

Big Bend Community College 2019-2020 Assessment Report

Submitted by Sean Twohy

07/01/2020

Table of Contents

Page 1: Moving Toward Program-level Thinking

- 7-Year Plan
- Prepackaged Activity

Page 2: Creating Clarity and Tightening Up Loose Ends

- Redefining Outcomes
- Adjusting Dates
- Utilizing In-service
- Assessment Videos

Page 4: General Faculty Assessment Reports

- Program-level
- Course-level

Page 7: Institutional Outcome 1 Faculty Assessment Reports

- Program-level
- Course-level

Page 12: Prepackaged Activity Faculty Assessment Reports

- Program-level
- Course-Level

Page 16: Reflection and Response to Faculty Assessment Reports

Page 18: Assessment Committee Plans for 2020/2021

- Sharing and Discussing the 2019/2020 Assessment Report
- Training for Assessment Committee Members
- Prepackaged Computation Plan
- Update and Simplify the Online Submission Process
- Define the Purpose of Assessment

Big Bend Community College 2019-2020 Assessment Report

Over the last three years, Big Bend's Assessment Committee has been working toward transitioning from a focus on course-level assessment, to thinking about assessment at the higher level, as well as defining and refining a process for assessment which allows for faculty to understand and take part in assessment more smoothly.

Moving Toward Program-level Thinking

In the last five years, while Big Bend has moved toward creating a more standard submission process and organizational theme, we have taken great care to allow assessment to be meaningful and practical for faculty by leaving the course-level assessment planning and execution entirely up to each instructor. While many of the reports the Assessment Committee received were very meaningful to the faculty doing them, those course-level reports were not planned and organized in such a way as to allow the college to make meaningful sense of them at a program, departmental, and institutional level. In addition, while some faculty loved the freedom of relatively little direction, other faculty had trouble understanding what classes and outcomes they were supposed to assess, when they were supposed to assess them, and what those assessments should look like. In order to address these issues, the Assessment Committee took two steps: Creating a 7-Year Plan and creating a Prepackaged Assessment Activity.

7-Year Plan: The first step was to have each department and program create a 7-Year Plan for assessment. This 7-Year Plan outlines which Program Outcomes are associated with each class, and which year each class and outcome is going to be assessed. As a college-wide standard, we required all faculty to assess the three Institutional Outcomes, over three years, in coordination with each other. In year one, the faculty at the college would assess Institutional Outcome 1 (communication), in year two faculty would assess Institutional Outcome 2 (computation) and in year three the faculty would assess Institutional Outcome 3 (human relations). Through this coordination, meaningful data could be made across programs and assessment efforts could be shared and understood in relation to one another (in addition to being valuable on their own).

Prepackaged Activity: The second step was to create an optional Prepackaged Activity around the Institutional Outcome being focused on for that year. For those faculty that did not want to do the activity or who did not have the Institutional Outcome being focused on as part of their teaching load or program, they could choose to work on any other program/course outcome they wanted to. This activity was an opportunity—not a restriction. Faculty would still have the ability to act autonomously with their course-level assessment but could also choose to take part in the larger college assessment. This prepackaged activity would outline an assessment activity a faculty could do—giving each faculty the opportunity to collaborate on a larger level with their peers. In addition, it gave faculty a direction to move towards if they were having trouble understanding the assessment process or getting started. This year, our Prepackaged Activity was focused on Institutional Outcome 1 (communication) and centered on the way in which holding students accountable for reading might change their success in the classroom. Next year, the prepackaged activity will focus on computation.

Creating Clarity and Tightening Up Loose Ends

Because the college has been working tirelessly to refine and define the assessment process, faculty have had to deal with quite a few changes in the last few years. Now that we are at the end of our third year of a consistent assessment process, we decided to try and create some clarity around the process itself. This took the form of four steps: Redefining Program and Institutional Outcomes, adjusting dates, utilizing In-service, and creating assessment videos.

Redefining Outcomes: For some time, the Assessment Committee had understood that there was confusion about outcomes regarding the Academic (Transfer) side of the college and the Workforce (Professional/Technical) side of the college. The Academic side of the college had five outcomes which were called the General Education Outcomes. Similarly, each program in the Workforce side had Program Outcomes. However, nestled within each of these were outcomes that both sides had to have—communication, computation, and human relations. Problematically, these three outcomes were also referred to as General Education Outcomes. It soon became clear that this was a categorization problem. In response, it was proposed that:

- 1) The term “General Education Outcomes” would no longer be used at all.
- 2) Both the Workforce and Transfer side of the college would refer to their outcomes as Program Learning Outcomes. For the Workforce side, Program Learning Outcomes would refer to the programs (Welding, Automotive Tech, etc.). For the Transfer side, the Program Learning Outcomes would be the five outcomes which were formerly called “General Education Outcomes” and the “program” being referred to would be the DTA (Direct Transfer Degree).
- 3) The three outcomes required by both the Workforce and Transfer side of the college would be referred to as Institutional Outcomes (which also matched the language of the accrediting body). Within the Program Learning Outcomes for both the Workforce and Academic side would be nestled the three Institutional Outcomes.

In order to avoid confusion for faculty, full transition to this terminology reorganization will occur in the summer (between assessment cycles)—although we have been discussing the reorganization throughout the year.

Adjusting Dates: Another thing we had been struggling with for some time is the fact that our contract did not require faculty reports to be submitted until the following year. That meant that an assessment done in fall of 2019, might not be submitted until fall of 2020. While the purpose of this was avoid adding work to the end of the year, it created an endless cycle of confusion for faculty and the Assessment Committee. This year, at the request of the Assessment Committee (which is comprised of faculty and administrators from across campus), the contract was changed to require that reports be submitted by the last day of the contract of the year they were done. In addition, the Assessment Chair contract, which had previously been 9-months, was made to be 12-months—allowing the writing of the report and planning to be done in the summer.

Utilizing In-service: Further, utilizing Fall and Spring In-service to allow the faculty to begin and end the assessment process has been very helpful in creating clarity. While assessment is happening all the time, the formal assessment reports we are requiring from faculty happen with up to a year in-between. This makes remembering the process more difficult—especially since the process has changed over time. To help offset this, we began using time at In-service to not only explain assessment, but to be doing

assessment. This helped to get faculty on the right path from the beginning while also allowing them to ask questions and get one-on-one help to the end. In addition to working on course-level assessment, In-service continued to serve as a time to discuss the Assessment Report among faculty and connect the report to larger program and institutional goals, policies, and practices.

Assessment Videos: While Fall In-service helped to remind faculty of what assessment was and started them down the path, the Assessment Committee also realized that many faculty left In-service and forgot what the process was. For this, we created videos to help faculty understand what they were expected to do, where they needed to submit, when they needed to submit by, where to find templates, etc. In addition, a video was created clarifying the prepackaged activity and demonstrating what that activity might look like. Watching the videos was a requirement of the Spring In-service but they are also available to faculty, online, anytime. In this way, faculty can retrain themselves any time they like. As the last day to submit reports approached, the views on those videos saw a dramatic spike and each of the three videos now has near 100 views—demonstrating that the videos were indeed an important tool and reminder of the process.

Assessment Reports Summary

The Assessment Committee received 78 Course and Program assessment reports, which correlated with the 7-Year Plans of programs across campus. These reports outlined the plan, results, and analysis of assessments designed to measure student learning outcomes and improve instructional programs. Some of the results of those plans are as follows:

General Assessment Reports

While an attempt to connect assessments to larger campus-wide goals is part of the college's strategy, individual programs and departments still must meet the needs of their 7-Year Plan. In this way, a number of assessment reports do not fit into the college's 2019-2020 focus on Communication or the prepackaged plan.

General Program-level Assessment Results

In coordination with the Nursing program, the **Biology Department** created a new class (Biology 160) which met the requirements of the program but also allowed students to enter the course without Biology or Chemistry prerequisites (in order to allow students to graduate in time). The department wanted to see whether completion rates for this course would meet or exceed completion rates for Biology 211. While the completion rate of students who took Chemistry concurrent to Biology 160 were similar in both Biology courses, students that took Biology 160 alone, had a much higher success rate. The faculty will recommend that students only take one science class a quarter.

The **Nursing Program** looked at Program Outcome 2: Deliver safe and effective physical, psychosocial, cultural, and spiritual care to the whole person in a variety of settings. Using a preceptorship evaluation tool, they expected to see students receiving mostly fours on the evaluation tool. The program found this to be the case, as 100% of students received a four or better, with the average being 4.84. Along with the preceptors, the "faculty were pleased with students' ability to effectively deliver holistic and culturally competent care to their patients"—especially in the face of a pandemic which challenged much of the program.

The **Agriculture Program** looked at Institutional Outcome 2, and Program Outcome 10: Students will be able to reason mathematically using methods appropriate to the profession. The department wanted to see whether the mathematical reasoning being taught in AGR211 was fruitful. Comparisons were made between students entering the course and leaving the course. It was found that, on entering the class, "students had an average score of 80% for general knowledge of mathematical reasoning associated with addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division. Their knowledge of geometry, volumes, and area was 70%. Their understanding of general algebra and formula rearrangements with known variables was 60%." By the end of the class, "after being provided instruction on the materials, they scored on average 95% for their knowledge of mathematical reasoning. Their knowledge of geometry, volumes, and area was scored at 100%. Lastly, their understanding of general algebra and formula rearrangement with known variables was assessed at 95%." The Agriculture Program will continue to teach mathematic principles based on the outcome of this assessment.

The **Automotive Program** looked at Program Outcome 3: Graduates demonstrate the ability to retrieve service information from manuals and on-line sources. The goal of this Assessment was to see how well

students could trace powerflow through a circuit using the circuit description. While 75% of the students could do this on the first try, the remaining students were asked to re-read the circuit description more carefully and were able to complete the task on the second try. While the instructor believes that the written circuit description is an invaluable part of the learning process, they plan on having students read and perform the task at the same time, from here on out—stating that “the stages of electrical flow are difficult to visualize without seeing the circuit.”

The **Art Program** looked at Program Outcomes 4 (Students will be able to recognize or articulate personal/interpersonal aspects of, or connections between, diverse cultural, social, or political contexts) and 5 (Students will be able to solve problems by gathering, interpreting, combining and/or applying information from multiple sources). For Art 216 and 217, the instructor introduced smaller weekly research assignments, which they hoped would increase the student’s understanding and breadth of the subject. The results of these assignments confirmed an increase in subject knowledge which was not seen as developed as when the instructor required only one large research paper. The instructor concluded that “in breaking it down into smaller weekly papers, the students could practice the skills they can use on a big paper. They also were excited about learning about new things. In final responses from students, the research each week was what they most enjoyed about the class.” In Art 140, the instructor took a complicated assignment and made it simple. The instructor added examples and tutorials and showed that students demonstrated a stronger understanding and confidence toward the assignment. While the original assignment gave a wider breadth toward understanding, it created confusion. The instructor plans on using the later version of the assignment, moving forward.

General Course-level Assessment Results

The **Physics Department** assessed PHYS&223 in relation to Program Outcome 5 (Students will be able to solve problems by gathering, interpreting, combining and/or applying information from multiple sources) and Course Outcome 3: Calculate electric fields and electric potential for different charge configurations, up to and including certain continuous charge distributions. In PHYS&223, the instructor looked at “problems involving electric fields and electric potential on the electricity unit test and the final test for my assessment Spring Quarter, 2020.” The instructor noted that students “have a very hard time making the leap from a description of a physical situation (or an illustration of one) to setting up and performing an integral” and “expressing the electric field as a vector, even for a single charge.” The instructor is going to continue to develop and emphasize materials on vectors in the first quarter of the Physics sequence.

In MCT100 (**Mechatronics**), the instructor looked at Course Outcome 1: Demonstrate knowledge of basic digital and analog electrical circuits/circuit theory. The instructor identified the problem that students were not retaining hardware and software basics from the first to the last course in the sequence, and felt that this might be due to the complicated workload. The instructor simplified the workload by removing Python instruction and focusing more heavily on other parts of the program. This simplification seemed to work and the instructor plans on continuing this simplification in the future.

Math&151 looked at Institutional Outcome 2 and Course Outcome 2: Calculate derivatives of functions. The instructor analyzed the results of an exam over three quarters, to determine whether students were able to do this task. An average of 83% of students were able to meet this standard on their first assessment. The department would like to do an item analysis to determine which functions are most

problematic for students. In MATH&107, the department looked at Course Outcome 1 (At the conclusion of the course the student will be able to apply at least three methods of mathematical modeling to real-life situations) and found that 73% of students were able to accomplish this task by the end of the quarter, with a 2.0. The department is considering adopting a theme or method for all courses, so that comparative data may be drawn between instructors.

In **MA112**, the Instructor looked at Course Outcome 4: Demonstrate critical thinking skills when faced with unexpected patient situations. The instructor assessed this outcome through a brief written response to a difficult patient scenario. They had a goal of 90% of students completing the assignment up to standards and found that only 87% of students were able to. Going forward, the instructor plans on using a rubric to assess students more specifically.

Institutional Outcome 1 Assessment Reports

More specifically, this year, the design and execution of many of these assessments was to facilitate program-level understandings to inform campus-wide cultures and practices, to create a continuously improving cycle of student learning. Faculty and programs were asked to assess Institutional Outcome 1: Students will be able to communicate clearly and effectively. Of the assessments submitted, 60 of the 78 assessments focused in this area. Because some of the programs and departments had 7-Year Plans that required them to assess outcomes beyond this request, this response shows that nearly everyone who could, chose to participate in this college-wide approach to assessment. This response is very promising in relation to continuing to move our campus toward program-level assessment thinking. Some of the results of those assessments were as follows:

Institutional Outcome 1 Program-level Assessment Results

The **Nursing Program** looked at Program Outcome 1: Communicate effectively to deliver relevant, accurate and complete information to patients, families, and the healthcare team. This outcome is also part of Institutional Outcome 1. The department assessed the way in which students communicated to patients, family, and other members of the healthcare community through a clinical evaluation tool which rated the students on a scale of 1-5. The average rating for students was a 4.4 and the program faculty and administrators were confident that those results met industry standards. Faculty will continue to push the importance of good communication to their students in the way that they have been.

In the **Accounting Department**, they looked at Institutional Outcome 1, and Program Outcome 2 (Communicate the cumulative effect of business transactions by preparing basic financial statements), by requiring students to take a pre-test and post-test to measure the ability to prepare and Income Statement. While the comparison between the two tests showed clear learning advancement taking place, the department was dissatisfied with the results of the post-test, which showed that only 8% of students could properly compute net income by the end of the course. While other areas of the test showed promise (85% of students could present results in a proper format), the department has decided to also administer a mid-test to give students the ability to practice their ability. The pre-test, mid-test, post-test arrangement will also be used in ACCT&201.

The **Agriculture Department** looked at Institutional Outcome 1 and Program Outcome 5: Students will be able to communicate clearly and effectively within a workplace context. In this assessment, faculty looked at the way in which students improved in writing over the course of the quarter. The instructor found that, while the average grade among four writing assignments (of similar nature) improved, students tended to put in less effort on the fourth assignment than on the third. The instructor attributed this to assignment fatigue and disengagement with the assignment. In the future, the instructor will only have the students do this assignment two to three times—instead of four.

The **Counseling Department** looked at Institutional Outcome 1, related to the ability for students to understand and respond to communication regarding their knowledge of credit requirements, GPA expectations, Degree requirements, campus resources, and their expected graduation date. While the counselors did find that most students do have an understanding of these things, in relation to their own education, the department did find that they could have probably had even greater success had they coordinated their efforts with the CSS classes, which also cover some of these key areas.

The **Commercial Driver's License** Program looked at Institutional Outcome 1 in relation to Program Outcome 2: Conduct pre-trip and post-trip inspections. The instructor of the program gave students a pre-trip inspection manual to read, study and practice. In the third week of the course, the instructor has the students perform a pre-trip inspection. 80% of the students were able to perform the task correctly. The instructor will evaluate and assess the student performance to see what changes need to be made to bring the number up but plans on writing another manual that will help to decode key letters, abbreviations, and acronyms found on the state testing sheet.

The **Library** Program assessed Institutional Outcome 1 in relation to library lab sessions performed during the 2019-2020 year. The library lab instruction is a supplementary instruction, given by the library at the request of faculty, focused on how to access and use library resources. The focus of this assessment activity was to calculate how well the communication cycle was occurring between students and the librarian giving the instruction. As the communication cycle involves both the instruction and the act of listening, student feedback can help to provide clarity on whether communication is happening effectively on both ends. The library provided a post-instruction survey, of which 91 students responded. These participation numbers are lower than typical as the pressure of Covid-19 had a particularly hard impact on the library resources. Nevertheless, these responses did provide valuable information, including but not limited to the idea that "students felt they now understood the William C. Bonaudi website, databases, eBooks, and resource evaluation." In fact, around 90% of students felt that they were more confident after receiving library instruction. There were also a number of responses that outlined what could have been more clear or done better. These included requests related to things like adding "more science research" and requests for "longer library hours, textbooks, snacks, better headphones, more comfy chairs, bilingual help, a tab on the college website, more green updated atmosphere, and hot chocolate." Aside from working toward some of these goals, the library also plans on taking on a number of improvements, including continuing and deepening the webinar series offered, maintaining a faculty connection, and promoting bilingual staff.

The **Medical Assistant** Program looked at Institutional Outcome 1, in relation to Program Outcome 1: Demonstrate clear, effective communications with patients and members of the healthcare team in a variety of structured settings. The program had students in MA 111, 112, and 113 demonstrate competence in verbal and written English through a research paper and an oral presentation. 93% of the class successfully completed the research paper while 100% of the class completed the oral presentation. This was accomplished despite the fact that English was not the primary language for 50% of the students. While these numbers meet and exceed expectations, the program will continue to work on ways to improve communication. The program also suggested that the program be re-connected into the I-BEST program—which would help to support its large Spanish-speaking student population.

The **Aviation Program** assessed Institutional Outcome 1 in connection with Program Outcome 4: Students will be able to communicate clearly and effectively within a workplace context. The program assessed four courses which used "a survey, quiz, written exam or comprehensive flight check/exam to evaluate the success of our desired learning outcome." For AVF113, a unit test and email survey regarding the textbook reading were used to determine success. While the class average for the test hovered around 81%, it was determined that students that did the reading averaged 88%. In AVF221, an FFA Standardized test was given at the end of the quarter. While 100% of students who took the test passed, there was a considerable difference between the scores of the final exam and a quiz given earlier in the quarter (which actually scored lower). The program determined that this may imply a

disconnect between the actual exam and the teaching. In all of the courses, data was skewed because of Covid-19. Sample sizes of students were much smaller than expected and missing data played a large role in inconclusive results. The program concluded: "There is a need for continued support in exploring creative ways to return to a "new normal" under social distancing to keep the flight training program active at BBCC. The aviation program will also likely need to offer additional resources (remedial ground schools) and instructor availability (flight hours / tutoring) once flight training resumes after the COVID-19 pandemic. Having the college willing to provide these resources maybe key to the health and long term sustainability of the program."

The **Developmental Studies (DVS)** Department looked at how well they were teaching reading comprehension skills in regard to Institutional Outcome 1 and Course Outcome 1: Reading/Writing: Students will be able to answer such questions as who, what, where, when, why, and how and recount major details that support the main idea of a text. The questions examined covered 11 subjects of a given reading. While the sample size was small, by the end of the assessment it was clear that increased focus on reading comprehension across campus should be considered. In addition, the department found that the use of CASAS assessment was unuseful in measuring college readiness. The department plans on designing an assessment that they can better control.

In the **Welding Program**, the instructor looked at Institutional Outcome 1 in relation to safety expectations. The instructor wanted to see whether the methods of instruction (written and verbal) were effective in getting students to demonstrate safety throughout the quarter. Given the opportunity that Covid-19 provided to try out different methods of safety communication, the instructor was able to look at this question from multiple angles. In the end, the instructor did find that students were generally demonstrating important reading and listening comprehension skills, as they were demonstrating the information in these communications throughout the quarter.

In the **Medical Simulation** program, the instructor looked at Institutional Outcome 1 in relation to Program Outcome 4: Promote Community Engagement - Promote occupational health and safety within the community by executing effective oral and written communication skills to provide customized simulation training opportunities. The instructor looked at a writing sample from students to see whether their writing was meeting college standards. While 75% of the students passed the writing assignment with full points, the sample size of students (four students, total, and one student did not submit the assignment), was too small to draw any broad conclusions. Nevertheless, nothing in the assessment seems to show that students are having trouble meeting communications expectations in the program. The instructor concluded by saying that they "believe the students in these courses could successfully communicate with the community and provide clear debriefs for their simulations."

Institutional Outcome 1 Course-level Assessment Results

The **Communications Department** assessed Institutional Outcome 1 and Program Outcome 9: Present speeches which cover a variety of styles and goals. For this assessment, the instructor of CMST&220 looked at quiz scores, speeches, and the final exam in comparison to the desired scores. While most of the students met the desired scores, the instructor plans to "Re-evaluate the 10 learning outcomes,

analyze students' tests and speech scores, review which lectures need to be changed to more effectively help students understand the content being taught."

The **Chemistry Department** was derailed in its assessment activity due to Covid-19, but revised the goal of their assessment to match what could practically be accomplished. Their basic assessment looked at the amount of reading students stated they did. The department compared data from Winter Quarter (which was face-to-face) to Spring Quarter (which was online). Surprisingly, the students from both sections claimed to have done a similar amount of reading. Moving forward, the department might consider "putting more content-based questions on the unit tests that would come specifically from the essays", allowing them to directly see how much of the reading students are doing, as well as to whether that reading was having a positive impact.

The **Nutrition Department** looked at Institutional Outcome 1, in relation to course outcome 3: Assess current nutritional status through a personal dietary analysis. In NUTR&101, the students were required to write a report based off of the results of a fitness tracker. The results of this assignment made it clear that students were lacking some of the basic writing skills. Moving forward, the department would like to "I would also like to include a pre-lesson on the basics of technical writing, so that students have a better understanding of how to communicate their data and results before they do this assignment."

In the **Foreign Languages** Department, the instructor assessed Institutional Outcome 1, in relation to Course Outcome 4: Read and summarize elementary texts in Spanish. The instructor compared the results of comprehension quizzes to determine if preparing students for reading through pre-reading assignments helped them in quizzes. While the results of this assessment initially showed promise (quizzes without pre-reading assignments scored an average much lower than quizzes with pre-reading assignments), further investigation into the data showed that the students who did well on the pre-reading activities also did well when no pre-reading activities were assigned. While pre-reading assignments may have been a good tool to motivate some students, the results of both the pre-reading activity and the quiz matched the effort of the student regardless of such an activity.

In the **Biology** Department, the BIOL&242 instructor looked at the method of instruction and student interaction to determine if the way communication was taking place was having a positive impact on student learning. The instructor moved everything online in spring quarter due to Covid-19. This required students to work more independently. The results of the data showed comparable scores between modalities, except in the case of material related to Urinary System Physiology and Microanatomy. In these areas, scores went down which, according to the instructor "underscores the value of including more interactive exercises." In addition, the instructor plans on including more small assignments and quizzes to help build positive results.

In **PSYCH&100**, the instructor looked at Institutional Outcome 1 in relation to Course Outcome 11: Describe the major or common types of psychological disorders and their treatments. The instructor "used two in class assignments where people had to correctly identify disorders based on behavior descriptions. Further we ask students to discuss treatments and why treatment options could differ depending on the thought process involved and their diagnosis." This assignment specifically asked students to identify disorders in the film One Flew Over the Cuckoos Nest. This was done over winter

and spring quarters and the instructor found that: “Winter and Spring quarter results were within a 1.5% difference from one another with almost all students meeting the assignment with above average scores. Where students erred was mostly in leaving out part of the assignment which is likely due to the way the instructions were written and not due to student lack of understanding.” In the future, the instructor plans to make instructions more clear.

In the **Early Childhood Education** Program, the EDUC&130 instructor looked at Institutional Outcome 1, in relation to Course Outcome 2: List and describe positive guidance techniques for children birth through early adolescence. This assessment consisted of an essay which was formed in order to “create an authentic and relevant assignment where students could be assessed on their content knowledge and ability to write clear and organized essays simultaneously.” The instructor provided a clear prompt, assigned readings, a rubric, and optional resources for the assignment. “Of the 16 students who completed this assignment, (5 did not submit an essay and received a zero), the following results were obtained. 4 of the submissions received a score of 100%. - 3 earned 96% - 1 earned 92% - 3 scored 88%, 1 received an 84% - 2 scored 64% and 1 earned only a 60%.” To continue the assessment cycle, the instructor plans to “ask students to offer feedback on their utilization of the text readings (for content/course/program outcome portion of the score) and their level of "optional" reading on correct essay mechanics (for the GE outcome portion of the score).”

In **POLS&203**, the instructor looked at how Institutional Outcome 1 was being accomplished in relation to Course Outcome 8: Explain a world problem from the viewpoint of a nation other than the United States. “Students were assigned a nation to research and represent in a mock-international forum in which a global problem was presented and they were to negotiate an agreement to the best interests of the nations assigned. This project is the final exam for the course and demonstrates whether students have successfully learned the course materials.” In the end, the instructor found that the students were unable to meet the expectations of the assignment as “students demonstrated a distinct inability to recognize where their nations would act and how they would react.” The department is currently discussing options for redesigning the course.

In **Criminal Justice 101**, the instructor looked at Institutional Outcome 1 in relation to Program Outcomes 1 (Identify the knowledge, skills, abilities, physical fitness and agency specific standards for Criminal Justice) and 5 (Demonstrate an understanding of the role and structure of leadership in Criminal Justice and how to employ leadership techniques), and Course Outcomes 1 (Compare and contrast criminal justice agency roles, responsibilities, and functions on the local, state, and federal level) and 7 (Discuss the Criminal Justice System in the context of a real case). The instructor administered an exam which demonstrated student competency in all of these outcomes. The instructor found that the students “completed the assignment with an 83% average overall. When evaluating students who completed all three components of the project, the average score jumps to 97%, showing mastery of the knowledge and application of the material to general terms in the course.” The instructor did find that there was one commonly missed answer that needed to be re-evaluated but, overall, that the assignment helped students to reach many outcomes for the course.

Prepackaged Activity Assessment Reports

Out of the 60 assessments that focused on communications, 8 chose to use the prepackaged plan as it was intended and designed—which asked faculty to look at the way in which they held students accountable for reading. Some of the results of those assessments were as follows:

Prepackaged Activity Program-level Assessment Results

The **Business Information Management** Program looked at Institutional Outcome 1, in relation to Program Outcome 2: Students will write and present information effectively by creating professional documents that would be used in an office environment. Over two quarters, the program looked at data related to how they held students accountable for reading. In the past, students were mostly held accountable for reading through their final exam—which required them to have read and understood the material being tested. However, the department wanted to see whether holding students accountable previous to the final exam could increase positive results on the exam. In this spirit, the department added quizzes on each chapter of the reading in Business 121. During spring quarter, there was a 6% increase in final exam scores in Business 121—which the department attributed to the addition of quizzes. In addition, in Business 112, the instructor added practice sheets to the course. In order to take the exams, students were required to score at least 90% on the practice sheets (this was increased from 85% the previous quarters). The data from this showed a slight increase in test score, both between students that passed and did not pass their tests. While the sample size of this class was very small, and other factors played a role for spring quarter, the faculty felt that “the way [they] held students accountable for reading in the spring had a positive impact on [their] students.”

The **Aviation Maintenance Technology** Program looked at Institutional Outcome 1, in relation to Program Outcome 1: Students will be able to identify and explain a variety of airframe and/or powerplant systems and components as evaluated by the completion of the FAA written, oral and practical exams. This program wanted to see “whether the way [they] have held students accountable for reading in the past was effective. [Their] version of holding students accountable for reading is through seeing what they learned through their ability to physically handle and manipulate objects. In this way, they demonstrate their learned skills. Through the use of online instruction, [the department] removed the hands-on aspect of our instruction. Students had all of the same basic learning materials, except hands-on access to physical parts.” The department noted that the results were as follows: “After returning to the Lab for actual physical face to face instruction we noticed that although a student was able to correctly describe about a particular aircraft part or component in a picture most were not able to do the same thing when handed the actual part or components and asked the same questions. Holding the students accountable for the reading they do, through ongoing hands-on instruction, is important to the success of the students.” Finally, the department concluded that “Online instruction can be viable part of instruction if co-mixed with face to face, hands on instruction. I can see the AMT program continuing to utilize some of the online format we have developed to enhance or in the class room instruction but cannot see us removing hands-on instruction altogether.”

Prepackaged Activity Course-level Assessment Results

The **Anthropology Department** assessed Institutional Outcome 1 in relation to Course Outcome 4: Describe, apply and critique key concepts in anthropology including a) cultural relativity, b) linguistic

relativity, c) family, d) persona/social identity, e) personality, f) nature/nurture influences, g) religion, h) political structure. More specifically, the department looked at how weekly summary assignments might reflect and influence the extent to which students do the required reading for the course. By the end of the quarter, the instructor found that “It is clear from reading nearly 300 summaries over the quarter, that the summaries do motivate students to systematically and regularly read the chapters before our first meeting, and that, for the purpose of this assignment, summaries gave students a structure wherein they could communicate clearly and efficiently about the chapters' content.” The Instructor went on to say that “Based on the results of the assessment, I am going to continue using these weekly summaries as a way to give student ample but repeated exposure to communicate clearly and effectively while connecting with some of the Big Ideas in Anthropology. Yes, the summaries demonstrate to me that they are an excellent way to hold students accountable for preparing before they come to class. The summaries actually give me as the instructor lots of information that students can bring to class to question, to repeat and retell and to clarify. Student generated material often determined the direction I would go in a class discussion. The summaries, among other issues, assure that students are challenged to communicate effectively content that is new to them.”

In the **History** Department, the instructor of the HIST&118 course looked at Institutional Outcome 1, in connection with Course Outcome 5: Define the significant terms used in telling the story of western civilization from 1800 to present. For one assignment, the instructor required students to write an essay after reading some assigned material. The instructor did not quiz the students on the reading. For another assignment, the instructor required students to participate in a Socratic seminar after doing some assigned reading. For this seminar, the instructor did quiz the students on the reading. In the end, it did not appear that holding students accountable for reading had much of an impact on how much the students read in this course. The instructor did note, however, that students, in general, were reading much less than the instructor expected they should. The instructor plans on repeating this assessment activity next year, as some of these results may have been influenced by Covid-19 and a general sense of fatigue. By contrast, a nearly identical assessment activity was done in HIST&116, by the same instructor, with very different results. It was found that “In comparing the two results, 88.9% of students read 80-100% of the required material when there was an assigned reading quiz, compared to 61.1% when there was no assigned reading quiz.” The instructor noted that “Clearly students read a higher percentage of the required material when a reading quiz is assigned prior to a major assessment. This is exciting! I will create a reading quiz for each major reading assignment to ensure students are meeting the course outcomes and engaged in a rigorous academic experience. This will ensure more students read the material and are prepared to meet the learning goals for the course.”

In **BIOL&222**, the instructor used a reading accountability software called “Smartbook” to track student completion of reading assignments. Comparisons between student scores on exams were made between the time before this application was used and after it was used. The instructor found that “There was significant improvement shown in test scores as a result of the reading assignments required through the use of SmartBook. Test scores improved remarkably as follows: For Test 1, the class average improved from 73% to 85%, for Test 2, the class average improved from 79% to 84%, and for Test 3, the class average improved from 73% to 85%. (Test 4 and the final exam were not analyzed as a result of current interruption by Covid-19).” The instructor continued on to say that “Based on the results of the assessment, I am going to continue to require the purchase and use of SmartBook. These results will definitely change the way I teach. Having the students consistently read the material (for points

towards their grade) and then be constantly assessed on the material to see if they understand it and have the reading assignment adjusted accordingly has been very effective. Furthermore, in the subsequent quarter (BIOL&223) I found that using the Connect resource to give additional follow-up quizzes on the material in the reading assignments was even more effective. I plan to use Connect reading assignments, homework assignments and quizzes in BIOL&221, BIOL&222 and BIOL&223 next year.”

In **PHIL210**, the instructor assessed Institutional Outcome 1, in relation to Course Outcome 1: Demonstrate understanding of major ethical theories such as Virtue Theory, Kantianism, and Utilitarianism. The Instructor assessed the way in which holding students accountable for reading might increase the success students had in other areas of the course. Overall, the instructor found that quizzing students on a reading only improved final products (exams, short essays) by about 2%. Given this relatively low number, the instructor concluded that this was not “very much at all given the amount of time that quizzes take away from the classroom. Although I do want my students to read the material ahead of time, I don’t think that quizzing them will have much improvement upon their performance on exams.” The instructor does not plan on continuing this practice in the future.

In the **English Department**, three instructors looked at the way in which holding students accountable for reading might impact their ENGL&102 class. The three instructors did nearly identical assessment activities, quizzing students on reading related to one activity or essay and not quizzing students on reading related to a different activity or essay. For one instructor, they found “that the quizzes do encourage some students to do the work if they weren’t going to, but I also discovered that students who do the reading do not always get the quiz answers right.” This instructor concluded that “while getting more students to read can be one possible benefit of providing reading quizzes, the quizzes are more important to get students to self-assess their reading comprehension and retention strategies.” For another instructor, they found that “It is clear that holding students accountable for reading has a tremendous impact on whether they do the reading and/or apply the reading to future work” and that “students generally have a strong aversion to doing any reading outside of what is absolutely required for a grade in the class.” This instructor went further by concluding that “I recommend that faculty hold students accountable for reading, if they actually want that reading to occur. With busy lives, students prioritize graded work over non-graded work. Work done for the classroom, including reading, should be recognized as coursework and assessed as such. If an instructor expects students to do something for a class, that work needs to be accounted for. Reading quizzes and article summaries are not only valuable in ensuring great class conversations and final products (essays, exams, and assignments), but they help to clarify the workload. In my opinion, holding students accountable for reading keeps the load honest. If I want my students to read 4 novels and 6 articles, write 6 papers, show up to class for lectures, etc., I need to see that those are all part of the burden that I place on students. To have them read but not have points assigned to that reading, is to essentially tell the students that I expect them to work for nothing.” The last instructor, the results of holding students accountable for reading showed an improvement in student success. For a discussion in which the instructor did not hold the students accountable for reading through a quiz, the average score from the rubric was a 33%. For the discussion in which students were quizzed, the average score increased to 75%. The instructor concluded that “Holding students accountable for reading has a huge impact on the amount of effort that they put into the reading, which then reflects how confident they are to contribute in class the next day. While it was discouraging that some people continued to not read at all, the increase in students who read the

whole story was great. It is also possible that the act of taking a quiz engages them to recall what they had read, and this familiarity makes them more willing to participate in discussion.” All three instructors indicated that they would have a departmental discussion about the results.

In the **Workforce Education** Program, WKED101 and 102 looked at the way in which they held students accountable for reading—as well as how focused reading assignments might improve results in student learning. This connected Institutional Outcome 1 to Course outcomes 3 (Describe the basic systems, infrastructure, operations, environment associated with their chosen industry) and 4 (Explain the basic systems, infrastructure, daily operations, and environment associated with chosen career). For one assignment, the instructor gave a quiz about a simple reading assignment but allowed the students to retake the quiz if they did poorly. For another assignment, the instructor gave a quiz about a focused reading assignment and did not allow retakes. The instructor also surveyed the students to see who had done the reading. The instructor stated that “Students who indicated that they read before the quiz, did better overall.” They went on to say that “Now that I can see that directed/focused reading assignments actually make a difference, I will use that tactic more often in the classes where I require reading regardless of whether the reading will be assessed or not.”

Reflection and Response to Faculty Assessment Reports

In looking at the reports, holistically, three things become clear: Faculty have a better idea of how assessment needs to work toward larger institutional goals, Covid-19 had a large impact on faculty (in both good and bad ways), and the weight of the importance of communication is felt across campus—even if the assessment data does not show any conclusive step for moving forward.

First, the outcome of this report clearly indicates that faculty recognize the need to have assessment not only be meaningful at the course level, but be meaningful at the program and college level. Though they were not required to, all but ten reports focused on Institutional Outcome 1. Not only does this represent faculty working toward a larger, program-level, goal, but it also shows compliance and follow-through with faculty 7-Year Plans. These plans were designed to coordinate Institutional Outcomes across campus, and they have done so. The very small number of reports that did not focus on IO1, can easily be accounted for by 7-Year Plans that have multiple outcomes to assess, or courses that do not specifically assess communication.

Second, while Covid-19 had a clearly negative impact on completing assessment plans, it had a clearly positive impact faculty growth. There were many reports that noted that the plan they had set out to do in the fall, had to be adjusted in the spring. This led to a lot of reports that didn't have sufficient data, or that seemed to miss the original purpose of the prepackaged plan. However, it is clear that faculty learned a lot this quarter and that their learning will have positive impacts on students in years to come. The most obvious way that this became clear is through the fact that, while many faculty began the year trying to see how “holding students accountable for reading might have a positive impact on student learning” many faculty ended up looking at how the way [modality] they [faculty] presented information had a positive or negative impact on learning. For example, in many of the Workforce programs, faculty were required to move from a hands-on approach to an online (reading and lecture) approach. While most of those faculty would not propose that they move their program entirely online, many of them did express the idea that they plan to transition some parts of their classroom to that modality, in the future.

Lastly, the value of communication is obviously and immensely felt by faculty across campus. In terms of looking more specifically at the outcome of assessing the Prepackaged Plan, it is clear that most (if not all) participating faculty would agree that holding students accountable for reading generally increases the amount of reading students do, and the quality of exams, discussions, and essays that have to do with the topics around those readings. However, two interesting caveats to that also came from the assessment. One, holding students accountable for reading with a quiz can be a valuable way to ensure students do read, but that quiz can also have value in providing a way for the instructor to investigate and encourage a greater understanding of the text. In this way, the things students don't know should not necessarily be thought of as just a way to determine whether students did the work, but also as a way to help them understand the work that the instructor asked them to do. Two, while holding students accountable for reading may encourage them to read and may have a positive impact on their final products in class, the amount of time it takes to hold students accountable for reading must be weighed against that positive impact. The time spent giving a reading quiz, may not be the best use of time—even if it has a positive impact on assignment grades. In this way, there is some accountability that must be placed on the students themselves, to do the reading, if the student would like to receive a better grade in the end. The best outcome would be one where a student did the reading for class

without having to be coerced into it via a quiz. This would allow the instructor to not have to spend time grading reading quizzes and, instead, spend class time building on top of the foundation that those readings provide. While this may not be a realistic expectation, it is something that faculty must consider when deciding how to build their classroom. Because of this, the big takeaway is really about faculty having realistic expectations. If there is something that a faculty really feels that the students need to read, it may be a good idea to hold students accountable for that reading through a quiz. In terms of looking at Institutional Outcome 1, as it was assessed more generally across campus, many faculty assessments found that students across campus are communicating and learning to communicate at a college level. Faculty that did assessments around communication generally found that students were near, at, or above the faculty expectations. For those faculty that found that their students were not meeting their expectations, many expressed ways in which they might be able to help the students through adjusting the modality that the faculty themselves used to communicate (putting some things online that weren't, adding videos, changing prereading assignments to post-reading quizzes, etc.). Finally, the assessment of Institutional Outcome 1 seemed to reinforce the idea that communication is being taught to students not only as an obtainable skill, but through continued practice and demonstration of communication. In order to be successful, students must listen to directions, interpret those words, reflect that communication through their work, and respond to feedback. While none of these things necessarily point to a need for some sort of cross-departmental change in policy or strategy, what they all point to is the value of a process and cycle of assessment which leads to continued self-reflection and change. These assessments will provide valuable insight for campus conversations in the future.

Assessment Committee Plans for 2020/2021

In regard to the 2019/2020 assessment reports, the Assessment Committee has five primary goals: Sharing and discussing the 2019/2020 assessment reports, create more clarity around the larger assessment training framework for current and future Assessment Committee members, create a computation-related prepackaged activity plan, update and simplify the SharePoint submission form, and define the purpose of assessment for faculty.

Sharing and Discussing the 2019/2020 Assessment Report: In regard to these reports, the Assessment Chair provided constructive feedback to 17 faculty members on their reports. This feedback ranged from questioning the conclusions being drawn by the faculty, to submission errors, to requesting clarifications. Along with this individual feedback, the faculty will have time at In-service to read and discuss the report. These discussions will help us to continue to build successful assessments in the future, as well as to push us to think of additional ways in which the results of the report might have meaningful impacts on policies and procedures moving forward. Lastly, the Assessment Team will continue to discuss and look at the report to determine any additional steps that need to be taken.

Training for Assessment Committee Members: The onboarding process for new and incoming Assessment Committee members is currently not as strong as it should be. Much of the process of learning about assessment comes slowly in a “sit back and watch” kind of approach. Now that the committee has a much more directed path for the assessment process, we would like to create a clearer onboarding process for new team members as well as members who would like to move into leadership roles. We hope to make a video which outlines the motivation, expectations, and timeline for many of the assessment activities (prepackaged plan, Fall In-service, report writing, accessing reports on SharePoint, etc.). By clarifying the process of what is expected of the committee, it will help to give members the broader understanding needed to help their peers across campus.

Prepackaged Computation Plan: In order to create and prepare faculty for our prepackaged communication plan, the Assessment Committee devised a set of primer activities which helped to shape the plan and got faculty interested. This began in winter of 2019, with a series of questions asking the faculty how they felt about communication in their classroom. From those responses, during spring of 2019, we asked faculty how they hold students accountable for reading and whether they would be willing to try holding their students accountable in a way they might not have. In fall of 2019, we proposed that prepackaged activity. This year, for the prepackaged computation activity, we did a very similar thing—in winter we created a set of questions and in spring we asked faculty in a survey to share any computation activities that they have tried (or thought of) that might apply to many classes or programs around campus. The results of these, along with discussion between the Assessment Committee and the Math and Science Departments, now needs to be crafted into a prepackaged activity that can be used to help the campus continue down a path of assessment which allows for meaningful data to be found at the program, departmental, and institutional level.

Update and Simplify the Online Submission Process: Our current SharePoint form does not reflect some of the changes in process and language developed in the last few years. While we did not want to implement these changes halfway through the year, contract shifts which require that assessment reports were started in the fall and submitted in the spring will allow our Big Bend Technology team to make changes to our online form over the summer. These changes will reflect simplifying the submission

process by only having one place to submit, as well as re-wording some of the form questions to better reflect current expectations. These changes echo a larger desire for the Assessment Committee to streamline and simplify the assessment process, in general.

Define the Purpose of Assessment: One area which the report reflected some room for improvement is in the Assessment Committee's lack of a clear definition of what an Assessment should do. While within the committee, we understand that the goal of assessment is to facilitate and encourage growth and improvement, some faculty have primarily focused on assessment as a way to reflect competency. For example, there were a number of reports that basically found an assignment which reflected an outcome, and then looked at the average grade on that assignment to determine whether the students were meeting this outcome. While technically this is part of the assessment process, it does not reflect the process of assessment as we at the college aim to see it reflected. In many comments to faculty with assessments like this, we suggested that the determination of whether an outcome is being met should be the first step in an assessment process. From there, the act of trying something new, and finding ways to confirm or refute the conclusion drawn, would make for a better assessment report. The Assessment Committee hopes to create a video regarding this definition over the summer.