Stark State College
Academic Affairs Assessment Annual Summary Report
2018-2019

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 nineteen semesters of course assessment, eighteen 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 we reorganized academic divisions in 2015. We combined Business and Information Technology into one division. Sciences 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 we must be re-assess during AY2019-2020. 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 2018 – SPRING 2019				
	Arts and Sciences	Business & Information Technology	Engineering Technologies	Health and Public Services
Courses Assessed this year	51/162=31%	114/277=41%	88/198=44%	138/274=50%
Programs/ majors/certs affected by courses assessed this year	22/22=100%	53/53=100%	33/48=69%	23/50=46%
Departments participating in course assessment this year	6/6=100%	4/4=100%	3/3=100%	4/7=57%

Table 2: COURSE RE-ASSESSMENT FALL 2018– SPRING 2019				
	Arts and Sciences	Business & Information Technology	Engineering Technologies	Health and Public Services
Courses reassessed during this academic year	2	9	0	6

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

The assessment process continued in Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 with faculty following their departmental timeline for assessment of courses. (See Table 3). Courses that fell below the 70% College minimum standard of student achievement during the previous assessment period were re-assessed.

Table 3: Summary of Data*	
Number of courses assessed, Fall 2018-Spring 2019	391/911=43%
Number of programs/majors/certificates affected by course assessment	131/173=76%
Departments participating in course assessment, Fall 2018-Spring 2019	17/20 = 85%
Number of courses re-assessed, Fall 2018-Spring 2019	17/18 = 94%

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

3. Evaluation methods used

The methods used to evaluate the General Learning Outcomes (GLOs) include the following:

- Application exercises
- Capstone assignments and experiences
- Case studies/analyses – oral and written
- Clinical evaluations
- Clinical practice and simulation
- Co-curricular activities
- Computer documentation
- Cooperating teacher evaluations
- Critical thinking exercises
- Critiques/responses
- Data interpretation
- Direct observation in clinical settings
- Discussion forums and blogs
- Drug calculations
- Electronic documentation
- Exams, essays, and quizzes
- Exhibits and demonstrations
- Graphing Tools
- Group or individual projects/presentations
- Homework Assignments
- In-class activities and exercises
- Internships, co-ops
- Interpretation of data
- Keyboarding Practice Documents
- Lab exercises, reports, journals, practical tests, notebooks and experiments
- Oral presentations (some technology-based)

- Online Assignments
- Patient scenarios
- Physiological assessments of patients

- Portfolio/Dossier development and assessments
- Practicums
- Prescriptive analysis
- Presentation outlines and presentations
- Problem solving requiring multiple steps and interdisciplinary skills
- Production progress checks
- Physiological assessments
- Rapid scene assessment
- Research papers, assignments, and projects
- Service learning projects
- Scene analysis
- Speeches
- Strategy formulation and decision-making exercises
- Trouble-shooting assignments
- Volunteer hours
- Writing workshops
- Written assignments including homework, essays, products, reports, research papers, scripts, and letters

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

During AY2018-2019, 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. The summary reports by departments provide evidence of students achieving the GLOs. The divisions collate the assessment summary report for their respective departments. The Provost and Chief Academic Officer prepares this report illustrating College-wide evidence of students achieving the learning outcomes. The PLOs and SLOs are dependent on each program/major/certificate and are not listed in this report; they are maintained within each department.

The faculty members follow a process for assessment and communication of GLOs. They review the GLOs, identified on the master syllabus for each course; next, they identify the course objectives to support the GLOs and align them with each course objective as evidenced on each master syllabus. They review and revise, as necessary, evaluation methods used to measure and evaluate student success of each GLO, and align the GLOs 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, the department identifies planned improvements to improve student learning in the respective GLO and to improve overall student success. For these courses, the departments implement the planned improvements 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 AY18-19. As demonstrated on the table, 93% of the students assessed or reassessed this academic year demonstrated proficiency in *Effective Communication*, 91% demonstrated proficiency in *Quantitative Literacy*, 94% demonstrated proficiency in *Information Literacy*, 94% demonstrated proficiency in *Critical Thinking*, 96% demonstrated proficiency in *Global and Diversity Awareness*, and 95% 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. Compared to last year, the percentage of students demonstrating proficiency in Effective Speaking decreased by 1%. Quantitative Literacy remained the same at 91%; Information Literacy and Critical Thinking increased by 2%; Global and Diversity Awareness declined by 7%; Civic, Professional, and Ethical Responsibility increased by 2%.

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%	94%	94%	96%	95%

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

In academic year 18-19, most courses overall met the College's minimum standard for student achievement of 70% or greater. While the assessment process requires departments to identify planned improvements 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. Listed below are the various planned improvements as identified by faculty:

- Analyze methods and timing of assessments
- Application activities as active learning in math
- Assessing the validity of questions
- Continually improve grading rubrics, study guides and review exercises
- Continue offering and increasing the number of in-person review
- Development of additional co-requisite remediation courses for math
- Emphasize co-curricular learning through clubs and organizations
- Emphasize importance of citations
- Emphasize importance of formal tutoring sessions
- Expand group assignments and team-based, active learning
- Evaluate the effectiveness of study chats, their structure and timing within a class
- Implement revisions to study guides, within course management system (Blackboard)
- Improve pre/post-test assessment continually
- Reinforce key concepts from prior classes to improve student learning outcomes

- Revise and adjust assessment methods in courses that fall below the threshold
- 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
- Update audio lectures and utilize "virtual" flashcards into online courses
- Utilize synchronous "live" review sessions for online courses

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. We also provided individual training on completion of the course assessment/re-assessment template for any faculty member or department.

Many of the division deans continue to put assessment as an agenda item for divisional, departmental, CCP, and advisory board/committee meetings. Career programs hold advisory boards/committee meetings to share information and ideas about the state of the program, and discuss avenues for improvement 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 & Chief Academic Officer). The Provost & Chief Academic Officer, along with the respective dean, discussed changes in any academic course. The Curriculum Committee, a shared governance standing committee of the College, reviewed the master and course syllabi template formats 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 posting of the updated templates to mystarkstate portal 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. Departments and divisions hold meetings to ensure accuracy and validity of the data being reported. Some divisions openly engage adjunct faculty by holding open meetings regarding 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 for 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, College Credit Plus (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.) Full-time faculty continued to mentor adjunct faculty members on the assessment process. Department meetings are held where student learning and strategies to improve it are discussed. Program advisory committees meet each semester; members are provided program specific achievement of learning outcomes and passage rates on certification and licensure exams.

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 for trend data, please note that Stark State reorganized academic divisions in 2015. We combined Business and Information Technology into one division. Sciences combined with Liberal Arts for the Arts and Sciences Division.

Table 4: COURSE ASSESSMENT FALL 2018 – SPRING 2019							
	Arts and Sciences		Business & Information Technology		Engineering Technologies		Health and Public Services	
	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct
Faculty	55	62	24	14	24	28	65	71
Modality	F2F = 144 W2 =17 W3 = 28 W4 = 0		F2F = 30 W2 = 25 W3 = 38 W4 = 5		F2F = 109 W2 = 2 W3 = 4 W4 = 0		F2F = 111 W2 = 11 W3 = 26 W4 = 3	
Campus	Main = 122 Satellite = 34 CCP = 14 EC = 6		Main = 76 Satellite = 4 CCP = 1 EC = 0		Main = 57 Satellite = 58 CCP = 0 EC = 0		Main = 128 Satellite = 13 CCP = 4 EC = 0	
Time	Day = 138 Eve. = 30 WKND = 23		Day = 61 Eve. = 10 WKND = 0		Day = 75 Eve. = 40 WKND = 0		Day = 117 Eve. = 58 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 Collaborate software, etc.
CCP = College Credit Plus
EC = Early College
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 2018 – SPRING 2019							
	Arts and Sciences		Business & Information Technology		Engineering Technologies		Health and Public Services	
	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct	FT	Adjunct
Faculty	5	3	6	6	0	0	2	0
Modality	F2F = 17 W2 = 2 W3 = 1 W4 = 0		F2F = 16 W2 = 0 W3 = 18 W4 = 0		F2F = 0 W2 = 0 W3 = 0 W4 = 0		F2F = 1 W2 = 0 W3 = 1 W4 = 0	
Campus	Main = 21 Satellite = 0 CCP = 1 EC = 0		Main = 10 Satellite = 5 CCP = 1 EC = 0		Main = 0 Satellite = 0 CCP = 0 EC = 0		Main = 2 Satellite = 0 CCP = 0 EC = 0	
Time	Day = 128 Eve. = 2 WKND = 1		Day = 13 Eve. = 3 WKND = 0		Day = 0 Eve. = 0 WKND = 0		Day = 1 Eve. = 0 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.
CCP = College Credit Plus
EC = Early College
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, we will continue to generate quantitative data compare it to SSC, Ohio, and national trends.
- 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.
- We aligned the College's strategic plan and College Completion Plan 2018-2020.
- 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.
  - Align courses with OTM, TAG, CTAG, and MTAG requirements
  - Analyze and evaluate data for future planning of programs/majors/certificates.
  - Assign course mentors
  - Blackboard training for faculty
  - 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 development master courses for key courses in the department. This is continually updated
  - Continue to review courses for Quality Matters standards
  - Continue to review curriculum and textbooks and communicate with faculty from other institutions for
  - Continue tracking attrition rates to assess effectiveness of online delivery
  - Continued assessment training for all faculty, including adjuncts
  - Continued mentoring of adjunct faculty by full-time faculty
  - Co-requisite remediation strategies
  - Course mentors will continue to support adjunct faculty and ensure consistency of teaching methods and assessment strategies
  - Encourage faculty to visit and observe their colleagues' classes to develop new ideas and perspectives on teaching and assessing their students
  - Enhance adjunct mentoring process
  - Expand peer mentoring in open labs and in faculty lab courses
  - Implement Starfish Early Warning System in classes
  - Improve co-requisite remediation strategies for English and math
  - Improve inter-rater reliability in clinical evaluation of students
  - Integrate industry/organizational best practices into classes
  - Monitor a newly developed advising guideline to ensure proper placement of students.
  - Promote student success resources for online learners
  - Promote tutoring services and open lab time
  - Promote professional development for faculty and staff (co-curricular assessment)
  - 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 and update PowerPoints

- Review the outcomes of faculty members, departments, divisions, and College student success goals
- Switch course modality from online to hybrid, based on assessment outcomes and where applicable, in support of student success
- Update course/assignment rubrics
- Use Starfish software to improve number of students receiving early alerts