



SARANAC LAKE . MALONE . TICONDEROGA

October 16, 2018

Dr. Elizabeth Sibolski
President
Middle States Commission on Higher Education
3624 Market Street
2nd Floor West
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Re: North Country Community College
Institutional Response to 2018 Team Report

Dear President Sibolski,

I hope this finds you well and enjoying the season. The weather has turned decidedly colder in the North Country and our first snow has already fallen in the mountains. May you enjoy warmer temperatures in Philadelphia for the next several weeks!

On behalf of North Country Community College, I am writing to submit our Institutional Response to the 2018 Team Report from their September 27-28th, 2018 visit. Within this document you will find our response along with an appendix that is referenced in the report.

We appreciate this opportunity to respond and thank you in advance for your review.

The best to you,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Steven J. Tyrell". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "S" and "T".

Dr. Steven J. Tyrell
President
North Country Community College
23 Santanoni Avenue PO Box 89
Saranac Lake, NY 12983
(518) 354-5282 (office)

Institutional Response to the Team Report to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education From North Country Community College

October 16, 2018

Dear President Sibolski:

On behalf of the North Country Community College (NCCC) faculty, staff, and administration, we thank the Commission, Vice President, Dr. Christy Faison, reviewers Dr. Judith Sciple and Dr. Bonnie Thomas, along with SUNY Assistant Provost, Dr. Kristina Bendikas for their time during a Middle States follow-up visit on September 27-28, 2018. This visit followed submission of a Monitoring Report filed on September 1, 2018, as required by Middle States based on the College's status as "not meeting" the requirements for *Middle States Characteristics of Excellence* Standards 2: Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal, and 14: Assessment of Student Learning. Within the 2018 Monitoring Report, NCCC addressed all of the recommendations and requirements of the September 2017 Follow-Up Report and documented compliance with these standards over the 2017-2018 academic year. The review team who visited on September 27-28 concurred with that sentiment; however, the team's judgment was that NCCC did not meet the requirements for Standard 5: Educational Effectiveness Assessment, *Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation* (previously Standard 14) under the umbrella of assessment of student learning outcomes.

While we appreciate the spirit and nature of the peer review process and its importance in reaccreditation actions, we disagree with the 2018 Visiting Team's conclusion that we have not met Standard 5. As per the MSCHE guiding principles, the standards "emphasize functions rather than specific structures, recognizing that there are many different models for educational and operational excellence" (*Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation*). We concur and readily agree that our model looks different than that of other institutions, but it is one that has worked for us given our institutional culture. Using these principles as our guide, we contest the conclusions the 2018 Visiting Team arrived at based on the following: 1) NCCC addressed all findings of the September 2017 Follow-Up Report as required; 2) the team's analysis of our assessment process seems to have overlooked some evidence; and 3) the College has documented compliance with Standard 5: Educational Effectiveness Assessment (both in its current iteration and its prior status as Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes). Evidence for these objections is provided in the following pages. It is worth noting that all evidence following was available to either the 2017 or 2018 Visiting Teams.

Given the parameters provided in the MSCHE *Follow-Up Reports and Visits* (dated September 1, 2018), the College prepared and submitted a Monitoring Report on September 1, 2018 along with supporting documents that focused on the areas identified as needing improvement by the visiting team in September of 2017. While a number of our assessment documents were not part of that Monitoring Report submission in 2018, the intent of the College's response was to "[i]nclude *only* those documents that are necessary to substantiate *institutional improvements* (emphasis added)" and to "[a]void tangential or irrelevant documentation that may confuse or distract readers" (*Follow-Up Reports and Visits*, p.3). We did not include a number of documents that might have illustrated overall compliance with Standard 5 based on the above guidelines from Middle States and the expectation that the 2018 Visiting Team had access to the information previously provided to the 2017 Visiting Team. Responding to the requirements, recommendations, and areas of weakness identified in the 2017 Follow-Up Report formed the basis for our assessment activities as detailed in the 2018 Monitoring Report.

NCCC Response to the 2017 Follow-Up Visit Report:

In this section, we focus on the findings of the 2017 Follow-Up Visit Report and the College's actions in response to those requirements. Those actions formed the structure and focus of the 2018 Monitoring Report. The following are the requirements and recommendations of the 2017 Follow-Up Report.

Requirements:

1. *The college must develop a documented, organized and sustained assessment process to improve student learning that has clear, realistic guidelines and timetables.*

Recommendations:

1. *The college should provide professional development and resources for faculty to learn how to assess student learning, how to improve their curricula and how to improve their teaching.*

In addition to the aforementioned requirements and recommendations, the 2017 Follow-Up Report commented on areas of weakness with regard to compliance with Standard 14 (now Standard 5). Those areas of weakness were addressed and evidence of changes are documented in our 2018 Monitoring Report and listed below:

- The 2017 Visiting Team noted that *“NCCC’s monitoring report cites the assessment of three institutional learning outcomes. The assessment of college-wide learning goals does not yet appear to be systematic. Interviews with administrators revealed that there is not a set schedule for the assessment of college-wide learning goals.”*

As stated in the NCCC 2018 Monitoring Report, “[o]ver the past year, the College established a clearly documented three-year cycle of assessment at both the institutional and program levels. Appendices 2.1 and 2.2 document the assessment cycle and resulting data as well as the next steps in response to those results.” This was acknowledged in the Small Team Follow-Up report from September 2018 that commended the College for the following accomplishments, one of which includes a *“documented three-year assessment plan and structure for academic programs and general education.”*

- In the 2017 report, the team stated that the College *“cites resource and curricular changes in five program areas as a result of program review. While there has been some progress made, it does not yet appear to be fully systematic as interview with faculty revealed that there are no clearly understood timetables or deadlines for completion of program reviews.”*

In NCCC's 2018 Monitoring Report, evidence of a five-year program review cycle was provided. All programs will have completed program reviews by the end of the 2018-2019 academic year and the next five-year cycle begins again in 2019-2020. This area was not commented upon nor addressed by the 2018 Visiting Team.

- The 2017 team reported that “*a tracking document indicated that numerous course syllabi were not fully aligned with the master syllabi. In cases where the courses were not aligned a remediation plan for the department chairs to review the course syllabi is noted. However the remediation plan does not appear to have a timeline for completion.*”

In 2018, NCCC documented that not only was the audit completed, we also changed the process to create a master syllabus for each course. We continue to perform audits in addition to the use of the master syllabi. As discussed with the 2018 Visiting Team, we continue to use audits each semester in addition to the master syllabus process.

- Another area of concern in the 2017 report was that of professional development resources focused on assessment. The team noted that they “*did not find evidence of a formal faculty development program in support of assessment in place at the time of the visit.*”

As documented in the 2018 Monitoring Report and in the 2018 Follow-Up Report by the visiting team, NCCC “*committed fiscal resources to deliver professional development for assessment of student learning outcomes.*” In the 2017-2018 year, we increased the professional development budget from \$12,000 to \$20,000, much of that additional budgeting was related to assessment. We added four mandatory assessment days to the academic calendar along with two other faculty meetings devoted to assessment. With 45 faculty members participating in these workshops, this is an additional \$45,000+ worth of resources based on faculty per diem salaries. Additionally, we funded the trip for three faculty members and two administrators to attend a SUNY conference on assessment last October and funded the Associate Dean’s participation in the MSCHE Annual Conference in 2017. For the 2018-2019 academic year, we have carried the schedule of assessment days forward and established a formalized professional development program, as well as included professional development as 20% of the job description for the new Coordinator of Strategic Academic Initiatives. The three sessions for the Fall 2018 semester are focused directly on assessment-related topics in the areas of item analysis and norming, integrating and assessing topics related to cultural competencies, and enhancing and assessing critical thinking assignments within courses and programs.

As documented in the submission of the 2018 Monitoring Report, the College met the requirement and recommendation from the 2017 report and, in addition, resolved the problems identified as areas of weakness listed above. This was acknowledged in the Small Team Follow-Up Report from September 2018, which commended the College for having a “*documented three-year assessment plan and structure for academic programs and general education.*” There are clear timetables, and guidelines, and while not in its final format, the assessment process is sustainable in its current iteration. As noted in the 2018 Monitoring Report, having addressed the deficiencies from the 2017 Follow-Up Report, as supported by the 2018 team’s own observations, NCCC has met the standard.

Small Team Follow-Up Report – September 2018:

In the September 2018 Follow-Up Report, the team commended the College in eight areas, four of which were related to Standard 5. Those commendations noted that since the 2017 Monitoring Report, the College had:

- *Committed fiscal resources to deliver professional development for assessment of student learning outcomes;*

- Documented a three-year assessment plan and structure for academic programs and general education;
- Created an Assessment Handbook;
- Invested resources to assign responsibility for assessment of student learning outcomes to the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs who, during the on-site interviews, demonstrated a strong commitment to the assessment process and support of faculty.

As stated earlier, the team went on to note:

Since the last small team visit on September 21-22, 2017, the College has established, a five-year program review cycle and guidelines with template; a three-year review cycle for program learning outcomes; an assessment guide; alignment of course syllabi with a master syllabus; a “request of faculty” timeline for each semester of assessment activities; a formalized faculty professional development schedule; and, a transition from Moodlerooms Competency Module to Blackboard Learn for 2018-2019.

Despite the above commendations, the team concluded that the College does not meet the requirements for Standard 5. The team arrived at that conclusion based on their assessment that: 1) NCCC’s current process for documenting assessment results is not sustainable; 2) their misperception that we used student grades as a measurement of program-level student learning outcomes; and 3) their sense that limited evidence exists demonstrating the use of assessment results to improve teaching and learning and inform planning and budgeting. We disagree with the analysis presented in the above claims and included evidence to the contrary. This is the same evidence provided to the team, but it was not reflected in the final report. It is noteworthy that despite the evidence, the team referenced faculty interviews as a major factor that framed their understanding, interviews that were less than 30 minutes long. In fact, after the visit, faculty remarked on their disappointment with the brevity of the interviews, the late start for the assessment session, and the inclusion of the Shared Governance group into the interview process prior to any opportunity for concluding remarks in the faculty session. The concern is that the limited time frame and multiple interruptions may have impacted the team’s ability to interact with the faculty as thoroughly as all parties may have wished regarding assessment.

In reference to the need for a sustainable process, we submit that our current system is sustainable and that the culture of assessment rests not in the format, but in the process. In the team’s report, there appears to be a conflation of process with format. Over the past year, our efforts were focused on strengthening the culture of assessment, documenting that progress, and demonstrating how results are used among programs. Currently, NCCC uses Excel to document and track the cycles and results of institutional and program-level learning outcomes. While we believe this is sustainable, we are working toward greater efficiencies, which include a decision to move to the Blackboard Learn course management system. This course management system provides an integrated module for tracking institutional, program and course-level outcomes. After careful review of available assessment software options along with learning management system integration into the assessment process, the College decided against adopting a separate assessment product. While moving to Blackboard will be an improvement, the current system is serving the College effectively.

A surprising conclusion stated in the 2018 report was that NCCC used grades as a measure for assessment results. The 2018 Follow-Up Visit Report states, *“In reviewing the assessment documents provided by the College and after interviewing faculty, it was unclear to the Team as to whether or not student grades were used as measurement of program level outcomes. Grade usage as a measurement of success in program-level student learning outcomes assessment does*

not conform to higher education expectations or best practices.” This is not an accurate description of the assessment process at NCCC.

After reviewing the team’s report, we sought to correct that misperception, citing evidence submitted to the team which illustrated the opposite, namely, that the College does not use grades as a basis for student learning outcomes assessment. From a conversation during the team visit, we understand that the review team may have made that assumption based on an incomplete reading of a document they referenced from a Spring 2018 course-level assessment in BUS 220: Business Communication. The document does identify that a comprehensive mid-term and final exam is used in student learning outcomes assessment; however, further reading of the document reveals extensive item analysis that details how questions on a comprehensive final exam are grouped and scored according to course-level objectives that align with program-level outcomes. This document is attached to this letter as Appendix 1. The classification of assessment results (Exceeding, Meeting, Approaching, Not Meeting) may be used as a basis by which to issue assignment grades to students when assessment tools measure objectives within a course that align with program-level outcomes. Nonetheless, the reverse is not true; grades are not a proxy for assessment. As a result, assessment analysis of the course and program outcomes may correlate with a student’s grade on an assignment or exam in that assessment results inform the student’s grade, but grades do not inform the assessment results. This is an acceptable, defensible, and often preferred way of authentically embedding assessment into course design, delivery, and evaluation.

In terms of the lack of evidence that our assessment process is used to improve teaching, learning, planning and budgeting, the documentation that we submitted in the 2018 Monitoring Report, including Appendix 2.2, provides evidence by program, both in the last year and historically, of how our assessment results are used in this fashion. The 2018 Follow-Up Report stated that this was the first full year cycle of assessment, but that is not the case. NCCC has been performing General Education assessment since 2003, and assessment within the current structure has occurred across academic departments since 2011. As evidenced in Appendix 2.2, twelve out of sixteen programs documented changes to teaching strategies based on results from the previous three-year assessment cycle (2014-2017). Additionally, sixteen out of twenty degree programs have documented changes planned for the 2018-2019 academic year based on results from the 2017-2018 assessment cycles presented on August 24, 2018. By the second department meeting of the Fall 2018 semester, the remaining departments will report on their intended use of results to improve teaching and learning, closing the loop for 100% of our programs. This information was presented to the team, but seems to have been overlooked. Some highlighted changes from the 2014-2017 assessment cycle include the creation of a social science research assignment that improved performance by 7%, increased contact time and writing lab for all developmental and first-year composition courses leading to a 3-12% range increase in student performance, further integration of Kaplan curriculum and test preparation in nursing courses, creation of new comprehensive assignments in eight programs, creation of common rubrics for assignments in five programs, and 95% of programs have revised curriculum maps over the last two years. In the areas of planning and budgeting, the creation of two new programs, one certificate, and the addition of two online programs with limited budgetary impact along with the de-activation of the AAS and Certificate in Office Technology were all part of academic planning and budgeting strategies during a time of scant resources, as documented in the Strategic Plan report.

As discussed during the 2018 Team Visit, the faculty at NCCC also rely on qualitative data to improve student learning and enhance instruction. Assessment has and continues to be an integral part of that process. In addition to the formalized program-level assessment process, faculty document other changes to teaching and learning with an informal report (submitted as

Appendix 2.5). When applicable, the information presented in these reports informs the larger assessment summary report (Appendix 2.2). While a sample of these informal reports was provided, further review of these forms would demonstrate multiple ways in which the faculty respond to classroom needs with immediate revisions and adjustments to teaching pedagogy and classroom dynamics. Much of this evidence provides feedback to enhance the quantitative data produced during the formalized assessment cycles.

The team did not address nor elaborate on the issue of inconsistent data analysis, so that section cannot be commented upon at this time except to say that NCCC has an established assessment structure and a consistent system for tracking and analyzing that data within and across programs.

Standard 5: Educational Effectiveness Assessment: Evidence of NCCC Compliance

The faculty and administration maintain that educational practices across the academic area of the college currently adhere to the assessment requirements of Standard 5 (previously Standard 14). In the following pages, we highlight aspects of our assessment process that the September 2018 Visiting Team may not have observed in the evidence we provided supporting NCCC's compliance with Standard 5: Educational Effectiveness Assessment.

The following, taken from Appendix 2.2 that was submitted to the 2018 Visiting Team, will summarize and highlight some of the most recent improvements to teaching and learning based on student outcomes assessment. Over the **2017-2018** academic year, program and pedagogical changes include (this list only includes program changes that are *directly* linked to student outcomes):

- Creation and revision of a hypothesis-based research assignment in PSY 101 in response to assessment of student understanding and analysis of research methods in social sciences (**7% increase in student performance—project is in its third revision**)
- Creation of Humanities Department Assessment Handbook that includes student artifacts, instructor notations, rubrics, and guidelines for assessment of written communication in response to assessment of norming sessions (**completed at the end of Spring 2018**)
- Planned implementation of formative assessments across history courses to improve assessment of those outcomes
- Increased use of Socratic Method and other student-centered pedagogies across programs, named directly in the assessment reports from Fine Arts and Business Departments (**both led to improvements in student performance and retention of information**)
- Increased use of low-stakes practice problems and simulations in business courses (**led to improved retention of information and enhanced critical thinking skills**)
- Addition of another writing assignment and revision of the rubric used to assess written assignments across all three human services programs (**while student performance on the learning outcome was acceptable, the faculty added the additional assignment to strengthen the validity and reliability of the results**)
- Inclusion of more direct instruction regarding ethical principles and decision-making across human services courses and programs (**resulting from poorer than expected student performance on the same as assessed in a capstone assignment**)
- Added the use of SANO electronic records across human services programs to improve student learning outcomes performance
- Increased use of presentation format to demonstrate knowledge in environmental science introductory course
- Addition of concrete, real-life experimental examples to improve understanding of the scientific method across science courses. Addition of a secondary measure for that

- learning outcome in BIO 109: Human Biology (*led to better understanding and articulation of the Scientific Method among students*)
- Increased norming sessions around math assessment for assessment in MAT 121: Statistics. Revision of assessment questions to more closely capture program-level outcomes
 - Addition of more formative assessments in Sports & Event Management Program
 - Revision of final portfolio for Computer Graphics & Design Program
 - Addition of assessment in CRJ 101 to compare to CRJ 202 (Criminal Justice)
 - Purchase of evidence kits to incorporate applied learning strategies in CRJ 208: Criminal Investigations (*added applied learning opportunities to improve students' ability to evaluate a crime scene*)
 - Addition of a skills lab in the introductory massage course to increase opportunities to apply skills and demonstrate mastery of basic massage skills (*improved performance in clinical application of skills*)
 - Addition of more research-based assignments in massage therapy courses to reinforce knowledge base and apply that knowledge to practice in the clinical setting
 - Further implementation of Kaplan Integrated Test Management into the Nursing Program (*preliminary NCLEX results show marked improvement in student performance*)
 - Presentation of nursing material prior to class time helped students prepare more fully for classes
 - Addition of more pharmacology in relation to math skills to enhance opportunities for real-life application of math skills in a dosage-related context within the nursing courses
 - Addition of a new outcome to focus on scientific literacy and a new measurement to focus on mathematical competency in the Radiologic Technology Program
 - Addition of homework packet for summer clinical sessions that ties science-related topics to math competencies to reinforce areas where students struggle in the Radiologic Technology Program

One would be hard-pressed to argue that there is not a pervasive culture of assessment that drives improvement in teaching and learning when one looks at the evidence presented above. The list of 22 specific actions only accounts for program-level changes for the 2017-2018 academic year and does not include the previous rounds of assessment-related changes.

Prior to 2017-2018, as noted in the 2017 Monitoring Report, assessment results prompted changes and a commitment of financial resources related to three College-Wide Goals: Mathematical Literacy, Social & Cultural Literacy, and Communication. The following actions required a long-term commitment of both human and financial resources:

- Adoption of the Quantway curriculum as an alternative to the developmental math sequence addressed mathematical competency at the point where we see most students are unable to persist. The adoption of this curriculum includes training for math faculty, math tutors, and support staff.
- The focus on Social & Cultural Diversity training resulted in competing for and receiving an award for a SUNY grant to support professional development training and to further faculty competence in integrating cultural content across disciplines.
- Lastly, contact time was increased to 60 contact hours in all developmental English and first-year composition courses, allowing for a mandatory writing lab component within the course. This required curricular changes, scheduling adjustments, and facilities improvements (including the creation of a classroom in the library equipped with laptops). All of these changes were directly related to academic department requests based on assessment of student learning outcomes and student persistence across programs. Over the past two years, an analysis of Accuplacer pre- and post-tests along

with pass rates across ENG 100 and ENG 101 classes illustrate improvements in both test scores and overall student pass rates in ENG 101. These improvements were observed in ENG 101 for both students who tested into developmental English and those who tested directly into college-level English. Feedback from writing instructors indicates improvement in their ability to work directly with students during the writing process based on the increased contact time and access to computers for lab instruction. This year (2018-2019) we will do another round of writing assessment across the college that will allow us to further evaluate the results of this change.

Most recently, Scientific Literacy and Social and Cultural Diversity were the College-Wide Goals assessed this past academic year (2017-2018). In response, the Diversity Committee and Academic Affairs collaborated to produce a rubric to assist faculty in assessing cultural competency within their courses and programs. Additionally, the Science Department is working on a lab assignment to administer more broadly across courses measuring Scientific Literacy. As of Fall 2018, five out of six institutional goals have been directly assessed within the last two years.

Other broad-based planning and budget-related changes related to student achievement that were presented as evidence include the following:

- Increased adjunct pay to reduce turnover of adjunct faculty after this was identified during the academic master planning process as a factor in consistency across programs
- Furniture replacement on all three campuses in response to faculty requests aligned with pedagogical changes to support collaborative classroom instruction and improve student comfort
- Increased support of Moodlerooms (and soon Blackboard) to improve the delivery of online courses and supplemental information
- Extended contact hours across all sections of ENG 100 and ENG 101
- Professional development funding increased from \$12,000 to \$20,000 to support faculty development across programs along with on-campus workshops related to assessment.
- Faculty stipends for program review and external reviewer honorariums
- Creation of three part-time Retention Specialists (one on each campus) to assist with helping students achieve their academic goals
- Creation of mandatory assessment days as part of the contracted work days in the academic calendar

Academic program and department budgets have remained flat or been reduced to match declining enrollment figures. However, a few areas where we identified places where program-level outcomes results contribute directly to departmental, program, and grant spending in addition to what is listed above include the following:

- Adobe Cloud Software (Computer Graphics & Fine Arts)
- Purchase of SANO electronic record-keeping program (Human Services Programs)
- Further integration of Kaplan Integrated Test Management (Nursing)
- Purchase of laptops and furniture to create a collaborative computer lab equipped with laptops to support lab-based writing instruction in all introductory writing courses.
- Development and printing of Humanities Writing Assessment Resource Guide
- Quantway Training & maintenance of funding for faculty release time

While not always linked to budget, academic programs have documented curricular changes related to assessment of student learning outcomes. These changes range from revising course outlines to improve alignment with program-level outcomes assessment to additions and/or deletions of courses within program requirements. These changes have been identified to varying

degrees in the 2016 PRR, the 2017 Monitoring Report, and the 2018 Monitoring Report.

Having established that the College has ameliorated areas of weakness identified in the 2017 Team Report, provided evidence to challenge the conclusions made in the 2018 Team Report, and documented compliance with Standard 5, we maintain that North Country Community College is in full compliance with the standards set forth by Middle States. In the spirit of continuous improvement, we know there are always areas in which we can make positive changes. We will continue to assess our processes and work to improve and support teaching and learning at NCCC. We thank the Commission for their dedication to peer review and its importance in maintaining high standards across higher education.

The grid below identifies where one can find evidence of compliance in each of the sub-categories of Standard 5: Educational Effectiveness Assessment. As noted in the column titles, all of the evidence listed below was presented to either the 2017 Visiting Team or the 2018 Visiting Team.

**North Country Community College
Evidence for Standard 5 Compliance
Educational Effectiveness Assessment**

| | Criteria | Sub-Criteria | Evidence Provided in 2018 Monitoring Report | Evidence provided in 2017 Monitoring Report |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| "An accredited institution possesses and demonstrates the following attributes or activities: | 1. Clearly stated educational goals at the institution and degree/program level which are interrelated with one another, with relevant educational experiences, and with the institution's mission | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 2.1 Three-year Cycle of College Wide Goals Assessment • Appendix 2.2 Three-year Cycle of Program Learning Outcomes <p>As stated in the 2018 Team Report: <i>"The General Education and program-level outcomes have a systematic structure, are clearly documented and shared with campus constituents" (p. 5).</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCCC College-Wide Goals— Program Goals • College-Wide Goals—Program Outcomes 2014-2015, 2015-2016, 2016-2017 • List of Course-Level Assessments, 2014-2016 • Overview of Course-Level, Program-Level Assessments: Closing the Loop Report <p>As noted in the 2017 Team Report: <i>"In 2016, the PRR reviewers noted that the College-Wide learning goals were being assessed in several programs and in the two liberal arts programs" (p.5).</i></p> |
| | 2. Organized and systematic assessments, conducted by faculty and/or appropriate professionals, evaluating the extent of student achievement of institutional and degree/program goals. Institutions should: | a. define meaningful curricular goals with defensible standards for evaluating whether students are achieving those goals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 2.1 College-Wide Goals Assessment • Appendix 2.2 Three-year Cycle of Program Learning Outcomes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Learning Outcomes • Program Curriculum Maps |
| | | b. articulate how they prepare students in a manner consistent with their mission for successful careers, meaningful lives, and, where appropriate, further | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 2.1 College Wide Goals Assessment • Appendix 2.2 Three-year Cycle of Program Learning Outcomes • Completed Program Reviews | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Learning Outcomes • Program Reviews • Career Services Coordinator |

| | | | |
|----|---|---|--|
| | education. They should collect and provide data on the extent to which they are meeting these goals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline of Program Review Schedule. <p>From the 2018 Team Report Summary: <i>“Since the last small team visit on September 21-22, 2017, the College has established a five-year program review cycle and guidelines with template, a three-year review cycle for program learning outcomes...”</i> <i>(p. 5).</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As noted in the 2017 Team Report: <i>“The institution’s monitoring report noted that 15 program reviews were completed and two more are schedule for completion for fall 2017. Unified program review process documents were developed and approved through the college governance process to increase the effectiveness of the program review process”</i> (p. 5). |
| | c. support and sustain assessment of student achievement and communicate the results of this assessment to stakeholders | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 2.22 2018 College Calendar (illustrating assessment days) • Professional Development Workshop Series • Appendix 2.23 Guide to SUNY Assessment Resources • Appendix 2.24 Guide to Competency Module in Moodlerooms • Appendix 2.4 NCCC Assessment Handbook • Expansion of Associate Dean work year from 221 to 261 days <p>As stated in the 2018 Team Report: <i>“The General Education and program-level outcomes have a systematic structure, are clearly documented and shared with campus constituents”</i> <i>(p. 5).</i></p> | |
| 3. | Consideration and use of assessment results for the improvement of educational effectiveness. Consistent with the institution’s mission, such uses include some combination of the following: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 2.1 College Wide Goals Assessment • Appendix 2.2 Three-year Cycle of Program Learning Outcomes | |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | a. assisting students in improving their learning | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 2.1 College Wide Goals Assessment • Appendix 2.2 Three-year Cycle of Program Learning Outcomes • 12/16 programs report use of assessment results (2014-17 cycle) • 16/20 programs report planned changes for 2018-19 year based on 2017-18 results. The remaining four programs are finalizing their plans. | |
| | b. improving pedagogy and curriculum | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 2.1 College Wide Goals Assessment • Appendix 2.2 Three-year Cycle of Program Learning Outcomes • Program Review and Departmental Meetings • Pedagogical shifts based on assessment results • Revision of course outlines across programs • Creation of specific tracks within the AA Liberal Arts degree program | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curricular changes across programs based on program review and outcomes assessment along with course-level outcomes • Purchase of furniture to increase collaborative learning opportunities in-line with pedagogical changes |
| | c. reviewing and revising academic programs and support services | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2018 Monitoring Report: 5-Year Cycle of Program Review with completion of 5- year cycle in 2018-2019. • Internal and External Program Reviews from 2017-2018 cycle • Creation of AEMT • Creation of Psychology and English Tracks with AA Liberal Arts • Proposal for Teacher Education Track | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External Program Reviews • Advisory Board Recommendations • Curricular Changes • Increased contact time in developmental English courses • Adoption of Quantway curriculum • Program reviews, recommendations, and actions from previous five-year cycle and prior years. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of Online Orientation section on website and Moodlerooms. |
| | d. planning, conducting, and supporting a range of professional development activities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2018 MR: Professional Development Workshops focused on assessment from 2017-2018 along with schedule for 2018-2019 academic years. • 2018 MR: Attendance at SUNY Council on Assessment Workshop Mohawk Valley Community College • Professional development workshops on campus • Increased budget for travel <p>As stated in the 2018 Team Report: <i>“The Team commends NCCC For the following Accomplishments... Committed fiscal resources to deliver professional development for assessment of student learning outcomes” (p. 5).</i></p> | | |
| | e. planning and budgeting for the provision of academic programs and services | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of tracks within AA Liberal Arts degree • Responding to needs of communities with AEMT certificate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing contact hours for ENG 100/101 • Adoption of Quantway curriculum • Diversity Grant for Professional Development workshops • Purchase of furniture to increase collaborative learning opportunities in-line with pedagogical changes | |
| | f. informing appropriate constituents about the institution and its programs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yearly Institutional Profile • Community Advisory Board Meetings, program and campus-specific | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yearly Institutional Profile • Community Advisory Board Meetings, program and campus-specific | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| | | g. improving key indicators of student success, such as retention, graduation, transfer, and placement rates | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yearly Institutional Profile | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yearly Institutional Profile |
| | | h. implementing other processes and procedures designed to improve educational programs and services | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senate Committees work and recommendations |
| | 4. If applicable, adequate and appropriate institutional review and approval of assessment services designed, delivered, or assessed by third-party providers | | Not Applicable | |
| | 5. periodic assessment of the effectiveness of assessment processes utilized by the institution for the improvement of educational effectiveness | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 95% of all programs have revised curriculum maps within the last two years • Review of institutional and program-level goals and outcomes • Review of assessment results and methods of measurements in programs and college-wide | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program review process changes; PLOs modification by program; evaluation and creation on new rubric for CWG • Planned revision of institutional learning outcomes |



NORTH COUNTRY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

NCCC Course-Level Assessment Spring 2018

Department: Business Programs

Course Name & Number: BUS 220/Business Communication

Course Objectives/Outcomes to Be Measured:

- A. Examine critically the internal and external flow of communication in organizations through formal and informal channels, explain the importance of effective media choices, and describe how to overcome barriers to organizational communication.
- B. Explain and apply active listening techniques.
- C. Analyze the purpose of a message, anticipate its audience, and select the best communication channel.
- D. Evaluate a message to judge its effectiveness.
- E. Distinguish between the direct and indirect strategies for conveying unfavorable news.
- F. Assess individual qualifications in preparation for searching for a job and the development of a resume.
- G. Explain the purposes and types of job interviews, including screening, one-on-one, panel, group, sequential, stress, and online interviews.

Assignment/Project/Exam/Application Used to Measure Objective/Outcome:

A comprehensive mid-term and final exam will be designed to include the above outcomes. Forty-four (44) students will take both exams.

Benchmark Goal:

The percentage grades related to whether students have not met, approached, met, or exceeded the goals are set as:

| <u>Numerical Grade</u> | <u>Category</u> | <u>Letter Grade</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| >86 | Exceed | B+, A-, A |
| 70-86 | Meet | C-, C, C+, B-, B |
| 60-69 | Approach | D-, D, D+ |
| <60 | Not meet | F |

A relatively normal distribution is expected:

| <u>Category</u> | <u>Expected Number of Students</u> | <u>Expected Percent</u> |
|-----------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Exceed | 11 | 25% |
| Meet | 26 | 60% |
| Approach | 4 | 10% |
| Not meet | 3 | 5% |

OVERALL RESULTS:

A total of 44 students were assessed utilizing a 40- question multiple choice and true and false mid-term exam and a 40- question multiple choice and true and false final exam. Multiple questions were utilized to assess a total of 6 learning objectives. All objectives were taken from BUS-220 Course Outline.

| <u>Category</u> | <u>Expected Number of Students</u> | <u>Actual Number of Students</u> | <u>Expected Percent</u> | <u>Actual Percent</u> |
|------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Exceed | 11 | 36 | 25% | 82% |
| Meet | 26 | 8 | 60% | 18% |
| Approach | 4 | 0 | 10% | 0% |
| Not meet | 3 | 0 | 5% | 0% |

OBJECTIVE A:

A total of 17 questions from the mid-term and final exam were utilized to assess objective A. There was a total of 644 correct responses out of a possible 748 correct responses.

| <u>Category</u> | <u>Expected Number of Students</u> | <u>Actual Number of Students</u> | <u>Expected Percent</u> | <u>Actual Percent</u> |
|------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Exceed | 11 | 38 | 25% | 86% |
| Meet | 26 | 6 | 60% | 14% |
| Approach | 4 | 0 | 10% | 0% |
| Not meet | 3 | 0 | 5% | 0% |

OBJECTIVE B:

A total of 9 questions from the mid-term and final were utilized to assess objective B. There was a total of 346 correct responses out of a possible 396 correct responses.

| <u>Category</u> | <u>Expected Number of Students</u> | <u>Actual Number of Students</u> | <u>Expected Percent</u> | <u>Actual Percent</u> |
|------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Exceed | 11 | 39 | 25% | 87% |
| Meet | 26 | 5 | 60% | 13% |
| Approach | 4 | 0 | 10% | 0% |
| Not meet | 3 | 0 | 5% | 0% |

OBJECTIVE C:

A total of 6 questions from the mid-term and final were utilized to assess objective C. There was a total of 209 correct responses out of a possible 264 correct responses.

| <u>Category</u> | <u>Expected Number of Students</u> | <u>Actual Number of Students</u> | <u>Expected Percent</u> | <u>Actual Percent</u> |
|-----------------|--|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Exceed | 11 | 35 | 25% | 79% |
| Meet | 26 | 9 | 60% | 21% |
| Approach | 4 | 0 | 10% | 0% |
| Not meet | 3 | 0 | 5% | 0% |

OBJECTIVE D:

A total of 7 from the mid-term and final were utilized to assess objective D. There was a total of 241 correct responses out of a possible 308 correct responses.

| <u>Category</u> | <u>Expected Number of Students</u> | <u>Actual Number of Students</u> | <u>Expected Percent</u> | <u>Actual Percent</u> |
|-----------------|--|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Exceed | 11 | 34 | 25% | 78% |
| Meet | 26 | 10 | 60% | 22% |
| Approach | 4 | 0 | 10% | 0% |
| Not meet | 3 | 0 | 5% | 0% |

OBJECTIVE E:

A total of 10 questions from the mid-term and final were utilized to assess objective E. There was a total of 301 correct responses out of a possible 440 correct responses.

| <u>Category</u> | <u>Expected Number of Students</u> | <u>Actual Number of Students</u> | <u>Expected Percent</u> | <u>Actual Percent</u> |
|-----------------|--|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Exceed | 11 | 30 | 25% | 68% |
| Meet | 26 | 14 | 60% | 32% |
| Approach | 4 | 0 | 10% | 0% |
| Not meet | 3 | 0 | 5% | 0% |

OBJECTIVE F:

A total of 7 questions from the mid-term and final were utilized to assess objective F. There was a total of 223 correct responses out of a possible 308 correct responses.

| <u>Category</u> | <u>Expected Number of Students</u> | <u>Actual Number of Students</u> | <u>Expected Percent</u> | <u>Actual Percent</u> |
|------------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Exceed | 11 | 32 | 25% | 72% |
| Meet | 26 | 12 | 60% | 28% |
| Approach | 4 | 0 | 10% | 0% |
| Not meet | 3 | 0 | 5% | 0% |