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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview

The Assessment Plan Team developed the following Institutional Assessment Plan as a result of their work in Spring 2018. This team met four times throughout the semester to discuss and review current assessment practices at the college and then establish a set of recommendations and attainable 2018-2019 goals to strengthen assessment practices at the institution.

The concept for this plan grew from the Strategic Plan and President Douglas’ Goal to develop a comprehensive assessment plan to integrate assessment practices at Bristol. The structure of this document includes background about the college and its assessment practices, the college’s assessment structure, an overview of the assessment of student learning and experience, recommendations, goals, and appendices for related materials.

Summary of Recommendations

The following recommendations emerged through the work of the Assessment Team.

1. Revisit the CAS Functional Area Review and Academic Program review processes.
2. Develop feedback loop for Academic Program Review and CAS Functional Area Review.
3. Establish systematic data collection process for various student characteristics.
4. Create a consistent mechanism to assess areas across the college.
5. Increase access to institutional data through ARGOS professional development.
6. Develop data sharing events.
7. Offer professional development opportunities regarding college-wide assessment.

Summary of Goals

The President’s Leadership Team (PLT) reviewed the Assessment Plan Goals on June 4, 2018. The Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (OIRPA) will assume responsibility for the implementation of the goals developed by the team with an additional item that the Leadership Team suggested (see Goal 5.B.).

1. Strengthen Academic Program Review and CAS Functional Area Review processes
   A. Obtain feedback to improve assessment processes and procedures.
   B. Create annual follow-up report template.
   C. Post Program Review and CAS reports on Bristol's website.

2. Establish a system to collect essential student variables for all Bristol students
   A. Update Student Data Collection Project Proposal
   B. Determine where in Banner "missing" metrics may be entered for continuous reporting and monitoring.

3. Create a consistent mechanism to assess all areas across the college
   A. Establish common definitions and metrics college-wide.
   B. Identify area-specific definitions and metrics.
4. Increase utilization of ARGOS data system
   A. Review ARGOS data reports for accuracy and overlap.
   B. Offer continuous ARGOS trainings focused on common reports that can be accessed by college community.

5. Foster Culture of Evidence
   A. Determine forums through which college data may be effectively discussed and shared with college community.
   B. Determine manner in which achievement is demonstrated within leadership team members' institutional plans.
BACKGROUND

For more than 50 years, Bristol Community College (BCC) has been the primary source for affordable, publicly supported higher education in the densely populated, highly diverse southeastern region of Massachusetts. In Fall 2017, the college enrolled 7,637 credit students in 28 Associate degree programs and 56 credit certificate programs offered in Attleboro, Fall River, New Bedford, and Taunton as well as online. In the prior fiscal year (FY17), the college served 11,069 credit students annually and another 18,889 individuals participated in non-credit programs and activities. With average wage and educational attainment levels in southeastern Massachusetts that are far below most other regions in the state, Bristol Community College is a vital link to improving the regional economy and individual earning power through education.

Bristol welcomed its fourth president, Dr. Laura L. Douglas, in June 2017. Dr. Douglas is dedicated to making data-informed decisions to improve the institution overall as well as strengthen student support, learning, and experience. The driving force for the establishment of an Institutional Assessment Plan is Bristol Community College’s 2016-2020 Strategic Plan, specifically Strategy Number 3 - Student Learning: Providing Robust, High-Quality Education. Aligning with this strategy is President Douglas’ 2017-18 goal which calls to “Assess Learning and Student Services with the objective that by June 2018 a college-wide assessment plan will be established in order to integrate academic assessment with the non-academic Council for Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) standards review process.” All Vice Presidents and Executive Directors at the college have been charged with the responsibility of ensuring the development of this comprehensive plan. Dr. Rhonda Gabovitch, Vice President of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment and Administrator of the Educational Effectiveness Committee, coordinated the effort and enlisted a team of individuals who span key areas of the college.

Currently, BCC has an emerging “culture of evidence” which is characterized by the commitment of all faculty, staff, and students to use data to demonstrate how programs, processes, and services are effective and contribute to an institution’s ability to accomplish its stated goals and achieve its mission (Culp & Dungy, 2012). “Data” – which refers to the institution-wide collection of measures - is a key component to a culture of evidence. Although Bristol has a wealth of data on students, faculty, and staff, the extent to which this data is used needs improvement. Although “data” and “evidence” appear synonymous, the major difference is that evidence is a sub-set of data that requires examination, discussion and supports a conclusion. While Bristol collects a great amount of data, not all data is evidence.

Assessment is the continuous process of collecting, evaluating, and using information to determine the degree to which goals, outcomes, or metrics are being met (Gansemer-Topf & Wren, 2018). It is the process by which decision-making is conducted in relation to data, creating the evidence that is needed to guide an institution. For the purpose of this plan, “assessment” is defined as the systematic way in which student learning and experience are captured and utilized at Bristol. While other areas of the college also need to be assessed, students are the focus of this plan as they are the primary stakeholders of our work.
ASSESSMENT STRUCTURE AT BRISTOL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Presently, the majority of data collection and assessment strategies at Bristol are led by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (OIRPA), which is comprised of a Vice President, Director, and Administrative Assistant II. OIRPA shares many of these efforts with other areas of the college because building a culture of evidence requires the time, commitment, and resources of many individuals within an institution; it cannot be a single person’s responsibility (Institutional Culture of Evidence, 2018)

A major forum through which assessment is monitored, shared, and discussed at BCC is the Educational Effectiveness Committee, which was established in Fall 2015. Previously, there were two committees that were conducting parallel assessment projects - the Outcomes Assessment Committee and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. Although these committees were effective groups to promote assessment at Bristol, there appeared to be a need for a larger, more comprehensive system when the college completed its ten-year NEASC accreditation in 2014. The name chosen for the new committee was Educational Effectiveness which aligned with the recently established NEASC Standard 8. In the proposal to the Central Committee, the committee was described as follows:

**Educational Effectiveness:**

The mission of the Educational Effectiveness Committee is to implement and monitor a college-wide program to assess the college’s effectiveness and assist all academic administrators, faculty and staff in meeting learning outcomes. All assessment should be designed to meet the goals agreed upon by College constituents. Course level, program level, and institutional level assessment should close the loop resulting in the most effective student learning outcomes. The Educational Effectiveness Committee should ensure that this takes place operationally through documented follow-up reports following program review, functional area review, and other Committee initiatives.

The college-wide program must align with the college’s mission, values, strategies, and goals by facilitating efforts to create a culture of assessment at the college, evaluating college-wide assessment tools and processes, creating a clearinghouse for assessment resources, and overseeing the college-wide assessment of general education competencies and the Educated Person goals advising the President on the implementation of a college-wide program to assess the institution’s effectiveness.

**Committee Function or Additional Information:**
The entire committee will meet to discuss college-wide data analysis and broad initiatives, as well as in subgroups to discuss more specific initiatives in order to make recommendations for student success. Each subgroup will have a defined charge and mission. Some committee members will serve as Chairs on specific subgroups for appropriate leadership and successful outcomes. Faculty and staff members outside of the committee will be invited to attend subgroups to ensure broad and appropriate representation across the college if undergoing an Academic Review, CAS Functional Area Review, and/or providing additional support to the subgroup.
The merging of the two committees aligned to the new NEASC standard will enhance the existing committee structure by providing a better exchange of information college-wide and unifying assessment activities. Budgetary implications of the proposed committee will be considered as the combined committee moves forward. This will include monies for External Evaluators’ fees as well as other administrative costs.

With the support of the Educational Effectiveness Committee, assessment activities such as Academic Program Review and Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) Functional Area Review, have moved beyond OIRPA to an institutionalized setting within the committee system. For instance, the committee provides a structured forum in which areas that have completed CAS reviews can share outcomes and experiences. This helps address the common issue of assessment being isolated and rarely shared, reviewed, or used. The subgroups also provide a regular setting in which staff from beyond OIRPA can provide feedback, support, and guidance. It has also increased accountability regarding assessment processes.

In an effort to grow the direct assessment of student learning at an institution-wide level, the college held its first Assessment Day in Spring 2017. One hundred and sixty-seven faculty, staff, and administrators scored student work using either the Critical Thinking or Quantitative Literacy Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP) Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) rubrics. After the morning keynote speaker, Dr. Bonnie Orcutt from Worcester State University, facilitators discussed the rubrics and how to norm sample artifacts. Student work was scored individually, then in small groups. Group scores were reviewed and discussed in an attempt to find consensus. In the afternoon, scorers worked independently to score artifacts. While some respondents found Assessment Day useful, informative, and/or relevant, there was dissatisfaction with time and convenience. Some respondents also indicated that there could have been more inclusiveness, i.e., the activities were irrelevant to their role, and/or it was difficult to find their voice as non-faculty in a room full of faculty. The full Assessment Day report is accessible at https://bit.ly/2M1F2sI.

Bristol held its second annual Assessment Day in Spring 2018 which offered a variety of ways in which participants could interact to move college-wide assessment forward. A variety of assessment-related activities were offered such as scoring student artifacts, assignment design for Blackboard, departments and programs work sessions on curriculum and student learning outcomes, PACE survey review and planning, etc. The General Education Competencies assessed were Scientific Reasoning and Discovery and Information Literacy. Annually, assessment of two competencies will occur. The keynote speaker for Assessment Day was Dr. Gavin Henning who serves as Director of the Master of Higher Education Administration and Doctorate of Education Programs at New England College and as President of the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). Staff from the LASH Center for Teaching and Learning are analyzing the survey results from this event.

A Retention Steering Committee now exists to address the feedback collected at the college’s first Retention Summit in March 2017 - a participant-driven approach to identify student retention issues at Bristol. The concept for this committee grew out of the joint meetings between
the Faculty and Professional Staff Senate and Central Academic Affairs. The charge of this committee is to prioritize action items from the Retention Summit, define retention measures, create an implementation timeline, and suggest retention sustainability measures for Bristol. In addition to specific areas of focus, overarching themes included the need for improved campus-wide communication and institutional policies to support college initiatives. The Retention Summit Action Plan will guide these efforts and is accessible at: https://bit.ly/2HJo8kI.

While the aforementioned strategies demonstrate significant progress toward honing its focus on assessment activities and strategies, a larger plan is required to further develop our culture of evidence. The following report provides an outline of systematic assessment activities current in practice at Bristol. Next, recommendations from the Assessment Plan Team focus on assessment practices that are missing or need improvement, followed by goals that will help move the college forward. OIRPA administered a brief Assessment Plan Survey (see Appendix B) in an attempt to capture feedback regarding assessment from a wider audience, the results of which are also available within this report.

ASSSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING AND EXPERIENCE

Indirect Assessment

The Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment frequently conducts indirect assessments of student learning through both nationally normed and homegrown survey instruments. The most frequently conducted survey at Bristol is the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), which has been administered regularly since 2007. CCSSE results are shared with President’s Leadership Team and distributed from Vice Presidents to their respective areas. Various College constituents share, present, and discuss at relevant meetings such as Vice President’s Council. Grants have consistently used CCSSE results to develop and monitor grant goals and objectives.

In the past five years, the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment have conducted the following indirect assessments:

1. CCSSE Spring 2018
2. Sightlines Campus Impressions Survey Fall 2017
3. Wisconsin HOPE Lab Survey Fall 2017
4. Personal Assessment of the College Environment Survey Fall 2017¹
5. CCSSE Spring 2017
7. Adult Learner Inventory/Adult Learning Focused Inventory Spring 2016
8. CCSSE Spring 2016
9. CCSSE Spring 2015

¹ Although PACE is an employee survey, it is included in this list as it asks about employees’ satisfaction on student-related items.
The aforementioned reports are available on the new Institutional Reports page of the OIRPA website found at the following link: https://bit.ly/2JxgCPr

The results of the above listed inventories are available to the College community in a similar manner as CCSSE. However, in recent years, OIRPA has shared results with the college community more widely by submitting articles to the BCC Weekly, formerly known as the Bristol Buzz.

Numerous areas have requested to conduct research at the college through the Institutional Review Board (IRB) which is overseen by the OIRPA Vice President. In the past five years, OIRPA approved 132 applications to conduct research with students and/or staff at Bristol, which includes various data collection activities via surveys, interviews, and focus groups. Results of several of these studies have been shared at the UMass Amherst Honors Symposium.

Assessments of student learning and experience are also conducted through Academic Program Review and CAS Functional Area Review. The schedules for these assessments are available in Appendix C and E. These activities are supported by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment but also require leadership and oversight from Academic Affairs and Student Affairs.

During the fall semester, those responsible for the reviews on the CAS schedule for the current academic year are invited to CAS subgroup meetings to provide updates about their review, ask questions, and seek support or guidance. Those who have completed their reviews in the past are also invited to provide advice. In the spring, those currently under review are welcome to attend subgroup meetings, if needed, but the focus is more on those who will conduct a CAS review the following academic year. Those responsible for the reviews are invited to the subgroup meetings to be trained on the CAS process (a PowerPoint presentation is conducted that provides an overview – see Appendix D) so they could begin planning for their reviews, and gathering team members and evidence ahead of time. If a person cannot attend a meeting, OIRPA will reach out to an individual to set up a time to meet to review the process and answer questions. A representative from OIRPA is also available to attend the first meeting of a CAS team gathering in order to train an entire CAS team on the process and provide guidance and data needed for the review. All CAS materials can be found on the OIRPA webpage.

Similar to the CAS process, during the fall semester, those responsible for the reviews on the Academic Program Review schedule participate in subgroup meetings to provide an update about their review, ask questions, and seek support/guidance. Those who have completed their reviews in the past are also invited to provide advice. In the spring, those under review are welcome to the meetings if needed, but the focus is on those who will conduct a Program Review the following fall semester. Those responsible for the reviews are welcome to the subgroup meetings for training on the process. The Program Review template (Appendix F) and other materials are available so faculty could begin planning for their reviews ahead of time. OIRPA also conducts a student survey to assist the program review process. All program review materials can be found on the OIRPA webpage. Five-year program review data reports are also distributed and reviewed during the meetings and distributed via email.
Five-year program review data reports have been provided to the Associate Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs by OIRPA since 2006. The reports are provided in hardcopy form, divided by division for each Associate Vice President to review and discuss with each Division Dean. The data are provided for all majors and concentrations. Once Deans have received this information, they are to discuss and distribute the data to Department Chairs, Coordinators, and Directors so the information can be shared with all members of a division. Those who are not currently on the Program Review schedule can use the data to continually assess their area.

**Direct Assessment**

Conducting Assessment Days are a successful way to introduce the college community to direct assessment. Using LEAP VALUE rubrics to assess how student work demonstrates knowledge and skills is one useful way to assess student learning. A further review of direct academic assessment will be explored by a committee of faculty members led by Holly Pappas, BCC Faculty Assessment Fellow. A report of this work will be completed by Spring 2019.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Seven broad recommendations emerged through the work of the Assessment Team. These recommendations captured feedback that team members collected through their areas and discussed at team meetings. Staff from OIRPA have also been cognizant of suggestions that have been brought to their attention and discussed these issues with the team.

1. Revisit the CAS Functional Area Review process, especially for smaller areas of the college (explore Custom Multi-Functional Area Self-Assessment Guide process). Also, examine the Academic Program review process, particularly for General Education areas that do not have departments.
2. Develop feedback loop for Academic Program Review and CAS Functional Area Review that includes a yearly assessment of progress toward our attainment of goals.
3. Establish data collection process for various student characteristics (e.g. single parent, first-generation status, LGBTQ, etc.) with a systematic mechanism through which variables are collected for all students.
4. Create a consistent mechanism to assess areas across the college with common definitions for overall areas of assessment while allowing for area-specific measures.
5. Increase access to data through professional development opportunities regarding the use of ARGOS. Notify the college community of ARGOS reports that are available with an explanation of how to interpret and use these reports.
6. Develop data sharing events to review and discuss available information at the college.
7. Offer professional development opportunities regarding assessment college-wide to foster a culture of evidence at Bristol.
GOALS

The President’s Leadership Team reviewed the Assessment Plan Goals on June 4, 2018. The Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment will assume responsibility for the implementation of the goals developed by the team and additional items suggested by the Leadership Team. All goals align with the Strategic Plan and will be aligned with the President’s FY19 goals.
Aligning with the College’s Mission to provide quality higher education, OIRPA gathers and analyzes evidence that aids in the assessment and continuous improvement of student learning and development at the College. For instance, the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) is administered regularly to examine student engagement which is a key component to student learning and retention. In Spring 2016, the Office facilitated the administration of the Noel-Levitz Adult Learner Inventory (ALI) and participated in the completion of the Adult Learner Focused Self-Assessment. In 2017, a Survey of Online Student Engagement was administered to study the engagement of the online student population. Student priorities and satisfaction are examined regularly from these surveys in order to identify issues that are important to students and assist with planning and decision-making. OIRPA’s Mission statement identifies the importance of utilizing data to help support college-wide initiatives to support opportunities for student to succeed in higher education and beyond. The OIRPA Mission aligns with the College’s Mission by identifying ways in which the Office provides evidence of student learning for strategic planning, accreditation, and continuous improvement which ties into the larger Mission of the College to prepare students for their educational career, employment, and life. 

OIRPA is able to support the College Mission through providing the evidence that is needed to monitor College initiatives and evaluate goals.

### INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH, PLANNING & ASSESSMENT

#### 2018-19 Institutional Plan Goals Template

The following list represents the main overarching goals to be completed in the 2018-2019 academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DHE Big Three</th>
<th>Strategic Plan Goals</th>
<th>President Level Goal (Yes)</th>
<th>President’s Goals</th>
<th>Area Plan Goals</th>
<th>Tactics/Action Steps</th>
<th>Measurable Outcomes</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
<th>Resources and Collaboration</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Achievement of Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Strengthen Academic Program Review process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | 3. Student Learning  
7. Institutional Advancement | Yes | | | Obtain feedback to improve program review processes and procedures. | Discuss current process, timelines, and forms to determine if program review process is meeting the needs of departments and institution. | Make decision to complete current review process or develop new process. | | Chief Academic Officer | Fall 2018 |
| | 3. Student Learning  
7. Institutional Advancement | Yes | | | Build culture of continuous improvement. | Create annual follow-up report template and develop annual performance improvement goals. | Annual follow-up template developed. | | Educational Effectiveness Committee and IRPA | Fall 2018 |
| | 3. Student Learning  
7. Institutional Advancement | Yes | | | Post Program Review reports on BCC website. | Organize all reports for IRPA webpage. Notify areas that reports will be publicly available. | Post completed review reports on Institutional Reports Webpage. | | Educational Effectiveness Committee and IRPA | Fall 2018 |
Aligning with the College’s Mission to provide quality higher education, OIRPA gathers and analyzes evidence that aids in the assessment and continuous improvement of student learning and development at the College. For instance, the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) is administered regularly to examine student engagement which is a key component to student learning and retention. In Spring 2016, the Office facilitated the administration of the Noel-Levitz Adult Learner Inventory (ALI) and participated in the completion of the Adult Learner Focused Self-Assessment. In 2017, a Survey of Online Student Engagement was administered to study the engagement of the online student population. Student priorities and satisfaction are examined regularly from these surveys in order to identify issues that are important to students and assist with planning and decision-making. OIRPA’s Mission statement identifies the importance of utilizing data to help support college-wide initiatives to support opportunities for student to succeed in higher education and beyond. The OIRPA Mission aligns with the College’s Mission by identifying ways in which the Office provides evidence of student learning for strategic planning, accreditation, and continuous improvement which ties into the larger Mission of the College to prepare students for their educational career, employment, and life. OIRPA is able to support the College Mission through providing the evidence that is needed to monitor College initiatives and evaluate goals.

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH, PLANNING & ASSESSMENT
2018-19 Institutional Plan Goals Template

The following list represents the main overarching goals to be completed in the 2018-2019 academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DHE Big Three</th>
<th>Strategic Plan Goals</th>
<th>President Level Goal (Yes)</th>
<th>President’s Goals</th>
<th>Area Plan Goals</th>
<th>Tactics/Action Steps</th>
<th>Measurable Outcomes</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
<th>Resources and Collaboration</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Achievement of Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Student Learning</td>
<td>7. Institutional Advancement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student Learning</td>
<td>7. Institutional Advancement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Build culture of continuous improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gather feedback from Assessment Day. Implement suggestions/feedback. Develop a plan to monitor effectiveness.</td>
<td>Make decision to complete current review process or develop new process.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chief of Staff</td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student Learning</td>
<td>7. Institutional Advancement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Post CAS reports on BCC website.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organize all reports for IR webpage. Notify areas that reports will be publically available.</td>
<td>Post completed review reports on Institutional Reports Webpage (Fall 2017 onward).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student Learning</td>
<td>7. Institutional Advancement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aligning with the College’s Mission to provide quality higher education, OIRPA gathers and analyzes evidence that aids in the assessment and continuous improvement of student learning and development at the College. For instance, the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) is administered regularly to examine student engagement which is a key component to student learning and retention. In Spring 2016, the Office facilitated the administration of the Noel-Levitz Adult Learner Inventory (ALI) and participated in the completion of the Adult Learner Focused Self-Assessment. In 2017, a Survey of Online Student Engagement was administered to study the engagement of the online student population. Student priorities and satisfaction are examined regularly from these surveys in order to identify issues that are important to students and assist with planning and decision-making. OIRPA’s Mission statement identifies the importance of utilizing data to help support college-wide initiatives to support opportunities for student to succeed in higher education and beyond. The OIRPA Mission aligns with the College’s Mission by identifying ways in which the Office provides evidence of student learning for strategic planning, accreditation, and continuous improvement which ties into the larger Mission of the College to prepare students for their educational career, employment, and life. OIRPA is able to support the College Mission through providing the evidence that is needed to monitor College initiatives and evaluate goals.

### INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH, PLANNING & ASSESSMENT
#### 2018-19 Institutional Plan Goals Template

The following list represents the main overarching goals to be completed in the 2018-2019 academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DHE Big Three</th>
<th>Strategic Plan Goals</th>
<th>President Level Goal (Yes)</th>
<th>President’s Goals</th>
<th>Area Plan Goals</th>
<th>Tactics/Action Steps</th>
<th>Measurable Outcomes</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
<th>Resources and Collaboration</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Achievement of Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Closing Gaps in Student Opportunity and Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify underrepresented groups and new markets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment Plan Team, Educational Effectiveness Committee, Enrollment Services, and IRPA</td>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Closing Gaps in Student Opportunity and Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Determine where in Banner “missing” metrics can be entered in for continuous reporting and monitoring.</td>
<td>Develop a team including Enrollment Services and ITS to identify appropriate areas for data entry in Banner.</td>
<td>Plan created for data entry of new student demographics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aligning with the College’s Mission to provide quality higher education, OIRPA gathers and analyzes evidence that aids in the assessment and continuous improvement of student learning and development at the College. For instance, the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) is administered regularly to examine student engagement which is a key component to student learning and retention. In Spring 2016, the Office facilitated the administration of the Noel-Levitz Adult Learner Inventory (ALI) and participated in the completion of the Adult Learner Focused Self-Assessment. In 2017, a Survey of Online Student Engagement was administered to study the engagement of the online student population. Student priorities and satisfaction are examined regularly from these surveys in order to identify issues that are important to students and assist with planning and decision-making. OIRPA’s Mission statement identifies the importance of utilizing data to help support college-wide initiatives to support opportunities for student to succeed in higher education and beyond. The OIRPA Mission aligns with the College’s Mission by identifying ways in which the Office provides evidence of student learning for strategic planning, accreditation, and continuous improvement which ties into the larger Mission of the College to prepare students for their educational career, employment, and life. OIRPA is able to support the College Mission through providing the evidence that is needed to monitor College initiatives and evaluate goals.

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH, PLANNING & ASSESSMENT
2018-19 Institutional Plan Goals Template
The following list represents the main overarching goals to be completed in the 2018-2019 academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DHE Big Three</th>
<th>Strategic Plan Goals</th>
<th>President Level Goal (Yes)</th>
<th>President’s Goals</th>
<th>Area Plan Goals</th>
<th>Tactics/Action Steps</th>
<th>Measurable Outcomes</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
<th>Resources and Collaboration</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Achievement of Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. College Completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Institutional Advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Assess learning and student service outcomes.</td>
<td>Research outcomes-based assessment at community colleges.</td>
<td>Repository developed to determine additional areas of assessment.</td>
<td>Retention Committee, Educational Effectiveness Committee, and IRPA</td>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal 2. Closing Gaps in Student Opportunity and Achievement</td>
<td>1. College Participation Yes</td>
<td>Identify area-specific definitions and metrics.</td>
<td>Review ARGOS data reports for accuracy and overlap.</td>
<td>Discus and identify ARGOS reports that can be eliminated or improved.</td>
<td>ITS and IRPA</td>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. College Completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Institutional Advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Build culture of continuous improvement.</td>
<td>Offer continuous ARGOS trainings focused on common reports that can be accessed by college community.</td>
<td>Training schedule developed in Fall 2018.</td>
<td>ITS and IRPA</td>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aligning with the College’s Mission to provide quality higher education, OIRPA gathers and analyzes evidence that aids in the assessment and continuous improvement of student learning and development at the College. For instance, the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) is administered regularly to examine student engagement which is a key component to student learning and retention. In Spring 2016, the Office facilitated the administration of the Noel-Levitz Adult Learner Inventory (ALI) and participated in the completion of the Adult Learner Focused Self-Assessment. In 2017, a Survey of Online Student Engagement was administered to study the engagement of the online student population. Student priorities and satisfaction are examined regularly from these surveys in order to identify issues that are important to students and assist with planning and decision-making. OIRPA’s Mission statement identifies the importance of utilizing data to help support college-wide initiatives to support opportunities for student to succeed in higher education and beyond. The OIRPA Mission aligns with the College’s Mission by identifying ways in which the Office provides evidence of student learning for strategic planning, accreditation, and continuous improvement which ties into the larger Mission of the College to prepare students for their educational career, employment, and life. OIRPA is able to support the College Mission through providing the evidence that is needed to monitor College initiatives and evaluate goals.

### INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH, PLANNING & ASSESSMENT 2018-19 Institutional Plan Goals Template

The following list represents the main overarching goals to be completed in the 2018-2019 academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DHE Big Three</th>
<th>Strategic Plan Goals</th>
<th>President Level Goal (Yes)</th>
<th>President’s Goals</th>
<th>Area Plan Goals</th>
<th>Tactics/Action Steps</th>
<th>Measurable Outcomes</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
<th>Resources and Collaboration</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Achievement of Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Foster Culture of Evidence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Institutional Advancement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Develop planning process in which the Strategic Plan drives departmental plans.</td>
<td>Determine forums through which college data can be effectively discussed and shared with college community.</td>
<td>Explore data sharing modalities and draft communication plan for review by various groups.</td>
<td>Communication plan developed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retention Committee, Educational Effectiveness Committee, and IRPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Institutional Advancement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Establish transparent process for selection of Strategic Planning consultant.</td>
<td>Begin process of searching for consultant to develop next strategic plan.</td>
<td>Create a committee to research different strategic planning models.</td>
<td>Committee interviews pool of applicants and provides information on cost and scope of work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College-wide committee and Strategic Planning Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Institutional Advancement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maintain a consistent mechanism for steady progress on area goals.</td>
<td>Determine manner in which achievement is demonstrated within leadership team members' institutional plans.</td>
<td>Discuss with President's Leadership Team format of the individual plans to include outcomes of items listed in the plans.</td>
<td>Format developed for individual plans and outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Team and IRPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 2: Closing Gaps in Student Opportunity and Achievement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Institutional Advancement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Build culture of continuous improvement.</td>
<td>Present data to PLT and Academic Affairs that provides new knowledge regarding performance of our students.</td>
<td>Present research findings from studies/surveys.</td>
<td>Once per month, IRPA presents information demonstrating new information and how it can be used by other areas within the college.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRPA, ITS and PLT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEASC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Strengthen and improve advising process.</td>
<td>Assist academic advising with data collection strategies for Orientation, Early Alert, and Proactive Advising.</td>
<td>Collaborate with the Dean of Advising to review current strategies and establish the necessary systems.</td>
<td>Data collection strategies for Orientation, Early Alert, and Proactive Advising developed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRPA, Academic Advising, and ITS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aligning with the College’s Mission to provide quality higher education, OIRPA gathers and analyzes evidence that aids in the assessment and continuous improvement of student learning and development at the College. For instance, the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) is administered regularly to examine student engagement which is a key component to student learning and retention. In Spring 2016, the Office facilitated the administration of the Noel-Levitz Adult Learner Inventory (ALI) and participated in the completion of the Adult Learner Focused Self-Assessment. In 2017, a Survey of Online Student Engagement was administered to study the engagement of the online student population.

Student priorities and satisfaction are examined regularly from these surveys in order to identify issues that are important to students and assist with planning and decision-making. OIRPA’s Mission statement identifies the importance of utilizing data to help support college-wide initiatives to support students for success in higher education and beyond. The OIRPA Mission aligns with the College’s Mission by identifying ways in which the Office provides evidence of student learning for strategic planning, accreditation, and continuous improvement which ties into the larger Mission of the College to prepare students for their educational career, employment, and life. OIRPA is able to support the College Mission through providing the evidence that is needed to monitor College initiatives and evaluate goals.

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH, PLANNING & ASSESSMENT
2018-19 Institutional Plan Goals Template
The following list represents the main overarching goals to be completed in the 2018-2019 academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DHE Big Three</th>
<th>Strategic Plan Goals</th>
<th>President Level Goal (Yes)</th>
<th>President’s Goals</th>
<th>Area Plan Goals</th>
<th>Tactics/Action Steps</th>
<th>Measurable Outcomes</th>
<th>Progress to Date</th>
<th>Resources and Collaboration</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Achievement of Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Make college more accessible and affordable</td>
<td>4. Workforce Alignment: Transitioning from Classroom to Workplace</td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop formative and summative assessments for WEI students.</td>
<td>Collaborate with Institutional Research to implement assessments of WEI students for feedback and assistance in shaping programs.</td>
<td>Assessments guide Advisory Board and WEI planning; Increase data-driven decision-making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VP of IRPA, VP of Academic Affairs, VP of Workforce Development</td>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3: Improving College Completion Rates</td>
<td>5. Preparing Citizens: Connecting Individual and Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expand Civic Learning programming and assessment through increased curricular and co-curricular engagement in service-learning (e.g. reestablishment of VITA Tax Program)</td>
<td>Civic Engagement office, work with faculty, deans, SSE/M (FYE) to increase number of sections, monitor persistence and retention</td>
<td>5% increase in student participation in designated service-learning courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Civic Engagement, Academic Deans, Individual Faculty, AA, SSE/M, FYE, IRPA</td>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A

CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC

The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Framing Language

This rubric is designed to be transdisciplinary, reflecting the recognition that success in all disciplines requires habits of inquiry and analysis that share common attributes. Further, research suggests that successful critical thinkers from all disciplines increasingly need to be able to apply those habits in various and changing situations encountered in all walks of life. This rubric is designed for use with many different types of assignments and the suggestions here are not an exhaustive list of possibilities. Critical thinking can be demonstrated in assignments that require students to complete analysis of text, data, or issues. Assignments that cut across presentation mode might be especially useful in some fields. If insight into the process components of critical thinking (e.g., how information sources were evaluated regardless of whether they were included in the product) is important, assignments focused on student reflection might be especially illuminating.

Glossary

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

- Ambiguity: Information that may be interpreted in more than one way.
- Assumptions: Ideas, conditions, or beliefs (often implicit or unstated) that are "taken for granted or accepted as true without proof." (quoted from www.dictionary.reference.com/browse/assumptions)
- Context: The historical, cultural, educational, or circumstantial settings or conditions that influence and complicate the consideration of any issues, ideas, artifacts, and events.
- Literal meaning: Interpretation of information exactly as stated. For example, "she was green with envy" would be interpreted to mean that her skin was green.
- Metaphor: Information that is (intended to be) interpreted in a non-literal way. For example, "she was green with envy" is intended to convey an intensity of emotion, not a skin color.

CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@ncsu.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Capstone 4</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of issues</td>
<td>Issue/Problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.</td>
<td>Issue/Problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.</td>
<td>Issue/Problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Information is taken from sources with enough interpretation and evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis.</td>
<td>Information is taken from sources with enough interpretation and evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis.</td>
<td>Information is taken from sources without any interpretation or evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of context and assumptions</td>
<td>Thoroughly systematically and methodically analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of context when presenting a position.</td>
<td>Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.</td>
<td>Identifies some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is taken into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)</td>
<td>Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.</td>
<td>Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints related outcomes (implications and consequences) are identified clearly.</td>
<td>Conclusion is logically tied to information, including opposing viewpoints, related outcomes (implications and consequences) are identified clearly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.
## Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric

The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual courses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position grading at all undergraduate levels within a common framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialing and understanding of student success.

### Definition

Quantitative Literacy (QL) – also known as Numeracy or Quantitative Reasoning (QR) – is a "habit of mind," competency, and comfort in working with numerical data. Individuals with strong QL skills possess the ability to reason and solve quantitative problems from a wide array of authentic contexts and everyday life situations. They understand and can create sophisticated arguments supported by quantitative evidence and can clearly communicate those arguments in a variety of formats (using words, tables, graphs, mathematical equations, etc., as appropriate).

Quantitative Literacy Across the Disciplines

Current trends in general education reform demonstrate that faculty are recognizing the steadily growing importance of QL. AAGUS's recent survey showed that concerns about QL skills are shared by employers, who recognize that many of today's students will need a wide range of High Level quantitative skills to complete their work responsibilities. Virtually all of today's students, regardless of major, will need basic QL skills such as the ability to draw information from charts, graphs, and geometric figures, and the ability to accurately complete straightforward calculations and computations.

Preliminary efforts to find these work products which demonstrate QL skills are often in their early stages. It is possible to find pages of mathematical problems, but what those problem sets don't demonstrate is whether the student was able to use the information presented to draw conclusions and understand the meaning of the data. It is possible to find research papers that include quantitative information, but those papers often don't provide evidence that allows the reader to judge how much of the thinking was done by the original source (often carefully cited in the paper) and how much was done by the student. Whether conclusions drawn from analysis of the source material are even accurate.

Given widespread agreement about the importance of QL, it becomes incumbent on faculty to develop new kinds of assignments which give students substantive, contextualized experiences in using such skills as analyzing quantitative information, interpreting quantitative information in appropriate forms, completing calculations to answer meaningful questions, making inferences based on quantitative data and communicating the results of this work for various purposes and audiences. As students gain experience with these skills, faculty must develop assignments that require students to create work products which reveal their thought processes and demonstrate the range of their QL skills.

This rubric provides for faculty a definition of QL and a rubric describing four levels of QL achievement which might be observed in work products within work samples or collections of work. Members of AAC&U's rubric development team for QL hope that these materials will aid in the assessment of QL – but, equally important, we hope that they will help institutions and individuals in the effort to more thoroughly embed QL across the curriculum of colleges and universities.

### Framing Language

This rubric has been designed for the evaluation of work that addresses quantitative literacy (QL) in a substantive way. QL is not just computation, not just the citing of sources alone. QL is a habit of mind, a way of thinking about the world that involves data and the mathematical analysis of data to make connections and draw conclusions. Teaching QL requires us to design assignments that address authentic data problems. Such assignments may call for the traditional written paper, but we can imagine other alternatives: a video, a PowerPoint presentation, or a well-designed series of web pages. In any case, a successful demonstration of QL will place the mathematical work in the context of a complete and robust discussion of the underlying issues addressed by the assignment.

Finally, QL skills can be applied to a wide array of problems of varying difficulty, confronting the use of this rubric. For example, a student might demonstrate high levels of QL achievement when working on a simple problem and low levels of QL achievement when working on a very complex problem. Thus, to accurately assess a student's QL achievement it may be necessary to measure QL achievement within the context of problem complexity much as is done in driving competitions where two scores are given, one for the difficulty of the drive and the other for the skill in accomplishing the drive. In this context, that would mean giving one score for the complexity of the problem and another score for the QL achievement in solving the problem.

### Table of Descriptors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Attempts to explain information presented in mathematical terms, but does not consider the nature of the information. For example, attempts to explain the trend data shown in a graph, but fails to explain the significance of the data or the implications of the trend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Complete comprehension of information and resulting mathematical portrayal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Competently converts relevant information into an appropriate and detailed mathematical portrayal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provides accurate explanations of information presented in appropriate forms. For example, accurately explains the trend data shown in a graph and acknowledges the significance of the trend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provides somewhat accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms, but occasionally misses minor details.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intervention**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Calculation attempts are essentially all unsuccessful and insufficiently comprehensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Calculation attempts are essentially all unsuccessful and insufficiently comprehensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Calculations attempted are essentially all unsuccessful and insufficiently comprehensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Calculations attempted are essentially all unsuccessful and insufficiently comprehensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Calculation attempts are essentially all unsuccessful and insufficiently comprehensive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Application/Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for conclusions drawn, making reasonable and appropriately qualified conclusions from the data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for conclusions drawn, making reasonable and appropriately qualified conclusions from the data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for conclusions drawn, making reasonable and appropriately qualified conclusions from the data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for conclusions drawn, making reasonable and appropriately qualified conclusions from the data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for conclusions drawn, making reasonable and appropriately qualified conclusions from the data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumption**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Explicitly describes assumptions and provides a reasonable basis for why assumptions are appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Explicitly describes assumptions and provides a reasonable basis for why assumptions are appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Explicitly describes assumptions and provides a reasonable basis for why assumptions are appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Explicitly describes assumptions and provides a reasonable basis for why assumptions are appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Explicitly describes assumptions and provides a reasonable basis for why assumptions are appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Communication**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Uses quantitative information in an effective and accurate format or in an effective format, but not effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Uses quantitative information in an effective and accurate format or in an effective format, but not effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Uses quantitative information in an effective and accurate format or in an effective format, but not effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Uses quantitative information in an effective and accurate format or in an effective format, but not effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Uses quantitative information in an effective and accurate format or in an effective format, but not effectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Presents an example for which quantitative evidence is not pertinent, but does not provide adequate explanation of why quantitative evidence is not pertinent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Presents an example for which quantitative evidence is not pertinent, but does not provide adequate explanation of why quantitative evidence is not pertinent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Presents an example for which quantitative evidence is not pertinent, but does not provide adequate explanation of why quantitative evidence is not pertinent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Presents an example for which quantitative evidence is not pertinent, but does not provide adequate explanation of why quantitative evidence is not pertinent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Presents an example for which quantitative evidence is not pertinent, but does not provide adequate explanation of why quantitative evidence is not pertinent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Assessment Plan Survey Report

Bristol Community College
Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment
February 26, 2018

Response Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disqualified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What assessment processes are working at Bristol Community College?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response #</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Portfolio project, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I'm not aware of any student assessment at all. What are we currently doing? I'm not sure that it's working if some of us are not even aware that a process exists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Individual course testing of learned information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The only assessment processes that work and MEAN SOMETHING are those accreditation processes in the health sciences.

Prior Learning Assessment, assuming the SLO’s are written in such a manner that allows students to demonstrate their learning.

I don't think they are working.

Scientific Reasoning & Discovery

Instructor assessments in the classroom. Departmental assessments of student work (ex: English Portfolio Assessment).

Grant-related processes, many programs in the Lash Division, Educational Effectiveness work and Assessment Day

I am a relatively new employee so I am not aware of what the previous processes were. I think that the proactive nature of the Office of Institutional Research is amazing and hopefully yields the results they are looking for.

SLO's for courses.

What needs to be **improved** about BCC’s assessment processes? How?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response #</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Math Pilot, and CAI Math courses- no assessment seems to have been conducted, nor shared with the college. A lot of money went into changes without evidence of improvement, no transparent discussion was held at BCC. Students mostly dislike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the CAI courses. There are other examples. XXX regularly claims outcomes that are not proven.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Transparency and effective communication as to what is being done and how it happens. A BCC Weekly announcement would suffice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>More transfer records of acceptance to four year schools and jobs taken by BCC students after graduation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gen ed assessment needs to be expanded. Perhaps the college could require faculty/staff (in disciplines that claim their courses fulfill gen ed requirements) participate FULLY in the assessment of the gen ed outcomes they claim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>First improvement would be the SLO's.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>So far, we seem to only have for assessment what we have done at the Assessment Day and that seems flawed. The whole concept, of assessing artifacts in a vacuum without any understanding of what the assignment criteria was, of how the assignment was designed to meet the objectives being assessed, was flawed. I understand that is the external recommendation but on the ground, it looked like quite a waste of time and a waste of gathering together people across disciplines, just to struggle to go through a pretty pointless exercise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ensuring that it is instated uniformly throughout the college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Although BCC is attempting a broader assessment of student work, it still needs to be related to specific disciplines and skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Inconsistency among departments, lack of common data collection and reporting, some areas without outcomes to measure or measurement strategies, lack of technology, centralized efforts requiring IR (you can't do it all, right?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response #</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assessment is missing of most academic initiatives and decisions; for example, why is ESL advising in the English department and not in Advising, as a special population like Veterans, at-risk, Connections, dual enrollment, etc? It’s not best for students. Where the assessment of that decision, or before that decision is was made?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assessment of front desk staff (departments collectively, by community/students), and assessment of college administrators (persons individually, by college employees).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The effects of confounding/extraneous variables out of the control of the college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A systematic approach and feedback/professional development with the findings of any assessment that we may have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>There needs to be release time or other compensation to really map out. Comprehensive assessment plan for courses and programs. Also, there needs to be workshops or some other method to make sure that courses which are theoretically meeting specific core competencies in fact are -- or can be retooled so that they clearly are, with specific artifacts that can be assessed (possibly like the portfolio project in English is done)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Collecting data more often and in more capacities. A computer-based system accessible to faculty might be useful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More departmental-level assessments. Departments should decide which key steps to assess in a student's journey within that discipline (whether gateway or capstone level). Then, faculty (the experts) should work together to design assessments that are fair and appropriate. All courses should have SLOS, so all instructors should be teaching toward the same end. I'm not suggesting some sort of standardized assessment of each course, but just at certain points within that discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>We need a dashboard to pull our own data, lack of common data collection and reporting, especially for some populations! Some areas without outcomes to measure or measurement strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I think the key factors are there. Hopefully the campus community engages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Understanding why students leave especially minority males. Assessing success for developmental classes especially math.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RECOMMENDED FIVE YEAR PLAN FOR CAS FUNCTIONAL AREA REVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Institutional Research (Complete)</td>
<td>1. Distance Learning/CITE Lab (In progress)</td>
<td>1. Recreational Sports Program (In progress)</td>
<td>1. The Multicultural Center</td>
<td>1. Adult Basic Education</td>
<td>1. Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Office of Admissions (Complete)</td>
<td>2. Health Services (Complete)</td>
<td>2. Learning Commons (In progress)</td>
<td>2. Registrar &amp; Records</td>
<td>2. Veteran Services</td>
<td>2. Office of Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Financial Aid (In progress)</td>
<td>4. Disability Resources and Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Career Services</td>
<td>7. Grants (Non-CAS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Cooperative Education</td>
<td>8. Dual Enrollment (CVTE) (Non-CAS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Center for Teaching and Learning (Non-CAS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COUNCIL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF STANDARDS (CAS) BASICS
Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education

• Founded in 1979
• Consortium of 42 member organizations
• CAS Board of Directors comprised of representatives from member associations
• Consensus-oriented, collaborative approach
• 45 standards and self-assessment guides (SAGs)
• Standards are designed to be achievable by any program or service, at any institution type
  o Threshold, not aspirational; standards, not goals
  o Guidelines are added to indicate what good practice beyond the threshold looks like
CAS Vision and Mission

• CAS Vision
  – Setting the standard for quality in higher education.

• CAS Mission
  – CAS, a consortium of professional associations in higher education, promotes the use of its professional standards for the development, assessment, and improvement of quality student learning, programs, and services (CAS, 2015).
Applications for CAS Standards

- Design new programs and services
- Focus time, energy, and resources
- Devise staff development
- Guide strategic planning
- Develop learning and development outcomes
- Measure program and service effectiveness
• Academic Advising Programs**
• Adult Learner Programs & Services
• Alcohol & Other Drug Programs**
• Assessment Services
• Auxiliary Services Functional Areas
• Campus Activities Programs
• Campus Information & Visitor Services
• Campus Police & Security Programs
• Campus Religious & Spiritual Programs
• Career Services
• Civic Engagement & Service-Learning Programs**
• Clinical Health Services
• College Honor Society Programs**
• College Unions
• Commuter & Off-Campus Living Programs
• Conference & Event Programs
• Counseling Services
• Dining Service Programs
• Disability Resources & Services
• Education Abroad Programs & Services**
• Financial Aid Programs**
• Fraternity & Sorority Advising Programs

• Graduate & Professional Student Programs & Services
• Health Promotion Services
• Housing & Residential Life Programs**
• International Student Programs & Services
• Internship Programs*
• Learning Assistance Programs
• LGBT Programs & Services
• Master's Level Student Affairs Professional Preparation Programs**
• Multicultural Student Programs & Services
• Orientation Programs**
• Parent & Family Programs
• Recreational Sports Programs
• Registrar Programs & Services
• Sexual Violence-Related Programs & Services**
• Student Conduct Programs**
• Student Leadership Programs
• Student Media Programs*
• Transfer Student Programs & Services
• TRIO & Other Educational Opportunity Programs
• Undergraduate Admissions Programs & Services*
• Undergraduate Research Programs
• Veterans & Military Programs & Services
• Women's and Gender Programs & Services**

* New or revised since the release of the 2015 edition of CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education
** New or revised in the 2012 CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education
Twelve Parts of the General Standards

- Mission
- Program
- Organization and Leadership
- Human Resources
- Ethics
- Law, Policy and Governance
- Diversity, Equity, and Access
- Institutional and External Relations
- Financial Resources
- Technology
- Facilities and Equipment
- Assessment and Evaluation

CAS
Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education
Understanding Standards & Guidelines

Standards
- Indispensable requirements
- Achievable by any and all programs of quality
- Appear in **bold** type
- Use **must** and **shall**

Guidelines
- Clarify & amplify Standards
- Guide enhanced practice beyond essential function
- Appear in light-faced type
- Use verbs **should** and **may**

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education
# CAS Evaluation Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Plan the Process</td>
<td>Map out steps for process, develop timeline, build buy-in with all stakeholders, and explicitly identify desired outcomes of the self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assemble and Educate Team</td>
<td>3-5 (program) to 8-10 (division) comprised of stakeholders including students; train team on self-assessment concepts &amp; principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identify, Collect, and Review Evidence</td>
<td>Define what constitutes evidence; then gather, collect, manage, and review evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conduct and Interpret Ratings using Evaluative Evidence</td>
<td>Clarify team’s rating criteria; employ a process for rating [small group, individual, staff]; negotiate rating differences; and manage group ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Develop an Action Plan</td>
<td>Identify discrepancies, corrective action, and recommended steps (e.g., identify strengths, weaknesses, benchmarks, resources, timeframe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Prepare a Report</td>
<td>Identify audience for report(s); describe self-study, evidence gathering, rating process, evaluations, strengths, weaknesses, and action plan; draft executive summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Close the Loop</td>
<td>Put action plans into practice; navigate politics and secure resources; identify barriers; and build buy-in to the program review results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self-Assessment Guides (SAG)

- Provides an effective workbook/format for evaluation, self-assessment, and institutional reviews
- Translates standards into multiple criterion statements which can be measured
- Clusters of criterion measures focus on subsections of the standards, allowing raters to express detailed and targeted judgments
- Informs on program strengths and weaknesses
- Leads to an action plan to enhance programs and services that benefit student learning and development

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education
CAS as Part of an Ongoing Planning and Assessment Cycle

- Data Gathering
- Interim Reviews
- Action Plan Enabled
- Strategic/Program Action Plan
- CAS Program Review
- Prep for Strategic/CAS Program Review

If an action plan already is in place, then CAS just becomes part of that process.

Maintaining timely, consistent, and accurate data is crucial to having good results.
For More Information

- Visit [www.cas.edu](http://www.cas.edu)
- *CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education* (9th edition)
- **Self-Assessment Guides**
  - Also available through CAS website
  - Available through Campus Labs Program Review
- **CAS Statements** (available on website)
  - Characteristics of Individual Excellence
  - CAS Statement of Shared Ethical Principles
- **CAS Resource Center** at [http://www.cas.edu/resources.asp](http://www.cas.edu/resources.asp)
Appendix E

Bristol Community College
Academic Program Review Timeline by Academic Year

2014-2015
- Theater Transfer (Concentration of Liberal Arts) – Division 1 – Complete

2015-2016
- Business (focus on Career) – Division 3 – In progress
- Engineering (focus on Career) – Division 5 – Complete

2016-2017
- Communication - Division 1 – In progress
- Computer Information Systems (focus on Career) - Division 3 – In progress
- Environmental Science Transfer (Concentration of Life Sciences) - Division 5 – In progress
- Fire Science Technology – Division 5 – In progress

2017-2018
- Art Graphics & Design Programs - Division 1 – In progress
- Fine Art Transfer - Division 1 – In progress
- Office Administration – Division 3 – In progress
- Paralegal Studies - Division 2 (substituting ABA accreditation process) – In progress

2018-2019
- Deaf Studies - Division 1
- Early Childhood & Elementary Education - Division 1
- Human Services - Division 2
- Culinary Arts - Division 3
- Veterinary Healthcare - Division 5
- Spanish/English Interpreting - Division 1

2019-2020
- Liberal Arts – Humanities - Division 1
- Liberal Arts – Professional - Division 2
- Hospitality Management - Division 3
- Liberal Arts – Math & Science - Division 5
- Sustainable Agriculture - (Concentration of Life Sciences) - Division 5
- Life Sciences (Concentration of Biology & Biotechnology) - Division 5
2020-2021

- Theater Transfer (Concentration of Liberal Arts) – Division 1
- Business (focus on Transfer) – Division 3
- Engineering (focus on Transfer) – Division 5

2021-2022

- See 2016-2017 – Note CIS (focus on Transfer)

Please note that most certificate programs are associated with a specific degree program and are evaluated as part of its Program Review. Additional independent certificate programs will be reviewed as needed.

[With the concurrence of your Dean, you can omit any items—except those areas indicated as required—that do not apply to your program, but all omissions must be explained in the report. Attachments should provide evidence/data for the information that is given.]

**Program Goal**

- Describe the program goal.
  *(Source: BCC Catalog 2018-2019)*

- In what ways does the program goal complement the mission of the institution?
  *(Source: BCC Catalog 2018-2019 Mission Statements)*

**The Educated Person**

- In what ways does the program strive to help students develop the characteristics of the BCC Educated Person?
  *(Source: BCC Catalog 2018-2019 The Educated Person)*
**Student Learning Outcomes**

- List the major learning outcomes for students in the program: the knowledge, skills, attitudes, or dispositions that you want your students to be able to demonstrate after they successfully graduate from your program.  
  *(Source: BCC Catalog 2018-2019)*

Describe and analyze for each major learning outcome

a. The curriculum’s effectiveness in helping students achieve this outcome. Please provide evidence to demonstrate effectiveness *(e.g. graduation rates, employer feedback, etc.)*.

b. The effectiveness of faculty teaching methods and out-of-class interactions and support in helping students achieve this outcome. Please provide evidence to demonstrate effectiveness *(e.g. completion rates, graduation rates, etc.)*.

c. How you are currently assessing how well your students have achieved this outcome? Please provide evidence to demonstrate effectiveness *(e.g. LEAP rubrics, grades, completion rates, etc.)*.
d. Evidence that recent graduating classes have achieved this outcome. Please provide evidence to demonstrate effectiveness (e.g. Perkin’s survey data (Sarah Morrell), transfer rates (Michael Bensink), employer feedback, etc.).

---

e. How you have used assessment results to improve teaching, learning, and assessment in your program. Please provide evidence to demonstrate effectiveness (e.g. curriculum revision, etc.).

---

**General Education Competencies**

- How do students in the program develop the abilities required by BCC’s General Education Competencies? *(Source: CWCC information, OAC Infusion Plan, etc.)*
**Program Improvement**

- List the goals established as a result of the last program review and indicate whether or not they have been achieved. If they have not been achieved, briefly explain why. *(Source: goals from previous program review report)*

**Program Quality**

Describe and analyze

1. The program’s effectiveness in meeting the needs of a diverse student population and preparing students to function in a diverse society. *(Source: internal department initiatives)*

2. How students benefit from faculty scholarly activities. For example, to what extent are students actively involved in faculty scholarship? How has faculty scholarship helped improve the curriculum and/or teaching methods? *(Source: professional development reports, CHP review, college service, service-learning, etc.)*
3. What makes this program distinctive? How does this program meet professional standards? How does this program compare with peer programs at Massachusetts Community Colleges or other programs with which it competes for students with, both at Bristol Community College and elsewhere? This could also include other regional or national public or private institutions. *(Source: institutional webpages, regional or national conferences, etc.)*

**Demand**

Describe and analyze

1. Past and anticipated enrollment trends in the program. *(As required by Department of Higher Ed.)* *(Source: Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (Angelina Medeiros)*

   [Note: Include details of where students are anticipated to come from and any efforts to recruit students from these schools/businesses.]

2. Regional and/or national trends in this discipline and their impact on this program. *(Source: regional or national journals, articles about program field, etc.)*

3. The curriculum’s effectiveness in addressing the needs of graduates and their employers. *(Source: employer surveys, employment trend data, etc.)*
Budget

Describe how the program is financed including college budget (if any) as well as any grants that have been received over the past five years, and outline any major expenses over the past five years. If possible, analyze the cost-effectiveness of the program (i.e. does current/projected student enrollment cover cost of faculty, supplies, etc. and/or are the faculty, staff, space and/or facilities appropriate for the current/projected enrollment justify?). Are you getting additional funding from grants or donors? *(Source: accounting, grants accounting)*

Other Information

Describe and analyze any other information essential to understanding the program and planning its future.
Summary Analysis of Major Strengths and Weaknesses

Summarize the major strengths and weaknesses of the program, as evidenced by this report and the external reviewer’s report. [REQUIRED] Weaknesses regarding insufficient resources (underfunding, understaffing, inadequate facilities, etc.) must be backed up by solid evidence, such as data from peer programs or the standards of an appropriate disciplinary association.

Action Plan

Outline substantive changes planned over the next five years (e.g., in courses and curricula, teaching methods, faculty, institutional support) in response to this program review and strategies for achieving those changes. An action plan must be provided for each identified program weakness. [REQUIRED] Action plans for weaknesses regarding insufficient resources must not consist solely of requesting additional/improved resources. The faculty must be willing to consider exploring other options (e.g., reducing the number of course offerings or concentrations/tracks, limiting the number of students admitted to the program, seeking grants and gifts, etc.). The action plan may say that the faculty will develop a proposal to address the insufficient resources and submit it to the Dean and Vice President.
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