

Saint Paul College-A Community & Technical College, MN

Project: Saint Paul College Project

Version 6.0- Project

What projects have you been following on the Collaboration Network? What have you learned from the experiences of other schools that is useful to your project?

Q: *To learn more about the progress and development of other projects, get alerts by following other projects*

A: We continue to follow Kellogg Community College and Independence Community College, teams we met at the Midpoint Roundtable. Particularly of interest is their work to engage part-time faculty in assessment.

Version 6.0- Update

Q: What were the most significant results from the Third Year Consultation?

A: Dr. Susan Hatfield's visit was reassuring to campus stakeholders. Some of the College's key takeaways were:

- The importance of building "administrator proof" assessment structures and processes, so this work continues as part of the college's culture despite transition
- Ensuring that the institution is clear about what it values, a system is in place to measure, and the institution funds those things that it values
- Continuing to work on growing cocurricular assessment in non-service area programs outside the classroom, such as common book, honors, service learning, events and activities
- The progress we have made in a single year in the areas of assessment is tremendous. We need to make sure we tell the College's assessment story at our upcoming site visit, demonstrating what we have accomplished, what we have learned, and where we are going.

Q: Looking back at the tasks that you had outlined for your project following the Midpoint Roundtable, what progress has been made and what tasks remain? What is your plan to address the remaining tasks in the next six months?

A: College Learning Outcomes

Faculty for 35 different course sections have committed to collecting CLO data this academic year, by academic division as well as six different co-curricular units. Initially AEI (Academic Effectiveness and Innovation), the department that provides leadership to the College's assessment work, asked faculty for volunteers. Now AEI is working with academic deans to identify underrepresented areas and making direct asks to additional identified faculty. The College is focusing on 2000 level courses that tend to consist of students in the final semesters of their academic program. The College now has a CLO curriculum map, which combined the program level CLO assessment maps, which was used to identify potential target courses. Overall faculty have been responsive and willing. The standard rubrics for the College's CLOs, developed this past year, have been received well by faculty.

The Assessment of Student Learning Committee will be reviewing CLO assessment data near the end of spring semester as well as at the start of fall 2020, and will subsequently discuss topics such as:

- What is the best way to aggregate CLO data?
- Moving forward should the College establish benchmarks to determine "success"?
- Is the current collection process resulting in data that is representative of the College?

Program Learning Outcomes

All programs have reviewed their program learning outcomes and reaffirmed them or revised them, submitting any changes through the Academic Affairs and Standards Council for approval. 78% of programs have created and submitted their assessment plans for their program learning outcomes. These assessment plans have been built into the College's newly acquired assessment software (SPOL). The College's Curriculum and Assessment Associate with working with Academic Deans and faculty for areas that are still working on assessment plans, and the preceding curriculum maps.

Non Program Discipline Specific Signature assignment and Rubric

Academic disciplines that do not confer a discipline specific credential (i.e. psychology, physics) were asked to develop a signature assignment, rubric and assessment plan for one of their frequently offered courses. 11 out of 22 of these disciplines have submitted their final plan and rubric. AEI staff are working with the remaining faculty to complete this project and ensure it is being utilized in the designated course.

Collection of Assessment Data through SPOL

Last year a cross-functional work group selected SPOL and its assessment module as the software for the College use to collect and store assessment data. In Fall 2019, in collaboration with It and IR, a team worked to get the needed course, program, faculty, curriculum maps and assessment plan information uploaded into the SPOL Assessment module. Since the start of spring semester, AEI has offered SPOL assessment module drop-in sessions multiple times throughout the week, where faculty can drop-in to learn how to log-in to SPOL and enter in their assessment data. 26 Faculty have attended these sessions thus far. Overall the response has been positive, and faculty have found SPOL easy to use and the entering of assessment data to be quick and easy.

Assessment of Student Learning Committee

The Assessment of Student Learning Committee, which includes representatives from faculty, staff, and administration, continues to meet monthly and has been instrumental in providing overall guidance to the above processes.

Program Review

At the January 2020 Faculty In-Service, time was dedicated to presenting the new program review process to faculty. This new process was developed by a small workgroup of faculty, with subsequent feedback sought through an electronic survey from the greater faculty community. With the release of the official program review handbook came the release and exploration of the college's new data dashboards. Institutional Research has developed new and improved Program Review dashboards. These dashboards contain data by program or discipline regarding enrollment trends, enrollment by various demographics, graduation and placement information, average local wages, instructional costs, cohort default rates and grade distributions. AEI staff led an exercise designed to provide guided exploration to faculty for the Program Review Dashboards, as well as prompts to stimulate reflection and discussion amongst faculty about the strengths and opportunities for their programs, as well as areas where they have made recent changes or improvements.

AEI worked with Academic Deans, who worked with their faculty to identify one third of their programs to conduct a comprehensive program review this spring, with the remaining 2/3rds scheduled to complete the annual program review.

Faculty Assessment Coaches

AEI is working with the faculty assessment coaches who have been invited to return for spring semester, to expand their coaching service continue to include assessment work, but to expand to include training to coach other faculty on program review.

Remaining Tasks and Next Six Months Plan

- Work with faculty who have not yet submitted assessment plans, to complete those plans and any related incomplete work (i.e. curriculum maps). Once received AEI will build those plans into SPOL
- Work with faculty to enter assessment data at the program or course signature assignment level into SPOL

- Follow the Program Review Timeline, providing support to Deans to support faculty on this timeline:
 - Draft Report Due to Dean on March 13th
 - Progress Report due to Dean on April 10th
 - Final Program Review report due to Dean on May 1st

How is the Academy project contributing to creating a culture of learning? How is the team engaging institutional stakeholders in the Academy work?

A: Fortunately for Saint Paul College, this Academy work is understood across the college as imperative as the College works to make great strides, in a short period of time, in the area of assessment of student learning and program review. This has been a central focus with faculty, and the college has invested in an infrastructure to provide support and guidance to the College in its assessment of student learning and program review work. Faculty and staff are highly engaged in this work, with peers coaching peers to improve the understanding and implementation of sustainable assessment practices.

What are your plans and goals for the next six months? What challenges do you anticipate?

A: February-May 2020

- Achieve a 95% submission of program/discipline assessment plans to AEI
- All programs with fall 2019 assessment data will have submitted it in SPOL by February 28th
- All programs with submitted assessment plans will enter spring assessment data by May 31st
- Annual and Comprehensive Program Reviews submitted to Dean by May 1st

June-August

- Institution wide data aggregated by CLO
- Program Review Peer Review model developed

September

- Assessment of Student Learning Committee reviews CLO and program/course assessment data and provide recommendations to process/structure/action plans

Challenges

- Robust Program Review and Assessment work is a cultural shift for faculty, and an additional expectation (for those programs that weren't previously doing this).

Working and supporting faculty in this shift is critical for success.

- The College has some programs that do not have full-time (tenured/tenure track) faculty affiliated with them. These programs are exclusively taught by adjunct faculty. Alternative plans have to be devised to ensure those programs are assessing student learning and a part of program review, to ensure quality, rigor, and continuous quality improvement.
- Engaging Adjunct Faculty-AEI will continue to work with Academic Deans and Full-time faculty to ensure that adjunct faculty teaching courses linked with assessment plans are informed of those plans and being asked to collect and report the assessment data for that program area/discipline.

Version 6.0- Response

Please give your name and contact information (email address and/or phone Q: number).

A: Dr. Mary Blakefield

mblakefi@iue.edu

765-977-4530

Reviewed by **Mary Blakefield** (Primary Mentor)

Rosemary Niedens, Scholar

niedensr@newmanu.edu

Q: What are some strengths of this project/Academy work? Why are these strengths?

A: The third year consultation under the guidance of Susan Hatfield seems to have been very successful. I find a number of positive accomplishments in this posting--it's clear that faculty and staff across campus are working diligently on assessment.

Here are a few examples that I want to particularly highlight:

CLO data will be collected from 35 course sections and 6 co-curricular units this term. Standardized rubrics have been developed for the CLOs and this uniformity will help with the data analysis.

All programs have reviewed/revise their learning outcomes; 78% have assessment plans in place. Academic disciplines that don't offer a credential are creating signature assignments (with rubrics) and assessment plans.

Faculty assessment coaches will continue their service and they will be expanding their role to include the program review process.

The Assessment of Student Learning Committee, composed of faculty, staff and administrators, meets monthly and this group has guided many of the initiatives at St. Paul College. They will be working in summer and fall 2020 on the review and analysis of the CLO assessment data.

SPOL has been adopted for the collection and storage of assessment data, and faculty have been trained in how to use this software.

These examples are a clear sign that St. Paul College has made a campus-wide commitment to assessment efforts. Rapid progress is being made at this point in time. This work will pay off for you!

Reviewed by **Mary Blakefield** (Primary Mentor)

From Rosemary Niedens, Scholar

I totally concur with the list provided by Mentor Mary Blakefield. In addition to that list, the review of the CLO mapping is such a fundamental step that it is sometimes not completed. Good job there. The holistic involvement that you report is also a very strong indicator of future success. Your gains appear, at least in part, to be due to the systematic continuous work that is occurring. Another strength is the wide representation on the Project team. Again this helps with the cultural acceptance that seems to be happening.

What remains unclear or what questions do you still have about this work to assess Q: and improve student learning?

A: Collecting data is one thing, and analyzing it is quite another. It appears that you have an excellent foundation in place to collect assessment data from most areas of campus. Have you considered how you will compile and analyze this data? Who will be involved? How will you convert this data into suggestions for improvement? This is tricky business so the ASL Committee needs to spend time creating the process.

Is co-curricular assessment developing satisfactorily? You mention that some units are beginning to assess their work which is a positive development. Will other co-curricular units be joining the effort?

Reviewed by **Mary Blakefield** (Primary Mentor)

From Rosemary Niedens, Scholar

Again Mary Blakefield's questions are ones that I would ask as well. The analysis plan is a critical step because without the proper plan, the process's validity can be derailed. The steps from analysis to improvement is another essential process that requires careful planning. Finally, I would add the need for a systematic way to provide communication about this stage of the plan to the community on a regular basis.

Co-curricular at Saint Paul's had seemed to be matching the processes on the academic side. Is that continuing?

What are some critical things to which the institution should pay attention as it plans its work for the next six months?

A: Some of the challenges indicated in the posting relate to educating and supporting adjunct faculty in assessment efforts. Although I hesitate to add more to your already full plate, is it possible to create an assessment handbook or assessment website which would provide information for adjuncts (as well as for newly hired full-time faculty)? This could include the assessment plans, rubrics, signature assignments, timeline for reporting, etc. There are other options of course, and I'm sure that you will find one which will work for you.

You also note that program review and assessment are viewed as an additional expectation for those programs that weren't already engaged in this work. You ARE changing the culture, and ignoring assessment, or declining to participate in assessment aren't really options any more. In time, this will become part of the normal work for all faculty across campus. In the short term though, it might be helpful to continue reinforcing the messages that assessment is about improving student learning, and I expect that all of your faculty can get on board with that.

Reviewed by **Mary Blakefield** (Primary Mentor)

From Rosemary Niedens, Scholar

The clearly outlined plan that you provided in the update answers most questions about upcoming steps. The comments in the previous section may change some of that but in addition, Mary Blakefield's suggestion of an assessment handbook is definitely worth your consideration. In this way, you can insure continuity of the processes that you are implementing beyond personnel change. Generally, there are multiple examples on line but gathering the work that has been done and is planned is a way to start. This may already be in place but would be helpful if you end up deciding to create adjunct training in this area.

Again, in emphasis, communication will assist in continuing to grow the value of your processes as you push out the plan to include all faculty and adjuncts.

Q: What are some other possibilities or resources that might contribute to the success of this project? For instance, can you suggest resources such as books, benchmarks, instruments, models, and processes?

A: From your posting, it appears that you have a strong plan of action in place. If you need anything, please contact me. I will be at the HLC meeting in Chicago if anyone would like to meet in person.

Reviewed by **Mary Blakefield** (Primary Mentor)

From Rosemary Niedens, Scholar

It is clear that you are making systematic progress in implementing your Project plans. I look forward to continuing to learn of your progress. Please feel to contact me with concerns or questions.

Scholar(s):	Rosemary Niedens
Primary Mentor(s):	Mary Blakefield