

Great Basin College Assessment Committee Summary Report on Course Assessments for 2012-2013

The Assessment Committee submits the following report in partial fulfillment of committee responsibilities as outlined in Great Basin College Policy 2.3.

Committee Composition, 2013-2014:

Marcus Babaoye (Ex-Officio), Darius Cooper, Frank Daniels, Dave Douglas, Jonathan Foster (Co-Chair), Rick Mackey (Co-Chair), Laura Pike

Introduction:

Great Basin College’s Institutional Assessment Policy and Procedure (Policy No. 2.3), as in effect for the 2012-2013 academic year required that each full-time member of the Great Basin College faculty complete and submit course assessment forms for one course taught in the fall semester and one course taught the spring semester. The course assessment form required that faculty members assessed each learner outcome listed in their syllabi, provide results of their assessment, and provide a plan of action if outcomes were not achieved.¹ The following report provides summary data and observations on submitted course assessments along with recommendations for future assessments and the assessment process.

Rate of Participation:

For the 2012-2013 academic 95 percent of all faculty members submitted course assessment forms. On a departmental basis, faculty participation rates were as follows:

Department	Percentage of Full Time Faculty Submitting a Course Assessment for 2011-2012	Percentage of Full Time Faculty Submitting Two Course Assessments for 2012-2013
Business	67 percent	100 percent
Career and Technical	60 percent	83 percent
Computer Technologies	83 percent	100 percent
English	80 percent	100 percent
Fine Arts and Humanities	100 percent	100 percent
Health Sciences	100 percent	100 percent
Math	80 percent	100 percent
Science	83 percent	86 percent
Social Science	100 percent	100 percent
Teacher Education	100 percent	100 percent

¹ For academic year 2011-2012 full-time faculty members were required to assess one course for the year. Beginning with academic year 2012-2013, GBC policy required full-time faculty members to assess one course taught in the fall semester and one course taught in the spring semester.

Courses Assessed:

The following table lists all courses assessed during academic years 2011-2012 (the first year of required course assessment) and 2012-2013.

Department	Courses Assessed, 2011-2012	Courses Assessed, 2012-2013
Business	ECON 102	ACC 203
	MGT 283	BUS 102
		BUS 107
		ECON 103
		ECON 307
		FIN 310
		MGT 283
	Career and Technical	IT 220
WELD 110		DT 105
WELD 210		EIT 348
		ELM 123
		ELM 127
		ELM 131
		ELM 132
		ELM 143
		IT 102
		IT 201
		IT 216
		IT 220
		WELD 105
		WELD 160
		WELD 220
		WELD 260
Computer Technologies	CIT 203	CIT 214
	GRC 119	COT 151
	IS 101	COT 240
	SUR 450	GIS 110
		GRC 188
		IS 101
		IS 201
		IS 301
		SUR 330
		SUR 460
English	ENG 102	ENG 101
	ENG 261	ENG 102
	ENG 333	ENG 107
		ENG 203
		ENG 329
		JOUR 102
Fine Arts and Humanities	ART 100	ART 100
	THTR 102	COM 101

	THTR 105	PHIL 101 MUS 101
	SPAN 111	PHIL 102 MUS 121
		MUS 101 PHIL 101
		MUS 121 PHIL 102
Health Sciences	HMS 105	HMS 200
	HMS 200	NURS 130
	HMS 250	NURS 135
	NURS 257	NURS 140
	NURS 258	NURS 157
	NURS 261	NURS 158
	NURS 338	NURS 273
	NURS 436	NURS 315
	RAD 225	NURS 336
		NURS 338
		NURS 416
		RAD 115
		RAD 116
Math	MATH 095	MATH 116
	MATH 120	MATH 120
	MATH 127	MATH 126
	MATH 128	MATH 128
	INT 359	MATH 181
		MATH 182
		MATH 191
		STAT 152
Science	AMS 320	AMS 320
	BIOL 223	BIOL 190
	BIOL 224	BIOL 191
	CHEM 100	BIOL 223
	GEOG 103	BIOL 251
	NRES 241	BIOL 341
		CHEM 100
		CHEM 122
		CHEM 142
		CHEM 242L
		PHYS 152
		INT 369
Social Sciences	ANTH 102	ANTH 201
	PSC 101	ANTH 440B
	SOC 101	CRJ 211
	SOC 276	CRJ 220
		HIST 101
		HIST 102
		HIST 105
		PSC 101
		PSY 241

		PSY 460
		SW 250
		SW 321
Teacher Education	ECE 190	ECE 127
	EDRL 437	ECE 251
	EDU 250	EDU 250
	EDRL 437	EPY 330

Course Assessment by Faculty Members

The following table lists all courses assessed by faculty members during academic years 2011-2012 (the first year of required course assessment) and 2012-2013.

	2011/2012	2012/2013
Bagley, Pete	BIOL 224	BIOL 190, BIOL 251
Bentley, Susanne	ENG 261	JOUR 102, ENG 102
Bhattarai, Sameer		BIOL 191, BIOL 341
Bruno, Carrie	GEOG 103, CHEM 100	CHEM 100, INT 369
Bruns, Tom		IT 105, IT 220
Byram, Robert		ELM 123, ELM 132
Charlebois, Wendy	SOC 276	SW 250, SW 321
Daniels, Frank	MATH 127	MATH 191
Davis, Stephanie	SOC 101	PSY 241, PSY 460
Donnelli, Amber	NURS 258	NURS 336, NURS 416
Doucette, Mary	HMS 200	HMS 200, RAD 116, RAD 115
Douglas, Dave		MATH 116
Drussell, Peggy	NURS 261	NURS 135, NURS 158
Du, Xunming	MATH 095, MATH 120	MATH 120, STAT 152
Elithorp, James	SUR 450	SUR 330, SUR 460
Foster, Jonathan		HIST 101, HIST 102
Fox, Patty	ART 100	ART 100
Friestroffer, David	BIOL 223, BIOL 224	CHEM 122, CHEM 142, CHEM 242L
Gailey, Tami	NURS 436	NURS 157
Garcia, Steve		ELM 127, ELM 143
Gavorsky, Scott		HIST 101, HIST 105
Gonzales, Danny	PSC 101	PSC 101 (Multiple sections)
Griffith, Dale		ENG 203, PHIL 101
Hanington, Gary	AMS 320	AMS 320, PHYS 152
Hogan, Doug		BIOL 190, BIOL 223
Howell, Teresa		ENG 101, ENG 329
Hyslop, Cindy	IS 101	COT 240, IS 101

Hyslop, Larry	CIT 203	
Jaques, Cherie	RAD 225	NURS 140, RAD 115
Jensen, Joseph		DT 100, DT 105
Johnston, Heidi	NURS 257	NURS 273, NURS 315
Kampf, Richard		MATH 181, MATH 182
Kelly, Dwaine		ELM 131
Licht, John	WELD 110	WELD 160, WELD 260
Mackey, Rick		CRJ 211, CRJ 220
Matula, Thomas		BUS 107, MGT 283
McFarlan, Lynnette	ECE 190	ECE 127, ECE 251
Negrete, Sarah	EDRL 437	
Newman, John	MATH 128	MATH 126, STAT 152
Nguyen, Hang		Econ 103, Fin 310
Nickel, Ed		IS 301, GIS 110
Orr, Russ	ENG 102	ENG 102, ENG 107
Owen, Earl		DT 100, DT 105
Owens, Lynne	MATH 128	MATH 128
Pike, Laura		IS 201, CIT 214
Ray, Mary	HMS 105, HMS 250	
Reagan, Tom	EDU 250	EDU 250, EPY 330
Schwandt, Kathy	GRC 119	GRC 188, COT 151
Scillaci, Steven	WELD 210	WELD 105, WELD 220
Shane, Tracy	NRES 241	INT 369
Skivington, Gretchen	SPAN 111	COM 101, PHIL 102
Stugelmeyer, Jim		EIT 348
Sutherland, Sharon	NURS 338	NURS 130, NURS 338
Tenney, Glenn	ECON 102	ACC 203, ECON 307
Therriault, Stephen	MGT 283	BUS 107, MGT 283
Theumler, Rick		
Uhlenkott, Linda	ENG 333	ENG 102
Walsh, Laurie	ANTH 102	ANTH 201, ANTH 440B
Whittaker, Norm	IT 220	IT 201, IT 216
Young-Gerber, Christine	THTR 102, THTR 105	MUS 101, MUS 121

Review of Assessments:

The Assessment Committee utilized the following rubric to assess Course Assessment Reports submitted for the 2012-2013 academic year:

KEY - 2 points = completely fulfilled; 1 point = partially complete; 0 points = missing				
Course	All Outcomes in the Syllabus are Assessed in the Report	Report includes measurement and result information	Report includes an action plan for improvement, if appropriate	Total Points

(scores of 4 or better of a possible 6 with no score of 0 in any one category are considered satisfactory)

As assessed by the committee’s application of the preceding rubric to all Course Assessment Forms submitted for academic year 2012-2013, 92 percent of the completed assessments were deemed satisfactory. This is an improvement of 2 percent over the previous year’s 90 percent submission rate.

Action Taken and Recommendations:

The Assessment Committee is satisfied with the results of course assessments for the 2012-2013 academic year. Submission rates for completed assessment forms increased significantly from the previous year. Eight of ten departments had a 100 percent assessment submission rate for 2012-2013. This is compared to four of ten departments with a 100 percent assessment submission rate for 2011-2012. No department participation rates decreased for 2012-2013. Individual department participation rates increased by as much as 23 percent over rates for 2011-2012. Overall, faculty submission of completed course assessment forms increased from 83 percent for 2011-2012 to 94.6 percent for 2012-2013. This significant increase in assessment form submission rate indicates that faculty are aware of assessment requirements and have embraced the process to a greater degree.

The quality of completed assessments also indicates increased faculty awareness of assessment requirements. For the most part, faculty successfully completed course assessment forms. As indicated above, the committee deemed 92 percent of the submitted forms as satisfactory or better.

With increased faculty participation rates and improved quality of assessments, it should become possible to draw conclusions from assessments concerning strengths and weaknesses of current instruction. For example, one might find that students are consistently failing to meet learner outcomes relative to the development of certain skills. This could provide useful in determining areas of instruction that deserve more emphasis or support.

Although participation rates improved and quality of assessments remained strong, there is room for improvement in course assessment process. One area of improvement exists in regard to the timely submission of completed assessment forms. As the following chart indicates, a significant number of faculty submitted their assessments well after the evaluation completion deadline:

		7/22/13	7/25/13	8/2/13	8/23/13
	# Faculty	Two Assessments Received	Two Assessments Received	Two Assessments Received	Two Assessments Received
BUS	4	1	4	4	4
CT	5	4	4	5	5
CTE	12	2	2	8	10
ENG	5	1	1	5	5
FA&H	2	2	2	2	2
HSCI	7	5	7	7	7
MATH	5	5	5	5	5
SCI	7	3	3	6	6
SOC SCI	7	7	7	7	7
TED	2	2	2	2	2
	56	32	37	51	53
		57%	66%	91%	95%

In reviewing the completed assessment forms and relevant syllabi, committee members also noted that several faculty members did not assess all outcomes listed in their syllabi. This was also the case for the 2011-2012 assessments. Also, as with 2011-2012, a few faculty members failed to provide action plans or provided generally vague and standard action plans for all outcomes assessed. The continuation of these issues indicates a need for increased emphasis on these aspects of the course assessment process.

Another issue noted by the Assessment Committee was in relation to the assessment of adjunct taught courses. GBC's Assessment Policy, while it required full-time instructors to assess two courses per year, did not address courses offered only by adjunct instructors. As a result, certain courses were not being assessed. The Assessment Committee addressed this issue by proposing the following revision/addition to the procedures of GBC's Institutional Assessment policy (Policy 2.3):

2.0 Adjunct Faculty Responsibility

Adjunct faculty will complete Course Assessment Report Forms only for courses that are not offered by full-time regular faculty. At a minimum, courses will be assessed following their initial offering and on a five-year rotation thereafter; departments will be responsible for deciding on the rotation.

Members of the GBC Faculty Senate approved the revision/addition by vote at the April meeting.

In terms of improving the quality of future course assessments, and timeliness of course assessment from submissions the Assessment Committee offers the following recommendations:

- Increase awareness of the need to include supporting data to for assessment conclusions.
- Emphasize the need to include meaningful action plans regarding assessments where outcomes' criteria for success are not met.
- More education and emphasis needed on the development of measurable outcomes.
- Increase awareness of the need to assess all outcomes listed on syllabus.
- Increase awareness of necessity of including criterion for achievement on forms.
- Increase awareness that faculty members must assess all outcomes listed on a syllabus.
- Streamline process for submission of completed assessment forms and increase awareness of this process.
- Clarify if sections or courses are being assessed on the five-year rotation and adjust process accordingly. If course-based assessment is the desired method, this would include consulting with departments regarding the implementation of common outcomes for sections of the same course taught by different faculty members. It would also require consideration and discussion of the implications of course-based assessment for the faculty evaluation process, as the assessment process would necessarily become collaborative rather than individual.