

Program Learning Outcome Assessment Plan Template

General Information

Academic Year of Implementation: 2010 – 2011

Academic Program / Discipline Area (for General Education) or Co-Curricular Program Area:

Mathematics

Planning Team:

Planning Team Leader(s) ¹	Campus	E-mail Address	Phone Extension	Mail Code
Scott Krise	West	skrise@valenciacollege.edu	1884	4-23
Planning Team Members ²	Campus	E-mail Address	Phone Extension	Mail Code
Angelique Trutie	Osceola	atrutie@valenciacollege.edu	4126	6-1
Aryan Ashkani	Osceola	aashkani@valenciacollege.edu	4833	6-1
Magdala Emmanuel	Osceola	memmanuel@valenciacollege.edu	4129	6-1

Learning Outcomes and Performance Indicators

Academic Program / Discipline Area (for General Education) or Co-Curricular Program Area:

¹ Planning Team Leaders assume the responsibility for coordinating activities associated with the expectations for the design, approval and implementation of Assessment Plans. See the attached documents entitled *Program Outcome Assessment Plan Approval and Improvement Process* and *Program Outcome Assessment Plan Approval and Improvement Process – Student Affairs*

² Planning Team membership, whenever possible, should reflect the *Principles for selection of members for assessment plan work teams*. For faculty teams the principles include: Collegewide representation where possible; Full-time faculty from the respective program / discipline (tenured, tenure track, and Non-Tenure Earning 4 / 8 / 10 month faculty); Adjunct faculty when an adequate number of full-time faculty do not teach in the program / discipline; Faculty from both disciplines or programs when an outcome is assessed in two programs or a program other than the primary discipline. For plans developed in Student Affairs planning teams should include the following: Collegewide representation where possible; Staff from the targeted program area; Part-time Student Affairs professionals when an adequate number of full-time staff do not work in the targeted program area; Faculty / staff from other program / discipline areas working on the same or similar outcomes; Students representation when possible.

Mathematics	
Targeted Program Learning Outcome: Critical Thinking	Targeted Course(s), Co-Curricular Program or Student Activity associated with the Academic Program: MAC1105 – College Algebra
	Targeted Outcome(s) within the Course(s), Co-Curricular Program or Student Activity identified above: Use Algebra to model real world situations.
Performance Indicators for the Program Learning Outcome(s) selected: Effectively analyze, evaluate, synthesize, and apply information.	Performance Indicators for Outcome(s) within the Course(s), Co-Curricular Program or Student Activity selected: Classify different types of functions Analyze given data Construct algebraic model Draw conclusions based on results
Common Assessment (What assessment method (written assignment, speech, test, etc.) will you use to assess student ability related to the program / course outcome(s) selected): Embedded question on an objective test	
Description of the Proposed Common Assessment (Common assessments should be designed to ensure a balance between (1) the need for a consistency within the program in order to ensure comparable student artifacts and (2) the need for reasonable flexibility in order to encourage faculty judgment in the design and delivery of learning activities): One question with multiple parts on a college algebra topic.	
Proposed Assessment Instrument (In some cases the assessment method may not need an associated assessment instrument – e.g., multiple choice tests): Multidimensional Rubric	

Implementation Process

Approval Process

Activities Associated with the Approval of Assessment Plans	Proposed Completion Date	Person Responsible
Draft assessment plan is circulated for input to reviewers appropriate to the program / discipline	September 2010	Scott Krise
College-wide live or e-mail / Blackboard discussion will be coordinated to consider input received	October 2010	Angelique Trutie
Draft assessment plan is revised to reflect input	November 2010	Aryan Ashkani
Current voter eligibility list for curriculum will be used to vote on draft assessment plan	December 2010	Magdala Emmanuel

Faculty / Professional Development Needs Associated with the Proposed Common Assessment

What training / preparation / information will faculty or staff need in order complete the proposed assessment plan?
[Email with instructions and necessary attachments \(assessment question, collection of artifacts, answer key, etc.\)](#)
[Training on rubric](#)

Collection of Student Artifacts

What information needs to be communicated to students concerning the assessment process (informed consent, etc.)?
[Give out consent forms](#)

How will student artifacts or data associated with student performance be collected?
[Anonymously collected, put in a sealed envelope, and returned to the department](#)

If student artifacts are to be collected based on a random sample of students registered for the course or participating in the program / activity, what characteristics should the sample include?

Students will be chosen from MAC1105 courses taught on all campuses (Classrooms only).

How will information about faculty / staff participation in the assessment project be communicated?

Via email

Who will be responsible for coordinating the collection of student artifacts?

Magdala Emmanuel supervised by Scott Krise

At what point in the academic year / semester will the student artifacts be collected?

End of Spring semester 2011

Program Level Assessment / Evaluation of Student Artifacts and Analysis of Results

When will student artifacts be assessed / evaluated (Learning Day 2011 is scheduled for February 11, 2011, Assessment Day 2011 is scheduled for May 5, 2011)?

Assessment Day, May 5, 2011 [Was Done on Sep 30, 2011]

Which faculty or staff from the program/discipline will evaluate student artifacts?

All available members of the mathematics department who attend Assessment Day. [Approximately 10 members from all campuses volunteered in August and evaluated 52 artifacts on September 30, 2011]

What training / preparation / information will faculty or staff need in order adequately assess / evaluate the student artifacts collected?

Discussions and/or clarifications with all faculty members present on how to interpret the rubric before evaluation of the student artifacts begin.

When will the results / data associated with the assessment plan be analyzed?

Summer 2011 – after assessment day [Results were actually sent on October 4, 2011]

What training / preparation / information will faculty or staff need in order to analyze the results data associated with this assessment plan?

Discussions on how to gather the data and present it in a format that is clear and understandable to all

What additional sources of data might allow faculty / staff to better understand and act on the results of this assessment plan?

In order to ensure curricular and programmatic alignment, who else should be included in this conversation (e.g., faculty from related discipline areas in General Education)?

Deans and Science faculty

How will the assessment results be disseminated to stakeholders (Faculty, Staff, Advisory Boards, etc.)?

Compiled data and charts will be sent to faculty members via email. [Just the data was sent via Excel spreadsheet]

Approval Process

Dean / Director Support

The Dean(s) / Directors (for Librarians) responsible for supporting and promoting the work necessary for the implementation of the Assessment Plan need to indicate their support for the plan.

Dean / Director East / Winter Park Campus	Signature
Dean / Director Osceola / Lake Nona Campus	Signature
Dean / Director West Campus	Signature

Improvement Plan and the Use of Assessment Results (To be completed after the implementation of the initial Assessment Plan and the review of student artifacts)

What do the results of this assessment plan suggest about changes / improvements needed within the curriculum (targeted course(s), co-curricular program or student activity)?
What changes to the common course outlines, if any, need to be considered?
What do the results of this assessment plan suggest about changes / improvements to the program assessment process?