



# MID-CYCLE REPORT

PREPARED FOR THE NORTHWEST COMMISSION  
ON COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES  
SEPTEMBER, 2016

SALISH KOOTENAI COLLEGE

Institutional Overview and Context	2
Part I Overview of Institutional Assessment Plan	3
1. Are your core these and objectives still valid?	
2. Describe/ explain your process of assessing mission fulfillment.	
3. Is the institution satisfied that the core themes and indicators are providing sufficient evidence?	
Part II Representative Examples	9
1. Example 1: Student Learning Outcomes Assessment	9
2. Example 2: Assessment of General Education Outcomes	12
Part III Preparation for Year Seven	15
Conclusion	16
List of Appendices	17

## **Institutional Overview and Context**

While not requested as part of the Mid-Cycle Review, Salish Kootenai College provides this overview to provide context and inform reviewers who may not be familiar with tribal colleges.

Salish Kootenai College (SKC) is a tribal college chartered by the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes (CSKT) in 1976 to provide postsecondary education opportunities for Native Americans. The Articles of Incorporation delineate the purposes of the College as provision of post-secondary educational opportunities, including 1) Vocational Training, 2) College Transfer Programs, 3) Occupational Training, 4) Community Service, 5) Indian Culture and History, and 6) Adult Basic Education. SKC is dedicated to meeting the needs of individual tribal members, the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes, and American Indians (AI) throughout the United States. While the College maintains an open admissions policy and serves as a community college for the non-Indian community members, the primary focus is on education of tribal members and descendants of enrolled tribal members. Curricula include vocational and academic programs that meet the needs of AI communities as well as classes and activities that sustain the traditional knowledge and practices of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai peoples.

Over the last two years, SKC experienced changes in senior leadership that provided serious challenges to the institution. The most impactful of these changes was the terminal illness of President Robert DePoe III, who died in December 2016. During the 15 months of President DePoe's illness, SKC and tribal culture provided that he remain in place as president while administrative team members carried out both presidential functions and their other responsibilities. Changes in leadership and prioritization of institutional activities resulted in delays in completion of some of SKC's planned activities related to institutional assessment, planning and change to increase effectiveness in the Core Themes.

In February 2016, the Salish Kootenai College Board of Directors installed SKC President Sandra Boham – formerly SKC Vice President for Academic Affairs. A new Vice President for Academic Affairs started in his position in July 2016 and SKC's organizational structure was revised in early September 2016. While these changes impacted institutional progress in some areas, the College continued to function effectively with forward progress in new academic programs, new student success initiatives, and new facilities.

The SKC Board of Directors affirmed a new vision statement in November 2015. That vision and the SKC Mission Statement and Core Themes informed development of a new Strategic Plan 2016-2020. Now focused with a new vision statement, strategic plan, and president, SKC is again ready to fulfill its logo, "Grounded in Tradition. Charging into the Future."

## PART I. Overview of Institutional Assessment Plan

Salish Kootenai College assesses mission fulfillment through multiple measures that center on its Core Themes. Because the Core Themes are directly derived from the institutional mission, the Themes are still valid and direct institutional planning, evaluation, and action. Many institutional processes use the Core Themes as a central focus, including annual department planning, academic program review, long-term strategic planning, and employee evaluation processes.

The four Core Themes were adopted by the Board of Directors in spring 2011 and directly relate to the institutional mission.

1. Provide Access to Higher Education for American Indians
2. Maintain Quality Education for Workforce or Further Education
3. Perpetuate the Cultures of Confederated Salish and Kootenai Peoples
4. Increase Individual and Community Capacity for Self Reliance and Sustainability

The Core Themes and objectives remain valid as they collectively represent the essential elements of the SKC Mission, as demonstrated in Table 1:

Table 1. Relationship of SKC Mission and Core Themes

<b>Mission</b>	<i>The mission of Salish Kootenai College is to <b>provide quality postsecondary educational opportunities</b> for Native Americans, locally and from throughout the United States. The College will promote <b>individual and community development</b> and help <b>perpetuate the languages and cultures of the Confederated Tribes of the Flathead Indian Nation.</b></i>			
<b>Core Themes</b>	<b>Provide Access to Higher Education for American Indians</b>	<b>Maintain Quality Education for Workforce or Further Education</b>	<b>Perpetuate the Languages and Cultures of the Salish, Pend D'Oreille, and Kootenai Tribes</b>	<b>Increase Individual and Community Capacity</b>
<b>Objectives</b>	<i>Access</i>	<i>Quality Faculty</i>	<i>Community Cultural Knowledge</i>	<i>Individual Impact</i>
	<i>Persistence</i>	<i>Quality Curricula</i>		
		<i>Quality Student Outcomes</i>	<i>Individual Cultural Knowledge</i>	<i>Community Impact</i>

## Core Theme Objectives and Indicators

Core Themes are associated with two to three objectives, each with up to six indicators. Indicators consist of appropriately-defined data that provide evidence of accomplishment of the objectives. Indicators are chosen to be actionable – that is, if the indicators do not meet benchmarks, there are actions which could be taken to improve effectiveness. Benchmarks were set using factors such as internal historical trends or external benchmarks such as IPEDS, the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) or Noel Levitz data. Indicators have been updated if needed, for example if assessment data suggests the baseline indicator is too low. New indicators are added if they seem appropriate and necessary to assessment of institutional effectiveness. For instance, in spring 2016 the indicator, “Percentage and number of students with unmet financial need” was added to Core Theme One (Access), Objective #1 (Access), as changes in PELL grant eligibility and scholarship availability may impact students’ ability to enroll or persist in college. The indicator is actionable, as SKC maintains institutional scholarships and the SKC Foundation actively works to provide scholarship funding for students with unmet need.

Table 2. Core Themes, Objectives, and Indicators

Objective	Indicators
<b>Core Theme 1. Provide Access to Higher Education for American Indians</b>	
Objective 1.1 Access: Serve American Indian and under-represented students including economically-disadvantaged, academically-disadvantaged, and first generation college students.	1.1.a. Percentage of student body that is American Indian
	1.1.b. Percentage of student body receiving PELL Grant
	1.1.c. Percentage and number of students with unmet financial need (new spring 2016)
	1.1.c Student participation in and satisfaction with student support service programs: Academic Advising Enrollment Services Financial Aid Services
	1.1.d. Student satisfaction with support for learners, full time and part time
	1.1.e. Percentage of students who enter college from the HiSet program and persist through first year
Objective 1.2 Persistence: American Indian and under-represented students, including economically-disadvantaged, academically-disadvantaged, and first generation college students, persist to educational goals.	1.2.a. Percentage of eligible students that continue from associate degree to bachelor degree at SKC
	1.2.b. Fall-to-fall persistence rates of students that continue from associate degree to bachelor degree at SKC
	1.2.c. Fall-to-fall persistence rates of students that start in developmental coursework
	1.2.d. Fall-to-fall persistence rates for:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• American Indian Students</li> <li>• First Generation College Students</li> <li>• PELL Recipients</li> <li>• Academically Disadvantaged</li> </ul>
	1.2.d. Graduation Rates of full-time associate degree and full-time bachelor degree students at 150% of estimated time to completion
<b>Core Theme 2. Maintain Quality Education for Workforce or Further Education</b>	
Objective 2.1 Promote Quality Curricula	2.1.a. Results of Academic Program Review demonstrate quality, relevant curricula
	2.1.b. Community College Survey of Student Engagement results indicate students are engaged in learning at levels greater or equal to comparison institutions: Student Effort (SE) Academic Challenge (AC) Student-Faculty Interaction (SFI)
	2.1.c. Department Advisory Board review of curricula
Objective 2.2. Provide Quality Faculty	2.2.a. Faculty members have appropriate experiential and/or educational qualifications
	2.2.b. Part Time Faculty are approved by the VPAA and have credentials and experience on file
	2.2.c. Faculty development and scholarship demonstrate that faculty maintain current expertise. (New spring 2016)
	2.2.d. Students perceive that faculty provide quality education. - quality of relationship with instructors (CCSSE) - instructor expertise (SSS) - academic advising (SSS) - quality of teaching (SSS)
Objective 2.3 Promote Quality Student Outcomes	2.3.a. Graduate surveys of student perceptions of the degree to which curricula prepared them for employment or transfer
	2.3.b. Percentage of students/graduates in eligible programs that pass certification exams
	2.3.c. Annual Program Learning Outcomes Assessment (LOAP) leads to actions for improvement of student learning.
	2.3.d. General Education assessment indicates that students achieve desired competencies in Critical Thinking, Communication, Citizenship, and Cultural Understanding (the '4 Cs')

Core Theme 3. Perpetuate the Cultures of Confederated Salish and Kootenai Peoples	
Objective 3.1 Support Individual Cultural Knowledge of Students, Faculty, and Staff Members	Student satisfaction with incorporation of culture into classes and curricula – “The College provides Native American cultural content in most classes”
	Student responses to course evaluation item, “This course helped improve my understanding of Native American culture and the local reservation community.”
	Student statement, “I increased my knowledge/skills this year in “Cultural Understanding”
	Faculty and staff satisfaction with opportunities to increase knowledge of CSKT culture, language, and current issues
	Faculty and Staff knowledge of “5 Key Concepts.”
Objective 3.2 Support Community Cultural Knowledge	Number of classes, seminars, events, and trainings with a focus on cultural perpetuation
	Number of community members who participate in classes, seminars, trainings
	Qualitative data from Cultural Advisory Committee (new fall 2016)
Core Theme 4. Increase Individual and Community Capacity for Self Reliance and Sustainability	
Objective 4.1 Individual Impact: Increase student capacity for self-reliance and meaningful contribution to one’s community.	4.1.a. Percentage of eligible students completing service learning activities
	4.1.b. Number of students who provide responses within defined qualitative themes concerning graduate perceptions of impact on their communities and role as a citizen (To be refined 2016-2017)
	4.1.c. Number (percentage) of first time students completing financial literacy training
	4.1.d. Graduate satisfaction with the extent to which SKC prepared them to care for themselves and their families
Objective 4.2 Community Impact: Increase community capacity and promote community development.	4.2.a. Number of SKC graduates working on the Flathead Indian Reservation or other reservations or in other settings working with AI people
	4.2.b. Number and dollar amount of NEW grants, research, and funded projects that directly impact individual and community well-being and the natural resource base

	4.2.c. Percentage of faculty and staff participating in community service outside of regular work activities
	4.2.d. Number of events and attendees that focus on individual/community development and impact the well-being of tribal communities

The objectives and indicators for Core Themes 1 and 2 (Access and Quality Education) continue to be effective means of improving institutional effectiveness, as they are measurable, appropriate, and actionable. There are sufficient numbers of indicators to provide a broad look at college effectiveness in these areas.

The institution continues to discuss and improve indicators associated with Core Themes 3 and 4. While there are sufficient indicators to provide a broad look at effectiveness in these Core Themes, college administration and the Theme Teams continue to review the indicators and strive to develop more meaningful data, including qualitative data that is aligned with Native American perspectives of effectiveness in cultural perpetuation and community development.

Determination of appropriate outcomes, indicators, and benchmarks for Core Theme 3 is confounded by several factors, including the intangible nature of cultural perpetuation and lack of consensus concerning the role of the College in cultural perpetuation. As the College has moved to strengthen its Native American Studies Department, its role in language education, and its relationships with the Salish/Pend d’Oreille and Kootenai Culture Committees, Theme Team 3 progressively gains a deeper understanding of how to measure cultural literacy and perpetuation. While this Core Theme is fundamental to the role of a tribal college, measurement of institutional effectiveness in this area will continue to develop. Continuing efforts in assessment, planning, and action have already impacted the achievement of the objectives of Core Theme 3. Through the efforts of Theme Team 3 and the actions of determining indicators, the College moved several steps forward on the path toward engaging with the community in the effort to promote cultural literacy and perpetuate the cultures of the Salish, Kootenai, and Pend d’Oreille.

Current assessment and planning structures for CT 4 create a vehicle for ongoing improvement through integration resource utilization, assessment of capacity, and evaluation of practices, and planning. The indicators for Community Impact continue to develop over time, as the College increases its engagement in intentional community-building activities.

In addition to Core Theme data and Core Theme Reports (described below), the College utilizes multiple additional data sources to assess mission effectiveness. These reports are provided to the Board of Directors and other campus stakeholders; data from these reports rolls into Core Theme Reports. Appendix A summarizes institutional effectiveness reporting that is provided to stakeholders.

Core Theme Reports

Core Theme Reports summarize annual data for the objectives and indicators. Each indicator is associated with benchmarks, a status indicator, data, and data source(s). Two benchmarks are



established for each indicator: a baseline and an aspirational benchmark. The baseline represents SKC's minimum expectation for performance, whereas the aspirational data point provides SKC's ambitions for achievement for each particular indicator. In Core Theme Reports, green, yellow, and red "lights" are used for status indicators. The key to the lights is consistent throughout the core themes: red is below baseline benchmark; yellow is between baseline and aspirational benchmarks, and green is at or above the aspirational benchmark. The status indicators are provided as a dashboard, so individuals who are quickly reviewing Core Theme Monitoring Reports can scan for a sense of whether or not the institution is achieving the benchmarks. The use of dashboard indicators is effective in Core Theme review by senior administration; administrators use talk about methods for improving effectiveness as "moving towards green" in specific indicators. A sample Core Theme Report is included as Appendix B.

During the initial definition of core theme objectives and indicators, a Theme Team was assigned to each Core Theme. Theme Teams continued to meet in subsequent years, reviewing data and indicators. Only the Theme Team associated with Core Theme Three, Cultural Perpetuation, met during Academic Year 2015-2016. Other Theme Team meetings were deferred for the year as the institution worked toward a new strategic plan and revisited core theme indicators.

While Theme Teams did not meet in 2015-2016, institutional data and Core Theme reports continued to inform institutional planning and actions. Additionally, Theme Team members were actively involved in facilitating focus groups and other listening sessions during development of the Strategic Plan 2016-2020. Core Theme Three met to advise the Strategic Planning Task Force, as Team members include a member of the Board of Directors as well as faculty and staff who are CSKT tribal members who are passionate about the area of cultural perpetuation. The Cultural Perpetuation Theme Team provided continued suggestions for objectives and indicators to improve institutional effectiveness in CT Three.

### Analysis

SKC's Core Themes are derived directly from the institutional mission statement. Together, the Core Themes represent the essential functions and focus of the College. The selected objectives and indicators provide sufficient evidence regarding mission fulfillment and indications of areas for changed resource allocation or further planning. There is a need for further development or refinement of indicators for Core Themes 3 and 4, and particularly a move to more direct indicators. While indirect measures such as student satisfaction surveys provide important data that can lead to institutional action, the College needs to move to more direct measures in areas such as Core Theme 3, Cultural Perpetuation, through determination of valid and reliable measures of student/faculty/staff learning as well as continuing to use qualitative measures such as input from elders and others.

## **PART II. Representative Examples**

SKC provides two examples of how the College has operationalized its mission of providing quality postsecondary education as well as Core Theme Two, Quality Education. Example 1 provides a summary of SKC's Student Learning Outcomes Assessment process and the specific example of outcomes assessment by the Business Technology and Hydrology Departments. Example 2 summarizes the College's work in assessment of general education outcomes and "closing the loop" through next steps in proposed revision of the general education program.

### **Example 1: Student Learning Outcomes Assessment**

SKC's Core Theme 2, Quality Education, has three objectives: Quality Faculty, Quality Curricula, and Quality Student Outcomes. Indicators associated with these objectives include the effective use of learning outcomes assessment to improve student learning within the academic majors.

SKC has a strong history of effective assessment of student learning and use of assessment results to improve educational processes. Since 2003, academic departments have been required to submit learning outcomes assessment reports which are compiled by the Department of Institutional Research and provided to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Examples of compiled Learning Outcomes Assessment Reports from previous years will be provided as exhibits for the site visit.

At SKC, student learning outcomes assessment provides a structured process for improving teaching and learning as well as a link between student learning outcomes and strategic planning. Academic departments complete an annual assessment cycle based on their Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan (LOAP). Each academic department has a published list of expected program outcomes that are termed "Student Learning Outcomes" in the SKC Catalog. The student learning outcomes (SLO) are written as terminal outcomes for each degree program. For example, catalog information for the Bachelor of Science Degree in Hydrology states, "Upon completing a Bachelor of Science in Hydrology, students should ...be able to...integrate hydrologic science concepts with awareness of place based (local or community) issues and their related cultural perspectives." Faculty members in each academic department review desired learning outcomes and methods for determination of student achievement of the outcomes. All academic majors reviewed and updated student learning outcomes (SLO) again in Academic Year 2015-2016 in preparation to the move to a new assessment software system (described below).

Academic departments determine appropriate indicators or measures of student learning in each SLO. During the academic year, data is collected to measure student achievement. Data primarily consists of direct evidence of student learning, such as analysis of student portfolios, projects, presentations, internship evaluations, and testing, so generally multiple data points are

used as indicators for each outcome. Indirect evidence such as student self-reports in course evaluations, input from departmental advisory committees, and program evaluations may also be utilized as assessment data. Analysis and discussion of the data lead to identification of areas for continued improvement and "next steps" that the faculty will take to improve student outcomes in desired areas. Examples of Learning Outcomes Assessment Reports are provided as Appendix C.

Results of Learning Outcomes Assessment are utilized to make program changes including changes in courses, syllabi, teaching methods, evaluation methods, and sequencing of courses. Annual department meetings to review outcomes stimulate productive discussions about when, how, and what students are learning in their respective curricula.

One significant factor impacting the effectiveness of learning outcomes assessment processes is the ongoing changes in academic department heads and faculty members. While outcomes assessment is required in every academic major, too often department heads have left the College, taking with them the departmental assessment processes. This commonly results in a year or two of lag in that department's assessment work. To alleviate this issue and provide a standardized platform for assessment work, SKC purchased Nuventive TracDat in winter 2016. TracDat is a "planning and outcomes assessment software provides a flexible framework that helps institutions organize, align, document, report, and take effective actions for improvement" (<http://www.nuventive.com/products/tracdat/>). TracDat provides SKC with a structured process for assessing student learning as well as documenting assessment processes and storing assessment materials. TracDat will also provide a "resources needed" section that asks departments to link budget requests to student learning outcomes. The Mid-Cycle Site Visitors will be provided with access to SKC's TracDat site.

The majority of academic majors moved their assessment processes to TracDat in winter and spring quarters. To support this transition, college administration provided in service training, individual department consulting by the Department of Institutional Effectiveness, and two half days of work time during faculty development days. The Assessment Committee will review completed TracDat reports for the first time in fall 2016.

In summer 2016, a member of the Assessment Committee developed a pilot rubric for assessment of department assessment plans using the TracDat format. The rubric allows the Assessment Committee to determine need for additional professional development. In summer 2016, a member of the Assessment Committee developed a pilot rubric for assessment of department assessment plans using the TracDat format. The rubric allows the Assessment Committee to determine need for additional professional development. An example is provided below.

Table 3. Pilot Rubric for Assessment of Department LOAP

Office Professions Certificate of Completion					
SLO	Measures	Results	Actions	Follow-Up	
Stated Outcomes					

Managing Records/Filing	2	2	2	0	
Basic Office Skills & Professionalism	1	1	1	1	
Computer Applications	5	5	5	0	
<b>Score</b>				Actual	Possible
<b>General Info Complete: Assessment Meeting Data, Assessment Coordinator</b>				2	2
<b>Learning outcomes measurable.</b> Learning outcomes clearly articulate what graduates should be able to know, do, or value; learning outcomes definitively describe realistic and achievable outcomes; precise concrete action verbs are used to indicate the specific behavior to be performed				5	5
<b>Measures focus on direct evidence.</b> Measures directly and appropriately assess intended PLO				5	5
	<b>Multiple measures of the outcome are used</b> Multiple types of measures (e.g. direct/indirect, objective/subjective, qualitative/quantitative) are present for all or some PLOs			5	5
	<b>Results provide evidence of student achievement</b> Findings provide concrete evidence that targets were met, partially met, or not met; compares new findings to past trends, as appropriate			5	5
	<b>Target levels of achievement</b> Targets represent a reasonable level of success; targets are meaningful – based on benchmarks, previous results, existing standards			5	5
<b>Actions document intent to improve student learning.</b> Actions focus on improvement of the program, teaching methods, or curriculum; actions may also modify learning strategies				1	1
<b>Curriculum Mapping completed, link courses to assessment</b>				5	5
<b>Final Report summarizes annual assmt work</b>				2	2
<b>Documents such as rubrics included</b>				5	5
		Total Score		38	38

### Specific Examples of Learning Outcomes Assessment

Specific examples of the use of learning outcomes assessment to improve student learning are provided by the assessment reports of the Business Technology and Hydrology Departments. Both departments successfully transitioned to TracDat, and both have effectively documented student learning including measures, results, and actions that will be implemented in 2016-2017 to improve student learning. The departments communicate results of the annual assessment processes via the assessment summaries on the department websites.

### Analysis

The majority of SKC academic departments effectively use learning outcomes assessment as a process for improvement of student learning and therefore improvement of institutional effectiveness in Core Theme 2: Quality Education. Departments which have been less effective in outcomes assessment generally have new department heads or other faculty turnover. College implementation of TracDat should assist with the continuity of department assessment efforts. Using the pilot rubric for evaluating assessment plans, the Department of Institutional Effectiveness noted areas of strength and weakness in current departmental assessment activities, which will be addressed through continued training in Academic Year 2016-2017. Additionally, a need for additional training for new faculty members is evident; this training will be implemented in mid-September as new faculty members are oriented.

### **Example 2: Assessment of General Education Outcomes**

Over the last three academic years, SKC faculty members have expended significant effort in development of an assessment process for the College's General Education Learning Outcomes. This work is directly aligned with Core Theme Two: Quality Education, and specifically Objective 2.3d. The purpose of the General Education assessment is to assess students' achievement of desired in general education courses. Indicators for General Education Assessment are designated levels of student achievement in the College's general education outcomes, known as the "4 Cs": Critical Thinking, Communication, Cultural Understanding and Citizenship.

The 4 Cs have been in place for almost 15 years. The outcomes are defined in the college catalog and emphasized in general education courses. Additionally, many academic programs have elected to embed the 4 Cs in student learning outcomes for their academic majors.

Assessment of general education outcomes has evolved over the last four years. In Academic Year 2012-2013, a task force of SKC faculty members, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Institutional Researcher investigated options for conducting an annual direct assessment of SKC's general education outcomes. The task force reviewed externally validated examinations such as the Collegiate Learning Assessment or CLA. The Institutional Researcher also attended the AAC&U General Education Assessment meeting and sessions at the Association for Institutional Research annual meeting. The task force ultimately decided to pilot the use of an institutionally developed assessment to measure student outcomes in the 4 Cs as a short-essay writing assessment. The General Education Assessment was piloted in spring 2013 and fully implemented in spring 2014.

In spring 2013, 99 graduating Associate Degree students completed the pilot of the writing assessment administered by their academic major departments who followed administration instructions. Discussion concerning the results suggested that while the mechanism of using the written assessment and the rubric appeared to be valid, there were some concerns related to consistency in the administration methods. In spring 2014, the administration process was standardized by having all graduating Associate Degree students sign up for a time slot in the library computer labs. The assessment was proctored by the Writing Lab Director and tutors,

ensuring increased fidelity of administration. In spring 2016, 97% of graduating Associate Degree students completed the assessment.

The assessment consists of a timed essay and is required of all graduating Associate Degree students. The Assessment is also taken by rising sophomores in majors offering only a Bachelor Degree. While SKC does have some students transferring to its upper division programs, approximately 85% of graduating Bachelor Degree students either started in an Associated Degree program or are included in the rising sophomore assessment cohort. Therefore, the assessment provides a measure of student outcomes in the 4 Cs at the sophomore level.

Prompts for the writing assessment were primarily derived from the Enduring Legacies Native Cases Project at Evergreen State College, Olympia, WA (<http://nativecases.evergreen.edu/>). The Enduring Legacies Native Cases are designed to promote the use of culturally relevant curricula, embedding issues such as tribal sovereignty and worldview into contemporary cases. The Liberal Arts Department developed assessment prompts; prompts were reviewed by members of the General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC) and General Education Committee.

The assessment rubric is derived from the AAC&U value rubrics (<https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics>). Evaluation of student results is completed by a cross-disciplinary group of faculty members using the established rubric. Inter-rater reliability is established by having all evaluators score the same essay and discuss their ratings. This process is repeated until all evaluators are within two points of each other.

Tabulated results provided areas of strength and areas for further development or emphasis in the general education program. For example, the spring 2015 results for Critical Thinking indicated that students were able to state a position on the issue, but not as successful in stating alternative or opposite positions that might impact the issue. Results of the GE assessment are reviewed annually by the GEAC. Results were shared with faculty members in the spring 2014 faculty inservice. A report of the spring 2016 assessment is finalized and will be provided to all faculty in October 2015 when faculty return to campus following summer break.

	Number of Participants	Average Critical Thinking Score (Max. Score = 15)	Average Communication Score (Max. Score = 15)	Average of Total Score (Max. Score = 30)
2014 Participants	78	10.1	8.4	19.3
2015 Participants	77	9.9	8.2	18.1
2016 Participants	66	10.4	11.2	21.3

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness also collects indirect evidence of student achievement of the 4 Cs, including student and graduate self-perceptions of learning in the 4 Cs as well as faculty perceptions of student learning in these areas. These assessments are included in the General Education Assessment Report 2016, included as Appendix D.

### Analysis

While the current GE Assessment process provides valid and reliable measures of student achievement of the competencies of Communication and Citizenship, the GEAC and GEC have determined that this assessment is useful but not sufficient to measure student learning in all of the 4 Cs.

Results of the direct assessment show inconsistent student achievement in Critical Thinking and Communication. In spring 2016, the GEAC piloted a rubric for “Cultural Understanding” based on the AAC&U Value Rubric for Intercultural Competence; these results have not been released pending review by the GEAC. The average student scores in Critical Thinking and Communication are below 75% (or 22.5/30 points), set as a benchmark for the purposes of Core Theme assessment. Interviews of faculty and discussion by the General Education Committee point to a number of issues with the current general education program, including no standardized definitions or implementation for the 4Cs within general education courses.

The General Education Committee review of the assessment results and Committee perceptions of the value of a more integrated general education program have resulted in draft recommendations for general education revision. The Committee plans to take its recommendations to the Curriculum Committee in fall 2016.

Recommendations for the general education revision include the following:

1. Implement a required 3-credit course to be placed in all first year curricula. The new course will be an integrated, interdisciplinary general education course that introduces students to the 4 Cs as well as disciplinary ways of knowing, and will be team-taught by three faculty members from different academic departments.
2. Reduce the number of general education requirements in the lower division (Associate Degree) program by at least one course.
3. Reduce the number of courses on the general education “lists” (SKC Catalog pgs. 25-33) and ensure that each general education course on a list enhances student learning in at least one of the “Cs” through specified learning outcomes and assessment methods. Currently, the lists are a disconnected set of courses that students take to fulfill general education requirements.
4. Create a menu of “flagged assignments” for each of the general education outcomes. Each course on a general education list will utilize one of the assignments as a component of the course grade. The assignments will be “flagged” and tracked via SKC’s assessment software, TracDat. This will align general education courses with outcomes and provide an additional mechanism for assessment of student outcomes in the 4 Cs.
5. Additionally, there is a need to provide new faculty members with orientation related to the 4 Cs, including teaching and assessment of those outcomes. Results from the faculty satisfaction survey suggest that newer faculty members, particularly those who have taught at SKC only 1-2 years, have lower self-perceptions of their own skills in teaching and assessing the 4 Cs.

## Part III

SKC's Mission is at the heart of all institutional decision-making. The Mission and Core Themes are firmly entrenched in the day-to-day and year-to-year activities of the College. This report describes Salish Kootenai College's status as of the third year of the seven-year accreditation cycle. The College has moved forward in its capacity to assess its effectiveness meeting its unique mission, and using the results of Core Theme assessments to plan and budget for actions to improve institutional effectiveness. Multiple measures of institutional effectiveness allow for analyses of trended data indicating areas of strengths and weaknesses in practices, policies, and programs. Data is used at multiple levels to assess accomplishments, to identify areas of weakness, and to plan new interventions and approaches.

Led by its new administration, SKC will continue to evolve in the effectiveness of its assessment/planning/budgeting cycle. Moving forward to the Year Seven report and site visit, SKC will further link outcomes assessment to institutional planning. Academic and non-academic department annual plans will be moved to TracDat to allow for increased continuity in department planning and enhanced access to department assessment by SKC administration.

Work to prepare for the Year Seven visit will include the following activities:

- Ensure that new administrative team is familiar with accreditation standards and process, particularly those related to Core Theme assessment and planning and student learning outcomes assessment.
- Reconvene Core Theme Teams for annual review of assessment, and determine methods for the Theme Teams to have meaningful input into institutional planning and budgeting processes.
- Continue to refine learning outcomes assessment rubric and assist academic departments to adopt TracDat, refine assessment practices, and effectively document student learning.
- Improve methods for disseminating Core Theme Reports and other assessment data to stakeholders.
- Continue to improve data sources for indicators which are important to the mission but difficult to collect, specifically Core Theme Three, Cultural Perpetuation, and define additional direct measures of institutional effectiveness in this area.
- Increase use of dashboards, data visualization, and other means to ensure that decision makers from department heads to senior administration have the data and resources needed for data-informed decision making.



## **Conclusion**

Salish Kootenai College continues to evaluate its effectiveness through Core Theme assessments and multiple other measures, and then plan and allocate resources to achieve its mission, Strategic Plan 2016-2020, and annual plans/goals. The College will be well-poised to demonstrate how it has focused its resources and efforts on fulfilling its mission, how it has used careful planning, assessment, and improvement to support mission fulfillment, and how it has adapted on the basis of those assessments to sustain the institution in an ever-changing environment.

## List of Appendices

Appendix A	Measures of Institutional Effectiveness
Appendix B	Sample Core Theme Report
Appendix C	Sample Learning Outcomes Assessment Reports, 2015-2016
Appendix D	General Education Assessment Report, Summer 2016

## **Appendix A**

### **Measures of Institutional Effectiveness**

# Measures of Institutional Effectiveness

---

Office of Institutional Effectiveness  
STACEY SHERWIN, PH.D.

Salish Kootenai College Office of Institutional Effectiveness

Methods for Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness

Measure of Overall Institutional Effectiveness		
NWCCU Accreditation	Annual reports completed each spring  Ad Hoc or Interim Reports as requested	Annual report provides institutional data
NWCCU Accreditation	7-Year Cycle.  Year One Report submitted 9/15/2014  MidCycle Report due fall 2016	Measures institutional effectiveness in evaluation, planning, data utilization, and mission fulfillment
Annual SKC Fact Book	Annual Publication in late fall	Provides institutional data about students, faculty/staff, facilities
Core Theme Monitoring Reports	Annual Cycle	Provides measure of progress in four Core Themes
AIMS/AKIS Data Reports	Every Year, due late fall	Provides institutional data required by AIHEC
IPEDS Reports: See Monthly Calendar	Fall, Winter, Spring data collection per required cycle	Provides data required by Department of Education/National Center for Educational Statistics
Strategic Plan Update	Annual for Board Retreat  (Start in fall 2017)	Provides update including assessment of progress on Strategic Plan
Students		
Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)	Every other year, even years	Provides student reports of engagement in learning
Student Satisfaction Survey	Every other year, odd years	Student reports of satisfaction with college (faculty, staff, facilities, services)
Student Enrollment and Persistence Report	November or as final census data obtained; quarterly enrollment reports	Provides persistence data disaggregated by demographic factors

Assessment of General Education outcomes (4 Cs: Critical Thinking, Communication, Citizenship, Cultural Understanding)	Annual, spring quarter.	Measure student achievement in the college's general education program and learning outcomes
Course Evaluations	Quarterly	Measure student perceptions of teaching and learning
Graduate Survey	Annual, fall quarter	Provides graduate perceptions of learning, employment data
Employer Surveys	As per Academic Departments and Career Services	Provides employer feedback on graduate knowledge, skills
Academic Departments and Faculty		
Academic Program Review	Each academic department to complete every four years. Piloted 2010-2011, and put in place 2011-2012	Measure of academic program quality and assessment of how programs meet institutional mission and goals
Learning Outcomes Assessment Reports	Completed by each academic department annually, reports due in fall. Reports summarized and final report provided late fall/early winter	Assessment of student learning of specified program outcomes or competencies
Faculty Satisfaction Survey	Every other year, odd years, Spring	Faculty reports of satisfaction with work environment
Annual Survey of Faculty Scholarly Activities and Community Engagement	Every fall – all employees. Data included with AIMS/AKIS report. Done concurrently with Faculty Survey of Scholarly Activities and Community Engagement.	Faculty reports of grants, presentations, publications, creative activities, and college/community service
Student Course Evaluations	Done per faculty evaluation policy (new faculty 1 course per quarter x 1 year, other FT faculty 2 courses per year, PT faculty similar)	Confidential reports to Academic V.P., each department head receives copies for their department, and each faculty members receives a copy of their own report. Managed by OIE/Stacey
Analysis of Academic Department Productivity	Every fall for preceding year – includes faculty/student contact hours, credit productivity	Provides data for Budget Committee, focusing on instructional productivity

Academic Department Annual Plan and Report	Summer/Fall.	Provides each department's annual plan related to Core Themes and department priorities
Staff and Non-Academic Departments		
Staff Satisfaction Survey	Every other year, even years	Staff reports of satisfaction with work conditions, facilities, and opinions about institutional effectiveness
Non-Academic Annual Plan	Every year, fall	Measure of programs meet institutional mission and goals
Annual Survey of Faculty/Staff Scholarly Activities and Community Engagement	Every fall – all employees. Data included with AIMS/AKIS report. Done concurrently with Faculty Survey of Scholarly Activities and Community Engagement	Staff reports of grants, presentations, publications, creative activities, and college/community service

**Appendix B**

**Sample Core Theme Report:  
Core Theme Three**



**CORE THEMES MONITORING REPORTS  
SPRING 2016**

**CORE THEME THREE: PERPETUATE THE CULTURES OF THE CONFEDERATED SALISH & KOOTENAI TRIBES**

Core Theme Three has two objectives:

1. Support Cultural Literacy of Students, Faculty, and Staff Members
2. Support Community Cultural Knowledge

Theme Team Three last reviewed indicators and results in April 2016. At this time, indicators are generally “indirect measures” and, to some extent, proxy measures for what may develop as more direct measures of effectiveness in this Core Theme. The following indicators and benchmarks are in place, as determined by Core Theme Team Three:

Indicators, benchmarks, status, and source of data for Objective 3.1, Core Theme 3				
Support Individual Cultural Knowledge of Students, Faculty, and Staff Members				
Indicators	Benchmark		Status	Source
	Threshold	Aspirational		
Student satisfaction with incorporation of culture into classes and curricula – “The College provides Native American cultural content in most classes”	3.5	4.0	2011: 3.9/5.0 2009: 4.4/5.0 2015: 3.9/5.0	Student Satisfaction Survey
Student responses to course evaluation item, “This course helped improve my understanding of Native American culture and the local reservation community.”	2.75	3.5	2013: 2.76/4.0 2015: 2.78/4.0	Course Evaluation Winter Quarter (Form 2)
Student statement, “I increased my knowledge/skills this year in “Cultural Understanding.”	3.5	4.0	2011: 3.8/5.0 2009: 4.2/5.0 2015: 4.2/5.0	Student Satisfaction Survey
Faculty and staff satisfaction with opportunities to increase knowledge of CSKT culture, language, and current issues	4.0	4.5	2013 Faculty Satisfaction Survey: 3.84/5.0 2015 Faculty Satisfaction Survey: 3.63/5.0 2016 Staff Satisfaction Survey: 4.02/5.0	Faculty and Staff Satisfaction Surveys
Faculty and Staff knowledge of “5 Key Concepts.”	2.0	2.5	2012 Faculty/Staff: Average 2.01/3.0 2015 Faculty/Staff:	5 Key Concepts Survey

SALISH KOOTENAI COLLEGE

		Average: 2.63
--	--	---------------

Indicators, benchmarks, status, and source of data for Objective 3.2, Core Theme 3				
Support Community Cultural Knowledge				
Indicators	Benchmark		Status	Source
	Threshold	Aspirational		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Number of classes, seminars, events, and trainings with a focus on cultural perpetuation</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Fall 2012: 49 classes, 1 nondeclared CSKT student</li> <li>● 2015-2016 - 18 events/trainings</li> </ul>	Enrollment records; staff survey
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Number of community members who participate in classes, seminars, trainings</li> </ul>			Collecting baseline data in 2016-2017	Registration records
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Qualitative Data from Cultural Advisory Committee</li> </ul>			Committee to be established in 2016-2017	

Key to Status indicators:

Green – status meets or exceeds aspirational benchmark

Yellow – status is between threshold and aspirational benchmarks

Red – status is below threshold benchmark

During Academic Year 2015-2016, use of previous years’ data resulted in several actions to improve effectiveness. A component of CSK&T culture was included in monthly staff/faculty meetings and included language, current issues, or cultural content such as dance dress attire. The focus on general education revision and the “4 Cs” resulted in increased emphasis and visibility of cultural content in some departments, particularly in the natural resources. The General Education Assessment Committee also piloted a rubric for assessment of cultural understanding in the current general education assessment process.

Core Theme Team Three has determined that some indicators suggest potential responses:

- a. Increase use of Salish and Kootenai language in signage, incorporate language in more institutional activities.
- b. Integrate assessment of the “Cultural Understanding” competency from the general education outcomes into assessment of cultural perpetuation.
- c. Implement revised orientation processes for new students, faculty, and staff, to include “5 Key Concepts” and other understanding of the unique status and location of SKC.
- d. Align NASD101 (History of Indian in U.S.) courses to ensure that all students have more understanding of concepts of sovereignty, treaty rights, and other core concepts. Learning outcomes from NASD101 could be utilized to evaluate student learning of essential content.

Core Theme Team Three has also initiated discussions concerning less tangible/measurable concepts related to cultural perpetuation, such as relationships and traditional values. The draft Strategic Plan 2016-2020 calls for establishing a cultural advisory board to advise the College on issues related to Cultural Perpetuation.

**Appendix C**

**Sample Learning Outcomes Assessment Reports  
2015-2016**

# Assessment: Program Four Column



## Program SLO - Office Professions (CRT)

**Department:** Business Technology/Office Professions

**Program Assessment Leader:** Nancy Nelson

**Date of Department Assessment Review:** 06/15/2016

**Assessment Summary for Department Website:** The Office Professions Certificate assessment incorporated outcomes using three of the Student Learning Outcomes as shown in the 2015-16 Catalog. The three assessed this year include managing records and filing in an office setting, learning computer application programs (MS Office 2013 Word, Excel and Access) in order to create office documents, spreadsheets and databases commonly used in office professions, and applying the office skills learned to “real world” experience via an office practicum.

Direct assessments were measured using exams in OFED 213 Records Management, supervisor evaluations from OFED 290 Office Practicum, and projects and exams in computer application courses (CAPP 102, 103, 161 and 162). All assessments are based on measuring students’ ability to comprehend and apply skills and concepts necessary for employment in entry-level office positions. The 4 C’s are assessed throughout the curriculum in designated courses.

Results of the learning outcomes assessment indicate that students are generally achieving the learning objectives when abiding by the due dates given, when attending class on a regular basis, and when spending the appropriate amount of study and homework time needed for thorough comprehension and accurate completion of assignments, tests, projects, etc. Students who completed an Office Practicum in a local business/office were generally rated very favorably by their site supervisor, which indicates that they have gained employment skills in the office professions field.

The analysis of the 2015-2016 Outcomes Assessment data resulted in adjustments for the 2016-2017 AY with the intent of improving overall student learning and employment readiness. The adjustments include revising instructional methods, creating informational packets for students prior to completing the Office Practicum course to ensure they are fully prepared to apply their skills in an office setting, and generally to emphasize student responsibility and due dates more explicitly. Professionalism and employment readiness skills in this field will be focused on throughout the curriculum.

<i>Learning Outcomes</i>	<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results/Analysis</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p><b>Managing Records/Filing</b> - Manage records in an organization including the ability to file records alphabetically, numerically, geographically, and by subject.</p> <p><b>Outcome Status:</b> Active</p> <p><b>Planned Assessment Year(s):</b> 2015 - 2016</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> 09/28/2015</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> 06/10/2016</p>	<p><b>Direct</b> - OFED 213 (Records Management/Filing) Midterm Exam</p> <p><b>Expected Level of Student Achievement:</b> 90% of students will achieve a grade of 70% or higher on the Midterm Exam</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">Final Exam Answer Form for Pg. 1.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Reporting Period:</b> 2015 - 2016</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Expected Level Met</p> <p>100% of the students achieved a grade of 70% or higher on the Midterm Exam (06/13/2016)</p> <p><b># of Students Assessed:</b> 7</p> <p><b># Who Met Expectation:</b> 7</p> <p><b># Who Did Not Meet Expectation:</b> 0</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continue using the same textbook and simulation for next year. (06/13/2016)</p> <p><b>Additional Resources Required:</b> None</p>

Learning Outcomes	Measures	Results/Analysis	Actions
	<a href="#">Final Exam Tab Cuts &amp; Positions.pdf</a> <a href="#">Final Exam Subject Filing.pdf</a> <a href="#">Midterm Exam Alpha Order.pdf</a> <a href="#">Midterm.docx</a>	<b>Reporting Period:</b> 2015 - 2016 <b>Result Type:</b> Expected Level Met 100% of the students achieved a grade of 70% or higher on the Final Exam (06/13/2016) <b># of Students Assessed:</b> 7 <b># Who Met Expectation:</b> 7 <b># Who Did Not Meet Expectation:</b> 0	<b>Action:</b> Continue using the same textbook and simulation for next year. (06/13/2016) <b>Additional Resources Required:</b> None
<b>Basic Office Skills &amp; Professionalism -</b> Exhibit competency in basic office skills and professionalism in a practicum setting. <b>Outcome Status:</b> Active <b>Planned Assessment Year(s):</b> 2015 - 2016	<b>Direct -</b> Supervisor's Evaluation of Office Practicum (OFED 290) <b>Expected Level of Student Achievement:</b> 90% of students will receive a "Good" or "Excellent" rating on the Supervisor's Evaluation in an office practicum (OFED 290) <b>Related Documents:</b> <a href="#">OFED 290 Supervisor's Eval Form.docx</a>	<b>Reporting Period:</b> 2015 - 2016 <b>Result Type:</b> Expected Level Met 100% of students completing the Office Practicum course (OFED 290) received an "Exceptional" or "Proficient" rating on the Basic Office Skills and Professionalism sections of the Site Supervisor's Evaluation. (06/13/2016) <b># of Students Assessed:</b> 10 <b># Who Met Expectation:</b> 10 <b># Who Did Not Meet Expectation:</b> 0	<b>Action:</b> Continue to prepare students for the Office Practicum experience via coursework and a detailed orientation to the specific organization where they will complete their practicum hours. (06/13/2016) <b>Additional Resources Required:</b> For some organizations, students must complete a Background Check and show proof of immunizations prior to starting their practicum. These issues will need to be addressed in the quarter before the practicum so the student can begin their hours the first week of classes. <b>Follow-Up:</b> Prepare information packets for students preparing to take OFED 290. The packets would be distributed to the students when they register for the course. The packet would include all the requirements of the course, examples of documents required for competing the course, background check information, immunization

Learning Outcomes	Measures	Results/Analysis	Actions
<p><b>Computer Applications</b> - Create and maintain spreadsheets, word processing documents, and databases commonly used in businesses.  <b>Outcome Status:</b> Active  <b>Planned Assessment Year(s):</b> 2015 - 2016</p>	<p><b>Direct</b> - CAPP 102 Final Exam  <b>Expected Level of Student</b>  <b>Achievement:</b> 90% of students will achieve 70% or higher on Final Exam.  <b>Note:</b> CAPP 102 is Document Processing. The final exam covers the entire course content.</p>	<p><b>Reporting Period:</b> 2015 - 2016  <b>Result Type:</b> Expected Level Not Met  2/3 (67%) achieved 70% or higher on final exam. The expectation was not met by one student due to lack of comprehension of course content. (06/15/2016)  <b># of Students Assessed:</b> 3  <b># Who Met Expectation:</b> 2  <b># Who Did Not Meet Expectation:</b> 1  <b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">CAPP102FinalExam.docx</a>  <a href="#">CAPP102FinalExamkey.docx</a></p>	<p>information, and tips for proper protocol at the practicum site. (06/14/2016)</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Evaluate course content for ways to help students comprehend the content. (06/15/2016)  <b>Additional Resources Required:</b> Assess content to ensure students are receiving what they need.</p>
	<p><b>Direct</b> - CAPP 103 Newsletter Project  <b>Expected Level of Student</b>  <b>Achievement:</b> 90% of students will achieve 70% or higher on the Newsletter Project</p>	<p><b>Reporting Period:</b> 2015 - 2016  <b>Result Type:</b> Expected Level Not Met  2/3 (67%) achieved 70% or higher on the newsletter project. The expected level was not met due to a student not turning in the assignment. (06/15/2016)  <b># of Students Assessed:</b> 3  <b># Who Met Expectation:</b> 2  <b># Who Did Not Meet Expectation:</b> 1  <b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">Newsletter Grading.docx</a>  <a href="#">newsletter instructions.docx</a></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Evaluate the requirement of the newsletter project and stress the importance of turning work in. (06/15/2016)  <b>Additional Resources Required:</b> Assess the requirement of the newsletter project.</p>
	<p><b>Direct</b> - CAPP 103 Final Exam  <b>Expected Level of Student</b>  <b>Achievement:</b> 90% of students will achieve 70% or higher on the final exam.  <b>Note:</b> CAPP 103 is Advanced Document Processing.</p>	<p><b>Reporting Period:</b> 2015 - 2016  <b>Result Type:</b> Expected Level Met  3/3 (100%) achieved 70% or higher on the final exam. (06/15/2016)  <b># of Students Assessed:</b> 3  <b># Who Met Expectation:</b> 3  <b># Who Did Not Meet Expectation:</b> 0  <b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">CAPP103Final Exam.docx</a>  <a href="#">CAPP103Final Examkey.docx</a></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continue with course content. (06/15/2016)  <b>Additional Resources Required:</b> Assess content to ensure students are receiving what they need.</p>
	<p><b>Direct</b> - CAPP 161 Final Exam  <b>Expected Level of Student</b>  <b>Achievement:</b> 90% of students will achieve 70% or higher on the final exam</p>	<p><b>Reporting Period:</b> 2015 - 2016  <b>Result Type:</b> Expected Level Met  1/1 (100%) achieved 70% or higher on the final exam. (06/15/2016)</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continue with course content. (06/15/2016)  <b>Additional Resources Required:</b> Assess content to ensure students</p>

Learning Outcomes	Measures	Results/Analysis	Actions
	<p><b>Note:</b> CAPP 161 is Electronic Spreadsheets. The final exam includes an activity and paper exam.</p>	<p><b># of Students Assessed:</b> 1  <b># Who Met Expectation:</b> 1  <b># Who Did Not Meet Expectation:</b> 0  <b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">CAPP161FinalExamKeySpring1516.docx</a>  <a href="#">CAPP161FinalExamSpring1516.docx</a></p>	<p>are receiving what they need.</p>
	<p><b>Direct -</b> CAPP 162 Final Exam  <b>Expected Level of Student Achievement:</b> 90% of students will achieve 70% or higher on the final exam  <b>Note:</b> CAPP 162 is Database Management Systems. The final exam includes an activity and paper exam.</p>	<p><b>Reporting Period:</b> 2015 - 2016  <b>Result Type:</b> Expected Level Met  2/2 (100%) achieved 70% or higher on the final exam. (06/15/2016)  <b># of Students Assessed:</b> 2  <b># Who Met Expectation:</b> 2  <b># Who Did Not Meet Expectation:</b> 0  <b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">CAPP162FinalExam.docx</a>  <a href="#">CAPP162FinalExamKey.docx</a></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continue with course content. (06/15/2016)  <b>Additional Resources Required:</b>  Assess content to ensure students are receiving what they need.</p>

# Assessment: Program Four Column



## Program SLO - Hydrology (BS)

**Department:** Hydrology

**Program Assessment Leader:** Antony Berthelote

**Date of Department Assessment Review:** 06/15/2016

**Assessment Summary for Department Website:** The Associate and Bachelor's degree programs are interdisciplinary curricula designed to prepare students for different levels of employment in hydrology-related positions. The leveled Learning Outcomes for the two programs demonstrate appropriate emphasis on technical, academic, and workplace or "soft" skills for each degree program. Course content delivery include approximately 27% combination lab and field based courses, 25% primarily field based courses, and 11% lab based courses. Both curricula include the College's "4 Cs" which encompass Critical Thinking, Communication, Cultural Understanding, and Citizenship. Both programs also emphasize science within both a Western and a Native American worldview.

The Hydrology program strategically assesses student's abilities to understand, critically explore, and communicate conceptual, technical, and cultural information. These assessments are encompassed in writing and presentation assignments, final exams, quizzes and completed in-class projects. Assessments continue to reveal that the program could benefit from strengthened efforts to prepare or assist entering students in fundamental technical and communication skills essential for success in Hydrology.

Hydrology faculty met quarterly to discuss the effectiveness of the learning outcomes to programmatic success of the Hydrology degree over the past few years. Annual Faculty evaluations of the effectiveness of the student learning outcomes periodically determined that they required realignment with expectations for student success and to allow for more effective assessment. In the 2014-2015 year, the learning outcomes took on major revisions following a faculty program self assessment. The new learning outcomes more closely reflect the expectations the program has of student learning, are more efficient to assess, are more realistically aligned with workforce needs, and have the 4C's embedded in the learning outcomes (which the faculty realized they were already doing and were passionate about). These outcomes are posted in the catalog and on the website.

The Hydrology Program, now in its sixth year, has conferred 7 Bachelors of Science, 14 Associates of Science degrees, and 6 GIS certificates. We are busy preparing our next cohort of graduates in the two science degrees as the program looks to the future. The Hydrology Program provides our students with a diverse program focusing on the technical, managerial, and social aspects of this important field. Faculty utilizes a variety of learning opportunities to prepare our students. Place-based, hands-on, inquiry approaches particularly fit the content within hydrology discipline. These approaches allow the use of a variety of formative and summative assessment tools to evaluate student learning. These include performance-based testing, conceptual-based written assignments, applied research projects, collaborative and individual classroom presentations, group fieldwork projects, technical reports, and more. Additionally, program assessment includes student evaluations, course surveys, peer evaluation, consultation with the Tribal professionals, and informal student feedback to suggest ways to continually improve the curriculum and content. The Hydrology program is continually evaluating the curriculum to provide our students with the necessary skills to meet the hydrological challenges in the 21st Century.

<i>Learning Outcomes</i>	<i>Measures</i>	<i>Results/Analysis</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<b>Foundational Hydrological Principles</b>	<b>Baseline - Direct - GEOL 410 (Fluvial</b>	<b>Reporting Period: 2015 - 2016</b>	



Learning Outcomes	Measures	Results/Analysis	Actions
<p>- Apply and effectively articulate some of the major foundational hydrologic principles (basic theoretical knowledge)  <b>Outcome Status:</b> Active  <b>Planned Assessment Year(s):</b> 2015 - 2016  <b>Start Date:</b> 09/21/2015</p>	<p>Geomorphology) Students be evaluated based on attendance, three written assignments and a final report.  <b>Expected Level of Student Achievement:</b> Students will achieve an 80% on their final grade.</p>	<p><b>Result Type:</b> Expected Level Met  91.0%, 49.5%, 92.3%, 97.8% (06/09/2016)  <b># of Students Assessed:</b> 4  <b># Who Met Expectation:</b> 3  <b># Who Did Not Meet Expectation:</b> 1</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> One students developed a pattern of absences resulting in a failing grade. For future courses an early intervention through one-on-one interaction and an alert to students support services may decrease absence based academic issues. (06/09/2016)</p>
	<p><b>Baseline - Direct - HYDR 410</b> (Applied Hydrology) Students will complete field data collection, analysis and compile a technical report for two separate project. Additionally, students will complete a performance final based on a given data set.  <b>Expected Level of Student Achievement:</b> It is expected that the student will all the requirement for the course with a final grade of a "C" or higher.</p>	<p><b>Reporting Period:</b> 2014 - 2015  <b>Result Type:</b> Expected Level Met  83.7%, 83.7%, 89.8%, 100.0% (06/09/2016)  <b># of Students Assessed:</b> 4  <b># Who Met Expectation:</b> 4  <b># Who Did Not Meet Expectation:</b> 0</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continue with course revision based on emerging hydrological techniques and analysis. (06/09/2016)</p>
<p><b>Advanced Technical and Computational Skills -</b> Demonstrate an advanced understanding of essential technical and computational skills applied in surface and groundwater quantification and quality  <b>Outcome Status:</b> Active  <b>Planned Assessment Year(s):</b> 2015 - 2016  <b>Start Date:</b> 09/21/2015</p>	<p><b>Baseline - Direct - HYDR 410</b> (Applied Hydrology) Student will collect and analyze the necessary data to recommend a bridge deck height based on an increased flow regime.  <b>Expected Level of Student Achievement:</b> It is expected that the student will achieve a score of 80% or greater on their analysis.</p>	<p><b>Reporting Period:</b> 2014 - 2015  <b>Result Type:</b> Expected Level Met  All students achieved an 80% or greater score (06/09/2016)  <b># of Students Assessed:</b> 4  <b># Who Met Expectation:</b> 4  <b># Who Did Not Meet Expectation:</b> 0</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continue with course revision based on emerging hydrological techniques and analysis. (06/09/2016)</p>
	<p><b>Baseline - Direct - GEOL 410</b> (Fluvial Geomorphology) Students will collect and analyze data to classify a stream according to Rosgen's method of stream classification.  <b>Expected Level of Student Achievement:</b> It is expected that all students will correctly classify the streams according to the Rosgen</p>	<p><b>Reporting Period:</b> 2015 - 2016  <b>Result Type:</b> Expected Level Met  All students correctly classified the measured stream. (06/09/2016)  <b># of Students Assessed:</b> 3  <b># Who Met Expectation:</b> 3  <b># Who Did Not Meet Expectation:</b> 0</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continue with course revision based on emerging hydrological techniques and analysis. (06/09/2016)</p>

Learning Outcomes	Measures	Results/Analysis	Actions
<p><b>Professional Communication -</b> Demonstrate effective professional written, oral, and graphical communication of advanced hydrologic measurements and concepts</p> <p><b>Outcome Status:</b> Active</p> <p><b>Planned Assessment Year(s):</b> 2015 - 2016</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> 09/21/2015</p>	<p>method of stream classification.</p> <p><b>Baseline - Direct - HYDR 311</b> Students will demonstrate effective professional written, oral, and graphical communication of advanced hydrologic measurements and concepts by creating a series of detailed graphical representations of complex hydrologic analyses that are intended to articulate complex ideas to a general audience.</p> <p><b>Expected Level of Student Achievement:</b> Students will achieve and average of 75% or higher on their course grade</p> <p><b>Note:</b> The course grade is an aggregate of the weekly graphical assignments and a few attendance and participation points</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">2015_Syllabus_HYDR_311_Antony_Berthelote (2).docx</a>  <a href="#">GIS 311 Exercises All_Final_3D_USGS_2015.docx</a></p>	<p><b>Reporting Period:</b> 2015 - 2016</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Expected Level Met</p> <p>There were 3 students in the class but one student failed the class with an eventual medical withdrawal so was not assessed. The two students assessed both received over 90% in the class. (06/10/2016)</p> <p><b># of Students Assessed:</b> 2</p> <p><b># Who Met Expectation:</b> 2</p> <p><b># Who Did Not Meet Expectation:</b> 0</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continue course revision as needed to address students ability to effectively demonstrate professional communication skills (06/15/2016)</p> <p><b>Additional Resources Required:</b> None</p>
	<p><b>Baseline - Direct - ENVS 408</b> Students will demonstrate effective professional written, oral, and graphical communication of advanced hydrologic measurements and concepts through completion of a professional paper and presentation</p> <p><b>Expected Level of Student Achievement:</b> Students will achieve a 80% or higher in the combined paper and presentation points which account for 50% of their total grade.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">Syllabus_ENVS_408_Senior</a>  <a href="#">Thesis_Natural Resources</a></p>	<p><b>Reporting Period:</b> 2015 - 2016</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Expected Level Not Met</p> <p>Class average was an 83.5% on this measure with a range from 58.1 to 95.4 [95.4, 88.3, 86.0, 89.7, 58.1] (06/13/2016)</p> <p><b># of Students Assessed:</b> 5</p> <p><b># Who Met Expectation:</b> 4</p> <p><b># Who Did Not Meet Expectation:</b> 1</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continue course revision as needed to address students ability to demonstrate effective professional hydrologic communication skills (06/15/2016)</p> <p><b>Additional Resources Required:</b> None</p>

Learning Outcomes	Measures	Results/Analysis	Actions
<p><b>Critical Thinking Articulation</b> - Use critical thinking skills to explain abstract or interdisciplinary problems related to the hydrologic sciences  <b>Outcome Status:</b> Active  <b>Planned Assessment Year(s):</b> 2015 - 2016  <b>Start Date:</b> 09/21/2015</p>	<p><b>Faculty_Spring_2015_2016.doc</b></p> <p><b>Baseline - Direct - HYDR 410</b> (Applied Hydrology) Student will develop two technical reports that includes their recommendation toward an action that may alter a natural or constructed water feature. Students should synthesis measured and calculated data with knowledge gained in previous courses.  <b>Expected Level of Student Achievement:</b> It is expected that the student will achieve a score of 70% or greater on their technical reports.</p>	<p><b>Reporting Period:</b> 2015 - 2016  <b>Result Type:</b> Inconclusive  53.3%, 73.3%, 70.0%, 100.0% (06/09/2016)  <b># of Students Assessed:</b> 4  <b># Who Met Expectation:</b> 3  <b># Who Did Not Meet Expectation:</b> 1</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> One students did not meet the expected level of achievement. The instructor will improve instruction and guidance on how to construct technical reports. The existing technical report template will be revised to better guide students to completing the reports. Additionally, an extended iterative assignment design will be employed to provide additional feedback between initial submission of assignments to final product. (06/09/2016)</p>
	<p><b>Baseline - Direct - GEOL 410</b> (Fluvial Geomorphology) Students provide hypsometric analysis of up to six watersheds in the Lower Flathead Watershed. Analysis will consider soil type, geology and tectonics in determining the apparent age of the watershed.  <b>Expected Level of Student Achievement:</b> It is expected that all students will complete the analysis to a satisfactory level as determined my the instructor.</p>	<p><b>Reporting Period:</b> 2015 - 2016  <b>Result Type:</b> Expected Level Met  All students provided a satisfactory analysis. (06/09/2016)  <b># of Students Assessed:</b> 4  <b># Who Met Expectation:</b> 4  <b># Who Did Not Meet Expectation:</b> 0</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continue with course revision based on emerging hydrological techniques and analysis. (06/09/2016)</p>
<p><b>Hydrology-Culture Integration</b> - Integrate hydrologic science concepts with awareness of place based (local or community) issues and their related cultural perspectives  <b>Outcome Status:</b> Active  <b>Planned Assessment Year(s):</b> 2015 - 2016  <b>Start Date:</b> 09/21/2015</p>	<p><b>Baseline - Direct - ENVS 408</b>  Students will Integrate hydrologic science concepts with awareness of place based (local or community) issues and their related cultural perspectives into their final senior thesis paper and presentation  <b>Expected Level of Student Achievement:</b> Students will achieve a 75% or higher in the average NRD</p>	<p><b>Reporting Period:</b> 2015 - 2016  <b>Result Type:</b> Expected Level Met  Class average was an 88.5% on this measure with a range from 77.3 to 95.7 [90.0, 95.7, 94.7, 84.7, 77.3] (06/13/2016)  <b># of Students Assessed:</b> 5  <b># Who Met Expectation:</b> 5  <b># Who Did Not Meet Expectation:</b> 0</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continue course revision as needed to address students ability to integrate hydrologic science concepts with awareness of place based (local or community) issues and their related cultural perspectives (06/15/2016)  <b>Additional Resources Required:</b> None</p>

Learning Outcomes	Measures	Results/Analysis	Actions
	<p>Faculty Instructor ranking of their Final Thesis Presentation in the Cultural Relevance category.</p> <p><b>Baseline - Direct - HYDR 431 (Tribal Waters)</b> Students will complete a series of project that incorporate hydrological tools into cultural knowledge of hydrology. These project findings will be presented before CSKT Tribal Council or the SPCC/KCC. Students will use a Salish TOK model to craft their presentation to deliver scientific and cultural understandings to a tribal audience.</p> <p><b>Expected Level of Student Achievement:</b> It is expected that the student will achieve a score of 70% or greater on their presentations.</p>	<p><b>Reporting Period:</b> 2015 - 2016  <b>Result Type:</b> Expected Level Met  All students achieved a presentation score of 70% or greater (06/09/2016)  <b># of Students Assessed:</b> 4  <b># Who Met Expectation:</b> 4  <b># Who Did Not Meet Expectation:</b> 0</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continue with course revision based on emerging hydrological techniques and analysis. (06/09/2016)</p>
<p><b>Practice good Citizenship -</b>  Understand and practice the values of good citizenship, team work, and community service  <b>Outcome Status:</b> Active  <b>Planned Assessment Year(s):</b> 2015 - 2016  <b>Start Date:</b> 09/21/2015</p>	<p><b>Baseline - Direct - SVLN 450</b>  Students will understand and practice the values of good citizenship, team work, and community service by completing 30 hours of community service.  <b>Expected Level of Student Achievement:</b> Students will achieve an average class grade of 90% or higher by completing the requirements of the course which includes all service hours tracking, reflections, service hours, etc.</p>	<p><b>Reporting Period:</b> 2015 - 2016  <b>Result Type:</b> Expected Level Met  All six students completed their service requirements with an average score of 94.9 ranging from 91 to 100 [93.6,91,100,92,94.4,98.4] (06/10/2016)  <b># of Students Assessed:</b> 6  <b># Who Met Expectation:</b> 6  <b># Who Did Not Meet Expectation:</b> 0</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continue course revision as needed to address students ability to practice good citizenship (06/15/2016)  <b>Additional Resources Required:</b>  None</p>

**Appendix D**

**General Education Assessment Report  
Summer 2016**

# **GENERAL EDUCATION OUTCOMES REPORT**

**SUMMER 2016**

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL  
EFFECTIVENESS

## I. Executive Summary

The Salish Kootenai College General Education Outcomes are Critical Thinking, Communication, Cultural Understanding, and Citizenship – the “4 Cs”. The 4 Cs were first delineated in 2003 and are firmly in place across the SKC curricula. In addition to the designation as learning outcomes for the general education program, many academic departments have chosen to embed the 4 Cs in student learning outcomes for their majors.

In Academic Year 2013-2013, the Vice President for Academic Affairs formed a General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC) that was charged with developing outcomes assessment for the general education program. Following extensive discussion and review of options for assessment of the 4 Cs, the task force decided to pilot the use of an institutionally developed measure consisting of a timed written assessment. The assessment is taken by graduating Associate Degree students and rising sophomores. While student scores and department averages are returned to the academic departments, individual student scores are not currently utilized to penalize or delay graduation for students. The scores are utilized to determine student achievement and to analyze the need for improvement in the general education program.

The purpose of the assessment is to determine overall institutional outcomes related to student learning in the 4 Cs. The first three years of the assessment focused on assessment of Critical Thinking and Communication. In spring 2016, the GEAC piloted a rubric for cultural understanding, also based on the AAC&U Value Rubrics.

In addition to use of the essay as a direct measure of student learning of the 4 Cs, SKC also uses indirect measures including student, graduate, and faculty satisfaction surveys.

In review of the results of the assessment, the General Education Committee and the GEAC determined that student achievement in communication and critical thinking are below the desired benchmark of 75%. The Committees are jointly working on a set of recommendations for general education revision, to be proposed to Curriculum Committee in fall 2016.

## II. General Education Direct Assessment

In Academic Year 2011-2012, SKC responded to the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities' recommendation that the College develop an assessment plan for general education. The Academic Vice President and the Institutional Researcher (now Office of Institutional Effectiveness) met to discuss the recommendation and discussion occurred in Curriculum Committee.

In Academic Year 2012-2013, a task force of SKC faculty members, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Institutional Researcher investigated options for conducting an annual direct assessment of SKC's general education outcomes. The task force reviewed externally validated examinations such as the Collegiate Learning Assessment or CLA. The Institutional Researcher also attended the AAC&U General Education Assessment meeting and sessions at the Association for Institutional Research annual meeting. The task force ultimately decided to pilot the use of an institutionally developed assessment to measure student outcomes in the "4 Cs". The General Education Assessment was piloted in spring 2013 and fully implemented in spring 2014.

The General Education Assessment consists of a timed essay, and is required of all graduating Associate Degree students. The Assessment is also taken by rising sophomores in majors offering only a Bachelor Degree. While SKC does have some students transferring to its upper division programs, approximately 85% of graduating Bachelor Degree students either started in an Associated Degree program or are included in the rising sophomore assessment cohort. Therefore, the assessment provides a measure of student outcomes in the 4 Cs at the sophomore level.

Prompts for the writing assessment were primarily derived from the Enduring Legacies Native Cases Project at Evergreen State College, Olympia, WA (<http://nativecases.evergreen.edu/>). The Enduring Legacies Native Cases are designed to promote the use of culturally relevant curricula, embedding issues such as tribal sovereignty and worldview into contemporary cases. The Liberal Arts Department developed assessment prompts; prompts were reviewed by members of the GEAC and General Education Committee. Instructions are provided to students concerning the Assessment; the instructions are provided as Appendix A. An example of a prompt is attached as Appendix B. The Assessment Rubric is attached as Appendix C.

In spring 2013, 99 graduating Associate Degree students completed the pilot of the writing assessment administered by their academic major departments who followed administration instructions. Discussion concerning the results suggested that while the mechanism of using the written assessment and the rubric appeared to be valid, there were some concerns related to consistency in the administration methods. In spring 2014, the administration process was standardized by having all graduating Associate Degree students sign up for a time slot in the library computer labs. The assessment was proctored by the Writing Lab Director and tutors, ensuring increased fidelity of administration. In spring 2016, 97% of graduating Associate Degree students completed the assessment.

The assessment rubric is derived from the AAC&U value rubrics (<https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics>). Evaluation of student results is completed by a cross-disciplinary group of faculty members using the established rubric. Inter-rater reliability is established by having all evaluators score the same essay and discuss their ratings. This process is repeated until all evaluators are within 2 points of each other.



Results of the General Education Assessment are provided below. **Data for individual departments should be interpreted cautiously, as only one or two students from certain departments may have taken the assessment.**

Table 1. Trends in Student Scores on General Education Assessment

	Number of Participants	Average Critical Thinking Score (Max. Score = 15)	Average Communication Score (Max. Score = 15)	Average of Total Score (Max. Score = 30)
2014 Participants	78	10.1	8.4	19.3
2015 Participants	77	9.9	8.2	18.1
2016 Participants	66	10.4	11.2	21.3

Table 2. Scores by Department, Spring 2014

Department	Student Count from Department	Average of Critical Thinking Score (15 points possible)	Average of Communication Score (15 points possible)	Average of Total Score	Lowest Score out of 30 possible	Highest Score out of 30 possible
ENTR	1	7.0	4.0	11.0	11	11
LART	2	7.0	6.0	13.0	12	14
NAMS	1	7.0	7.0	14.0	14	14
OFFP	1	8.0	6.0	14.0	14	14
HYDR	2	9.0	7.0	16.0	15	17
DENTA	3	8.7	8.0	16.7	15	20
BTAAS	3	9.7	7.7	17.3	14	23
ITAS	4	9.8	8.0	17.8	12	26
NURS	15	9.9	8.4	18.3	12	26
PSYC	8	10.8	7.6	18.4	10	26
BMGMT	5	9.8	8.6	18.4	14	25
ELEME	10	10.9	8.9	19.8	13	26
SWCD	5	11.4	9.0	20.4	14	25
ECED	5	11.0	9.6	20.6	16	24
TRPR	11	11.1	9.8	20.9	13	26
WILD	1	12.0	11.0	23.0	23	23
ENVS	1	13.0	11.0	24.0	24	24
Overall Average		10.1	8.4	18.5	10	26
Total # of Students	78					

Table 3. Scores by Department, Spring 2015

Department	Student Count from Department	Average of Critical Thinking Score (15 points possible)	Average of Communication Score (15 points possible)	Average of Total Score	Lowest Score out of 30 possible	Highest Score out of 30 possible
HCT	1	6.0	5.0	11.0	11	11
LART	2	7.0	6.0	13.0	12	14
MDDSN	1	7.0	6.0	13.0	13	13
NAMS	1	7.0	7.0	14.0	14	14
OFFP	1	8.0	6.0	14.0	14	14
DATD	1	7.0	8.0	15.0	15	15
BMGMT	6	8.0	7.5	15.5	13	22
HYDR	2	9.0	7.0	16.0	15	17
DENTA	3	8.7	8.0	16.7	15	20
ENVS	2	10.0	7.5	17.5	11	24
NURS	14	9.6	8.1	17.8	12	26
PSYC	8	10.5	7.6	18.1	10	26
BTAAS	2	10.5	8.5	19.0	15	23
ITAS	3	11.0	8.7	19.7	16	26
ELEME	10	10.9	8.9	19.8	13	26
ECED	3	11.3	9.7	21.0	17	24
SWCD	6	11.7	9.3	21.0	14	25
TRPR	9	11.1	9.9	21.0	13	26
FORS	1	14.0	8.0	22.0	22	22
WILD	1	12.0	11.0	23.0	23	23
Overall Average		9.5	7.9	17.4	14.9	20.1
Total # of Students	77					

Table 4. Scores by Department, Spring 2016

Department	Student Count from Department	Average of Critical Thinking Score (15 points possible)	Average of Communication Score (15 points possible)	Average of Total Score	Lowest Score out of 30 possible	Highest Score out of 30 possible
Spokane TC	4	7.5	6.3	13.8	13.0	15.0
BMGMT	6	7.2	9.7	16.8	11.0	21.0
LART	2	9.5	8.0	17.5	14.0	21.0
LSCI	1	8.0	11.0	19.0	19.0	19.0
ARTS	3	9.3	10.0	19.3	18.0	22.0
MDDSN	3	10.0	10.3	20.3	16.0	24.0
NASD	2	10.0	10.5	20.5	11.0	30.0
ECED	2	11.0	10.5	21.5	21.0	22.0
PSYC	15	9.8	11.7	21.5	14.0	30.0
BTAAS	3	10.3	11.3	21.7	13.0	28.0
WILD	1	11.0	12.0	23.0	23.0	23.0
SWKCD	6	11.2	12.2	23.3	14.0	29.0
NURS	9	11.8	11.8	23.6	17.0	29.0
ECEDP3	2	12.5	13.0	25.5	23.0	28.0
ELEME	2	8.0	11.5	19.5	13.0	26.0
ITAS	2	13.0	15.0	28.0	27.0	29.0
HYDR	2	14.5	14.0	28.5	27.0	30.0
TRPR	1	14.0	15.0	29.0	29.0	29.0
Overall Average		10.2	11.2	21.3	11.0	
Total # of Students	66					

### III. Indirect Assessment of General Education Outcomes

In addition to direct measurement, SKC also uses surveys to elicit student, graduate, and staff perceptions of student outcomes in the 4 Cs. Students are asked to rate their learning in these general education outcomes in the biannual student satisfaction survey. This section of the report provides these results followed by analysis.

Table 5. Student Perceptions

Student Perceptions of Learning the 4 Cs (Critical Thinking, Communication, Cultural Understanding, Citizenship)			
5 = Strongly Agree, 1 = Strongly Disagree	2011	2013	2015
I understand what my instructors mean by:			
Critical Thinking	3.8	4.1	4.2
Communication	4.0	4.0	4.1
Citizenship	4.0	4.0	4.0
Cultural Understanding	3.9	4.1	4.0
I increased my knowledge/skills this year in:			
Critical Thinking	3.8	4.0	4.1
Communication	4.0	4.0	4.1
Citizenship	4.0	3.9	4.0
Cultural Understanding	3.8	4.1	4.0

Table 6. Graduate Perceptions of Learning the 4 Cs.

How satisfied are you with the way your education at SKC prepared you to do the following:		
5 = Very Satisfied, 1 = Very Dissatisfied	2013	2015
Think critically	4.2	4.2
Communicate clearly and effectively	4.2	4.4
Participate as a citizen in your community	4.1	4.4
Respect and be aware of Native American culture and traditions	4.2	4.5

The biannual faculty satisfaction survey asks faculty to provide their perceptions of their own skills in teaching and assessing the 4 Cs as well as their perceptions of student outcomes.

Table 7. Faculty Perceptions of Skills Teaching and Assessment the 4 Cs

<b>Please rate your ability as a faculty member in the following areas:</b>	2011 Average	2013 Average	2015 Average
Teaching Critical Thinking	3.73	3.89	3.76
Assessing Critical Thinking	3.56	3.6	3.71
Teaching Communication	3.66	3.58	4.04
Assessing Communication	3.79	3.86	3.73
Teaching Cultural Understanding	3.52	2.91	2.91
Assessing Cultural Understanding	3.31	2.83	2.93
Teaching Citizenship	3.55	3.17	3.51
Assessing Citizenship	3.24	3.14	3.40

Table 8. Faculty Perceptions of Student Learning of the 4 Cs

<b>Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:</b>	2011 Average	2013 Average	2015 Average
SKC's General Education Program emphasizes the 4 Cs.	4.03	4.09	4.09
In my teaching, I emphasize the Four Cs (Critical Thinking, Communication, Cultural Understanding, Citizenship).	4.23	4.22	4.18
I have a working definition of the College's 4 Cs.	4.15	4.22	4.11
In general, SKC graduates demonstrate good communication skills.	3.51	3.49	3.41
In general, SKC graduates demonstrate good critical thinking skills.	3.52	3.54	3.51
In general, SKC graduates demonstrate citizenship.	3.79	3.78	3.82
In general, SKC graduates demonstrate cultural understanding	3.93	3.86	3.91

#### IV. Summary of Findings

Results of the direct assessment essay show inconsistent student achievement in Critical Thinking and Communication. However, the average student scores are below 75% (or 22.5/30 points), set as a benchmark for the purposes of Core Theme assessment.

## V. Next Steps

The General Education Committee review of the assessment results and Committee perceptions of the value of a more integrated general education program have resulted in draft recommendations for general education revision. The Committee plans to take its recommendations to the Curriculum Committee in fall, 2016.

Recommendations for the general education revision include the following:

1. Implement a required 3-credit course to be placed in all first year curricula. The new course will be an integrated, interdisciplinary general education course that introduces students to the 4 Cs as well as disciplinary ways of knowing, and will be team-taught by 3 faculty members from different academic departments.
2. Reduce the number of general education requirements in the lower division (Associate Degree) program by at least one course.
3. Reduce the number of courses on the general education "lists" (SKC Catalog pgs. 25-33) and ensure that each general education course on a list enhances student learning in at least one of the "Cs" through the syllabus and assessment methods. Currently, the lists are a disconnected set of courses that students take to fulfill general education requirements.
4. Create a menu of "flagged assignments" for each of the general education outcomes. Each course on a general education list will utilize one of the assignments as one component of the course grade. The assignments will be "flagged" and tracked via SKC's assessment software, TracDat. This will align general education courses with outcomes and provide an additional mechanism for assessment of student outcomes in the 4 Cs.

Additionally, there is a need to provide new faculty members with orientation related to the 4 Cs, including teaching and assessment of those outcomes. Results from the faculty satisfaction survey suggest that newer faculty members, particularly those who have taught at SKC only 1-2 years, have lower self-perceptions of their own skills in teaching and assessing the 4 Cs.

## Appendix A

### **Information about the General Education Essay Assessment**

#### **What is the General Education Assessment?**

In each SKC degree program, students complete a set of courses called “General Education Courses.” These courses include an emphasis on the 4 Cs: Critical Thinking, Cultural Awareness, Citizenship, and Communication.

The SKC faculty is interested in how well students are learning the 4 Cs. The General Education Essay Assessment is one process that is used to help faculty improve student learning at the College. In 2016, the assessment will emphasize three Cs: Critical Thinking, Communication, and Cultural Understanding.

#### **Who has to complete the Assessment?**

The Assessment is a written essay that is taken by students who are graduating from an Associate Degree Program and students who are continuing from sophomore to junior year. The requirement for the Assessment is listed in the SKC Catalog under graduation requirements (p. 5) and described further described on p. 20.

**All students graduating from SKC this June with an Associate Degree are required to take this assessment.** Students in Bachelor Degree programs who are moving from sophomore to junior status may be asked by their department to take the assessment.

Accommodation for documented disabilities will be provided. Please contact Stacey Sherwin at the number below to arrange for accommodations.

#### **When is the Assessment?**

All students will take the assessment in the D’Arcy McNickle Library’s Computer Labs. The Labs will be proctored. There will be five minutes of directions, then you will have 60 minutes to complete the essay.

Here are the times for this year’s assessment:

Monday, April 18, 11-12:15 – large computer lab (18 slots)  
Tuesday, April 19, 2:30-3:45 – large computer lab (18 slots)  
Wednesday, April 20, 9-10:15 - large computer lab (18 slots)  
Thursday, April 21, 2:30-3:45 – large computer lab (18 slots)  
Friday, April 22, 11-12:15 – large computer lab (18 slots)  
Monday, April 25, 9-10:15 – large computer lab (18 slots)  
Wednesday, April 27, 9-10:15 - large computer lab (18 slots)  
Wednesday, April 27, 11-12:15, -large computer lab (18 slots)  
Thursday, April 28, 2:30-3:45 – large computer lab (18 slots)

### **How do I Sign Up?**

Please watch for an email from Stacey Sherwin, Director of SKC's Office of Institutional Effectiveness, with information about registering for an assessment session. The email will be titled, "Signing up for General Education Assessment."

### **Should I Study for the Assessment?**

There is no need to study for this assessment. The essay will include the writing basics you learned in your college English courses and the critical thinking skills you learned in other classes.

### **Are There Other Rules for the Assessment?**

1. Once you start the assessment, you will not be able to leave the room until the end of the time period, even if you have finished your work.
2. You may not eat during the assessment. Beverages will be allowed in containers with secure lids.
3. You will not be allowed to use headphones unless you have a documented disability requiring headphones.
4. Cell phones must be turned off and put away during the assessment.

### **Is there a Passing Score?**

The maximum score for the assessment is 30 points.

### **How is the Assessment Used?**

A group of faculty members evaluate the essays. The criteria for evaluating the essays are included on the next pages.

Scores on the essay are NOT used to delay individual student graduation or progress toward degree completion. Scores on the essay do NOT count toward grades in any class.

The results of the assessment are very important to the College, as student achievement on the essay IS used to improve student learning in the general education program. Additionally, assessment of general education is required by our accrediting body, the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities.

If you have questions about this assessment process, you can talk to the Department Head in your academic major, or call Stacey Sherwin, SKC Director of Institutional Effectiveness, at 275-4931 or the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs at 275-4972.



## Appendix B

Salish Kootenai College Assessment Spring 2016

### Essay Prompt #5

Starting in the mid-1940's, the Hanford Nuclear Reservation in southeastern Washington was used to manufacture plutonium for development of nuclear weapons. By the 1980s, activities at Hanford had left a legacy of environmental degradation that led to an ongoing, costly, and incredibly complex effort to clean up what has been called "the most contaminated site in the Western Hemisphere" In 1988, Hanford was designated as a Superfund site, and the federal government took the responsibility for cleaning the area of contaminants and toxic waste and making it safe for human use.

The environmental and health risks left at Hanford are a particular concern to Native Americans in the region. Treaties that ceded the Hanford region to the federal government in 1855 also retained Native rights to use the area for hunting, fishing, gathering, and cultural practices. Native people, including the Yakama (Yakima), have been exposed to radiological and other hazardous materials because of their traditional diets and the location of the contamination at Hanford. Despite its claim to protect Native American rights to resources, the federal Department of Energy (DOE) has stated its plans to put the Hanford site into long term monitoring, which would stop active clean up processes.

The DOE admits that cleanup of Hanford may not be not possible for several reasons, including the technical difficulty and huge cost of the remediation. Essentially, the DOE has defined environmental remediation at Hanford to actually mean partial clean up and restoration in order to accomplish its stated objectives as well as adhere to their obligation to protect Native resources. This leaves residents in the region and Native Americans like the Yakama to struggle with the continuing toxic legacy of Hanford.

Write an essay in response to the question below. Justify your reasoning.

*What position and actions should the Yakama take in dealing with the Department of Energy and the Hanford site?*

Adapted from Evergreen State College Enduring Legacies Project: The Yakama Nation and the Cleanup of Hanford: Contested Meanings of Environmental Remediation. (Bush, 2014).

## Appendix C

### General Education Assessment Rubric

Essential Characteristics	Level of Achievement		
Points	1	2	3
<b>Critical Thinking</b>			
Explanation of issues	No identification or summary of the issue/problem	The main question/idea is apparent or implied, but not clearly stated	The main question/idea and related aspects of the question are identified and clearly stated
Student's Position	The student does not take a position or interpret the topic or question.	The student's interpretation or position on the topic is implied or unclearly stated.	The student's own interpretation or position on the topic is clearly stated.
Complexities and Alternative Positions	Specific position is stated but simplistic and does not consider complexities or other possible positions.	Specific position (perspective, thesis) acknowledges other sides of an issue	The student's position, perspective, or thesis takes into account the complexities of the issue, limitations of the student's position
Influence of context, assumptions (historical, cultural, societal, or other contexts).	Little to no discussion of the context of the issue, assumptions that may impact the issue	Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).	Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.
Logic and Evidence	No supporting data, logical argument, little attempt to provide evidence, no logical argument presented	Evidence and logic are used, and inferences of cause and effect are stated but not substantiated. Facts and opinions are not clearly distinguished from value judgments.	Evidence and/or background information are identified. Facts are separated from opinions, and a logical argument is provided.
<b>Communication</b>			
Ideas	Does not clearly focus on topic, with limited demonstration of understanding the topic	Some focus on topic, with insufficient details to demonstrate understanding of topic	There is one clear, well-focused topic
Organization	Rambling and unfocused with no clear beginning or ending, and no clear overall organization	There is an overall organization and logical order to ideas, and an attempt at introduction and conclusion	There is an introduction, a logical order to ideas, and a conclusion
Conventions (Mechanics)	Numerous or frequent errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, grammar, which would require substantial editing	Demonstrates control of writing conventions (punctuation, spelling, grammar, usage)	Strong control of writing conventions, with few errors so minor they do not impede readability
Word Choice	Uses a limited vocabulary that does not communicate strongly, does not draw vivid images	Uses some vivid words, but some word choices inaccurate or repetitive, does not communicate strongly	Word choice is accurate, using vivid words and phrases
Sentence Fluency	Sentences are difficult to read, awkward, distractingly repetitive, or disconnected from other sentences	Some sentences are awkward, difficult to understand	All sentences sound natural, with flow and clarity; sentences are connected to other sentences

