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Introduction

Spokane Community College (SCC) is a comprehensive, public two-year institution that offers educational opportunities in academic transfer, workforce, developmental and adult basic education. The College is one of two independently accredited colleges that comprise Community Colleges of Spokane (CCS) District 17, which also includes Spokane Falls Community College. The district is the state’s largest community college district geographically, and 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. The College’s main campus is located in the city of Spokane and it has five education centers located throughout the service area.

As part of a district, the College is governed by a district-wide board of trustees. The CCS Board delegates district-wide administrative authority to a chancellor. The chancellor delegates authority and operational responsibility for each of the two colleges to a president, respectively.

This Mid-Cycle Evaluation for SCC provides an overview of the College’s readiness to show evidence of mission fulfillment and sustainability in the Year Seven Report. It outlines the College’s assessment processes and offers two examples representing outcomes assessment. The report concludes with the College’s assessment of what is needed to move forward to the Year Seven Report.

Part I: Overview of Institutional Assessment Plan

Institutional Level Assessment
The purpose of institutional level assessment at SCC is to evaluate to what extent the College fulfills its mission. SCC’s mission statement was adopted in June 2014 by the CCS Board of Trustees. It clearly articulates the College’s purpose. The mission statement is widely published and understood by the faculty, staff, students, and the community it serves.

*Spokane Community College offers educational opportunities in college readiness, workforce training, and university transfer that meet the needs of the diverse communities we serve. We are committed to student success through active learning, dynamic relationships, and supportive environments.*

The College interprets mission fulfillment by the extent to which the institution meets the objectives, indicators, and targets of the core themes, individually and collectively. The College’s core themes were revised during the 2013-14 academic year and included input from faculty, staff, students, and community members. These core themes were approved by the CCS Board in June 2014 and are as follows:

- Academic Transfer
- Workforce Development
The College uses a weighted scoring matrix (see Appendix A) to evaluate results against set benchmarks and targets for each core theme. Performance thresholds have been identified which are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Threshold</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results are within 90% of target</td>
<td>Fully achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results are between 80% and 90% of target</td>
<td>Achieved at an acceptable threshold, with areas to improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results are below 80% of target</td>
<td>Not achieved. Action plan(s) are needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results at each level are aggregated upward to a comprehensive evaluation of SCC’s achievement of its mission. The expectation of the College is to have an overall score above 80%, meaning SCC met an acceptable threshold for fulfilling its mission while recognizing that there are always areas to improve. Data are reported and communicated regularly through the mission fulfillment dashboard available on the College’s intranet. The College reports to the CCS Board on core theme objectives as updates on accreditation or CCS strategic planning. Each core theme has been mapped to the CCS Strategic Priorities.

The College’s four core theme teams play a key role in assessing mission fulfillment as well as evaluating programs, services, resources, and capacity with respect to accomplishment of the core themes. Each core theme team consists of faculty, staff, and college administrators and is co-chaired by a faculty member and an administrator. The core theme teams are charged with the following tasks:

- Review/revise core theme objectives and indicators of achievement (1.B.2)
- Evaluate whether or not identified indicators of achievement are valid, reliable, and measurable (1.B.2)
- Review/revise baselines, targets, and system for evaluating accomplishment of the core theme as a whole and its objectives (1.B.2)
- Engage in ongoing evaluation of achievement on core theme objectives and indicators of achievement and recommend plans for improvement (4.A.1)
- Engage in annual planning around the core themes that is consistent with the College’s comprehensive plan, programs, and services to ensure they are aligned with and contribute to the accomplishment of the core theme’s objectives (3.B.1)

Each year, the core theme teams review the objectives and indicators of achievement associated with each core theme within the context of the College’s purpose, expectations, and evaluation of mission fulfillment. In Spring 2015, the core theme teams began the annual review of the objectives and indicators of achievement in preparation for the next assessment cycle. After substantial discussion, the
teams affirmed the current objectives and indicators, with minor fine-tuning, providing a robust framework for assessing mission fulfillment.

Two of the core theme teams made slight revisions which are outlined below:

**Academic Transfer Core Theme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Indicator</th>
<th>Revised Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1: Students enrolled in transfer programs are retained.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Percentage of students retained from 1st quarter to 2nd quarter.</td>
<td>1.1 Percentage of first-time, full-time transfer students retained from 1st quarter to 2nd quarter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Percentage of students retained from 1st year to 2nd year.</td>
<td>1.2 Percentage of first-time, full-time transfer students retained from 1st year to 2nd year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Percentage of students who successfully complete college-level math within their 1st academic year of enrollment.</td>
<td>1.3 Percentage of first-time, full-time transfer students who successfully complete a college-level math course within their 1st academic year of enrollment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2: Students enrolled in transfer programs are prepared to transfer.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Students demonstrate mastery of distribution area outcomes</td>
<td>2.1 Students demonstrate mastery of distribution area outcomes (Deleted indicator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Percentage of full-time students with intent to transfer complete a degree within four years (200% of completion time)</td>
<td>2.1 Percentage of first-time, full-time students with intent to transfer complete a transfer degree within four years (200% completion time)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Transfer degrees include Associate of Arts (AA-DTA), Associate of Science-Transfer (AS-T), and Associate of Fine Arts (AFA). Major related DTAs include Associate in Biology, Associate in Business, Associate in Math Education, and Associate in Pre-Nursing.

**Student Success Core Theme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Indicator</th>
<th>Revised Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 4: Students progress toward educational benchmarks.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 SCC’s retention rates for specific student populations are equivalent to or exceed that of other Washington community and technical colleges</td>
<td>4.2 SCC’s fall-to-winter retention rates for specific student population cohorts are equivalent to or exceed that of other Washington CC System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The College was unable to gather significant evidence during the 2015-16 academic year due to the adoption of a new enterprise planning system (ERP), called ctcLink. The software system is provided by Peoplesoft and is intended to replace the Washington State community and technical colleges (CTC) system’s antiquated legacy administrative software system that has been in place since the early 1980s. ctcLink was developed as a single, centralized system of online student and administrative functions to streamline and standardize practices and data across the 34-college system.

Spokane Community College is one of three schools in Washington to first launch the ctcLink system. As a “First Link” college, the College immediately realized that much of the data ported over to the new system had been corrupted in the conversion. Additionally, the new ERP system was disconnected from the state’s data warehouse at launch, and thus the College was no longer able to gather data. Local IR
staff explored options for manual workarounds and this severely hampered the ability to maintain prior normal data gathering and reporting functions. 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 a lot of manual work to crosswalk data tables. We quickly realized in September 2015 that we would likely not be able to rely on data gathering during the academic year, and this resulted in an annual cycle that will be missing data for the core theme objectives and indicators.

While most of the core functions of the new ERP system were problematic at launch and resulted in severe college and student financial issues, the financial pillar of the software remains inaccessible to college administration as of October 2016, 14 months after the launch of the system. The College therefore has also lost all budget access and functionality for 14 months, which in turn impacts the planning and budgeting process.

On April 30th, 2016, the SCC and SFCC presidents submitted a letter of disclosure to NWCCU President, Dr. Sandra Elman, regarding the software adoption issues.

With little to no access to system data and budget information, the core theme teams did not meet regularly during the 2015-16 academic year because they were unable to serve the role of gathering and reviewing data for objectives and indicators and making planning suggestions. Because the college pursued a Title III grant in the summer of 2015 that directly addressed recommendations from the core theme teams, the president focused on what work could be done in the upcoming academic year in response to core theme team recommendations from the previous academic year and in alignment with the Title III grant objectives.

A First-year Experience (FYE) taskforce was formed and charged with this work. Significant college resources ($50,000) were allocated to support the research activities of the task force. Further, a direct result of the core theme team recommendations was the significant investment and reallocation of resources to construct a new Counseling and Tutoring Center. The College determined in 2014 that Counseling and Tutoring needed to share a centralized location and approximately $2.3 million was allocated to convert unused program space into more usable and modern space. All campus counselors are co-located with Tutoring Services to allow for convenient access and referrals. Additional funds were allocated during the 2015-16 academic year to provide enhanced technology and furnishings to ensure a welcoming environment. This project will be completed October 2016. Another result of the core theme team recommendations was the development of a new Teaching and Learning Center to be located in the space formerly occupied by counseling and tutoring.

**General Education Assessment**

In Spring 2014, the College adopted a four-year assessment cycle to assess general education which is defined as the four college-wide student abilities: problem-solving, written and oral communication, global awareness, and responsibility. The process, overseen by the Student Learning and Assessment
Committee (SLAC), was implemented in 2014-15 with the assessment of problem-solving to be followed by communication, global awareness, and responsibility in subsequent years.

SLAC convened the cross-disciplinary faculty assessment 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students (n)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct. of Total</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Credits</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following year, SLAC formed a sub-committee, consisting of faculty from different disciplines, to develop improvement strategies related to problem-solving. The sub-group recommended that the College 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. With critical thinking, there are a number of nationally normed assessments available.
- 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.

The recommendation was presented to the faculty at the June 2016 all-faculty forum where they voted unanimously to adopt critical thinking as a general education outcome in lieu of problem-solving.

*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.*

Furthermore, based on the feedback from the cross-disciplinary faculty team assessing problem-solving, the SLAC revised the assessment process from a four-year cycle to a three-year cycle as follows:

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

Prior to the assessment of communication in 2015-16, the committee also made the following improvements to the overall assessment process:

- Standardization of the administration procedures of the assessment instrument.
- Adoption of nationally normed rubrics that have been tested for validity and reliability.

The adoption of nationally-normed rubrics from the Association of American Colleges & Universities for use in assessing the college-wide abilities and standardization in how the assessments were administered led to improved consistency in the data collected. However, as SLAC and other faculty volunteers began the work of assessing Communications, it became clear that the procedures to assess Written and Oral Communications were quite separate, even though they are a shared outcome. SLAC members realized 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 and Written Communication outcomes. Consequently, the assessment of Oral Communication was delayed until Fall 2016 in order to give those involved sufficient time to create a useful and appropriate process. The assessment of Written Communication was completed Spring 2016 and the results will be shared with SLAC and with all college faculty Fall 2016. SLAC will offer faculty development in both critical thinking and formative assessment through the Teaching and Learning Center during the 2016-17 academic year.

**Program Level Assessment**

In Spring 2014, the College adopted a systematic program review process that provides faculty and administration an opportunity to engage in a collegial dialog about the program’s quality, current state, and future direction. The process allows for a department-wide discussion and analysis of the quality of their program as a whole, 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.

The program review process is overseen and coordinated by the Office of the Vice President of Instruction. All instructional programs complete the program review process every five years. The process begins fall quarter with faculty evaluating their program in regard to enrollment and completion; curriculum; faculty and staff; support services including facilities; learning outcomes assessment; and student success and outcomes. Results and findings are discussed and reviewed by the program’s department chair and dean. The process ends spring quarter with the faculty meeting with the department chair, dean, and vice president of instruction to discuss findings and address weaknesses, if any, by developing an action plan.

During the 2014-15 academic year, a total of 12 instructional programs piloted the new program review process and examples of improvements that resulted from the process include:
• Accounting Assistant – ACCT 204 was revised to a capstone course with updated learning outcomes to meet requirements for national Certified Professional Bookkeeper.

• Diagnostic Medical Sonography – revised the program’s math requirement from Intermediate Algebra (Math 099) to College Algebra (Math 108) and added a learning outcome on non-cardiac chest to SONO 273.

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:

• Automotive Technology – 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.

• Surgical Technology - develop an annual outcomes assessment plan. Revise course syllabi to link curriculum and assessments to core learning domains.

• Developmental and Non-Transfer Math - 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.

Based on the results of this year, the College has recognized the need to develop a more systematic, ongoing process to review, revise and assess program learning outcomes college-wide. While assessments of student learning at the program level occur, results have not been systemically documented and shared across the College. To address this concern, the College will focus its efforts in 2016-17 to achieve the following improvements:

• Ensure all programs and disciplines have clear, observable, and measurable program learning outcomes.

• Create a systematic process and a repository for collecting and documenting assessment results.

• Develop more efficient ways to communicate assessment results college-wide.

Non-Instructional Program Assessment
Similarly, the vice president of student services developed and implemented a comprehensive program review process during the 2013-14 academic year. The process is based on a three-year cycle of continuous improvement and allows student services departments to demonstrate their contribution to mission fulfillment and accomplishment of core theme objectives.

Course Level Assessment
Faculty are responsible for assessment of course learning outcomes in their courses. Each course at SCC has a course outline on file with the curriculum office. Course outlines are developed by faculty and approved by the appropriate department chair and then by the curriculum committee. The course
outline lists the course learning outcomes, which state what students should be able to do and/or know after completing specific courses. All sections of the same course share common course learning outcomes which are provided on the course syllabus. Course outlines are reviewed as needed. Faculty are encouraged to rely on direct assessments of student learning as much as possible and supplement with indirect assessments, where appropriate.

In Winter 2015, faculty were awarded a three-year Welty Foundation Grant, the purpose of which was to strengthen faculty knowledge and participation campus-wide in using formative feedback in their classrooms in order to increase student learning and engagement. Beginning in the 2016-17 academic year, faculty have access to a database of research-driven formative assessment techniques and access to an online asynchronous professional development curriculum focused on formative assessment strategies in the classroom. This will be fully-implemented in partnership with the new Teaching and Learning Center by the end of the current academic year.

Faculty are consistently reliable in teaching to their course outcomes and supporting an assessment driven culture; however, collection and sharing of this data has been inconsistent. The College had planned to use CurricUNET to systematically document assessments to support evidence-based improvement efforts. However, after implementation, the College realized the software as purchased and configured could not meet the College’s specific needs. The College hired a special projects consultant for 2016-17 to help develop and implement a database to augment CurricUNET, specifically for collecting and reporting assessment data at the program and course level.

**Part II: Representative Examples**

**Representative Example I: Core Theme Assessment and Planning Resulting in Changes in First-Year Curriculum, Advising, and Tutoring.**

In January 2014, after reviewing two years’ worth of data, three of the four core theme teams (academic transfer, workforce development, and college readiness) identified retention and completion as a major area of improvement. Data showed that SCC’s fall-to-fall retention rate has declined from 50.4 percent in 2010-11 to 47.3 percent in 2012-13. At 47 percent, the College ranks 20th out of 34 in the state system in retaining first-year students to their second year. Of all degree-seeking students, only 22.6 percent earn a degree or certificate within three years. When narrowing the students to first-time, full-time degree-seeking students, the rate only increases to 25.4 percent. Meanwhile, the average completion rate at two-year public community colleges for first-time, full-time degree-seeking students in Washington is 28.1 percent.

The core theme teams presented the administration with a list of recommendations for improvement (see Appendix B). The vice president of instruction called a meeting with the co-chairs of the core theme teams to discuss the recommendations in depth and to develop an action plan. As part of the action plan, the vice president of instruction convened an all core theme team member meeting in February
2014 to discuss and prioritize interventions to improve retention and completion. Interventions outlined to improve retention and completion included implementing college success coursework, intrusive advising, enhanced tutoring services to high need programs and subjects, engaging faculty in adopting high impact best practices into course and program curriculum, increasing fall to fall retention rates for full time degree-seeking students, and increasing the three year completion rates for full-time degree seeking students.

The executive team fully supported these recommended initiatives and began to identify ways to reallocate existing funding and secure new funding needed to implement recommendations. One potential resource identified was a federal Title III grant. The president committed funds to help support the application effort which included hiring a national Title III consultant. The College’s grant was submitted in June 2015, and the College was awarded nearly $2 million in October 2015.

Dr. Carstens, the College’s new president hired July 1, 2015, was engaged in the Title III grant submission process prior to his arrival at the institution. With his extensive experience in implementing first-year experience initiatives, Dr. Carstens proposed the College utilize a FYE framework for the implementation of Title III and additional recommendations from the core theme teams to improve student retention and completion.

**FYE-First Year Experience**

The president convened a First-Year Experience task force charged with developing a plan for a holistic, integrated, wrap-around service program for students in the first year of their college journey. The task force included faculty and staff from both instruction and student services. The plan for the program was to include an implementation strategy, timeline, potential resource needs, and return on investment projections. Additional elements that need to be considered in the plan included but were not limited to:

- Reformed placement assessment methods that utilize multiple indices.
- Integration of career exploration and advising outcomes into orientation and first quarter activities.
- An on-ramp for adult students transitioning from Adult Education to developmental to credit-bearing coursework that is seamless, transparent, and student-friendly.
- A framework for co-curricular learning outcomes supportive of college outcomes.
- Integration of the goals of ongoing work being done under the Title III and Pathways initiatives involving counseling, advising, tutoring, instruction, interventions, and changes thereto with the advent of the new Tutoring and Counseling Center and the Teaching and Learning Center.
- Use of data analytics as a means for identifying success indicators.
- Emphasis on students completing or making substantial progress in math and English requirements in the first year of study.
Six working groups were formed which also included members from the four different core themes teams. With the lack of local data due to ctcLink, the task force was encouraged to look nationally at effective practices among other FYE programs.

The workgroups identified the following objectives that will be reviewed by the core theme teams to implement as part of the First-Year Experience framework and plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Group</th>
<th>Objective(s)</th>
<th>Supporting Core Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community and engagement</td>
<td>– Develop a set of co-curricular learning outcomes</td>
<td>Student Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided Pathways</td>
<td>– Develop recommendations for a seamless and student friendly process for students transitioning from Adult Education into credit-bearing coursework.</td>
<td>College Readiness, Academic Transfer, Workforce Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Develop recommendations for guided student pathways.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Develop recommendations for career exploration advising and also for intrusive advising at the 15, 30, and 45-credit benchmarks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAN the Student Intake Process</td>
<td>– Develop recommendations for reformed placement assessment methods that utilize multiple indices.</td>
<td>Student Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Develop recommendations for a streamlined application and registration process that can be completed in less than two weeks with clearly demarcated steps.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Recommend improvements in signage and other visitor-friendly measures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Resource Awareness and Use</td>
<td>– Develop recommendations for tutoring practices and use of tutoring center.</td>
<td>Student Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Develop recommendations for improving student awareness of financial aid processes and student financial literacy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Develop strategies for increasing student awareness and use of other college resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Expectations</td>
<td>– Develop strategies and recommendations for helping students complete or make substantial progress on math and English requirements in the first year of study.</td>
<td>Workforce Development, Academic Transfer, College Readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Assist the Counseling Department in the deployment of GUID 102 consistent with requirements of Title III Grant and make recommendations for embedding curricular modules from that course into existing CTE coursework in the first quarter of study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Learning Center</td>
<td>– Research best practices in the implementation of teaching and learning centers.</td>
<td>Workforce Development, Academic Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Develop recommendations for the implementation of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many of the FYE work group recommendations for institutional changes will be implemented in the coming year. The task force identified five student outcomes for FYE. Those five outcomes are:

- **Outcome 1:** Students will develop a sense of belonging to and connectedness with someone at SCC, and develop a sense of belonging at SCC.
- **Outcome 2:** Students will develop an educational plan.
- **Outcome 3:** Students will identify a barrier to academic success and develop a plan to address it.
- **Outcome 4:** Students will access a student support service (e.g., tutoring, counseling).
- **Outcome 5:** Students will complete English and math requirements of their intended credential.

Among the institutional changes recommended by the task force and identified as college priorities in the coming year are:

- improved signage for visitors and new students
- leaning of pre-and post-application student intake processes
- mandatory early career advising
- utilization of data analytics as well as student responses on the CSI to identify high-risk students, and targeting of high-risk students for intervention and more frequent check-ins
- creation of a centralized information center on the college website for FYE resources

Implementation and assessment of activities associated with FYE will be assigned to appropriate department leaders in instruction and students services, with the overall effort coordinated by the Senior Director of Institutional Effectiveness, Planning, and Initiatives.

As the FYE task force members learned more about FYE as a collaborative inter-departmental “program” to serve students, the college president determined a need exists for a more systemic coordinated approach supporting initiatives such as FYE and additional college-wide capacity for research, planning, and data-gathering in general. Consequently, the president committed to double institutional effectiveness (IE) staffing, and is in the process of hiring a new Senior Director of Institutional Effectiveness, Planning, and Initiatives, reporting directly to the president, to oversee planning, research, and initiatives such as the Title III-funded First Year Experience effort. This IE team of four will advance college-wide efforts in inquiry, scholarship, and data-informed decisions and assessment. The hiring process for all four positions is ongoing during Fall 2016.

**Representative Example II: Core Theme Assessment Resulting in Changes in Business Technology Curriculum and Learning Outcomes**

The Business Technology Department (BT) at SCC prepares students for administrative support positions in a variety of settings, including business, legal, and medical offices. In alignment with core theme assessment, the department also gathers and reviews data on retention of students from first quarter to
second quarter, and from first year to second year, as well as administering satisfaction surveys to employers following student internships.

BT 152, Business Technology Department’s Business Student Preparation course, was originally designed to assist students who are underprepared to be successful in post-secondary education. This class has always been a requirement of BT programs. Course objectives that support student success include:

- Describe ways you can make the college experience more successful and satisfying.
- Utilize techniques to increase self-esteem and self-confidence.
- Become more creative in the processes of learning, writing, and solving problems.
- Identify personal and career goals.

Previous data from the admissions process showing that the majority of our students enter at the lowest level of reading/writing college readiness, according to the Compass Test, raised concerns that students were not adequately prepared to be successful in college courses. This testing has been discontinued by the college and the decision was made to admit all students without reading/writing placement scores. Since students are entering with a variety of skill levels, enrolling all students in the BT 152 class in their first quarter ensures that they are provided with the tools to be successful in their program.

The faculty in the BT department decided to improve retention and student success by revising the BT 152 Class. A team of instructors attended several workshops for the “On Course” college success textbook and decided to adopt this curriculum for our Business Student Preparation (BT 152) class. This curriculum focuses on eight habits of successful students, which include improving self-motivation, self-confidence, self-management, and self-esteem, as well as personal and academic goal setting. The course curriculum is informed by a large amount of research data to show it improves retention and student success. Data gathered for SCC after one year of using the revised curriculum confirmed those findings.

Data was gathered by the director of planning and research comparing first to second quarter retention of students who took this course (BT 152) in 2012-13 using the original course textbook and curriculum and students in 2013-14 using the new On Course model. This data showed improvement of almost eight percentage points:

- First to second quarter retention of students that took BT151 in 2012-13: 76.8% (n=69)
- First to second quarter retention of students that took BT151 in 2013-14: 84.5% (n=84)

Another comparison was made to show retention of students from first year to second year during the same time period. This data showed even greater retention of 21.2 percent.

- First to second year retention of students that took BT151 in 2012-13: 47.8% (n=69)
- First to second year retention of students that took BT151 in 2013-14: 69.0% (n=84)
In the academic year 2013-14, the President’s Office issued a request to all areas of the College for proposals to improve student success within the framework of improving retention and completion. One of the proposals funded was development of curriculum for student success courses to be offered to undecided or transfer students by the Counselling Department (GUID 102) and offered for Professional/Technical program students by the Business Technology Department (BT 152). At this time, the BT 152 course was shortened to a 3-credit version, developed as an online class, and renamed “College and Career Success Strategies” so it could be offered to more students and other departments, as BT 152.

In June of 2016, the BT 152 class was adopted for SCC’s Management, General Business, Marketing, and Accounting AAS degrees as part of their first-quarter core curriculum.

**Part III: Moving Forward**

Spokane Community College continues efforts toward preparing for a successful Year Seven Report. The College’s structure for evaluating mission fulfillment is set up so that the College has a clear and data-driven picture of its progress each year. As a whole, all core theme teams are confident they will be able to provide evidence of mission fulfillment with multiple cycles of data collection in preparation for year seven.

With the arrival of Dr. Carstens, the College has begun to put much emphasize on planning, assessment, and improvement. Preparing the Mid-Cycle Evaluation has clarified how much progress the College has made in the areas of planning and assessment. While valuable progress has been made in developing a structure for institutional assessment, the College must continue to build on this effort so that assessment is fully integrated into the work of the institution at all levels. As SCC moves forward in preparing for year seven, the College will focus on the following steps:

- Continue to review and fine-tune core theme objectives and indicators of achievement.
- Integrate core theme assessment/mission fulfillment assessment with strategic planning and budget allocation.
- Develop more efficient ways to communicate assessment data to support improvement efforts.
- Continue to build on the College’s instructional assessment plan, including, but not limited to:
  - Assessment of college-wide abilities, including Oral Communication, Global Awareness, and Personal Responsibility.
  - Assessment of program-level learning outcomes across all instructional programs.
  - Supporting faculty development regarding best practices in formative assessment.
Appendix A – Mission Scoring

**Step 1: Indicators**
The result of each indicator is scored against the target and the color of the dot is based on this score. Two exceptions exist: 1) if the results are higher than the target, the score is capped at 1, and 2) if the result is less than the baseline, it is automatically given a score of 0.8. The score is weighted according to the importance rating (3 for ‘critical’, 2 for ‘very important’, and 1 for ‘important’) for aggregating up to the objective.

Corresponding “dots” are based off of the “Dot Score,” “Objective Score,” “Core Theme Score,” and “Mission Fulfillment” score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Theme, Objective, Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Result Score</th>
<th>Dot Score</th>
<th>Indicator Importance Score</th>
<th>Indicator Weighted Score</th>
<th>Aggregated Score</th>
<th>Possible Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>9.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>&gt;=0.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 2: Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Theme</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Aggregated Score</th>
<th>Possible Score</th>
<th>Objective Score</th>
<th>Indicator Importance Weight</th>
<th>Objective Weighted Score</th>
<th>Aggregated Score</th>
<th>Possible Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>÷ 11.00 = .87</td>
<td>3 = 2.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 3: Core Themes & Mission Fulfillment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Theme</th>
<th>Aggregated Score</th>
<th>Possible Score</th>
<th>Core Theme Score</th>
<th>Mission Fulfillment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>÷ 7.00 = .970</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average of Core Theme Scores
2014-15 Core Theme Recommendations

Overview
During fall quarter each of the core theme teams examined the results of their objective and indicator performance from the conclusion of the 2013-14 academic year. In some cases, additional data was needed to isolate issues or gain a more robust understanding of the result(s). During this process each team was asked to identify areas in which improvement is needed. The core themes came up with this list of recommendations to the planning and budgeting committee.

Workforce Development
1) **Increase retention (first to second quarter and first to second year)**
   Rationale: Objective 1 (Students enrolled in workforce programs progress) did not meet the target, achieving 81% of target. Furthermore, all three indicators earned a "yellow" dot, and the two retention measures (1st to 2nd quarter, and 1st to 2nd year) had results of 77.2% and 51.4% respectively (against targets of 85% and 60%).
2) **Better relationships between the college and employers in order to help students find employment after graduation**
   Rationale: Objective 4 (Students graduating from workforce programs secure employment) was the only other objective to not meet its target, achieving 85% of target. Of the two indicators that make up the objective, indicator 4.1 (Percentage of workforce program graduates who are employed nine months after graduation) did not meet target. It came in at 86% against a target of 92%.

Academic Transfer
1) **Increase retention (first to second quarter and first to second year)**
   Rationale: Transfer students are being retained from year to year at 43%. Less than half of the transfer students come back to SCC the following year (adjusted for graduations.) Furthermore, just over 75% of transfer students come back for their second quarter. These statistics are leading indicators to the three year graduation rate of 22% for SCC. Increased retention will impact graduation rates and enrollment challenges as well.
2) **Increase the percentage of students taking college level math and/or English in their first year of enrollment**
   Rationale: Of the transfer students that started at SCC in the Fall of 2013, 10% passed a college level math class that year. Only 85% of the students attempted a college level math class that first academic year. As for college level English being taken in the first academic year, 58% of the students passed it in their first academic year, with 72% of the population attempting it.
Transfer students need to pass college level math and English to earn their degree, and further analysis has showed that students are most successful when they take college level English in their first quarter (2.65 average grade; 80% success rate), or their fifth quarter (2.63 average grade; 82% success rate.) The lowest average grade and success rates occur when students take college level English in their sixth quarter or later.

3) Expand advising and orientation for first-year students
Rationale: According to CCSSE results, the majority of students at SCC (over 55%) have not had an advisor help them develop a personalized education plan tailored to their goals by the end of their first quarter. This calls for expanded advising opportunities for students. Furthermore, when asked what/who has been their best source of academic advising, most students said faculty (33%) followed by counselors (31%). Additionally, the core theme reviewed the WACTC Strategic Visioning Committee whitepaper on Themes from Aspen Nominee College Applications and discovered that mandatory orientation and intrusive advising were identified as best-practices.

College Readiness
1) Increase the percentage of students that successfully complete developmental classes
Rationale: Developmental classes are taken by a large percentage of students at SCC (30% in 2013-14) and the success rate of developmental classes is 60%. The result in 2013-14 earned the core theme a yellow indicator, against a target of 65%.

2) Increase the percentage of students that successfully complete gatekeeper\(^1\) classes
Rationale: Gatekeeper classes were identified by the core theme as Math 97, Math 99, and English 99. Of the students that take one or more of these classes, only 68% of them are successful. This result is against a target of 73%.

Student Success
1) Increase engagement on CCSSE benchmarks: "Student Faculty Interaction" and "Support for Learners"
Rationale: Objective 1 (Students are engaged with their learning environment) did not meet the target. The 2014 administration of CCSSE showed the college was below other large, two year colleges on two of the four CCSSE benchmarks, accounting for an achievement of 50%. The goal for this core theme is to meet or exceed other large, two year colleges on all four benchmarks (100%). The two benchmarks that the college fell short on were student-faculty interaction, and support for learners. Of the six questions that made up student-faculty interaction, SCC scored lower than its comparison group on five of them, and of the seven questions that made up support for learners, SCC scored lower than its comparison group on six of them.

2) Increase professional development opportunities for faculty
Rationale: Professional development for faculty was identified by the core theme in response to the CCSSE benchmark scores along with Objectives 2 and 4 to provide training for faculty to improve teaching practices and strategy leading to more engaged students who will successfully complete courses at higher rates.

\(^1\) Math 97, Math 99, English 99