copy.
	Level 1	Level 2	

Sign Here, Please

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Signature: Dr. Roberta L. Derlin	Position: Associate Professor
Printed Name: Dr. Roberta L. Derlin	Organization: New Mexico State University
Address: Dept of EMD - Box 3N New Mexico State University Las Cruces, New Mexico 88003	Telephone Number: (505) 646-3825
	Date: September 23, 1996

OVER

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC , *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of this document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents which cannot be made available through EDRS).

Publisher/Distributor:	
Address:	
Price Per Copy:	Quantity Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name and address of current copyright/reproduction rights holder:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

If you are making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, you may return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Facility
1301 Piccard Drive, Suite 300
Rockville, Maryland 20850-4305
Telephone: (301) 258-5500