Sauk Valley Community College

Academic Assessment System Evaluation

Annual Report

2013-2014 & 2014-2015

Written by:

Jane Hamilton, Assistant Professor of English

Dr. James Chisholm, Professor of Physics & Faculty Assessment Leader

Dr. Steve Nunez, Dean of Institutional Research and Marketing

Reviewed by the Assessment Core Team of 4/8/2015

Approved as Amended by the Assessment Committee on 5/15/2015

Revised and approved (with addendum) by the Assessment Committee on 9/4/2015

Preamble

This report follows the structure as dictated in Appendix A:

- System Participation
- Documentation
- Communication of the System
- Surveys
- Accomplishments
- Recommendations

With the addition of:

- Appendix A: System Evaluation Checklist.
- Appendix B: Proposed Assessment Committee Charge
- Appendix C: Update on Assessment Report Recommendations

System Participation

2014-2015: From the database, the following participation was noted:

General Education: 33/45 (73.3%) full-time faculty gathered data from more than 58 distinct classes.

Area Level: 22/45 (48.9%) full-time faculty and three adjunct faculty gathered data from more than 28 distinct classes.

Four full-time and one adjunct English faculty participated in an Information Literacy assessment (TRAILS) in FY 2015. In total, students from four English 101 classes and two English 105 classes were evaluated (304 students total). This special project will provide a pre-and post-test of student research skills through the composition and research sequence.

Data was discussed at the following meetings:

Full Faculty Meetings (committee minutes are also found in FAST)	
Date	Topic(s)
September 10, 2014	General Education data discussions on Problem Solving and Communications
November 5, 2015	General Education Data
February 11, 2015	(missing minutes)
March 25, 2015	ETS Proficiency Profile report

Area Meetings (committee minutes are also found in FAST)	
Date	Topic(s)
August 27, 2014	Area Assessment Projects and review of last year's assessment data
September 17, 2014	General Education Data
September 24, 2014	General Education Data
March 25, 2015	Employability Data for CTE Programs

Assessment Committee Meetings (committee minutes are also found in FAST)	
Date	**Topic(s)**
December 1, 2014	Core Team only: Data flow was discussed especially about listening and collaboration.
November 3, 2014	Core Team only: Clicker presentation was finalized.
September 29, 2014	Core Team only: Problem solving and communication competencies.
May 15, 2015	Full Assessment Committee: Review of Assessment Report including recommendations

2013-2014: From the database, the following participation was noted:

General Education: 30/43 (69.8%) full-time faculty gathered data from more than 55 distinct classes.

Area Level: 27/43 (62.8%) full-time faculty and seven adjunct faculty gathered data from more than 36 distinct classes.

Data was discussed at the following meetings:

Full Faculty Meetings: (committee minutes are also found in FAST)	
Date	**Topic(s)**
September 11, 2013	General Education data discussions: Research and Ethics
October 9, 2013	General Education data discussions and recommendations
March 26, 2014	General Education follow-up
April 30, 2015	"World Café" and General Education competencies

Area Meetings: (committee minutes are also found in FAST)	
Date	**Topic(s)**
August 28, 2013	Area Projects and review last year's assessment data
September 25, 2015	Review of Gen Ed Data and cross-curricular comments
October 30, 2013	General Education data discussions
March 16, 2014	Employability data for CTE programs

Assessment Committee Meetings: (committee minutes are also found in FAST)	
Date	**Topic(s)**
October 9, 2013	Core Team only: Review of the assessment system and Gen. Ed. competencies
November 20, 2013	Core Team only: Development of new Gen. Ed. competencies

Recommendation:

- Faculty Leaders need to identify adjuncts who teach in courses that should be contributing to area and program-level assessments in the database and then approach them about participating in the assessment process. (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 adjunct instructors

need not participate outside of their exit data because they are not at college-level. We also agreed that dual enrollment adjuncts should be included, but will phase that in, starting with information and encouragement.)

Documentation

The FAST Assessment page, the database, and area meeting minutes are providing adequate documentation of the process.   Faculty leaders are ensuring that assessment-related actions are recorded on operational plans for academic areas. However, General Education Core Curriculum (GECC) or Area objectives are not yet complete in the database: Communications 3 of 6; Math, 6 of 6 (complete); Social Sciences, 2 of 4; Physical Sciences, 2 of 4; Humanities, 1 of 5.

Recommendation:
- Areas should undertake a project to complete development of rubrics for the remaining Area Objectives so the database is completely populated.

Communication of the System

The 2013 Report to the Community did include a summary of assessment activities (see page 11 of that document). However, no 2014 Report to the Community was generated. No evidence exists in the minutes of Board of Trustees meetings that any reference to Assessment of Academic Achievement was ever on the agenda or presented.

Recommendation:
- Request ETS results, annual Employability assessment results, and Student Learning Data be added to dashboard. These are results that are of interest to our public stakeholders and would provide some evidence of our internal system linking to their interests.
- Suggest a report on the Assessment of Academic Achievement be placed on a Board agenda (President's Report) on a regular annual basis.

Surveys

As outlined in Appendix A, there is a defined three year survey cycle for faculty, administrators and area facilitators, and students.   No surveys have been done in the last two years.

Recommendation:

- Evaluate the survey cycle and its value.

Accomplishments

- At Spring 2014 In-Service, faculty participated in a "World Cafe" event that provided broad-based, cross-curricular brainstorming on an array of general education competencies. These competencies are not currently recognized at Sauk but appeared, to the Core Team, to be worthy of discussion (as Gen Eds were being reviewed). At a subsequent full-faculty meeting on April 30, 2014, cross-curricular groups evaluated

"pros and cons" of a narrowed list: diversity, social responsibility, information literacy, employment readiness, visual literacy.

- Core Team members attended both the 2014 Illinois Assessment Fair (Jane Hamilton) and the 2015 Illinois Assessment Fair (Catherine Akker, James Chisholm, Jane Hamilton, Jon Mandrell, Jeff Newbury).
- The first ETS Proficiency Profile exam was administered to 51 sophomore students in spring 2014 and data reported to faculty on March 25, 2015, by the Dean of Institutional Research and Marketing.
- The revision of the EV-3 for faculty evaluations was revised in 2014 to include the recommended faculty accountability for participation in assessment. Here is the assessment language in the evaluation:

_____

Assessment*: Faculty members are required to do a minimum of one area assessment and two general education assessments per academic year, unless your job description says otherwise (e.g., Counseling).*

I fulfilled my assessment responsibilities this year by:
o Participating in one area or discipline-level assessment event.
o Participating in two General Education Assessment Events
o Participating in a focused, special assessment project for the college or department.
o Other(s) Describe:
o OR not required by job description (check if this applies)

Recommendation:

- Using faculty feedback from the April 30, 2014 and November 5, 2014 full faculty meetings, finalize any proposals for either changing existing Gen Ed competencies or adding new ones.

Recommendations

- Discontinue the full-faculty meeting as the first review and go directly to the first area meeting. The faculty identified areas of improvement in their review of the Gen. Ed. Competencies as some faculty are not valuing the data collected during the assessment process. Thus, faculty should discuss them first in area meetings, then bring those recommendations back and allow for some discussion there. Use the full-faculty meeting for curriculum mapping, continued discussion of the proposed Gen. Ed. changes, and proposal of special assessment projects.
- Create a taskforce to review and update the official Assessment Plan. A review of the Assessment Plan in FAST shows that it is outdated and needs revision. For example, the CAAP material needs removing or replacing. Given the new HLC accreditation process, the Dean of Institutional Research and Marketing should serve as administrator for this effort working with the Assessment Committee. The classroom data collection method is working well and should be kept as much the same as possible, but the link to institutional planning and reporting to HLC and the Board needs to be addressed. The group should also look into improving the ease of querying the database.
- Create a budget line for Assessment. Jane Hamilton has been charging most (not all) copying of Assessment materials to the English department for most of her involvement in the last 10 years. A small budget just for Assessment would not only help with the accurate direction of charges but would demonstrate institutional commitment to Assessment to HLC and other stakeholders.

This budget would include:
- ○ Appropriate professional development (e.g. annual Illinois Assessment Fair attendance and HLC meetings as appropriate)
- ○ Release time or overload for faculty chair
- ○ Release time or overload for data manager when design issues require extensive time commitment.

● Discontinue Core Team as separate from the Assessment Committee.   The charge should be revised and then the Assessment Committee, consisting both of the faculty core and appropriate administrators would meet in a regular time and place.

Summary of Recommendations from Above Sections

● Faculty Leaders need to identify adjuncts who teach in courses that should be contributing to area and program-level assessments in the database and then approach them about participating in the assessment process. (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 adjunct instructors need not participate outside of their exit data because they are not at college-level. We also agreed that dual enrollment adjuncts should be included, but will phase that in, starting with information and encouragement.)

● Areas should undertake a project to complete development of rubrics for the remaining Area Objectives so the database is completely populated.

● Request ETS results, annual Employability assessment results, and Student Learning Data be added to dashboard. These are results that are of interest to our public stakeholders and would provide some evidence of our internal system linking to their interests.

● Suggest a report on the Assessment of Academic Achievement be placed on a Board agenda (President's Report) on a regular annual basis.

● Evaluate the survey cycle and its value.

● Using faculty feedback from the April 30, 2014 and November 5, 2014 full faculty meetings, finalize any proposals for either changing existing Gen Ed competencies or adding new ones.

Proposed Assessment Tasks FY 2016

Fall 2015

1. Full faculty Meeting - Curriculum mapping activity for full faculty?
2. 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.
3. Area Meeting - Review last year's data and set area project for this year.
4. Full Faculty – Respond to Gen Ed recommendations from areas – Clicker session

Spring 2016

1. If needed, an activity related to curriculum mapping or Gen Ed exploration or roll-out of plan revisions
2. Split into transfer and career areas for discussions related to career data and to various IAI issues.

Appendix A - System Evaluation Checklist

Checklist: Annual Core Team Evaluation of the Assessment System   (approved 12/7/10)
This appendix to the Assessment Plan identifies system components that should be included in the annual evaluation of the system.

1) System participation benchmarks:
· 100% of areas and programs have documented projects for the prior year
· 100% of full-time faculty have documented participation at the expected minimum level for the prior year (2 Gen Eds and 1 area project)
· Determine % of adjunct faculty who have documented participation for the prior year and set benchmark for next year

2) Documentation Benchmarks:
· 100% of areas have minutes in place in FAST (based on sampling dates determined by schedule calling for assessment tasks)
· 100% of Full-faculty assessment-related discussions have minutes in place in the Assessment Folder/FAST
· Previous Year's annual report is in place in the Assessment Folder.
· CAAP report in public place on website and details in Assessment Folder (following CAAP year)

3) Communication of the system (public webpage, news releases, etc)
· CAAP data (in cycle year) or plans for in prior year
· External data (eg. transfer rates)
· Orientation pamphlet
   o current (revise as needed)
   o number distributed provided by Counseling)
· Public Webpage (revise as needed)
· Assessment Plan (revise as needed)
· Adjunct pamphlet (revise as needed)

4) Surveys (Three-year cycle, beginning as shown)
· Faculty   - 2010
· Administrators and Area Facilitators (against HLC Matrix) - 2011
· Students - 2012

5) Accomplishments
· Progress on prior year recommendations
· Professional Development
o Conferences attended (including presentation)
o In-house development activities
· Curriculum/Budgetary proposals arising from assessment data

6) Recommendations
· System changes (if needed)
· Tasks for next year (via suggested meeting schedule)
· Professional development recommendations
· General Education Assessment Project
· Reimbursements (data management, etc.)

Appendix B: Proposed Assessment Committee Charge

The Assessment Committee activities are related to, but not limited to the following objectives of the strategic plan:
1.1 Improve existing instructional courses and programs using available data and resources including data from program reviews and assessment activities.
2.1 Offer appropriate instructional courses and programs for our community and our students using available resources and data.
1.6 Maintain and improve facilities, technology and equipment.
2.1 While maintaining academic quality, improve student persistence in classes.
2.2 While maintaining academic quality, increase semester to semester retention rates.

Charges	Membership	Support Resources	Procedures
• Oversee/direct/support the ongoing Learning Outcomes Assessment process • Encourage, collect, evaluate, and provide suggestions regarding on-going General Education Assessment of the Core Competencies • Communicate assessment results to faculty at large • Approve and revise an annual assessment report • Support and recommend an external standardized testing process • Recommend professional development stemming from or relating to assessment results to the Faculty Development Committee for consideration	-Dean of Institutional Research and Marketing: Co-chair -Faculty Assessment Leader: Co-chair -Provost -Dean of Academics and Student Services -Dean of Health Professions -Assistant Dean of Academics -FaCIT Staff member -Director of Academic Development -Faculty: Natural Sciences/Math/P.Ed. -Faculty: Humanities/Communications -Faculty: CTE/Business -Faculty: Behavioral & Social Sciences -Faculty: Health and Fire Sciences -Adjunct Faculty -Student Representative 15 members	Administrative Assistant to Dean of IRM	Meetings will be scheduled at least once per semester during the regular academic year. The Co-Chairs of the Committee may call additional meetings as needed.

Updated August 2015

Appendix C: Update on Assessment Report Recommendations (added 8/19/2015)

1. Alan Pfeifer will work with Information Services to develop an automated system that will allow faculty participation to be better tracked. Additionally, a more efficient querying tool will be created that will allow Assessment Committee members and Faculty Leaders to search the Assessment Database. Some discrepancy exists between the current electronic query of the database and conducting the same data analysis manually. This discrepancy will be resolved this year, but until then the database will have to be queried manually.

2. ETS Proficiency Profile results were already found on the College Dashboard. The addition of other recommended assessment data was rejected by OPIC in 2013, but new conversations will be held at a later point.

3. A report on the Assessment of Academic Achievement has been added to the list of regularly scheduled Board of Trustees reports. This report is currently scheduled for June. The Assessment Co-chairs will be available to answer any questions during that Board meeting.

4. New surveys on assessment will be created by the Assessment Committee in FY 2016 and distributed at a full faculty meeting.

5. The academic assessment schedule will be revised in FY 2016 with input from the Assessment Committee.

6. The Assessment Committee charges were revised and include the removal of the Assessment Core Team. The Assessment Committee will be charged with revising the Assessment Plan/System. General Education Competencies revisions will be addressed simultaneously.

7. The CFO has added a budget line item for "academic assessment." A copying number has also been supplied to the Faculty Assessment Leader.

8. President Cabinet approved the job description for the new Faculty Assessment Leader which will include a stipend.

9. The Dean of Institutional Research and Marketing will serve as co-chair to the Assessment Committee along with the newly created Faculty Assessment Leader.

10. Faculty Leaders have been charged with tracking faculty assessment participation in their areas and with identifying adjunct faculty who may participate in the assessment process.