**Continuous Improvement Plan**

**Outcomes might not change from year to year. For example, if you have not met previous targets, you may wish to retain the same outcomes. *If this is an academic, workforce, or continuing education program, you must have at least one student learning outcome.* You may also add short-term administrative, technological, assessment, resource or professional development goals, as needed.**

**Date:** 2-01-20 **Name of Program/Unit:** General Education/Core Curriculum

**Contact name:** Jon Hardesty **Contact email:** jhardesty@collin.edu **Contact phone:**  972-549-6338

**Table 1: CIP Outcomes, Measures & Targets Table (focus on at least one for the next two years)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **A. Expected Outcome(s)**Results expected in this unit(e.g. Authorization requests will be completed more quickly; Increase client satisfaction with our services) |  **B. Measure(s)**Instrument(s)/process(es) used to measure results(e.g. survey results, exam questions, etc.) | **C. Target(s)**Level of success expected(e.g. 80% approval rating, 10 day faster request turn-around time, etc.) |
| Current: Collect and use data from COAT assessment to measure progress  | Current: COAT assessment documents | Current: Level 3 on average (on a 4-point scale) |
| Increase faculty knowledge and skill on how to align COAT assessment assignments to corresponding COAT assessment rubric  | Professional Development Exit Survey | 80% of faculty report an increase in knowledge and skills on how to align COAT assessment assignments to corresponding COAT assessment rubric  |
|  |  |  |

**Description of Fields in the Following CIP Tables:**

**A. Outcome(s)** -Results expected in this program (e.g. Students will learn how to compare/contrast conflict and structural functional theories; increase student retention in Nursing Program).

**B. Measure(s)** -Instrument(s)/process(es) used to measure results

(e.g. results of surveys, test item questions 6 & 7 from final exam, end of term retention rates, etc.)

**C. Target(s)** -Degree of success expected (e.g. 80% approval rating, 25 graduates per year, increase retention by 2% etc.).

**D. Action Plan** -Based on analysis, identify actions to be taken to accomplish outcome. What will you do?

**E. Results Summary** - Summarize the information and data collected in year 1.

**F. Findings** - Explain how the information and data has impacted the expected outcome and program success.

**G. Implementation of Findings** – Describe how you have used or will use your findings and analysis of the data to make improvements.

**Table 2. CIP Outcomes 1 & 2 (FOCUS ON AT LEAST 1)**

**Results from prior CIP:**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Outcome #1**

Collect and use data from COAT assessment to measure progress  |
| 1. **Measure (Outcome #1)**

COAT assessment documents (i.e. student artifacts and COAT rubrics) | 1. **Target (Outcome #1)**

Level 3, on average |
| 1. **Action Plan (Outcome #1)**

Targeted efforts were undertaken to emphasize for faculty the importance of teaching core objectives in their classes routinely. During the Summer of 2017, Academic Services staff planned, developed, and presented a Train-the-Trainer workshop to all Deans, Associate Deans and Discipline Leads. This step-by-step training was designed to assist them in facilitating training for all faculty in their respective disciplines on a) the inter-rater reliability process and b) the implications of misaligned assignments. Moreover, during the Fall 17 and Spring 18 discipline leads meetings for transfer programs, discipline lead faculty members were asked to encourage their colleagues to highlight for students the core objectives that were being addressed with each learning activities assigned to students during their class meetings. This discussion occurred in the department meetings conducted prior to each long semester. The goal of this activity was simply to ensure that faculty were making students aware of how and when core objectives were being taught in classes. Additionally, Collin College expanded this effort by inviting Dr. Lorraine Phillips, the Associate Provost of Academic Effectiveness at Georgia Tech University, and former chair of LEAP Texas to come to Collin for the Fall 2018 Faculty Development Conference to deliver a presentation on the importance of designing assessments that are well aligned to the core objectives to allow students to effectively demonstrate their skills with the core objectives. The talk presented by Dr. Phillips prompted one faculty member, Professor of History Matthew Coulter, to present a professional development session entitled “Scaffolding Toward a Better Artifact” at the Spring 2019 Faculty Professional Development Conference, nicely supplementing the session presented at this same conference by the Core Objective Assessment Team, |
| 1. **Results Summary (Outcome #1)**

Assessment Day results of the student artifacts of core objective assessments collected during the 18-19 academic year are summarized below. Only the Empirical & Quantitative and the Personal Responsibility core objectives were assessed this year. Results for the personal responsibility assessment found that students demonstrated a mean rating of 2.0 (on a 4-point scale) for the three criteria assessed on the rubric (choices, actions, and consequences), missing the desired goal of an average score of 3.0. In the case of students with 12-15 SCH of core courses completed, only 34-35% met the standard of an average score of 3.0 on each criterion. Whereas in the case of students with 30+ SCH of core courses completed, only 30-38% met the standard of an average score of 3.0 on each criterion.Results for the Empirical & Quantitative assessment found that students demonstrated a mean rating of 3.0 (on a 4.0 scale) for the three criteria assessed on this rubric (manipulation of numerical data, analysis of numerical data, and informed conclusions). Those students with 12-15 SCH of core courses completed, 61-69% of the students met the standard of an average score of 3.0 on each criterion; whereas, in the case of students with 30+ SCH of core courses completed, 63-70% of the students met the standard of an average score of 3.0 on each criterion. |
| 1. **Findings (Outcome #1)**

Prior assessment of the Personal Responsibility Core Objective was conducted in the 16-17 academic year. During this assessment, the average scores obtained on each criterion of the three assessed on the rubric ranged from 1.9 – 2.1. Among those students with 12-15 SCH of core courses completed 31-33% met the standard of a 3.0 or higher on the 4-point scale of the rubric, and among those students with 30 or more SCH of core courses completed, 28-32% met the standard of 3.0 or higher on the 4-point scale of the rubric. Comparison of the results from 16-17 with those from 18-19 reveal little improvement from one assessment cycle to the next for the personal responsibility objective.Prior assessment of the Empirical & Quantitative Core Objective was also conducted during the 16-17 academic year. During this assessment cycle, the average scores on each of the three criteria on the rubric ranged from 2.1 - 2.5. Among those students with 12-15 SCH of core courses completed, 37-46% met the standard of a 3.0 or higher on the 4-point scale of the rubric, and among those students with 30 or more SCH of core courses completed, 31-59% met the standard of a 3.0 or higher on a 4-point scale of the rubric. In the case of Empirical & Quantitative meaningful improvement in the average scores were obtained from 16-17 to 18-19. Examination of many of the student artifacts relating to the E&Q objective revealed that a large number of faculty members made concerted efforts to better align their assessment activities to the rubric. Specifically, it was noted that a number of faculty members (or departments-for those choosing to implement departmental core assessment activities) made a concerted effort to utilize guided inquiry approaches in developing their assessment activities that were well aligned to the rubric used to assess student work.  |
| 1. **Implementation of Findings**

For the first time at Collin College since the Core Objectives began being assessed on a pilot basis (in 2011-2012) we have seen meaningful improvement in the assessment of student performance related to one core objective. The knowledge and insight provided by Dr. Phillips in her talk at the beginning of the fall 2018 academic year proved helpful for faculty assessing the Empirical & Quantitative Objective. More targeted efforts aimed at assisting those assessing four of the other five objectives are needed at Collin College. |

**New CIP for Implementation During the ‘20-‘21 Academic Year**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Outcome #1**

Increase faculty knowledge and skills on how to align COAT assessment assignments to corresponding COAT assessment rubrics |
| 1. **Measure (Outcome #1)**

Professional Development Exit Survey | 1. **Target (Outcome #1)**

80% of faculty report an increase in knowledge and skills on how to align COAT assessment assignments to corresponding COAT assessment rubrics |
| 1. **Action Plan (Outcome #1)**

Work collaboratively with COAT to - * Design an annual theme that aligns to the COAT assessment schedule (for example, “***Socially Responsible and Critical Thinking Learners***” for 2020-2021
* Develop a targeted training schedule that aligns to the COAT assessment schedule
* Search and recruit faculty or consultants who are experts in the focused core objectives (to conduct the training)
* Coordinate an annual training and ongoing support for faculty teaching courses in the focused, targeted core objectives

The development of an annual training that concentrates on the core objectives that will be assessed in the upcoming academic year provides an opportunity to focus on the specific knowledge and skills faculty need in these core objectives assessment assignments. A college-wide assessment theme will serve to strengthen awareness and support for faculty who need to participate in the targeted training. |
| 1. **Results Summary (Outcome #1)**
 |
| 1. **Findings (Outcome #1)**
 |
| 1. **Implementation of Findings**
 |