Introduction

The annual assessment summary report assists the College in documenting assessment progress by providing:

1. the faculty with the data needed to assess quality and to complete the academic program review and accreditation requirements
2. the departments with the data needed for evaluation and continuous improvements to meet quality and accreditation requirements
3. and the divisions with data needed toward strategic alignment of human, fiscal and physical resources to fulfill the mission of the College of student access and success, while meeting accreditation requirements.

This summary report and the steps listed below are based on the College’s formal assessment process as required by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC).

1. Summary of milestones

To date, the college has participated in three semesters of course assessment, two semesters of course reassessment, initial development of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for each program/option/certificate, and development of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the general education courses under the updated process.

The number of courses assessed varied from division to division with all divisions (100%) participating in the assessment process. Table 1 shows the number of courses assessed with the number of programs/options affected by and departments participating in course assessment. Table 2 illustrates the number of courses that needed to be re-assessed out of the total number of courses in programs/options/certificates. These few courses in Table 2 did not achieve the minimum college standard of 70% achievement level.

Reorganization at the college this past academic year reflects that the Arts and Sciences Division is now three separate divisions: Liberal Arts, Mathematics, and Sciences. Additionally, courses that were taught in the Teaching and Learning Division are now being taught in the Liberal Arts Division.
### Table 1. COURSE ASSESSMENT FALL 2010 – SPRING 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses Assessed</th>
<th>Liberal Arts</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Sciences</th>
<th>Business &amp; Entrepreneurial Studies</th>
<th>Education &amp; Human Services</th>
<th>Engineering/Information Technology</th>
<th>Health Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19/51=37%</td>
<td>4/9=44%</td>
<td>11/36=31%</td>
<td>68/163=42%</td>
<td>17/34=50%</td>
<td>68/322=21%</td>
<td>79/150=53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs/options affected by courses assessed</td>
<td>11/11=100%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4/4=100%</td>
<td>8/10=80%</td>
<td>4/5=80%</td>
<td>49/49=100%</td>
<td>19/21=90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments participating in course assessment</td>
<td>3/3=100%</td>
<td>1/1=100%</td>
<td>2/2=100%</td>
<td>4/4=100%</td>
<td>2/2=100%</td>
<td>4/4=100%</td>
<td>6/6=100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NA = not applicable**

### Table 2. COURSE RE-ASSESSMENT FALL 2010 – SPRING 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses Reassessed/Number of courses identified for reassessment in previous academic year</th>
<th>Liberal Arts</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Sciences</th>
<th>Business &amp; Entrepreneurial Studies</th>
<th>Education &amp; Human Services</th>
<th>Engineering/Information Technology</th>
<th>Health Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/2=100%</td>
<td>0/0=100%</td>
<td>0/0=100%</td>
<td>10/10=100%</td>
<td>2/2=100%</td>
<td>4/4=100%</td>
<td>0/0=100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Summary of previous year’s data and plans for improvement

The assessment process continued in Fall semester 2010 and Spring 2011 with faculty re-assessing courses that fell below the 70% college minimum standard of student achievement when the course(s) were initially assessed during the previous semester. From Spring 2010 and Fall 2010 semesters, 100% (18/18) of the courses that were reported to fall below the 70% college minimum standard were re-assessed after plans for improvement, which were identified by the faculty during the initial course assessment, were implemented. The course assessment/re-assessment process will continue with the culmination of an academic program review every three years.
Table 3: Summary of Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of courses assessed, Fall 2010-Spring 2011</td>
<td>266/765 = 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of courses assessed, Spring 2010</td>
<td>113/640 = 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of programs/options/certificates affected by course assessment,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010-Spring 2011</td>
<td>95/98 = 97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of programs/options/certificates affected by course assessment,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments participating in course assessment, Fall 2010-Spring 2011</td>
<td>22/22 = 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments participating in course assessment, Spring 2010</td>
<td>19/19 = 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of courses re-assessed, Fall 2010-Spring 2011</td>
<td>18/18 =100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The following factors may reflect the variations in the total number of courses from the previous assessment period to this assessment period: addition of new courses, retirement of courses, and/or reorganization of divisions and departments.

**The initial assessment summary template reflected program/option/certificate review, which will not begin until Fall 2013; therefore, the template was revised in Spring 2011 to reflect the number of programs/options/certificates affected by course assessment.

3. Evaluation methods used

The methods used to evaluate the General Learning Outcomes (GLO’s) include the following:

- Attendance and participation
- Pre- and post-testing
- Exams and quizzes
- Clinical evaluations and procedure description
- Practicum/Internship evaluations
- Cooperating teacher/site supervisor evaluation
- Problem solving on board
- Written assignments including homework, essays, research papers, and ANGEL web discussions
- Oral presentations
- Classroom bulletin board, discussion forums, or blogs
- Case studies
- Critical thinking exercises
- Group or individual projects
- Service learning projects
- Article analysis
- Lab exercises/journals/practical tests
- Reading, interpreting, developing, revising, and presenting technical documents and calculations including computer programs
- Capstone experience
- Portfolio assessments
- Juried review and associated performance evaluation
- Active participation in peer review
• Laboratory notebooks
• Graphing
• Interpret data in various forms: graphs, tables, charts, etc.
• Standardized/competency-based tests preparing for licensure tests
• Satisfactory demonstration of required skills and competencies through clinical performance (Health)
• Lesson/activity plans and presentations (Education)
• Professional code of ethics

4. Evidence of students achieving the learning outcomes (charts, graphs, etc.)

The College modified its Civic, Professional, and Ethical Responsibility General Learning Outcome to reflect the addition of “principles of sustainability” as an outcome. During this past academic year, each department has been developing their Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) as the next step in the assessment process, which will lead to academic program review. The PLOs are dependent on each program and its accreditation and are not listed in this report.

General Learning Outcomes (GLOs)

EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION (WRITTEN, ORAL, READING, AND LISTENING)
1. Organize and develop ideas effectively.
2. Present ideas in an appropriate, mechanically and grammatically correct, professional style.
3. Follow a standardized documentation format.

QUANTITATIVE LITERACY (INCLUDES COMPUTATIONAL SKILLS)
1. Determine a solution strategy and set up the problem with the pertinent information.
2. Solve the problem using the appropriate data, the mathematical operations (symbols and formulas), and the appropriate technology (such as calculators and computers) as needed.
3. Analyze and interpret the results for accuracy and reasonableness and explain the results using such tools as graphs, charts, and tables as needed (i.e., business, including economic and finance; health; information technology; engineering technology; liberal arts; mathematics and sciences; education and human services).

INFORMATION LITERACY SKILLS
1. Locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information.
2. Manipulate current software and hardware to access and communicate information appropriately.
3. Understand copyright rules and the ethics of extracting, sharing and citing source information.

CRITICAL THINKING SKILLS
1. Understand and interpret data by analyzing and synthesizing information.
2. Challenge assumptions and draw informed and logical conclusions.
3. Test conclusions against relevant criteria and standards while considering practical and ethical implications.

GLOBAL AND DIVERSITY AWARENESS
1. Demonstrate appreciation and respect for individuals and groups and use effective interpersonal and collaboration skills.
2. Demonstrate awareness of the interdependence of factors of diversity: culture, history, sexual orientation, psychological functioning, education, economics, environment, geography, language, politics, age, gender, ethnic heritage, physical challenges, social class, social skills and religion.

CIVIC, PROFESSIONAL, AND ETHICAL RESPONSIBILITY
1. Demonstrate personal integrity and social responsibility consistent with ethics, individual rights, principles of sustainability and civility in a democratic society.
2. Accept responsibility for and act in a manner that reflects the values of the communities and organizations.
3. Relate to others in a respectful, courteous, and professional manner.

The faculty continued to follow the process for course assessment as established: The GLOs, which are identified on the master syllabus for each course, were reviewed; and the course objectives were then identified to support the GLOs. Evaluation methods used to measure and evaluate student success of each GLO were also identified. If several sections of the same course were being taught, a representative sample (to include both full-time and adjunct faculty, each type of modality, campus location, and times the course is offered) of the course sections were assessed and then summarized to create a course assessment summary. Based on this information, the level of achievement for each evaluation method was reported using the number of students earning a 70% or higher out of the total number of students who completed the evaluation tool and who completed the course. If the overall achievement level of the GLO fell below the 70% minimum college-wide standard, planned improvements were identified to improve student learning in that GLO and to improve overall student success. For these courses, these planned improvements were implemented in the course(s) during the next time the course(s) was taught; and then the course(s) was re-assessed.

Twelve courses were identified to be re-assessed during this past academic year. All but one course that was re-assessed showed improvement in the areas that fell below the minimum standard. While showing a marked improvement in the GLOs from the previous assessment period but still falling below the minimum standard in some areas, the Technical Editing and Layout, ENG125, course will be re-assessed this next academic year after implementation of test revisions and improved study guides and exercises to improve student success.

5. Summary of action plans developed to enhance student learning based on gathered evidence

During this second round of course assessment, most courses overall met the College’s minimum standard for student achievement of 70% or greater. While the assessment process requires planned improvements to be identified for those courses NOT meeting this minimum standard, many faculty reported planned improvements for any method of evaluation used in the course to assess the GLOs, even when the course met the minimum standard. The various planned improvements are identified below:

- Monitoring student completion, performance and assessment data to measure the effectiveness of prerequisites.
- Exploring “best practices” in teaching college-level math courses
- Increasing and improving use of simulation in health-related laboratory activities
- Evaluating tests and revising if necessary
- Reviewing and evaluating learning objectives and related GLOs to improve student outcomes (syllabi and will be revised as necessary)
- Continuing to assess GLOs in courses as additional methods of evaluation are identified
• Establishing an online ANGEL tool to share resources and best practice ideas with all English, Reading, and Liberal Arts instructors
• Adding study guides and reviewing exercises
• Emphasizing more utilization of the learning and tutoring centers for early intervention with students
• Revising timing or method of assessment
• Increasing and/or improving use of rubrics
• Adding/revising audio and video lectures/tutorials/etc.
• Increasing writing assignments, presentations, and group work
• Changing course sequencing of assignments
• Modifying delivery modalities of courses
• Exploring active learning strategies and other testing methods
• Reviewing grading criteria
• Increasing group discussion/interaction in all course modalities
• Providing more support and resource materials to Web students
• Re-evaluating validity and difficulty of exam questions

6. Steps taken to ensure shared responsibility by faculty, staff, students and advisory boards for student learning and assessment of student learning

The assessment process continued with course assessment/re-assessment training provided to faculty, department chairs, and deans during scheduled group meetings throughout the year. Individual training on completion of the course assessment/re-assessment template for any faculty member or department was also provided. Additional training on developing learning outcomes for programs, option, and one-year OBR certificates (Program Learning Outcomes, PLOs) was provided to department chairs in Spring 2011.

The revision of the Civic, Professional, and Ethical Responsibility GLO was communicated to all faculty. The faculty continue to choose the courses they want to evaluate each semester, keeping in mind that all courses must be re-assessed by the end of Spring 2013 semester.

A representative sample of courses taught by both full-time and adjunct faculty and offered in different modalities, during different times, and on different campuses, including dual enrollment and Early College High School, ensured shared responsibility for student learning and the assessment of student learning. Departmental and divisional meetings were held to ensure accuracy and validity of the data being reported. Table 3 illustrates division representation of faculty participating in course assessment, types of course modalities assessed, campus locations of courses assessed, dual enrollment/Early College High School, and time of course offering. (Some faculty assessed more than one course or course section; therefore, the faculty numbers reported on the divisional assessment summary reports reflect this). Table 4 illustrates division representation of faculty participating in course re-assessment, types of course modalities re-assessed, campus locations of courses re-assessed, dual enrollment/Early College High School, and time of course offering. (Some faculty may have re-assessed more than one course or course section; therefore, the faculty numbers reported on the divisional assessment summary reports reflect this). Two academic divisions—the Liberal Arts Division and the Business and Entrepreneurial Studies Division—reported courses to be re-assessed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Liberal Arts</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Sciences</th>
<th>Business &amp; Entrepreneurial Studies</th>
<th>Education &amp; Human Services</th>
<th>Engineering/Information Technology</th>
<th>Health Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>FT Adj.</td>
<td>FT Adj.</td>
<td>FT Adj.</td>
<td>FT Adj.</td>
<td>FT Adj.</td>
<td>FT Adj.</td>
<td>FT Adj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47 85</td>
<td>10 15</td>
<td>59 50</td>
<td>58 22</td>
<td>14 34</td>
<td>52 52</td>
<td>34 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality</td>
<td>F2F = 182</td>
<td>W2 = 0</td>
<td>W3 = 24</td>
<td>W4 = NA</td>
<td>F2F = 68</td>
<td>W2 = 2</td>
<td>F2F = 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W2 = 0</td>
<td>W3 = 5</td>
<td>W4 = NA</td>
<td>W4 = NA</td>
<td>W2 = 11</td>
<td>W3 = 28</td>
<td>W2 = 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W3 = 24</td>
<td>W4 = NA</td>
<td>W4 = NA</td>
<td>W4 = NA</td>
<td>W3 = 28</td>
<td>W4 = 0</td>
<td>W3 = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W4 = NA</td>
<td>W4 = NA</td>
<td>W4 = NA</td>
<td>W4 = NA</td>
<td>W4 = 0</td>
<td>W4 = NA</td>
<td>W4 = NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Main = 126</td>
<td>Main = 22</td>
<td>Main = 64</td>
<td>Main = 48</td>
<td>Main = 44</td>
<td>Main = 182</td>
<td>Main = 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat. = 50</td>
<td>Sat. = 2</td>
<td>Sat. = 16</td>
<td>Sat. = 35</td>
<td>Sat. = 19</td>
<td>Sat. = 10</td>
<td>Sat. = 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DE = 5</td>
<td>DE = 2</td>
<td>DE = 9</td>
<td>DE = 0</td>
<td>DE = 0</td>
<td>DE = 6</td>
<td>DE = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EC = 2</td>
<td>EC = 0</td>
<td>EC = 4</td>
<td>EC = 0</td>
<td>EC = 0</td>
<td>EC = 9</td>
<td>EC = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Day = 148</td>
<td>Day = 21</td>
<td>Day = 71</td>
<td>Day = 67</td>
<td>Day = 38</td>
<td>Day = 147</td>
<td>Day = 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eve. = 29</td>
<td>Eve. = 7</td>
<td>Eve. = 15</td>
<td>Eve. = 18</td>
<td>Eve. = 20</td>
<td>Eve. = 60</td>
<td>Eve. = 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WKND = 4</td>
<td>WKND = 0</td>
<td>WKND = 8</td>
<td>WKND = 0</td>
<td>WKND = 1</td>
<td>WKND = 1</td>
<td>WKND = 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FT** = Full-time faculty; **Adj.** = Adjunct faculty  
**F2F** = Face-to-face class offering (traditional offering); **W2** = Web 2 (hybrid course); **W3** = online offering; **W4** = i.e.; use of Second Life (avatars)  
**Sat.** = Satellite campus  
**DE** = Dual Enrollment campus  
**EC** = Early College campus  
**Eve.** = Evening offering  
**WKND** = Weekend offering  
**NA** = not applicable
Table 5. COURSE RE-ASSESSMENT FALL 2010 – SPRING 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Liberal Arts</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Sciences</th>
<th>Business &amp; Entrepreneurial Studies</th>
<th>Education &amp; Human Services</th>
<th>Engineering/Information Technology</th>
<th>Health Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Adj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>F2F = 5</th>
<th>W2 = 0</th>
<th>W3 = 1</th>
<th>W4 = NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Main = 2</th>
<th>Sat. = 3</th>
<th>DE = 0</th>
<th>EC = 0</th>
<th>Main = 7</th>
<th>Sat. = 0</th>
<th>DE = 0</th>
<th>EC = 0</th>
<th>Main = 2</th>
<th>Sat. = 0</th>
<th>DE = 0</th>
<th>EC = 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Day = 3</th>
<th>Eve. = 1</th>
<th>WKND = 1</th>
<th>Day = 6</th>
<th>Eve. = 0</th>
<th>WKND = 0</th>
<th>Day = 2</th>
<th>Eve. = 0</th>
<th>WKND = 0</th>
<th>Day = 4</th>
<th>Eve. = 0</th>
<th>WKND = 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FT = Full-time faculty; Adj. = Adjunct faculty**

**F2F = Face-to-face class offering (traditional offering); W2 = Web 2 (hybrid course); W3 = online offering; W4 = i.e.; use of Second Life (avatars)**

**Sat. = Satellite campus**

**DE = Dual Enrollment campus**

**EC = Early College campus**

**Eve. = Evening offering**

**WKND = Weekend offering**

**NA = not applicable**

Career programs hold advisory committee meetings to share information and ideas about the state of the program, and avenues for improvement are discussed with the committee members. Further improvements include holding workshops with department chairs and faculty to help everyone, especially the new employees, understand the assessment process, including what worked and what could be improved. Due to these workshops, the assessment summary template for department chairs and deans was revised to reflect the breakdown of the representative sampling of faculty, modality, campus location, and time of offering for course assessment and re-assessment. Actively engaging adjunct faculty in the course assessment process also enhanced shared responsibility for assessment of student learning.
7. Steps to improve effectiveness of the efforts to assess and improve student learning for next year

- In addition to being qualitative with focus on processes, assessment needs to be quantitative with more direct measures of assessment and focus on outcomes and performance. For the purpose of continuous improvement, more quantitative data needs to be generated and compared to:
  - Longitudinal data to evaluate how the College, the divisions, and the programs are improving over the years (This has begun to take shape since the departments, divisions, and programs have started to collect data that can be compared to previous semesters.)
  - Other in-state or out-of-state institutions to evaluate the standing of the College on key assessment categories or how the College compares with national trends
- During this past year, the Mathematics Division reviewed the structure of the developmental Math courses; and with a grant from the National Center for Academic Transformation, the Mathematics Division has piloted the Emporium Model on a limited basis. This model is a new methodology of teaching mathematics. Full implementation will start in Fall semester 2011 for all sections of MTH100, MTH101, and MTH123. This model replaces the traditional classroom lecture setting with a lab equipped with computers and fulfills the core value of student-centeredness by providing an empowering and supportive learning environment in which students can persist and complete their educational goals at their own pace with the faculty acting as a facilitator of learning. The Emporium Model deals with the concept of modularization of the content whereby students can master learning of the content that is broken up into smaller chunks or modules. With the remodel of several classrooms at a cost of approximately $1 million, over 200 computers will be available to students for this Emporium Model at the end of summer semester 2011.
- With the addition of the math and science learning centers, a dedicated coordinator was hired for each of these learning centers to support student success.
- In order to increase consistency and evaluation in the assessment process, assessment training for department chairs, full-time faculty and adjuncts, including dual enrollment instructors, will continue.
- In order to enhance awareness of the assessment process and maintain its level of priority throughout the year, the following activities will continue to take place:
  - Provide an assessment summary, including course assessment/re-assessment, program learning outcomes, and student learning outcomes—during department meetings, division meetings, and advisory board/committee meetings with time to discuss and review learning strategies, methods of evaluation, and potential and planned improvements.
  - Encourage faculty to visit and observe their colleague's classes to develop new ideas and perspectives on teaching and assessing their students.
  - Increase the use of rubrics for assignments/tests/etc. to encourage consistency in evaluation of students’ achievement.
  - Develop master courses for courses that serve the majority of the students; i.e., BCA120 and ECA122, both entry-level computer applications courses.
  - Align the GLOs with the course objectives and the methods of evaluation/methods of assessment on the master and class syllabi in order to enhance student success.
  - Assess the first full implementation of the Math Emporium model.