

New Mexico Junior College
Assessment of Student Learning / Fall 2009 – Spring 2010
Annual Report

New Mexico Junior College (NMJC) continues its processes for assessing student learning outcomes on three levels: institutional, department/program, and course. This document reports on the status of assessment activities at each level for the 2009-2010 academic year as well as other activities associated with assessment at NMJC.

Oversight for assessment activities at NMJC is performed by the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (SLOAC). 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 each the fall and spring semesters of the academic year. Minutes of meetings are maintained in the TracDat system.

Institutional Level Assessment

There are three student learning outcomes at the institutional level of assessment:

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-determined classes in one semester for scoring by pre-appointed faculty teams the following semester and/or evaluating surveys completed by students enrolled in pre-selected classes.

The first artifacts were collected for the communication outcome from the fall 2006 semester and scored in spring 2007. The critical thinking and problem solving outcome was first assessed in fall 2007 using artifacts collected in spring 2007. The self and community outcome

has been assessed using two different tools, a survey and a rubric. Surveys completed by students in spring 2008 were compiled and analyzed in fall 2008. A rubric was applied to fall 2008 student work which was evaluated in spring 2009. Hence, as of spring 2010, the communication outcome has been assessed six times, critical thinking and problem solving five times, and self and community two times using the survey and two times using the rubric.

Communication

The three components measured with regard to the communication outcome are: 1) information is expressed in a concise way; 2) information is structured and organized; and, 3) information is appropriate to audience, purpose, and topic. The benchmark established by the SLOAC for this outcome through spring 2010 was: 80% 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 2006 / S 2007	S 2007 / F 2007	F 2007 / S 2008	F 2008 / S 2009	S 2009 / S 2010	F 2009 / S 2010
Total # of Artifacts Scored	51	48	50	50	30	16
# of Artifacts scoring ≥ 3	32	40	21	23	14	4
% of Artifacts ≥ 3	63%	83%	42%	46%	47%	25%

Artifacts were not collected in the spring 2008 semester for scoring in fall 2008. The scoring of artifacts collected in spring 2009 was delayed until the spring 2010 semester to accommodate a member of the scoring team who was unavailable during the fall 2009 semester due to family medical leave. As a result of challenges in collecting the requisite number of artifacts (minimum of 50), beginning in the spring 2009 semester SLOAC agreed that the minimum number could be reduced to 30. The low number of artifacts collected in the fall 2009 semester was attributed to the resignation of a faculty member from whom a large number of artifacts had been anticipated.

Resulting Action:

As a result of low scores, in the spring of 2009 the SLOAC called upon full-time faculty to create a Communications Toolbox—a collection of best practice tools to be used by faculty across all disciplines to help students develop better communication skills. Included in the toolbox are a compilation of faculty's responses to questions designed to inform all toolbox users how communication is used in classes across campus, rubrics for grading five-paragraph essays, one each for critiquing reports on research-based articles and on non-research based articles, and checklists for students' use when writing five-paragraph and cause and effect essays. The toolbox also contains forms for use by reviewers to provide feedback and a link to the Essay Writing Center to share with students to help them improve their writing skills. There has not been any follow up to determine if faculty members are using the toolbox. The Communications Toolbox is available through the NMJC website.

Following continued low scores, in September, 2009, SLOAC, working with English Department faculty, selected a text as a Student Handbook and recommended that faculty include the text in their respective syllabi either as required or suggested course material. However, there has not been any follow up to determine if any faculty acted on the committee's recommendation.

To ensure that an adequate number of artifacts are available for scoring, the VPI has placed renewed emphasis on the importance of participating in the institutional level of assessment in his communications to the selected faculty, and SLOAC member liaisons have worked more closely with the selected faculty to communicate exactly what is needed for the process. Some faculty had the impression that SLOAC was asking for student work in addition to their standard curriculum / assignments. The SLOAC liaisons now work with the selected faculty to help determine which standard assignments in their respective courses will meet the criteria for student artifacts as well as asking them for a timeframe as to when the artifacts will be available for processing.

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 was: 80% 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, 4, 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
Total # of Artifacts scored	50	50	50	30	35
# of Artifacts scoring \geq Moderate Skill Level	20	31	24	23	14
% of Artifacts \geq Moderate Skill Level	40%	62%	48%	88%	40%

Resulting Action:

A meeting/workshop was held during the spring 2010 in-service for faculty whose courses had been previously identified for the Critical Thinking outcome. Faculty were asked to bring student assignments to the meeting for peer review and discussion and sharing of ideas to improve students' critical thinking skills. Discussions began in SLOAC during spring 2010 proposing identification of institutional outcome assignments on course syllabi.

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 was: 80% 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: 1) analyze and reflect on the ethical dimensions of legal, social, and/or scientific issues; and, 2) communicate an awareness of a variety of perspectives on ethical issues. The established benchmark was: 70% 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 Ethical Dimensions of Legal, Social, and/or Scientific Issues – Scoring Scale

- 3 = The student's work analyzes contrasting perspectives of ethical issues.
- 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 ethical 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 ethical issues.
- 1 = The student's work states only one side of the issue subjectively and without detail.

Component 2: Communicate an Awareness of a Variety of Perspectives on Ethical Issues
– Scoring Scale

- 3 = The student's work describes contrasting perspectives of ethical issues.
- 3 = The student's work objectively compares and contrasts a variety of perspectives of the issues.
- 2 = The student's work identifies and defines some perspectives of ethical issues.
- 1 = The student's work lists some perspectives of ethical issues.

Results:

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

* 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:

No action has been taken through the spring 2010 semester as a result of these data.

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. The department chair or the chair's designee / scribe is responsible for communicating the assessment plan and the subsequent results (observations) to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness for entry into the TracDat assessment system. Following is a list of departments/programs expected to assess student learning outcomes.

NMJC Department/Program Assessment Summary of Results	
Department / Program	Summary of Results
Communication (Education Department)	<p>This area has not been assessed as a department. Taught only by adjuncts, Communication courses were not required to be assessed during the 2009-2010 academic year since adjuncts were not required to participate in assessment activities except when the courses appear within the General Education rotation cycle.</p> <p>For future reports, any departmental assessment activities for Communication courses will be reported under the Education Department.</p>
Computer Information Systems (Business Department/Program)	<p>One student learning outcome was measured in five sections of CS123D using hands-on labs in the fall 2009 semester. The benchmark was not met. Action plans included spending extra time on queries, restructuring the 8-week course included in the assessment results, and adding more lecture and lab for spreadsheets and databases.</p> <p>Two student learning outcomes were measured in CS113, CS213, CS213C, and CS213J in the spring 2010 semester. Assessment methods included a lab assignment, an essay question, and an "assignment" (no description of the assignment was provided). The benchmark was met in CS213 using the lab assignment, but not met using the essay question. The benchmark was met in CS213J and CS213C with the "assignment", but not met in CS113. Action plans for improvement included: "continue current practices;" doing additional scenario solving practice, array assignment, labs on loops, practice labs on flowcharting, more problem solving exercises; and, practicing documentation skills earlier in the semester.</p> <p>For future reports, any departmental assessment activities for C.I.S. courses will be reported under the Business Department/Program.</p>

<p>Education (includes Education; Communication; Music; Art; Drama; Transitional Studies)</p>	<p>Fall 2009 assessment activities measured one student learning outcome in ED233 using classroom observation, reports, and rubrics*. The benchmark was met. The action plan will require students to report on their progress on observations once a week compared to every three weeks previously.</p> <p>Only Education classes were included for assessment in the spring 2010 semester. Reports and rubrics were used to assess one student learning outcome in ED113A and ED233. The benchmark was met in ED113A and exceeded in ED233. The action plan for improvements included providing more concrete opportunities such as videos, role-playing, and websites to research and practice behavioral management techniques.</p>
<p>English (Languages Department)</p>	<p>Department Chair’s Statement for the Record: Due to problems with having faculty report data from their courses in a consistent way, the English Department Assessment Plan has never gotten off the ground even though course level assessment in quite strong. With the help of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, we are standardizing the way faculty report assessment data and hope to begin aggregating data from the course level assessment as of fall 2009.</p> <p>For the spring 2010 semester, one outcome was assessed using pre and post-tests. The benchmark was not met. The action plan is to request “Adobe Captivate” at the start of the 2010-2011 fiscal year with which to design and present standardized lectures with assessment embedded in the lectures, starting with a few basic presentations and quizzes.</p> <p>For future reports, any departmental assessment activities for English courses will be reported under the Languages Department.</p>
<p>Independent Automotive Technology (Public Safety and Industry Division / Department)</p>	<p>Two courses were assessed at the course level. The assessment method for both classes was a lab sheet with assignment rubric. The benchmark was not met in either class. The action plans included more hands-on practice, more instructor review, and more use of relevant websites.</p>
<p>Languages (includes English, German, Spanish, Philosophy, and World Religion)</p>	<p>Assessment activities for English, Spanish, Philosophy, and World Religion have occurred and been reported at the general education and / or course level. German courses have not been assessed.</p> <p>For future reports, any departmental assessment activities for the relevant courses will be reported under the Languages Department.</p>

Mathematics (Mathematics and Lab Sciences Department)	<p>Fall 2009 data was compiled from course-level assessments and reported for Basic Math, Elementary Algebra, Intermediate Algebra, College Algebra, and Trigonometry courses. The four general education outcomes were assessed with eight common questions. The benchmark was met in 3/5 of the courses for the 1st outcome, met in 2/4 of the courses for the 2nd outcome (not assessed in Basic Math), met for 2/5 of the courses for the 3rd outcome, and met for 2/4 of the courses for the 4th outcome (not assessed in Basic Math). The action plan involves updating outcomes.</p> <p>Using the same outcomes and assessment methods in the spring 2010 semester, 1/5 of the courses met the benchmark for the 1st outcome, 0/4 of the courses met the benchmark for the 2nd outcome (not assessed in Basic Math), 2/5 of the courses met the benchmark for the 3rd and 4th outcomes. The action plan included distributing new question sets to adjunct faculty, and making changes to the outcomes.</p> <p>For future reports, any departmental assessment activities for Mathematics courses will be reported under the Mathematics / Lab Sciences Department.</p>
Music (Education Department)	<p>Assessment activities for Music courses have occurred and been reported at the general education and / or course level and not as a stand-alone department or as part of the Education Department assessment reporting.</p> <p>For future reports, any departmental assessment activities for Music courses will be reported under the Education Department.</p>
Physical Education	<p>Fitness For Life classes were the focus of departmental assessment for fall 2009 / spring 2010. Two outcomes were measured each semester using pre- and post-tests. The benchmark was not met for either outcome in fall 2009. In the spring 2010 semester, the benchmark for both outcomes was met by 3/5 classes. Action plans included providing students with a study guide, more specificity and creativity in classroom instruction, and assigning more workouts outside of class time.</p>
Science (Mathematics and Lab Sciences Department)	<p>Biology courses were the focus of departmental assessment for the reporting period. Assessment methods included pre- and post-tests. Results met acceptable levels in all courses assessed. The action plan is to continue administering pre- and post-tests, providing more review during class time, and re-evaluating assessment questions. Assessment results for Geology and Physics courses are reported in the General Education portion of this report.</p>

	<p>For future reports, any departmental assessment activities for Lab Sciences courses will be reported under the Mathematics and Lab Sciences Department.</p>
<p>Social & Behavioral Sciences (includes Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology, Government, History, Geography)</p>	<p>History, Geography, and Sociology course assessment results are included in the General Education section of this report. The action plan for the Social & Behavioral Sciences Department beginning in the spring 2010 semester re-structures departmental assessment. The department will review the previous year's General Education Report to the NMHED, emphasize one course/area based on that report each year, and additionally tie all departmental assessment to the institution-level processes and outcomes.</p> <p>For future reports, any departmental assessment activities for the relevant courses will be reported under a single Social & Behavioral Department category.</p>
<p>Theatre (Education Department)</p>	<p>Theatre/Drama has not been assessed as a stand-alone department. No individual course results were reported for the 2009-2010 academic year.</p> <p>For future reports, any departmental assessment activities for Theatre courses will be reported under the Education Department.</p>
<p>Visual Arts--Fine Arts & Design (Education Department)</p>	<p>Assessment activities for Arts courses have occurred and been reported only at the course level and not as a stand-alone department or as part of the Education Department assessment reporting.</p> <p>For future reports, any departmental assessment activities for Arts courses will be reported under the Education Department.</p>
<p>ACT: Cosmetology (Public Safety & Industry Division / Department)</p>	<p>Assessment activities for ACT-Cosmetology courses have occurred and been reported only at the course level and not as a stand-alone department, as part of the Cosmetology Department, or as part of the Public Safety & Industry Division/department.</p> <p>For future reports, any departmental assessment activities for ACT: Cosmetology courses will be reported under the Public Safety & Industry Division/Department.</p>
<p>ACT: Nursing (Public Safety & Industry Division / Department)</p>	<p>Assessment activities for ACT-Nursing courses have occurred and been reported only at the course level and not as a stand-alone department, as part of the Nursing Department, or as part of the Public Safety & Industry Division / Department.</p>

	<p>For future reports, any departmental assessment activities for ACT: Nursing courses will be reported under the Public Safety & Industry Division / Department.</p>
<p>ACT: Welding (Public Safety & Industry Division / Department)</p>	<p>Assessment activities for ACT-Welding courses have occurred and been reported only at the course level and not as a stand-alone department, as part of the Welding courses, or as part of the Public Safety & Industry Division / Department.</p> <p>For future reports, any departmental assessment activities for ACT: Welding courses will be reported under the Public Safety & Industry Division / Department.</p>
<p>Adult Basic Education</p>	<p>Assessment activities were not reported to the O.I.E. for the 2009-2010 academic year.</p>
<p>ASEP – GM (Public Safety & Industry Division / Department)</p>	<p>Assessment activities for ASEP-GM courses have occurred and been reported only at the course level for the fall 2009 and spring 2010 semesters and not as a stand-alone department or as part of the Public Safety & Industry Division / Department.</p> <p>For future reports, any departmental assessment activities for the ASEP-GM program will be reported under the Public Safety & Industry Division / Department.</p>
<p>ASSET – Ford (Public Safety & Industry Division ; Department)</p>	<p>Assessment activities for ASSET-Ford courses have occurred and been reported only at the course level for the fall 2009 and spring 2010 semesters and not as a stand-alone department or as part of the Public Safety & Industry Division / Department.</p> <p>For future reports, any departmental assessment activities for the ASSET-Ford program will be reported under the Public Safety & Industry Division / Department.</p>
<p>Business (includes Business, Accounting, Economics, Information Systems, and Office Technology)</p>	<p>In the fall semester 2009, one outcome was assessed in AC114 and AC213 using practice sets and one outcome was assessed in SC223D using a Microsoft Word Performance Assessment. The benchmark was met for both outcomes. The action plan was to “continue” with the same assessment methods to determine if the results would “hold.”</p> <p>For the spring 2010 semester, one outcome was assessed in AC114 and AC223 using practice sets. One outcome was assessed in SC113B using a 10-Key Mastery program, and one outcome was assessed in BU213 using PowerPoint presentations. The benchmark was met for the 1st and 3rd outcomes, but not met for the 2nd outcome. The action plan included repeating the same assessment to ensure consistent results for the outcomes that were met, and to spend more time with 10-key touch pad skill sets for the outcome that was not met.</p>

<p>Cosmetology</p>	<p>Assessment activities for fall 2009 occurred only at the individual course level. Results were reported as such and not compiled into one cohesive report.</p> <p>Beginning in the spring 2010 semester, the VPI determined that assessment activities for the Cosmetology program would best be served by assessing as a program and not require individual course-level assessment. Three outcomes were assessed. Assessment methods included standardized tests, daily practical sheets, and circle sheets. Benchmarks were met for 2/3 of the outcomes. The action plan was to continue with current procedures.</p>
<p>Criminal Justice (Public Safety & Industry Division / Department)</p>	<p>Assessment activities for C.J. courses have occurred and been reported only at the course level and not as a stand-alone department or as part of the Public Safety & Industry Division / Department.</p> <p>For future reports, any departmental assessment activities for C. J. courses will be reported under the Public Safety & Industry Division / Department.</p>
<p>Emergency Medical Technician (Public Safety & Industry Division / Department)</p>	<p>Assessment activities for EMT courses have occurred and been reported only at the course level and not as a stand-alone department or as part of the Public Safety & Industry Division / Department.</p> <p>For future reports, any departmental assessment activities for the EMT program will be reported under the Public Safety & Industry Division / Department.</p>
<p>Law Enforcement Academy</p>	<p>Assessment activities were not reported for the fall 2009 semester.</p> <p>Six outcomes were assessed for the spring 2010 semester. Assessment methods included written examinations and practical qualifications, practical scenario applications, practical test-out, practical demonstrations, and demonstrations. The benchmark was met for 4/6 outcomes. Action plans for improvements included adding an increased number of rounds spent on shooting on the move drills, increasing the amount of practical application of element identification during scenario based training, with better utilization of the manual during classroom instruction and assigning written element assignments, increasing benchmarks, and extra remedial training sessions.</p>
<p>Nursing</p>	<p>Assessment activities for fall 2009 occurred only at the individual course level. Results were reported as such and not compiled into one cohesive report.</p>

	<p>Beginning in the spring 2010 semester, the VPI determined that assessment activities for the Nursing program would best be served by assessing as a program and not require individual course-level assessment. The institutional-level outcomes were assessed in NU128 and PC123. Assessment methods included completion by students of patient teaching plans, performing a cultural assessment of a clinical patient and develop a culturally specific plan, to develop a prioritized plan of patient care in NU128. Assessment methods for PC123 included completion by students of patient teaching plans, a paper discussing ethical and legal issues informed consent, and a detailed patient pharmacological regimen. The benchmark was met for all outcomes in NU128 and 2/3 in PC123. The action plan was to increase the benchmark.</p>
Office Technology (Business Department)	<p>Assessment activities have occurred and been reported only at the course level and not as a stand-alone department.</p> <p>For future reports, any departmental assessment activities for Office Technology courses will be reported under the Business Department.</p>
Paralegal (Department category unknown)	<p>Assessment activities in paralegal courses have occurred and been reported at the course level only.</p>
SENM Corrections Academy	<p>Assessment activities were not reported for the Corrections Academy for fall 2009 and /or spring 2010.</p>
TS: Freshman Seminar (Education Department)	<p>Assessment activities have not been reported for Freshman Seminar since at least fall 2006.</p> <p>For future reports, any departmental assessment activities for Freshman Seminar courses will be reported under the Education Department.</p>
TS: Reading (Education Department)	<p>TS 123 Reading Improvement was the focus of departmental assessment. The assessment method was a vocabulary test. Results met acceptable levels. The action plan was to develop sentence practices for each chapter covered and stronger emphasis on developing a working vocabulary.</p> <p>For future reports, any departmental assessment activities for TS: Reading courses will be reported under the Education Department.</p>
TS: Writing (Education Department)	<p>Departmental assessment focused on Review I students. The assessment method was a paragraph / five paragraph grading rubric. The benchmark was met. The action plan is to continue to use current teaching methods.</p>

	For future reports, any departmental assessment activities for TS: Writing courses will be reported under the Education Department.
Welding (Public Safety & Industry Division / Department)	Welding courses were assessed and reported at the course level only in fall 2009 and 2010. For future reports, any departmental assessment activities for Welding courses will be reported under the Public Safety & Industry Division / Department.

*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 at least two classes per semester. In the event a faculty member teaches only one general education class, he/she must then also assess one other course for the semester.

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 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 faculty must assess all six competencies for Area I Communications. The report submitted to the NMHED in fall 2010 covers the 2009-2010 academic year and is available for viewing on the NMJC website homepage (summarized below).

Assessment of General Education Courses / Rotation Three: Fall 2009 / Spring 2010	
Area I—Communications: No courses for this reporting period.	Not included in the 2009-2010 reporting cycle.
Area II—Mathematics / Calculus: MA 234	Assessment methods included tests for the 1 st two competencies and five-point rubrics for the 3 rd and 4 th competencies. Results met acceptable levels. Action plans included comparing results from previous classes and an analysis of online student success.
Area II—Mathematics / Other College Level MA 123	Student learning was measured for five competencies using assignment rubrics, chapter tests, and homework assignments. Results were met acceptable levels for 4/5 of the competencies. Action plans included placing more emphasis on topics covered in the competencies, dedicating more time for students to practice and adding questions from the material to the final exam,
Area III—Laboratory Sciences: GE 114; GE 124; PH 114; PH 124; PH 214; PH 224	Assessment methods included laboratory tests and reports, quizzes, pre- and post-tests, computer-based experiments, journal article critiques, problem/solution papers, research papers, and journal reports. Results met acceptable levels in all courses assessed except one. Action plans included allowing more class time dedicated to review, revising test questions and assignment instruments, encouraging students to attend additional study sessions outside of class time, requiring oral presentations, requiring students to conduct multiple trials of the same apparatus, employing a more precise means of measurements, and modifying the experimental method to allow for a greater diversity of topics.
Area IV—Social/Behavioral Sciences: GG 113; SO 213; SO 223; SO 223W	Student learning was measured using objective tests, critical thinking essays, and research projects. Results met acceptable levels. Action plans included pairing students for joint presentations, more variety in teaching methods, providing additional resource information to students, adding additional requirements to portfolio assignments, devoting more class time to study, and analyzing each item in the test bank for reliability.

<p>Area V—English/Humanities/Fine Arts: HI 113; HI 113A; HI 123; HI 213; HI 223; PI 213; RE 113</p>	<p>Assessment methods included written assignments (research and essays), and multiple choice, matching, and essay questions on tests. Results met acceptable levels in all but four classes. Action plans included placing greater emphasis on writing style and citing, revising essay assignments, devoting more class time to class discussion, using the CPS system to improve student participation, and requiring more online interaction.</p>
---	---

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. Full-time 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 full-time faculty who participated in the course level assessment activities at NMJC in the fall 2008, spring 2009, fall 2009, and spring 2010 semesters and the number of courses assessed.

Full-Time Faculty Participation in Course-Level Assessment				
	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	Fall 2009	Spring 2010
Total Full-Time Faculty	74	74	71	69
Full-Time Faculty Required to Assess at Course Level	74	74	71	57
Full-Time Faculty Participation	49	53	69	56
Non-Participating Full-Time Faculty	25	21	2	1

Courses Assessed				
	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	Fall 2009	Spring 2010
Total Number of Courses Assessed	66	79	126	98
General Education	12	16	18	18
Other	54	63	108	80
Courses Assessed in Consecutive Semesters	24	24	52	52

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

- SLOAC has drafted an Assessment Handbook for use by faculty. The final version of the report is expected to be completed by fall 2010.
- 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.