

Stark State College
Academic Affairs Assessment Annual Summary Report
2014-2015

Introduction

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

1. the faculty with the data needed to assess course and program quality, including student learning outcomes, and to complete academic program review and accreditation requirements
2. the departments with the data needed for evaluation and continuous improvement to meet quality standards and accreditation requirements
3. the divisions with data needed toward strategic alignment of human, fiscal, and physical resources to support our mission of student success

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

Under the current assessment process, the College has participated in eleven semesters of course assessment, ten semesters of course re-assessment, review of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for each program/major/certificate, and development of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the general education courses and technical/concentration courses for each program/major/certificate under the updated process. Using the current assessment process, the College began its first formal academic program review process in Fall 2013. Academic program review continued in this academic year.

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/majors/certificates affected by assessment and departments participating in course assessment. Table 2 illustrates the number of courses that needed to be re-assessed during AY2014-2015. These few courses in Table 2 did not achieve the minimum College standard of 70% achievement of learning outcomes during the initial assessment or were voluntarily identified by faculty to be re-assessed based on the course not meeting the 70% minimum standard in one or more methods of evaluation.

Table 1: COURSE ASSESSMENT FALL 2014 – SPRING 2015					
	Business & Entrepreneurial Studies	Education, Liberal Arts, and Mathematics	Engineering Technologies & Information Technologies	Health and Human Services	Sciences
Courses Assessed this year	30/84=36%	41/120=34%	264/445=25%	106/188=56%	22/47=43.5%
Programs/ majors/certs affected by courses assessed this year	37/37=100%	23/23=100%	75/81=93%	24/27=89%	6/6=100%
Departments participating in course assessment this year	2/2=100%	4/4=100%	6/6=100%	8/8=100%	3/3=100%

Table 2: COURSE RE-ASSESSMENT FALL 2014– SPRING 2015					
	Business & Entrepreneurial Studies	Education, Liberal Arts, and Mathematics	Engineering Technologies & Information Technologies	Health and Human Services	Sciences
Courses reassessed during this academic year	5	0	19	7	2

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

The assessment process continued in Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 with faculty following their departmental timeline for assessment of courses. Courses that fell below the 70% College minimum standard of student achievement during the previous assessment period were re-assessed (see Table 3). From the Spring 2014 and Fall 2014 semesters, most of the courses that fell below the 70% College minimum standard were re-assessed after plans for improvement were implemented. Neither American Literature: 1965 to Present (ENG237) nor Scriptwriting (ENG232) were reassessed this past year due to a combination of low enrollment and implementation of changes to the courses. Both courses will be reassessed in AY15-16.

Number of courses assessed, Fall 2014-Spring 2015	463/884=52%
Number of programs/majors/certificates affected by course assessment, Fall 2014-Spring 2015	165/174=95%
Departments participating in course assessment, Fall 2014-Spring 2015	23/23 = 100%
Number of courses re-assessed, Fall 2014-Spring 2015	33/35 = 94%

**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.*

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
- Tutorials (SAM, MyMathLab, MyLabsPlus)
- Written assignments including homework, essays, research papers, scripts, letters, and ANGEL web discussions
- Oral presentations (some technology-based)
- Classroom bulletin board, discussion forums, reflections, or blogs
- Case studies/analyses – oral and written
- Literature review
- Group or individual projects/presentations
- Service learning projects
- Article reviews/analyses
- Lab exercises/reports/journals/practical tests
- Journal assignments/critiques
- Reading, interpreting, developing, revising, and presenting technical documents and calculations including computer programs
- Capstone assignments
- Portfolio/Dossier development and assessments
- Laboratory experiences/competencies
- Clinical evaluations – Midterm and Final (Health)
- Direct observation in clinical settings (Health)
- Nursing Care plans/concept maps

- Patient Scenarios
- Graphing
- Interpret data in various forms: graphs, tables, charts, etc.
- Lesson/activity plans (Education)
- Observation/social interaction reflections and reports (Education)
- Debates
- In-class activities and exercises
- Critiques/Responses
- Application exercises
- Reading sheets
- Feminine Critic Paper
- Video Evaluation/Paper
- Writing Workshops
- Movie/Video Analysis
- Speeches
- Presentation Outlines
- Correcting improper use of math terminology
- Problem solving requiring multiple steps and interdisciplinary skills
- Data interpretation
- Computer database assignment
- Speaker critiques
- Interviews/Job Shadowing
- Networking events
- Situation testing
- Resource book
- Performance-based assessments
- Trouble-shooting assignments (HVAC program)
- Electrical systems analysis (diagramming and hands-on activities) (Engineering)

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

During AY2014-2015, each department continued to review, revise, and/or develop their Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs). Each department continues to maintain all course assessment/re-assessment reports and annual assessment summary reports. Evidence of students achieving the general learning outcomes are reported on the summary reports by department, and then evidence is collated divisionally on the assessment summary report. College-wide evidence of students achieving the learning outcomes is prepared by the Provost and Chief Academic Officer and included in this report. The PLOs and SLOs are dependent on each program/major/certificate and are not listed in this report but are maintained within each department.

The process to further enhance the communication of the GLOs to the students continues. The faculty members follow a process for assessment and communication of GLOs: The GLOs, which are identified on the master syllabus for each course, are reviewed; the course objectives are then identified to support the GLOs and are aligned with each course objective as evidenced on each master syllabus. Evaluation methods used to measure and evaluate student success of each GLO are also reviewed and revised as necessary, and the GLOs are aligned with each evaluation method as evidenced on each class syllabus. If several sections of the same course are being taught, a

representative sample (to include both full-time and adjunct faculty, each type of modality, College Credit Plus (dual enrollment), campus location, and times the course is offered) of the course sections are assessed and then summarized to create a course assessment summary. Based on this information, the level of achievement for each assessment measure is reported using the number of students achieving a 70% or higher on the student learning outcome out of the total number of students who completed the assessment and who completed the course. If the overall achievement level of the GLO falls below the 70% minimum college-wide standard, planned improvements are identified to improve student learning in that GLO and to improve overall student success. For these courses, the planned improvements are implemented in the course(s) during the next time the course(s) is taught; and then the course(s) is re-assessed.

The table below summarizes the percentage of students in all academic divisions who, college-wide, demonstrated proficiency in each General Learning Outcome for AY14-15. As demonstrated in the table, 93.06% of the students assessed or reassessed this academic year demonstrated proficiency in *Effective Communication*, 93% demonstrated proficiency in *Quantitative Literacy*, 92.5% demonstrated proficiency in *Information Literacy*, 92% demonstrated proficiency in *Critical Thinking*, 92.21% demonstrated proficiency in *Global and Diversity Awareness*, and 92.98% demonstrated proficiency in *Civic, Professional, and Ethical Responsibility*. Based on the results of the data obtained, the majority of students at Stark State College demonstrated proficiency in each of our general learning outcomes.

GLO 1	GLO 2	GLO 3	GLO 4	GLO 5	GLO 6
Effective Communication	Quantitative Literacy	Information Literacy	Critical Thinking	Global and Diversity Awareness	Civic, Professional, and Ethical Responsibility
93.06%	93%	92.5%	92%	92.21%	92.98%

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

In academic year 14-15, most courses overall met the College's minimum standard for student achievement of 70% or greater. While the assessment process requires planned improvements be identified for those courses that do NOT meet the minimum achievement, many faculty reported planned improvements in their methods of evaluation even when the course met the minimum standard. The various planned improvements as identified by faculty are listed below:

- Begin classes with quizzes to jump start discussions
- Add journals to the curriculum to encourage discussion points
- Increase the frequency of open book quizzes to ensure effective reading of the literature for the course
- Modify assignments
- Send additional reminders to students on requirements for assignments
- Develop a sample resource page for assignments
- Continue to encourage students to use the Writing Center, Math Learning Center, and Science Learning Center
- Reinforce key concepts from prior accounting classes to improve student learning outcomes

- Continue offering and increasing the number of in-person review sessions for online students
- Online instructors will encourage better student advising regarding the rigors of web-based classes
- Increase the use of video based learning within online sections
- Continue to train new Adjunct Faculty on the use of the financial calculator
- Place more emphasis on the key concepts contained in the applicable sections of the course
- Emphasize to students the availability and benefits of using the Tutoring Center
- Continue to reevaluate the validity of test and quiz questions and problems
- Add more support materials on Angel
- Reevaluate study guides and review exercises
- Reevaluate online exercise topics and discussion forum topics
- Addition of assignments and course objective to support the GLO's
- Add live "study" chats for web courses
- Additional review of material
- Revise/add audio lectures
- Develop virtual flashcards
- Add videos
- Revise timing or method of assessment
- Add pre- and post-tests as assessments
- Increase group work (i.e. discussions, team projects)
- Improve announcements and other communications in ANGEL delivered courses
- Increase emphasis on attendance and in-class assignments
- Improve/re-enforce instructions required for assignments
- Revise grading scales for assignment categories and grading criteria (increase/improve rubrics)
- Review pre-requisites for first level courses
- Increase emphasis on tutoring and early intervention
- Increase writing assignments, presentations, and team interaction/group work
- Revise course outcomes/objectives
- Review test banks to confirm accuracy and to determine if they are accurately assessing student knowledge
- Revise rubrics to provide more detailed evaluation criteria
- Revise lab manuals to refine the timing of subject presentations and skill evaluation activities
- Incorporate weekly ANGEL quizzes to help students prepare for the final comprehensive examination
- Increase case studies and direct skills in labs
- Expand electronic documentation into semesters 2, 3, and 4
- Change from HESI product outcomes for nursing program changed to ATI for external testing norms
- Data is being separated to look for trends in program options and sites for each course
- Implement multidisciplinary Sims with other health programs
- Strengthened orientation of new faculty on evaluation of student learning outcomes
- Converting to a concept based curriculum to eliminate content overload
- Increase simulations for health students

6. Steps taken to ensure shared responsibility by faculty, staff, students and advisory boards/committees 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. All Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) were completed by each department for each program/major/certificate.

Many of the division deans continue to put assessment as an agenda item for divisional, departmental, and advisory board/committee meetings. Career programs hold advisory boards/committee meetings to share information and ideas about the state of the program, and avenues for improvement are discussed with the committee members. Department chairs frequently met with their faculty to ensure accuracy and validity of the data being reported.

Assessment was discussed at the Academic Affairs Council (academic deans and Provost). Changes in any academic course were discussed and vetted through this Council. The Curriculum Committee, a shared governance standing committee of the College, reviewed the course syllabi template format as part of continuous improvement for the assessment process. The Curriculum Committee communicates any revisions on either template with the faculty and ensures the updated templates are posted to mystarkstate in a timely manner. The faculty were instructed through training and department meetings that the new cycle for course assessment began in Fall 2013. The first cycle of academic program review (APR) also began in Fall 2013 and incorporated course assessment as part of the review process. The Assessment Council, consisting of faculty and staff, is an operational committee that reports to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, which is a standing committee of President's Cabinet. A charge of this committee is to review academic and co-curricular assessment.

The GLO alignment with the course objectives and the methods of evaluation reflected on the master and class syllabi informs students of learning outcomes and the assessment of student learning; the syllabi must be available to every student on the first day of class per college policy (SSC Policy & Procedures Manual, Section 3357:15-13-35). All course syllabi are shared resources within each department and/or division.

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 College Credit Plus (dual enrollment) and Early College High School, ensures shared responsibility for student learning and the assessment of student learning. Departmental and divisional meetings are held to ensure accuracy and validity of the data being reported. Some divisions hold open meetings for adjunct faculty to actively engage them in the course assessment process, which also enhanced shared responsibility for assessment of student learning. Some departments assign courses to full-time faculty to coordinate. These course coordinators assist the department chairs with the assessment process of their courses and assist with communication to adjunct faculty.

Table 4 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 are duplicated headcount.) Table 5 illustrates division representation of faculty participating in course re-assessment, types of course modalities re-assessed, campus locations of courses re-assessed, College Credit Plus (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 are duplicated headcount.)

Table 4: COURSE ASSESSMENT FALL 2014 – SPRING 2015

	Business & Entrepreneurial Studies		Education, Liberal Arts, and Mathematics		Engineering Technologies & Information Technologies		Health and Human Services		Sciences	
	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct
Faculty	41	8	82	59	36	70	70	117	24	16
Modality	F2F = 27 W2 = 1 W3 = 21 W4 = 0		F2F = 151 W2 = 8 W3 = 47 W4 = 0		F2F = 180 W2 = 8 W3 = 23 W4 = 4		F2F = 150 W2 = 11 W3 = 12 W4 = 0		F2F = 53 W2 = 2 W3 = 3 W4 = 0	
Campus	Main = 21 Satellite = 5 DE = 0 EC = 0		Main = 154 Satellite = 35 DE = 5 EC = 0		Main = 135 Satellite = 62 DE = 8 EC = 0		Main = 149 Satellite = 17 DE = 0 EC = 0		Main = 45 Satellite = 3 DE = 6 EC = 0	
Time	Day = 19 Eve. = 9 WKND = 0		Day = 134 Eve. = 22 WKND = 0		Day = 156 Eve. = 52 WKND = 1		Day = 130 Eve. = 37 WKND = 11		Day = 43 Eve. = 8 WKND = 1	

FT = Full-time faculty
 F2F = Face-to-face class offering (traditional offering); W2=Web 2 (hybrid course); W3 = online offering; W4 = use of Second Life (avatars), etc.
 DE = Dual Enrollment campus
 EC = Early College campus
 Eve. = Evening offering
 WKND = Weekend offering
 NA = Not applicable

**The Law Enforcement Academy must comply with instructor/student ratio set by the State of Ohio (OPOTA). Multiple sections of a course may have required more than one instructor, multiple class periods, and/or various locations.*

Table 5: COURSE RE-ASSESSMENT FALL 2013 – SPRING 2014

	Business & Entrepreneurial Studies		Education, Liberal Arts, and Mathematics		Engineering Technologies & Information Technologies		Health and Human Services		Sciences	
	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct
Faculty	8	2	0	0	11	9	3	0	9	10
Modality	F2F = 3 W2 = 0 W3 = 3 W4 = 0		F2F = 0 W2 = 0 W3 = 0 W4 = 0		F2F = 32 W2 = 0 W3 = 6 W4 = 0		F2F = 7 W2 = 0 W3 = 0 W4 = 0		F2F = 16 W2 = 0 W3 = 3 W4 = 0	
Campus	Main = 3 Satellite = 0 DE = 0 EC = 0		Main = 0 Satellite = 0 DE = 0 EC = 0		Main = 11 Satellite = 27 DE = 0 EC = 0		Main = 7 Satellite = 0 DE = 0 EC = 0		Main = 13 Satellite = 1 DE = 2 EC = 0	
Time	Day = 1 Eve. = 2 WKND = 0		Day = 0 Eve. = 0 WKND = 0		Day = 30 Eve. = 8 WKND = 0		Day = 7 Eve. = 0 WKND = 0		Day = 12 Eve. = 4 WKND = 0	

FT = Full-time faculty

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

DE = Dual Enrollment /College Credit Plus

EC = Early College campus

Eve. = Evening offering

WKND = Weekend offering

NA = Not applicable

7. Steps to improve effectiveness of the efforts to assess and improve student learning for next year

- For the purpose of continuous improvement, more quantitative data will continue to be generated and compared to SSC, Ohio, and national trends.
- An AQIP Action Project was developed to assess our assessment process and identify ways to improve it, including our forms.
- 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.
- The College's strategic plan and College Completion Plan include an emphasis on assessment and student success.
- In order to enhance awareness of the assessment process and maintain its level of priority throughout the year, the following activities will 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.
 - Continue to review courses for Quality Matters standards.
 - Encourage faculty attendance at professional development activities, including JOLT, Focus Day, faculty-staff retreat, and Best Practices workshops.
 - Actively engage career program advisory board/committee members in the assessment process, including academic program review.
 - Continue to review curriculum and textbooks with faculty from other institutions for ideas.
 - Track retention and enrollment data to measure the effectiveness of action plans from current and previous assessment periods.
 - Review the outcomes of faculty's, department's, and division's student success goals
 - Research and implement CbD recommendations for student success.
 - Monitor DFW rates in courses to improve retention and student success.
 - Analyze and evaluate data for future planning of programs/majors/certificates.
 - Course mentors will continue to support adjunct faculty and ensure consistency of teaching methods and assessment strategies
 - Discuss best practices and delivery methods during department meetings to improve student learning in the courses.
 - Incorporate TAG (Transfer Assurance Guide) changes, if and when they are determined for relevant programs.
 - Continue best practices workshops geared toward mathematics instructors.
 - Plan active learning educational opportunities in the Science Learning Center.
 - Expand peer mentoring in open labs and in faculty lab courses.
 - Provide regular Science Learning Center workshops on topics students find especially difficult.
 - Review and Revise Lab Manuals.
 - Review all syllabi at the beginning of each semester to ensure alignment of GLOs with

course objectives and methods of evaluation.

- Continued mentoring of adjunct faculty by fulltime faculty.
- Enhance assessment training for all faculty, including adjuncts.
- Add additional review of materials covered in previous courses.
- Increase contact with adjunct faculty at satellite campuses.
- Continued assessment training, including Academic Program Review training, for all faculty, including adjunct.
- Course mentors will continuously update the faculty support site on ANGEL with master and class syllabi to standardize course material including syllabi.
- Introduce Clinical Documentation Improvement (CDI) into coursework to match skills needed in the industry and to meet new domains set forth by CAHIIM, effective October 2016.
- Continue to review and update HIM courses and revise curriculum if needed.
- Faculty will continue to review course content and tests to assure that both coincides with the NBRC matrix.
- Continue tracking attrition rates to assess effectiveness of online delivery.
- Communicate to students the assessments used to evaluate PLOs by listing them on the course syllabus.
- Changed vendors from HESI to ATI to improve validity and reliability of predicting NCLEX success for nursing students.
- Conduct department “best practice” meetings (including adjunct and college credit plus instructors each semester).