2017 Ad-Hoc Report

Prepared for the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

March 1, 2017



Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Recommendation 2	3
Conclusion	10
List of Appendices	11

Introduction

Spokane Community College (SCC) is one of two comprehensive, public, independently-accredited colleges that comprise the Community Colleges of Spokane, District 17. The district, the largest community college district in Washington geographically, serves approximately 32,600 students annually in a six-county service area in eastern Washington that includes Spokane, Ferry, Stevens, Pend Oreille, Lincoln, and Whitman Counties. SCC awards certificates, Associate of Arts, Associate of Science, and Associate of Applied Science degrees.

In September 2013, SCC submitted its *Year Seven Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability Evaluation* for reaffirmation of accreditation by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) which was followed by a comprehensive Year Seven visit in October. The on-site evaluation team made three commendations and five recommendations. The recommendations were:

- 1. Evaluators recommend that for each year of operation, the College undergo an external financial audit and that the results from such audits, including findings and management letter recommendations, be considered in a timely, appropriate and comprehensive manner by the Board of Trustees (ER 19, 2.A.30, 2.F.7).
- 2. Evaluators recommend the institution develop systematic and college-wide means to assess the student learning outcomes associated with general education and demonstrate that this data is used to inform decision-making. It is further recommended that the institution develop systematic and college-wide means to assess the student learning outcomes of programs in relation to the institution's mission and demonstrate that this data is used to inform decision making at that level (2.C.2, 2.C.9, 2.C.10, Core Themes: 4.A.1, 4.A.2).
- 3. Evaluators recommend the Board of Trustees develop and implement a self-evaluation instrument to regularly evaluate its performance to ensure its duties and responsibilities are fulfilled in an effective and efficient manner (2.A.8).
- 4. Evaluators recommend the College appropriately revise the Community Responsiveness Core Theme Indicators to be meaningful, assessable, or verifiable (1.B.2).
- 5. Evaluators recommend that planning for library and information resources be guided by data that include feedback from affected users and appropriate library and information resources faculty, staff, and administrators. It is further recommended the institution regularly and systematically evaluates the quality, adequacy, utilization, and security of all library and information resources and services (2.E.2, 2.E.4).

In reaffirming the College's accreditation on the basis of the *Year Seven Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability Evaluation*, the Commission requested that SCC submit an Ad-Hoc Report in Fall 2014 to address Recommendations 1, 2, 4, and 5. With regard to Recommendation 3, the Commission requested the College provide a letter and relevant documentation by March 3, 2014, to verify compliance with Standard 2.A.8. The College provided the letter with relevant documentation by the requested date, and the Commission found the College to be in compliance.

The College submitted its Ad-Hoc Report on September 2, 2014. In correspondence dated February 17, 2015, the Commission determined that the College had met its expectations in regard to Recommendations 4 and 5 of the Fall 2013 Year Seven Peer-Evaluation Report. However, its expectations in regard to Recommendations 1 and 2 had not been met although the Commission recognized that the College had made progress. Therefore, the Commission requested the College once again to submit an Ad-Hoc Report to address Recommendations 1 and 2 by October 15, 2015.

The College submitted a second Ad-Hoc Report on October 15, 2015. On February 17, 2016, the Commission informed the College that expectations related to Recommendation 1 had been fulfilled. While the Commission noted that the College was "substantially in compliance" regarding Recommendation 2, the Commission requested a third Ad-Hoc Report without a visit, due March 1, 2017. Also worth noting is the occurrence of a successful Mid-Cycle review by NWCCU in November 2016. The results of the review were accepted and approved by the Commission in February 2017.

This Ad-Hoc Report responds specifically to that request and outlines the College's progress in addressing Recommendation 2 of the 2013 *Year Seven Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability Evaluation*.

Recommendation 2

Evaluators recommend the institution develop systematic and college-wide means to assess the student learning outcomes associated with general education and demonstrate that this data is used to inform decision-making. It is further recommended that the institution develop systematic and college-wide means to assess the student learning outcomes of programs in relation to the institution's mission and demonstrate that this data is used to inform decision making at that level (Standards 2.C.2, 2.C.9, 2.C.10, 4.A.1, and 4.A.2).

Since 2013, the College has sustained a Student Learning and Assessment Committee (SLAC) comprised of 12 faculty representing each instructional division, the library, and counseling department as well as two instructional deans and four ex-officio members representing the SCC administration. The committee was charged with developing, implementing, and overseeing a college-wide comprehensive process to assess student learning at the course, program, and degree levels that is purposeful, systematic, and faculty-driven (see Appendix 2-1). Initial results (AY 2013-14, AY 2014-2015, AY 2015-2016) of the efforts of the committee include the hiring of two faculty assessment coordinator positions (1/3 workload release), adoption of common terminology for student learning outcomes and assessments, and implementation of CurricuNET to support efforts in managing and documenting curriculum revisions and assessment documents.

During AY 2015-2016, the College faced assessment and data collection challenges due to the adoption of a new enterprise planning system (ERP), called ctcLink. The system offered a single, centralized strategy for online student and administrative functions to streamline and standardize practices and data across the 34-college system. Developed by Peoplesoft, ctcLink will eventually replace the Washington State community and technical colleges (CTC) system's legacy administrative software system. The initial challenges of implementation at SCC are described in the 2015 Ad-Hoc Report, as well as in the 2015 Mid-Cycle Report; they are also summarized below.

Spokane Community College was one of three schools in Washington to participate in the initial launch of the ctcLink system, and each of the pilot schools experienced major disruptions to service during the pilot and adoption phases. Unfortunately, much of the data ported over to the new system was corrupted in the conversion. Additionally, the new ERP system was disconnected from the state's data warehouse at launch; thus, the College was unable to gather data from the state system. As IR staff explored emergency options for manual workarounds, the ability to maintain prior normal data gathering and reporting functions was compromised. Local IR staff were not able to gain access to data via the state data warehouse until Spring 2016. The link between the state data warehouse and the college district's local online data system (ODS) was also disconnected. A reconnection to our ODS did not occur until August 2016, and involved months of manual work to crosswalk data tables.

Due to aforementioned data corruption issues, the College recognized during Fall 2015 that data gathering would be unreliable for the remainder of the academic year. This resulted in the absence of one annual cycle of data for assessment of institutional objectives and indicators. The college-wide disruption also altered the assessment options for general education and program assessment; as this report will demonstrate, much progress was still made in these areas since the 2015 Ad-Hoc Report.

Assessment of College-Wide Student Abilities (General Education Learning Outcomes)

In Fall 2015, the College, at the recommendation of the SLAC, moved a four-phase assessment cycle to a three-phase assessment cycle for general education. Each phase corresponds roughly to one academic year, although the College has found that sometimes the cycle can be done more quickly and other times requires more time.

- **Phase One**: SLAC assesses students' mastery of the ability across the curriculum; committee communicates findings to all faculty.
- **Phase Two**: SLAC sub-committee develops and recommends strategies in consultation with all faculty during Faculty Forums to improve teaching and learning associated with the college-wide ability.
- **Phase Three**: Faculty across the curriculum implement improvement strategies.

The College defines general education as the four college-wide student abilities of Problem Solving (now, renamed "Critical Thinking," as a result of faculty assessment successes), Communication, Global Awareness, and Responsibility. Although the SLAC reviews data for all college-wide abilities each year, the SLAC takes targeted action on each ability according to a rolling cycle, as indicated above and in the following chart.

College-Wide Ability	Phase One	Phase Two	Phase Three
Critical Thinking (was Problem Solving)	AY 2015-2016	AY 2016-2017	AY 2017-2018
Communication	AY 2016-2017	AY 2017-2018	AY 2018-2019
Global Awareness	AY 2017-2018	AY 2018-2019	AY 2019-2020
Responsibility	AY 2018-2019	AY 2019-2020	AY 2020-2021

The SLAC also made improvements to the overall assessment process:

- Standardization of the administration procedures of the assessment instrument
- Adoption of nationally-normed Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) rubrics that have been tested for validity and reliability

A summary of efforts since Fall 2015 for each college-wide ability follows.

Critical Thinking (Formerly "Problem Solving")

In Fall 2015 (Phase One), the SLAC convened a cross-disciplinary faculty team to assess students' mastery of Problem Solving across the curriculum using a common assignment and rubric. The assessment results showed there was a positive correlation between the number of credits earned and students' level of mastery. Further results can be found in Appendix 2-2.

Statistic	Emerging	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	TOTAL
Students (n)	24	77	49	2	152
Pct. of Total	16%	51%	32%	1%	100%
Average Credits	47.5	49.1	73.0	76.5	56.9

During Fall 2015 (Phase Two), the SLAC formed a sub-committee, consisting of faculty from different disciplines, to develop improvement strategies related to Problem Solving. The sub-group recommended that SCC's Problem Solving learning outcome be broadened to "Critical Thinking" with the following rationale:

- Critical thinking is broader than problem solving.
- Critical thinking includes mental dispositions or "habits of mind" which is applicable to both professional/technical programs and liberal arts disciplines.
- Problem solving as defined by the College was difficult to assess comprehensively. Conversely, a number of nationally-normed assessments are available that address critical thinking.
- In many of the professional-technical programs, faculty are moving more and more toward requiring students to have critical thinking skills as compared to just problem solving skills.

At the June 2016 Faculty Forum, the recommendation was presented to the faculty, who voted unanimously to adopt Critical Thinking as a general education outcome in place of Problem Solving. The definition of critical thinking, as adopted by faculty, suggests that:

Students will be able to conceptualize, interpret, apply, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information gathered from or generated by observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication as a guide to belief and action.

Further documentation of these changes appears in Appendix 2-3.

During AY 2016-2017 (Phase Three), faculty across the curriculum are engaged in small book groups regarding the teaching of critical thinking. The books were selected via a faculty survey and include the following:

- Fall 2016: *Teaching Critical Thinking: Tools and Techniques to Help Students Question Their Assumptions* (Stephen D. Brookfield) / 28 faculty participants in 3 separate groups
- Winter 2017: *The End of Average: How We Succeed in a World That Values Sameness* (Todd Rose / 30 faculty participants in 3 separate groups
- Spring 2017: *Blink: The Power of Thinking Without Thinking* (Malcolm Gladwell) / Participation TBD

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Planning & Initiatives will survey faculty in late Spring 2017 to understand changes made based on these professional development opportunities. The SLAC will use this information when Critical Thinking returns to Phase One of the cycle in AY 2017-2018. Additionally, at an upcoming Faculty Forum, faculty will reflect on whether book clubs could be used to explore the other core themes.

Communication

Assessment of Communication is currently in Phase One of the assessment cycle. As a result of the previous work on Problem Solving/Critical Thinking, the SLAC was able to streamline processes in order to facilitate efficient data collection and analysis. The adoption of nationally-normed rubrics for use in assessing the college-wide abilities and standardization in how the assessments were administered led to improved reliability in how the data was collected.

However, as SLAC and other faculty volunteers began the pre-work of assessing Communication in AY 2015-2016, they realized that the procedures to assess written and oral communication were quite different, even though they are a shared outcome. It also became apparent that assessing oral communication would take quite a bit more collaboration and planning on the part of the SLAC, the

faculty coordinators, faculty in classrooms, and e-learning staff than had been previously experienced with the Problem Solving/Critical Thinking outcomes. Consequently, the assessments of written and oral communication were divided into two sub-areas of the larger Communication outcome.

At the request of the SLAC, in late 2015, faculty identified courses teaching and assessing the written communication learning outcome. Initial procedures for selection, assessment, and analysis of artifacts were undertaken. However, in the middle of the assessment of written communication, the entire staff of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Planning & Initiatives resigned, as did the Vice President of Instruction and the Director of Accreditation. Although the assessment of written communication occurred, many important lessons were learned about record keeping, norming, and selection of artifacts for assessment. Specifically, the College recognized the necessity of a standardized and transparent process for documenting ongoing assessment efforts, in order to reduce the loss of work due to staff turnover. The initial analysis of written communication between credits earned and written communication ability. Fearing data unreliability, the college has opted to do a second assessment of written communication. The rubric used for evaluation of written communication can be found in Appendix 2-4, and a report on the results can be found in Appendix 2-5.

In Fall 2016, the SLAC developed an appropriate instrument to assess oral communication across the curriculum (see Appendix 2-6). During Fall 2016, faculty assessment coordinators held training sessions with SLAC on norming and scoring for oral communication. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Planning & Initiatives randomly selected courses in which to administer the common assignment. Artifacts were collected accordingly. During Fall 2016 and Winter 2017, 183 pieces of student work were scored by two faculty members from the SLAC sub-committee. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Planning & Initiatives will analyze and summarize the scores in Spring 2017. Results will be shared with faculty at the Faculty Forum in Spring 2017.

Global Awareness and Responsibility

Currently, a sub-committee of the SLAC is completing preparations for a Phase One assessment of Global Awareness (AY 2017-2018) and Responsibility (AY 2018-2019). Current activities include: review of existing data and creation/adoption of rubrics (see Appendix 2-7 and 2-8). Additionally, the committee is exploring options for using the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) as a strategy for collecting data in these two areas. Data will be available for analysis in Summer 2017.

In summary, the College defines general education as the four college-wide student abilities of Critical Thinking, Communication, Global Awareness, and Responsibility. The rolling implementation of the overall general education assessment process has been beneficial to the College; the iterative nature of the plan has allowed for many opportunities for meta-assessment and continuous improvement of the overall system, as exemplified by the transition from a four-phase to a three-phase system and the reconfiguration of the Problem Solving/Critical Thinking outcome. Through a faculty–led effort, the College has developed a systematic and college-wide means to assess its college-wide student abilities. Furthermore, the College has demonstrated that this data is used systematically to inform regular decision-making.

Assessment of Program-Level Learning Outcomes

To address the evaluation team's second half of the recommendation that the College develop "systematic and college-wide means to assess the student learning outcomes of programs in relation to

the institution's mission and demonstrate that this data is used to inform decision making at that level," the Vice President of Instruction worked with the Council of Chairs (main faculty governance body) to develop a program review process that would include assessment of program-level student learning outcomes. The program review proposal was presented by the Council of Chairs to the faculty at a Faculty Forum in June 2014 and vetted with minor revisions. The program review process is overseen and coordinated by the Office of the Vice President of Instruction (VPI) (see Appendix 2-9). All instructional programs complete the program review process every five years (see Appendix 2-10).

June	_	VPI notifies programs (dean, department chair, and faculty)
		scheduled for program review.
	—	VPI notifies IR which programs are scheduled for program review
September	_	VPI emails <i>Program Review Document</i> including data generated by the Office of Planning and Institutional Research to program faculty, department chair, and dean.
	_	VPI holds initial kick-off meeting with faculty, department chair, and dean to go over process and document.
October through March	-	Faculty complete program review document.
April - May	_	Faculty submit completed <i>Program Review Document</i> to department chair and dean to review.
	-	Dean submits completed <i>Program Review Document</i> to Vice President of Instruction to review.
	_	VPI holds summary meetings with program faculty, department chair, and dean.

A detailed timeline for the process is described below:

To document assessment of program-level learning outcomes, faculty are asked to describe and provide evidence for the following:

- 1. The process by which the department/program identifies, measures, and evaluates student learning outcomes at the department/program level.
- 2. The process by which department/program improvements are made as a result of student learning outcomes assessment, and provide evidence that this process is being followed.

This process is outlined in Appendix 2-11; one major change made since the last Ad-Hoc Report is the requirement that program learning outcomes are included as an appendix.

During the 2015-16 academic year, a total of 16 instructional programs completed program review. Action plans were developed, and examples of improvements that will be implemented in the upcoming year include:

- <u>Automotive Technology</u>: develop program-level learning outcomes for the AAS in Automotive Technology degree. Revise syllabus to link curriculum to NATEF certification tasks. Have all full-time program faculty become ASE G1 certified.
- <u>Surgical Technology</u>: develop an annual outcomes assessment plan. Revise course syllabi to link curriculum and assessments to core learning domains.
- <u>Developmental and Non-Transfer Math</u>: partner with Adult Education to provide seamless transitions from ABE math to developmental math. Utilize computer lab to provide computer-aided instruction. Work with Tutoring Services to enhance discipline specific tutoring opportunities for students.

- <u>Life Sciences (Biology and Anatomy and Physiology</u>): develop virtual labs to be able to offer courses that require labs online. Develop documentation for safety procedures for new faculty.
- <u>Electronics Engineering/Biomedical Equipment</u>: restructure curriculum to improve student completion and success rates. Develop program-level learning outcomes for the Electronics Engineering and the Biomedical Equipment programs.
- <u>Philosophy</u>: develop and offer philosophy courses that meet Allied Health programs' need to provide discipline specific Humanities/Ethics courses for their students.

Additionally, program reviews in the area of Student Services, although primarily focused on student support, address some student learning outcomes in the area of Student Development, which includes activities like student government and student leadership training. None of these outcomes were scheduled to be reviewed during the year relevant to this report, but the overall process for addressing program outcomes (and, by association, some student learning outcomes) within Student Services has undergone revision to require review by a committee of Student Services personnel, faculty, and the Vice President for Student Services; in the past, these reviews were conducted solely by the Vice President for Student Services. Program reviews of the Multicultural Student Services Office and the College's Off-Campus Centers were conducted in AY 2015-2016, and Student Development is scheduled to be reviewed during the AY 2017-2018.

The College also benefits from program review at the Community Colleges of Spokane (CCS) district level. CCS provides several services for all colleges within the district. Examples relevant to student learning outcomes include: library services, online learning resources, honors programs, and global education initiatives. CCS employs a Strategic Program Assessment (SPA) process to assess these initiatives; the process includes:

- 1. an internal self-study of a program;
- 2. a peer review assessment of that program; and
- 3. a final report that provides a clear plan for applying the results of the reviews.

The objectives of SPA are to provide clear assessments of a program's strengths and weaknesses and to develop a plan for future action. Any recommendations for improvement in quality and effectiveness will be based upon data and in accord with the departments' visions, missions, goals and values. Appendix 2-12 describes the specific CCS program reviews over the last several academic years.

In addition to evaluating program review data and conducting program reviews, the focus of AY 2016-2017 includes the following College-specific goals:

- Goal 1: Ensure all programs and disciplines have clear, observable, and measurable program learning outcomes
 - In February 2017, the college hired a new Director of Accreditation and Assessment. This position was vacant for five months, and a review of program learning outcomes and self-assessments is one of the first tasks of the new director. Currently, the director is conducting SWOT analyses (Appendix 2-13) and review of disciplinary accreditation materials by program, with hopes of assembling a document for website publication and individual program review by Summer 2017. The staffing of the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Initiatives is also new, as of February 2017. Simultaneous vacancies in these five key positions have cost the college time in assessing progress

toward program review goals, although programs have been advised to conduct self-assessments.

- Goal 2: Create a systematic process and repository for collecting and documenting assessment results
 - Annual, transparent documentation of program reviews and assessments is a goal of the Vice President of Instruction and Director of Accreditation and Assessment. This goal emerged, in part, because of difficulties locating information to assemble the November 2016 Mid-Cycle Report for NWCCU. In Winter 2016, the college initiated a task force to focus on best practices for displaying program review outcomes. The task force is expected to deliver its results before the end of AY 2016-2017, with implementation to begin in Fall 2017.
- Goal 3: Develop more efficient ways to communicate assessment results college-wide
 - The college is currently in the process of creating a new website. As a part of this endeavor, the aforementioned task force related to the collection of assessment artifacts will work with web designers to determine how to best display all program review and accreditation materials.

Each of these goals is supported by the work of four college-wide Core Theme Teams. The college has identified four "core themes" as a part of its mission, vision, and values: Workforce Development, Academic Transfer, College Readiness, and Student Success. Each team includes staff and faculty representatives from across the campus. The teams, in service of demonstrating success related to their core themes, review program learning outcomes, curriculum, and general education assessment results quarterly. Each of the teams is co-led by one faculty member and one administrator. Although these teams operate with broad objectives related to mission fulfillment, they meet their goals by focusing on program-level details.

Conclusion

This Ad-Hoc Report has provided an update on the progress Spokane Community College has made in the past year to address Recommendation 2 from the *Year Seven Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability Evaluation*.

Recommendation 2:

Since receiving Recommendation 2, the College has accomplished the following:

- 1. Development and execution of a process to assess its general education learning outcomes referred to as college-wide student abilities
- 2. Development and implementation of a standing, faculty-led committee to execute assessments of student learning
- 3. Development and implementation of a process to assess program-level learning outcomes
- 4. Use of assessment results systematically to make improvements and inform decision-making

More specifically, since the 2015 Ad-Hoc Report, the College has accomplished the following:

- Adoption, implementation, and assessment of ctcLink, the college's student information system
- Assessment of artifacts related to two of four core themes of the college's mission and general education programming
- Revision of continuous improvement / assessment cycle from four phases to three phases, based on initial results from general education assessment processes
- Development of a system for assessing changes made based on program reviews
- Completion of 16 program reviews
- Identification and pursuit of a discrete set of program review goals at the administrative level
- Assembly of a task force to address collection, communication, and display of artifacts and assessment for all college programs
- Hiring of five key College positions: Director of Accreditation and Assessment, Senior Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Initiatives, Senior Institutional Research Associate, and two Institutional Research Associates

As a result, the College is in compliance with Standards 2.C.2, 2.C.9, 2.C.10, 4.A.1, and 4.A.2.

List of Appendices

Appendix 2-1	Student Learning and Assessment Committee Charge
Appendix 2-2	Report to Student Learning and Assessment Committee on Assessment of General Education – Problem Solving
Appendix 2-3	Appendix 2-3 Student Learning and Assessment Committee Fall 2015 Meeting Minutes
Appendix 2-4	Written Communication Rubric
Appendix 2-5	Written Communication Report
Appendix 2-6	Oral Communication Rubric
Appendix 2-7	Global Awareness Learning Outcomes
Appendix 2-8	Global Awareness Rubric
Appendix 2-9	Program Review Five-Year Schedule
Appendix 2-10	Program Review Action and Progress Plan
Appendix 2-11	Program Review Template
Appendix 2-12	CCS District Program Review Reports
Appendix 2-13	SWOT Analysis Template

Student Learning and Assessment Committee

Spokane Community College

Assessment is an ongoing process aimed at understanding and improving *student learning* within courses, programs, and degrees. Thus, any assessment process should be **purposeful, systematic** and **faculty-driven** by the goal of improving student learning.

- Purposeful in that it is deliberate, planned, and tied to identified student learning outcomes
- <u>Systematic</u> in that it is cyclic and institution-wide
- <u>Faculty driven</u> in that it is a collaborative effort valued by the faculty and vested in the faculty

Committee Charge:	Develop, implement and oversee a college-wide comprehensive process to assess student learning at the course-, program ¹ -, and degree-level that is purposeful, systematic, and driven.				
	 Specifically, the Committee is charged with: Champion an assessment environment that is supportive, concrete and value-added Coordinate and guide college-wide assessment efforts. Develop by-laws and working documents for the committee including meeting schedules Provide tools and resources to assist faculty/departments/programs in developing and implementing their assessment plans In collaboration with the curriculum committee, align assessment efforts and documentation with the curriculum process Collect and analyze assessment results from all areas and ensure results are communicated college-wide Implement the assessment of the SCC abilities as recommended by the Student Outcomes Taskforce Advise the Vice President of Instruction on resource allocation related to assessment and continuous improvement. 				
Membership:	The committee will be comprised of 14 permanent voting members: 10 faculty representing each instructional division 2 faculty representing the library and counseling 2 instructional deans Ex-officio members are non-voting members and include: Vice President of Instruction Director of Planning and Institutional Research Curriculum Program Coordinator Accreditation Project Manager				

¹ For the purpose of student learning outcome assessment at SCC, a program shall be defined as:

- A program of study leading to a degree
- A program of study leading to a state-approved certificate
- A sequence of courses leading to a defined objective (i.e. organic chemistry sequence)

SPOKANE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT

PROBLEM SOLVING

2014-15 ACADEMIC YEAR



Community Colleges of Spokane Spokane Community College

July, 2015





Ben Wolfe Director of Planning and Research ben.wolfe@scc.spokane.edu; 533-8861

With Extraordinary Help From

Gwen James and Lou Dunham, chars; Michele Cook, Scott Dawson, Annette Johnsonbriley, Kris Cornelis, Janine Odlevak, Bill Rambo, Andrea Reid, Methea Sap, Becky Scheid, Jeremy Groth, Eric Christiansen, Jeff Brown, Jenni Martin, Rebecca Rhodes, Cindi Plowman, Fia Eliasson-Creek, Amanda Spears

SUMMARY

During spring quarter the Student Learning and Assessment Committee conducted an assessment on student learning of the Problem Solving college-wide student ability. The committee wanted to know:

> Does the number of credits earned at SCC correlate positively with an increased score on the problem solving assessment?

The committee tested this hypothesis by creating an in-class assignment distributed to students in randomly selected classes that faculty had identified as being those in which problem-solving was both taught and assessed. Classes were limited to those that teach to a minimum of six (of the nine) competencies.

The faculty scoring group rated each of the student works on a scale of one (emerging) to four (exemplary), with each work scored by two faculty members.

After analyzing the results for interclass reliability (the degree to which the raters were in agreement, which affects the level of acceptance we can conclude from the significance test) and correlation between credits earned and assessment score (using a linear regression to determine the interaction of the variables and its strength), it was determined that the number of credits earned at SCC correlates positively with an increased score on the problem solving assessment - with caveat that the level of agreement between raters was not high enough to fully endorse this conclusion. The conclusion shall be accepted tentatively.

Further, the two individual competencies that garnered the lowest average scores were "understand connections and apply knowledge among various disciplines" and "identify available technologies and analytical methods."

There are ways for the committee to improve the reliability of the results, outlined below in the Conclusion section, which include improving the task and rubric.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary	2
Introduction	
Process	
Instrument	
Results	4
Conclusion	7
Sources	





INTRODUCTION

The following report outlines the process and details by which Spokane Community College assessed the general education outcome of problem solving during the 2014-15 academic year. This report was produced to inform the Student Learning and Assessment Committee, college administration and faculty, and other parties with vested interest in the learning of SCC students.

PROCESS

The college has adopted a four-year general education assessment cycle that assesses one outcome per year in perpetuity, according to the following schedule:

- 2014-15 Problem Solving
- 2015-16 Communication
- 2016-17 Global Awareness
- 2017-18 Responsibility

In the years following an assessment, the college will share the results with the faculty and administration, determine if any action is necessary to improve teaching and learning, use the results in the planning process, and refine/improve the process of general education assessment.

The table below gives a general outline of the activities perused during the 2014-15 academic year in regards to assessing the problem solving outcome.

Action	Quarter
Convened Student Learning and Assessment Committee	Fall
Developed the in-class task & scoring rubric	Winter
Administered the assessment	Spring
Score the student work	Spring
Analyze the results	Spring
Shared the results	Summer/Fall

INSTRUMENT

The assessment team developed an in-class assignment for students to complete. Because the assessment would be conducted in a wide variety of classes, it became important to that group to use an assignment that was applicable to all students regardless of program.



One of two situations were presented to students to assess problem solving. One asked students to choose from two jobs that they were offered and provide explanations as to what factors contributed to their decisions, what information they used in their decisions, what information was absent that they would have liked to include in their decisions, and finally what their decisions were. The second situation gave students the option to either eliminate the penny as a form of US currency, or to allow its continued use. Students were several pieces of information on the topic and asked similar questions to ascertain what information they were using to make their decisions and how they used it.

RESULTS

The determination and validity of the results is determined in two parts, first the consistency of the raters determines whether or not the regression results can be upheld, and second the regression results indicate whether the hypothesis was rejected.

Raters

The first step in validating results in research designs that include observational ratings by multiple raters is to calculate the degree to which the raters are consistent and in agreement. Based off of Shrout and Fleiss' seminal work on the topic titled "Intraclass Correlations: Uses in Assessing Rater Reliability" it was determined that the appropriate¹ type of intraclass correlation to use is ICC(3,1) which applies to situations where each student is assessed by each rater, the raters are the only ones of interest (the raters are not a subset of a larger pool of raters), and the score is calculated by a single measurement. The statistical package R was used to compute the ICC, which is named "Single_fixed_raters" of type "ICC3." Before we computed the ICC, we used the cutoff values below to determine the level of rater agreement. A conservative² approach³ to measuring agreement dictates that conclusions should be discounted for

¹ Decision tr	ee:	
Туре	Description	
ICC (1,1)	 Each student is assessed by a different set of raters (selected randomly) Score is calculated by a single measurement (rater scores a work once) 	
ICC (1,k)	 Each student is assessed by a different set of raters (selected randomly) Score is calculated by taking the average of many measurements by a rater 	
ICC (2,1)	 Each student is assessed by each rater. Raters are considered representative of a larger population of raters Score is calculated by a single measurement (rater scores a work once) 	
ICC (2,k)	 Each student is assessed by each rater. Raters are considered representative of a larger population of raters Score is calculated by taking the average of many measurements by a rater 	
ICC (3,1)	 Each student is assessed by each rater. Raters are the only ones of interest Score is calculated by a single measurement (rater scores a work once) 	\checkmark
ICC (3,k)	 Each student is assessed by each rater. Raters are the only ones of interest Score is calculated by taking the average of many measurements by a rater 	

² <u>Computing Inter-Rater Reliability for Observational Data: An Overview and Tutorial</u> and "Krippendorff K. Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology. Sage Publications; Beverly Hills, CA: 1980"

³ Cutoff values:	
ICC Values	Impact on Conclusions
Less than 0.67	Conclusions should be discounted
Between 0.67 and 0.80	Conclusions are tentative
Above 0.80	Conclusions are definitive

values of 0.67 or less, conclusions tentatively made for values between 0.67 and 0.80, and definite conclusions can be made for values above 0.80.

The single measure ICC was .69 with a 95% confidence interval from .60 to .77 (F(152)=5.6, p<.001). This means that the conclusions from our ensuing regression analysis were tentative.

Assessment of Student Learning

In order to test our hypothesis: *Does the number of credits earned at SCC correlate positively with an increased score on the problem solving assessment?* We ran a regression to determine the correlation between the two variables. This allowed us to see how much influence our independent variable (credits earned at SCC) has on our dependent variable (assessment score).

There was considerable variance in the results. The model only explained about 8% of the variation in assessment score (r^2 =.084). Further, the goodness of fit of the regression was on the low end of the spectrum (r=.29). The model itself was statistically significant, with a p value less than .001. Overall, these results indicate that credits earned is not the sole variable at play in regards to how well a student will score on the assessment. However, students with more credits earned at SCC did better on the assessment task, with statistically significant results.

Furthermore, to augment the regression analysis, it proved helpful to look at the individual measures of learning, namely how many students are achieving each level of: emerging, developing, proficient, and exemplary.

Statistic	Emerging	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	TOTAL
Students (n)	24	77	49	2	152
Pct. of Total	16%	51%	32%	1%	100%
Average Credits	47.5	49.1	73.0	76.5	56.9



There was a clear delineation between the credit levels of students that scored on the lower half of the scale (emerging and developing) and the upper half of the scale (proficient and exemplary). The chart above (titled "Distribution of scores") plots the number of students that received the corresponding score on the primary axis, and on the secondary axis plots the credits earned per student by their assessment score. The graph shows that the highest percentage of students scored in the developing category, as well



as that the average credits per student jumps dramatically between the students that earned a developing score to those earning a proficient score.

The chart below takes the analysis a step further, and looks at the frequency distribution of students that took the assessment by the number of credits they have earned. Students that have earned between 30 and 45 credits is the largest group among participants. No students participated that had earned between 165 and 210 credits. For each "bin" the average score was calculated and overlaid (secondary axis) so we could understand how the quarter a student is in affects their assessment score. The dotted trend line suggest that the more credits a student earns, the higher their score will be on the assessment. This was confirmed by our regression analysis.



The problem solving student ability is made up of nine competencies. These are listed in the table below, along with the frequency at which students earned one of the four scores. The average score is provided as well.

	Frequency				Average
Competency	Emerging	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	Score
Formulate questions	19	73	51	9	2.57
Recognize the need for both quantitative and qualitative information	14	59	73	3	2.71
Recognize that accurate and complete information is the basis for effective decision-making	19	77	51	5	2.51
Identify available technologies and analytical methods	39	87	25	1	2.11
Analyze information and critically recognize viable solutions	23	80	38	11	2.43
Understand connections and apply knowledge among various disciplines	61	72	19	0	1.91
Use one's own creativity to generate diverse possible solutions (recognizing that making errors is part of the process)	39	75	35	3	2.22

	Frequency				
Competency	Emerging	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	Score
Formulate reasoned solutions and interpret them to others	23	69	53	7	2.50
Evaluate and test solutions for validity and appropriateness	27	71	46	8	2.42

Students have the most room for improvement on the "understand connections and apply knowledge among various disciplines" and "identify available technologies and analytical methods" competencies. According to the results, no students were exemplary on understanding connections between various disciplines. Students scored the highest on their ability to recognize the need for both quantitative and qualitative information.

CONCLUSION

Coupling the two analysis that were run (infraclass coefficient and regression) in effort to determine the influence that Spokane Community College has on the general education outcome of problem solving we have learned that tentatively, the more credits students earn at SCC the better they do on the problem solving task. We are not able to accept this conclusion with full confidence, as our interrater reliability fell into the range that informs us to accept the results tentatively. Furthermore, our regression analysis informed us that there are other factors at play, and that credits earned alone only accounted for a small proportion of the variability in assessment scores. As with all analysis, we are often left with more questions, and ways to improve the process next time.

Recommendations to improve the process and validity of the results:

- Task
 - Improve standardization
 - o Consider response limitations (for more consistent scoring)
 - o Involve student input/feedback on the instrument before using it
- Rubric
 - Simplify less categories and less overlap
 - o Create an overall score
 - o Training on how to apply the rubric norming sessions
 - o Testing of the rubric statistical and experiential



SOURCES

Krippendorff K. Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology. Sage Publications; Beverly Hills, CA: 1980

R Core Team (2015). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <u>http://www.R-project.org/</u>.

Revelle, W. (2015) psych: Procedures for Personality and Psychological Research, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, USA, http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych Version = 1.5.4.

Student Learning and Assessment Committee Minutes

	OCTOBER 15, 2015	3:00 PM	BLDG 16, RM 132A
MEETING CALLED BY	Fia Eliasson-Creek		
TYPE OF MEETING	Scheduled meeting		
NOTE TAKER	Megan Davis		
COMMITTEE	Members Attended: Christensen, Eric; James, Gwen; Cornelis, Kris Dawson, Scott; Eliasson-Creek, Fia; Davis, Me Members Absent: Brown, Jeff; Cook, Michele; Sapp Mathea; Gro	s; Wolfe, Ben; Reid, Andrea; M egan oth, Jeremy; Rhodes, Rebecca	lartin, Jenni; Dunham, Lou; ı;

Agenda topics

DISCUSSION	Welcome

Gwen welcomed everyone. Started the meeting at 3:04 pm.

DISCUSSION Committee Binders

Gwen spoke about the binders that Lou and Fia created for SLAC (Student Learning and Assessment Committee). This binder provides a place to archive work, reference committee's bylaws and charge, show member vacancy and term end dates (page 5), and locate meeting schedules (page 6). This binder also provides assistance in how to write learning outcomes, overview of college-wide student abilities, and how outcomes will be assessed.

Gwen explained to the committee that if a member does not feel that he/she can attend the meetings, to please find a replacement. This can be done through Carla.

If any committee member would like to add reference documents to the binder, please feel free to forward your suggestion to Fia, Lou, or Gwen.

DISCUSSION	Approval of Minutes	
------------	---------------------	--

June minutes were not present to approve. Committee will vote to approve June electronically.

DISCUSSION Assessment of Problem-Solving (Results, Recommendations, Next Steps)

A. Results

Gwen spoke about the work that was done on problem-solving last year. She passed out the General Education Assessment Problem Solving report for the 2014-15 academic year. The documents used to assess that had been created in the past were used to honor the work of other faculty. A committee was convened, and a rubric was created based on those documents.

Faculty identified which classes defined certain competencies. Ben and Fia did a random selection from those classes. The instructor had his/her choice of what instrument to use to assess. One assignment was to write an essay on why we should or should not do away with the penny. Lou explained about the second assignment, which was to look at two different job offers and identify all of the differences. Looking at all the factors to assist in the decision of choosing one job.

Another committee was convened that was designated to score. Ben explained the committee of 13 completed the scoring process. Due to too much variability between the 13 people in the way they scored, the results were invalid and statistically rejected.

Fia noted that even though there was disagreement, the statistics still showed the more credits the students had, the better they scored on the assessment.

Ben explained that by improving the process of scoring and the number of scorers, the stronger results would be. The assessment was rescored and variability went down. The results were then accepted, but showed the same results: The more credits a student takes, the better a student is a problem solving.

Fia stated that between the penny assignment and the job assignment, the penny assignment was easier to score. The essay was more in-depth and richer in the information. The penny assignment was short sentences or yes or no answers. Making sure to have an assignment that provides reading material and asks questions, will improve scoring overall.

Lou mentioned that the rubric was developed from different competencies or behaviors that were identified in the past. Too much complexity in what the scorer was expected to find. The rubric was non-standardized.

Ben agreed and thought that it was important that the student being assessed has the opportunity to speak up if he/she does not understand the assignment. If this is the case, the information returned may not be what is expected. The rubric can be simplified by having less categories and less overlap. It would help to create an overall score.

Jenni asked what other colleges have done to be successful, how our rubric differed from the other colleges, and was the scoring committee as large.

Fia mentioned that the rubric that we used differs from other college's rubric.

Gwen answered that at our institution, it is mandatory to go through the union when convening a committee. Not all institutions function this way.

B. Recommendations

Fia talked about the first recommendation, which is looking at the actual process itself. To standardize the actual administration among faculty. The assignment itself needs to be one that will illicit enough information to measure the students' ability. A suggestion was made to use a rubric that has already been tested. The Association of American Colleges and Universities can provide rubrics for different disciplines that are used by other colleges.

The second recommendation is in regards to the cycle of the process. Originally, it was talked about to have a four-year cycle. The cycle should be changed to three years. The assessment will happen every fourth year. The process will start fall quarter doing up-front work, winter quarter will be assessment and scoring, spring quarter will be to decide what to do with the results.

The third recommendation is rather than appointing a new committee, use SLAC members. Two sub-committees will be created. The sub-committees will work on strategies, deciding on what kind of instrument to use, etc.

A motion was made to accept recommendation one and two; however, we did not have enough committee members present to vote. This motioned was tabled and will be voted on in the next meeting.

DISCUSSION Committee Member Vacancies

Fia noted that we have three vacancies: counseling, library, and Health Sciences. Gwen mentioned that the committee does not have a rep from math.

Jenni noted that the committee should really look at the composition of the members to ensure strong membership and bylaws that match.

DISCUSSION CurricUNET Demonstration

Megan gave a brief overview on CurriUNET software. She passed out an example of a report that would show the mapping of outcomes to courses and programs. It was explained that the software at this time will have the data to align and map rather than measure and assess. A module to do this is available.

Fia explained that CurricUNET is a tool to document rather than assess. Faculty can get together and decide how to score their students and measure on their own.

DISCUSSION Updates (Faculty Assessment Coordinators)

It has been approved to permanently fund two faculty assessment coordinators.

ACTION ITEM Tabled Item – November 19th

Recommendations to be approved at the next meeting when enough members are present to vote.

DISCUSSION	Next meeting Scheduled – Fia Eliasson-Creek					
November 19, 2	November 19, 2015 at: Bldg. 16, Room 132-A from 2:45 pm – 4:15 pm.					
It was agreed up meetings to be s	on by the committee to extend the meetings to an hour and a half rather than add more meetings to the calendar. All cheduled for 2:45 – 4:15 pm.					

25

Spokane Community College Assessment Rubric: Written Communication

Spokane Community College's Written Communication Rubric is based on the Montgomery College General Education Effective Writing Rubric, Washington State University's Integrated Critical Thinking Rubric, and the Association of American Colleges and Universities' *Written Communication VALUE Rubric*.

Standard 1 Content				
Advanced(3)	Proficient(2)	Novice (1)	Not Evident(0)	
Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work; Exceeds the discipline and assignment expectations, meeting all specified requirements, such as subject, organization, and length; Integrates and responds to alternate points of view	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work; Fulfills the discipline and assignment expectations, meeting all specified requirements, such as subject, organization, and length	Uses limited content to develop and explore simple ideas; Basically or simplistically meets the discipline and assignment expectations Provides a simplistic or one sided view of the topic	Uses irrelevant or inaccurate content or information and does not develop or explore appropriate ideas; Does not meet the discipline or assignment expectations	Not Applicable Assessment task does not reflect these characteristics for student performance.

Standard 2 Organization				
Advanced(3)	Proficient(2)	Novice (1)	Not Evident(0)	
Exceeds discipline and assignment	Follows the discipline and assignment	Simplistically meets discipline and	Uses ineffective organizational pattern	Not Applicable
expectations for organization; Uses an	expectations for organization; Maintains	assignment expectations for	or does not meet discipline or	Assessment task
advanced organizational pattern that	focus and unity throughout the assignment	organization; Uses a simplistic or	assignment expectations; Lacks a central	does not reflect
maintains focus and unity throughout the	while supporting a central idea, or thesis	unclear central idea or thesis; uses	idea or thesis, focus or unity and	these
text while furthering the central idea and	using some of the following organizational	organizational devices such as a	includes irrelevant and unrelated ideas;	characteristics for
skillfully using the following	devices to connect ideas throughout the	central idea, topic sentences,	Does not use organizational devices	student
organizational devices to connect ideas	text: thesis statement, topic sentences,	opening and closing paragraphs or	such as topic sentences, opening and	nerformance
throughout the text: thesis statement, topic	opening and closing paragraphs, and	transitions inconsistently	closing paragraphs and transitions	performance.
sentences, opening and closing paragraphs	transitions throughout most of the		effectively	
and transitions throughout the assignment	assignment			

Standard 3: Style and Expression				
Advanced(3)	Proficient(2)	Novice (1)	Not Evident(0)	
Uses a superior style (tone, word choice, sentence patterns) for the discipline, assignment, audience and purpose; Clearly communicates ideas and may be nuanced or eloquent.	Consistently uses effective style (tone, word choice, sentence patterns) for its discipline, assignment, audience, and purpose; Clearly communicates ideas	Uses a simplistic style (tone, word choice, and sentence patterns) Ideas are conveyed simplistically	Uses a style (tone, word choice, and sentence patterns) that is not appropriate for discipline, assignment, audience or purpose; Fails to communicate ideas effectively and may obscure meaning	Not Applicable Assessment task does not reflect these characteristics for student performance.

Standard 4: Mechanics				
Advanced(3)	Proficient(2)	Novice (1)	Not Evident(0)	
Follows conventions of standard	Follows the conventions of standard written U.S.	Has persistent errors in	Has significant errors in	Not Applicable
written U.S English and avoids of	English and generally avoids errors (grammar,	grammar, mechanics,	grammar, mechanics,	Assessment task does not
errors in grammar, mechanics,	mechanics, punctuation, and usage) that impede	punctuation and usage that	punctuation, and usage that	reflect these characteristics
punctuation and usage	meaning or distract the reader	may impede meaning	significantly impede meaning	for student performance.

Standard 5: Sources				
Advanced(3)	Proficient(2)	Novice (1)	Not Evident(0)	Not Applicable
Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality,	Demonstrates consistent use of credible,	Demonstrates an attempt to use credible	Plagiarizes or does not	Assessment task does not
credible, relevant sources to develop ideas	relevant sources to support ideas that are	and/or relevant sources to support ideas	use sources to support	reflect these characteristics
that are appropriate for the discipline and	situated within the discipline and genre of	that are appropriate for the discipline and	ideas in the writing.	for student performance.
genre of the writing	the writing.	genre of the writing.		I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I

Written Communication Assessment: Comparison of AA-Transfer and Professional/Technical Students

Austin Davis: Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Planning, and Initiatives





Demographics

The sample in this study was drawn from the Spokane Community College (SCC) population and consists of **140** students enrolled in either an AA-Direct Transfer Agreement plan (**AA-DTA**) or a Professional/Technical (**PRFTC**) program. The total amount of college-level credits (CLVLCs) completed by students averaged **77.19** (SD = **44.23**). The students in this sample were grouped by academic plan, either by **AA-DTA** or **PRFTC**, and no additional demographic information was collected (i.e. sex, race/ethnicity, age etc.).

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1.

N = 140

Written Communications Assessment Scores

	AA-DT	AA-DTA (<i>n</i> = 54)		PRFTC (<i>n</i> = 86)		Ove	rall
Variable	М	SD	-	М	SD	 М	SD
College Level Credits	61.88	46.18		86.80	40.56	77.19	44.23
Scale Scores							
C1 Score	1.52	.57		1.46	.60	1.48	.56
C2 Score	1.44	.62		1.28	.61	1.34	.60
C3 Score	1.47	.69		1.38	.67	1.41	.68
C4 Score	1.77	.70		1.58	.56	1.65	.63
C5 Score	.98	.88		.81	.79	.88	.84
Total Score	7.18	2.56		6.51	2.65	6.76	2.59

Definitions:

College Level Credits - Number of credits earned in college-level classes.

C1 Score – Organizational pattern

C2 Score – Language choice

C3 Score – Delivery technique

C4 Score – Supporting materials

C5 Score – Central message

Two (2) raters assessed students' skills in written communication using a 4-point scale ranging from 0 to 3. A total of five (5) competencies were used to measure students' ability in demonstrating effectiveness in written communication. Scores pertaining to each competency were then summed together and averaged out thus providing a total mean score out of 15 points possible (M = 6.76, SD = 2.59). Total mean scores by academic plan were also provided: **AA-DTA** (M = 7.18, SD = 2.56), **PRFTC** (M = 6.51, SD = 2.65). The means scores pertaining to the five (5) individual competencies, overall, ranged from .88 to 1.65 (SDs ranged from .98 to 1.77 (SDs ranged from .57 to .88) while the **PRFTC** group had competency mean scores that ranged from .81 to 1.58 (SDs ranged from .56 to .79).

	AA-DTA	AA-DTA (<i>n</i> = 54)		(<i>n</i> = 86)	Overall	
Variable	r	sig.	r	sig.	r	sig.
C1 Score	16	.25	10	.37	13	.12
C2 Score	12	.37	.07	.60	05	.56
C3 Score	02	.91	13	.25	10	.26
C4 Score	03	.84	07	.51	09	.30
C5 Score	19	.17	06	.56	14	.09
Total Score	14	.30	08	.50	13	.12
Note : <i>P</i> = .05						

Correlation Results

Correlation between College-Level Credits and Competency Scores

Table 2.

The hypothesis used for this study proposed that students' scores on written communication should correlate positively with the total number of CLVLCs they earn. In other words, the more CLVLCs students have, the higher their written communication scores will be. A correlations test was used to measure the relationship between CLVLCs and communications scores. The results of that test indicated no positive correlation between the Total Score and the amount of CLVLCs earned for all groups. The same test was used for each of the individual competencies, and the results indicated no positive correlation between individual competency score and amount of CLVLCs earned for all student groups. The lone exception to this was the **C2** Score in the **PRFTC** group, which yielded a slight positive correlation of **.07**. The results of each test were not statistically significant at the alpha level **.05**.

N = 2

Reliability Results

Table 3.

Reliability Among Raters

	AA (DTA)				PRFTC			Overall		
	Stat.	Confidence Interval		Stat.	Confidence Interval		Stat.	Confidence Interval		
Variable	Avg.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Avg.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Avg.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
C1 Score	0.45	-0.063	0.703	0.29	-0.115	0.554	0.34	-0.072	0.588	
C2 Score	0.34	-0.086	0.611	0.30	-0.148	0.584	0.32	-0.087	0.567	
C3 Score	0.48	0.128	0.695	0.59	0.276	0.755	0.54	0.301	0.698	
C4 Score	0.56	0.209	0.752	0.32	-0.166	0.607	0.41	-0.044	0.644	
C5 Score	0.83	0.672	0.905	0.80	0.694	0.874	0.81	0.722	0.873	

Notes: Results based on ICC Model 3

Assumptions:

1.) Each subject is assessed by fixed raters.

2.) Raters are of the only interest.

3.) Reliability is calculated by taking the average scores from (k) raters.

Confidence Interval - 95%

A reliability test was used to measure consistency between the two (2) raters. The purpose of this is to determine whether the ability of our two (2) raters to assess students' effectiveness in written communication is indeed reliable. In the **Overall** group, the scores for **C1** through **C4** ranged from **.32** to **.54**. In the **AA-DTA** group, the scores for **C1** through **C4** ranged from **.34** to **.56**. In the **PRFTC** group, the scores for **C1** through **C4** ranged from **.29** to **.59**. The score for **C5** in all groups was relatively strong (**Overall** = **.81**, **AA-DTA** = **.83**, **PRFTC** = **.80**), which is also the competency students tended to score the lowest.
Spokane Community College Assessment Rubric: Oral Communication

Spokane Community College's Oral Communication Rubric is based on the Montgomery College General Education Effective Oral Communications Rubric and the Association of American Colleges and Universities' Oral Communication VALUE Rubric.

Standard 1 Organization				
Advanced(3)	Proficient(2)	Novice (1)	Not Evident(0)	
Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and skillful; Organizational pattern makes the content of the presentation cohesive.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the presentation.	Organization pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions is not observable within the presentation	Not Applicable Assessment task does not reflect these characteristics for student performance.

Standard 2 Language				
Advanced(3)	Proficient(2)	Novice (1)	Not Evident(0)	
Language choices are imaginative,	Language choices are thoughtful	Language choices are	Language choices are unclear	Not Applicable
memorable, and compelling, and	and generally support the	commonplace and partially	and minimally support the	Assessment task does not
enhance the effectiveness of the	effectiveness of the presentation;	support the effectiveness of the	effectiveness of the	reflect these characteristics
presentation;	Language in presentation is	presentation;	presentation;	for student performance.
Language in presentation is	appropriate to audience	Language in presentation is	Language in presentation is not	
appropriate to audience.		appropriate to audience.	appropriate to audience.	

Standard 3: Delivery				
Advanced(3)	Proficient(2)	Novice (1)	Not Evident(0)	
Delivery techniques (posture,	Delivery techniques (posture,	Delivery techniques (posture,	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture,	Not Applicable
gesture, eye contact, and vocal	gesture, eye contact, and vocal	gesture, eye contact, and vocal	eye contact, and vocal expressiveness)	Assessment task does
expressiveness) make the	expressiveness) make the	expressiveness) make the	detract from the understandability of	not reflect these
presentation compelling;	presentation interesting,	presentation understandable,	the presentation	characteristics for
Speaker appears polished and	Speaker appears comfortable.	Speaker appears tentative.	Speaker appears uncomfortable.	student performance.
confident.				

Standard 4: Supporting Material				
Advanced(3)	Proficient(2)	Novice (1)	Not Evident(0)	
A variety of types of supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis	Insufficient supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make reference to information or	Not Applicable Assessment task does not reflect these
information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	that partially supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	analysis that minimally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	characteristics for student performance.

Standard 5: Central Message				
Advanced(3)	Proficient(2)	Novice (1)	Not Evident(0)	Not Applicable
Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.)	Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material	Central message is basically understandable but is not often repeated and is not memorable.	Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation.	Assessment task does not reflect these characteristics for student performance.

SCC's Current College-Wide Ability:

Global Awareness

Students will demonstrate an awareness and appreciation of the world: its scientific complexity, its cultural and social diversity, and its artistic variety.

Students will be able to demonstrate the following measurable behaviors/skills:

- #1. Demonstrate understanding and openness toward another point of view
- #2. Use intercultural and/or international perspectives
- #3. Recognize bias, stereotyping, and manipulation

Global Awareness Rubric

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

Definition

Students will demonstrate an awareness and appreciation of the world: its scientific complexity, its cultural and social diversity, and its artistic variety.

Framing Language

Effective and transformative global learning offers students meaningful opportunities to analyze and explore complex global challenges, collaborate respectfully with diverse others, apply learning to take responsible action in contemporary global contexts, and evaluate the goals, methods, and consequences of that action. Global learning should enhance students' sense of identity, community, ethics, and perspective-taking. Global learning is based on the principle that the world is a collection of interdependent yet inequitable systems and that higher education has a vital role in expanding knowledge of human and natural systems, privilege and stratification, and sustainability and development to foster individuals' ability to advance equity and justice at home and abroad. Global learning cannot be achieved in a single course or a single experience but is acquired cumulatively across students' entire college career through an institution's curricular and co-curricular programming. As this rubric is designed to assess global learning on a programmatic level across time, the benchmarks (levels 1-4) may not be directly applicable to a singular experience, course, or assignment. Depending on the context, there may be development within one level rather than growth from level to level.

We encourage users of the Global Learning Rubric to also consult three other closely related VALUE Rubrics: Civic Engagement, Intercultural Knowledge and Competence, and Ethical Reasoning.

Glossary

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

Global Self-Awareness: in the context of global learning, the continuum through which students develop a mature, integrated identity with a systemic understanding of the interrelationships among the self, local and global communities, and the natural and physical world.

Perspective Taking: the ability to engage and learn from perspectives and experiences different from one's own and to understand how one's place in the world both informs and limits one's knowledge. The goalis to develop the capacity to understand the interrelationships between multiple perspectives, such as personal, social, cultural, disciplinary, environmental, local, and global.

Cultural Diversity: the ability to recognize the origins and influences of one's own cultural heritage along with its limitations in providing all that one needs to know in the world. This includes the curiosity to learn respectfully about the cultural diversity of other people and on an individual level to traverse cultural boundaries to bridge differences and collaboratively reach common goals. On a systems level, the important skill of comparatively analyzing how cultures can be marked and assigned a place within power structures that determine hierarchies, inequalities, and opportunities and which can vary over time and place. This can include, but is not limited to, understanding race, ethnicity, gender, nationhood, religion, and class.

Personal and Social Responsibility: the ability to recognize one's responsibilities to society--locally, nationally, and globally--and to develop a perspective on ethical and power relations both across the globe and within individual societies. This requires developing competence in ethical and moral reasoning and action.

Global Systems: the complex and overlapping worldwide systems, including natural systems (those systems associated with the natural world including biological, chemical, and physical sciences) and human systems (those systems developed by humans such as cultural, economic, political, and built), which operate in observable patterns and often are affected by or are the result of human design or disruption. These systems influence how life is lived and what options are open to whom. Students need to understand how these systems 1) are influenced and/or constructed, 2) operate with differential consequences, 3) affect the human and natural world, and 4) can be altered.

Knowledge Application: in the context of global learning, the application of an integrated and systemic understanding of the interrelationships between contemporary and past challenges facing cultures, societies, and the natural world (i.e., contexts) on the local and global levels. An ability to apply knowledge and skills gained through higher learning to real-life problem-solving both alone and with others.



Global Awareness Rubric

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Definition

Students will demonstrate an awareness and appreciation of the world: its scientific complexity, its cultural and social diversity, and its artistic variety.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

	4	3	2	1	NA
	Advanced	Proficient	Novice	Not Evident	
Global Self-Awareness (SCC GA #3)	Recognizes new perspectives about own cultural rules and biases (e.g. not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer); Evaluates the global impact of one's own and others' specific local actions on the natural and human world.	Identifies own cultural rules and biases (e.g. with a strong preference for those rules shared with own cultural group and seeks the same in others); Analyzes ways that human actions influence the natural and human world.	Shows minimal awareness of own cultural rules and biases (even those shared with own cultural group(s)) (e.g. uncomfortable with identifying possible cultural differences with others.); Identifies some connections between an individual's personal decision-making and certain local and global issues.	Demonstrates no evidence of	Not Applicable
Perspective Taking (SCC GA #1)	Synthesizes other perspectives (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical) when investigating subjects within natural and human systems.	Identifies and explains multiple perspectives (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical) when exploring subjects within natural and human systems.	Identifies multiple perspectives while maintaining a value preference for own positioning (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical).	Demonstrates no evidence of	Not Applicable
Cultural Diversity (SCC GA #2)	Analyzes substantial connections between the worldviews, power structures, and experiences of multiple cultures historically or in contemporary contexts, incorporating respectful interactions with other cultures.	Explains and connects two or more cultures historically or in contemporary contexts with some acknowledgement of power structures, demonstrating respectful interaction with varied cultures and worldviews.	Describes the experiences of others historically or in contemporary contexts primarily through one cultural perspective, demonstrating some openness to varied cultures and worldviews.	Demonstrates no evidence of	Not Applicable
Knowledge (SCC GA #1)	Demonstrates adequate understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Demonstrates partial understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Demonstrates surface understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Demonstrates no evidence of	Not Applicable
Understanding Global Systems (SCC GA #2)	Analyzes major elements of global systems, including their historic and contemporary interconnections and the differential effects of human organizations and actions, to pose elementary solutions to complex problems in the human and natural worlds.	Examines the historical and contemporary roles, interconnections, and differential effects of human organizations and actions on global systems within the human and the natural worlds.	Identifies the basic role of some global and local institutions, ideas, and processes in the human and natural worlds.	Demonstrates no evidence of	Not Applicable

Spokane Community College Program Review Schedule

			A	Academic Year	r		
Division/Department/Program	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
		Adult	Education				
Adult Basic Education/GED			Х				
English as a Second Language	Х					Х	
High School Completion			Х				
		Arts 8	k Sciences		1		
English and Foreign Languages							
English				Х			
Foreign Language				Х			
Communication Studies	•						
Communication Studies					Х		
Humanities			1	-	1	1	
Art		Х					Х
Drama		Х					х
Humanities		X					X
Music		X					X
		~					~
Philosophy		Х					Х
Social Sciences				1	1	•	
Anthropology			Х				
Political Science			Х				
Geography			Х				
History			Х				
Psychology			Х				
Sociology			Х				
Mathematics							
Mathematics		Х					Х
Sciences							
Anatomy and Physiology		Х					Х
Biology		Х					Х
Chemistry	Х					Х	
Geology			Х				
Physics & Astronomy			Х				
	A	thletics and I	Physical Educ	ation			
Physical Education			Х				
	Business, H	lospitality, ar	nd Informatio	n Technologie	es		
Business and Management							
Accounting Assistant/Clerk	Х					Х	
Business DTA		Х					Х
Business General (AAS) and					Х		
Business Occupations							
Integrated Business and			Х				
Entrepreneurship (IBE)							
Economics							
Marketing and Management				х			
Paralegal	Х			Х			Х
Business Technology							
Administrative Office				Х			

	Academic Year						
Division/Department/Program	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Health Information	Х					Х	
Management*							
Medical Office			Х				
Legal Office					Х		
Computer Information Systems		•	<u> </u>	•	•	•	•
Network Design and			Х				
Administration							
Software and Web			Х				
Development							
Hospitality Careers							
Culinary Arts*		Х					Х
Hotel & Restaurant					Х		
Management							
Professional Baking					Х		
		Extend	ed Learning				
Corrections			Х				
Rural Centers					Х		
	He	alth and Env	ironmental So	iences			
Allied Health							
Dental Assistant*			Х				
Diagnostic Medical Sonography*	Х					Х	
Emergency Medical Technician	х					Х	
Invasive Cardiovascular			Х				
Technology*							
Medical Assistant*		Х		Х			Х
Noninvasive Cardiovascular		Х					Х
Tech.*							
Pharmacy Technician*	Х					Х	
Radiology Technology*		Х					Х
Respiratory Care*					Х		
Surgical Technology*		Х					Х
Vascular Technology*			Х				
Nursing							
Nursing*		Х					Х
Environmental Science							
Agriculture Business		х					Х
Florist/Floral Design	1			Х			
Greenhouse/Nursery	1			х			
Landscape Management	1				х		
Natural Resources*	1				х		
Water Resources	1				Х		
		Technic	al Education				
Aerospace Composite		X					Х
Technician							
Applied Education	X					Х	
Aviation Maintenance				x			
Cosmetology	1			X			
Diesel/Heavy Duty Equipment	x					х	
Electronics/Biomedical			1	x			
Electrical Maint, and	+		1		x		
Automation							
HVAC/Refrigeration	1			x			
Hydraulic & Pneumatic	1			x			
Automation							
	1	1	1	1		1	

	Academic Year						
Division/Department/Program	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Machining/CNC Technology					Х		
Welding and Fabrication				Х			
Technology							
Automotive							
Automotive Technology	х					Х	
Automotive: T-Ten	Х					Х	
Automotive Collision and					х		
Refinishing							
Engineering and Architecture							
Architectural Technology		Х					Х
CAD Design and Drafting				Х			
Mechanical Design Technology					Х		
Public Safety							
Criminal Justice/Corrections				X			
Fire Science				Х			

*Accredited by an external agency/organization recognized by the DoE and/or CHEA.

Program Review Action and Progress Plan			
Program:	Date of Rev	view:	
Division:	Next Review	w:	
FINDINGS			
Strengths		Majo	or Concerns
ACTION PLAN TO ADDRESS CONCERNS AND MAIN	TAIN QUAL	TY OF PROG	RAM
Action Item	Due Date	Completed	Results
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
FOLLOW-UP			

Instructional Program Review 2016-17

[Name of Program]



Community Colleges of Spokane Spokane Community College

This page is left blank intentionally.

Purposes, Scope, and Process

What is a Program Review process?

Program review is a <u>reflective</u> process that focuses on continuous improvement of instruction and learning. A systematic program review process provides faculty and administration an opportunity to engage in a <u>collegial dialog</u> about the program's quality, current state, and future direction.

What is the purpose of a Program Review process?

Program review provides a department-wide discussion for faculty to analyze the quality of their <u>program as a whole</u>, to affirm ways that the program is working well, and to implement improvements. It also helps inform and justify decisions about allocating resources including space, equipment and materials, and faculty positions.

Program review is intended to:

- Improve the quality of the instructional programs offered by SCC
- Guide changes in curriculum, pedagogy, and faculty development to meet the needs of students and the community.

Program review is <u>NOT</u>:

- Used to evaluate faculty performance
- Used to eliminate programs/departments

Principles guiding the Program Review Subcommittee in identifying a process for SCC:

- Process identified must have value added.
- Process identified must be transparent, effectively communicated between faculty and administrators, and not open to the general public.
- Process must balance the need for transparency with the need to avoid putting programs in jeopardy.
- Not all departments are measured equally well by each metric.
- Each metric must be clearly defined so people understand the data.
- Use both quantitative and qualitative data; there is no single or group of metrics that can identify action, we will need to add context

Scope

At Spokane Community College, the program review process applies to all instructional areas:

- Adult Basic Education (Basic Skills and ESL)
- Professional/technical (except those programs with accreditation requirements)
- Transfer

Frequency of Program Review

Programs shall conduct program review on a <u>five-year</u> rotating cycle.

Definition of Program

For the purpose of program review, a "program" in transfer shall be defined as follows:

• As determined by the faculty

Process and Timeline

The program review process is overseen and coordinated by the Vice President of Instruction (VPI). The process begins fall quarter and ends spring quarter.

The review process for completed documents is as follows:

 Faculty submit completed document to department chair and dean to review - > dean submits report to the Vice President of Instruction to review -> Vice President of Instruction holds summary meeting with faculty, department chair, and dean to discuss results and recommendations - > Vice President of Instruction submits approved recommendations to President for final approval.

The differine for proce	55 15 d5 1010W3.
October	 VPI notifies programs (dean, department chair, and faculty) scheduled for program review.
	 VIP notifies IR which programs are scheduled for program review
November	 VPI emails <i>Program Review Document</i> including data generated by the Office of Planning and Institutional Research to program faculty, department chair, and dean.
	 VPI holds initial kick-off meeting with faculty, department chair, and dean to go over process and document.
November through March	 Faculty complete program review document.
April - May	 Faculty submit completed <i>Program Review Document</i> to department chair and dean to review.
	 Dean submits completed Program Review Document to Vice
	President of Instruction to review.
	 VPI holds summary meetings with program faculty, department chair, and dean.
June	 VPI submits approved recommendations to the President for final approval.

The timeline for process is as follows:

Completed by:

The department/program faculty listed below collaborated to prepare this Program Review. Statements included herein accurately reflect the conclusions and opinions of the department/program faculty.

Date Submitted:	Click here to enter a date.
Faculty:	Click here to enter name of faculty completing review.

Reviewed by:

Vice President of Instruction:	Date:
Dean of Instruction:	Date:
Department Chair:	Date:

Outcome:

Program Review Approved
Program Review Returned for Further Work

This page is left blank intentionally.

Table of Content

Section A: Executive Summary	9
Section B: Description of Program	10
Section C: Program Enrollment	11
Section D: Program Curriculum	12
Section E: Program Faculty and Staff	14
Section F: Professional Development	15
Section G: Instructional Support Services	16
Section H: Program Support (Facilities and Budget)	18
Section I: Advisory Committees/Industry Relations (*WORKFORCE ONLY*)	20
Section J: Learning Outcomes	21
Section K: Student Success/Outcomes	22
Section L: Program Review Summary	24

This page is left blank intentionally.

Section A: Executive Summary

This section is to be completed by department/program faculty as a group. Please provide a brief summary of what the major strengths and concerns are for your department/program based on finding through this process.

Program Strengths:

Click here to enter text.

Program Concerns:

Click here to enter text.

Faculty recommendations for program improvement:

Section B: Description of Program

Questions 1 through 5 in this section are to be completed by department/program faculty as a group. If a question is not applicable to your department/program, please indicate "NA" and go to next question.

1. Description of instructional program, transfer discipline, or academic area.

Click here to enter text.

2. Does the program have a mission statement? If so, please enter it below.

Click here to enter text.

3. List degrees and certificates offered by the program, if any.

Click here to enter text.

4. Describe progress in achieving goals outlined in the previous program review? (*Some Programs ONLY*)

Section C: Program Enrollment

Question 1 in this section is to be completed by department/program faculty as a group.

The department/program data in Tables 1 and 2 are provided by the Office of Planning and Institutional Research.

Table 1. Enrollment Trends

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Annual FTES					
Annual Enrollment					
Annual Student-Faculty Ratio					

Table 2. Student Demographics

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Annual Unduplicated Headcount					
By Enrollment Status					
% New					
% Continuing					
By Gender					
% Female					
% Male					
By Enrollment Type (*TRANSFER ONLY*)					
% Face-to-Face					
% eLearning					

1. Discuss/comment on enrollment trends for your department/program.

Section D: Program Curriculum

Questions 1 through 4 in this section are to be completed by department/program faculty as a group. If a question is not applicable to your department/program, please indicate "NA" and go to next question.

The department/program data in Tables 3 and 4 are provided by the Office of Planning and Institutional Research. Data provided in Table 5 are provided by the Office of Curriculum.

Table 3. List of program courses and sections offered (Five Year Trend)

Course	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16

Table 4. Course Fill Rates (Five Year Trend)

Course	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Comments:					

1. Are program courses offered so students are able to complete the program in a timely manner (day, evening, online).

Click here to enter text.

Table 5. List of program course prerequisites

Course	Pre-requisite

2. Are program courses pre-requisites reviewed and assessed regularly for relevance?

Click here to enter text.

3. Evaluate program core courses against the major preparation requirements for WA four-year institutions. (*TRANSFER ONLY*)

Click here to enter text.

4. What process is place to ensure consistency between classes offered face-to-face versus online? Please enter N/A if not applicable to your department/program.

Section E: Program Faculty and Staff

Questions 1 through 5 in this section are to be completed by department/program faculty as a group. If a question is not applicable to your department/program, please indicate "NA" and go to next question.

1. Number full-time faculty.

Click here to enter text.

2. Average number of adjunct faculty teaching per quarter.

Click here to enter text.

3. Describe issues related to securing qualified faculty for your department/program, if any.

Click here to enter text.

4. Number and type of support staff related to your department/program.

Click here to enter text.

5. Describe issues related to support staff, if any.

Section F: Professional Development

Questions 1 through 2 in this section are to be completed by department/program faculty as a group. If a question is not applicable to your department/program, please indicate "NA" and go to next question.

		Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A
1.	How would you rate the availability of professional development funding for faculty?					
	development funding for facardy.					

Click here to enter comments, if any.

2. Describe any unmet professional development needs among faculty, and outline plans to address those needs.

Section G: Instructional Support Services

The purpose of this section is to assess the level of support available from each instructional support area as whole, not individual employees. If you have comments or concerns, please do not mention an individual employee by name.

Questions 1 through 6 in this section are to be completed by department/program faculty as a group. If a question is not applicable to your department/program, please indicate "NA" and go to next question.

1.	How would you rate support from advising/ counseling services to help prospective and current students?	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A □
	Click here to enter comments, if any.					
2.	Have the department/program faculty met with a cool liaison to discuss your needs?	unseling	Y [es]	No □	N/A □
	Click here to enter comments, if any.					
3.	How would you rate Tutoring Services in supporting students enrolled in this department/program?	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A □
	Click here to enter comments, if any.					
4.	How would you rate the Library in supporting the faculty and students in the program?	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N∕A □
	Click here to enter comments, if any.					
5.	Have the department/program faculty met with a Lib liaison to discuss your needs?	rarian	Y [es D	No □	N/A □
	Click here to enter comments, if any.					

		Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A
6.	How would you rate Media Services (audio-visual) in supporting the technology needs for your department/program?					
	Click here to enter comments, if any.					
		Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A
7.	How would you rate the Assessment Testing Center (test proctoring, placement) in supporting the					

department/program needs?

Click here to enter comments, if any.

8. Are other instructional support services needed that are not currently being provided?

Section H: Program Support (Facilities and Budget)

Questions 1 through 6 in this section are to be completed by department/program faculty as a group. If a question is not applicable to your department/program, please indicate "NA" and go to next question.

The department/program data in Table 6 are provided by the Budget Office.

9. Are current facilities (classrooms, labs, offices) ad to support the department/program?	equate	Yes □	;	No □	N/A □
Click here to enter comments, if any.					
10. How would you rate the safety of classrooms/labs and equipment used by faculty and students in the department/program?	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A □
Click here to enter comments, if any.					
11. How would you rate the lighting, heating, and ventilation in classrooms, labs, and offices used by the department/program?	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N∕A □
Click here to enter comments, if any.					
12. How would you rate the adequacy of custodial services in maintaining classrooms, labs and offices used by the department/program?	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A

Click here to enter comments, if any.

•		•	•			
		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Goods & Services						
Budget						
Expenditures						
Travel						
Budget						
Expenditures						
Equipment						
Budget						
Expenditures						

Table 6. Department/Program Budget and Expenditures (Five Year Trend)

13. How would you rate the adequacy of operating budget (supplies) needed to support the department/program?	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A □
Click here to enter comments, if any.					
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A

14. How would you rate the adequacy of supplementary budgets (lab fees, coop fees) which support the department/program?

Poor Fair Good Excellent N/A

Click here to enter comments, if any.

Section I: Advisory Committees/Industry Relations (*WORKFORCE ONLY*)

This section applies only to professional/technical programs and is to be completed by faculty as a group.

The department/program data in Table 7 are provided by the Office of Planning and Institutional Research.

1. Please discuss and give an example of how the Advisory Committee has made a positive impact on the program's curriculum development, course content, and/or equipment.

Click here to enter text.

Quick Facts	s: [Enter Occupation]
Median Pay	
Entry-Level Education	
Work Experience in a Related Occupation	
On-the-job Training	
Number of Jobs	
Job Outlook	
Employment Change	

Table 7. Employment Outlook for Program Graduates

Click here to enter comments, if any.

Section J: Learning Outcomes

Questions 1 through 2 in this section are to be completed by department/program faculty as a group. If you questions about assessing your program level learning outcomes, please contact your faculty assessment coordinator.

- 1. Describe the process by which the department/program identifies, measures, and evaluates student learning outcomes at the department/program level.
- 2. Describe the process by which department/program improvements are made as a result of student learning outcomes assessment, and provide evidence that this process is being followed.
- 3. See Appendix A for current program learning outcomes.

Section K: Student Success/Outcomes

This section is to be completed by department/program faculty as a group. If a question is not applicable to your department/program, please indicate "NA" and go to next question.

Question 1 applies to <u>all</u> departments/programs Questions 2, 3, and 4 applies to <u>professional/technical</u> programs Question 5 applies to <u>transfer</u> departments/disciplines

The department/program data in Tables 8 through 12 are provided by the Office of Planning and Institutional Research.

Table 8. Course Completion Rates¹ by Quarter

Quarter/Course	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16

¹ Course completion rates are calculated using a 2.0 GPA or higher unless the Office of Planning and Institutional Research is notified that a different cut-off grade should be used for the department/program.

1. Discuss/comment on course completion rates.

Click here to enter text.

Table 9. Three-Year Program Completion Rates¹ (*WORKFORCE ONLY*)

2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16

¹ Three-year completion rates are calculated for degree/certificate completers and "work-force" ready completers.

2. Discuss/comment on three-year program completion rates.

Click here to enter text.

Table 10. Number of Degrees and Certificates Conferred (*WORKFORCE ONLY*)

Degree/Certificate	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Degree					
Certificate					
Exit Code 9					

3. Discuss/comment on annual degree or certificate completions.

Click here to enter text.

Table 11. Estimated Employment Rate¹ and Median Hourly Wages for Program (*WORKFORCE ONLY*)

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Estimated Employment Rate					
Median Hourly Wages					

¹ If program tracks employment rates for its students, program data will be used. If not, data will be provided by the Office of Planning and Institutional Research.

4. Discuss/comment on employment rates and median hourly wages.

Click here to enter text.

Table 12. Performance of Transfer Students at Baccalaureates and in Subject Area Courses¹ (*TRANSFER ONLY*)

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
All Transfer Students					
Students in Subject Area Courses					
1 (for a literate la seconda de la seconda d					

¹ If applicable to program

5. Discuss/comment on transfer students' performance.

Section L: Program Review Summary

This section is to be completed by department/program faculty as a group based on finding through this process.

1. List and discuss major strengths for the department/program.

Click here to enter text.

2. List and discuss major concerns of the department/program, if any.

Click here to enter text.

3. Are there significant concerns related to the overall quality and effectiveness of the department/program?

Click here to enter text.

4. Are the significant concerns or needs regarding program staffing, support services, or financial support?

Click here to enter text.

5. Identify specific steps to address areas of concerns, if any.

Click here to enter text.

6. What are the most important actions that need to be taken to maintain the current level of quality of the department/program?

Click here to enter text.

7. Describe plans to advance the department/program, if any?

Instructional Support Services Strategic Program Assessments <u>Overview</u>

Department	2013-14	2014-15	2016-17
Libraries	Topic:	Topic:	Topic:
	Rural Outreach	Electronic Resources	Collections
Annual cycle by topic			
	Outcome:	Outcome:	Outcome: In process
	Shared librarian position/Colville	Database consolidations	
eLearning	Topic:		Topic:
	Comprehensive Self-Study		Online enrollment and completion
3 year cycle -			
comprehensive	Outcome:		Outcome: In process
	Online information literacy		
	module		
	• elutoring mitegration		
	• Increase use of social media		
	Improve course construction/		
	registration processes		
Grants & Sponsored	<u>Iopic</u> :	<u>l opic</u> : Desel Envelles ent/Desel Cas dit	<u>l opic</u> : Des fracional Development
Research	Grants Resource Development	Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit	Professional Development
Annual cycle by topic	Outcome:	Outcome:	Outcome: In process
	• Explore intrinsic and extrinsic	• Expansion of District outreach	1
	motivations to encourage grant	• Acceptance of alternative	
	participation	forms of assessment	
	• Define roles, responsibilities,	Increase efficiency of	
	relationships, results and	processes	
	rewards	-	
	Improve efficiency of		
	processes		
	Feasibility of creating Office		
	of Grants & Sponsored		
	Research		

Department	2013-14	2014-15	2016-17
Institutional Research	Topic:		Topic:
	Comprehensive Self-Study		IR/IT Relationship/
3 year cycle –			Infrastructure
comprehensive	Outcome:		
	 Capacity issue addressed 		Outcome: In process
	Web reporting enhanced		
	Leverage STIP data		
Global Education	Topic:		Topic: International Recruitment
	Comprehensive Self-Study		
3 year cycle –			Outcome: In process
comprehensive	Outcome:		
	Streamlined student		
	processing		
	 Connected partnerships to 		
	goals		
American Honors			Topic:
			Comprehensive Self-Study
3 year cycle –			
comprehensive			Outcome: In process
Compliance & Safety ²			Topic:
			Safety Program Review
			<u>Outcome</u> : In process

² Reorganization at District.

PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES SWOT ANALYSIS

PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES BY PROGRAM OR DISTRIBUTION AREA

	FACTORS
STRENGTHS (+)	WEAKNESSES (-)
What are the attributes of the program and/or distribution area that aid in the achievement of the identified program learning outcomes?	What are the attributes of the program and/or distribution area impede the achievement of the identified program learning outcomes?
EXTERNAL	. FACTORS
OPPORTUNITIES (+)	THREATS (-)
What external conditions (non-program and/or distribution area) aid in the achievement of the identified program learning outcomes?	What external conditions (non-program and/or distribution area) impeded the achievement of the identified program learning outcomes?
EVALUATION OF OUTCOMES / POTE	NTIAL NEXT STEPS AND STRATEGIES