

St. Petersburg College

Outcomes Assessment Review Report

Report Completion Date: December, 2008

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 'Suggest revisions to the current general education objectives to Cabinet', 'Identify models for capturing and disseminating best classroom practices associated with "real world" experiences', and 'Propose to Cabinet that we utilize the Board of Trustees (BOT) rule that requires that all students who apply for graduation be available to take an assessment (e.g., Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP) or other general education areas)', will be moved forward into areas needing improvement in the current year.

Table 1
2007-08 Action Plan Item Status

Objective	Status	Comments
Provide faculty training in development of assessment tools	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>A session on assessing critical thinking has been conducted in each of the three Critical Thinking Institutes (CTIs) conducted thus far. The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Team and the Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IRE) department have served as a resource for any programs conducting Critical Thinking (CT) assessment</i> ▪ <i>The CT gateway website is finalizing construction and should be available very soon: (www.spcollege.edu/criticalthinking)</i> ▪ <i>The QEP team is currently considering a model to establish a faculty champion devoted to CT assessment</i>
Research an Intranet solution to provide college-wide access to assessments and materials	Completed	<p><i>The critical thinking gateway website is finalizing construction and should be available very soon: (www.spcollege.edu/criticalthinking)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>The Educational Outcomes website now includes a 'public' access search component that allows 'completed' assessment reports to be viewed by any college employee</i>

Objective	Status	Comments
Suggest revisions to the current general education objectives to Cabinet	In Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Objective was originally delayed due to a decision to wait for any review or changes until after the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) reaffirmation process had been completed</i> ▪ <i>Educational Oversight committee (11/14/2008) voted to make a recommendation to redesign the General Education Outcomes in the College Mission Statement</i>
Identify models for capturing and disseminating best classroom practices associated with “real world” experiences	In Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Educational Oversight Committee will share courses of record repository and best practices</i> ▪ <i>Many disciplines have included A New Global Environment for Learning (ANGEL) communities designed to upload and share discipline “best practices”</i>
Propose to Cabinet that we utilize the BOT rule that requires that all students who apply for graduation be available to take an assessment (e.g., MAPP or other general education areas)	In Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Presented to Cabinet as part of the 2007-08 Educational Oversight Group Report. Discussed a model at the Nov. 2008 General Education Team meeting, and IRE is creating a detailed plan to share with leadership</i> ▪ <i>Once detailed plan is created and reviewed by Educational Oversight Group it will be shared with leadership</i> ▪ <i>Models proposed included contacting graduates who have completed 45 credit hours and including a student’s score on their transcripts (no retakes will be available)</i>

Objective	Status	Comments
Explore in-house administration of Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) to eCampus students	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussed online model with University of Texas at Austin staff and they were not interested in pursuing this idea ▪ Discussed creating an in-house student engagement model using Student Survey of Instruction (SSI) items ▪ While using the CCSSE survey for online students is not a viable option, the committee discussed creating an in-house student engagement survey
Explore the SSI process from a college-wide perspective	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SSI was successfully piloted as an online administration to face-to-face classes in the spring. A full college wide implementation of the SSI online is being conducted this semester (Fall). ▪ Discussed creating an in-house student engagement model using SSI items (see new objective #6) ▪ New CT items are being discussed with the QEP team

Areas that need improvement:

In order to identify the areas needing improvement, the 2007-08 General Education and Program Assessment reports were reviewed. Each of the 2007-08 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 2007-08 General Education Assessment Reports (Two Gen Ed Goal Areas: Citizenship, and Critical Thinking)
2. Conducted analysis for individual action items (6) 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 2007-08 Program Assessment Reports or those in advanced stage of completion (Ten programs: Aviation Maintenance Management, Business Administration, Early Childhood Education, Emergency Administration and Management, Fire Science Technology, Industrial Management (AAS), IT Security, Radiography, Sign Language Interpretation, Veterinary Technology).
2. Conducted analysis for individual action items (21) 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 2007/08: #4]
2. Suggest revisions to the current general education outcomes to Cabinet [From 2007/08: #3]
3. Propose (again) to Cabinet that we utilize the BOT rule that all students who apply for graduation be required to take an assessment (e.g., MAPP or other general education areas) [From 2007/08: #5]

In addition, four other areas were identified through discussions with the members of the Educational oversight group. These three areas are:

1. Provide faculty training in teaching and assessment for critical thinking
2. Evaluate the SSI process to include critical thinking items
3. Develop an in-house student engagement survey
4. 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

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

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: *Align general education outcomes with curriculum and/or accreditation/national standards of the discipline*

Objective for Upcoming Year:

Suggest revisions to the current general education outcomes to Cabinet (see BOT 6Hx23-1.02: 3/20/07 Revision)

Action Steps:

- Work with faculty to draft new general education outcomes based on state proposed outcomes [Academic Deans to discuss with faculty during January 9th meetings]
- Work with general education areas to create program-specific operational definitions of general education objectives
- Have the Educational Oversight Committee serve as a resource during the transition
- Map general education outcomes (current/new) across AS/AAS program curriculum

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

Objective for Upcoming Year:

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)

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:

- Create a detailed graduate Gen Ed assessment plan (e.g., student assessment for general education outcomes conducted after completing 45 credit hours, assessment scores posted on student transcripts to ensure adequate participation, etc.)
- Share plan and elicit feedback from relevant stakeholders

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

Objective for Upcoming Year:

Provide faculty training in teaching and assessment for critical thinking

Action Steps:

- Conduct a session in assessment training for faculty as part of every Critical Thinking Institute
- Incorporate critical thinking based curriculum (e.g., lessons plans) and assessment examples on the new critical thinking gateway website ([http:// www.spcollege.edu/sacs/criticalthinking](http://www.spcollege.edu/sacs/criticalthinking))
- Identify additional in-house assessment experts through QEP process

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

Objective for Upcoming Year:

Evaluate the SSI process to include critical thinking items

Action Steps:

- Create new critical thinking items for the SSI
- Pilot new critical thinking items on the SSI

VI. Area Needing Improvement: *Identify and assess the level of student engagement for different student groups (instructional modality, class standing, etc.)*

Objective for Upcoming Year:

Develop an in-house student engagement survey

Action Steps:

- Create an in-house student engagement survey to assess relevant student groups
- Pilot the in-house student engagement survey (e.g., SSI)

VII. Area Needing Improvement: *Review and improve upon the existing process related to course development and review with a focus on improving teaching and learning for all modalities*

Objective for Upcoming Year:

1. 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

Action Steps:

- Review the current course development/approval process and the three-year course review process with a focus on improving teaching and learning for all modalities
- Conduct discussions with key stakeholders such as program administrators, faculty, and C&I committee members
- Document each of these process and make recommendations for improvement to the Educational Oversight Committee

Completion and Review Process Information

This Outcomes Assessment Review report was prepared by:

Jesse Coraggio and Maggie Tymms

Enter Name of Preparers

December 8, 2008

Date