2020-21 Assessment Report in Program Review

Art:

Date: 10-22-2020

- 2020-2021 3-Year Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Art (Studio, Media, Graphic Design and Photography)

Sorted by: Program

SI Section Templates: Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21, Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

Art

Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21

2020-2021 3-Year Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Art (Studio, Media, Graphic Design and Photography)

Courses	% Students Exceeds	% Students Meets	% Students Doesn't Meet	% Students N/A
Art B1	53.25%	10.58%	15.77%	20.41%
Art B2	57.58%	21.21%	7.58%	13.64%
Art B3				
Art B4	53%	31%	10%	6%
Art B5	48.28%	43.1%	5.17%	3.45%
Art B6				
Art B7				
Art B8				
Art B9				
Art B10	33.7%	40.22%	9.78%	16.3%
Art B11	23.01%	76.92%	0%	0%
Art B12	0%	100%	0%	0%
Art B13	83.33%	16.67%	0%	0%
Art B16	80.36%	1.79%	16.07%	1.79%
Art B17	82.35%	14.71%	2.94%	0%
Art B20	75%	6.48%	10.19%	8.33%
Art B24	36.84%	50%	10.53%	2.63%
Art B25	84.38%	0%	3.12%	12.5%
Art B26	65%	15%	11.67%	8.33%
Art B35	39.41%	27.06%	15.88%	17.65%
Art B36	37.5%	38.64%	13.07%	10.8%
Art B37	24.04%	26.92%	8.65%	40.38%
Art B38				

Courses	% Students Exceeds	% Students Meets	% Students Doesn't Meet	% Students N/A
Art B40	66.67%	5.56%	22.22%	5.56%
Art B41	56.25%	43.75%	0%	0%
Art B42	71.43%	21.43%	7.14%	0%
Art B43	91.67%	4.17%	0%	4.17%
Art B44	85.42%	4.17%	6.25%	0%
Art B45	73.33%	13.33%	0%	13.33%
Art B46	90.91%	0%	4.55%	4.55%
Art B47	75%	0%	6.25%	18.75%
Art B48	100%	0%	0%	0%

Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

2020-2021 3-Year Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Art (Studio, Media, Graphic Design and Photography)

PLAN:
Describe the process, timing, and tools used to assess the courses for the program.
(see examples)

Each spring semester the department assess SLOs for all courses. The fulltime faculty each assess the courses they teach, and adjuncts participate voluntarily. One weakness in the process is that there are several classes only taught by adjunct and we don't have data for all classes. Faculty have become more comfortable with eLumen and we typically meet as a group to have eLumen data entry session where experienced faculty assist others.

REFLECT:
Based on the SLO performance data listed in the table, describe both the strengths and weaknesses of the program.
(see examples)

In general students are meeting or exceeding the expected results for SLOs in the department. In advanced courses in particular the data shows that students are doing well. The courses with the lowest success rates are some of our most difficult, including Art History classes that involve more traditional testing and research.

REFINE:
Summarize the changes that discipline faculty plan to implement based on the program's strengths and weaknesses listed above.
(see examples)

The missing data for classes only taught by adjuncts is unfortunate and demonstrates the need for a full-time faculty in the Studio Arts program. We plan to continue to push for the Painting and Drawing full-time position. This year we are reviewing a vast majority of art courses and we plan

on refining the SLOs based on previous assessment data and to narrow them down for each course. By having fewer, broader SLOs we hope to be able to assess them more frequently and create additional useful data for the department.

DIALOGUE:
Explain the frequency and content of assessment planning for the program (e.g., department meetings, advisory boards, etc.). (see examples)

Assessment is a standing agenda item for department meeting and is discussed at a minimum of four meetings each year. Additionally, in the spring we typically have work sessions to help each other with gathering and entering data and reflecting on what we see. We are represented on the Assessment committee. We also find that we informally discuss assessment weekly. We are fortunate that almost all of our classes on the main campus are taught in our dedicated buildings, so we see each other often and have conversations about assessment.

2020-21 Assessment Report in Program Review

Electronics Technology:

    • 2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Electronics Technology

SI Section Templates: Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21, Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

Date: 10-22-2020

Sorted by: Program

Electronics Technology

Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21

2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Electronics Technology

Courses	% Students Exceeds	% Students Meets	% Students Doesn't Meet	% Students N/A
ELET B1a	14.29%	43.7%	15.13%	26.89%
ELET B1b	53.57%	45.24%	1.19%	0%
ELET B3	74.51%	25.49%	0%	0%
ELET B4	71.74%	26.09%	2.17%	0%
ELET B55a	0%	0%	0%	0%
ELET B56	16.67%	43.33%	40%	0%
ELET B58	41.79%	42.6%	0.9%	14.8%
ELET B61	59.42%	38.23%	4.35%	0%
ELET B62	33.33%	58.33%	8.33%	0%
ELET B63	38.59%	55.56%	5.56%	0%
ELET B70	40.48%	21.43%	28.57%	9.52%

Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Electronics Technology

PLAN:
Describe the process, timing, and tools used to assess the courses for the program.
(see examples)

As a background on our program, there are not sections taught by many different professors and that have dozens or perhaps hundreds of sections of a particular course. In our program, professors specialize in specific courses, so the plans for assessment, reflection, and action depend on the particular professor teaching the course. Each professor approaches assessment differently. Generally, professors look at test results that are divided into SLO's. They base the SLO categories (exceeds expectations. meets expectations, etc.) on the particular exam grade for each SLO. Other types of assessments, for example, have skills assessments or completions of lab work as the means of obtaining the categories. The timing of assessments vary from

professor to professor.

Several of us are hoping to integrate assessment into our Canvas courses. That training took a back seat last spring and the fall semester due to the inordinate amount of work that has gone into hybrid course development. Yet, we are still awaiting training/staff development to this end.

REFLECT:
Based on the SLO performance data listed in the table, describe both the strengths and weaknesses of the program.
(see examples)

One of the greatest challenges in making an assessment of strengths and weaknesses is that different professors apply different criteria to determine the categories that each student is assigned to. In other words, the meaning of "exceeds...", "meets...", "Does not meet...", and "Not Applicable" differs from professor to professor.

From the data, we can see that the greatest number of "does not meet expectations" occurs in ELET B56 and ELET B70. There is one course with zero assessment data. Beginning (first semester) courses, with the exception of B70, show a small number of "does not meet expectations". This is evidence of marked improvements made over the past several years.

The most technical, advanced-level classes have made improvements in this category over the past several years. We believe that this is not just changing student expectations (such as lowering them), but rather the assessment process being used to improve course curriculum, directing the creation of additional student resources, and altering lecture and lab procedures to ensure that more of the students are "getting" the material.

REFINE:
Summarize the changes that discipline faculty plan to implement based on the program's strengths and weaknesses listed above.
(see examples)

It is apparent that we need to focus on the following things:
1. More consistent and regular assessment reporting participation by program faculty. For some professors in this and other programs, it will need to be contractually addressed to motivate them.
2. Investigation into the reasons why ELET B56 and ELET B70 had more students who did not meet expectations.
3. Standardize the meaning of the rating categories among all program faculty so that the data is more relevant to the program as a whole.
4. After COVID, it will be important to resume the program meetings.
5. Continue to look at the SLO data for each course to identify trouble spots and work to correct them.

DIALOGUE:
Explain the frequency and content of assessment planning for the program (e.g., department meetings, advisory boards, etc.). (see examples)

Our program faculty meetings for the past couple of years have mainly focused on the challenges we are having as a program, so to be honest, assessment discussions have been on the "back burner" so to speak. With less than desirable SLO data from which to evaluate the program's successes and failures, assessment needs to be brought to the "front burner"

Major curricular changes, as well as improvements of the course by utilizing current technology is usually a regular topic for the Advisory Committee meetings.

Also, we have started to adopt "Curriculum Steering Committes" when a course needs to be revised.

2020-21 Assessment Report in Program Review

Health Information Technology:

 • 2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Health Info Technology

SI Section Templates: Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21, Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

Date: 10-22-2020

 Sorted by: Program

Health Information Technology

Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21

2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Health Info Technology

Courses	% Students Exceeds	% Students Meets	% Students Doesn't Meet	% Students N/A
HEIT B10	74.81%	4.44%	11.85%	8.89%
HEIT B11	0%	0%	0%	0%
HEIT B12	89.08%	7.47%	2.3%	1.15%
HEIT B15	89.29%	5.36%	2.68%	2.68%
HEIT B16	96.15%	3.85%	0%	0%
HEIT B20	86.54%	14.46%	0%	0%
HEIT B21	0%	0%	0%	0%
HEIT B22	0%	0%	0%	0%
HEIT B23	0%	0%	0%	0%
HEIT B24	85.94%	6.25%	7.81%	0%
HEIT B25	88.89%	4.44%	6.67%	0%
HEIT B26	100%	0%	0%	0%
HEIT B60	57.89%	15.79%	15.79%	10.53%
HEIT B30	66.67%	33.33%	0%	0%

Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Health Info Technology

PLAN:
Describe the process, timing, and tools used to assess the courses for the program.
(see examples)

Analytics for each assignment are run after each assignment's due date has lapsed. Faculty review the results for each assignment to identify trends and problematic areas. When areas of opportunity are identified faculty review the concept(s) with the course via lecture and/or feedback. The concepts are also added to future assignments in the course to measure if the

concept has been successfully grasped.

REFLECT:
Based on the SLO performance data listed in the table, describe both the strengths and weaknesses of the program. (see examples)

Our strengths and weaknesses are the same, our success rate. As a program our totals were:

	N/A	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
HEIT Program	3.86%	82.03%	7.81%	6.30%

The HIT Faculty work hard to help students succeed and often hold virtual study group sessions with students in addition to regular office hours. This commitment from our faculty is one of our best strengths. However, seeing that most students exceed expectations, earn a B or higher, warrants our review of the rigor of the assignments of each course. The first goal identified above will help us identify areas of opportunity and ensure we are meeting all the required Bloom's Taxonomy levels identified in our accreditation standards.

REFINE:
Summarize the changes that discipline faculty plan to implement based on the program's strengths and weaknesses listed above. (see examples)

The faculty has moved from an individual curriculum review process to a group curriculum review process. Also, we have reformatted our department meetings to include a report on the progress of curriculum review at each meeting. The HIT faculty hold department meetings twice a month. We have formalized our meetings to include standard discussion topics, an agenda for each meeting, and minutes are recorded at each meeting as well. All meeting documentation is saved in a community drive where all faculty can access all documentation as well as our area dean. Lastly, the area dean is now invited to each department meeting.

DIALOGUE:
Explain the frequency and content of assessment planning for the program (e.g., department meetings, advisory boards, etc.). (see examples)

The HIT faculty, including the Faculty Director, meet twice a month and the area dean has a standing open invitation to each meeting. Assessment planning is addressed and reviewed at each department meeting. Program self-evaluation and outcome measurement are critical to the HIT program earning and maintaining accreditation. The HIT Advisory Committee meets at a minimum of twice per year. Each meeting of the advisory committee includes general program performance, SLO performance, accreditation required outcomes performance, etc.

2020-21 Assessment Report in Program Review

Ornamental Horticulture:

• 2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Ornamental Horticulture

SI Section Templates: Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21, Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

Date: 10-22-2020

 Sorted by: Program

<mark>Ornamental Horticulture</mark>

Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21

2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Ornamental Horticulture

Courses	% Students Exceeds	% Students Meets	% Students Doesn't Meet	% Students N/A
N/A				

Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Ornamental Horticulture

PLAN:
Describe the process, timing, and tools used to assess the courses for the program.
(see examples)

Assessment tools used include multiple choice questions, short answers, fill in responses, Pre/Post test comparisons, and lab practicals. Faculty reviews the class data and compare the data with past years.

REFLECT:
Based on the SLO performance data listed in the table, describe both the strengths and weaknesses of the program.
(see examples)

The program has consistently met the fundamental goal or our program of an SLO success rate of 70% or higher, which is a strength.

REFINE:
Summarize the changes that discipline faculty plan to implement based on the program's strengths and weaknesses listed above. (see examples)

Continue to assess as before. Be mindful of the new online format as some students struggle with exams from a distance.

DIALOGUE:
Explain the frequency and content of assessment planning for the program (e.g., department meetings, advisory boards, etc.). (see examples)

The program has a yearly meeting with local industry to evaluate the content of the program and the focus of the SLOs which drives the program's assessments.

2020-21 Assessment Report in Program Review

Student Success & Counseling:

  • 2020-2021 Hybrid Instructional Program Review Student Success and Counseling

SI Section Templates: Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21, Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

Date: 10-22-2020

 Sorted by: Program

Student Success & Counseling

Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21

2020-2021 Hybrid Instructional Program Review Student Success and Counseling

Courses	% Students Exceeds	% Students Meets	% Students Doesn't Meet	% Students N/A
STDV B1				
STDV B2				
STDV B6				

Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

2020-2021 Hybrid Instructional Program Review Student Success and Counseling

PLAN:
Describe the process, timing, and tools used to assess the courses for the program.
(see examples)

Below are examples of the SLOs The Counseling Department assessed during this cycle:

  • **STDV B1**, to assess the SLO, the instructors created discussions board to discuss about educational planning, and students completed their Comprehensive Student Education Plan.
  • **STDV B2**, to assess the SLO, the students had to do a Career/Transfer Exploration Paper, Values inventory, and a Values Reflection Paper.
  • **STDV B6**, to assess the SLO, the instructors implemented a Money Management and a Budget exercise. In addition, the Department conducts substantive evaluation resulting in planning and program improvement, as discussed in the last section of this document: "Dialogue".

REFLECT:
Based on the SLO performance data listed in the table, describe both the strengths and weaknesses of the program.
(see examples)

Overall, students in the STDV courses met or exceeded the Outcomes for the course (approximately 75.94% to 83.8%). The student development courses are meant to introduce students to college study skills and policies and procedures that they will need to become successful college students. To perform the assessment, multiple tasks had to be completed. How this was accomplished is up to the instructor due to Academic Freedom. Because there is a lack of consistency, it is difficult to attribute the success of the program to one factor.

REFINE:
Summarize the changes that discipline faculty plan to implement based on the program's strengths and weaknesses listed above.
(see examples)

To improve consistency of assessment, the Counseling Faculty will develop a standardized assessment that all instructors can implement. Also, the Counseling Faculty will work to align how each section is taught.

DIALOGUE:
Explain the frequency and content of assessment planning for the program (e.g., department meetings, advisory boards, etc.).
(see examples)

One of the outcomes for the Counseling Courses is the development of a comprehensive student education plan (CSEP). The Counseling Faculty met to discuss the accuracy of the CSEPs. As a result of this review, it was determined that there is a necessity to align how the CSEPs are developed in the courses, and that more individualized trainings for adjunct faculty needed to occur. The Counseling Faculty will develop structures to ensure that the adjunct faculty are normed to policies, procedures, and regulations that determine student success.

The Faculty initiated, restated, and improved SLO statements as follows, effective the 2019-2020 academic year:

SLO 01 Students will be able to identify college resources that support their academic success. (Institutional SLO: Communicate Effectively and Engage Productively)

SLO 02 Students, in collaboration with a counselor/advisor, will develop a Student Educational Plan that is in alignment with their educational and career goals. (Institutional SLO: Communicate Effectively, Demonstrate Competency, Think Critically)

SLO 03 Students will be able to identify computer-based resources and to implement it into their overall educational goals. (Institutional SLO: Demonstrate Competency, Think Critically, Engage Productively)

Counseling Faculty regularly assess LSOs during Counseling student appointments or drop-in sessions. These are reported annually in their Mode A evaluation packet through an SLO assessment report. It detailed how Counseling Faculty assessed, reflected, and refined their practice. To review and report LSO data, and incorporate in an annual review, the data will be aggregated and shared with faculty, during the annual retreat.

The Counseling Faculty continuously review efficacy, content, and accuracy of the education plans the Counseling Faculty develop. They also education plan completion data as provided by Institutional Research and MIS reporting. They actively participated in the scripting of Ellucian's DegreeWorks, and now Hobson's Starfish Degree Planner and regularly provide feedback in the development of how the new technology can provide accurate CSEPs moving forward for the 2019-2020 Academic Year.