

St. Petersburg College

Outcomes Assessment Review Report

Report Completion Date: December, 2009

Introduction

Institutional effectiveness and planning process is a continuous endeavor; operationally the process begins with a series of meetings by four oversight groups (Student Services, Educational Support Services, Administrative Services and Educational).

The four oversight groups are charged with the following key tasks:

- (i) Evaluate whether the institution successfully achieved its desired outcomes from the previous institutional effectiveness and planning cycle,
- (ii) Identify key areas requiring improvement that were identified in the assessment analysis, and
- (iii) Develop strategies and recommendations to formulate quality improvement initiatives for the next institutional effectiveness and planning cycle

Check the Appropriate Oversight Group:

	Student Services Oversight Group
	Educational Support Services Oversight Group
	Administrative Services Oversight Group
x	Educational Oversight Group

Educational Oversight Group

The Education Oversight Group members are appointed by the Senior VP Academic & Student Affairs. Their focus area is to review key educational outcomes information including but not limited to Educational Outcome Assessment Reports, State Accountability Measures Reports, and Student Survey Reports.

Status of each item identified in this report last year:

There were seven action plan item objectives that were recommended as a result of last year's review of academic assessments by the Educational Oversight Group. Of the seven recommended action items, four were completed during the calendar year. Table 1 contains a description of each of the seven action items along with their current completion status and relevant details.

The remaining action item objectives 'Identify models for capturing and disseminating best classroom practices associated with "real world" experiences', 'Evaluate the SSI process to include critical thinking items' and 'Develop an in-house student engagement survey', will be moved forward into areas needing improvement in the current year.

Table 1
2008-09 Action Plan Item Status

Objective	Status	Comments
<p>I. Identify models for capturing and disseminating best practices associated with “real world” experiences (practical applications)</p>	<p>Not fully completed, move forward</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Educational Oversight Committee will share courses of record repository and best practices determined as part of this process ○ Various disciplines have included A New Global Environment for Learning (ANGEL) communities designed to upload and share discipline “best practices” and are encouraging faculty to participate ○ Exploring the possibility of developing a global repository as part of the faculty champion process accessible through the QEP website or as part of the proposed center of excellence for teaching and learning ○ Best Practices should be organized (e.g., content, practice, technology, a specific lesson, and grouped each in terms of whether it is content specific or practice specific ○ Involve the Library and Ethics staff which has already identified high quality media references and placed them in a repository of Best Practices which is available to all instructors to utilize
<p>II. Suggest revisions to the current general education outcomes to Cabinet</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed revisions to the General Education Outcomes were approved by the College during 2009. The eleven original outcomes have been replaced with the following five: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Critical Thinking: Analyze, synthesize, reflect upon, and apply information to solve problems, and make decisions logically, ethically, and creatively ○ Communication: Listen , speak, read, and write effectively

Objective	Status	Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning: Understand and apply mathematical and scientific principles and methods ○ Information and Technology Fluency: Find, evaluate, organize, and use information using a variety of current technologies and other resources ○ Global Socio-Cultural Responsibility: Participate actively as informed and ethically responsible citizens in social, cultural, global, and environmental matters
<p>III. Propose to Cabinet that we utilize BOT rule 6Hx23-4.45 (6/20/00 Revision) that requires that all students who apply for graduation be available to take an assessment (e.g., MAPP or other general education areas)</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Presented to Cabinet as part of the 2007-08 and 2008-09 Educational Oversight Group Report ○ A detailed assessment plan has been created and the model proposed includes contacting graduates who have completed 45 credit hours ○ An assessment specification for the new Institutional Assessment contains domain and competency details for each of the five new outcomes, and is almost completed ○ The plan is to administer a pilot during Spring 2010
<p>IV. Provide faculty training in teaching and assessment for critical thinking</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Three Critical Thinking Institutes were conducted in 2008, and two in 2009 ○ Each Critical Thinking Institute included session(s) on assessment training for faculty ○ The Assessment Rubric for Critical Thinking (ARC), a global rubric template developed by SPC to provide a snapshot view of how student learning is being affected by the critical thinking initiative has

Objective	Status	Comments
		<p>been used by several disciplines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Carol Weideman, the assessment faculty champion assisted faculty with the creation and implementation of scenarios based on the ARC, in several specific disciplines ○ The Critical Thinking Assessment Test (CAT) was administered in 2009 ○ The CT gateway website is available at: www.spcollege.edu/criticalthinking ○ The Educational Outcomes website includes a ‘public’ access search component that allows ‘completed’ assessment reports to be viewed by any college employee
<p>V. Evaluate the SSI process to include critical thinking items</p>	<p>Not fully completed, move forward (combine with action VI.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SSI committee created and proposed a new set of questions, which were then provided to the faculty for their review ○ Faculty representatives reviewed and revised the questions ○ Faculty approved only one of the three proposed critical thinking items, which were needed to satisfy the QEP student measure ○ The revised set will be administered as a pilot during Spring 2010
<p>VI. Develop an in-house student engagement survey</p>	<p>Not fully completed, move forward (combine with action V.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SSI committee created and proposed a new set of questions, which were then provided to the faculty for their review ○ Faculty representatives reviewed and revised the questions ○ Faculty approved only one of the three proposed student engagement items ○ The revised set will be administered as a pilot during Spring 2010

Objective	Status	Comments
VII. Explore the processes for course development and review (e.g. developing new courses, three-year course review, etc.) with the purpose of improving teaching and learning across all modalities	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The current course development/ approval process and the three-year course review process were reviewed by program administrators, faculty, and C&I committee members○ The revised process is being piloted in paper form, and is scheduled to transition to an online process in 2010

Areas that need improvement:

In order to identify the areas needing improvement, the 2008-09 General Education and Program Assessment reports were reviewed. Each of the 2008-09 General Education and Program Assessments included action items intended to facilitate the improvement of these academic areas. To provide a College-level overview of the areas requiring the greatest need, an action item coverage analysis was conducted. It should be noted that the General Education Assessment has one to two General Education outcomes per assessment and often multiple action items per outcome as opposed to the Program Assessment which has two to thirteen major learning outcomes per Assessment with generally one item per Major Learning Objective (MLO) requiring attention.

The analysis consisted of the steps as follows:

For General Education Assessments:

1. Listed all action items from the completed 2008-09 General Education Assessment Reports (Four Gen Ed Goal Areas: Read/Write, Speak/Listen, Humanities, and Mathematics/ Problem Solving)
2. Conducted analysis for individual action items (7) and by Gen Ed Goal Area (2)
3. Analyzed coverage by overall area and by sub-area

For Program Assessments:

1. Listed all action items from either completed 2008-09 Program Assessment Reports or those in advanced stage of completion (Eight AS Programs: Criminal Justice Technology, Computer Networking, Dental Hygiene, Health Information Management, Hospitality Management, Human Services, Medical Lab Technology, and Nursing).
2. Conducted analysis for individual action items (28) and by program (7)
3. Analyzed coverage by overall area and by sub-area

Three areas were identified (or re-identified) as a result of the analysis. These three areas are:

1. Identify models for capturing and disseminating best practices associated with “real world” experiences (practical applications) [From 2008-09: #1]

2. Utilize the BOT rule that all students be required to take a general education assessment [Revised from 2008-09: #3]
3. Evaluate the SSI process to include critical thinking items and student engagement items [From 2008-09: #5, #6]

In addition, another area was identified through discussions with the members of the Educational oversight group. This area was to:

4. Explore the development of a center of excellence for teaching and learning to provide new and existing faculty training and mentoring in teaching and assessment to include critical thinking

For each area that needs improvement, identify objectives and action steps that will lead to improvement (these should be included in individual Unit Plans in the upcoming year)

It should be noted that assessments also discovered minor areas for improvements that will be acted upon by individual departments. However, aside from the objectives listed below, there were no systemic issues that require institutional direction.

I. Area Needing Improvement: *Incorporate “real world” experiences (practical applications) into the curriculum*

Aligned College Goal/Institutional Initiative:

College Goal: VII. Provide a diverse student body with innovative teaching and learning technologies in various instructional modalities. Institutional Initiative: N/A

Objective for Upcoming Year:

Identify models for capturing and disseminating best practices associated with “real world” experiences (practical applications)

Action Steps:

- Share courses of record repository and best practices among faculty
- Ensure that individual disciplines have resources (e.g., ANGEL community) to capture and disseminate best practices among faculty

II. Area Needing Improvement: *Improve the general education assessment process*

Aligned College Goal/Institutional Initiative:

College Goal: X. Perform continuous institutional self-evaluation and efficient and effective operations to assure a culture of excellence in student services and academic success.

Institutional Initiative: N/A

Objective for Upcoming Year:

Utilize the BOT rule 6Hx23-4.45 (6/20/00 Revision) that students be required to take a general education assessment

Related excerpt from BOT rule 6Hx23-4.45:

“II. Assessment Testing (c) Students pursuing all degrees and certificates may be required to participate in an assessment of General Education outcomes.”

Action Steps:

- Pilot the new online Gen Ed Assessment process

III. Area Needing Improvement: *Identify ways to improve the Student Survey of Instruction (SSI)*

Aligned College Goal/ Institutional Initiative:

College Goal: VII. Provide a diverse student body with innovative teaching and learning technologies in various instructional modalities. Institutional Initiative: B. Continue the critical thinking initiative to conclude the work with the first four programs, as well as continuation of the Critical Thinking Academy, academic roundtables and other activities included in the QEP.

College Goal: X. Perform continuous institutional self-evaluation and efficient and effective operations to assure a culture of excellence in student services and academic success.

Institutional Initiative: N/A

Objective for Upcoming Year:

Evaluate the SSI process to include critical thinking items and student engagement items

Action Steps:

- Create new critical thinking items and student engagement items for the SSI
- Pilot new critical thinking items and student engagement items on the SSI

IV. Areas Needing Improvement: *Improve collegewide teaching, learning, and assessing*

Aligned College Goal/ Institutional Initiative:

College Goal: VII. Provide a diverse student body with innovative teaching and learning technologies in various instructional modalities. Institutional Initiative: N/A

College Goal: IX. Recruit and develop an outstanding, diverse faculty and staff. Institutional Initiative: C. Provide professional development programs and other support for faculty and staff to facilitate the success of a diverse student body, including those with special learning needs or disabilities.

Objective for Upcoming Year: Develop a Center of Excellence for Teaching and Learning to provide new and existing faculty professional development in teaching, assessment, and critical thinking

Action Steps:

- Research current models and gather feedback from member of the Ed Oversight group and faculty
- Develop a comprehensive plan using available resources
- Proposed plan to Cabinet and other member of senior leadership
- If approved, develop initial steps for implementation

In addition, one other area was identified through discussions with the members of the Educational oversight group. This area relates to conducting a review of the C&I process. The resulting objective and respective action steps for 2009-10 are listed below.

V. Areas Needing Improvement: *Review the existing process related to the Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) process with a focus on improving teaching and learning at SPC*

Aligned College Goal/ Institutional Initiative:

College Goal: X. Perform continuous institutional self-evaluation and efficient and effective operations to assure a culture of excellence in student services and academic success.

Institutional Initiative: N/A

Objective for Upcoming Year: Review the current Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) process for possible enhancements

Action Steps:

- Utilize current C&I subcommittee to research the current process and gather feedback from members of the Ed Oversight group, program administrators, and faculty
- After a thorough review of the current processes, the subcommittee will make recommendations for enhancements to the C&I process
- Any identified changes will be presented to the Cabinet and other members of senior leadership
- If approved, develop initial steps for implementation of the changes

Completion and Review Process Information

This Outcomes Assessment Review report was prepared by Jesse Coraggio and Maggie Tymms on December 17, 2009.