

New Mexico Junior College  
**Assessment of Student Learning / Fall 2010 – Spring 2011**  
**Annual Report**

New Mexico Junior College (NMJC) continues to assess student learning outcomes on three levels: institutional, department/program, and course. This report discusses the assessment activities at each level for the 2010-2011 academic year as well as other activities associated with assessment at NMJC since the last annual report.

The Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (SLOAC) oversees assessment activities at NMJC. The committee's charges include reviewing North Central Association/Higher Learning Commission (NCA/HLC) and New Mexico Higher Education Department (NMHED) guidelines and requirements related to student academic achievement and learning; reviewing, updating, disseminating, and developing strategies for the implementation of a college-wide assessment plan; and, developing strategies to ensure shared responsibility for student learning and the assessment of student learning. The SLOAC is comprised of eight voting members, including seven faculty members and the Coordinator of Assessment and Quality Improvement, plus the Vice President for Instruction (VPI), four academic deans in ex-officio capacities, and a support staff recorder. The committee meets once a month throughout both the fall and spring semesters of the academic year. Minutes of meetings are maintained in the TracDat system.

Institutional Level Assessment

NMJC has adopted the following three institutional student learning outcomes. Student learning outcomes are knowledge and abilities achieved by students graduating with an Associate Degree from NMJC.

Communication – The student is able to:

- Comprehend information to summarize, analyze, evaluate, and apply to a specific situation.
- Communicate in an accurate, correct, and understandable manner.

Critical Thinking and Problem Solving – The student is able to:

- Define a problem and arrive at a logical solution.
- Use appropriate technology and information systems to collect, analyze, and organize information.
- Apply critical thinking, analysis, and problem solving to data.

Self and Community – The student is able to:

- Analyze and reflect on the ethical dimensions of legal, social, and/or scientific issues.
- Communicate an awareness of a variety of perspectives of ethical issues.
- Interact with individuals and within groups with integrity and awareness of others' opinions, feelings, and values.

The evaluation process for this level involves collecting student work samples (artifacts) from pre-selected classes in one semester for scoring the following semester by pre-appointed faculty teams and/or compiling and analyzing student survey data collected from students enrolled in pre-determined classes.

Communication was the first of the three outcomes to be assessed beginning with the collection of artifacts from the fall 2006 semester for scoring in the spring of 2007. Assessment of the critical thinking and problem solving outcome began with spring 2007 artifacts scored in the fall of 2007. Self and community outcome surveys were first administered to students in Spring 2008 and analyzed in the Fall 2008 semester, and Fall 2008 self and community artifacts were first scored during Spring 2009. As a result, the communication outcome has been assessed eight times, critical thinking and problem solving seven times, and self and community four times using the survey and four times using the rubric.

### Communication

The three components measured with regard to the communication outcome are: 1) summarize -- information is expressed in a concise way; 2) correct -- information is structured and organized; and, 3) information is well-developed with content appropriate to the assignment's purpose. At its September, 2010 meeting, in order to create uniformity and align institutional benchmarks with those for course and department assessments, the SLOAC lowered the benchmark for this outcome from 80% to 75%. Hence, the benchmark established by the SLOAC for this outcome through spring 2011 was: 75% of students will score 3 or higher on all components.

#### Communication Outcome Scoring Scale:

5 = Exemplary: Excellent; the paper exceeds all expectations.

4 = Proficient: Strong; the essay shows control and skill in the trait under consideration.

3 = Moderate: Competent; the strengths outweigh the weaknesses; revisions needed.

2 = Developing: Weak; weaknesses outweigh strengths; clear points are isolated.

1 = Beginning: Very weak; the essay is simply incoherent; writer shows no control.

The scoring team used a rubric approved by SLOAC.

#### Results:

<i>Communication Outcome</i>	F'06/ S'07	S'07/ F'07	F'07/ S'08	F'08/ S'09	S'09/ S'10	F'09/ S'10	S'10/ F'10	F'10/ S'11
Total # of Artifacts Scored	51	48	50	50	30	16	50	46
# of Artifacts scoring $\geq 3$	32	40	21	23	14	4	29	31
% of Artifacts $\geq 3$	63%	83%	42%	46%	47%	25%	58%	67%

Spring 2008 artifacts were not collected and scored, most likely due to personnel turnover in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness which resulted in temporary miscommunication between the new assessment coordinator and the team liaison. There was a delay in scoring the spring 2009 artifacts due to emergency medical leave by a scoring team member. Resignation of a pre-selected faculty member attributed to the exceptionally low number of artifacts collected in fall 2009. Whereas the permissible number of artifacts necessary for the process had been reduced from 50 to 30 for the spring 2009 semester, at its October, 2010 meeting SLOAC returned the number of necessary artifacts for scoring to 50, to be randomly selected from a larger number of artifacts collected from faculty.

### Critical Thinking and Problem Solving

The critical thinking and problem solving components that are measured are:

- 1) Define a problem;
- 2) Use appropriate technology and information systems;
- 3) Collect information;
- 4) Analyze information;
- 5) Organize information;
- 6) Apply to a specific situation; and,
- 7) Arrive at a logical solution.

The benchmark established by the SLOAC at its October, 2010 meeting was: 75% of students will exhibit at least a moderate skill level on 3 or more of the 4 pre-selected components. The four components represented in the following scores are 1, 3, 5, and 6. The scoring scale is the same for this outcome as it is for the communication outcome shown above. The scoring teams used a rubric approved by the SLOAC.

Results:

<i>Critical Thinking and Problem Solving</i>	S 2007 / F 2007	S 2008 / S 2008	F 2008 / S 2009	S 2009 / F 2009	F 2009 / S 2010	F 2010 / S 2011
Total # of Artifacts scored	50	50	50	30	35	50
# of Artifacts scoring $\geq$ Moderate Skill Level	20	31	24	23	14	26
% of Artifacts $\geq$ Moderate Skill Level	40%	62%	48%	88%	40%	52%

## Self and Community

The self and community outcome was initially assessed using a survey. After two cycles of assessment by survey, the SLOAC added a rubric for assessing student artifacts. The self and community results based on the survey measured the following component: Interact with individuals and within groups with integrity and awareness of others' opinions, feelings, and values. The benchmark established by the SLOAC at the October, 2010 meeting was: 75% of students will agree to 6 of the 8 statements on the survey. The survey statements are categorized as follows:

Statements 1 – 3:	Self-reflection on participation in activities
Statements 4 – 7:	Reflection on class/group dynamics
Statement 8:	Increased awareness of diverse opinions

Using the rubric approved by the SLOAC the scoring team measured two components associated with the self and community outcome. The established benchmark was: 75% of students will score 2 or 3 on both components of the rubric. Each component has a separate scoring scale as follows:

Component 1: Analyze and reflect on the dimensions of legal, social, and/or scientific issues with regard to self and community – Scoring Scale

- 3 = The student's work analyzes contrasting perspectives of issue/s.
- 3 = The student's work objectively and thoroughly examines all sides of the issues.
- 3 = If applicable, the student's position is clearly communicated.
- 2 = The student's work identifies some sides of the issues.
- 2 = The student's work addresses some sides of the issue subjectively, but lacks detailed explanations.
- 1 = The student's work identifies one side of the issue/s.
- 1 = The student's work states only one side of the issue subjectively and without detail.
- 0 = The student's work does not identify or address any issues.

Component 2: Communicate an awareness of multiple perspectives concerning community issues – Scoring Scale

- 3 = The student's work describes contrasting perspectives of issue/s.
- 3 = The student's work objectively compares and contrasts a variety of perspectives of the issue/s.
- 2 = The student's work identifies and defines some perspectives of issue/s.
- 1 = The student's work lists some perspectives of issues.
- 0 = The student's work does not identify or address any issues.

## Results:

<i>Self and Community Outcome</i>	Spring 2008 / Fall 2008	Fall 2008 / Spring 2009	Fall 2009 / Spring 2010	Fall 2010 / Spring 2011
<b>Survey</b>				
# of Surveys Evaluated	26	30		33
# Agreed to 6 out of 8 stmts.	22	30		31
% Agreed to 6 out of 8 stmts.	85%	100%		100%
<b>Artifacts / Rubric</b>				
Total # of Artifacts Scored		49	30 + 30 = 60*	21
# of Artifacts $\geq 2$ on both Components		23	19 + 17 = 36	11
		47%	63% + 57% = 60%	52%

\* The Self and Community outcome was assessed two times for the fall 2009 / spring 2010 academic year using two different batches of fall 2009 student artifacts (30 artifacts each, representing two different courses).

## Resulting Action:

At the Spring, 2011 faculty in-service meeting, in an effort to address the continued low scores for all three institutional outcomes, the VPI asked faculty to include their institutional assessment activities in their respective syllabi (specifically within the Course Outline section) effective for the Fall 2011 semester. The purpose for this action was to make students aware of the institution's assessment activities and to encourage their active participation.

Department/Program Level Assessment

Department chairs and program directors are responsible for communicating with their respective faculty to define the student learning outcomes and assessment plans within their own areas. Effective as of the spring, 2011 semester, department chairs and program directors submit their assessment plans to their respective division Deans at the beginning of the semester, as well as their results at the end of the same semester. After their review, the division Deans forward the plans and results to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness for entry into the TracDat system.

NMJC Department/Program Assessment Summary of Results	
Department / Program	Summary of Results and Action Plans
Adult Basic Education	Assessment activities were not reported to the OIE for the 2010-2011 academic year.
Automotive Programs/Department (includes Ford-ASSET, GM-ASEP, and Independent Automotive Technology)	<p>Fall 2010 – Departmental assessment focused solely on “Instructor Certification” and did not assess student learning outcomes.</p> <p>Spring 2011 – One outcome was assessed for both the GM-ASEP and Ford-ASSET programs. Students were required to fill out worksheets that would be used for the institutional level Critical Thinking and Problem Solving outcome. Specific student learning outcome results were not reported to the OIE.</p> <p>There were not any departmental level action plans to follow up.</p>
Business Program/Department (includes Accounting, Business, Computer Information Systems, Economics, and Office Technology)	<p>Fall 2010 – Two outcomes were assessed in BU113 using a research project. The benchmark was met for both outcomes. The action plan is to repeat the same assessment in a subsequent semester to insure the percentages.</p> <p>Spring 2011 – A plan was submitted to the OIE wherein the same outcomes would be assessed in the same courses, using the same assessment methods. However, results were not reported to the OIE.</p> <p>Follow-up for action plans for the previous semester were not reported. All other courses within this department were assessed and reported for at the general education and/or course level only.</p>
Corrections Academy	<p>The most recent report received from the Corrections Academy is dated for Summer 2010. No reports have been received for the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 semesters.</p> <p>Summer 2010 – Six outcomes were assessed through written exams and practical scenario applications and demonstrations. Benchmarks were met for all six outcomes. The action plan is to continue to maintain the state mandated qualifications for corrections officers.</p>

<p>Cosmetology Program/Department</p>	<p>Fall 2010 – Three outcomes were assessed. Assessment methods included standardized final exams for each level, daily practical sheets, and circle sheets. Benchmarks were met for 2/3 of the outcomes. Action plans included continuing to use standardized final exams, both written and practical, to continue use of the practical sheets, and to devote more time for students to review.</p> <p>Spring 2011 – The same three outcomes were assessed, using the same assessment methods. Benchmarks were met for all three outcomes. The action plan was to extend the instructional time for each chapter, and otherwise to continue with use of the practical and circle sheets.</p>
<p>Education Department (includes Art, Communication, Drama, Education, Music, and Transitional Studies)</p>	<p>Fall 2010 – One outcome was assessed in ED223C and ED213 using end-of-semester reports (assignments) and research and class discussion. A rubric was used. The benchmark was met. The action plan for improvement was to require the students to do shorter assignments, more often, instead of waiting for a final report at the end of the semester. Because of the rotational nature of this department's assessment plan, the success of this action plan will not be immediately reported. There was no reference to the action plan from the previous semester.</p> <p>Spring 2011 – Four outcomes were assessed in AR113 and AR213B. Assessment methods included individual and/or group critique discussion and/or report, a vocabulary exam, tests, and written reports. There were varying benchmarks, and the benchmark was met for ¾ of the outcomes. The action plan includes a stronger emphasis on art vocabulary, refining the expected assignment outcomes, refining lectures and assignments, and conferring with other instructors about methodologies. This was the first time Art classes were assessed at the departmental level, so there was not a previous action plan to follow up.</p> <p>All other courses within this department were assessed and reported for at the general education and/or course level only.</p>

<p>Languages Department (includes English, German, Philosophy, Spanish, and World Religion)</p>	<p>Fall 2010 – The department chair reported that there were unforeseen technical difficulties in accomplishing the department’s electronic assessment strategy (per the Spring 2010 action plan). Hence, department level assessment did not occur for this semester.</p> <p>Spring 2011 – Six outcomes were assessed in EN113 and EN123. Assessment methods were not explained. The benchmarks were met or exceeded for each outcome. The action plan is specific for each outcome and includes encouraging professors to assign and discuss critical reading materials, issuing a call for assignments and teaching materials to be shared among the professors, reviewing the curriculum for EN123, encouraging professors to have students submit drafts and prewriting before submitting the final assignments, revising the department handbook, and searching for supplemental materials on logical reasoning.</p> <p>All other courses within this department were assessed and reported for at the general education and/or course level only.</p>
<p>Law Enforcement Academy</p>	<p>Six outcomes were assessed using written exams, and practical scenario applications and demonstrations. Benchmarks were met for 5/6 of the outcomes. The action plan includes conducting more time sensitive shooting drills and increasing in the area of fundamentals of driving and adding practical driving time.</p>
<p>Mathematics and Lab Sciences Department</p>	<p>Fall 2010 – Five outcomes were assessed for Mathematics using common questions on final exams across the discipline. The benchmark was met for 2/5 of the outcomes. The action plan included the redesign of Basic Math starting with the Fall 2011 semester and stronger focus by all instructors on word problems.</p> <p>Lab sciences were assessed at the general education and/or course level, but not as a cohesive departmental focus.</p> <p>Spring 2011 – The same five outcomes were assessed for Mathematics, again using common questions on final exams across the discipline. The benchmark was met for 2/5 of the outcomes. The action plan was the continued work to redesign Basic Math for the Fall 2011 semester.</p> <p>Lab sciences were assessed at the general education and/or course level, but not as a cohesive departmental focus.</p>



<p>Nursing Program</p>	<p>Assessment activities were not reported to the OIE for the 2010-2011 academic year.</p>
<p>Physical Education</p>	<p>Fall 2010 – Cognitive and physical assessments occurred in all PY111H classes, using written and physical tests. The benchmarks were met for all assessment points. The action plan included exploring new technologies for student accountability for performing workouts for the online courses, and more homework activities and specific topic quizzes for face-to-face classes.</p> <p>Spring 2011 – Five outcomes were assessed in all physical education courses using a pre/post course questionnaire. The benchmark was not met for any of the outcomes. The action plan was to require student journals with specific components addressed weekly, to be turned in and evaluated at mid-term and finals.</p>
<p>Public Safety &amp; Industry Division/Department (includes ACT:Cosmetology, ACT:Nursing, ACT:Welding, Criminal Justice, Emergency Medical Technician, Paralegal, and Welding) *Corrections Academy, Cosmetology, and Law Enforcement Academy are within this division, but are assessed as individual units because of externally mandated criteria.*</p>	<p>Fall 2010 – Four outcomes were assessed for Welding. Assessment methods included written mid-term and final exams, welded exemplars and pattern-cutting exemplars. The benchmark was met for ¾ of the outcomes. The action plan included encouraging better attendance and attention to assignment completion, including more practice, and increasing practical welding exercises.</p> <p>Spring 2011 – Assessment activities were not reported for this division for the Spring 2011 semester.</p> <p>Assessment results for the remaining courses within this division were reported at the course level only.</p>
<p>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences (includes Anthropology, Geography, Government, History, Psychology, and Sociology)</p>	<p>Fall 2010 – One outcome was assessed in three HI123 classes using written assignments. The benchmark was not met. The action plan was to give students more chances to focus on and discuss the importance of connections between history and current events/issues within the classroom.</p> <p>Spring 2011 – One outcome was assessed in 12 sections of HI123. Assessment methods were not explained. The benchmark was met, showing a 21-point increase from the Fall 2010 semester. The action plan was to continue to reinforce stronger writing skills and to diversify the types of assignments used to improve students' understanding.</p>

Social & Behavioral Sciences (continued)	All other courses within this department were assessed and reported for at the general education and/or course level only.
---	--

\*Assignment rubrics are provided to students with or as part of their assignments. Some of the assignment rubrics are checklists for students to follow in completing their assignments. Some of the assignment rubrics provide grading criteria to the students for their consideration in completing the assignments. The difference is in the individual instructor's preference.

### Course Level Assessment

Assessment at the course level began in spring 2008. The two categories of course level assessment are general education courses and all other courses. All full-time faculty are required to assess a minimum of two classes per semester. In the event a faculty member teaches only one general education class, he/she must then also assess at least one other course for the semester. Beginning with the fall 2010 semester, adjunct faculty were required to assess at least one class per semester, except for general education courses. Adjunct faculty are required to assess all general education classes which they may teach.

#### *General Education:*

The New Mexico Higher Education Department (NMHED) mandated student learning competencies for courses in the general education core. The competencies are divided into the following five areas:

Area I	--	Communications (six competencies)
Area II	--	Mathematics / Algebra (four competencies) Mathematics / Calculus I (four competencies) Mathematic / Other College-Level (five competencies)
Area III	--	Laboratory Science (five competencies)
Area IV	--	Social and Behavioral Sciences (four competencies)
Area V	--	Humanities and Fine Arts (four competencies)

The VPI identified when the general education courses were to be assessed per a General Education Assessment Three-Year Rotation schedule. When a general education course is required to be assessed per its location on the schedule, the full-time and adjunct faculty teaching that course were required to assess every competency within the applicable area in every section of the course. When EN 113 Composition and Rhetoric is required to be assessed for reporting to the NMHED, for example, all applicable full-time and adjunct faculty must assess all six competencies for Area I Communications. The report submitted to the NMHED in fall 2011 covers the 2010-2011 academic year and is available for viewing on the NMJC website homepage, and is summarized below.

Assessment of General Education Courses / Rotation Three: Fall 2010 / Spring 2011	
<p>Area I—Communications: EN113; EN123; EN123A</p>	<p>Student learning was measured for six competencies using written essays addressing their reading of specific passages, research and written essays on various topics, student-developed study questions over works of fiction and literary terms, research and a written business feasibility report, completing research method exercises, student discussion about plagiarism, and written sample crime scene presentations. The benchmark was met or exceeded for all competencies. The action plan(s) included placing more emphasis on the skills set forth in the mandated competencies, allowing more class time for students to work on their assignments, providing more instruction in preparation of the assignments, and encouraging students to express their ideas in the classroom.</p>
<p>Area II—Mathematics / Algebra: MA113</p>	<p>All college algebra students were assessed for four competencies by means of a final capstone project, through homework, and test performance. The benchmark was met for 2/4 of the competencies. The action plan to improve results included allowing students to submit drafts of assignments, obtain feedback and make corrections before final submission, additional group work, placing additional emphasis on problem area topics, and providing students with additional take-home work.</p>
<p>Area II—Mathematics / Calculus: MA 144</p>	<p>Four competencies were assessed by means of tests, free response questions, and homework questions. The benchmark was met for 2/4 of the competencies. The action plan included modeling problems during class time, adding a capstone project, adding preliminary quizzes and more homework, and placing greater emphasis on problem area topics.</p>

<p>Area II—Mathematics / Other College Level MA 113B</p>	<p>Student learning was measured for five competencies through assignments and unit tests. The benchmark was met for 5/5 competencies within traditional classrooms, and for 4/5 of the competencies for online students. The action plan included more in-class assignments, more clarification for online students, stressing the importance of the assignments to students, and slight modifications to course content.</p>
<p>Area III—Laboratory Sciences: BI114; BI124; BI134; BI144</p>	<p>Student learning was assessed for five competencies by means of assignments, multiple choice quizzes, use of rubrics in student design of controlled lab experiments, exams, journal articles, oral presentations, and written papers. The benchmarks were met for all competencies. The action plan for improvement of student learning included placing greater emphasis on topics, revising instructions to reduce subjectivity in data collection, stressing the importance of the scientific method, adding lab exercises, stressing the importance of class participation, devoting more time to preparing students for effective communication and writing techniques, and more emphasis on the importance of data analysis and information evaluation.</p>
<p>Area IV—Social/Behavioral Sciences: EC213; EC223; GO213; GO233</p>	<p>Four competencies were measured through written assignments, research and reports, short answer and essay questions, class presentations, and a capstone exercise. The benchmark was met in <math>\frac{3}{4}</math> of the courses for the first competency, <math>\frac{2}{4}</math> of the courses for the second competency, <math>\frac{3}{4}</math> of the courses for competency three, and in all of the courses for competency four. To address improvement in student learning, more class time will be spent to communicate the process for accessing materials, discussion of topics in class materials will be increased, short classroom assignments will be added, and adding more class time to prepare for tests.</p>

Area V—English/Humanities/Fine Arts: MU213; DR113	Student learning was assessed for four competencies through written critiques. Benchmarks were met for 2/4 of the competencies. To see improvements in student learning, more emphasis will be placed on proper usage of musical terms, more time will be devoted to preparation of written tests, and a mock exercise will be employed in the drama course to prepare students for their assignment.
--	---

*All Other Courses:*

Full-time faculty for all other courses each select a minimum of two classes to assess every semester. When full-time faculty who teach general education courses are not required to assess specific courses according to the rotation schedule, they are required to assess two other classes and are encouraged to assess the general education courses to meet this requirement. Adjunct faculty are required to assess at least one class per semester. All faculty were encouraged to assess three to five outcomes (competencies) per semester. The voluntary average was two outcomes.

The following tables set forth the number of faculty who participated in the course level assessment activities at NMJC in the fall 2008, spring/fall 2009, spring/fall 2010 and spring 2011 semesters and the number of courses assessed.

Faculty Participation in Course-Level Assessment						
	F / 2008	S / 2009	F / 2009	S / 2010	F/ 2010	S / 2011
Total Full-Time Faculty	74	74	71	69	67	67
Full-Time Faculty Required to Assess at Course Level	74	74	71	57	54	46
Full-Time Faculty Participation	49	53	69	56	49	44
Non-Participating Full-Time Faculty	25	21	2	1	5*	2
Total Adjunct Faculty**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	66	60
Adjunct Faculty Required to Assess at Course Level***	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	49	60
Adjunct Faculty Participation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	49	59
Non-Participating Adjunct Faculty	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	17	1

\*Included in this number are several faculty members who left the employ of NMJC at the end of the fall 2010 semester who did not turn in their assessment results.

\*\*NMJC full-time professional staff who teach classes as overloads to their contracts are included in this number.

\*\*\*Physical Education adjunct faculty were not required to assess for the Fall 2010 semester.

Course Sections Assessed						
	F / 2008	S / 2009	F / 2009	S / 2010	F / 2010	S / 2011
Total Number of Course Sections Assessed	66	79	126	98	151	148
General Education	12	16	18	18	33	42
Other	54	63	108	80	118	106
Courses Assessed in Consecutive Semesters	24	24	52	52	48	80

The full-time faculty participation and courses assessed numbers dropped from fall 2009 to spring 2010 resulting from a combination of a reduction in the workforce and changing assessment requirements for Nursing, Cosmetology, Law Enforcement Academy, Corrections Academy, and Automotive programs from course level to program level only.

#### Other Activities Associated with Assessment

- The Assessment Handbook created by SLOAC was completed in the Fall 2010 semester and was uploaded to the NMJC Assessment of Student Learning webpage for use by faculty.
- NMJC's website includes a page dedicated to assessment activity at the campus which provides links to the general education reports, the Progress Report on Assessment submitted to HLC, and resource materials for use by faculty including assessment activity due dates, and the Communications Toolbox, and assessment reporting forms.