***Reviewed by the Assessment Core Team on 4/30/2013;***

***Approved by the Assessment Committee on 5/14/2013***

**2011-2012; 2012-2013 Assessment System Evaluation[[1]](#footnote-1)**

**1) System Participation**

2011-12: Review of data collection and meeting minutes showed that participation benchmarks were met for area and program projects; Participation in gen ed collection was much improved thanks to the ease of the new database; Adjunct participation has leveled off, with almost 100% of developmental adjunct faculty participating and relatively few college-level adjunct faculty involved.

2012-13: From the database, the following participation was noted:

* Reading Special Project (FA11-FA12): 12 faculty participated, providing an N of 322 students
* Problem-solving (F11-S13): 5 faculty; n = 76
* Writing (F11-S13): 5 faculty; n = 71
* Oral Communication (F11-S13): 3 faculty; n = 56
* Collaboration (F11-S13): 2 faculty; n = 26
* Reading Competency (F11-S13): 3 faculty; n = 45
* Listening (F11-S13): 3 faculty; n = 85
* Technology (F11-S13): 1 faculty; n = 11
* Quantitative Reasoning (F11-S13): 5 faculty; n = 81
* Research (F11-S13): 9 faculty; n = 207
* Ethical Reasoning (F11-S13): 4 faculty; n = 120
* Career Capstone (F11-S13): 12 faculty; n = 133
* CJS (program-level) (F11-S13): 1 faculty; n = 21
* Communications (F11-S13): 8 faculty; n = 211
* Humanities (F11-S13): 5 faculty; n = 94
* Mathematics - Problem solving (F11-S13): 3 faculty; n = 67
* Mathematics - End of Course 080 (F11-S13): 4 faculty; n = 83
* Mathematics - End of Course 106 (F11-S13): 4 faculty; n = 95
* Mathematics - End of Course 121 (F11-S13): 4 faculty; n = 64
* Physical Science (F11-S13): 5 faculty; n = 106
* Social Science (F11-S13): 6 faculty; n = 82

This information shows a general and consistent participation in data collection on the part of faculty. It is also the first year that mathematics forms have been available on the database system. It also demonstrated that we have not yet designed sufficient reporting mechanisms; the data had to be collected manually.

***Recommendations:***

* Revise the assessment system to detach developmental assessment from the college-level system, leaving just a process to allow flow of data from exit testing into the appropriate area (e.g. math exit data discussed by math area faculty; language arts data discussed by Communications faculty).
* Given the report that administration responded to last year’s request and expects adjuncts to participate in assessment data collection, Area Facilitators need to be asked to identify adjuncts who teach in courses that should be contributing to AREA and PROGRAM assessments in the database. (We agreed that Allied Health clinical nursing and rad tech adjuncts are exempt because they are not sole providers of instruction but serve as support, and that developmental instructors need not participate outside of their exit data because they are not at college-level; we agreed that dual enrollment adjuncts are included, but will phase that in, starting with information and encouragement.
* Develop an assessment brochure for the adjuncts and information for the adjunct web page.
* Set up a regular reminder system for faculty to make sure they do the required two gen ed competency assessment and their area or program assessment and to get it into the system before the end of the academic year.

**2) Documentation**

The FAST Assessment page, the database, and area meeting minutes are providing adequate documentation of the process.

***Recommendation:***

* No action needed at this time.

**3) Communication of the System:**

We did not succeed again this year in developing a public webpage to communicate assessment system projects and findings to the public and students.

***Recommendation:***

* Add information to blank spaces on the database page and others in the Assessment of Academic Achievement pages in FAST.
* Ask Steve Nunez to provide a page on assessment in the Report to the Community and a system for requesting and creating that report.

**4) Surveys:**

2011-12 was the first in our new three-year cycle for assessing student attitudes about assessment. The most systematic communication with students about assessment occurs in PSY 100 (Orientation). We failed to obtain and discuss this data. 2012-13 should have included a survey of faculty, but we failed to schedule a survey. Clearly this aspect of system review does not have a high priority.

***Recommendation:***

* We need to review the survey cycle aspect of the system to see if we are getting sufficient feedback from other sources that we don’t need to continue it, or revise it so it is workable.

**5) Accomplishments**

* The HLC peer review resulted in the confirmation of our accreditation and in the session with faculty, the visiting team was quite complimentary about the general education competency portion of our system (‘11-12).
* On February 25, Jane Hamilton, Ruth Montino, Carrie Conderman, Chris Shelley, and Eric Epps attended the Illinois Assessment Fair at Oakton Community College. (‘11-12)
* More area assessments were moved over into the database, so the old “folder” has been archived on a drive accessible only by the Area Facilitators. (‘11-12)
* On February 15, Jane Hamilton attended the Illinois Assessment Fair at Elgin Community College. (’12-13)
* The Core Team reviewed information presented by Steve Nunez, Dean of Institutional Research, about the CAAP and ETS and recommended using the ETS for a standardized external measure. (’12-13)
* Val Wittman, Chris Shelley, and Jane Hamilton presented a technology assessment curriculum proposal at the April 2013 Curriculum Committee meeting, which finally closed the loop on the 2009 technology competency data collection project and faculty directive to act on that data with a technology readiness assessment tool. The Curriculum Committee will make its decision some time over the summer, but the presenters are confident there will be a self-assessment available for students as early as Spring 2014.

**6) System Changes[[2]](#footnote-2)**

* General Education competencies are 10 years old and in following up a self-study commitment, the Core Team has begun a process of review that should involve full faculty in ‘2013-14.
* Self-study items should be revisited once the General Education Competency review is complete and a new first priority for action chosen. (See Appendix A – below.)
* Review reporting capabilities of the database so that we can more easily access some of the system-level reports we routinely need and to create some added editing flexibility.
* We need to design a way to incorporate the eportfolios into the system and to explore whether music and education could make use of them.

**7) Tasks and requests for 2013-14:**

* Schedule meetings and discussions as presented in the Assessment meeting proposal. (See separate draft in Appendix B – below.)
* Request a block of time at each of the in-services for faculty to conduct a review of the general education competencies.

Request professional development funds for at least 6 attendees to the Illinois Assessment Fair in February 21, 2014 at Moraine Valley.

***Appendix A:*** Action Plan developed from the 2011 Self-Study, based on the evaluation of the assessment system reported within that document and assigned to the Assessment Committee.

**Assessment Committee Task List**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Individual(s) Responsible** | **Targeted****Completion****Date** | **Status in 2012-13** |
| The most recent revision of the assessment system has revealed overlap of the general education competencies of mathematics and communications, which are also GECC areas. In addition, the faculty has provided evidence that it values diversity. The self-study committee suggests that when the faculty re-evaluates the general education competencies, these findings should be addressed. | Assessment Committee |  Academic Year 2013-14 | Planning underway |
| Given the importance of diversity to HLC and other regulatory agencies and the findings that the concept is valued in general by the faculty, the self-study committee recommends that the faculty revisit its original decision not to establish diversity as a general education competency and more clearly define how and where diversity is appropriately an outcome in both transfer and career program coursework. | Assessment Committee |  Academic Year 2013-14 |  Planning underway |
| In the current design of the Assessment of Academic Achievement, there is no clear connection to the non-credit certificate programs. It is not entirely clear whether this is a significant gap in the system. The self-study committee recommends that this issue be investigated and a recommendation made on how to appropriately assess this category of certificates. | Academic VP, Dean of Instruction, Assessment Committee |   |  No action taken |
| Despite the assessment system focus on the GECC areas, certain disciplines, such as music or education, may require a discipline-level assessment when success in subsequent transfer work is dependent on a very specific sequence of discipline-specific skills. The system is responsive enough to allow for such discipline-level outcomes to be developed and assessed where appropriate. The self-study committee recommends careful monitoring of the change by the Core Team and Assessment Committee. | Assessment Committee |   |  Looking at e-portfolio development and pending possible full-time faculty position |
| The culture of assessment can only be maintained if adjuncts and new faculty are given clear instruction in the system and expectations for their participation. The self-study committee suggests that the Assessment Committee design an orientation mechanism to ensure that new faculty members understand assessment tasks. | Assessment Committee |   |  no action taken |
| The college has made little or no effort to communicate to the public the good work it is doing to assess its student learning and the achievements of those students. The self-study committee recommends that the Assessment Committee revise the assessment plan to create guidelines ensuring the systematic public access to appropriate assessment data. | Assessment Committee |   |  On 2013-14 Action plan as request for page in ***Report to the Community*** |
| Because of the importance of Board involvement in supporting a culture of assessment, the self-study committee recommends that some reporting mechanism be added to the Assessment Plan to assure communication to the Board about assessment findings. | Assessment Committee |   |  On 2013-14 Action plan as request for page in ***Report to the Community*** |

Appendix B:

***Required Assessment Tasks – Fall 2013***

**August**

***In-service:*** Curriculum mapping activity for full faculty and discussion by areas

Area Meeting – Review last year’s data and set area project for this year.

**September**

Full Faculty – Review Gen Ed database Data (This cycle is research and ethics) –in cross curricular groups

Area Meeting - Review Gen Ed Data (and cross-curricular comments) – make recommendations for 1) area/program operational planning and 2) anything related to institutional action.

**October**

Full Faculty – Respond to gen ed recommendations – Clicker session (NOTE: This was postponed until spring in 2012-13 to the detriment of the discussion. It NEEDS to happen no later than this, please.)

***Required Assessment Tasks – Spring 2014 (preferred)***

In-service - Follow-up activity related to review of General Education Competencies (tbd)

Full faculty --SPLIT into transfer and career areas for discussions related to career data and to various IAI issues.

1. ***This report combines information from the 2011-2012 report that was not reviewed and approved during that academic year as it should have been with additional information from the 2012-2013 review of the system. It report complies with a Checklist approved 12/7/10 by the Core Team to standardize the components evaluated and to provide basic benchmarks where appropriate.*** [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. ***All of the changes recommended for ‘12-13 in the ’11-12 report were either resolved OR have been repeated in the ’12-13 recommendations with appropriate adjustments.*** [↑](#footnote-ref-2)