

New Mexico Junior College
Assessment of Student Learning / Fall 2011 – Spring 2012
Annual Report

New Mexico Junior College (NMJC) assesses student learning outcomes on three levels: institutional, department/program, and course. This report discusses the assessment activities at each level for the 2011-2012 academic year. For additional information, NMJC's website includes a page dedicated to assessment activities at the campus and 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, a Communications Toolbox, and assessment reporting forms.

Oversight of assessment activities at NMJC is performed by the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (SLOAC). 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. In general, 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 (Assessment of Student Learning Handbook, Spring 2010).

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 involved 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 10 times, critical thinking and problem solving seven times, and self and community three times using the survey and five 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. The benchmark established by the SLOAC for this outcome: 75% of students will score 3 or higher on all components. The scoring team used a rubric approved by SLOAC.

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.

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	S'11/ F'11	F'11 S'12
Total # of Artifacts Scored	51	48	50	50	30	16	50	46	50	46
# of Artifacts scoring ≥ 3	32	40	21	23	14	4	29	31	32	42
% of Artifacts ≥ 3	63%	83%	42%	46%	47%	25%	58%	67%	64%	91%

Spring 2008 artifacts were not collected and scored, most likely due to personnel turnover in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) 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 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	S 2011 / F 2011	F 2011 / S 2012
Total # of Artifacts scored	50	50	50	30	35	50	50	*
# of Artifacts scoring \geq Moderate Skill Level	20	31	24	23	14	26	39	*
% of Artifacts \geq Moderate Skill Level	40%	62%	48%	88%	40%	52%	78%	*

*The scoring sheet was not submitted to the OIE for the 2011-2012 academic year.

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: 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	Spring 2011 / Fall 2011	Fall 2011 / Spring 2012
Survey						
# 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%		
Artifacts / Rubric						
Total # of Artifacts Scored		49	30 + 30 = 60*	21	37	37
# of Artifacts \geq 2 on both Components		23	19 + 17 = 36	11	5	27
		47%	63% + 57% = 60%	52%	14%	73%

* 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:

The VPI pointed out at the November, 2011 SLOAC meeting that the assessment handbook (2010) clearly states that the institutional level outcomes were the knowledge and skills acquired by students who complete Associate Degrees at NMJC, and that the results obtained through the process to date do not accurately reflect that statement. Hence, the process was changed to collect artifacts by selecting students by credit hours earned rather than through random course selection. The change was implemented as a pilot with the spring 2012 semester to gather data from students who have earned enough credits to be near graduation (students with 50 or more credit hours, including in-progress) and determine if those artifacts meet benchmarks for each outcome.

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 respective disciplines. Assessment plans are submitted to the appropriate division Deans at the beginning of each semester, and results are similarly submitted at the end of the same semester. After their review, the division Deans forward the reports to the OIE 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 or 2011-2012 academic years.
Automotive Programs/Department (included Ford-ASSET, GM-ASEP, and Independent Automotive Technology)	Assessment activities were not reported to the OIE for the 2011-2012 academic year.
Business Program/Department (included Accounting, Business, Computer Information Systems, Economics, and Office Technology)	<p>2011-2012 Academic year – One outcome was assessed in CS123D, CS123G, CS213, and SC223D using five targeted questions on the final exam. The benchmark was not met. To encourage improvement in student learning, assessment will be conducted regularly throughout semesters rather than at the end of the semester.</p> <p>Another outcome was assessed in BU113, BU213, and BU223A using an essay writing assignment. The benchmark was met and the faculty will employ the same scenario one more time to ensure the result.</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	The most recent report received from the Corrections Academy covers Summer 2010. No reports have been received for the 2010-2011 or 2011-2012 academic years.
Cosmetology Program/Department	<p>Fall 2011 – Four outcomes were assessed in COSM 211, COSM 213, COSM 212B and COSM 216. Assessment methods included circle sheets, standardized exams, daily practical sheets, and rubrics. Benchmarks were met for 3/4 of the outcomes. Actions to improve student learning included revision of the circle sheets, continued emphasis on studying, continued use of the daily practical sheets and rubrics.</p> <p>Spring 2012 – The same four outcomes were assessed in COSM220 and COSM 222, using the same assessment methods. The benchmarks were met for the same 3/4 outcomes. Improvements in student learning will be encouraged with continued use of the circle sheets, daily practical sheets, and rubrics, as well as implementing the use of practice written exams in the pre-requisite courses.</p>

<p>Education Department (included Art, Communication, Drama, Education, Music, and Transitional Studies)</p>	<p>Fall 2011 – Five outcomes were assessed in ED123, ED213C, ED213G, ED113B, and ED112A using observation reports, test questions, and written papers and projects. The benchmark was met for all five outcomes. To promote improvement in student learning, faculty will use specific examples and films, establish time blocks to help students be better organized, bring in guest speakers, allow for more class discussion and classroom time, and use the tutors in the Learning Resource Center for student support in writing professional reports. There was no reference to the action plan from the previous semester.</p> <p>Assessment activities were not reported to the OIE for the Spring 2012 semester.</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 (included English, German, Philosophy, Spanish, and World Religion)</p>	<p>Assessment activities were not reported to the OIE for the Fall 2011 semester.</p> <p>Spring 2012 – Four outcomes were assessed for 87 EN213 students through a range of daily assignments, compare and contrast exams, and research papers. The benchmark was met for all outcomes. For improvement in student learning, faculty will emphasize the importance of completing the daily tasks, provide sample exam questions before the first exam, and break up the research papers into smaller steps with more draft work.</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>Assessment activities were not reported to the OIE for the 2011-2012 academic year.</p>
<p>Mathematics and Lab Sciences Department</p>	<p>Fall 2011 – The first 10 questions of each course final exam covered the department’s five outcomes. The benchmark was met for all five outcomes. Both Basic Math and Elementary Algebra were redesigned effective with the Spring 2012 semester. Success rates and retention in the redesigned courses will be tracked in order to detect any improvement in student learning and success.</p> <p>Spring 2012 – The same five outcomes were assessed for Mathematics, again using 10 common questions on final exams across the discipline. The benchmark was met for 2/5 of the outcomes. Faculty will continue with the redesign of the entry</p>

	<p>level courses and track student success and retention.</p> <p>Lab sciences were assessed at the general education and/or course level, but not as a cohesive departmental focus.</p>
Nursing Program	Assessment activities were not reported to the OIE for the 2010-2011 or 2011-2012 academic years.
Physical Education	<p>Fall 2011 – Five outcomes were assessed in all physical education courses using a pre/post course questionnaire. The benchmark was met for 3/5 of the outcomes. Student learning was attributed to the implementation of student journals. The questionnaire and journals will be continued as the tools for physical activity course assessment.</p> <p>Spring 2012 – Assessment of physical activity classes continued with the approach utilized through Fall 2011. The benchmark was met for 3/5 of the outcomes, but not the same outcomes. Faculty will place greater emphasis on the importance of exercise and the three-part approach to safe fitness pursuits.</p>
Public Safety & Industry Division/Department (included 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>Departmental assessment activities were not reported to the OIE for the 2011-2012 academic year.</p> <p>Assessment results for courses within this division may or may not have been reported at the course level.</p>
Social & Behavioral Sciences (included Anthropology, Geography, Government, History, Psychology, and Sociology)	<p>Fall 2011 – Two components of the institutional level Communication outcome were the departmental assessment focus within three behavioral science and two social science courses, using a variety of written assignments. The benchmark was met in all five courses. Institutional level outcomes will continue to be the departmental assessment focus.</p> <p>Spring 2012 – Two components of the institutional level Critical Thinking and Problem Solving outcome were assessed</p>

	<p>in three behavioral science courses and two social science courses. Assessment methods were not explained. The benchmark was met in all courses. Institutional level outcomes will continue to be the departmental assessment focus.</p> <p>All other courses within this department were assessed and reported for at the general education and/or course level only.</p>
--	---

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. Adjunct faculty are 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 per the course rotation schedule.

General Education:

The 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. For example, when EN 113 Composition and Rhetoric is required to be assessed for reporting to the NMHED, all applicable full-time and adjunct faculty must assess all six competencies for Area I Communications. The report submitted to the NMHED in fall 2012 covers the 2011-2012 academic year and is summarized below. The entire report can be viewed on the NMJC website assessment page.

Assessment of General Education Courses / Rotation Four: Fall 2011 / Spring 2012	
Area I—Communications: SE113; SE123	Student learning was measured using interactive listening assignments, student-peer speech evaluations, essay discussion questions on exams, weekly journal reports, speech outlines and speaking notes, in-class presentations/speeches, including debates and group presentations, and final exams . The benchmark was met or exceeded for 4/6 competencies. Action plans included adding additional interactive listening assignments, additional reading requirements, stronger emphasis on assignment completion, cutting back on essay questions within exams, as well as the number of journal reports; devoting more classroom time to demonstration of paper development; more frequent oral and written feedback to students; providing outline examples; providing in-class coaching on delivering speeches, as well as showing videos of famous speeches; and, require students to discuss debate strategies with the professor before the debate.
Area II—Mathematics / Algebra:	Not assessed this rotation.
Area II—Mathematics / Calculus: MA 154	The four competencies were assessed using MyMathLab assignments with questions corresponding to each component of each outcome. The benchmark was met for 2/4 of the competencies. The action plan included providing a review of the MML competency assignments and directing students to work on the competency review assignments by chapter to allow them to build up a reference for use on the cumulative assessment due before the final exam.
Area II—Mathematics / Other College Level	Not offered/assessed this rotation.
Area III—Laboratory Sciences: CH114A	Student learning was assessed by means of unit assignments, self-quizzes, class discussions, unit labs, and written reports. The benchmarks were met for all competencies. Plans for improving the assessment process and/or student learning included adding more and

Area III—Laboratory Sciences (cont.):	different problem solving on the publisher's website, and more and different multimedia; the selection of different lab experiments, with additional questions for some lab experiments, providing a pre-lab tutorial with example calculations and Internet references, and additional unit discussion topics.
Area IV—Social/Behavioral Sciences: PS113; PS213; PS213B; PS223; AN123	Competencies were measured using written assignments, unit quizzes, case studies, assignment rubrics, discussion posts, hands-on application of knowledge at a dig site, and exam questions. The benchmark was met in all of the courses for the first competency, 3/5 of the courses for the second competency, 1/2 of the courses for competency three, and in 3/5 of the courses for competency four. To address improvement in student learning, information will be presented differently, targeting areas within the material where students need additional resources provided, changing emphasis of topics used in written assignments, adding more behavior-related questions to assignments/exams; and, placing stronger emphasis on studying before exams, as well as on attendance.
Area V—English/Humanities/Fine Arts: EN213; EN213C; EN213D; EN223; EN223A; EN223C; EN223D; SP114; SP124	Student learning was assessed through daily assignments, quizzes, response papers on assigned readings, oral reports, compare/contrast exam questions, research papers, short-answer exams, and in-class activities. Benchmarks were met for all of the competencies. To see improvements in student learning, the number of quizzes will be reduced and replaced with bring-in reaction/response papers, adding components to increase interactivity among students, utilizing Canvas alerts to remind students of due dates, more in-class discussion, varying the types of daily assignments; stronger emphasis on oral communication; splitting the compare/contrast exam questions between the midterm and final exams; revising handouts and revising some test questions; adding more practice test questions; reducing the number of required

	research papers, and breaking the research papers into smaller steps.
--	---

The new VPI will review the formal report and will convene a working group to address analysis and interpretation/reflection on results or trends.

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 from the fall 2008 through the spring 2012 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	F / 2011	S / 2012
Total Full-Time Faculty	74	74	71	69	67	67	68	68
Full-Time Faculty Required to Assess at Course Level	74	74	71	57	54	46	49	46
Full-Time Faculty Participation	49	53	69	56	49	44	41	39
Non-Participating Full-Time Faculty	25	21	2	1	5	2	8	7
Total Adjunct Faculty*	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	66	60	92	95
Adjunct Faculty Required to Assess at Course Level	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	49	60	88	91
Adjunct Faculty Participation	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	49	59	34	45
Non-Participating Adjunct Faculty	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	17	1	54	46

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

Course Sections Assessed								
	F / 2008	S / 2009	F / 2009	S / 2010	F / 2010	S / 2011	F / 2011	S / 2012
Total Number of Courses Sections Assessed*	66	79	126	98	151	148	117	112
General Education	12	16	18	18	33	42	25	38
Other	54	63	108	80	118	106	92	74
Courses Assessed in Consecutive Semesters	24	24	52	52	48	80	41	62

*As assessment reporting has evolved over the semesters, some faculty have quit listing the number of sections they are assessing. Hence, the numbers are lower for fall 2011 and spring 2012.

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 Assessment-related Activities

- The VPI initiated the use of SLOAC subcommittees for analysis of departmental assessment reports on an annual basis beginning during the fall 2011 semester with the spring 2011 semester reports. The resultant general consensus after the first analysis was that most, if not all, reports need to provide more detail, and that consistency across divisions needs to be implemented. However, analysis of the fall 2011 reports was postponed for the spring 2012 and subsequent semester because of the departure of the VPI at the end of the fall 2011 semester and pending hire of a replacement VPI.
- The action plan to improve student learning at all levels of assessment at NMJC is the implementation of a comprehensive professional development program for faculty beginning in the fall 2012 semester.