

IV. Program SLOs/Assessment

What are your program student learning outcomes? Have each of these been assessed since the last comprehensive program review? Describe changes you have made to courses or the program based on these data.

All course student learning outcomes (CSLOs) are assessed annually. All CSLOs are mapped to the program learning outcomes (PLO's). All PLOs meet the 70% college-benchmark for meeting the standards.

To assess the CSLOs, the nursing faculty used a variety of measures that included standard testing (Assessment Technology Institute NCLEX-RN test plan based content mastery), clinical evaluation tools, written assignments, midterms and final examinations, and specific test items questions.

More specifically, based on the standardized ATI RN predictor tests, the AHC nursing students meet the national benchmark. Graduates of the program, as a group, scored similarly to the students from comparable nursing programs across the United States.

In 2013, the assessment tool used for Nursing 109 (Medical Surgical Nursing 2) was changed to better reflect course learning. This resulted in a change in the trend of the data obtained.

All faculty have identified declining trends in student academic preparedness in math and English (reading, writing, and comprehension). Recommendations for tutoring and help for remediation were repeatedly identified in multiple course improvement plans. There continues to be minimal adjustments in the course content since nursing content is approved by the California BRN as well as aligned with the national licensure test plan. Meanwhile, the nursing faculty continue to innovate strategies to promote student learning. Dose calculations and medication word problems continue to be ongoing problem areas that warrant tutoring, remediating, and overall support.

A comprehensive review of the SLO data is included in Appendix E 6. The course improvement plan summary states:

There were remarkable efforts to address the students' academic needs. The nursing faculty drafted various strategies to

enhance instruction, adjust assessment measures, augment student support, and seek resources to enhance the learning experiences of the nursing students. In Nursing 111 and Nursing 112, a number of data points indicate below standards on CSLOs that relate to dose calculations. The math lab does not provide enough support for nurse-related word problems and calculations. There were equipment requests for the nursing skills courses (NURS 111 and NURS 112) that were critical to ensuring that the students develop competence in currently used technologies. These include infusion pumps, patient-controlled analgesia (PCA) pumps, and feeding pumps. These numbers are worth careful scrutiny because the knowledge and skills for these technologies are integral to the roles and responsibilities of the registered nurse.

All faculty identified in several assessment plans over the past five years the need for tutorial and remediation assistance for students. The SLO data does not reflect a deficiency because faculty have stepped in and provided the assistance. This time and effort is in addition to regular office hours and routine student contact. There is no documentation of what has been provided for students so it is not possible to statistically demonstrate the impact on student success.

IV. Program SLOs/Assessment

What are your program student learning outcomes? Have each of these been assessed since the last comprehensive program review? Describe changes you have made to courses or the program based on these data.

Our program student learning outcomes are:

1. Utilize camera, sound, editing and lighting equipment in a professional capacity.
2. Write compelling narrative stories in proper screenplay format and structure.
3. Apply analysis and critical evaluation to cinematic works through discourse and writing.

All three of the Film and Video Program's Program Learning Outcomes have been assessed since our last comprehensive program review in 2011/12. In 2011, The Film and Video Program instituted rubrics for grading term papers and critiquing of student video productions. The student learning outcomes data for the Film and Video program demonstrates the high degree of success for film and video courses and students. We routinely review SLO data to ensure robust program success.

The following is a summary of the Program Student Learning Outcomes data between 2011 and 2016:

1. FILM PSLO – Utilize camera, sound, editing and lighting in a professional capacity.
 - **58% exceed institutional standards**
 - **33% meet institutional standards**
 - **8% below institutional standards**
2. Write compelling narrative stories in proper screenplay format and structure.
 - **42% exceed institutional standards**
 - **39% meet institutional standards**
 - **18% below institutional standards**
3. Apply analysis and critical evaluation to cinematic works through discourse and writing.
 - **58% exceed institutional standards**
 - **33% meet institutional standards**
 - **8% below institutional standards**

PSLO: FILM PSLO - Utilize camera, sound, editing and lighting equipment in a professional capacity.							
	Institutional Exceeds Standards		Institutional Meets Standards		Institutional Below Standards		Total
Fall 2011	17	73.91%	3	13.04%	3	13.04%	23
Fall 2012	45	57.69%	29	37.18%	4	5.13%	78
Fall 2015	1	33.33%	2	66.67%	0	0.00%	3
Fall 2016	10	47.62%	8	38.10%	3	14.29%	21
Overall	73	58.40%	42	33.60%	10	8.00%	125
PSLO: FILM PSLO - Write compelling narrative stories in proper screenplay format and structure.							
	Institutional Exceeds Standards		Institutional Meets Standards		Institutional Below Standards		Total
Fall 2012	31	39.24%	41	51.90%	7	8.86%	79
Fall 2015	5	50.00%	3	30.00%	2	20.00%	10
Fall 2016	10	47.62%	8	38.10%	3	14.29%	21
Spring 2017	10	43.48%	0	0.00%	13	56.52%	23
Overall	56	42.11%	52	39.10%	25	18.80%	133
PSLO: FILM PSLO - Apply analysis and critical evaluation to cinematic works through discourse and writing.							
	Institutional Exceeds Standards		Institutional Meets Standards		Institutional Below Standards		Total
Fall 2012	117	84.78%	9	6.52%	12	8.70%	138
Spring 2013	13	59.09%	9	40.91%	0	0.00%	22
Fall 2013	12	44.44%	12	44.44%	3	11.11%	27
Spring 2014	16	76.19%	5	23.81%	0	0.00%	21
Fall 2014	12	63.16%	7	36.84%	0	0.00%	19
Spring 2015	9	56.25%	6	37.50%	1	6.25%	16
Fall 2015	14	82.35%	2	11.70%	1	5.95%	17
Spring 2016	11	61.11%	7	38.89%	0	0.00%	18
Fall 2016	76	40.64%	92	49.20%	19	10.16%	187
Spring 2017	31	45.59%	30	44.12%	7	10.29%	68
Overall	311	58.35%	179	33.58%	43	8.07%	533

Two representative courses:

1. Film 110, Introduction to Motion Picture/Video Production, student learning outcome: **"Students will learn to operate video cameras, lighting and editing equipment."** This course SLO was assessed most recently in Spring 2016 and met with a 100% student success rate. The average student assessment score was 82%. The success of this course level outcome is indicative of program SLO #1.
2. Film 101, Film as Art and Communication, student learning outcome: **"Identify and analyze the stylistic elements of cinema (editing, cinematography, sound, mise-en scene and acting)."** This course SLO was assessed in Fall 2016 and met with an 85% average success rate. This assessment reveals that this area of the course generating success for our students. This course level SLO correlates to program SLO #3.

These results reveal the following:

1. In regard to student success in the areas production and analysis we have high student success rates.
2. The outcomes show moderate to high levels of success on an individual student basis.
3. The instruction in our programs is meeting the needs of our students. Further research on the specific courses that these SLOs were extrapolated from reveal that the minority of students that did not meet the success rate largely did not complete the assignment or complete it within

specified project guidelines or timelines. For faculty members, this reinforces the need to set clear objectives for each assignment as well as clearly spelling out project timelines and expectations.

IV. Program SLOs/Assessment

What are your program student learning outcomes? Have each of these been assessed since the last comprehensive program review? Describe changes you have made to courses or the program based on these data.

Current PSLOs:

PSLO 1: Demonstrate understanding of concepts, materials and processes involved in the creation of visual art throughout history by participation in discussions, knowledge of terminology and successful execution of projects and assignments.

PSLO 2: Participate in a variety of visual arts, demonstrating accomplishment of skills, techniques and processes involved in their creation, through a portfolio of work.

Have PSLOs been assessed?

Our Program Learning Outcomes appear to continue to perform well. Overall, a range of 86% to 91% of students met PLO standards over the past 6 years based off the Comprehensive Program Review Learning Outcomes Assessment Data document provided to us. Six of the eleven semesters shown on the Historical Performance PLO Chart include almost 1000 or mostly over 1000 students assessed for each semester.

We are overall happy with our current PLO's. We might adjust some minor language in the two, and would like to add a third PLO related to broadening knowledge and developing appreciation for the diverse practices and ways of thinking in art across cultures and time periods. We plan on formally implementing the new PSLO's through CurriQuinet in 2023.

Changes made to our courses and program regarding assessment data:

The most salient change we have had to make is the shift to teaching in an emergency remote teaching capacity. A change that was necessary to continue instruction, but also to try and maintain as much student learning as possible given the pandemic situation we are still in. The transformation of studio classes to online synchronous learning has especially overwhelmed art program faculty requiring an enormous amount of additional preparation in a short amount of time. One year into the pandemic and we continue to experiment, expand, and evolve our teaching practices to maintain rigor and intellectual growth in our classrooms during these unprecedented changes. The gap existing between the use of Elumen and our next assessment interface will hinder our ability to more accurately see how all of this change will register in our student learning outcomes. Art Program faculty will do our best to keep record of SLOs until a new assessment interface is ready, but without a current interface it will be more difficult to direct part-time faculty regarding SLO assessments.

In our last program review, the addition of English and reading advisories to our lecture classes was recognized as a way to satisfy the need to better prepare students for taking our art history and art appreciation courses. We believe the implementation of this has contributed to student learning in these courses. Changes in requirements on math and English from the AB 705 bill required us to alter our advisories. We made the necessary changes to our advisories.

Available and accessible lab times for ceramics and sculpture classes is a necessary condition for successful completion of student learning outcomes in our three-dimensional studio courses. Amiko Matsuo worked extensively with John Hood to make the operation of labs efficient in terms of FTES/FTEF. While working with our Dean, it was eventually decided that three-dimensional labs supervised by classified staff was the best working model both in terms of student success and efficiency. As the possibility of returning to face-to-face instruction becomes something we hope to achieve soon for our studio classes, it will be necessary for us to continue to receive funding of staff for these labs. The pandemic has been especially hard on our three-dimensional classes and we will need to rebuild them to get them enrolling as they used to before Covid. Without available and accessible lab time this will be impossible.

The loss of our full-time Ceramics and 3D Faculty has had a catastrophic effect on the Art Program's 3D area offerings. The loss of Amiko Matsuo after the first semester of the pandemic has left our 3D courses in a complete state of non-operation. We had to cancel all 3D classes for the spring 2021 semester. We believe a full-time faculty member very well have been able to keep 3D classes going as they have at other colleges.

Classes such as Ceramics 1 which was offered twice a semester and usually enrolled well, no longer enroll enough students to keep one class going. Part of this is the specialized knowledge that a full-time 3D discipline faculty brings into the classroom, but much of it is the coordination of the area as an overall. Without a replacement full-time faculty member for our 3D area, that half of our Art Program will continue to wither up and die even after a successful return to face to face instruction.

From a first-hand account, we as full-time Art Program faculty witnessed everything that Amiko had done to rebuild our 3D area into a much more efficient discipline within the college. In addition to revamping our labs, she had done many things which affect student success:

- She stopped offering many Art 199 courses which were inefficient and replaced those classes with CWE 149 opportunities.
- She created a ceramics certificate to fulfill the need to increase the number of degrees awarded and maintain proper college funding from the state.
- As mentioned earlier in this report, our 3D area had become a hazardous environment to our students and staff. She worked hard to coordinate the clean-up of that workspace, and she advocated for a new filtration system to decrease toxicity in the air.
- She also was a significant part of bringing deficiencies in SLO assessments in the 3D area up to speed and was active on the LOAC committee.

These are just a few examples illustrating the roles our Full-time 3D faculty plays to maintain our program. Without a replacement soon, most of what that she had built along with what Bob Nichols had built before her will probably disappear. Ceramics and sculpture courses are expected components of professional degrees within the visual arts fields. Three-dimensional courses are requirements for students earning our degrees. We need proper instruction and coordination by a full-time faculty member, and we need staff for 3D labs.

The results from the 2016 focus group have been used to guide decision making regarding the program and services of MESA/STEM as well as forming the basis for further grant development. Space and staffing constraints have caused barriers to implementation or expansion of items marked with an asterisk (*) above.

On November 29, 2018, a SGID was conducted by the Dean, Academic Affairs overseeing MESA/STEM regarding the program. These are the results:

Student Comments:

Positive Aspects of the (Program)	Areas for Improvement	Suggestions for Bringing about Improvement
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Book, calculator, laptop lending 2. Good & friendly staff 3. Environment supports growth with peers 4. Priority registration 5. Snacks & drinks 6. Home away from home—mutual support 7. MESA students get CalFresh 8. Field trips 9. Counseling & support from Dorine 10. Lockers, microwave 11. Individual attention: students are not anonymous 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Old, slow computers 2. More drop-in counseling 3. Study room 4. Stay open later (midnight!) 5. More tutors 6. Kitchen 7. Faculty-led review sessions 8. More compartmentalization of space 9. No need to open so early (9:30-10) 10. Quiet study space 11. More non-academic social time 12. Space is cramped 13. Rebalance non-engineering activities: field trips & internships 14. More electrical outlets 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Communal pantry 2. One-on-one mentoring with alumni, others with STEM success 3. More electrical outlets 4. Bigger budget 5. More whiteboards 6. Better computers 7. Ways to get more students to MESA convocation (after move) 8. Two FT counselors 9. Medicinal vending nearby (after move) 10. Dedicated transportation for MESA events

D. MESA established an assessment cycle in the 2012/2013 academic year as follows:

SLO	Assessment Schedule	Assessment Completed
MESASLO1: <i>After participating in AEW's MESA students will demonstrate a command of collaborative work skills in the chosen field of study and exhibit the appropriate study skills to master the material.</i>	Every May	Spring 2013; 2014; 2015; 2016; 2017; 2018
MESASLO2: <i>By the end of fall term of their final year at Allan Hancock College, MESA students will have identified a long-term support system including faculty, on-campus resources, professional organizations, and potential employers.</i>	December of odd years	Fall 2013; 2015; 2017

<p>MESASLO3: <i>Within 2 semester of admission to the program, MESA students will have an educational plan that outlines the requirements needed for transfer to a four-year institution.</i></p>	December of even years	Fall 2012; 2014; Spring 2017* *The MESA Counselor/Coordinator was on sabbatical fall 2016 so SLOs were not completed during their scheduled assessment cycle that term, but were completed during the term after she returned.
<p>MESASLO4: <i>By the end of spring term prior to their final year at Allan Hancock College, MESA students will have an adequate resume in order to obtain internships to professionally develop themselves for tomorrow's workforce.</i></p>	May of even years	Spring 2014; 2016; 2018
<p>MESASLO5: <i>By the end of spring term of their final year at Allan Hancock College, MESA students will have developed the confidence required to successfully navigate the academic process at the accepted transfer institution.</i></p>	May of odd years	Spring 2013; 2015; 2017

Data collected over the last six years includes:

SLO	Data Method	Data Summary	Changes Made
<p>MESASLO1: <i>After participating in AEW's MESA students will demonstrate a command of collaborative work skills in the chosen field of study and exhibit the appropriate study skills to master the material.</i></p>	<p>AEW Facilitators are asked to evaluate their students based on a Collaborative Work Skills rubric.</p>	<p>On average, 91% of students participating in AEW demonstrated a command of collaborative work and study skills at "exceeds" or "meets" standard level.</p> <p>2013: 80% 2014: 94% 2015: 92% 2016: 95% 2017: 83% 2018: 100%</p>	<p>Communicated regularly with all our students about the importance of attending the AEW sessions and their proven success rates with course completion and higher grades; Offered AEW sessions more regularly and implemented strategies for the workshop facilitators to be more closely connected to the course instructor and students; required all MESA students who are on academic probation to attend AEW sessions; MESA Counselors took an active role in training the facilitators and encouraging instructors to promote AEWs in their classes</p>

SLO	Data Method	Data Summary	Changes Made
<p>MESASLO2: By the end of fall term of their final year at Allan Hancock College, MESA students will have identified a long-term support system including faculty, on-campus resources, professional organizations, and potential employers.</p>	<p>All students who have applied to university complete a survey developed using a rubric in which they identify options that best describe their support system.</p>	<p>On average, 91% of students in their final year at AHC could identify a long-term support system that "exceeds" or "meets" standard.</p> <p>2013: 85% 2015: 92% 2017: 97%</p>	<p>Communicated regularly with our new students about the importance of developing a support network of faculty, campus resources, and professional organizations and maintaining contact with them; Offered workshops and learning experiences designed to assist students in identifying sources of support and teaching them proper communication techniques with these contacts; held students accountable for attending these workshops; Required all new students to complete ENGR 100 or STEM 100 – geared towards assisting them in identifying and developing a long-term support system</p>
<p>MESASLO3: Within 2 semester of admission to the program, MESA students will have an educational plan that outlines the requirements needed for transfer to a four-year institution.</p>	<p>The MESA Counselors review each student's records and evaluate based on a rubric each students education plan status.</p>	<p>On average, 96% of students had a comprehensive SEP on file.</p> <p>2012: 99% 2014: 91% 2017: 99%</p>	<p>Communicated regularly with our new students about the importance of developing an SEP and completing it through DegreeWorks; offered workshops and learning experiences designed to assist students in identifying a major and transfer universities and on how to use DegreeWorks; required all new students to complete ENGR 100 or STEM 100 – geared towards assisting them in identifying a major and a transfer university as well as understanding the course requirements</p>

SLO	Data Method	Data Summary	Changes Made
<p>MESASLO4: By the end of spring term prior to their final year at Allan Hancock College, MESA students will have an adequate resume in order to obtain internships to professionally develop themselves for tomorrow's workforce.</p>	<p>Each student approaching their final year at AHC is asked to submit a resume that the MESA Counselor evaluates the qualities of the resume based on a rubric.</p>	<p>On average, 69% of students in their final year at AHC had an adequate resume developed at "exceeds" or "meets" standard level.</p> <p>2014: 94%* 2016: 77%* 2018: 37%*</p> <p>*The evaluation and rating practices for this SLO have been inconsistent amongst all three years.</p>	<p>Communicated regularly with all our students about the importance of developing and maintaining effective resumes throughout their educational journey at AHC and beyond; offered workshops and personal assistance to aid students in understanding the importance of an effective and professional resume and to guide them in developing one of their own; required all MESA students who have been accepted to university to submit a resume before receiving their transfer stipend</p>
<p>MESASLOS: By the end of spring term of their final year at Allan Hancock College, MESA students will have developed the confidence required to successfully navigate the academic process at the accepted transfer institution.</p>	<p>All students who have been accepted to a university complete a survey developed using a rubric in which they identify options that best describe their transition plan, confidence level, and study skills.</p>	<p>On average, 96% of students in their final year at AHC had developed confidence required to successfully navigate academic processes at "exceeds" or "meets" standard level.</p> <p>2013: 89% 2015: 100% 2017: 100%</p>	<p>Communicated regularly with all our students about the importance of attending workshops geared towards understanding the transfer, admissions, and financial aid processes; offered field trips to universities designed to assist students in understanding and developing confidence in the transfer process; required all MESA students who have been accepted to university to attend a "We're Outta Here" workshop in the spring term prior to fall transfer</p>

NOTE: MESA does not have a previous program review to compare data against.

- The top three EOPS/CARE & CalWORKs services students felt were the most helpful for them were: priority registration, counseling services, and the health fee waiver.
- The top two services that students were aware of but did not use were tutoring and the book lending service.
- 87.5% of students felt that EOPS/CARE & CalWORKs had enough counselors to assist them when needed.
- 95% of student indicated that the EOPS/CARE & CalWORKs hours of operation were convenient for them.
- 98% felt that EOPS/CARE & CalWORKs provided them with the services they needed to reach their educational goals.
- 85.5% of the students indicated that most of their classes were taken on the Santa Maria campus, 12.5% at the Lompoc Valley Center, and 2% online.

Student learning outcomes are discussed at EOPS/CARE & CalWORKs department meetings and planning retreats. All EOPS/CARE & CalWORKs faculty and staff contribute to the SLOs development process. The departments SLO liaisons facilitate these discussions and are responsible for recording SLO data in eLumen. EOPS/CARE & CalWORKs have six year assessment schedules that outline identified SLOs, target assessment dates, and the assessment collection process and method(s). Every semester at least one student learning outcome is assessed. After the data is collected, the results are discussed at department meetings, followed by the development of an improvement plan, if necessary. The improvement plan outlines proposed activities and changes that are desired to support student learning and success. Rubrics, student surveys, registration data, Banner data and program contact records from the EOPS database were used to measure EOPS/CARE & CalWORKs SLOs for the 2010-2016 assessment plans.

All eight of the EOPS/CARE SLOs on the 2010-2016 assessment schedule were assessed at least twice. The following two EOPS/CARE SLOs were inactivated/retired during the 2012-13 school year because they had been successfully assessed for several cycles:

SLO 7 – Students will utilize student portal to access academic information (More than 90% could identify central functions and information accessible in the portal).

SLO 8 – Students will utilize email accounts and use as communication tool (92% met or exceeded standards).

When SLO 3 – Students will identify EOPS/CARE services to strengthen their academic progress was assessed in 2014-15, data showed that 91% of students met or exceeded standards. SLO 3 will be retired at the end of the 2010-2016 assessment period.

Data from the following EOPS/CARE SLOs showed a steady increase in the number of students meeting and exceeding standards:

SLO 1 - Students will articulate short term and/or long term goal(s) and develop a semester by semester plan showed a 12% increase from 2014 to 2015.

SLO 5 - Students will be able to demonstrate the importance of meeting deadlines and requirements as contracted in EOPS showed a 10% increase from spring 2013 to

Student Services Program Review Self Study Evaluation Components

spring 2015. In 2013, as part of the improvement plan, the EOPS orientation was revised to be more clear and concise regarding student responsibilities and program requirements.

As of fall 2015, four of the six CalWORKs SLOs on the 2010-2016 assessment schedule were assessed at least three times. During spring 2016, the remaining two SLOs (1 & 5) are being assessed for the first time. The following two CalWORKs SLOs will be retired at the end of the 2010-2016 assessment period because they had been successfully assessed for several cycles:

SLO 2 – Students will be able to identify individual needs.

SLO 3 – Students will identify solutions to the identified individual needs.

EOPS/CARE & CalWORKs have made no significant program changes as a result of SLO data. The data collected indicated that the majority of EOPS/CARE & CalWORKs students were meeting or exceeding expectations pertaining to the SLOs. SLO data did not identify any gaps or inequities among the students served by the programs.

EOPS/CARE & CalWORKs have completed the six year assessment schedules for 2016-2022. Five of the eight SLOs from the EOPS/CARE 2010-2016 assessment schedule will continue to be assessed for 2016-2022, as well as two new SLOs were added. One of the new SLOs assesses financial literacy. The other assesses students' understanding of the negative impacts of social media on current and future professional opportunities. Four of the six CalWORKs SLOs from the 2010-2016 assessment schedule will continue to be assessed, as well as one new SLO was added for 2016-2022. The new SLO assesses time management as it relates to priority registration.

Methods/Evidence:

AHC Fact Book 2014

Source for all tables: California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office MIS Data Mart

CCC Chancellor's Office Student Success Scorecard

Student Surveys

Student Exit Interviews

CAS Self-Assessment Guide

eLumen – SLO data

2010-2016 & 2016-2022 SLO assessment schedules for EOPS/CARE & CalWORKs

Plan of Action:

- Increase on-campus student in-reach and intensify high school and community outreach efforts in order to increase student participation in EOPS/CARE & CalWORKs programs by 20% over the next two years.
- Track and follow-up with students that don't return the following semester to find out the reasons in order to improve our services to help those at-risk.
- Ensure that the way we collect and measure the data for EOPS/CARE SLO 4 and CalWORKs SLO 3 (2016-2022) is consistent each time we assess them.

Student Services Program Review Self Study Evaluation Components

Page 28 of 44

III. Analysis of Resource Use and Program Implementation

Describe the program's current allocation and use of human, physical, technology, and fiscal resources. Are resources sufficient and appropriate to meet program needs? Can program resources be reallocated to better meet student needs? If so, how?

IV. Program SLOs/Assessment

What are your program student learning outcomes? Have each of these been assessed since the last comprehensive program review? Describe changes you have made to courses or the program based on these data.

V. Distance Learning (If applicable):

Describe the distance education courses offered in your program and any particular successes or challenges with these courses. Include the enrollment as well as percentage of courses offered by modality and the rationale for this ratio.

- x Compare the success and retention of your online offerings to the same courses offered face-to-face. Analyze any gaps and plans to address these.

As well, describe how program instructors ensure regular substantive instructor-initiated contact in online classes.

VI. Success, Retention, and Equity

Describe how the program works to promote student success. Include teaching innovations, use of academic and student support services (library, counseling, LAP, community partnerships, etc.). Refer to list of Student Services.

- x Then, utilizing data from the office of Institutional Research and Planning, report on student success through course completion and retention data. Analyze, by discipline, success by gender, age, ethnicity, and online (may analyze other variables such as disability, English as a second language, day vs. night courses, etc. as appropriate).
- x Suggest possible reasons for these trends and planned actions to address any disproportionate impact.

SECTION 3

ASSESSMENT PLAN (*SAMPLE PROVIDED*)

includes: Program Learning Outcomes,
Assessment Methods, Alignment of Course SLOs, Assessment
Calendar,
Plan for Dissemination of Results



Assessment Plan

This part of the program review demonstrates alignment of courses with coverage of program student learning outcomes and lays out the program's plans for conducting assessments over the forthcoming five years.

Mission

The mission of the Department of Physics is to provide students with an education in the fundamental processes of the physical world with thorough study in both the classroom and laboratory.

Program Outcomes

Program SLO 1: Students will demonstrate knowledge in the fundamentals of physics (waves, mechanics, electricity, and magnetism) so that they are prepared for graduate study or professional work in physics, engineering, education and related fields.

Program SLO 2: Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze a variety of physics problems.

Program SLO 3: Students will be able to investigate an area of physics and explain that research to other students at a similar level.

Program SLO 4: Students will demonstrate technical skills needed for lab work in physics.

Program SLO 5: Students will demonstrate the ability to independently collect, analyze, evaluate and/or explain data concerning a question of current research interest.

Course/Program Alignment

Outcomes will be introduced, developed and practiced with feedback, and demonstrated at their highest levels as shown below. Outcomes 1 and 2 are assessed with an exam. This exam is given in P390/391. Outcome 2 is also assessed with alumni feedback obtained via survey. Outcome 3 is assessed in P390/391 using a rubric. Outcome 4 is assessed using a practicum exam at the end of the lab associated with P240. Outcome 5 is assessed for participating students by successful completion of research programs, and any resulting conference presentations, honors theses, and published paper. (Key: I= Introduced, D=Developed and practiced with feedback; M=Demonstrated at a specified mastery level)

	Outcomes				
	1	2	3	4	5
P106	I,D				
P110		I,D			
P120	D		I,D		
P240	D			I,D	
P250					I,D
P310	D	D	D	D	
P320		D			
P330	D		D		
P340	D			D	
P390	M	M	M	M	M
P391	M	M	M	M	M

Implementation of Assessment

Responsibility for implementing the assessment lies with the entire department. Confident that outcomes are reflected in actual coursework of your major/program, describe the mechanisms for assessment. Think of assessing your outcomes on a 4 or 5 year cycle. (If you have 10 outcomes assessing 2 a year is ideal.)

AssessmentCycle

Use one row for each Program outcome. *Your 6-Year assessment schedule can be inserted here, if you've already completed it.*

.Program Outcome	To be assessed in semester:	Assessment method (s)	Team to review assessment results	Resources needed to conduct assessment	Individual responsible for assessment report	Date we expect to complete review

Data for all outcomes will be collected every year, except for the alumni survey associated with Outcome 2. This will be collected every other year when we collect information for our alumni newsletter. Analysis of the data will follow the schedule given above.

The department chair is responsible for gathering the assessment data and insuring that discussion takes place.

Dissemination of Information

Results will be shared in a special department meeting once a year. This will occur near the end of the academic year as soon as exam data for the year are available. In addition, written summaries will be shared with the Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee, the dean, and the Vice President, Academic Affairs.