Sauk Valley Community College

Academic Assessment System Evaluation

Annual Report

2015-2016

Written by:

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

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee on 5/6/2016

Approved by the Assessment Committee on 8/24/2016

Preamble

This report follows the structure as dictated in Appendix A:

1. System Participation
2. Documentation
3. Communication of the System
4. Accomplishments
5. Recommendations

With the addition of:

- Appendix A: System Evaluation Checklist.
- Appendix B: Aggregated General Education Assessment Data (2011-2015)
- Appendix C: HLC Feedback about Assessment

1.   System Participation

- 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/discipline project)
- Determine % of adjunct faculty who have documented participation for the prior year and set benchmark for next year

100% of full-time faculty have met the expected minimum level for Gen Ed assessments. Due to revisions of area assessments, not all full-time faculty completed Area Assessments – this is discussed further in Section 4. Adjunct participation is discussed in Section 5.

Assessment data was discussed at the following meetings. All committee minutes are found on FAST.

Full Faculty Meetings
Date	Topic
October 7th, 2015	Updates on the Assessment System, Gen Ed data from 2014-2015 (no minutes)
November 4th, 2015	Best Practices in Assessment Small Group Discussions
February 17th, 2016	Updates, Gen Ed data from Fall 2015, faculty poll on rubrics

Area Meetings
Date	Topic
October 14th, 2015	Gen Data and Area Assessments
October 21st, 2015	Gen Data and Area Assessments

Assessment Committee Meetings
Date	Topic
August 19th, 2015	New Committee Structure, Revision of last year's report
September 25, 2015	Four hour meeting on Area/Gen Ed/Discipline assessments

October 28th, 2015   Planning for Best Practices in Assessment discussion with full faculty

January 20th, 2016   Updated assessment plan, database changes, Fall Gen Ed data

February 24th, 2016   Use of rubrics in Assessment, possible changes to assessment system

April 6th, 2016   Radiology Assessment System review

May 6th, 2016   End of year wrap-up; review of Assessment Report.

2.   Documentation

- 100% of areas have minutes in place in FAST (based on sampling dates determined by schedule calling for assessment tasks)

Areas were instructed to specifically address Assessment during their meetings of 10/14/2015 and 10/21/2015. The Areas of Social Sciences, Natural Sciences/Math, and Humanities all show minutes posted on FAST from one or both of those dates, while Health Careers and CTE do not.

- 100% of Full-faculty assessment-related discussions have minutes in place in the Assessment Folder/FAST

Of the three full-faculty assessment-related discussions noted above, two of them have minutes posted in FAST. For that one meeting where minutes weren't posted (10/7/2015), the majority of the items discussed were presented in the Assessment Committee minutes from 9/25/2015, along with the assessment data presented in this appendix.

- Previous Year's annual report is in place in the Assessment Folder.

The 2013-2015 Assessment Report is posted on FAST.

- ETS Proficiency Profile report in public place on website

The Spring 2016 ETS Proficiency Profile Summary Report is posted in the Institutional Research & Planning area on the website.

3.   Communication of the System

- Pertinent data is presented on the SVCC website

A copy of the Assessment Plan, all previous Annual Reports, Committee Minutes, and Assessment Data are available on FAST.

- Annual Academic Assessment Report is given to the Board of Trustees

A summary of this report is scheduled to be presented to the Board of Trustees in Summer 2016.

4.   Accomplishments

- Progress on prior year recommendations:

1. Updated Assessment Committee Structure

As appended to last year's assessment report, the Assessment Committee was restructured to include a balance of faculty and non-faculty. Midway through the year, some Committee members were assigned new titles, and their positions updated accordingly on the Committee charge, with one change being the VP of Academics and Student Services becoming co-chair.

2. Updated Assessment Plan

The Assessment Plan was updated in the Spring 2016, and approved by the Assessment Committee on 5/6/2016.

3. Area and Program level Assessments

Areas were given the freedom to reformulate their Area-level assessments. As of May 2016, two areas (the Mathematics sub-area of Natural Sciences/Mathematics and Social Sciences) have developed new Area Assessments for use starting Spring 2016.

Faculty were also given the freedom to formulate Program-level assessments (to be used in place of an Area level assessment for the purposes of satisfying their reporting requirement) to allow for more focused data to be collected; as of Spring 2016 no program-level assessments have been created.

- Professional Development:

Three members of the Assessment Committee (Michelle Barkley, James Chisholm, Steven Nunez) attended the 2016 Illinois Community College Assessment Fair (held 2/26/2016 at Harper College). Two members of the Assessment Committee attended the HLC Annual Conference (held 4/17-4/19/2016 in Chicago, IL).

The full faculty meeting on 11/4/2015 was used to facilitate small-group discussions among faculty about Best Practices in Assessment. Feedback from these discussions was scanned and posted on FAST. One item coming out of these discussions was the desire for standardized rubrics for use in collecting Assessment data. These were researched and a sample rubric was presented to the faculty on 2/17/2016 (see minutes from the above for more details).

- Curriculum/Budgetary proposals arising from assessment data:

None.

5.   Recommendations
- System changes (if needed)

Changes to the database, such as those related to creating and editing assessments, continue to be made.

- Tasks for next year (via suggested meeting schedule)

1. **Adjunct Faculty Involvement**.   Particularly in areas without any full-time faculty. Suggested ideas include:
    a. Formulating Standardized Gen Ed assessments that can be presented to faculty to give in their class (or possibly directly integrated into Canvas).
    b. Developing Area assessments for those areas without full time faculty (ideally with adjunct faculty participation in the development process)
    c. Provide assessment training as part of start of year in-service days.

2. **Closing the Loop**. This was something the recent HLC report highlighted, which was a lack of an institutional mechanism for using Gen Ed assessment data to recommend changes that will improve student learning.

It was also recommended that the first full-faculty assessment meeting include:

   o Presentation of purpose and philosophy of the Assessment System
   o What changes have been made to the Assessment System
   o Recommendations for doing assessments (namely, repetition of gen ed assessments, areas choosing their assessment)
   o Presenting and analyzing the previous year's assessment data.

- Professional development recommendations

This year, only 1 faculty member was able to attend the Illinois Community College Assessment Fair; for next year we would like to have a larger faculty presence at this important meeting.

- General Education Assessment Project

There was no Gen Ed assessment project this year.

Appendix A - System Evaluation Checklist

<u>Checklist</u>: Annual Assessment Committee Evaluation of the Assessment System (approved for FY 2016)

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/discipline 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.
- ETS Proficiency Profile report in public place on website

3) Communication of the system (public webpage, news releases, etc)
- Pertinent data is presented on the SVCC website
- Annual Academic Assessment Report is given to the Board of Trustees

4) Accomplishments
- Progress on prior year recommendations
- Professional Development
  - Assessment Fair Attendance (Spring)
  - Other conferences attended (including presentation)
  - In-house development activities
- Curriculum/Budgetary proposals arising from assessment data

5) Recommendations
- System changes (if needed)
- Tasks for next year (via suggested meeting schedule)
- Professional development recommendations
- General Education Assessment Project

Appendix B – Aggregated General Education Assessment Data (2011-2016)

	2015-2016 Year					2014-2015 Year				
Compentency	**Total**	**a**	**b**	**c**	**d**	**Total**	**a**	**b**	**c**	**d**
GE 1 Problem Solving	17	99	79	81	66	12	77	74	71	65
GE 2A Writing	12	86	79	82	82	8	88	88	91	83
GE 2B Oral Present.	11	89	77	76	63	8	93	87	86	88
GE 2C Collaboration	4	100	90	91	100	6	93	84	92	90
GE 2D Reading	9	79	83	75	72	6	80	90	60	74
GE 2E Listening	2		63		76	2	87	84	84	81
GE 3 Technology	8	96	75			7	97	96		
GE 4 Quant. Reasoning	14	96	77	78		11	78	65	26	
GE 5A Research	6	69	55	66	52	6	83	79	75	68
GE 6 Ethical Reasoning	3	89	91	92		8	96	91	92	

	2013-2014 Year					2012-2013 Year				
Compentency	**Total**	**a**	**b**	**c**	**d**	**Total**	**a**	**b**	**c**	**d**
GE 1 Problem Solving	11	74	77	80	75	7	87	81	71	74
GE 2A Writing	6	89	83	78	93	4	89	69	84	71
GE 2B Oral Present.	9	99	96	88	96	6	88	86	83	92
GE 2C Collaboration	5	88	83	67	81	1	86			86
GE 2D Reading	5	74	57	46	78	8	68	70	56	64
GE 2E Listening	3	44	74	35	35	1	50	83	67	83
GE 3 Technology	4	100	95			4	100	88		
GE 4 Quant. Reasoning	7	91	84	96		4	91	93	100	
GE 5A Research	4	100	100	92	73	11	77	63	54	68
GE 6 Ethical Reasoning	7	87	90	90		4	69	34	34	

	2011-2012 Year					2011-2016 Aggregated Data				
Compentency	**Total**	**a**	**b**	**c**	**d**	**Total**	**a**	**b**	**c**	**d**
GE 1 Problem Solving	5	70	82	71	52	52	83	78	77	67
GE 2A Writing	3	67	89	64	66	87	85	81	81	82
GE 2B Oral Present.	4	91	84	71	98	39	93	87	83	87
GE 2C Collaboration	2	77	77	77	73	18	91	85	84	89
GE 2D Reading	3	69	63	100	71	85	75	76	67	71
GE 2E Listening	2		21	78	62	10	69	63	69	66
GE 3 Technology	0					23	97	85		
GE 4 Quant. Reasoning	5	80	58	67		41	87	75	63	
GE 5A Research	6	87	87	72	83	33	80	72	67	67
GE 6 Ethical Reasoning	3	99	100	100		25	87	77	79	

Aggregate percentages for each sub-compentency (a – d) are listed for each Gen. Ed. Competency in addition with the total number of courses for which assessment data were collected. Not every sub-compentency was sampled equally within a particular Gen. Ed. Competency. Cells marked red have an aggregate percentage less than 60%, while those marked yellow fall between 60% and 70%.

Appendix C – HLC Feedback about Assessment

Errors of Fact

2.B.

SVCC's website contains information about accreditation both by the HLC and program-specific accreditation for nursing, fire science, and the radiation technology programs.

Only the radiation technology program is accredited. Other programs listed have been approved by relevant state agencies.

Concerns

While the inconsistency in exposure is typical in community colleges, SVCC may wish to consider identifying ways to review assessment data for students in career and technical programs separately or specifically in order to ensure that these students learning needs are being met in this area.

In 2015, the college employed 44 full-time and 91 adjunct faculty. The majority of courses are taught by full-time faculty. As noted in the Assurance Argument, this number is sufficient to carry out the roles of faculty, but may be edging toward inadequate. The college notes that the average load is 38.5 hours, so the standard overload is 8.5 hours. Some veteran faculty apparently regularly teach even larger overloads. Five programs do not have full-time faculty to lead the program. The college notes declining enrollment and the rural nature of the institution, but does not indicate a plan for addressing this looming problem. The team recommends the institution create a plan to address declining fulltime faculty and increasing reliance on adjunct faculty.

SVCC appears to be paying specific attention to this need for both faculty and staff however it will remain an area where continuous focus and attention is required - even, and perhaps most especially, in challenging financial times. It is critical that the College ensure adequate professional development is provided to its staff in student support services areas. Evidence provided now is minimal and should be strengthened significantly for the next review.

Along with other colleges in Illinois, SVCC offers guarantees of general education transfer or relevant workforce skills depending on the student's degree. SVCC could strengthen its argument that this serves as a measure of the assurance that its programs are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum by providing relevant data on student transfer, student success at transfer institutions, job placement and salary data as well as indicating whether any students have taken action on the guarantee program.

While all of these are positive, the information presented about the Assessment Plan including the Assessment Report seem to be largely about the processes utilized in assessment rather than on the actual outcomes of assessment and the resultant actions taken. While the Assessment Committee is charged with evaluating the assessment system overall, a majority of the evaluation metrics listed in the assessment plan seem focused on compliance with use of the system rather than evaluating the overall effectiveness of assessment efforts at SVCC as well as use of assessment data to carry out the two-fold purpose of assessment as identified in the assessment plan. SVCC appears to have put a positive framework in place and built a relative set of tools for implementing that framework, however SVCC may benefit from further streamlining and clarifying the tools and processes used to ensure that the institution isn't becoming overburdened by its own processes and not spending adequate time reviewing the important student learning outcomes and relevant assessment data to improve curriculum and instruction.

As noted in 3.C, five programs do not have fulltime faculty as leaders. SVCC must designate a process to ensure that regular review of assessment data for improvement purposes is not overlooked in these programs. A strong feedback loop to the adjunct faculty is recommended.

One of the largest gaps identified by the current team is in the area of use of assessment data to improve student learning. While SVCC presented a couple of examples of use of assessment level data to revise curriculum, little evidence was provided to demonstrate how assessment data was used to improve student learning. Revision of curriculum does not necessarily lead to improvements in student learning. SVCC would be well served to ensure that the focus of its robust assessment plan remains, at its core, about improving student learning and that appropriate staffing, dedication, and attention remain on executing the assessment plan throughout the entirety of the next review cycle with appropriate evidence provided of ongoing attention to assessment throughout the entire cycle.

On an annual basis, staff complete a self-evaluation and receive an evaluation from their supervisor. However, neither of these documents appears to specifically address ongoing training and professional development and its effectiveness from the perspective of the employee. SVCC may wish to consider reviewing these tools to ensure that professional development is considered a part of these evaluation processes and that this data can potentially be utilized for planning for future professional development.

SVCC has developed processes and procedures as well as a relevant financial processes timeline that, in years when there are resource allocations that can be made, should essentially ensure that allocations are made in a manner that is in accordance with the mission, vision and strategic plan. However, the major piece of evidence provided to demonstrate that all of these processes and procedures are carried out in a way that ensures allocation of resources in alignment with mission and priorities is from a point in time at which no allocations could be made due to expected budget shortfall. Since the processes should be ongoing and repeated it's concerning the institution could not demonstrate a pattern of such meetings and discussions to highlight that this does occur on a regular and repeating basis.

SVCCs assessment of student learning includes but is not limited to the institution's assessment of student learning efforts as described in the assessment plan, ICCB mandated program review, the new ICCB mandated PTR review process. In addition, overarching metrics such as student success, retention, completion and transfer provide a framework for measuring success in these areas. Each of these evaluating efforts should be included - and evidence has been provided to demonstrate that they are included - as the institution takes on its own cross institutional planning efforts through annual operational planning and the longer term strategic planning efforts. These efforts feed back into the budgeting process and do appear to have an alignment with it. It is suggested that due to the number of activities and the need for all of them to interrelate that SVCC consider mapping these overarching processes and identify specific ways in which they are to overlap and intermingle as a means to ensure that the effectiveness of these processes in achieving their objectives could be measured and gaps and overlaps could be identified.

SVCC detailed a long listing of items related to its planning for emerging factors as detailed in 5.C.5. All of these are important and relevant to the criterion. However, largely missing from this list were externally generated and/or externally focused reports. SVCC has indicated in previous areas it will join the National Community College Benchmarking Project in order to better understand its performance relative to other community colleges. SVCC should continue to see out and incorporate other external resources, tools, knowledge and insights which might also aid in driving the planning processes.