Approved by the Assessment Core Team on 4/22/10 and by the Assessment of Academic Achievement Committee on May 13, 2010.

2009-2010 System Evaluation

System function

- In Fall 2009, faculty discussed and responded to 2008-2009 assessment of discipline and area-level goals and objectives at the assigned meeting times, and established area projects for 2009-2010.
- Database use for the 2008-2009 Academic year confirms that less than half of full-time faculty are documenting results in the assessment system (see Figure 1). Program and Discipline data submission is declining (see Figure 2), but area projects are being conducted in all six transfer areas.
- At a meeting on September 16, full-time faculty discussed the results of the assessment of the two general education competencies for the year: Technology and Mathematics. Subsequently, these findings were discussed at area level, and the technology recommendations were returned for faculty consideration at a meeting held on November 4, 2009. The math recommendations were postponed and no time ever became available to present them.
- CAAP was administered during the week of April 19-23 to almost 90 graduating students, a 70% response rate. Faculty volunteers proctored the sessions, which were organized by Steve McPherson. Students were given a cafeteria meal ticket as a thank you for participating and a chance at two $100 drawings if they score at or above national norms.

Assessment Database
Count of reported results
Fall, 2008 and Spring, 2009
Compiled 5/6/2010

GE 1	9	Problem Solving
GE 2a	3	Writing
GE 2b	1	Oral Presentation
GE 2c	0	Collaboration
GE 2d	12	Reading*
GE2e	0	Listening
GE3	2	Technology
GE4	3	Quantitative Reasoning
GE5	6	Research
GE6	3	Ethics
	30	Total Submissions

* Includes 9 Special Project Participants

Figure 1: Faculty participation in gen ed assessment

Most recent reporting year	Number of Program/Disciplines*
No data	3
2004-5	8
2005-6	9
2006-7	5
2007-8	4
2008-9	6

* Shows the most recent year data has been filed. There may be some clerical error involved as well as lack of participation.

Figure 2: Assessment Folder Participation

Follow-through on last year's recommendations

- On November 17, 2009, the Assessment Committee reviewed a gap analysis and approved a set of recommendations to address areas of concern. As of this report, all of these recommendations have either been carried out or placed on a roll-out plan to be addressed in the next year.

- On January 20, 2010, the Core Team presented the system revisions to the Area Facilitators and on February 3, 2010, each Area reviewed its area/program objectives and revised them according to the new system requirements.
- An assessment of computer skills, developed over the summer by Heather Dowd, Val Wittman and Eric Epps, was administered to a sample of students (n = 584) during the first full week of the fall semester. These findings were presented to the faculty on November 4, 2009. The Developmental Taskforce repeated the assessment event for all developmental classes (n =169) the first full week of the spring semester. These findings were presented to the faculty on March 17, 2010, and then directed to the areas for appropriate responses to be included in operational plans. (At this time, operational planning is not complete, so what specific action has been recommended is not yet knowable.)

Professional Development

- On March 5, 2010, Jane Hamilton, Amanda Eichman, Heather Dowd, and Mary Heitmann of the Core Team, plus Jon Mandrell, a new faculty member, attended the Illinois Assessment Conference at IVC.
- On April 14, 2010, Chris Shelley and Heather Dowd presented professional development on the role of technology in cheating. In-house professional development on a math-related topic was cancelled as a result of additional meeting time required for the spring technology assessment results discussion.

System Evaluation

- **2010 Faculty Survey of Assessment Results:** A review of the faculty assessment survey shows continued improvement in several areas: faculty attitude toward individual assessment activities, faculty perception of general education assessment, and faculty sense of participation in the link between assessment and operational planning. (These findings are reported in a separate document.) Once again, the numbers show that as the process moves away from the individual faculty member and becomes part of the planning cycle, individual instructors do not see how their data fits into the overall picture. With regard to faculty perception of organizational culture and learning, a fairly high percentage (nearly 40%) doesn't believe the college makes data-driven decisions, nor puts student learning first. Numbers improve on the measure of including employees in the decision-making process.
- **Administrator Evaluation Results:** Four academic administrators used the HLC Levels of Implementation matrix to evaluate the SVCC system against HLC expectations. (These findings are reported in a separate document). While the respondents gave the system itself and faculty engagement its highest marks, they gave their lowest ratings to student engagement and to resource allocation.

2009-2010 Concerns

- The system revisions interfered with the plans to begin moving the career area data into the database with the gen eds. The assessment folder is still troublesome, and there is anecdotal evidence that more teachers are relying on stored forms rather than going directly to the folder for the current one.
- The database is not available to users off campus, nor are adjunct faculty trained to make use of it. Only one Sauk staff member is fully trained in data entry and design aspects of the database, which requires manual updates each year.
- The Wednesday meetings proved insufficient time to get all of the assessment tasks done. Mathematics recommendations from the areas never got discussed, nor did the Reading project data from 2009-2010. Only one of the two planned professional development sessions happened. These tasks will have to be "made up" at the beginning of next year—if additional time can be found.
- Complaints about the Wednesday meetings reached a new all-time high even as the Core Team made a conscious effort to make sure that there was no "waste of time."
- No particular progress was made on either improving student awareness of assessment or on adjunct understanding and buy-in. The reason seems to be that no one is particularly accountable to see that it gets done and that neither of these areas are directly Core Team responsibility.

2010-2011 Recommendations for Change

The Assessment of Academic Achievement recommends the following changes be made for FY 2009:

1. **Move the Assessment Folder:** The Assessment Folder should be moved into FAST to eliminate increasing numbers of problems with access. Jane Hamilton would work with Eric Epps over the summer to get the transition done. ***Rationale:*** FAST did not exist when the folder was developed. Putting the folder there will make the folder more easily accessible without the separate shortcut on each desktop, remove a set of passwords for users, and eliminate some of the linking issues that now exist.
2. **Continue database development:** As soon as the discipline data is archived and the revision of the area/program objectives forms are in place, those areas that are standardized should be moved into the database with the gen eds. ***Rationale:*** The database eliminates the need for manual aggregation, thereby reducing error and delay in that process. In addition, the database allows for myriad reports that are not available in the folder system. The intent when the spreadsheet system was set up was that it would be transferred to database as it settled into a standard form, so this step is part of the natural progression of the system.
3. **Improve public reporting:** Create a webpage for an annual assessment results summary (in cooperation with Tom Gospodarczyk and Brian Olmstead). The summary of assessment data would be created in conjunction with this report. ***Rationale:*** The Core Team members who attended the Illinois Assessment Conference heard Dr. Lynn Priddy of the HLC stress that a successful assessment system MUST include communication to the stakeholders (taxpayers, accrediting agencies, etc.). We have no such external communication mechanism. We recognize that new HLC requirements for reporting in the Pathways method may include just such a requirement, so working with Institutional Research to make sure our reporting also serves that purpose is important.
4. **Depict system flow graphically:** Work with Tom Gospodarczyk to revise 2004 graphics showing the relationship of strategic planning to program review and operational planning to include assessment as one of the important data streams and the combined timeline. ***Rationale:***

See faculty survey results above. We did the survey the day after the OPIC presentation on how our planning cycle works, in which academic assessment was not mentioned as a major data stream. This perception is in direct conflict with the superior connections we have in the institution and needs correcting.

5. **Update system documentation:** The Assessment Plan and Faculty Assessment Procedures Manual (aka Assessment Handbook) need to be updated. Provide a stipend for Amanda Eichman to accomplish this task over the summer. ***Rationale:*** We must have up-to-date documentation of the system before the reaffirmation team arrives in the spring. The revisions to the system are substantive enough that the revision process will require almost complete rewriting. Although funds are tight, this rewrite is not going to happen if left to volunteers.

6. The following Core Team positions should be reimbursed for FY11: 3 hours release time (in summer) for Assessment documentation overhaul to Amanda Eichman; 3 per semester (total of 6) to Val Wittman to create database for the area/program data and to maintain and revise the system during the design phase. ***Rationale:*** The data manager job is primarily maintenance so diverting that expenditure to rewriting the plan will not increase the normal cost. The investment in the database development is critical to moving toward common rubric elements, as required by the HLC focused visit team.

2010-2011 Recommendations for Activities

The Core Team recommends the following activities for 2010-2011:

- Schedule meetings and discussions as presented in the Assessment meeting proposal (see separate draft). ***Rationale:*** The sequence of tasks presented ensures that we cover the system requirements and carries out our commitment to provide opportunities for pertinent in-house professional development on gen eds.
- Set aside time at each of the 4 in-services for required attendance at assessment activities**.** ***Rationale:*** We never got to the math questions that came out of the initial faculty discussion, nor were we able to provide professional development on statistics that we'd planned. Meeting times are at a premium, so increasing the use of in-services for tasks that take more than 45 minutes to do well improves opportunity and efficiency for accomplishing assessment tasks.
- Approve at least 6 attendees to the Illinois Assessment Fair in Spring 2011 so that we can present our technology assessment experience. ***Rationale:*** This meeting of peers on the focused topic of Assessment never fails to provide important feedback about our own system information on best practices, and ideas for improving our system. Our technology assessment will demonstrate how our system works at the institutional level and our innovative approach.
- Conduct an institution-level gen ed project on Research. ***Rationale:*** Based on our experience with the technology assessment, a small committee, consisting of members of the library and IT staffs, as well as Core Team, will develop a computer assessment tool to be used in conjunction with library tours---and if possible, a clicker version for classrooms. The assessment will evaluate students' knowledge of research in keeping with our gen ed objectives in that area. Note: A committee consisting of IT and LRC staff and faculty have already begun the design process because they are excited by this opportunity.
- Allow time each semester for in-house professional development on the two gen ed areas for the year (Research and Ethics). ***Rationale:*** Chris Shelley will coordinate this for Research/Technology, but this might be a year when the library staff steps forward as educators. In either case, this in-house form is cost-effective, but demonstrates our commitment as an institution and as faculty to the importance of teaching and learning.