**Reedley College Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary 2011-2012**

**Background**

In spring 2005 the Program Review Handbook, amid Cycle Two, underwent a revision to include student learning outcome identification and assessment process responses. During this same time, all Course Outlines of Record were revised to include SLOs. Identification of certificate, degree, and program learning outcomes, including GE learning outcomes followed. With the guidance of an SLO coordinator and SLO assessment advisory committee many college-wide activities helped establish and instill SLO planning and reporting procedures. The Cycle Three Program Review handbook was revised to include responses to SLO assessment results and action plans. During this time, the Resource Action Plan Proposal form was revised to include SLO assessment results in addition to program review goal identification. The SLO process has included the development of a timeline to identify, assess, evaluate, analyze, and report course and program SLOs. All timelines, along with assessment tools, communications, and reports are housed within program folders on the SLO Blackboard site. In spring 2011, the SLO coordinator began reporting to the College the GELO Assessment Summary, highlighting assessment types, results, and conclusions/action plans as they respond to the GELO areas.

All above mentioned references and materials are made available to the College on the webpage at <http://www.reedleycollege.edu/index.aspx?page=1413> and on the Blackboard SLO site.

**SLO Planning and Implementation Data as of Spring 2012**

Percent of all college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes**: 100%**

Percent of all college courses with on-going assessment of learning outcomes**: 96.4%**

Percent of all college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes**: 100%**

Percent of all college programs with on-going assessment of learning outcomes**: 98.2%**

Percent of all student and learning support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes**: 100%**

Percent of all student and learning support activities with on-going assessment of learning outcomes**: 92.1%**

**Course and Program Assessment Action Plans**

In addition to the semesterly GELO Assessment Summary report, the following provides data on course and program SLO action plans.

**Table 1**

Reported course action plans from outcomes assessments: **2011-2012**

Total number of active courses: **564**

Academic courses reporting: **228**

Percentage of courses to complete at least one assessment cycle: **40%**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Results are positive/no changes to be made | **65%** |
| Conduct further assessment related to the issue and outcome | **23%** |
| Use new or revised teaching methods | **20%** |
| Develop new methods for evaluating student work | **18%** |
| Plan purchase of new equipment or supplies needed for modified student activities | **9%** |
| Make changes in staffing plans | **4%** |
| Engage in professional development about best practices for this type of class/activity | **5%** |
| Revise the course sequence or prerequisite | **5%** |
| Revise the course syllabus or outline  | **13%** |
| Unable to determine what should be done | **0%** |
| Other | **12%** |

**Table 2**

Reported program action plans from outcomes assessments: **2011-2012**

Total number of programs: **74**

Programs reporting: **27**

Percentage of programs to complete at least one assessment cycle: **36%**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Results are positive/no changes to be made | **63%** |
| Conduct further assessment related to the issue and outcome | **19%** |
| Use new or revised resources or services | **11%** |
| Develop new methods for evaluating student learning | **11%** |
| Plan purchase of new equipment or supplies needed for modified student activities | **11%** |
| Make changes in staffing plans | **7%** |
| Engage in professional development about best practices for this type of activity | **7%** |
| Unable to determine what should be done | **0%** |
| Other | **19%** |

**Examples of Course and Program Assessment Activities, Assessment Results, and Action Plans**

Assessment activities, results, and action plans may be found with each program’s SLO Assessment Reporting forms (Course and Program) and most recent Program Review report.

Below are brief descriptions of some selected programs, highlighting a variety of activities, results, and action plans. These are taken directly from their Course/Program Assessment Reporting forms with their permission. Each year a different group of programs will be showcased.

**Aviation Maintenance Technology Program**

**Activities:** The Aviation Maintenance Technology (AMT) Program faculty determined our assessment tools and defined our measurement standard in the spring of 2010. We began assessing our Program Learning Outcome (PLO) in the fall of 2010 and the spring of 2011. The reason for the two semester assessment period is to allow us to gather enough data to properly evaluate the results. The AMT program is a two year program that consists of four courses, Aero 1, Aero 2, Aero 3, and Aero 4. By performing the assessment during these two semesters, we were able to include all four courses. We will be evaluating our data and making recommendation this fall (2011). After we determine what changes are to be made if any, we will implement the changes and report in the spring of 2012.

**Results:** The assessment for the AMT program has been in place for a number of years. We use attendance records and a number of course-embedded assessments as an intregal part of our program assessment. The system works well and is in compliance with the Federal Aviation Regulations. Students completing the program are well prepared for their certification exams. Certification tests are administered by an FAA Mechanics Designated Examiner and a C.A.T.S. test proctor. These examiners have observed that the students who have completed the program are adequately prepared to take these exams.

A couple areas of concern are the use of adjunct faculty and equipment repair / replacement costs. One faculty position is staffed for one half the semester with an adjunct instructor, then we must hire a different instructor to complete the second half of the semester. We feel this may have a negative impact on student success.

**Action Plans:** We do not have a clear idea when we will implement the desired changes. The staffing situation is currently being address with no solution in sight and the current budget will not support the cost of purchasing all the new equipment needed.

**History Program**

**Activities:** During the History program’s fourth cycle of SLO assessment, a second round of SLO assessment is done for all outcomes in History 11, 12 & 12H. Initial assessment is done using the new course outcomes (SLO’s) for all remaining history classes. After analyzing the second set of data for History 11, 12 & 12H, department members agree to make minor adjustments to some of the assessment questions. A second round of assessment will be done for all remaining classes before changes are made. For each of the History Program’s courses, two test questions are written for each SLO. A pre-test and post-test is also administered to capture the knowledge students acquire during the course of the semester.

**Results:** Although initial assessment results were higher than expected, History faculty are looking at the results and rewriting both the assessments while looking at the course curriculum outcomes to better define the student learning outcomes.

**Action Plans:** SLO’s are being assessed in all classes offered by the History Department of Reedley College every fall semester. Analysis and discussion of changes are done involving both full & part time members of the department during the spring (Cycles 3 & 4). All course outcomes (SLO’s) are rewritten to bring all history classes into a consistent and coherent method of assessment. (Cycle 3) Assessment is regular and mapped to both program learning outcomes (PLO’s) and institutional learning outcomes (ILO’s or GELO’s).

**Mechanized Agriculture (MAG 20 course)**

**Activities:** By spring of 2010 the instructors in the Mechanized Agriculture program proposed to determine the assessment, define the measurement, and assess. In the fall of 2010 we planned on evaluating the data and make recommendations. Due to tight timelines we were unable to assess in the spring and instead performed assessments in the fall of 2010. Evaluation and recommendations were also completed in the fall of 2010

**Results:** The assessment results for the Engines section of MAG 20 were dismal at best. The criteria used for assessment were: Engine Labs and Reports, Engine Shop Participation, and Engines Lab Practical Exam. Here are the results:

 Engines Labs and Reports 18 of 31 scored 70% or higher (24% success)

 Engines Shop Participation 31 of 31 scored 70% or higher (100% success)

 Engines Lab Practical Exam 11 of 31 scored 70% or higher (35% success)

The assessment worked in the sense that it clarified what we have emphasized in our grading criteria. Our goal with the program is to be 50% hands-on shop work and 50% in the classroom. The reality is we are actually more like 25% in the shop and 75% in the classroom. When you look at our success on the assessment the shop participation is very good and the report writing and exam taking is unacceptable. We know that our students are leaving with a high level of skills based on our discussions with industry partners who have hired our students but our assessments are not reflecting this.

We will be examining our grading categories and procedures as well as our methods of testing to incorporate more shop activities that reflect the students’ true abilities. Most of our exams are multiple choice, or as the students call them “multiple guess” tests. We feel that the students are not adequately preparing themselves for these exams, relying instead on their statistical advantage to choose a correct answer. This does not reflect the real workplace environment and we will be transitioning away from this type of assessment.

**Action Plans:** The Fall 2011 semester will see changes in the class grading so that more emphasis is placed on hands-on practical activities that would directly reflect the tasks asked of graduates once they enter the workplace. More quizzes and tests will be given in a lab practical format so that students get used to a form of testing other than a scantron, multiple choice format. Student work groups and activities will be structured so that students are organized into smaller groups and whenever possible, asked to complete assignments entirely on their own in the lab setting. This will necissitate additional equipment and supplies to accommodate smaller groups and individual work. These changes will be noted in the syllabus so that students know what to expect and can prepare themselves.

**Health Services Program**

**Activities:** The Health Services program conducted a survey of health issues knowledge in the residence halls in 2009-2010. After data compiled was inconclusive, the program turned its attention to a more specifically directed query in 2011-12. Using the Ten Leading Public Health Indicators as defined by the National Healthy Campus 2010 framework and 4 measures of health, RC Health Services defined the following areas of focus: physical activity, overweight/obesity, tobacco use, substance abuse, responsible sexual behavior, mental health, injury/violence prevention, environmental quality, immunization, access to health care, oral health care, diabetes, control of infectious disease, and sleep. The Health Services program combines any outreach method with any of the identified health measures to develop an outreach activity. Data is recorded to keep track of the areas covered and plan for upcoming events

**Results:** The spring 2011 health survey was given and a total of 23 students answered one or more items. Unfortunately, the majority of items were answered by less than that with an average of 20 responses per item. The demographic identifiers were not fully answered either making analysis of the data very difficult. Between 5 and 8 (of the 23) chose not to indicate gender, age, and race.

**Action Plans:** The poor response rate indicates that a change may be needed for future surveys. One interesting note is that the questions regarding “what percentage of peer” types of things were almost always fully answered. This indicates to me that students are very engaged in what they think their peers are doing. It was determined that outreach was needed. To capture more student involvement, subsequent events include diabetes awareness day, social marketing the above health awareness issues in the residence halls, and further development of intervention theory.

**Identification of College-wide Gaps**

The main gap identified is the use of assessment results and subsequent action plans to influence college-wide planning, allocation of resources, and “improvement and further alignment of institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning”. In response to this gap, the Program Review Chair, working with the Program Review Committee and Student Learning Outcome Assessment Advisory Committee (a sub-committee of Program Review) is in the process of revising the Cycle Three Handbook to incorporate SLO assessment planning, mapping, and reporting of results and action plans exclusively within the program review report. This streamlining will address this gap as programs determine their goals for their programs and those goals are made known to the College while also assuring our movement through the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement stage for both SLOs and Program Review.