

Stark State College
Academic Affairs Assessment Annual Summary Report
2015-2016

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, accreditation requirements, and student success initiatives.
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 thirteen semesters of course assessment, twelve 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. Using the current assessment process, the College began its revised formal academic program review process in Fall 2013. Academic program review continued in this academic year. When comparing annual reports, please note that academic divisions were reorganized. Business and Information Technology is now combined into one division. Sciences is combined with Liberal Arts for the Arts and Sciences Division.

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 AY2015-2016. 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 2015 – SPRING 2016

	Business & Information Technology	Arts and Sciences	Engineering Technologies	Health and Public Services
Courses Assessed this year	92/300=30%	41/161=25%	86/219=39%	84/205=41%
Programs/ majors/certs affected by courses assessed this year	47/47=100%	22/25=88%	44/46=96%	21/31=87%
Departments participating in course assessment this year	5/5=100%	7/7=100%	3/3=100%	8/8=100%

Table 2: COURSE RE-ASSESSMENT FALL 2015– SPRING 2016

	Business & Information Technology	Arts and Sciences	Engineering Technologies	Health and Public Services
Courses reassessed during this academic year	26	5	0	4

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

The assessment process continued in Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 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).

Table 3: Summary of Data*

Number of courses assessed, Fall 2015-Spring 2016	303/885=34%
Number of programs/majors/certificates affected by course assessment,	140/149=94%
Departments participating in course assessment, Fall 2015-Spring	23/23 = 100%
Number of courses re-assessed, Fall 2015-Spring 2016	35/35 = 100%

**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 (GLOs) include the following:

- Application exercises
- Article reviews/analyses
- Autobiographies
- Capstone assignments
- Case studies/analyses – oral and written
- Classroom bulletin boards, discussion forums, reflections, & demonstrations
- Clinical evaluations
- Clinical evaluations and procedure description
- Community learning experiences
- Computer database assignment
- Cooperating teacher evaluations
- Correcting improper use of math terminology
- Critical thinking exercises
- Critiques/responses
- Data interpretation
- Debates
- Direct observation in clinical settings
- Discussion forums and blogs
- Electrical systems analysis (diagramming and hands-on activities)
- Exams, essays, and quizzes
- Exhibits and demonstrations
- Feminine critic paper
- Graphing
- Group or individual projects/presentations
- In-class activities and exercises
- Internships, co-ops
- Interpretation of data

- Interviews and job shadowing
- Journal assignments and critiques
- Lab exercises, reports, journals, practical tests, notebooks and experiments
- Lesson/activity plans
- Literature review
- Movie/Video analysis and evaluations
- Multimodal projects
- Negotiation exercises
- Networking events
- Nursing care plans/concept maps
- Observation/social interaction reflections and reports
- Oral presentations (some technology-based)
- Patient scenarios
- Peer evaluations
- Performance-based assessments
- Portfolio/Dossier development and assessments
- Practicums
- Pre- and post-testing
- Presentation outlines and presentations
- Problem solving requiring multiple steps and interdisciplinary skills
- Production progress checks
- Reading sheets
- Reading, interpreting, developing, revising, and presenting technical documents and calculations
- Research papers, assignments, and projects
- Service learning projects
- Situation testing
- Speaker critiques
- Speeches
- Strategy formulation and decision-making exercises
- Trouble-shooting assignments
- Writing workshops
- Written assignments including homework, essays, reports, research papers, scripts, and letters

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

During AY2015-2016, each department continued to review, revise, and/or develop their Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs). Each department continues to maintain all course assessment/re-assessment reports and annual assessment summary reports. Evidence of students achieving the GLOs are reported on the summary reports by department, and then evidence is collated divisionally on the assessment summary report. College-wide evidence of students achieving the learning outcomes is prepared by the Provost and Chief Academic Officer and included in this report. The PLOs and SLOs are dependent on each program/major/certificate and are not listed in this report but are maintained within each department.

The faculty members follow a process for assessment and communication of GLOs. The GLOs, which are identified on the master syllabus for each course, are reviewed; the course objectives are then identified to

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

The table below summarizes the percentage of students in all academic divisions who, college-wide, demonstrated proficiency in each General Learning Outcome for AY15-16. As demonstrated on the table, 93% of the students assessed or reassessed this academic year demonstrated proficiency in *Effective Communication*, 91.4% demonstrated proficiency in *Quantitative Literacy*, 93.4% demonstrated proficiency in *Information Literacy*, 93.4% demonstrated proficiency in *Critical Thinking*, 93% demonstrated proficiency in *Global and Diversity Awareness*, and 94.3% demonstrated proficiency in *Civic, Professional, and Ethical Responsibility*. Based on the results of the data obtained, the majority of students at Stark State College demonstrated proficiency in each of our GLOs. The trend is consistent with data from previous years.

GLO 1	GLO 2	GLO 3	GLO 4	GLO 5	GLO 6
Effective Communication	Quantitative Literacy	Information Literacy	Critical Thinking	Global and Diversity Awareness	Civic, Professional, and Ethical Responsibility
93%	91.4%	93.4%	93.4%	93%	94.3%

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

In academic year 15-16, most courses overall met the College's minimum standard for student achievement of 70% or greater. While the assessment process requires planned improvements be identified for those courses that do NOT meet the minimum achievement, many faculty reported planned improvements in their methods of evaluation even when the course met the minimum standard. The various planned improvements as identified by faculty are listed below:

- Add live "study" chats for web courses
- Add more support materials on ANGEL
- Add pre- and post-tests as assessments
- Addition of assignments and course objective to support the GLO's
- Begin classes with quizzes to jump start discussions

- Continue offering and increasing the number of in-person review sessions for online students
- Improve course sequencing/pathways
- Improve grading rubrics
- Incorporate pre- and post-tests
- Incorporate virtual flashcards into web courses
- Increase group work (i.e. discussions, team projects)
- Increase the use of video based learning within online sections
- Increase emphasis of GLOs in co-curricular activities
- Introduce live study chats for online courses
- Modify assignments
- Place more emphasis on the key concepts contained in the applicable sections of the course
- Provide additional study guides in ANGEL
- Reevaluate online exercise topics and discussion forum topics
- Reevaluate study guides and review exercises
- Reevaluate and rewrite test for validity of questions
- Reinforce key concepts from prior classes to improve student learning outcomes
- Revise lab manuals to refine the timing of subject presentations and skill evaluation activities
- Revise rubrics to provide more detailed evaluation criteria
- Update and improve audio lectures for web courses in addition to written lecture notes

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.

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

Assessment was discussed at the Academic Affairs Council (academic deans and Provost). Changes in any academic course were discussed and vetted through the Council. The Curriculum Committee, a shared governance standing committee of the College, reviewed the course syllabi template format for curriculum submissions 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 Assessment Council, consisting of faculty and staff, is an operational committee that reports to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, which is a standing committee of President's Cabinet. A charge of this committee is to review academic and co-curricular assessment.

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

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

Table 4 illustrates division representation of faculty participating in course assessment, types of course modalities assessed, campus locations of courses assessed, dual enrollment/Early College High School, and time of course offering. (Some faculty assessed more than one course or course section; therefore, the faculty numbers reported on the divisional assessment summary reports are duplicated headcount.) Table 5 illustrates division representation of faculty participating in course re-assessment, types of course modalities re-assessed, campus locations of courses re- assessed, College Credit Plus (dual enrollment)/Early College High School, and time of course offering. (Some faculty may have re- assessed more than one course or course section; therefore, the faculty numbers reported on the divisional assessment summary reports are duplicated headcount.) When comparing annual reports, please note that academic divisions were reorganized. Business and Information Technology is now combined into one division. Sciences combined with Liberal Arts for the Arts and Sciences Division.

Table 4: COURSE ASSESSMENT FALL 2015 – SPRING 2016								
	Business & Information Technology		Arts and Sciences		Engineering Technologies		Health and Public Services	
	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct
Faculty	76	48	62	48	19	33	46	52
Modality	F2F = 92 W2 = 7 W3 = 71 W4 = 0		F2F = 114 W2 = 6 W3 = 39 W4 = 1		F2F = 76 W2 = 1 W3 = 0 W4 = 0		F2F = 98 W2 = 6 W3 = 10 W4 = 0	
Campus	Main = 95 Satellite = 15 CC+ = 14 EC = 0		Main = 134 Satellite = 11 CC+ = 3 EC = 3		Main = 43 Satellite = 34 CC+ = 0 EC = 0		Main = 102 Satellite = 4 CC+ = 2 EC = 0	
Time	Day = 96 Eve. = 20 WKND = 0		Day = 103 Eve. = 19 WKND = 5		Day = 52 Eve. = 25 WKND = 0		Day = 82 Eve. = 39 WKND = 9	
FT = Full-time faculty F2F = Face-to-face class offering (traditional offering); W2=Web 2 (hybrid course); W3 = online offering; W4 = use of Collaborate software, etc. CC+ = College Credit Plus 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 2015 – SPRING 2016								
	Business & Information Technology		Arts and Sciences		Engineering Technologies		Health and Public Services	
	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct
Faculty	33	6	5	3	0	0	4	3
Modality	F2F = 25 W2 = 1 W3 = 22 W4 = 0		F2F = 6 W2 = 0 W3 = 1 W4 = 0		F2F = 0 W2 = 0 W3 = 0 W4 = 0		F2F = 7 W2 = 0 W3 = 0 W4 = 0	
Campus	Main = 28 Satellite = 0 CC+ = 3 EC = 0		Main = 6 Satellite = 0 CC+ = 2 EC = 0		Main = 0 Satellite = 0 CC+ = 0 EC = 0		Main = 6 Satellite = 0 CC+ = 0 EC = 0	
Time	Day = 24 Eve. = 6 WKND = 0		Day = 7 Eve. = 0 WKND = 0		Day = 0 Eve. = 0 WKND = 0		Day = 5 Eve. = 2 WKND = 0	
FT = Full-time faculty F2F = Face-to-face class offering (traditional offering); W2=Web 2 (hybrid course); W3 = online offering; W4 = use of Collaborate software, etc. CC+ = College Credit Plus EC = Early College campus Eve. = Evening offering WKND = Weekend offering NA = Not applicable								

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

- For the purpose of continuous improvement, quantitative data will continue to be generated and compared to SSC, Ohio, and national trends.
- We will continue reviewing the changes proposed by the Action Project Committee regarding the assessment process for areas of improvement.
- In order to increase consistency and evaluation in the assessment process, assessment training for department chairs, full-time faculty and adjuncts, including College Credit Plus instructors, will continue.
- The College's strategic plan and College Completion Plan are aligned with a focus on student success.
- We will track retention and enrollment data to measure the effectiveness of action plans from current and previous assessment periods.
- We will implement student success ideas generated by Completion by Design and Ohio's Student Success Leadership Institute.
- In order to enhance awareness of the assessment process and maintain its level of priority throughout the year, the following activities will take place:
 - Add additional review of materials covered in previous courses.
 - Analyze and evaluate data for future planning of programs/majors/certificates.
 - Communicate assessment processes to students
 - Conduct department "best practice" meetings, including adjunct and College Credit Plus instructors
 - Continue to advance tutoring services offered to students in all centers
 - Continue to review courses for Quality Matters standards
 - Continue tracking attrition rates to assess effectiveness of online delivery
 - Continued assessment training for all faculty, including adjunct
 - Continued mentoring of adjunct faculty by fulltime faculty
 - Course mentors will continue to support adjunct faculty and ensure consistency of teaching methods and assessment strategies
 - Course mentors will continuously update the faculty support site on ANGEL with master and class syllabi to assist with standardizing course material
 - Create new homework assignments and revisions to existing homework assignments
 - Develop course coordinator checklist and duties to ensure the methods of evaluation align with the GLOs
 - Encourage faculty attendance at professional development activities, including JOLT, Focus Day, faculty-staff retreat, and Best Practices workshops
 - Encourage faculty to visit and observe their colleagues' classes to develop new ideas and perspectives on teaching and assessing their students
 - Enhance assessment training for all faculty, including adjuncts
 - Expand peer mentoring in open labs and in faculty lab courses
 - Review all syllabi at the beginning of each semester to ensure alignment of GLOs with course objectives and methods of evaluation
 - Review and revise lab manuals
 - Review the outcomes of faculty members, departments, divisions, and College student success goals