

If **you are working on several programs** please submit a template for each one; each labeled for the specific program.

## Six Items Documenting Results

Please fill in the blue shaded areas with brief sentences. A second page is provided for longer comments.

### Documenting the Assessment Process

Academic Program / Discipline Area (for General Education) or Co-Curricular Program Area				
Planning Team Leader(s) <sup>1</sup>	Campus	E-mail Address	Phone Extension	Mail Code
Note from Planning Team Fall 2011: Please note, with respect to the designation of Planning Team Leaders: The Planning Team came to a consensus that Planning Team Leaders should include representation from each of the three major campuses (East, Osceola, and West). Those selected, or volunteering, for the role of Planning Team Leader are to be a non-tenure track full time faculty members (tenured or four-month). It was the determination of the Planning Team that tenure-track faculty should be encouraged to concentrate on the completion of their ILP.				
Karen Cowden	West	<a href="mailto:kcowden@valenciacollege.edu">kcowden@valenciacollege.edu</a>	1960	4-11
Planning Team Members <sup>2</sup>	Campus	E-mail Address	Phone Extension	Mail Code
The Planning Team came to the consensus that all tenured, tenure-track, and full-time four-month faculty are considered members of the planning team. As the work being conducted for these Assessment Plans impacts all tenured and tenure-track faculty, they all should play an active role in the work being conducted.				
Claudine Bentham	West	<a href="mailto:cbentham@valenciacollege.edu">cbentham@valenciacollege.edu</a>	1219	4-11
Elizabeth Earle	Osceola	<a href="mailto:earle@valenciacollege.edu">earle@valenciacollege.edu</a>	4121	6-1
Jean-Marie Fuhrman	Winter Park	<a href="mailto:jfuhrman@valenciacollege.edu">jfuhrman@valenciacollege.edu</a>	6865	5-3
Corinne Fennessy	West	<a href="mailto:cfennessy@valenciacollege.edu">cfennessy@valenciacollege.edu</a>	1645	4-11
Rich Gair	East	<a href="mailto:rgair@valenciacollege.edu">rgair@valenciacollege.edu</a>	2641	3-20
Jane Maguire	East	<a href="mailto:jmaguire@valenciacollege.edu">jmaguire@valenciacollege.edu</a>	2228	3-20
Dawn Sedik	West	<a href="mailto:dsedik@valenciacollege.edu">dsedik@valenciacollege.edu</a>	1176	4-11
Summer Trazerra	East	<a href="mailto:strazerra@valenciacollege.edu">strazerra@valenciacollege.edu</a>	2267	3-20

<sup>1</sup> Planning Team Leaders assume the responsibility for coordinating activities associated with the expectations for the design, approval and implementation of Assessment Plans.

<sup>2</sup> Planning Team membership, whenever possible, should reflect the *Principles for selection of members for assessment plan work teams*. For faculty teams the principles include: College-wide 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: College-wide 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.

1. In a sentence or two, what did you do and who was responsible for coordinating the collection of student artifacts / data?

As part of our PLOA (Program Learning Outcome Assessment) we are charged with measuring growth in our department. Karen Cowden provided an overview of the assessment plan, institutional effectiveness funds and objectives, as well as the agenda for assessment day. We are focusing on questions 1 & 2 of the PLOA:

1. What do the results of your assessment suggest about the student preparation in your program?
2. What are the strengths of your students as shown through your program assessment?

A main portion of our time was devoted to coming to consensus regarding the pre-program assessment measure.

2. At what point in the academic year / semester were the student artifacts / data collected? How many students were assessed?

Individual instructors at various points during the semester(s) have collected artifacts of assessment of student learning in Reading. Most instructors have a form of a pre-program measure (some use the PERT score, some use the Lab Diagnostic pre-test, some use the My Reading Lab “Lexile” level pre-test, others use a My Reading Lab “Skills” pre-test). Additionally, most instructors evaluate artifacts of pre-program measure within the first two weeks of the term and provide personalized learning plans for their students based on performance on these measures. All students in courses are assessed in some format (most instructors had 15-25 students per class, per semester). Additionally, many instructors re-evaluate student learning and assessments in survey form or after benchmark chapter/unit tests.

Our team decided on some action items that may build college-wide standardization of pre-program measures. All instructors use the redesigned department-created final exam as a post-course assessment measure.

## Improvement Plan and Use of the Assessment Results – Next Year’s Cycle

3. What were your results? (Please e-mail the data and copies of instruments when you submit this form if possible, for example rubric scores in an Excel sheet.) How did this compare with any predictions that you made in the Fall?

Our team is just beginning our assessment day activities and as such our improvement plan will be focusing on the measure of growth between our publisher-content assessment versus our department-created assessment. Attached are two rubrics that the team will evaluate during the coming year. Further, the predictions of our student success were accurate as we designed the new final exam. Below are our pre and post assessment measure options. We will measure our results after the pilot exam delivery in the summer term of 2013.

Pre-Program Assessment Measure options:

- Instructors may use the PERT scores, “Lexile” levels, “My Reading Lab” skill pre-test, or Lab Diagnostic assessment as a “pre-program” score. (If there are

2 PERT scores from 2 attempts we will take the average of the two scores as the pre-program score. Laura Balassi may be able to assist with getting data from these assessments.)

○ UPDATE TO PRE-PROGRAM SCORE:

- Instructors are finding a need to summarize their pre-program assessment measure, as we did not have a college-wide pre-program assessment that would be available to incorporate in the report by the deadline. Instructors decided to send a summary of their own pre-program assessment measure (some using a “Lexile” reading level, others using a PERT overall course average, and others using a pre-diagnostic Lab Assessment). Our focus for 2014-2015 will be to have a common pre-program measure in place.

Post-Program Assessment Measure options:

- Instructors will use Form B Final Exam given Fall 2012 as the “post-program” assessment for students.

Originally the team considering having each instructor will send a report to Karen Cowden that consists of the average PERT and Form B Final average scores per class from Fall 2012, and a summary of the instructor’s observations regarding the strengths of the students as demonstrated on these tests. However, with the limited timeframe to complete this report, along with the first attempt of our Assessment Day gathering, we have made an amendment in this requirement (see statement in #4). This will be sent to Karen by May 10, 2013.

4. What are the changes / improvements you plan to make within the curriculum (targeted courses), co-curricular program, or student activity over the next year? (Please use the following page if you need more space for your response.)

Instructors are finding a need to summarize their pre-program assessment measure(s) as this is our first year completing the assessment day process. Discussions are occurring via e-mail regarding a college-wide pre-program assessment that would be available to incorporate in the report by the deadline, next year. Instructors decided to send a summary of their own pre-program assessment measure (some using a “Lexile” reading level, others using a PERT overall course average, and others using a pre-diagnostic Lab Assessment). Our focus for 2014-2015 will be to have a common pre-program measure in place.

5. What changes, if any, will be made to the common course outlines, the catalog, etc.

Changes to our program will be great due to the new legislation regarding Developmental Education delivery model requirements moving from mandated structure to student opt-in model. Our focus for changes/improvements will not only be to continue to build common pre-program and post-course measures (already in place), but also, to strategically align our co-curricular activities to meet the new needs of the college, students, and course curriculum. We anticipate a need to change the common course outline and course catalog for 2014-2015.

## Next Steps – Planning for Next Year’s Cycle— Academic Year 2013-2014 (see below for detailed planning)

6. What are your next steps – acting on the results? (These steps will guide others in the next cycle... moving the process forward.) If these steps include the development and implementation of a new assessment, include that information here. If you plan to change the current assessment or the program learning outcome that you focus on, you will want to do that here.

Our next steps are for each instructor (tenure and tenure-track) to submit their pre-program assessment results and summary statement to include in this report along with their results and summary statement on the Final exam Form B. All instructors will keep results of their Form B measures from spring 2013 and compare those results with the final, approved, version of Form C to be delivered in fall 2013.

- The attendees thanked the Form C Committee who worked on creating and editing a final exam for Valencia with original passages and questions: Jean-Marie Fuhrman, Liz Earle, Summer Trazerra, Jane MacQuire, Karen Cowden, and Corinne Fennessy.
- Form B Revised will be the final exam used for Summer 2013 by all reading instructors with the exception of those instructors who are piloting Form C.
- Form C Final Exam will be piloted this summer by Summer Trazerra, Jane MacQuire, Liz Earle, and Corinne Fennessy.
- The Final Exam Form B revised is in Blackboard in the Final Exam link in the Developmental Reading Dept. course. Instructions for exporting the test to import it into your own courses are also there on the same page in Blackboard.

Please include the name of the person completing this page and your program:

Karen Cowden, Reading Department

See next page...

## Additional Space for Comments Reporting on Prior Year (if needed)

3) *If you have additional comments for the following question, please share them here:* What were your results?

Our division found incomparable pre-program assessment measures, which resulted in a decision for each instructor to summarize and reflect upon their pre-program measure(s) compared to their post-program assessment results. Across the college our division has comparable results on the post-program assessment measure. Both individual instructors' summaries are submitted, here, along with a summative statement of results from the post-program assessment measure (see below). All instructors reflected on progress with their REA 0017c course(s).

***Note- item analysis chart(s) and CRN detailed reports are on file with PLOA assessment leader and available for review. Further, it is imperative to review our results with "first-year" assessment day experience vision. Some instructors chose the summative written method and others chose the summative chart method. All instructors rose to the challenge of summarizing their results, and participating in this process, with professionalism, swift action, and collegiality – a mark of an excellent team.***

### Individual instructors' summaries

#### 1. Claudine Bentham

- My REA 0017 spring classes completed a diagnostic test on the second day of class. The average for all five classes was 51%.
- At the end of the spring semester of 2013, my students completed the final exam Form B and the overall average was 70%.

CRN#	Diagnostic scores (average)	Final Exam Scores (average)
25138	52.8%	73%
25122	51.6%	66.1%
25141	52.9%	73.2%
25128	50.1 %	68.6%
25136	49%	67%

- The average of the final exam results indicate that my students have improved throughout the semester. There was an 18% increase on their overall performance. In order to continue with ongoing improvements, we need to evaluate and determine the specific skills students tend to have struggle in reading.

#### 2. Elizabeth Earle

- I measured my four REA0017C classes from Spring 2013, using the Initial Diagnostic Score from their lab program, *Connect Reading*. The average diagnostic overall average % score for 4 classes: 59%

CRN#	Diagnostic scores (average)	Final Exam Scores (average)
24474:	55%	77%

27110:	54%	73%
24473:	68%	75%
27663:	58%	63%

❖ *Alternately, I have PERT Reading scores for these same classes, but these are reported as scores, not percentages. Scores on the PERT vary from 50-150.*

- CRN# 24474: 96.8 (This includes 2 students who opted to take REA0017C to be in a Dev. Reading/Writing LinC, but had scores of 142 and 131, respectively.)
- 27110: 92.3
- 24473: 93.2
- 27663: 93.6

### 3. Corinne Fennessy

- I measured three REA 0017 classes out of my 5 classes (3 on-campus and 2 online) who took the same diagnostic test at the beginning of the spring semester 2013. The average for each of the classes were:

CRN	Diagnostic scores (average)	Final exam Form B (average)
25123:	45%	67%
25744:	49%	69%
27279:	45%	69%

- This shows that all three classes made significant improvement over the course of one semester in REA 0017. The average amount of growth was 22 percentage points higher, which is good progress for 15 weeks of instruction. I think that if we used an item analysis to determine which skills showed the most growth and which did not show significant growth, we can determine the specific skill areas that need more attention.

### 4. Jean-Marie Furhman (results compiled by Val Woldman and Jason Balsera in Jean-Marie's absence)

- Jean-Marie measured one REA 0017 class who took a SRA diagnostic test, which was conducted the beginning of spring semester, and the final exam Form B.

CRN	Diagnostic scores (average)	Final exam Form B (average)
25494:	31%	70%

- The scores indicate a 39% average growth in Jean-Marie's REA0017 class.

### 5. Rich Gair

- The low scores obtained on the lab placement indicated that most students have multiple skills weaknesses and thus get assigned several labs to boost their skills. Three sections of REA 017 took Form B of the Final Exam this semester. Through an item analysis the following trends seem to be evident across all three sections. The number of students was low as the classes were all quite small. With that being the case I only have data for the 24 students who took the Final. Larger classes would have hopefully yielded more reliable data that could be generalized across the large population. Once another semester passes and the same version of the test is administered it will be more conclusive in telling me what the weakest skill areas are.
- Strengths include Identifying relationships within a sentence and between sentences, as well as identifying supporting details in a passage. I would like to see them do better on organizational patterns as they are closely related to the relationship skills. I would have expected

better results on the patterns questions since they scored well on the relationships, which in essence form the pattern. Again that says to me they are not seeing the bigger picture as far as patterns just like they do poorly on the main idea-central point, which are also related to seeing the larger picture.

- Data sheets are attached (Note – Rich chose to compile detailed item analysis from his courses. Those are attached at the end of this document for review) but the weak areas that are evident are identifying the main idea (both stated as well as implied) and identifying the central point (stated or implied). The data is fairly consistent across the sections. It does not come as a surprise to me that main idea and central point are weak areas. This is a trend that I have seen repeated over prior academic years. Students have difficulty seeing the bigger picture when reading. Further they also have trouble seeing that a main idea and central point are not the same. I believe they often use the two skill labels interchangeably in their minds as they tackle reading tasks. We do distinguish between the two in our instruction. In fact I have come up with some unique models that I use to teach them how they differ. Still, they continue to struggle with this set of skills.
- Examination of the three classes shows the following averages using the Lab Placement Test given the first week of the term.

CRN 24993- Pretest 52 %, Final Form B 70%  
CRF 24494- Pretest 59 %, Final Form B 78 %  
CRN 24555 Pretest 59 %, Final Form B 71 %

All 3 sections combined scored 57 % on the Pretest and 73 % on the Final Form B.

- My summary is that there was a 16-point jump from the average on the pretest to the Final Form B. Growth did occur, more on one particular section than the others. My item analysis, which I explained above details where the weak and strong areas were. Growth is important and it would be my hope that after further focusing my instruction on the areas indicated as weak that next semester the growth will be greater.

#### 6. Jane Maguire

- The following are the results of the diagnostic versus final exam averages show: 16% average improvement. In each case, the results show improvement between a 12% and 16% average range. In addition to the following results, we have already completed an itemized analysis of the diagnostic assessment should we decide to go further. The final exam itemized analysis has not been completed.

<i>CRN</i>	<i>DIAGNOSTIC AVERAGES</i>	<i>FINAL EXAM AVERAGES</i>
24488	51.15%	69%
24539	52.23%	68.56%
24556	48.86%	66.30%
27484	51.75%	64.16%

#### 7. Dawn Sedik

- I looked at diagnostic scores from TTTT, compared with final exam scores (in percentages) for five classes of students. While not a perfect comparison, the two exams are in the same format, same number of questions with a very similar mix of question types within the same grade level range. Here are the results: (All CRNs are for REA0017)

Section(CRN)	Diagnostic Average ( in %)	Final Exam score (in %)	Average % increase
25135	45.5%	68%	22.5%
25140	48%	72%	24%
25124	51%	75%	24%
25126	53%	74%	21%
25127	49%	73%	24%

- While individual improvements differed, it is apparent that as a whole students in these classes improved their reading performance. At the diagnostic level, the only two skills that students did consistently well on were vocabulary in context and details (literal). The biggest problem areas were main idea, inferences and patterns of organization. Those who had the highest diagnostic scores showed the biggest gains. In the future, repeating the diagnostic test at the end of the semester might yield a more valid comparison. This would only be possible with the longer semester classes, not during the summer, as the same test should not be administered within a four-month period. It is clear to me, however, that learning took place in all five of these sections.

8. Summer Trazerra

- The following are the results of the diagnostic versus final exam averages show: 16% average improvement. In each case, the results show improvement between a 12% and 16% average range. In addition to the following results, we have already completed an itemized analysis of the diagnostic assessment should we decide to go further. The final exam itemized analysis has not been completed.

CRN	DIAGNOSTIC AVERAGES	FINAL EXAM AVERAGES
24496	57.5%	68.98%
27506	51.3%	72.68%
24912	51.5%	64.48%

4) *If you have additional comments for the following question, please share them here: What are the changes / improvements you plan to make within the curriculum (targeted courses), co-curricular program, or student over the next year?*

It seemed imperative that we consider “Best Practices” in design principles with regards to the formatting and standardization of delivery with the new final department-created final exam. Therefore, we implemented some design principles, which not only would help build consistency, but also, would integrate OSD design standards. Finally, with the new features provided within the Blackboard 9.1 upgrade we found it important to be able to complete an item analysis of our test and built in the parameters to collect such data after post-course assessment using simply test question structure. The following e-mail documents the design principles as sent to the Form C Final Exam design team:

Hi Corinne, Jane, Summer, and Liz,

I hope you all had as smooth of a Monday me! I got so much final polishing of my Kellogg Institute report, lots of changes in my online REA 0017c course (I hope to share those with the reading team as I am using more non-publisher material - as requested). Maybe I can set aside a day to share it with the gang when we meet again?

Action item: To wrap-up our final exam - Form C process, can you (Corinne and Jane) add your 9 questions/passages into the "Form C" exam in Blackboard following the design standards, below? Summer and Jane finished theirs during the Assessment Day timeframe (speedy gals). Since Corinne took meeting notes and did all the work of the item analysis, I will import Jean Marie's passages and complete the paper OSD versions (both the test and the answer key). Then, I will send a note to all to approve the final test version, OSD version, OSD answer key, and item analysis.

Thanks, team! We did a spectacular job with bringing this together and making it happen. :)

## FINAL EXAM DESIGN GUIDELINES:

- \* All questions are to be titled by story subject/underscore title as follows:
  - \* "Vocabulary\_Sheriff's Drones"
- \* All passages are in 14-point Times New Roman font
- \* All vocabulary words are in bold and italics
- \* All passages are to be included in each test question box
- \* All questions are to be listed at the bottom of each passage box as follows: 'QUESTION: \_\_\_\_\_'
- \* All answers are to be in lower-case a, b, c, d form
- \* All answers are to be randomized

6) *If you have additional comments for the following question, please share them here:* What are your next steps – acting on the results? If these steps include the development and implementation of a new assessment, include that information here. If you plan to change the current assessment or the program learning outcome that you focus on, you will want to do that here.

See next page....

# Planning for AY 2013-2014 Learning Outcomes and Performance Indicators

**Complete only the sections that apply to your work.**

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

College Preparatory Reading – I & II

**Targeted Program Learning Outcome(s)**

**(How many will you be assessing this coming year?):**

- We will be targeting the growth between the Form B publisher-content test passages and questions versus our Form C department-created test passages and questions.
- We will be redesigning the entire College Preparatory Reading program to accommodate the legislative actions from 2013 session, inclusive of the Conference Committee changes to SB 1720 and HB 7057.
- We will review the literature and “Best Practices” of other states, which have recently made changes to their preparatory programs based on legislative changes from a mandated enrollment to a student opt-in design.

**Targeted Course(s), Co-Curricular Program or Student Activity associated with the Academic Program:**

- College Preparatory Reading II (REA 0017c)
- College Preparatory Reading I (REA 0007c)

**Targeted Outcome(s) within the Course(s), Co-Curricular Program or Student Activity identified above:**

- Measure student growth between department-designed Form B final exam and Form C final exam.
- Align our work to best support Student Learning Outcomes for redesigning the entire College Preparatory Reading program to accommodate the legislative actions from 2013 session, inclusive of the Conference Committee changes to SB 1720 and HB 7057.

**Performance Indicators for the Program Learning Outcome(s) selected:**

In light of the recent legislative changes, we will need to thoughtfully review the literature and “Best Practices” of other states, which have recently made changes to their preparatory programs based on legislative changes from a mandated enrollment to a student opt-in design. Our overarching learning outcomes will be to improve student critical thinking, student success, and reading skills across the disciplines.

**Performance Indicators for Outcome(s) within the Course(s), Co-Curricular Program or Student Activity selected:**

In light of the recent legislative changes, we will need to thoughtfully review the literature and “Best Practices” of other states, which have recently made changes to their preparatory programs based on legislative changes from a mandated enrollment to a student opt-in design. Our overarching learning outcomes will be to improve student critical thinking, student success, and reading skills across the disciplines

**External Standard(s) in the field or discipline (please contact Laura Blasi [lblasi@valenciacollege.edu](mailto:lblasi@valenciacollege.edu) with any questions about this):**

In light of the recent legislative changes, we will need to thoughtfully review the literature and “Best Practices” of other states, which have recently made changes to their preparatory programs based on legislative changes from a mandated enrollment to a student opt-in design. Our overarching learning outcomes will be to improve student critical thinking, student success, and reading skills across the disciplines.

**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):**

- Instructors piloting Form C final exam for summer term will compare data from their student results on Form B final exam.
  - Both Form B and Form C were designed and delivered in Blackboard.

- Instructors, in light of the recent legislative changes, will thoughtfully review the literature and “Best Practices” of other states, which have recently made changes to their preparatory programs based on legislative changes from a mandated enrollment to a student opt-in design to consider a common assessment measure that makes sense with the college objectives and initiatives for the envisioned preparatory program(s). Our overarching learning outcomes will be to improve student critical thinking, student success, and reading skills across the disciplines.

**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):

- The Form C final exam was created to measure student growth across nine course learning outcomes. The faculty agreed that design and delivery of these learning activities helped support student measure of growth in overall skills building critical thinking, active learning, enhanced communication, and value judgment skills.
- Instructors, in light of the recent legislative changes, will thoughtfully review the literature and “Best Practices” of other states, which have recently made changes to their preparatory programs based on legislative changes from a mandated enrollment to a student opt-in design to consider a common assessment measure that makes sense with the college objectives and initiatives for the envisioned preparatory program(s). Our overarching learning outcomes will be to improve student critical thinking, student success, and reading skills across the disciplines.

**Proposed Assessment Instrument** (In some cases the assessment method may not need an associated assessment instrument – e.g., multiple choice tests):

- At the time of this writing, our assessment instrument will be a multiple choice 36-question, online delivered, final exam.
- **Note - in light of the recent legislative changes, will thoughtfully review the literature and “Best Practices” of other states, which have recently made changes to their preparatory programs based on legislative changes from a mandated enrollment to a student opt-in design to consider a common assessment measure that makes sense with the college objectives and initiatives for the envisioned preparatory program(s). Our overarching learning outcomes will be to improve student critical thinking, student success, and reading skills across the disciplines.**

## Implementation Process

### Collection of Student Artifacts

**What information needs to be communicated to students concerning the assessment process (informed consent, etc.)?**

- *In light of the recent legislative changes, we may need to consider communicating the impact of an “opt-in” program to our student body. Pathways to make this communication clear, thoughtful, and supported through academic advising will need to be thoughtfully reviewed.*
- At this time, students will be informed their final exam percentage as it relates to their overall course grade via the course syllabus as well as their pre-evaluative measure impact on overall comparative classes of performance.

**How will student artifacts or data associated with student performance be collected?**

- Individual instructors will collect, and average, student’s PERT scores as well as data a pre-program measure of their choice. Instructors will retain this data and present to the reading team during a fall assessment/re-design summit session.

**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?**

- At this time, we will not be randomly sampling students. All students will be informed their final exam percentage as it relates to their overall course grade via the course syllabus as well as their pre-evaluative measure impact on overall comparative classes of performance. **However, In light of the recent legislative changes, we may need to consider communicating randomly sampling some of the students in the fall and spring terms for an opt-in**

*pilot course design based on PERT scores/grade point averages. It is imperative that we plan and evaluate the impact of an “opt-in” program to our student body. Pathways to make this communication clear, thoughtful, and supported through academic advising will need to be thoughtfully reviewed.*

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

- We have been using a “Reading Department” Blackboard course shell for the past year and will continue to use this platform to communicate legislative changes, share “Best Practices”, and results of student pre-program measures. Further, as we have direction from the Florida College System and leadership team at Valencia College we will gather to communicate and inform each other of our research and review of results.

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

- Individual instructors will collect and compile summative results of their students’ pre and post assessment measures and build a repository of their results/artifacts.

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

- Individual instructors will post their pre-program measure and results in the “Reading Department” Blackboard shell after the first two weeks of the semester.
- Individual instructors will post their results post-assessment results in the “Reading Department” Blackboard shell one week after final exams.

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

**When will student artifacts be assessed / evaluated?**

- Individual instructors will evaluate their pre-program results after the first month of the semester and post a summative paragraph evaluation of the results prior to mid-term of the semester in the “Reading Department” Blackboard shell.
- Individual instructors will evaluate their post-assessment results after the first month of the semester and post a summative paragraph evaluation of the results prior to mid-term of the semester in the “Reading Department” Blackboard shell.

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

- Individual instructors will evaluate their students’ results and share summative feedback in the “Reading Department” Blackboard shell prior to mid-term.
- College-wide Reading Department instructors will gather to share and evaluate their students’ results of the post-assessment measure (Form C of Final Exam) prior to start of the following term (less than one week after final exam delivery).

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

- All College Preparatory Reading Instructors, in light of the recent legislative changes, will need intense support from the college to adequately prepare for the student learning outcomes/assessment measures from a mandated enrollment 16-week courses sequence to a student opt-in enrollment, accelerated model.
- All instructors will need to be retrained to meet the demands of a redesign.
- Training on various models of delivery will need to be considered that makes sense with the college objectives and initiatives for the envisioned preparatory program(s) alongside the “Start Right” and “LifeMap” objectives.
- Clear communication and open-door feedback will be needed to train and prepare adequately for the redesign initiatives. As a program we will need to collect students artifacts, which improve student critical thinking, student success, and reading skills across the disciplines.
- **Faculty will need to be trained on the new Blackboard program upgrades.**

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

- Individual instructors will evaluate their students' results and share summative feedback in the "Reading Department" Blackboard shell prior to mid-term.
- College-wide Reading Department instructors will gather to share and evaluate their students' results of the post-assessment measure (Form C of Final Exam) prior to start of the following term (less than one week after final exam delivery).

**What are your predictions regarding student performance? (What do you expect to see when you analyze your results?)**

- In light of the recent legislative changes, we predict a busy year!
- What we expect to see from our Form C final exam results is similar scores (if not slightly higher) than with the publisher content, and overarching improvement with student learning outcomes with regards to critical thinking, student success, and reading skills across the disciplines.

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

- All College Preparatory Reading Instructors, in light of the recent legislative changes, will need intense support from the college to adequately prepare for the student learning outcomes/assessment measures from a mandated enrollment 16-week courses sequence to a student opt-in enrollment, accelerated model.
- All instructors will need to be retrained to meet the demands of a redesign.
- Training on various models of delivery will need to be considered that makes sense with the college objectives and initiatives for the envisioned preparatory program(s) alongside the "Start Right" and "LifeMap" objectives.
- Clear communication and open-door feedback will be needed to train and prepare adequately for the redesign initiatives. As a program we will need to collect students artifacts, which improve student critical thinking, student success, and reading skills across the disciplines.
- **Faculty will need to be trained on the new Blackboard program upgrades.**

**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)**

- **All College disciplines, in light of the recent legislative changes, will need to be included to adequately prepare for the student learning outcomes/assessment measures from a mandated enrollment 16-week courses sequence to a student opt-in enrollment, accelerated model.**  
**Specifically,**
  - Gordon-Rule Instructors
  - Academic Advising
  - Financial Aid
  - Enrollment
  - Gen. Ed.
  - Office of Students with Disabilities

- All instructors will need to be retrained to meet the demands of a redesign.
- Training on various models of delivery will need to be considered that makes sense with the college objectives and initiatives for the envisioned preparatory program(s) alongside the “Start Right” and “LifeMap” objectives.
- Clear communication and open-door feedback will be needed to train and prepare adequately for the redesign initiatives. As a program we will need to collect students artifacts, which improve student critical thinking, student success, and reading skills across the disciplines.
- *Faculty will need to be trained on the new Blackboard program upgrades.*

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

- Deans (and those stakeholders that request access) are currently enrolled as “Guests” in the “Reading Department Blackboard course and will be informed when new summative reports from faculty are compiled.

**Approval Process**

<b>Activities Associated with the Approval of Assessment Plans</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Results</b>
Draft assessment plan is circulated for input to reviewers appropriate to the program / discipline (including Deans / Directors responsible for supporting and promoting the work necessary for the implementation of the Assessment Plan)	May 10, 2013	Karen Cowden	Instructors showed positive feedback from the options allowed with pre-program measures. Further, instructors were supportive of our first time Assessment Day experience and demonstrated compassionate support.
College-wide live or e-mail / Blackboard discussion will be coordinated to consider input received (if needed)	May 2 <sup>nd</sup> – May 14 <sup>th</sup> , 2013	Karen Cowden	Individual e-mailing of instructors has proven problematic; however, it is not unexpected with a first attempt. A success was sending “Outlook Calendar” events to all parties with a follow-up reminder note of the location of day’s activities and agenda. Input was received from meeting minutes (compiled by Corinne Fennessy) as well as the revisions to the pre-program measure(s).
Draft assessment plan is revised to reflect input	May 14 <sup>th</sup> – 18 <sup>th</sup> , 2013	Claudine Bentham Elizabeth Earle Corinne Fennessy Val Woldman (for Jean-Marie	We have two individuals completing their Year-2 TLA process. As such, we wanted to allow some grace to their timeframes. Laura Balasi approved an extension of the final report to be completed by May 18 <sup>th</sup> . Thank you!

		Fuhrman) Rich Gair Jane Maguire Dawn Sedik Summer Trazzera	
Faculty vote on the Assessment Plan using the Current voter eligibility list for curriculum ( <a href="http://valenciacollege.edu/faculty/forms/voterlists/">http://valenciacollege.edu/faculty/forms/voterlists/</a> )	May 17 <sup>th</sup> , 2013	Claudine Bentham Elizabeth Earle Corinne Fennessy Val Woldman (for Jean-Marie Fuhrman) Rich Gair Jane Maguire Dawn Sedik Summer Trazzera	A "Survey Monkey" survey was sent to all faculty to vote on assessment day.

## Dean / Director Support

The Dean(s) responsible for supporting and promoting the work necessary for the implementation of the Assessment Plan need to indicate their support for the plan. Please copy and paste in E-mail approval (as applies) at the end of the document and then send the form complete to us or obtain, scan, and send handwritten signatures and then send.

SEE BELOW E-Mail Approval

Michelle McArdle Dean / Director Winter Park Campus	Signature
Jenni Campbell Dean / Director Osceola / Lake Nona Campus	Signature
Elizabeth Renn Dean / Director West Campus	Signature
Linda Neal Dean / Director East	Signature

**From:** Elizabeth Renn

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 14, 2013 10:16 AM

**To:** Karen Cowden; Liz Earle; Jane Maguire; Summer Trazzera; Corinne Fennessy; Claudine Benthams; Dawn Sedik; Richard Gair; Jean Marie Fuhrman; Stephanie Freuler; Carolyn Karraker

**Cc:** Linda Neal; Michele McArdle; Jenni Campbell; Karen Marie Borglum; Laura Blasi

**Subject:** RE: Form for Approval/Feedback: Program Outcomes Assessment

Add my support to the list!

Linda

*Linda R. Neal*

Interim Dean, Communications

East Campus

Hi Karen,

I notice at the end of the report that Deans are supposed to email a note of support for the plan to include with the report when you submit it. I support this plan. Great work, team.

Beth

I also support the plan. Great work!

Jenni

I approve the plan.

Michele