**Assessment Report**

**First-Year Programs**

**Structural Change**

During the 2013-14 academic year, there were numerous structural changes to First-Year Programs (FYP). The first of these changes included a title and objective change as the recruitment component of the department was transitioned to the Director of Admissions. The second structural change included a merger of Student Academic Services (SAS) and FYP into a new department entitled The Center for Academic Emichment (CAE), which will begin July **1,** 2014. Another aspect of the department that changed was the reporting line, which moved from the Vice-President of Student Services and Enrollment Management to the Provost. As both the VP of SSEM and the Provost were recent additions to CSU-Pueblo, little had been established regarding the assessment of First-Year Programs as much change was expected to arise and continues at the writing of this report.

**Data 2013-14**

Currently, First-Year Programs exists as an advising center for first-year students. Again, the recruiting responsibilities were transitioned, and the department awaits the opportunity to develop its new duties. Therefore, this assessment will simply focus on the first-year retention rate as that is the charge of the department. Absent a strategic plan, the department seeks to improve upon its highest retention percentage since the inception of FYP, which was 65.6% in 2012. Currently, the retention rate is at 65.9%, which is the highest percentage rate the institution has reported since 2000.

**Future Direction**

As aforementioned, FYP will become CAE within weeks of the writing of this report. Inherent in the process of developing of new departmental goals, duties, and responsibilities is the assessment of these initiatives. CAE will work closely with the Vice-Provost for Assessment to develop appropriate methodologies and measurements for the new department.

Non-Instructional  Program/Service Assessment/Evaluation  Report Review Rubric
Colorado State University-Pueblo
June 2014

Reviewer:                                          Date:                        Program/Service  Reviewed:_____

| | Yes | No | Partially | Unclear | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Were the student learning outcomes/program objectives in **Column  A** assessed/evaluated according to the assessment plan? (Please refer to the assessment  plan included  in your packet.) | | | | | |
| 2. Does **Column 8** describe  the date on or during which the outcome/objective was last assessed/evaluated? | | | | | |
| 3. Does **Column C** have an appropriate assessment/evaluation measure? | | | | | |
| 4. If a rubric was used  in the assessment process, is it attached? (Please  indicate N/A in comments  if no rubric was used) | | | | | |
| 5. Does **Column D** describe  the students  or group of students  involved  in the assessment/evaluation process? | | | | | |
| 6. Does **Column E** describe the percentage  of students  the program/service expects  to perform at a given level (e.g., 80 percent  of students assessed will perform  at the "meets expectation" and "exceeds expectation"  level)? | | | | | |
| 7. From the information  provided in **columns F, G, and H,** do you believe  that the program/service has genuinely  engaged in a meaningful assessment process  to improve  the program  or service? | | | | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8. In **columns F, G, and H,** does the program/service comment on actual student/program/service performance on the assessment instrument/process compared to the level it expected (the target level) in Column E? In other words, does the department discuss whether students/program/service performed at, below, or above the level the unit expected? | | |
| 9. Does the unit describe in **Column H** improvements in programs or services based on the assessment/evaluation instrument/process? | | |

10. Please comment on the strengths of the report:

11. Please make constructive recommendations for improvement: