

Texas A&M International University

Annual Institutional Effectiveness Review (AIER)

Date Submitted February 13, 2006

Assessment Period Covered (2006)

Academic Program/AES Unit Program for Academic Support and Enrichment /Testing Center

Person(s) Preparing Review Alejandro A. Martinez, Jr.

Provide summary of the last cycle's use of results and changes implemented

After reviewing last years results, it was determined that the Testing Center had a large number of registrants for the GRE; however, on exam day there was a poor turn out. This was due mainly to the fact that exaninees did not have to pay in advance since registration was on-site. The testing center, in conjunction with Educational Testing Services, the company that administers the General GRE, had students register and pay through them instead of doing on-site registration where the students would normally register early and pay on the day of the exam. This has assured that that all examinees who register for the GRE examination attend the session selected. The testing Center will now focus on using the same method with other testing services to obtain the same reuslts as the GRE.

Results from last year revealed that students wanted more assistance when saving, scanning and printing out their documents while using the PASE Computer Lab. In an effort to obtain desired outcome for customer service, lab assistants were assigned to the floor offering assistance to lab patrons, greeting patrons as they enter the lab and providing faster delivery of patron's printouts. Will use comments to see how overall customer service satisfaction can be increased to 85% of those polled to indicate that they are 4 (satisfied) or 5 (very satisfied).

Section I: Planning and Implementation

Institutional Mission

Texas A&M International University, a Member of The Texas A&M University System, prepares students for leadership roles in their chosen profession in an increasingly complex, culturally diverse state, national, and global society ... Through instruction, faculty and student research, and public service, Texas A&M International University embodies a strategic point of delivery for well-defined programs and services that improve the quality of life for citizens of the border region, the State of Texas, and national and international communities.

Academic Program or Administrative/Educational Support Unit Mission

To provide a quiet, secure, and professional environment suitable for testing, and to administer local, state and national examinations to meet needs of TAMIU students and community: To provide students and the community with state of the art hardware and software that serve their academic and/or professional needs.

Identify outcomes and the relationship to Strategic Plan

Outcome 1

Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)?

Students who register for exams will be satisfied with customer service provided by PASE Testing Center

Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 1

Goal 3 Service

Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 1

3.2 Provide service and outreach activities to the University service area in a professional, courteous, efficient and timely manner

Identify methods of assessment to be used

Testing Service Survey - Question #2

Indicate when assessment will take place

Annual

Criteria/Benchmark

Students who register for an exam will be polled to determine a customer service satisfaction increase by 2% from the 88% (2004-2005) to 90% (2006) indicating 4 (satisfied) or 5 (very satisfied) for the 2006 year

Outcome 2

Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)?

Students who register for an national administration of an examination such as the IBTOEFL, GRE or PearsonVue It Cetification will be well attended by students who are pre-registered

Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 2

Goal 1 Academics

Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 2

1.4 Prepare students for success in their chosen careers

Identify methods of assessment to be used

Examinee rosters provided by testing companies

Indicate when assessment will take place

Annual

Criteria/Benchmark

70% of students who pre-registered (listed on roster) for an examination will attend scheduled test sessions.

Outcome 3

Is this outcome related to writing (QEP)?

Increase attendance of PLATO user for GENU and developmental classes

Identify Strategic Plan Goal related to Outcome 3

Goal 1 Academics

Identify Strategic Plan Objective related to Outcome 3

1.2 Support a student-centered learning environment supported by excellent teaching

Identify methods of assessment to be used

PLATO attendance reports

Indicate when assessment will take place

Annual

Criteria/Benchmark

80% of students who are registered for PLATO will attend assigned PLATO session.

Section II: Analysis of Results

When (term/date) was assessment conducted?

Outcome 1

December 2006

Outcome 2

December 2006

Outcome 3

December 2006

What were the results attained (raw data)?

Outcome 1

Benchmark met - 291 out of 320 patrons polled indicated a 4 or 5 range of customer service satisfaction indicating 91% were satisfied.

Outcome 2

Benchmark met. 99% of the 336 students who register for an national administration of an examination such as the IBTOEFL, GRE or PearsonVue It Cetification attended their assigned session.

Outcome 3

Benchmark met - 95% of those enrolled inn the PLATO lab attened their assigned seessions.

Who (specify names) conducted analysis of data?

Outcome 1

Alejandro A. Martinez, Jr.

Outcome 2

Alejandro A. Martinez, Jr.

Outcome 3

Alejandro A. Martinez, Jr.

When were the results and analysis shared and with whom (department chair, supervisor, staff, external stakeholders)? Submit minutes with data analysis to assessment@tamiu.edu (Please use Minutes Template located on the **Project INTEGRATE web page.)**

Results will be shared at the February scheduled department meeting.

NOTE: Submit all assessment documentation (i.e., surveys, rubrics, course exams with embedded questions, etc.) to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning.

Use of Results: Indicate whether criteria were met/not met and what changes, if any, have been identified based on the data collected?

Outcome 1

Met Not Met

Provide narrative: Since outcome was met, the testing center will set new outcomes for 2007.

Outcome 2

Met Not Met

Provide narrative: Since outcome was met, the testing center will set new outcomes for 2007.

Outcome 3

Met Not Met

Provide narrative: Since outcome was met, the testing center will set new outcomes for 2007.

How have these data-based changes improved your program/unit?

By reaching set benchmarks, the Testing Center can set new goals allowing to find other areas of improvement.

Section III: Programmatic Review

Are resources affected by the changes identified in Section II? Yes No

If so, specify the effect(s) using the chart below:

Funding	Physical	Other
<input type="checkbox"/> New resources required	<input type="checkbox"/> New or reallocated space	<input type="checkbox"/> Primarily faculty/staff time
<input type="checkbox"/> Reallocation of current funds		<input type="checkbox"/> University rule/procedure change only
		<input type="checkbox"/> Other: Enter text here

Provide a narrative description and justification for requested resources (include linkage to Strategic Plan)

N/A

Identify proposed outcomes for the next assessment cycle:
Continuation of present outcome(s) – (Indicate reason for continuation): N/A
New Outcome(s) – (List outcomes below): N/A
Modification of present outcome(s) – (Indicate reason for modification): N/A

**** This section to be completed by dean/director/vice-president ****

Are resources requested a priority for the academic program/AES unit?

Yes No

Comments:

N/A

If funding, physical or other resources were requested, what is the impact of the budget decisions on the academic program/AES unit?

N/A