

## **Institutional Effectiveness Committee**

### **End of Year Report 2016/2017**

#### **Summary**

As dictated by the Cisco College Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Plan (IE Plan Attached), planning units of the college submitted IE Reports for the 2016 Fall Semester. More than 86 percent of college planning units responded, creating a database capable of ensuring that effective, meaningful assessment occurs in all arenas of the institution, one of the primary responsibilities of the IE Committee. Following the review of planning unit reports by the IE Committee, those reports in need of revision were returned to appropriate planning units with specific recommendations for improved revision and re-submission, all steps in the IE Plan to assure that Cisco College has an on-going, integrated and institution-wide planning and evaluation process based on measurable goals and data.

In 2016/2017, the IE Committee assured that each planning unit adhered to a reporting process that clearly measured each unit's success in achieving stated goals and objectives. The IE Committee met four times to review planning unit reports, assess and evaluate the success of the IE Plan, and establish future priorities (Minutes Attached). To this end, the IE Committee emphasized the need for clearly stated objectives and outcomes, as well as measurable data, on the part of each planning unit.

Cisco College's Fifth Year Referral Report was accepted by SACS with no further action required. The Region 14 Monitoring Report was accepted by SACS with no further action required. The acceptance of both reports makes Cisco College's IE Plan compliant.

#### **Recommendations from the 2015/2016 IE Committee:**

The IE Committee Recommendations from last year included:

- The Executive Council (EC) continue to communicate the importance of defining and assessing outcomes directly to the head of each planning unit; that the EC act as a quality assurance unit for unit-level outcomes-based assessment for the IE process.  
Recommendation Achieved
- An IE Workshop be included as part of the Fall 2016 college organizational meetings to focus on planning units that have not submitted IE Reports or those whose processes are not outcomes-based or data-driven.  
Recommendation Achieved (Training Workshop Lists Attached)
- IE Committee membership for the 2015/2016 academic year have college-wide representation, including all programs, divisions, departments and services.  
Recommendation Achieved (Membership Attached in Minutes)

#### **Recommendations from the 2016/2017 IE Committee:**

The IE Committee recommend:

- The Executive Council (EC) coordinate a college-wide effort to revise and clarify the language of Cisco College's Mission Statement, in order to achieve a more accurate ability to assess the stated goals of the Mission Statement

- The IE Committee state clearly the specific reasons that any report is measured as “Non-compliant.”
- The IE Committee review percentages of planning units’ response for several years to establish an institutional goal for the desired percentage of planning unit response for any given year, and that the IE Committee create a standard document to represent that measurable goal.
- Planning Unit Reports include specific action plans to seek improvement in assessment data and/or results. This recommendation improves the ability for non-compliant planning unit reports to successfully respond and bring the unit into compliance.

Note: For example, a number of planning unit reports stated simply that data would be used to “improve” rather than providing specific actions, activities or details.

Liberal Arts IE Plan Workshop, 29 August 2018

15-16, 16-17, and 17-18 IE reports from liberal arts departments reveal continuous gaps or areas of non-compliance:

- \*Pre/post results not analyzed in relation to SLOs.
- \*Lack of or assumed benchmarks for SLO success.
- \*Non-specific improvement plans.
- \*Lack of a coherent assessment plan for depts.

In order to demonstrate efforts to improve the student learning in 17-18 IE reports, please develop a department assessment plan that ensures faculty know which SLO(s) to assess; how to assess the SLO(s); what data to collect, analyze, and report to the division chairperson and/or department head.

<b>Faculty-Driven Assessment Plan based on SLO performance</b>		<b>Department Assessment Plan based on SLO performance with common assessment methods</b>		<b>Department Assessment Plan based on SLO rotation, faculty-driven</b>	
1. Faculty review 17-18 gradebooks to link course assignments to SLOs and determine which SLO(s) indicate the weakest student performance.		1. Faculty review 17-18 gradebooks to link course assignments to SLOs and determine which SLO(s) indicate the weakest student performance. Chair/Head determines lowest performing SLO(s) across the dept.		1. Chair/Head determines SLO rotation schedule for each course (i.e. even numbered years = even numbered outcomes; Year 1 SLOs 1-3, Year 2 SLOS 4-5; etc.)	
2. Faculty identify an improvement plan to implement in 18-19 courses. -what will you do in the course to improve student performance? -how will you assess the SLO(s)? -what will be the success benchmarks for the SLO(s)?		2. Chair/Head & faculty determine improvement plan to implement in all 18-19 courses: -what will you do in the course to improve student performance? -how will you assess the SLO(s)? -what will be the success benchmarks for the SLO(s)?		1. Faculty review 17-18 gradebooks to link course assignments to SLOs and determine student success rate.	
3. Faculty review Fall 18 courses to gauge impact of the improvement plan and make adjustments for Spring 19 courses.		3. Faculty report Fall 18 assessment results and data to chair/head.		2. Faculty identify an improvement plan to implement in 18-19 courses. -what will you do in the course to improve student performance? -how will you assess the SLO(s)? -what will be the success benchmarks for the SLO(s)?	
4. Faculty review Spring 19 courses to determine whether student performance on the SLO(s) has improved.		4. Faculty report Spring 19 assessment results and data to chair/head. Chair/head determines whether student performance across the dept has improved.		3. Faculty review Fall 18 courses to gauge impact of the improvement plan and make adjustments for Spring 19 courses.	
<b>SLO benchmark not met</b>	<b>SLO benchmark met.</b>	5. Faculty review Spring 19 courses to determine whether student performance on the SLO(s) has improved.		4. Faculty review Spring 19 courses to determine whether student performance on the SLO(s) has improved.	
5. Faculty continue with improvement plan to implement in 19-20 courses.	Begin again at #1.	<b>SLO benchmark not met</b>	<b>SLO benchmark not met</b>	<b>SLO benchmark not met</b>	<b>SLO benchmark met.</b>
		6. Faculty continue with improvement plan to implement in 19-20 courses.	Begin again at #1.	5. Faculty continue with improvement plan to implement in 19-20 courses.	Begin again at #1.