Student Learning Assessment Committee

ANNUAL REPORT
2012-2013

August 2013

Student Learning Assessment Committee

ANNUAL REPORT
2012-2013

August 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

This report is a summary of the activities of the Student Learning Assessment Committee (SLAC) from June 2012 to May 2013.

COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

During the 2012-2013 academic year, the Student Learning Assessment Committee consisted of the following members:

Tom Morris	Chair, Health and Wellness Facility Coordinator/Faculty
Donna Garcia	Director of Academic Affairs
Sabrina Gaskill	English/Communications Faculty
Natalie Gillard	Vice-President of Academic Affairs
Janet Griffiths	Pre-Collegiate Faculty
Dr. Axel Hungerbuehler	Museum Curator/Natural Sciences Faculty
Dr. Philip Kaatz	Mathematics/Physical Science Faculty
Kim Enriquez	Committee Secretary, Administrative Assistant/ Adjunct Faculty

COMMITTEE OBJECTIVES

The Student Learning Assessment Committee has four explicit objectives that are stated in the *Student Learning Assessment Model*. The objectives of the Student Learning Assessment Committee are to:

Objective 1 Enhance the knowledge of the faculty at Mesalands Community College about the assessment of student learning by conducting meetings and workshops, distributing materials, and by providing resources (e.g., Assessment Reserve Collection in the Library). All faculty will receive a copy of the *Student Learning Assessment Guide for Faculty* by the first week of classes. The Student Learning Assessment Committee will have at least one joint meeting with the Faculty Council every semester.

Objective 2 Spearhead the development of assessment at the College by producing, if needed, by August of each year, a revised *Student Learning Assessment Guide for Faculty*.

Objective 3 Facilitate and implement the development of feedback loops and information dissemination about assessment at the College by:

a. producing an *Annual Report* by October of each year
b. providing all faculty with copies of the *Student Learning Assessment Guide for Faculty* each academic year
c. having at least one joint meeting with the Faculty Council every fall and spring semester
d. providing all adjunct and new faculty with assessment-related training and an assessment mentor
e. presenting information on assessment at every new student orientation and during each section of ACS 100 Student College Success class, including delivery of the brochure *Student Guide to Learning Assessment*
f. conducting a semi-annual Assessment Day to be held every fall and spring semesters. The semi-annual Assessment Day is a joint meeting between the Committee and all full-time faculty used to discuss, update, and refine the assessment practices at the College

Objective 4 Oversee the implementation of the *Student Learning Assessment Model* and *Student Learning Assessment Guide for Faculty* so that faculty and staff will provide all the documents and reports specified in the *Model* and *Guide* within one week of the stated deadline.

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES 2012-2013

The Student Learning Assessment Committee completed its participation in the Higher Learning Commission's Academy for Assessment of Student Learning with the submission and presentation of its *Results Forum Impact Report*. The *Impact Report* was submitted to the HLC on September 7, 2012, and presented at the Academy for the Assessment of Student Learning Results Forum on November 7-9, 2012. Mesalands Community College was also asked to present its *Impact Report* as part of a showcase of completed academy projects on November 8, 2012.

The *Results Forum Impact Report* summarized the assessment-related activities that were implemented by the College based upon its four-year participation in the Academy for Assessment of Student Learning from 2008 through 2012. The Action Portfolio (also referred to as the Student Learning Plan) generated by the College's participation in the Academy was entitled "Beyond the Basics: Reinventing Assessment at Mesalands Community College**."** This Student Learning Plan addressed and built upon the findings of the 2004 Higher Learning Commission's on-site visit for reaccreditation, with emphasis on addressing student learning assessment at all three levels – course, program and institution.

The following assessment-related changes at the institutional-level, program-level, and course-level, were instituted during the 2012-2013 academic year:

1. Full implementation of the *Student Learning Assessment Guide for Faculty* as a means to establish sustainability for the continued assessment activities established in the Action Portfolio.
2. Preliminary conversations with Student Affairs regarding the development of an action plan to establish a plan→do→study→adjust cycle of assessing the quality and quantity of student services as it relates to its affect on student learning.
3. Preliminary conversations with the Director of Educational Services Center regarding the development of an action plan to establish a plan→do→study→adjust cycle of assessment for the ABE/GED programs.
4. Established a "closed" Drop Box for securely viewing ENG 299 student oral presentations.

COMMITTEE SELF-EDUCATION

The Student Learning Assessment Committee continued its ongoing self-education process during the fall 2012 and spring 2013 semesters.

- Ms. Griffiths, Dr. Hungerbuehler, and Mr. Morris participated in and presented the *Results Forum Impact Report* at the Academy for the Assessment of Student Learning Results Forum on November 7-9, 2012, in Saint Charles, Illinois.
- Numerous committee members attended the New Mexico Higher Education Assessment and Retention Conference on February 28 – March 1, 2013.
- Ms. Gaskill, Ms. Gillard and Mr. Morris also attended the Higher Learning Commissions Annual Conference in Chicago, Illinois, on April 5 – 9, 2013.

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE GOALS
2013–2014

Student learning assessment is a living, breathing process that will mature and change as the College identifies the most effective and efficient methods of understanding, confirming and improving student learning. The 2013-2014 goals and objectives associated with this process are specific, measureable, attainable and relevant.

Priorities	Goals	Objectives	Responsible Individual(s)
Establish a data-driven culture utilizing the plan-do-study-adjust cycle of assessment to facilitate continual improvement in all aspects of learning	Use the plan-do-study-adjust cycle of assessment to improve learning in pre-collegiate programming and Student Affairs.	1. Develop an action plan to establish a plan→do→study→adjust cycle of assessment in Student Affairs. 2. Develop an action plan to establish a plan→do→study→adjust cycle of assessment in the Educational Services Center for the ABE/GED programs. 3. Investigate ways to collect data from graduating students, alumni, and employers in order to assess how successful the College is at placing well-prepared graduates into the workforce and using this information to improve student learning. Note: Numerous objectives are identified throughout this Student Learning Assessment Committee's Annual Report via the PDSA Annual Cycle Opportunities for Improvement sections. There are far too many opportunities for improvement identified to list them in this document. Please refer to the specific sections of the *Annual Report* for objectives and time frames for accomplishment.	Student Learning Assessment Committee, Vice President of Student Affairs, Student Affairs staff. Student Learning Assessment Committee, Pre-Collegiate lead faculty, Director of Educational Services Center and full-time and adjunct faculty. Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs, Student Learning Assessment Committee, program directors/lead faculty and employers.

INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL ASSESSMENT

Direct assessment measures of student learning at the institutional level include, but are not limited to the following: COMPASS, CAAP, capstone portfolio course (ENG 299), embedded assessments, and general education competency assessments based on the *General Education Competency Reporting Schedule*. Indirect measures of student learning include a number of student surveys. The following sections describe and summarize the results of these assessments.

Computer Adaptive Placement Assessment and Support System (COMPASS)

The COMPASS test is a comprehensive software and operational support package developed by ACT to help post-secondary institutions place students into appropriate entry-level courses and to diagnose specific areas of strengths and weaknesses. COMPASS software administers, scores, and reports the results of adaptive placement and diagnostic tests in the areas of mathematics, reading, and writing skills.

The following tables show the number of students who completed each of the COMPASS sub-tests, their averages, and standard deviation for each sub-test completed in preparation for the 2012-2013academic year.

COMPASS SCORE SUMMARY 2012-2013 ACADEMIC YEAR						
	Pre- Algebra	**Algebra**	**College Algebra**	**Trigonometry**	**Reading**	**Writing**
Summer 2012						
N	23	67	2	2	58	58
M	39.3	34.2	52.5	39	78.7	58.8
SD	12.5	14.7	2.1	7.1	15.7	27.5
Fall 2012						
N	85	160	3	2	190	167
M	37	27.8	47.3	54	72.2	55.3
SD	13.4	13.0	23.7	14.1	16.3	30.8
Spring 2013						
N	73	146	10	4	128	132
M	42.0	31.1	46.1	43.7	75.8	54.1
SD	16.2	16.1	19.6	21.4	17.0	31.6

N=number of students tested; M=mean (average score); SD=standard deviation

The following table displays the numbers of students that were placed in each course level for each semester of this report:

MESALANDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE COMPASS DISTRIBUTION SUMMARY 2012-2013 ACADEMIC YEAR							
COURSE	**ABE**	**099/100**	**101/102**	**107**	**110**	**112**	**None**
Summer 2012							
Math	1	16	57	8		2	
English	5	25	28				
Reading		34					24
Fall 2012							
Math	7	59	144	13	1	2	
English	24	73	70				
Reading		69					121
Spring 2013							
Math	4	42	124	13	6	4	
English	15	72	45				
Reading		59					69

The following table identifies the percentage of students needing remediation over the course of the last 7 years.

MESALANDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS NEEDING REMEDIATION 2006-2013 ACADEMIC YEARS							
	2006-07	**2007-08**	**2008-09**	**2009-10**	**2010-11**	**2011-12**	**2012-13**
Math	88.3	89.0	87.5	86.6	89.9	87.5	90.2
English	59.5	65.5	62.0	62.8	60.3	66.3	59.9
Reading	64.5	59.9	58.3	52.9	51.5	53.7	56.9

Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency Testing (CAAP)

The CAAP test is administered at the end of the fall and spring semesters to students petitioning to graduate and/or those students completing 60 hours of course work by the test dates. Students who have completed ENG 102 – English Composition are eligible to complete the writing and reading portions of the CAAP. Students who have completed a required laboratory science course are eligible to complete the science reasoning and critical thinking portions of the CAAP. Students who have completed Math 110 – College Algebra are eligible to take the math portion of the test.

Note: The CAAP test was not administered at the end of the fall 2012 semester due to too few students eligible for the test.

Students who score above the 50th percentile nationally in any subject are awarded certificates of achievement from ACT. The following tables summarize these achievement results:

MESALANDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE CAAP CERTIFICATE AWARDS BY SUBJECT SPRING 2013 SEMESTER					
	Writing	**Math**	**Reading**	**Critical Thinking**	**Science**
Number of Certificates Awarded	9	9	10	14	5
Number of Students Participating	25	25	26	26	26

MESALANDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE NUMBER OF STUDENTS RECEIVING CAAP CERTIFICATE AWARDS BY NUMBER OF SUB-TESTS SPRING 2013 SEMESTER							
Number of Students Participating	**Total Sub-tests**	**Number of Certificates Awarded**	**Five Sub-tests**	**Four Sub-tests**	**Three Sub-tests**	**Two Sub-tests**	**One Sub-test**
26	128	48	0	6	3	3	9

The CAAP result averages for each subject area compared to the corresponding national average are given in the following table:

MESALANDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE CAAP AVERAGES BY SUBJECT AREA SPRING 2013 SEMESTER					
Subject	**Writing**	**Math**	**Reading**	**Critical Thinking**	**Science Reasoning**
MCC Avg.	59.5	55.0	59.8	60.2	57.1
National Avg.	61.5	56.1	60.1	60.6	59.2

The following table displays the comparative results of the CAAP Test for the years 2003 through 2013.

PERCENT OF NATIONAL AVERAGE 2003-2013											
Mesalands Community College Mean Score as % of National Mean	**Year**										
	2003	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**
Writing	94.88	95.04	96.47	97.27	96.30	95.65	95.65	96.77	97.90	97.73	96.75
Math	99.82	102.1	99.47	98.25	99.82	96.98	103.2	102.4	101.4	97.51	98.04
Reading	95.40	94.88	97.35	95.70	97.85	97.35	99.00	98.51	98.34	98.84	99.51
Critical Thinking	94.07	98.02	98.84	95.22	97.04	97.05	95.89	97.03	98.02	97.85	99.34
Science Reasoning	95.93	97.80	97.95	97.97	97.29	98.65	97.47	100.2	98.48	99.15	96.45

ENG 299: Capstone Portfolio Course

In an attempt to better assess general education competency attainment of graduating students, the College implemented ENG 299: Capstone Portfolio Course in the spring of 2012. The capstone course utilizes the College's rubrics to assess achievement of the general education competencies (writing, oral presentation, information technology, critical thinking, scientific and mathematical reasoning) using student artifacts. A portfolio reflecting best practices is submitted to a faculty committee for review and evaluation. This course must be completed during the student's last semester, prior to graduating with a degree.

Note: The ENG 299 requirement replaced the College's General Education Assessment (GEA) as of the spring 2012 semester. The GEA was the College's attempt to measure general education competency attainment using a home-grown case scenario assessment tool. Student effort on the GEA was frequently poor since the results had no bearing on either the student's grade or whether or not the student would graduate. The ENG 299 class is an one-hour credit course that is a requirement to graduate in all degree programs.

Measurement Tool: ENG 299 Capstone Portfolio Course

General Education Objective(s): 1-5

Goal Results: 90% "Excellent(4)"/"Proficient(3)"/ "Adequate(2)"

General Education Competency: Writing

Year	Excellent (4)	Proficient (3)	Adequate (2)	Inadequate (1)
2012-2013				
• 1.1.1	4	11	6	
• 1.1.2	4	11	6	
• 1.1.3	4	11	6	
• 1.2.1	4	11	6	
• 1.2.2	4	11	6	
• 1.2.3	4	11	6	
• 1.3.1	4	9	4	4
• 1.3.2	3	11	3	3
• 1.4.1	3	11	4	2
• 1.4.2	3	14	4	
Year	**Excellent (4)**	**Proficient (3)**	**Adequate (2)**	**Inadequate (1)**
2011-2012				
• 1.1.1		2	3	
• 1.1.2		2	3	
• 1.1.3		2	3	
• 1.2.1		2	3	
• 1.2.2		2	3	
• 1.2.3		2	3	
• 1.3.1		2	2	1
• 1.3.2		2	2	1
• 1.4.1		2	3	
• 1.4.2		4	1	

General Education Competency: Writing

Provides a clear, concise thesis statement

1.1.1 Statement is clear and concise

1.1.2 Statement is well-reasoned

1.1.3 Statement leads to plentiful additional discussion

Provides supporting paragraphs which relate to the thesis

1.2.1 Supporting paragraphs are well-reasoned

1.2.2 Supporting paragraphs clearly relate to the thesis

1.2.3 Supporting paragraphs are cohesive and logically developed

Correctly incorporates outside sources

1.3.1 Provides relevant outside sources

1.3.2 Cites outside sources correctly

Uses appropriate grammar, syntax, punctuation, and spelling

1.4.1 Writing is error free in all categories (sentence structure, punctuation, spelling and grammar)

1.4.2 Sentence structure and vocabulary are well-developed and varied

General Education Competency: Oral Presentation

Year	Excellent (4)	Proficient (3)	Adequate (2)	Inadequate (1)
2012-2013				
• 2.1.1	3	6	2	2
• 2.1.2	1	7	4	2
• 2.1.3	1	7	4	2
• 2.2.1	2	7	3	2
• 2.2.2	2	7	3	2
• 2.2.3	2	7	3	2
• 2.3.1	1	5	6	2
• 2.3.2	1	6	5	2
• 2.3.3	1	7	4	2
• 2.4.1	1	8	2	3
• 2.4.2	2	9	1	2
• 2.4.3	2	8	1	1
• 2.5.1	1	4	5	4
• 2.5.2	1	6	3	4
• 2.5.3	1	1		2
Year	**Excellent (4)**	**Proficient (3)**	**Adequate (2)**	**Inadequate (1)**
2011-2012				
• 2.1.1		1	2	
• 2.1.2		2	1	
• 2.1.3		2	1	
• 2.2.1	1		2	
• 2.2.2	1		2	
• 2.2.3	1	1	1	
• 2.3.1	1		2	
• 2.3.2	1	1	1	
• 2.3.3	1	1	1	
• 2.4.1	1	1	1	
• 2.4.2	1	2		
• 2.4.3	2	1		
• 2.5.1			1	2
• 2.5.2		1		2
• 2.5.3		1		

General Education Competency: Oral Presentation

Provides a well-organized speech with appropriate introduction and conclusion

2.1.1 Very well-organized

2.1.2 Attention grabbing introduction

2.1.3 Convincing conclusion

Provides main points that are well-documented, compelling, supported with facts, developed clearly and concisely, and focused on the topic

2.2.1 All main points are well-documented and supported by numerous, compelling facts

2.2.1 Clearly and concisely presented
2.2.3 Remains focused on topic throughout entire presentation
Uses appropriate gestures, movements and eye contact
2.3.1 Excellent gestures and eye contact
2.3.2 Conversational presentation
2.3.3 Utilize note cards appropriately
Speaks clearly and understandably using standard, edited English with correct mechanics (pronunciation, sentence structure and grammar) relative to audience
2.4.1 Excellent mechanics throughout
2.4.2 Very appropriate presentation relative to audience
2.4.3 Tone is respectful and civil
Provides appropriate handouts and/or visual aids
2.5.1 Provides entire audience with useful, presentation quality handouts
2.5.2 Handouts/audiovisual aids contain appropriate amount of information
2.5.3 Grammatically correct material

General Education Competency: Information Technology

Year	Pass (4)	Fail (1)
2012-2013		
• 3.1.1	20	1
• 3.1.2	20	1
• 3.1.3	20	1
• 3.1.4	20	1
• 3.1.5	20	1
• 3.2.1	19	2
• 3.2.2	16	4
• 3.2.3	19	2
• 3.2.4	20	1
• 3.2.5	16	5
• 3.3.1	18	3
• 3.3.2	18	3
• 3.3.3	18	3
• 3.4.1	18	3
• 3.4.2	18	3
Year	**Pass (4)**	**Fail (1)**
2011-2012		
• 3.1.1		
• 3.1.2		
• 3.1.3		
• 3.1.4	5	
• 3.1.5		
• 3.2.1	2	3
• 3.2.2		5
• 3.2.3	4	1
• 3.2.4	3	2

• 3.2.5		5
• 3.3.1	1	4
• 3.3.2		
• 3.3.3		5
• 3.4.1		5
• 3.4.2		5

General Education Competency: Information Technology

Demonstrates basic computer and operating skills

3.1.1 Access and change computer setting under Control Panel
3.1.2 Navigate file directory structures and paths
3.1.3 Perform file management tasks (select, copy, rename and/or delete files)
3.1.4 Create, save, open, and print a document from some application
3.1.5 Navigate and locate information from Windows Help

Performs core tasks of Microsoft Office applications

3.2.1 Format a document and how to use page layout, e.g., headers, footer, page breaks, bullets, etc.
3.2.2 Create tables, charts, graphs and/or formulas
3.2.3 Import and sort data and/or images in to a document and format them appropriately
3.2.4 Demonstrate techniques for copying, cutting and pasting text and/or images with a document
3.2.5 Review a document using tools: spelling, grammar, word count, and thesaurus

Uses a search engine to access, navigate and evaluate information on the internet

3.3.1 Retrieve information from an internet search engine
3.3.2 Evaluate and rank sources of information for validity
3.3.3 Select, copy and paste information retrieved from the internet College database

Uses email with appropriate etiquette

3.4.1 Open, create and/or send email with attachments
3.4.2 Demonstrates appropriate email etiquette

General Education Competency: Mathematical Reasoning

Year	Excellent (4)	Proficient (3)	Adequate (2)	Inadequate (1)
2012-2013				
• 4.1.1	3	8	8	1
• 4.1.2	1	8	7	4
• 4.2.1	2	8	9	1
• 4.2.2	3	5	11	1
• 4.2.3				
• 4.3.1	2	8	10	
• 4.3.2	1	9	8	2
Year	**Excellent (4)**	**Proficient (3)**	**Adequate (2)**	**Inadequate (1)**
2011-2012				
• 4.1.1	3		1	
• 4.1.2	3		1	
• 4.2.1	2	2		
• 4.2.2	2	2		
• 4.2.3				
• 4.3.1	1	3		
• 4.3.2	2	1	1	

General Education Competency: Mathematical Reasoning

Constructs and/or analyzes numerical or graphical representations of data
4.1.1 A correct solution using an appropriate strategy is given
4.1.2 Descriptions of the results are complete and coherent
Simplifies, evaluates, and/or solves various equations and/or formulas
4.2.1 Demonstrates complete understanding of the problems with correct solutions
4.2.2 Answers are interpreted correctly, with appropriate labels
4.2.3 Correctly identifies units and performs conversions
Formulates and communicates mathematical explanations
4.3.1 Gives a complete response with clear explanations
4.3.2 Communicates effectively to the intended audience; demonstrates complete understanding of the mathematical ideas and processes

General Education Competency: Scientific Reasoning

Year	Excellent (4)	Proficient (3)	Adequate (2)	Inadequate (1)
2012-2013				
• 5.1.1	1	4	5	10
• 5.1.2	2	3	4	11
• 5.2.1	2	4	2	12
• 5.3.1		2	6	12
• 5.4.1	1	5	5	9
• 5.5.1	1	4	4	11
• 5.5.2	1	5	3	11
Year	**Excellent (4)**	**Proficient (3)**	**Adequate (2)**	**Inadequate (1)**
2011-2012				
• 5.1.1			1	2
• 5.1.2			1	2
• 5.2.1			2	1
• 5.3.1			2	1
• 5.4.1			1	2
• 5.5.1		1		2
• 5.5.2			1	2

General Education Competency: Scientific Reasoning
Problem is recognized and investigative question is formulated
5.1.1 Problem is recognized and explained in detail
5.1.2 Investigative question is clearly formulated
Reasonable, testable hypothesis is presented
5.2.1 Hypothesis is reasonable, clearly stated, and fully explains question
Prediction is formulated as logical consequence of the hypothesis
5.3.1 Prediction is logical and fully explained
Data/observations to test hypothesis are gathered or compiled
5.4.1 High quality date and /or high quantity of suitable data gathered and presented professionally (list or table)
Formulation of a conclusion
5.5.1 Conclusion is logical and well formulated
5.5.2 Conclusion explains in detail the degree of correctness of the hypothesis and identifies further avenues of testing, or formulates new hypothesis

PDSA CYCLE 2011-2012 ANALYSIS
OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Problem Area

Students did not use or familiarize themselves with the rubrics prior to identifying and completing the artifacts. It is critical that students review the rubrics since they are scoring tools that identify specific expectations for the assignments. Rubrics divide the tasks into its component parts and provide a detailed description of what constitutes an acceptable or unacceptable level of performance for each of those parts. Using the rubrics in this manner will ensure that students are aware of how their exemplars are being assessed and allows them the ability to make changes to those artifacts so as to better demonstrate that they meet the learning objectives of the class.

Goal

Assist student in understanding and using the rubrics in order to ensure that their artifacts meet all the assessment criteria.

Action Plan

1. Ask all faculty to explain what a rubric is and how it can be used to ensure that classroom assignments meet the stated criteria. This activity should be performed in all College courses as well as by the ENG 299 faculty to reinforce the importance and benefit of rubrics. Constant reinforcement is critical throughout the students' academic experience at the College.
2. Present students enrolled in ENG 299 examples of artifacts that meet all the general education competency "excellent" criteria.

Results

1. All faculty were instructed to distribute and review the Writing Rubric as part of the Writing Across the Curriculum assignment. This request is identified in the *Student Learning Assessment Guide for Faculty* which was given to faculty, wherever or however they taught for the College. This requirement was also discussed at the orientation sessions held at the beginning of the spring 2013 semester for adjunct faculty. A total of 47 adjunct faculty attended the orientation sessions held at the following locations:

- Tucumcari, January 25, 2013; 31 attendees
- Clayton High School, February 13, 2013; 5 attendees
- Northern New Mexico Detention Center, February 13, 2013; 5 attendees
- Moriarty High School, February 19, 2013; 6 attendees

2. Math, science, English, and information technology faculty each presented examples of exemplars that would meet the general education competency "excellent" criteria for the mathematical reasoning, scientific reasoning, writing,

oral presentation, and information technology rubrics during separate presentations to the spring ENG 299 class. The quality of the artifacts did improve somewhat except for the scientific reasoning exemplars.

Problem Area

Students had difficulty uploading their complete oral presentations onto Moodle. It was later discovered that Moodle will only support clips of less than 2 minutes which does not allow for sufficient time for students to demonstrate the oral communication competency.

Goal

Identify alternative methods that would allow students to upload much longer oral presentation clips to ensure the student adequate time to demonstrate attainment of the competency.

Action Plan

1. Investigate utilizing Facebook or YouTube for uploads.
2. Determine how this may relate to FERPA.
    a. Identify whether or not we can “close” these clips to the public.

Results

The majority of the files created by students for the ENG 299 class were uploaded to the Moodle course site. Video files, however, for the oral presentations were generally too large for Moodle. To facilitate collection of the video files, students were sent a link to join a private, shared folder on Dropbox which offers a minimum of 2 GB data storage space. Faculty could then view the video files for evaluation from the shared Dropbox account. If any of the video files could not be viewed in Windows Media Player, they were further uploaded to a private YouTube account which performed the appropriate video conversion to a universal viewing format.

Problem Area

The students enrolled in courses at the prisons may have difficulty collecting and saving artifacts due to a number of foreseen and unforeseen constraints.

Goal

Identify what impediments the students enrolled in prison courses may encounter in terms of collection and storage of artifacts as well as other problems they may encounter with the requirements of the ENG 299 course in general.

Action Plan

1) Convene meetings with all stakeholders to identify possible hurdles faced by students enrolled in the prisons in terms of successful completion of ENG 299.
2) Discuss possible solutions to those identified hurdles.
3) Identifying specific faculty who will require artifact assignments (lab science faculty will require scientific reasoning and critical thinking assignment). This will allow students the ability to immediately submit their work as an artifact.

Results

Although preliminary discussions did take place within SLAC regarding the difficulty of implementing ENG 299 at the correctional sites, specific solutions were not discussed nor were corrective actions implemented.

Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC)

The Writing Across the Curriculum movement (which first appeared on college campuses in the 1970's and 1980's) "is largely a reaction against traditional writing instruction that associates good writing primarily with grammatical accuracy and correctness, and thus isolates writing instruction within English departments, the home of grammar experts. The problem with traditional writing instruction is that it leads to a view of writing as a set of isolated skills unconnected to" the students' major and discipline. Learning to write in a discipline is intimately connected to learning to think within that discipline. This will improve both the students' writing abilities as well as their understanding of their major field of study.

Mesalands Community College instituted the Writing Across the Curriculum initiative during the 2009-2010 academic cycle by requiring all faculty to assess writing skills wherever or however they taught for the College every semester. Below are the assessment results. The major goal of collecting this data is three-fold. First, the College is attempting to identify whether or not its degree graduates are accomplishing the general education competency of writing. Second, the College is attempting to identify whether there is any added value to completing ENG 102. Third, results from this assessment can be used to identify specific areas of weakness with the goal of using this information to improve future (teaching and learning of) writing.

MESALANDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM
STUDENTS WITHOUT A PREVIOUS ENG 102 CLASS
SPRING 2012 SEMESTER

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Proficient (3)	Adequate (2)	Inadequate (1)	Total	Average
1.1.1	75 (45.2 %)	53 (31.9 %)	31 (18.7 %)	7 (4.2 %)	166	3.18
1.1.2	69 (42.9 %)	52 (32.3 %)	28 (17.4 %)	12 (7.5 %)	161	3.11
1.1.3	70 (42.9 %)	52 (31.9 %)	33 (20.2 %)	8 (4.9 %)	163	3.13
1.2.1	74 (44.8 %)	50 (30.3 %)	34 (20.6 %)	7 (4.2 %)	165	3.16
1.2.2	72 (44.4 %)	52 (32.1 %)	31 (19.1 %)	7 (4.3 %)	162	3.17
1.2.3	71 (44.9 %)	49 (31 %)	32 (20.3 %)	6 (3.8 %)	158	3.17
1.3.1	44 (36.1 %)	40 (32.8 %)	23 (18.9 %)	15 (12.3 %)	122	2.93
1.3.2	41 (35.3 %)	42 (36.2 %)	20 (17.2 %)	13 (11.2 %)	116	2.96
1.4.1	40 (24.5 %)	63 (38.7 %)	26 (16 %)	34 (20.9 %)	163	2.67
1.4.2	47 (29.6 %)	57 (35.8 %)	25 (15.7 %)	30 (18.9 %)	159	2.76

MESALANDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM
STUDENTS WITHOUT A PREVIOUS ENG 102 CLASS
FALL 2012 SEMESTER

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Proficient (3)	Adequate (2)	Inadequate (1)	Total	Average
1.1.1	70 (27.7%)	91 (36.0 %)	68 (26.9 %)	24 (9.5 %)	253	2.81
1.1.2	70 (27.7 %)	93 (36.4 %)	63 (24.9 %)	28 (11.0 %)	253	2.80
1.1.3	68 (27.8 %)	85 (34.7 %)	65 (26.5 %)	27 (11.0 %)	245	2.79
1.2.1	65 (26.5 %)	94 (38.4 %)	60 (24.5 %)	26 (10.6 %)	245	2.80
1.2.2	81 (33.6 %)	70 (29.0 %)	62 (25.7 %)	28 (11.6 %)	241	2.85
1.2.3	62 (25.8 %)	81 (33.8 %)	65 (27.1 %)	32 (13.3 %)	240	2.72
1.3.1	45 (24.9 %)	38 (21.0 %)	49 (27.1 %)	49 (27.1 %)	181	2.43
1.3.2	38 (26.0 %)	35 (24.0%)	41 (28.1 %)	32 (21.9 %)	146	2.54
1.4.1	43 (16.6 %)	99 (38.2 %)	83 (32.0 %)	34 (13.1 %)	259	2.58
1.4.2	55 (23.7 %)	84 (36.2 %)	62 (26.7 %)	31 (13.4 %)	232	2.70

MESALANDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM
STUDENTS WITHOUT A PREVIOUS ENG 102 CLASS
SPRING 2013 SEMESTER

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Proficient (3)	Adequate (2)	Inadequate (1)	Total	Average
1.1.1	69 (27.2 %)	72 (28.3 %)	82 (32.3 %)	31 (12.2 %)	254	2.70
1.1.2	70 (28.0 %)	79 (31.6 %)	74 (29.6 %)	27 (10.8 %)	250	2.77
1.1.3	69 (27.6 %)	74 (29.6 %)	79 (31.6 %)	28 (11.2 %)	250	2.74
1.2.1	67 (26.6 %)	73 (29.0 %)	88 (34.9 %)	24 (9.5 %)	252	2.73
1.2.2	72 (28.8 %)	73 (29.2 %)	81 (32.4 %)	24 (9.6 %)	250	2.77
1.2.3	69 (27.3 %)	76 (30.0 %)	84 (33.2 %)	24 (9.5 %)	253	2.75
1.3.1	53 (34.4 %)	42 (27.3 %)	42 (27.3 %)	17 (11.0 %)	154	2.85
1.3.2	50 (32.5 %)	46 (29.9 %)	37 (24.0 %)	21 (13.6 %)	154	2.81

1.4.1	53 (20.9 %)	90 (35.4 %)	86 (33.9 %)	25 (9.8 %)	254	2.67
1.4.2	63 (24.8 %)	72 (28.3 %)	100 (39.4%)	19 (7.5 %)	254	2.70

MESALANDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM
STUDENTS WITH A PREVIOUS ENG 102 CLASS
SPRING 2012 SEMESTER

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Proficient (3)	Adequate (2)	Inadequate (1)	Total	Average
1.1.1	95 (60.9 %)	41 (26.3 %)	17 (10.9 %)	3 (1.9 %)	156	3.46
1.1.2	79 (54.9 %)	43 (29.9 %)	19 (13.2 %)	3 (2.1 %)	144	3.38
1.1.3	83 (57.6 %)	40 (27.8 %)	18 (12.5 %)	3 (2.1 %)	144	3.41
1.2.1	88 (56.4 %)	45 (28.8 %)	20 (12.8 %)	3 (1.9 %)	156	3.40
1.2.2	82 (56.9 %)	38 (26.4 %)	21 (14.6 %)	3 (2.1 %)	144	3.38
1.2.3	75 (54 %)	42 (30.2 %)	21 (15.1 %)	1 (0.7 %)	139	3.37
1.3.1	72 (50.7 %)	29 (20.4 %)	21 (14.8 %)	20 (14.1 %)	142	3.08
1.3.2	67 (51.1 %)	31 (23.7 %)	17 (13 %)	16 (12.2 %)	131	3.14
1.4.1	76 (48.4 %)	61 (38.9 %)	17 (10.8 %)	3 (1.9 %)	157	3.34
1.4.2	66 (45.5 %)	64 (44.1 %)	13 (9 %)	2 (1.4 %)	145	3.34

MESALANDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM
STUDENTS WITH A PREVIOUS ENG 102 CLASS
FALL 2012 SEMESTER

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Proficient (3)	Adequate (2)	Inadequate (1)	Total	Average
1.1.1	37 (29.8 %)	53 (42.7 %)	26 (21.0 %)	8 (6.5 %)	124	2.96
1.1.2	35 (27.6 %)	53 (41.7 %)	26 (20.5 %)	13 (10.2 %)	127	2.87
1.1.3	44 (36.1 %)	45 (36.9 %)	21 (17.2 %)	12 (9.8 %)	122	2.99
1.2.1	38 (30.9 %)	49 (39.8 %)	28 (22.8 %)	8 (6.5 %)	123	2.95
1.2.2	42 (31.8 %)	47 (35.6 %)	27 (20.5 %)	16 (12.1 %)	132	2.87
1.2.3	39 (32.8 %)	42 (35.3 %)	29 (24.4 %)	9 (7.6 %)	119	2.93
1.3.1	37 (35.9 %)	25 (24.3 %)	26 (25.2 %)	15 (14.6 %)	103	2.81
1.3.2	34 (34.0 %)	25 (25.0 %)	28 (28.0 %)	13 (13.0 %)	100	2.80
1.4.1	28 (20.7 %)	62 (45.9 %)	29 (21.5 %)	16 (11.9 %)	135	2.76
1.4.2	40 (31.7 %)	47 (37.3 %)	28 (22.2 %)	11 (8.7 %)	126	2.92

MESALANDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM
STUDENTS WITH A PREVIOUS ENG 102 CLASS
SPRING 2013 SEMESTER

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Proficient (3)	Adequate (2)	Inadequate (1)	Total	Average
1.1.1	213 (43.4 %)	182 (37.1 %)	72 (14.7 %)	24 (4.9 %)	491	3.34
1.1.2	220	197	71 (13.9 %)	24 (4.7 %)	512	3.20

	(43.0 %)	(38.5 %)				
1.1.3	202 (40.0 %)	202 (40.0 %)	75 (14.9 %)	26 (5.1 %)	505	3.15
1.2.1	147 (30.2 %)	220 (45.2 %)	92 (18.9 %)	28 (5.7 %)	487	3.00
1.2.2	182 (37.3 %)	206 (42.2 %)	76 (15.6 %)	24 (4.9 %)	488	3.12
1.2.3	172 (35.5 %)	211 (43.6 %)	73 (15.1 %)	28 (5.8 %)	484	3.09
1.3.1	160 (41.2 %)	123 (31.7 %)	60 (15.5 %)	45 (11.6 %)	388	3.03
1.3.2	157 (40.4 %)	131 (33.8 %)	65 (16.8 %)	35 (9.0 %)	388	3.06
1.4.1	122 (25.0 %)	204 (41.8 %)	131 (26.8 %)	31 (6.4 %)	488	2.85
1.4.2	150 (30.6 %)	203 (41.4 %)	110 (22.4 %)	27 (5.5 %)	490	2.97

1. Provides a clear, concise thesis statement.
    - 1.1.1 Statement is clear and concise
    - 1.1.2 Statement is well-reasoned
    - 1.1.3 Statement leads to plentiful additional discussion
2. Provides supporting paragraphs which relate to the thesis.
    - 1.2.1 Supporting paragraph are well-reasoned
    - 1.2.2 Supporting paragraphs clearly relate to the thesis
    - 1.2.3 Supporting paragraphs are cohesive and logically developed
3. Correctly incorporates outside sources.
    - 1.3.1 Provides relevant outside sources
    - 1.3.2 Cites outside sources correctly
4. Uses appropriate grammar, syntax, punctuation, and spelling.
    - 1.4.1 Writing is error free in all categories (structure, punctuation, spelling and grammar).
    - 1.4.2 Sentence structure and vocabulary are well-developed and varied.

Summary: The College will continue to collect future WAC data in order to identify trends and gaps.

Embedded Assessments: ENG 104

The goal of the embedded assessment is to determine whether or not the quality and quantity of learning in ENG 104: English Composition and Research is the same between different education sites (dual enrollment versus main campus). An identical multiple choice exam was given during the same week at the end of the spring 2012 semester at four different dual enrollment sites (n=68) and one main campus site (n=10).

MESALANDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE ENG 104: ENGLISH COMPOSITION ASSESSMENT SPRING 2012 SEMESTER			
English Communication Objectives:	**Students should perform the following activities to meet the objectives:**	**Percent meeting the objective**	
		Dual	Main
1. Students will analyze and evaluate oral and written communication in terms of situation, audience, purpose, aesthetics, and diverse points of view.	Understand, appreciate, and critically evaluate a variety of written and spoken messages in order to make informed decisions.	78%	97%
2. Students will express a primary purpose in a compelling statement and order supporting points logically and convincingly.	Organize their thinking to express their viewpoints clearly, concisely, and effectively.	79%	100%
3. Students will use effective rhetorical strategies to persuade, inform, and engage.	Select and use the best means to deliver a particular message to a particular audience. Rhetorical strategies include but are not limited to modes (such as narration, description, and persuasion), genres (essays, web pages, reports, proposals), media and technology (PowerPoint, electronic writing), and graphics (charts, diagrams, formats).	93%	95%
4.Students will employ writing and/or speaking processes such as planning, collaborating, organizing, composing, revising, and editing to create presentations using correct diction, syntax, grammar, and mechanics.	Use standard processes for generating documents or oral presentations independently and in groups.	94%	97%
5. Students will integrate research correctly and ethically from credible sources to support the primary purpose of a communication.	Gather legitimate information to support ideas without plagiarizing, misinforming or distorting.	81%	92%
6. Students will engage in reasoned civic discourse while recognizing the distinctions among opinions, facts, and inferences.	Negotiate civilly with others to accomplish goals and to function as responsible citizens.	72%	100%

PDSA CYCLE 2011-2012 ANALYSIS
OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Problem Area

It is highly questionable whether or not a multiple choice exam is a valid measure of whether or not students are accomplishing the New Mexico Higher Education Department (NMHED) Core Competencies Communication. It is also questionable whether or not a multiple choice test is an accurate guage to determine if the quality and quantity of learning in ENG 104: English Composition and Research is the same between different education sites (dual enrollment versus main campus).

Goal

Construct a process that will accurately assess student attainment of the Core Competency based on some type of written assignment such as a critical or argumentative term paper.

Action Plan

The English lead faculty will be charged with constructing a more appropriate tool to assess attainment of the New Mexico Higher Education Department Core Communication Competency.

Results

The English lead faculty member charged with constructing a more appropriate assessment tool did not complete the activity.

Embedded Assessments: MATH 110

The goal of the embedded assessment is to determine whether or not the quality and quantity of learning in MATH 110: College Algebra is the same between different education sites (dual enrollment versus main campus). An identical exam was given during the same week at the end of the spring 2012 semester at one dual enrollment site (n=11) and one main campus site (n=21).

MESALANDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE MATH 110: COLLEGE ALGEBRA ASSESSMENT SPRING 2012 SEMESTER			
Mathematics Objectives:	**Students should perform the following activities to meet the objectives:**	**Percent meeting the objective**	
		Dual	Main
1. Students will construct and analyze graphs and/or data sets.	• Sketch the graphs of linear, quadratic, higher-order polynomial, rational, absolute value, exponential, logarithmic, and radical functions. • Construct graphs using a variety of techniques including plotting points, using properties of basic transformations of functions, and by using key characteristics of functions such as end behavior, intercepts and asymptotes. • Determine the key features of a function such as domain/range, intercepts, and asymptotes.	52%	61%
2. Students will use and solve various kinds of equations.	• Solve quadratic equations using techniques such as factoring, completing the square and square root method, and the quadratic formula. • Solve equations using inverse operations for powers/roots, exponents/logarithms and other arithmetic operations. • Use the equation of a function to determine its domain, to perform function operations, and to find the inverse of a function.	73%	67%
3. Students will understand and write mathematical explanations using appropriate definitions and symbols.	• Correctly use function notation and the vocabulary associated with functions. • Describe the implications of key features of a function with respect to its graph and/or in relation to its real world context.	49%	55%
4. Students will demonstrate problem solving skills within the context of mathematical applications.	• Apply the knowledge of functions to identify an appropriate type of function to solve application problems. • Solve application problems including those requiring maximization or minimization of quadratic functions and exponential growth & decay problems. • Interpret the results of application problems in terms of their real world context.	64%	57%

PDSA CYCLE 2011-2012 ANALYSIS
OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Problem Area

The present assessment tool for Math 110 is not compatible with the Moodle platform utilized by the College distance education courses.

Goal

Convert the present math assessment tool to the Moodle platform.

Action Plan

The math lead faculty will be charged with investigating how the present embedded math assessment tool can be used on the Moodle platform.

Results

After a preliminary investigation, the math lead faculty and Director of Distance Education concluded that the Moodle platform is not able to support the current assessment tool. Further investigation into this matter will be addressed during the 2013-14 academic cycle.

Effectiveness of Pre-Collegiate Course Work

Academic Cycle 2012-2013	Number	C or better	% C or better
Students Completing ENG 102	**193**	**168**	**87%**
Completed pre-collegiate ENG in past year	19	12	63%
No pre-collegiate ENG in past year	174	156	90%
Students Completing MATH 107	**248**	**215**	**87%**
Completed pre-collegiate MATH in past year	35	22	63%
No pre-collegiate MATH in past year	213	193	91%
Academic Cycle 2011-2012	**Number**	**C or better**	**% C or better**
Students Completing ENG 102	**219**	**188**	**86%**
Completed pre-collegiate ENG in past year	19	12	63%
No pre-collegiate ENG in past year	200	176	88%
Students Completing MATH 107	**135**	**79**	**59%**
Completed pre-collegiate MATH in past year	33	18	55%
No pre-collegiate MATH in past year	102	61	60%

PDSA CYCLE 2011-2012 ANALYSIS
OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Problem Area

This data represents the College's first attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of pre-collegiate course work in preparing students for future success in general education collegiate courses.

Goal

The Pre-collegiate Faculty and the Educational Services Center, which is responsible for administration of pre-collegiate, ABE, and GED course work, will begin establishing a plan→do→study→adjust cycle of assessment with the goal of improving its services with the ultimate goal of preparing students enrolled in the pre-collegiate classes for future success in their regular college courses.

Action Plan

Begin discussions with Director of Educational Services Center to establish the "plan" portion of the cycle of assessment.

Results

Initial discussions were held between the Chair of the Student Learning Assessment Committee and the new Director of Educational Services Center during the fall 2012 semester regarding the need to establish a plan-do-study-adjust cycle of assessment. No formal "plan" was developed.

PDSA CYCLE 2012-2013 ANALYSIS
OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Problem Area

The College will continue to collect data to evaluate the effectiveness of pre-collegiate course work in preparing students for future success in general education collegiate courses in order to identify gaps and trends.

Goal

The Pre-collegiate Faculty and the Educational Services Center, which is responsible for administration of pre-collegiate course work, will begin establishing a plan→do→study→adjust cycle of assessment with the goal of improving its services with the ultimate goal of preparing students enrolled in the pre-collegiate classes for future success in their regular college courses.

Action Plan

Begin discussions with Director of Educational Services Center to establish the "plan" portion of the cycle of assessment.

Results

To be discussed in the 2013-2014 report.

INSTITUTIONAL SURVEYS

Mesalands Community College has, in the past, utilized a regular cycle of surveys (Student Opinion Survey, Withdrawing/Non-Returning Student Survey, Alumni Survey and others) which provided indirect measures of student learning, as well as some attitudinal data useful for assessment. However, because of significant changes involving personnel responsible for the administration, collection and data reduction of these surveys, no results have been reported over the course of the last several years.

PROGRAM LEVEL ASSESSMENT

DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES GRANTED

A comparison of the number of graduates in the various degree plans of the 2012-2013 academic year with the previous nine years follows:

ASSOCIATE OF ARTS DEGREES										
Program	**2003 -04**	**2004 -05**	**2005 -06**	**2006 -07**	**2007 -08**	**2008 -09**	**2009 -10**	**2010 -11**	**2011 -12**	**2012-13**
Business Administration			3			2	1	5	2	1
Criminal Justice	1	2			1				1	1
Early Childhood Education		1	1	1	2	2	4	1	5	
Elementary Education	5	1	6	3	2	2	1		3	1
Fine Arts			1		1		2			
General Studies			1				1		2	
Human Services			1							
Liberal Arts									1	
Paleontology				1			1	2	1	
Pre-Dentistry			1							
Pre-Engineering	1				1					
Pre-Medical Arts	2							1	1	1
Secondary Education		1	2	1	2					
Social Work		2	2	2	1	5		1		3
University Studies	3	3	4	5	2	2	4	7	5	6
ASSOCIATE OF APPLIED SCIENCE DEGREES										
Program	**2003 -04**	**2004 -05**	**2005 -06**	**2006 -07**	**2007 -08**	**2008 -09**	**2009 -10**	**2010 -11**	**2011 -12**	**2012-13**
Agricultural Business			1	2				3		
Animal Science	3			3	2	2	3	5	2	2
Automotive Technology	1	1			1		1	1		19
Building Trades					1		1		2	2
Business Administration	7		7	3	2	3	4	4	7	11
Business Office Technology	6		3					1	2	
Communications						1				
Computer Science				1		1	2			
Diesel Technology			1	1				3		
Farrier Science			2	1	2		3	2	2	1
General Studies	4		4	4	9	4	12	14	22	15
Horticulture									1	
Landscape and Nursery Management										5
Office Systems				1		15	2			
Public Administration				1	1	2	3	1		
Wind Energy Technology							16	22	20	7

OCCUPATIONAL CERTIFICATES

Program	2003 -04	2004 -05	2005 -06	2006 -07	2007 -08	2008 -09	2009 -10	2010 - 11	2011 - 12	2012- 13
Gnathology for the Horse Owner								6	1	4
Artistic Silversmithing										2
Automotive Technology					1					
Advanced Automotive Technician										2
Basic Auto Technician										1
Basic Woodworking										2
Building Trades				1		2	2			
Business Administration									1	
Commercial Truck Driving	13	21	16	29	48					
Computer/ Information Systems			8		18			29		
Computer Maintenance										19
Corrections Officer								14		21
Diesel Technology					1					
Farrier Science	3	1	1		6	3	3	7	3	3
Fine Arts			3		3		1			
General Studies									1	
Horticulture									1	
Liberal Arts									3	1
Metal Arts							1	1	2	
Nail Technology	3	1	2							
PC Specialist										48
Pre-Nursing					2	7	2	2	6	5
Professional and Technical Writing										2
Publishing Specialist										14
Wind Energy Technology						17	23		47	19
Wind Energy Technology Occupational										29
Total Degrees and Certificates	**52**	**34**	**70**	**60**	**108**	**70**	**93**	**132**	**144**	**240**

COMPLETION RATES OF GENERAL EDUCATION CORE CLASSES

The data below also includes dual enrollment of high school students taking classes through the College.

COMPLETION RATES OF GENERAL EDUCATION TRANSFER CLASSES 2007-2012 ACADEMIC YEARS										
Year	2012-13									
Course	N	% C or better	N	% C or better	N	% C or better	N	% C or better	N	% C or better
Area I: Communications										
ENG 102	193	87.05								
ENG 104	142	92.25								
COM 101	76	67.11								
COM 102	82	92.68								
Area II: Mathematics										
MATH 110	50	80.00								
STAT 213	8	75.00								
Area III: Laboratory Science										
BIOL 113	45	86.67								
CHEM 113	10	60.00								
CHEM 115	18	55.56								
CHEM 116	0									
GEOL 141	30	80.00								
GEOL 151	5	80.00								
PHYS 115	5	60.00								
PHYS 120	23	78.26								
Area IV: Social and Behavioral Science										
ANTH 101	10	80.00								
ECON 251	91	94.79								
ECON 252	10	100.0								
PSCI 102	89	96.63								
PSCI 202	29	79.31								
PSY 101	57	87.72								
SOC 101	52	86.54								
SOC 212	0									
Area V: Humanities and Fine Arts										
ART 101	73	68.49								
MUS 101	46	86.96								
HIST 101	34	79.41								
HIST 102	28	96.43								
HIST 121	10	60.00								
Total Number of Students Enrolled and Overall %C or Better Averages										
Totals	1221	85.09								

COMPLETION RATES OF GENERAL EDUCATION TRANSFER CLASSES 2007-2012 ACADEMIC YEARS										
Year	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12	
Course	N	% C or better	N	% C or better	N	% C or better	N	% C or better	N	% C or better
Area I: Communications										
ENG 102	187	86.63	258	81.78	205	78.05	221	80.54	220	87.27
ENG 104	71	81.69	145	90.34	120	89.17	171	89.47	129	92.25
COM 101	83	73.49	41	70.73	93	96.77	87	87.36	87	78.16
COM 102	49	77.55	45	86.67	86	75.58	94	76.60	72	84.72
Area II: Mathematics										
MATH 110	36	77.78	58	82.76	51	80.39	79	86.08	46	69.56
STAT 213	16	87.5	16	68.75	17	94.11	7	42.86	28	92.86
Area III: Laboratory Science										
BIOL 113	43	76.74	23	78.26	64	73.44	42	69.05	60	80.00
CHEM 115	41	95.12	102	97.06	12	75.00	35	91.43	42	92.86
CHEM 116	16	100.0	41	90.24	11	100.0	23	86.96	27	88.89
GEOL 141	12	50.0	37	81.08	65	70.77	45	75.55	61	62.30
GEOL 151	15	53.33	5	100.0	27	100.0	3	100.0	7	85.71
PHYS 115	0	NA	0	NA	5	60.00	5	100.0	8	100.0
PHYS 120	12	83.33	5	60.00	0	NA	24	29.17	5	100.0
Area IV: Social and Behavioral Science										
ANTH 101	20	55.00	17	82.35	5	60.00	8	50.00	11	100.0
ECON 251	54	83.33	97	92.78	105	76.19	77	93.57	81	91.36
ECON 252	10	40.00	19	52.63	7	85.71	24	58.33	31	67.74
PSCI 102	41	100.0	90	88.89	77	96.10	85	89.41	93	91.40
PSCI 202	11	90.91	17	100.0	32	96.88	33	84.85	29	86.21
PSY 101	46	91.30	110	84.55	107	88.79	159	86.79	92	84.78
SOC 101	29	96.55	50	94.00	48	89.58	44	88.64	44	93.18
SOC 212	14	78.57	0	NA	16	56.25	12	100.0	1	100.0
Area V: Humanities and Fine Arts										
ART 101	62	80.65	31	54.84	109	55.96	77	71.43	98	72.45
MUS 101	26	80.77	39	66.67	39	79.49	36	86.11	106	74.53
HIST 101	23	95.65	26	92.31	58	96.55	50	84.00	37	89.19
HIST 102	28	96.43	35	100.0	59	96.61	29	86.21	19	89.47
HIST 121	11	90.91	10	70.00	7	57.14	8	100.0	5	40.00
Total Number of Students Enrolled and Overall %C or Better Averages										
Totals	956	83.16	1317	85.12	1425	82.25	1478	82.81	1439	83.67

PSDA CYCLE 2011-2012 ANALYSIS
OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Problem Area

It is important for the College to identify courses with high failure and/or drop-out rates. Up to this point in time, these trends have not been considered.

Goal

Identify courses with high failure and/or drop-out rates.

Action

SLAC will establish a process of identifying courses with high failure and/or drop-out rates.

Results

No attempt was made by the Student Learning Assessment Committee to establish a process to identify courses with high failure/dropout rates. A preliminary discussion was held between the Chair of the Student Learning Committee and the new Retention Specialist regarding the importance of evaluating this data and establish possible plans to improve student success in these courses.

PDSA CYCLE 2012-2013 ANALYSIS
OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Problem Area

The College does not utilize the plan-do-study-adjust cycle to assess efforts for improving student retention, persistence and graduation.

Goal

The College is considering applying for the Higher Learning Commission's Academy for Student Persistence and Completion in order to establish and implement a comprehensive plan to assess and improve retention, persistence and completion efforts.

Action Plan

Apply for the Higher Learning Commission's Academy for Student Persistence and Completion in order to establish and implement a comprehensive plan to assess and improve retention, persistence and completion efforts. If this is not

feasible, the College should consider participating in the New Mexico Higher Education Assessment Association's (NMHEAA) summer 2014 retreat by sending a team of 4 or more participants to develop a plan-do-study-adjust cycle of assessment to improve student retention, persistence and graduation.

Results

To be discussed in the 2013-2014 report.

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT
PROGRAM REPORTS

The purpose of program level assessment is to document how well students are accomplishing the program specific objectives and general education competencies. The program objectives and general education competencies are Mesalands' contract with all stakeholders and reflect those competencies that students will possess and demonstrate upon graduation. These program objectives and general education competencies reflect those knowledge, skills and professional dispositions valued by workplace employers and other interested parties and represent the most deeply held values of the College, thereby driving much of what occurs at Mesalands. Degree programs are required to assess both general education competency and program objective outcomes. Certificate programs are required to measure program objective outcomes only.

The Student Learning Assessment Program Reports collectively document the College's attempt to more succinctly and comprehensively identify and measure outcomes attainment and to use this information to improve learning. The individual program reports are published in a separate document entitled *Student Learning Assessment Program Reports 2012-2013* and are available on the College website.

ASSESSING PROGRAM ASSESSMENT
2012-2013

Assessment can be defined as the process of determining the quality and quantity of student learning in order to make improvements (Bordon and Zak, 2001). It is critical that faculty members at Mesalands Community College meaningfully capture and document what they are teaching, what students are learning and how this information ultimately improves the teaching-learning relationship. To that end, Mesalands Community College encourages faculty to take "ownership" of their respective programs and courses in terms of whether or not students are learning what faculty say they are learning as identified in the course objectives, program objectives and general education competencies. Effective assessment of student learning is a matter of commitment, not a matter of compliance. Mesalands Community College is dedicated to establishing a culture of assessment embedded in every aspect of the educational process.

In order to improve the plan→do→study→adjust cycle of program assessment at the College, the Student Learning Assessment Committee (SLAC) assesses program assessment on an annual basis. The goals of assessing the assessment are twofold. First, this report will give feedback to the faculty as to how they are doing in terms of assessment with the goal of helping them to continually improve the teaching-learning relationship both inside and outside the classroom. Second, this report will help the College identify how it is doing in terms of its own assessment efforts with the goal of attentively reshaping and meaningfully improving the continual process of student learning and assessment.

This report focuses on how well programs are assessing both program objectives and general education competencies. Degree and certificate programs are required to complete an annual report documenting their annual assessment activities. Lead faculty and program directors are encouraged to modify their reports so as to better meet the individual needs and characteristics of their programs and make the report more meaningful to all stakeholders. These reports are then reviewed by the Chair of the Student Learning Assessment Committee who uses the *Student Learning Assessment Program Report Evaluation Rubric* to evaluate each program report. Results of this evaluation are shared with the College during the August Assessment Day.

Generally speaking, SLAC would like to see a migration of programs from the left hand columns of the following rubrics to the right hand columns indicating more comprehensive and meaningful assessment efforts. It is SLAC's goal to facilitate this migration.

MEASURES PROGRAM OBJECTIVES*

1 No program objectives measured	2 Some program objectives measured (<50%)	3 Most program objectives measured (<100%)	4 Measures all program objectives
Farrier Science (4) Social Work (4)		Natural Sciences (4)	Animal Science (S) Business Administration (S) Business Office Technology (S) Early Childhood (S) Fine Arts (1) Professional Writing (S) Wind Energy Technology (3)

USES MULTIPLE MEASURES: PROGRAM OBJECTIVES*

1 No measures	2 One (1) measure	3 Two (2) measures	4 Three (3(triangulation)) or more measures
Farrier Science (2) Social Work (4)	Business Administration (S) Business Office Technology (S) Wind Energy Technology (3)	Animal Science (S) Early Childhood (S) Natural Sciences (2)	Fine Arts (S) Professional Writing (S)

MEASURES GENERAL EDUCATION COMPETENCIES *

Communication-Writing (Writing Across the Curriculum)

1 No General Education Competency: Communication-Writing measured	2	3	4 General Education Competency: Communication-Writing measured
Business Administration (4) Business Office Technology (4) University Studies (4)			AAS General Studies (1) Animal Science (S) Early Childhood (S) Farrier Science (S) Fine Arts (S) Natural Sciences (1) Pre-Nursing (S) Professional Writing (S) Social Work (S) University Studies (S) Wind Energy Technology (S)

Communication-Oral Presentation

1 No General Education Competency: Communication-Oral Presentation measured	2	3	4 General Education Competency: Communication-Oral Presentation measured
Business Administration (S) Business Office Technology (4) Farrier Science (4) Fine Arts (S) Natural Sciences (S) Social Work (S) University Studies (4) Wind Energy Technology (S)			AAS General Studies (S) Animal Science (S) Early Childhood (S) Pre-Nursing (S)

Communication-Information Technology

1 No General Education Competency: Communication-Information Technology measured	2	3	4 General Education Competency: Communication-Information Technology measured
Business Administration (S) Business Office Technology (4) Early Childhood (4) Fine Arts (S) Natural Sciences (S) Social Work (S) University Studies (4) Wind Energy Technology (S)			AAS General Studies (S) Animal Science (S) Farrier Science (S) Pre-Nursing (S)

Critical Thinking

1 No General Education Competency: Critical Thinking measured	2	3	4 General Education Competency: Critical Thinking measured
Business Administration (4) Business Office Technology (4) Early Childhood (4)			AAS General Studies (1) Animal Science (S) Farrier Science (S) Fine Arts (1) Natural Sciences (1) Pre-Nursing (S) Social Work (1) University Studies (S) Wind Energy Technology (S)

Mathematical Reasoning

1 No General Education Competency: Mathematical Reasoning measured	2	3	4 General Education Competency: Mathematical Reasoning measured
Business Administration (4) Business Office Technology (4) Early Childhood (4)			AAS General Studies (S) Animal Science (S) Farrier Science (S) Fine Arts (1) Natural Sciences (1) Pre-Nursing (S) Social Work (1) University Studies (S) Wind Energy Technology (S)

Scientific Reasoning

1 No General Education Competency: Scientific Reasoning measured	2	3	4 General Education Competency: Scientific Reasoning measured
Business Administration (4) Business Office Technology (4) Early Childhood (4)			AAS General Studies (S) Animal Science (S) Farrier Science (S) Fine Arts (1) Natural Sciences (1) Pre-Nursing (S) Social Work (1) University Studies (S) Wind Energy Technology (S)

USES MULTIPLE MEASURES FOR GENERAL EDUCATION COMPETENCY*

Writing

1 No measures	2 One (1) measure	3 Two (2) measures	4 Three (3(triangulation)) or more measures
Business Administration (2) Business Office Technology (3)	Early Childhood (4) Natural Sciences (1) University Studies (4)	AAS General Studies (S) Farrier Science (4) Fine Arts (2) Social Work (2)	Animal Science (S) Pre-Nursing (3) Wind Energy Technology (S)

Oral Presentation

1 No measures	2 One (1) measure	3 Two (2) measures	4 Three (3(triangulation)) or more measures
Business Administration (S) Business Office Technology (2) Farrier Science (3) Fine Arts (S) Natural Sciences (S) Social Work (S) University Studies (3) Wind Energy Technology (S)	AAS General Studies (S) Early Childhood (3) Pre-Nursing(S)	Animal Science (2)	

Information Technology

1 No measures	2 One (1) measure	3 Two (2) measures	4 Three (3(triangulation)) or more measures
Business Administration (S) Business Office Technology (2) Early Childhood (2) Fine Arts (S) Natural Sciences (S) Social Work (S) University Studies (3) Wind Energy Technology (S)	AAS General Studies (S) Farrier Science (S)	Animal Science (2) Pre-Nursing (2)	

Mathematical Reasoning

1 No measures	2 One (1) measure	3 Two (2) measures	4 Three (3(triangulation)) or more measures
Business Administration (2) Business Office Technology (2) Early Childhood (2)	Farrier Science (3) Fine Arts (1) Natural Sciences (1) Social Work (1) University Studies (4)	AAS General Studies (S) Pre-Nursing (S) Wind Energy Technology (2)	University Studies (3)

Scientific Reasoning

1 No measures	2 One (1) measure	3 Two (2) measures	4 Three (3(triangulation)) or more measures
Business Administration (2) Business Office Technology (3) Early Childhood (2)	Farrier Science (3) Fine Arts (1) Natural Sciences (1) Social Work (1) University Studies (4)	AAS General Studies (S) Animal Science (2) Pre-Nursing (S) Wind Energy Technology (2)	

Critical Thinking

1 No measures	2 One (1) measure	3 Two (2) measures	4 Three (3(triangulation)) or more measures
Business Administration (2) Business Office Technology (3) Early Childhood (2)	AAS General Studies (S) Farrier Science (4) Fine Arts (1) Natural Sciences (1) Social Work (1) University Studies (4)	Pre-Nursing (S) Wind Energy Technology (2)	Animal Science (S)

USES BOTH INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL SOURCES*

1 No data	2	3 Uses either internal data or external data	4 Uses both internal data and external data
		AAS General Studies (S) Animal Science (S) Business Administration (S) Business Office Technology (S) Early Childhood (S) Farrier Science (4) Fine Arts (S) Natural Sciences (S) Pre-Nursing (S) Professional Writing (S) Social Work (S) University Studies (S) Wind Energy Technology (S)	

HAS COMPLETE DATA SUMMARY*

1 No data summary	2 Minimal summary explaining little data	3 Partial summary explaining some data	4 Full data summary explaining who, what, where, when, how, why and to what extent
	Animal Science (S) Business Office Technology (S) Fine Arts (S) Professional Writing (S) Social Work (S) University Studies (S)	AAS General Studies (S) Early Childhood (S) Pre-Nursing (2)	Business Administration (2) Farrier Science (3) Natural Sciences (3) Wind Energy Technology (S)

CHANGES TO CURRICULUM BASED ON DATA (CLOSES THE LOOP)*

1 No changes made	2 Changes made without data/changes based on anecdotal data	3 Changes made based on empirical data	4 Changes made based on empirical data with follow-up plans to measure effectiveness
	AAS General Studies (1) Animal Science (1) Business Office Technology (S) Early Childhood (3) Fine Arts (S) Social Work (3) University Studies (S)	Pre-Nursing (2) Professional Writing (2)	Business Administration (S) Farrier Science (3) Natural Sciences (S) Wind Energy Technology (3)

*The number in parenthesis following the program title represents that column under which that specific program appeared last year. An "S" meaning "same" indicates that the program did not change columns from last year while an "N" indicates that the program is "new" to the chart and did not appear on it last year. As indicated earlier, SLAC would like to see a migration of programs from the left hand columns of the rubric to the right hand columns indicating more comprehensive and meaningful assessment efforts.

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT PROGRAM REPORT EVALUATION RUBRIC
MESALANDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Evaluation Criteria	1	2	3	4
Measures Program Objectives	No program objectives measured.	Some program objectives measured. (<50%)	Most program objectives measured. (<100%)	All program objectives measured.
Uses Multiple Measures: Program Objectives	No measures.	One measure.	Two measures.	Three (triangulation) or more measures.
Measures General Education Competencies**	Not measured			Measured
Uses Multiple Measures-General Education Competencies	No measures.	One measure.	Two measures.	Three (triangulation) or more measures.
Uses Both Internal and External Sources	No data.		Uses either internal data or external data.	Uses both internal data and external data.
Has Complete Data Summary	No data summary.	Minimal summary explaining little data.	Partial summary explaining some data.	Full data summary explaining who, what, where, when, how, why and to what extent.
Changes to Curriculum Based on Data (Closes the Loop)	No changes made.	Changes made without data/changes based on anecdotal data.	Changes made based on empirical data.	Changes made based on empirical data with follow-up plans to measure effectiveness.

**Assessment of the General Education Competencies is based on the *General Education Competency Reporting Schedule*.

PDSA CYCLE 2009-2010 ANALYSIS
OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Problem Area

Despite implementation of the Writing Across the Curriculum plan and collection of the data, very few programs reported data specific to their plan of study students.

Goal

One hundred percent of programs will report on the general education competency of writing utilizing the Writing Across the Curriculum rubric.

Action Plan

Lead instructors/program directors will be required to keep hard copies of their results as documented on the Writing Across the Curriculum rubric and to report this data using a standardized report format. *Note: Faculty did submit assessment results on the general education competency of writing utilizing the Writing Across the Curriculum rubric. This data was reported for the entire College but not broken down program-specifically.*

Results

Only 44% of programs (7 out of 16) reported program-specific Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) data in their Student Learning Assessment Program Reports. This is difficult to explain since all faculty at the College are required to participate in the WAC initiative. A general education competency writing rubric was developed in order to facilitate the data collection in support of the WAC initiative.

Problem Area

Assessment of the general education competencies – critical thinking will be implemented during the Spring 2011 semester. This data will be collected both at a College-wide and program level.

Goal

One hundred percent of programs will report on the general education competency – critical thinking utilizing the specific rubric that will be created during the Fall 2010 semester.

Action Plan

The Student Learning Assessment Committee will be responsible for creating the rubric as well as “rolling out” this plan to all full-time and adjunct faculty.

Results

Only 12% of programs (2 of 16) reported program-specific data on critical thinking competency attainment. After this goal was established, the SLAC decided to allow all faculty to assess either the general education competencies of critical thinking or oral presentation. Thirty-one percent (5 of 16) of programs reported oral presentation competency attainment. Having said that, only 44% of programs (7 of 16) reported program specific data on either critical thinking or oral presentation competency attainment in their Student Learning Assessment Reports.

PDSA CYCLE 2011-2012 ANALYSIS
OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Problem Area

Three years ago with the initiation of the updated Student Learning Assessment Program Reports, lead faculty and program directors were given a report format to assist in the generation of the individual program reports. This suggested report format was in response to faculty requests for directions on what they “needed to do.”

Goal

Facilitate faculty to take more ownership of their program reports by encouraging them to modify, revise and rework them to more adequately reflect the unique characteristics and needs of the program with the ultimate goal of improving learning.

Action Plan

Discuss in detail the above mentioned goal at the spring 2013 Assessment Day.

Results

On Friday, January 18, 2013, a significant amount of time was spent during the Faculty Council meeting discussing the collective quality of the *Student Learning Assessment Program Reports*. General and specific suggestions were made to lead faculty and program directors on how to revise and rework the *Reports* to

reflect the unique characteristics and needs of the different programs. The importance of "closing the loop" reflecting data driven changes was also focused upon. Having said that, the Chair of the Student Learning Assessment Committee was disappointed in the quality of the Reports as reflected in the above Assessing Program Assessment results. Problems areas identified were as follows:

- Not a single program modified its Report to better reflect its unique characteristics
- Specific recommendations made by the Chair of the Student Learning Assessment Committee were not implemented into any of the identified programs.
- Numerous programs lacked data on a number of their identified objectives.
- Changes based on the analysis of assessment results were not data driven

PDSA CYCLE 2012-2013 ANALYSIS
OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Problem Area

There will be a significant number of new program directors/lead faculty (Animal Science, Business Administration, Business Office Technology, and Technical and Professional Writing) arriving at the College during the fall 2013 semester. It is important that the plan-do-study-adjust cycle of assessment and closing of the loop not be disrupted.

Goal

1. New faculty will be trained and mentored to continue the assessment cycle.
2. Meaningful Student Learning Assessment Program Reports will be submitted for the 2013-2014 reporting cycle

Action Plan

The Chair of the Student Learning Assessment Committee is charged with the mentoring of new faculty in order to ensure creation of the above mentioned reports.

Results

To be discussed in the 2013-2014 report.

CLASSROOM LEVEL ASSESSMENT

The goal of faculty assessment of student learning at the individual course level is to identify what has and has not worked at increasing learning in the classroom and how this information can be used in present and future classes to improve the teaching-learning relationship between faculty and students. Historically, Mesalands Community College required all faculty to complete a *Faculty Outcomes Assessment Form*. This form was the College's attempt to collect quantitative data regarding the students' performance on the courses' identified learning outcomes, i.e., course objectives.

The *Faculty Outcomes Assessment Form* was not well received by faculty. Faculty indicated that the form was too time consuming to fill out while the information they were required to supply did not lead to improved student learning. Based on this feedback, the SLAC redesigned the form to make it more user friendly, as well as provide more useful information that could be used to improve student learning, regardless of who was teaching the course in question. The new *MCC Faculty Outcomes Assessment Narrative Form* asks three questions:

1) Comment on any strategies you used in the course that improved student learning.
2) Comment on anything that was not successful in meeting your learning objectives.
3) What changes to this course would you recommend for yourself or another instructor to improve student learning the next time this course is offered?

Faculty complete the *MCC Faculty Outcomes Assessment Narrative Form* for each class they teach at the end of the fall, spring and summer semesters.

Electronic as well a hard copies of completed forms are kept on file and made available to all College faculty teaching that specific course. The availability of these forms is identified in the *Student Learning Assessment Guide for Faculty*. Faculty are encouraged to review the information on these Forms with the goal of assisting them at improving student learning.