

Stark State College
Academic Affairs Assessment Annual Summary Report
2013-2014

Introduction

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

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

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

1. Summary of milestones

Under the current assessment process, the College has participated in nine semesters of course assessment, eight semesters of course re-assessment, review of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for each program/major/certificate, and development of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the general education courses and technical/concentration courses for each program/major/certificate under the updated process. Using the current assessment process, the College began its first formal academic program review process in Fall 2013. Academic program review continued in Spring 2014.

The number of courses assessed varied from division to division with all divisions (100%) participating in the assessment process. Table 1 shows the number of courses assessed with the number of programs/majors/certificates affected by assessment and departments participating in course assessment. Table 2 illustrates the number of courses that needed to be re-assessed during AY2013-2014. These few courses in Table 2 did not achieve the minimum College standard of 70% achievement of learning outcomes during the initial assessment or were voluntarily identified by faculty to be re-assessed based on the course not meeting the 70% minimum standard in one or more methods of evaluation.

Table 1: COURSE ASSESSMENT FALL 2013 – SPRING 2014					
	Business & Entrepreneurial Studies	Education, Liberal Arts, and Mathematics	Engineering Technologies & Information Technologies	Health and Human Services	Sciences
Courses Assessed this year	6/80=7.5%	39/128=30%	113/445=25%	72/181=40%	15/45=33%
Programs/ majors/certs affected by courses assessed this year	33/41=80.4%	24/29=83%	52/70=74%	13/17=76%	25/25=100%
Departments participating in course assessment this year	1/2=50%	5/5=100%	6/6=100%	4/4=100%	3/3=100%

--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 2: COURSE RE-ASSESSMENT FALL 2013– SPRING 2014					
	Business & Entrepreneurial Studies	Education, Liberal Arts, and Mathematics	Engineering Technologies & Information Technologies	Health and Human Services	Sciences
Courses reassessed during this academic year	0	1	5	0	2

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

The assessment process continued in Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 with faculty following their departmental timeline for assessment of courses. Courses that fell below the 70% College minimum standard of student achievement during the previous assessment period were re-assessed (see Table 3). From the Spring 2013 and Fall 2013 semesters, most of the courses that fell below the 70% College minimum standard were re-assessed after plans for improvement were implemented. ENG232 wasn't reassessed because the course wasn't offered this academic year. ENG237 wasn't reassessed due to lack of data to reflect a quality sample. Both courses will be reassessed the next academic year.

Number of courses assessed, Fall 2013-Spring 2014	245/879=28%
Number of programs/majors/certificates affected by course assessment, Fall 2013-Spring 2014	147/182=81%
Departments participating in course assessment, Fall 2013-Spring 2014	19/20 = 95%
Number of courses re-assessed, Fall 2013-Spring 2014	8/10 = 80%

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

3. Evaluation methods used

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

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

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

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

During AY2013-2014, each department continued to review, revise, and/or develop their Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs). Each department also identified the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for each program/major/certificate. The Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) template and a Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) matrix were implemented to assist with this process. The PLO template and the SLO matrix were used in preparing for academic program review, which began in Fall 2013. Assessment data for the PLOs was reported on the PLO template after course assessment for the first cycle (3-years) was completed in Spring 2013.

Each department continues to maintain all course assessment/re-assessment reports and annual assessment summary reports. Evidence of students achieving the general learning outcomes are reported on the summary reports by department, and then evidence is collated divisionally on the assessment summary report. College-wide evidence of students achieving the learning outcomes is prepared by the Provost and Chief Academic Officer and included in this report. The PLOs and SLOs are dependent on each program/major/certificate and are not listed in this report but are maintained within each department. GLO rubrics and the SLO measurements will be reviewed and updated in future semesters as next steps in the advancement of our assessment process. All revisions will be communicated to the entire college, especially the department chairs, faculty, deans, and Provost & Chief Academic Officer, in order for the academic departments to review and revise, if necessary, their respective SLOs.

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

In the Health and Human Services Division, all accredited programs reported success on pass rates for those students who sat for their respective licensure examination.

Ten courses were identified to be re-assessed during this past academic year. COM225 didn't achieve the 70% minimum standard last year and again this year. BIO127 was reassessed but still fell below the 70% benchmark for effective communication. The evaluation methods of the courses are being evaluated for re-assessment next year. RCT221 was reassessed but didn't meet the 70% benchmark. The content of the course was evaluated and it was decided that the course should be divided into two courses based on content, RCT226 and RCT227. This change will be implemented in Fall 2014. ENG232 wasn't reassessed this academic year due to the course not being offered. ENG 237 wasn't assessed due to a lack of a quality sample. The courses will be assessed next academic year.

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

In academic year 13-14, most courses overall met the College's minimum standard for student achievement of 70% or greater. While the assessment process requires planned improvements to be identified for those courses which did NOT meet this minimum standard overall, many faculty reported planned improvements for any method of evaluation used in the course to assess the GLOs, even when the course met the minimum standard. The various planned improvements as identified by faculty are listed below:

- Monitoring student completion, performance, and assessment data to measure the effectiveness of prerequisites.
- Strengthening orientation for new faculty on evaluation methods for student learning
- Revising content and evaluation methods to incorporate critical thinking, case studies, clinical performance, and decision making
- Refining simulation activities
- Increasing simulation opportunities for nursing students
- Requiring attendance at Student Success workshops
- Evaluating tests and revising if necessary
- Reviewing and evaluating learning objectives, delivery methods, and related GLOs to improve student outcomes (syllabi and objectives will be revised as necessary)

- Continuing to assess GLOs in courses as additional methods of evaluation are identified
- Adding study guides and reviewing exercises
- Emphasizing more utilization of the learning and tutoring centers for early intervention with students
- Revising timing or method of assessment
- Instituting test reviews in the classroom
- Providing/communicating clear expectations to students
- Reviewing lab manuals
- Communicating the importance of class attendance/participation
- Developing hands-on activities to address different learning styles
- Encouraging student interaction with instructors
- Increasing and/or improving use of rubrics
- Adding/revising audio and video lectures/tutorials/etc.
- Increasing writing assignments, presentations, and group work
- Changing course sequencing of assignments
- Modifying delivery modalities of courses
- Exploring active learning strategies (lab activities or worksheets) and other testing methods
- Reviewing grading criteria and grading software (when applicable)
- Increasing group discussion/interaction in all course modalities
- Providing more support and resource materials to Web students
- Re-evaluating validity and difficulty of exam questions
- Encouraging student use of the tutoring, writing, science, and math centers and Digital Library
- Mentoring instructors to ensure consistency in courses offered and assessment reporting
- Encouraging students to use online review materials, when provided
- Adding online support materials, when applicable
- Adding live chats for Web 3 classes
- Adding virtual flashcards
- Review of questions in the testbank
- Additional time equipping students with knowledge of the Digital Library
- Increasing physical training exercises in the Law Enforcement Academy

Writing, reading, and math boot camps were also continued this academic year. The data reports illustrated success for those students who were enrolled in these boot camps. Funding through the CbD grant has assisted the College in the operation of all the boot camps.

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

The assessment process continued with course assessment/re-assessment training provided to faculty, department chairs, and deans during scheduled group meetings throughout the year. Individual training on completion of the course assessment/re-assessment template for any faculty member or department was also provided. All Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) were completed by each department for each program/major/certificate.

Many of the division deans continue to put assessment as an agenda item for divisional, departmental, and advisory board/committee meetings. Career programs hold advisory boards/committee meetings to share information and

ideas about the state of the program, and avenues for improvement are discussed with the committee members. Department chairs frequently met with their faculty to ensure accuracy and validity of the data being reported.

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

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

A representative sample of courses taught by both full-time and adjunct faculty and offered in different modalities, during different times, and on different campuses, including dual enrollment and Early College High School, ensures shared responsibility for student learning and the assessment of student learning. Departmental and divisional meetings are held to ensure accuracy and validity of the data being reported. Some divisions hold open meetings for adjunct faculty to actively engage them in the course assessment process, which also enhanced shared responsibility for assessment of student learning. Some departments assign courses to full-time faculty to coordinate. These course coordinators assist the department chairs with the assessment process of their courses and ensuring communication with the adjunct faculty.

Table 4 illustrates division representation of faculty participating in course assessment, types of course modalities assessed, campus locations of courses assessed, dual enrollment/Early College High School, and time of course offering. (Some faculty assessed more than one course or course section; therefore, the faculty numbers reported on the divisional assessment summary reports are duplicated headcount.) Table 5 illustrates division representation of faculty participating in course re-assessment, types of course modalities re-assessed, campus locations of courses re- assessed, dual enrollment/Early College High School, and time of course offering. (Some faculty may have re- assessed more than one course or course section; therefore, the faculty numbers reported on the divisional assessment summary reports are duplicated headcount.)

Table 4: COURSE ASSESSMENT FALL 2013 – SPRING 2014

	Business & Entrepreneurial Studies		Education, Liberal Arts, and Mathematics		Engineering Technologies & Information		Health and Human Services		Sciences	
	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct
Faculty	7	8	59	60*	42	30	21	20	23	42
Modality	F2F = 7 W2 = 1 W3 = 7 W4 = 0		F2F = 101 W2 = 1 W3 = 26 W4 = NA		F2F = 88 W2 = 8 W3 = 28 W4 = 2		F2F = 77 W2 = 13 W3 = 16 W4 = 0		F2F = 82 W2 = 8 W3 = 8 W4 = 0	
Campus	Main = 6 Satellite = 2 DE = 0 EC = 0		Main = 107 Satellite = 19 DE = 2 EC = 0		Main = 83 Satellite = 28 DE = 2 EC = 0		Main = 104 Satellite = 3 DE = 0 EC = 0		Main = 89 Satellite = 9 DE = 5 EC = 2	
Time	Day = 6 Eve. = 2 WKND = 0		Day = 109 Eve. = 18 WKND = 1		Day = 107 Eve. = 18 WKND = 1		Day = 62 Eve. = 26 WKND = 3		Day = 78 Eve. = 20 WKND = 6	

FT = Full-time faculty

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

DE = Dual Enrollment campus

EC = Early College campus

Eve. = Evening offering

WKND = Weekend offering

NA = Not applicable

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

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

	Business & Entrepreneurial Studies		Education, Liberal Arts, and Mathematics		Engineering Technologies & Information		Health and Human Services		Sciences	
	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct
Faculty	0	0	1	0*	2	2	0	0	5	26
Modality	F2F = 0 W2 = 0 W3 = 0 W4 = 0		F2F = 1 W2 = 0 W3 = 0 W4 = 0		F2F = 2 W2 = 1 W3 = 4 W4 = 0		F2F = 0 W2 = 0 W3 = 0 W4 = 0		F2F = 29 W2 = 0 W3 = 2 W4 = 0	
Campus	Main = 0 Satellite = 0 DE = 0 EC = 0		Main = 1 Satellite = 0 DE = 0 EC = 0		Main = 7 Satellite = 0 DE = 0 EC = 0		Main = 0 Satellite = 0 DE = 0 EC = 0		Main = 18 Satellite = 7 DE = 3 EC = 0	
Time	Day = 0 Eve. = 0 WKND = 0		Day = 1 Eve. = 0 WKND = 0		Day = 5 Eve. = 2 WKND = 0		Day = 0 Eve. = 0 WKND = 0		Day = 19 Eve. = 9 WKND = 1	

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

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

- In addition to being qualitative with a focus on processes, assessment needs to be quantitative with more direct measures of assessment and a focus on outcomes and performance. For the purpose of continuous improvement, more quantitative data will continue to be generated and compared to:
 - Longitudinal data to evaluate how the College, the divisions, and the programs are improving over the years. (This has begun to take shape since the departments, divisions, and programs have started to collect data that can be compared to previous semesters.)
 - Other in-state or out-of-state institutions to evaluate the standing of the College on key assessment categories or how the College compares with national trends
- An AQIP Action Project was developed to assess our assessment process and identify ways to improve it, including our forms.
- In order to increase consistency and evaluation in the assessment process, assessment training for department chairs, full-time faculty and adjuncts, including dual enrollment instructors, will continue.
- The College's strategic plan and College Completion Plan include an emphasis on assessment and student success.
- In order to enhance awareness of the assessment process and maintain its level of priority throughout the year, the following activities will continue to take place:
 - Provide an assessment summary, including course assessment/re-assessment, program learning outcomes, and student learning outcomes—during department meetings, division meetings, and advisory board/committee meetings with time to discuss and review learning strategies, methods of evaluation, and potential and planned improvements.
 - Encourage faculty to visit and observe their colleague's classes to develop new ideas and perspectives on teaching and assessing their students.
 - Increase the use of rubrics for assignments, tests, etc. to encourage consistency in evaluation of students' achievement and provide training for faculty.
 - Review courses for Quality Matters standards.
 - Encourage faculty attendance at professional development activities, including JOLT, Focus Day, faculty-staff retreat, and Best Practices workshops.
 - Actively engage career program advisory board/committee members in the assessment process, including academic program review.
 - Continue to review curriculum and textbooks with faculty from other institutions for ideas.
 - Track retention and enrollment data to measure the effectiveness of action plans from current and previous assessment periods.
 - Review the outcomes of faculty's, department's, and division's student success goals
 - Increase peer mentoring in open labs.
 - Research and implement CbD recommendations for student success.
 - Monitor DFW rates in courses to improve retention and student success.
 - Analyze and evaluate data for future planning of programs/majors/certificates.
 - Include student success goals on their respective performance evaluations for full-time faculty, department chairs, and division deans.