Trinity Valley Community College
General Education Report Results
FY08

May 19, 2010

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Trinity Valley Community College's (TVCC's) General Education Evaluation Team, acting as a subcommittee of the curriculum and instruction committee included team members: Jeremy McMillen, Kelly Driskell, Brad Elmore, Nancy Long, David Loper, Bill Monds, Kay Pulley, Tina Rummel, and Russell Self.

The charge was given to rate the appropriateness of the Learning Enhancement Annual Plans LEAP(s) for a given General Education Outcome, so the reviewer had to rate the outcome as high quality, moderate quality or poor quality, using the definitions below.

 •A High Quality – LEAP(s) outcome and results had to convincingly demonstrates that we are measuring how well students engage in this specific learning outcome (e.g. Reading Pre and Post tests in developmental reading courses measure specific outcomes related to reading skills) a high quality outcome includes measurement, the discussion of results, and proposed changes.
•Moderate Quality - LEAP(s) outcome and results would appear to be related to the specific general education outcome listed, but the outcome statement, measurement method, discussion of results, or proposed changes were off target.
•Poor Quality - LEAP(s) outcome and results would be an outcome plan that DOES NOT appear to be related to the specific general education outcome listed, and/or the measurement DOES NOT clearly demonstrate how the institution is accomplishing the outcome, which would require modification or changing of the entire outcome.

Evaluation of TVCC's General Education Outcomes Results Processes

STRENGTHS

- TVCC is measuring student learning and continuing to share information in a way that appears to be leading to enhanced student learning.
- Results of student learning outcomes are being shared through increased communication channels which are causing good conversations about learning.
- The Learning Enhancement Annual Plan (LEAP(S) process is designed in a manner that creates significant faculty and departmental input.
- While we are not experts at measuring and reporting student learning, there are clear indications that this process is leading to improvements in this process and student learning.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENHANCEMENT

IMPROVING AND STREAMLINING THE EVALUATION PROCESS

The General Education Outcomes used for this evaluation process were the more specific ones adopted in FY07. More recent discussions were held to redesign the evaluation form by creating a more clearly defined rating scale. Though each General Education Outcome evaluator has individual control of their ratings, the goal of arriving at more equity in the ratings has been addressed. In addition, the evaluation form was put online for convenience. (See Appendix A)

IMPROVING QUALITY

A major effort to get the evaluated LEAP(S) into the hands of the departmental chairmen and the faculty that originated them has been undertaken. There has also been some departmental meetings to help improve the quality of LEAP(S) by additional training.

ADDITIONAL ENHANCEMENT

A faculty development program called the Learning Academy is actively enhancing teaching methods and assisting in the cultural shift from teaching to learning. The LEAP(S) process has become so permanently embedded in the beginning and end of regular school year duties that all faculty on all campuses are now tied to the student learning outcomes development and analysis. Additional discussions, training, and instructions are needed to consistently use the results for appropriate changes to the LEAP(S) goals.

OTHER DATA SOURCES

TVCC continues to use a variety of assessment instruments to help gather data to determine our success in meeting our General Education Outcomes. The Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP), Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), and TVCC's Graduating Student Survey continue to be used as additional measurements. Our assessment populations are being expanded and multi-year data is yielding better comparisons since our benchmarking efforts in FY06.

The table below provides a ranking of the outcomes evaluated and shows how well the institution is writing LEAP(s) related to a specific General Education Outcome. As you will notice in the table, it is clear that we have made progress towards evaluating General Education Outcomes at Trinity Valley Community College.

General Education Goal Description	High Quality Count	%	Moderate Quality Count	%	Poor Quality Count	%	Total by Goal Count	%
To communicate clearly and effectively in both oral and written English.	46	58.23%	30	37.97%	3	3.80%	79	100.00%
To improve reading skills focused on comprehending, analyzing, interpreting, and evaluating printed materials.	28	33.73%	30	36.14%	25	30.12%	83	100.00%
To utilize computer based technology in accessing information, solving problems, and communicating.	22	88.00%	1	4.00%	2	8.00%	25	100.00%
To demonstrate qualitative and quantitative critical thinking skills.	16	22.54%	38	53.52%	17	23.94%	71	100.00%
To understand mathematical information and utilize mathematical skills.	14	48.28%	10	34.48%	5	17.24%	29	100.00%
To understand and appreciate cultural and ethnic diversity.	6	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%	6	100.00%
To demonstrate knowledge of the physical universe and living systems.	12	66.67%	4	22.22%	2	11.11%	18	100.00%
To develop skills and strategies to become an engaged learner.	29	72.50%	8	20.00%	3	7.50%	40	100.00%
To improve basic understanding of political, economic, and social systems.	5	62.50%	2	25.00%	1	12.50%	8	100.00%
To recognize and evaluate artistic achievements in the visual and performing arts.	4	57.14%	3	42.86%		0.00%	7	100.00%
Grand Total by Quality	**182**	**49.73%**	**126**	**34.43%**	**58**	**15.85%**	**366**	**100.00%**

ORAL & WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

DATA ANALYZED - FY08 LEAP(s) Results, Graduating Student Survey

Quality of Learning Enhancement Annual Plans LEAP(s) Results

High Quality – LEAP(s) outcome and results had to convincingly demonstrates that we are measuring how well students engage in this specific learning outcome (e.g. Reading Pre and Post tests in developmental reading courses measure specific outcomes related to reading skills) a high quality outcome includes measurement, the discussion of results, and proposed changes. Below is a list of courses that assessed oral and written communication as a high quality LEAP(s):

COURSE	# OF HIGH QUALITY OUTCOMES
Accounting	2
Agriculture	2
Business and Office Administration	5
Child Development	3
Communications/Journalism	2
Cosmetology	1
Criminal Justice	2
Developmental Writing	1
English	2
Foreign Language	2
History	1
Horticulture	2
Kinesiology	2
Legal Assistant	2
Management	2
Medical Office Technology	2
Music	1
Nail Technology	2
Ranch Management	2
Sociology	1
Speech	2
TDCJ-Business Computer	3
TDCJ-Drafting	1
Theater	1
TOTAL	**46**

Forty-six (58%) of the 79 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of high quality. They all clearly show relation to oral and written communication. An example of a high quality LEAP was in the speech department, this outcome contributed to the oral and written communication general education goal specifically because students had to do a number of activities in order to succeed. They were asked to communicate in a public format by creating and organizing information before they could present it. The use of a rubric clearly communicated to the students what they were expected to do. In addition, speaking publically builds self-confidence and firsthand knowledge of the importance of communication skills and research. One aspect of this is the ability to use borrowed information as well as using both verbal and nonverbal skills. This outcome was most definitely a valuable learning experience for students.

Another example of a vocational class was in the area of the Business and Office Administration where the

outcome was that students be able to examine, analyze, classify, prepare, and record accounting data for an Income Statement, in accordance with General Accounting Methods and Principles. This outcome is strong because it requires students to use conventional grammar and apply this in writing and speaking in order to communicate effectively.

It seems clear that all of the LEAP(s) in this category truly addressed the instruction of oral competencies, established valid criteria, and assessed these skills evaluated effectively.

Moderate Quality - LEAP(s) outcome and results would appear to be related to the specific general education outcome listed, but the outcome statement, measurement method, discussion of results, or proposed changes were off target. Below is a list of courses that assessed oral and written communication as a moderate quality LEAP(s):

COURSE	# OF HIGH QUALITY OUTCOMES
Cosmetology	2
Criminal Justice	1
Developmental Writing	1
English	1
Government	2
Horticulture	3
Legal Assistant	1
Medical Office Technology	1
Nail Technology	1
TDCJ-Auto Body	3
TDCJ-Computer Maintenance	3
TDCJ-Construction Carpentry	2
TDCJ-Drafting	2
TDCJ-Electronics	4
TDCJ-Horticulture	3
TOTAL	30

Thirty (38%) of the 79 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of moderate quality. They all clearly show relation to oral and written communication, but left something out that could be redone to make these a high quality LEAP(s).

In Accounting, one moderate quality outcome written stated that students should be able to calculate employee earnings and deductions and prepare and complete a Payroll Register. The goals, implementation, assessment, criteria, results, and changes implemented for students who did not succeed were clear and specific results were given, but the number of students evaluated, numbers of sections evaluated, and locations of sections evaluated were not given, resulting in a moderate evaluation by the elevator of the LEAP(s).

Poor Quality - LEAP(s) outcome and results would be an outcome plan that does not appear to be related to the specific general education outcome listed, and/or the measurement does not clearly demonstrate how the institution is accomplishing the outcome, which would require modification or changing of the entire outcome. Below is a list of courses that assessed oral and written communication as a poor quality LEAP(s):

COURSE	# OF POOR QUALITY OUTCOMES
TDCJ-Auto Body	1
TDCJ-Horticulture	1
Vocational Nursing	1
TOTAL	**3**

Only three (4%) of the 79 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of poor quality. They clearly did not show a relation to oral and written communication, therefore they would need to be rewritten in order to be considered a high or moderate quality LEAP(s). The TDCJ Auto Body outcome describes that students will have the skill to properly condition metal for painting using the product Rust Cure. This outcome is considered poor quality because the assessment method was that students use the product Rust Cure to treat a metal panel for painting and that the chemical must stay on the panel long enough to remove any surface rust and penetrate the pores of the metal. The panel will sheet water if properly treated and bead water if not properly treated. This does not relate to oral and written communication other than being tested in their third cycle. I would categorize this outcome as a hands-on learning experiment. Careful consideration should be given in the future when selecting genral education goals.

*Note – We are not judging how well the planning unit achieved its Assessment Criteria listed (e.g. 50% of students were able to write an argumentative essay), only whether it is a plausible way to measure this General Education Outcome (assessing an argumentative essay using a rubric that identifies the key components of an essay and student strengths and weaknesses is an appropriate way to measure the general education outcome of writing).

DATA QUALITY REVIEW - OTHER RELEVANT DATA

Overall, I do believe the quality of data to be high. Many LEAP(s) accurately assessed oral and written communication skills. While the overall qualities of the LEAP(s) themselves were high, benchmark data from the 2007-2009 TVCC Graduating Student Survey results also revealed that students do perceive that their oral and written communication skills improved after their tenure at TVCC. On a scale of one ("I learned nothing") to seven ("I learned a great deal"), 545 Students 19% of vocational students, 43% of AAS (vocational) students, and 38% of AA (transfer) students selected a 5 or 6 in ranking their improvements resulting in a 5.36 mean average.

EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT OUTCOME

SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS - Seventy-six or 96%, of the 79 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of high or moderate quality . As stated above the overall qualities of the LEAP(s) themselves were high and benchmark data from the 2007-2009 TVCC Graduating Student Survey results also revealed that students do perceive that their oral and written communication skills improved after their tenure at TVCC.

SUMMARY OF WEAKNESSES - Only three or 4% of the 79 outcomes were rated as poor quality. Specifically, the weaknesses lie in the understanding of what teaching and evaluating oral and written communication skills really means. TVCC instructors need clarification on the type of activities and behaviors that qualify as oral and written communication skills. Each of the issues raised above should be

addressed with faculty members in one-on-one or small group sessions so that each instructor's LEAP may be discussed and clarified.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Perhaps each faculty member's supervisor/division chairperson should make a point of carefully reading each LEAP(s) and discussing with the faculty member any problems with the LEAP(s) before it is submitted further. In addition, continued training (perhaps during the division meetings) would be appropriate, but it is believed that it is best to work one-on-one with those who seem to be having difficulty. Small group sessions can be scheduled with the Assistant Vice President of Research, Planning and Effectiveness or the Institutional Research Director for faculty to get a better understanding of how to properly write and evaluate a LEAP(s). After training has taken place, when each LEAP(s) is submitted to the appropriate supervisor, the LEAP(s) will be approved or it will be rejected and sent back for additional modifications. The institutional research department is in the process of redoing the assessment database for easier use to the user and tracking for the research department. Every TVCC instructor must be on the same page when it comes to the development and implementation of LEAP(s).

READING

DATA ANALYZED

FY08 LEAP(s) Results, CAAP Reading, Graduating Student Survey

DATA QUALITY REVIEW - Learning Enhancement Annual Plans (LEAP(s)) Results

Quality of LEAP(s) Submitted.

<u>High Quality</u> – LEAP(s) outcome and results had to convincingly demonstrates that we are measuring how well students engage in this specific learning outcome (e.g. Reading Pre and Post tests in developmental reading courses measure specific outcomes related to reading skills) a high quality outcome includes measurement, the discussion of results, and proposed changes. Below is a list of courses that assessed reading as a high quality LEAP(s):

Course	# OF HIGH QUALITY OUTCOMES
AAT- Education	1
Associate Degree Nursing	1
Biology	1
Business and Office Administration	1
Computer Science	2
Developmental Reading	3
Developmental Writing	2
English	3
Foreign Language	1
History	1
Music	1
Sociology	1
TDCJ-Auto Body	3
TDCJ-Computer Maintenance	3
TDCJ-Construction Carpentry	1
TDCJ-Electronics	3
AAT- Education	1
Associate Degree Nursing	1
Biology	1
Business and Office Administration	1
Computer Science	2
Developmental Reading	3
Total	**28**

Twenty eight or 33.73%, of the 83 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of high quality. LEAP(s) rated

as high quality specified a student learning outcome that did clearly relate to a component or components of reading.

 In Biology 2401 students had to demonstrate scientific reading and comprehension ability with basic biology reading passages. This outcome directly addresses improving comprehension of discipline specific reading and they used a pre and post semester test to assess improvement of reading skills. The outcome results did access the improvement of reading skills even though results were not quite those desired in number of students participating or level of success. The pre and post test concept used an instrument that assessed scientific reading comprehension and not material covered in the class.

Moderate Quality - LEAP(s) outcome and results would appear to be related to the specific general education outcome listed, but the outcome statement, measurement method, discussion of results, or proposed changes were off target, but making modification to this would make this an acceptable outcomes. Below is a list of courses that assessed reading as a moderate quality LEAP(s):

COURSE	# OF MODERATE QUALITY OUTCOMES
Accounting	3
Agriculture	1
Business and Office Administration	5
Communications/Journalism	2
Computer Science	1
Criminal Justice	3
Government	2
History	2
Legal Assistant	2
Management	1
Nail Technology	2
Physics	1
Ranch Management	1
Sociology	1
TDCJ-Business Computer	2
TDCJ-Horticulture	1
Grand Total Business and Office Administration	**30**

Thirty or 36.14%, of the 83 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of moderate quality. LEAP(s) rated as moderate quality specified a student-learning outcome that did clearly relate to a component or components of reading, but was missing something.

One outcome in History 1301 and 1302 stated that students would be able to demonstrate an understanding of the historical evolution and current role of the United States in world affairs. The criteria stated that during the 07-08 academic year, the history instructors at TVCC selected readings from the

textbook for both HIST 1301 and HIST 1302 to measure student engagement and critical thinking as part of the Learning Initiative. A standardized, multiple-choice instrument was developed and administered to all sections through the WebCT portal. The pre and post semester reading skills were evaluated and students met a goal of successful completion on the reading tests, but the results did not provide an analysis of improvement or decline in reading skills over the period of the course. Information provided only indicated that students passed the test. If the information had provided an analysis of improvement or decline this would have been considered a high quality LEAP(s).

 Many of these outcomes were too broad in scope. Several outcomes could be written from one broad outcome. Modifications of this would make them acceptable outcomes. Measurements were good, and discussion of results was on target.

Poor Quality - LEAP(s) outcome and results would be an outcome plan that DOES NOT appear to be related to the specific general education outcome listed, and/or the measurement DOES NOT clearly demonstrate how the institution is accomplishing the outcome, which would require modification or changing of the entire outcome. Below is a list of courses that assessed reading as a poor quality LEAP(s):

Course	# OF POOR QUALITY OUTCOMES
Fire Science	1
Horticulture	4
Kinesiology	1
Legal Assistant	1
Management	2
Medical Office Technology	3
Nail Technology	1
TDCJ-Auto Body	1
TDCJ-Business Computer	1
TDCJ-Construction Carpentry	1
TDCJ-Drafting	3
TDCJ-Electronics	1
TDCJ-Masonry	5
Fire Science	1
TOTAL	**26**

Twenty-five or 30.13% of the 83 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of poor quality. They clearly did not show a relation to reading, therefore they would need to be rewritten in order to be considered a high or moderate quality LEAP(s). Many of these were from courses that required hands-on evaluations, not reading-based assessments. While many courses required that students read, assessments required visual action for evaluation.

*Note – We are not judging how well the planning unit achieved its Assessment Criteria listed (e.g. 50% of students were able to write an argumentative essay), only whether it is a plausible way to measure this General Education Outcome (assessing an argumentative essay using a rubric that identifies the key components of an essay and student strengths and weaknesses is an appropriate way to measure the general education outcome of writing).

DATA QUALITY REVIEW - OTHER RELEVANT DATA

The quality of data overall was very good. General Educational Outcomes were supported by the data. Some outcomes needed more description of the testing instrument, but, overall, outcomes were supported by assessment measures.

While the overall qualities of the LEAP(s) themselves were high, benchmark data from the 2007-2009 TVCC Graduating Student Survey results also revealed that students do perceive that their reading skills improved after their tenure at TVCC. On a scale of one ("I learned nothing") to seven ("I learned a great deal"), 544 Students 19% of vocational students, 43% of AAS (vocational) students, and 37% of AA (transfer) students selected a 5 or 6 in ranking their improvements resulting in a 5.09 mean average. Results from the 2006 CAAP of all Reading Test taken nationally, provide another positive perspective. Composite reading scores reflect that on average face-to-face students scored 51% nationally and TVCC graduates performed better at 58%. Distance education graduates scored 63% nationally and TVCC graduates performed better at 69% of all Reading CAAP tested students. Evaluation of student performance on the arts/literature reading sub-scale indicates that national students perform at 45% of all Reading CAAP tested students, while TVCC graduates perform better at 59%. Analysis of student performance on the social studies/sciences reading sub-scale indicate that nationally, students perform at 40%, while TVCC graduates perform better at 51% of all Reading CAAP tested students. Performance among other groups was within close range of these rankings.

EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT OUTCOME

SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS - Of the reading LEAP(s), 70% were of high or moderate quality. This is a good indication that our institution expects students to perform better on reading comprehension. Results from the 2006 CAAP of all Reading Test taken nationally, provide another positive perspective. Composite reading scores reflect that on average face-to-face students scored 51% nationally and TVCC graduates performed better at 58%. Distance education graduates scored 63% nationally and TVCC graduates performed better at 69% of all Reading CAAP tested students. Evaluation of student performance on the arts/literature reading sub-scale indicates that national students perform at 45% of all Reading CAAP tested students, while TVCC graduates perform better at 59%. Analysis of student performance on the social studies/sciences reading sub-scale indicate that nationally, students perform at 40%, while TVCC graduates perform better at 51% of all Reading CAAP tested students. Performance among other groups was within close range of these rankings.

SUMMARY OF WEAKNESSES - Twenty-five (30.12%) of the 83 outcomes were rated poor quality. In many of these courses, hands-on evaluations were necessary. In some cases desired outcomes simply were too broad to be measured by the assessment tools. Improvements could be made by narrowing our desired outcomes to one observation instead of many. Many vocational courses require visual assessment where rubrics would be used to strengthen the assessment tool.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT - It is important that we continue to evaluate reading as a component of the Learning Initiative to determine progress towards accomplishing this outcome. Discipline-Specific Reading Tests, the CAAP Test, and the Pre-TASP will continue to provide sufficient evidence of student learning related to reading. The charge for the institution is to identify promising approaches and techniques for making progress towards improvement in reading comprehension. The Student Success Center, Professionals offering Departmental Studies (PODS), and other supplemental instruction activities will be evaluated to determine improvements in the future. Additionally, an evaluation of student performance in courses that have been recently blocked for reading should be conducted in order to determine if the challenge is truly basic-level reading or difficulties among students who have mastered basic reading and need support in learning how to read in the discipline.

Computer Literacy

DATA ANALYZED

FY08 LEAP(s) Results, Graduating Student Survey

DATA QUALITY REVIEW - Learning Enhancement Annual Plans (LEAP(s)) Results

Quality of LEAP(s) Submitted

High Quality **–** LEAP(s) outcome and results had to convincingly demonstrates that we are measuring how well students engage in this specific learning outcome (e.g. Reading Pre and Post tests in developmental reading courses measure specific outcomes related to reading skills) a high quality outcome includes measurement, the discussion of results, and proposed changes. Below is a list of courses that assessed computer literacy as a high quality LEAP(s):

COURSE	# OF HIGH QUALITY OUTCOMES
Chemistry	1
Communications/Journalism	2
Computer Science	3
Developmental Math	1
Drafting Technology	2
Kinesiology	1
Music	1
Ranch Management	1
TDCJ-Business Computer	3
TDCJ-Computer Information Systems	7
TOTAL	22

Twenty-two (88%) of the 25 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of high quality. LEAP(s) rated as high quality specified a student learning outcome that clearly related to a component or components of computer literacy.

The high quality of the computer literacy LEAP(s) had a correspondingly high rate of accuracy of completion and accomplishment. The students using the computer to access, create, modify, print and review web pages and web page sites, certainly confirmed that the students were utilizing computer-based technology in accessing, solving and communicating information. The students certainly had a change in learning and had collaboration with the faculty member, including piers, the internet and others in this process.

The 98% percent completing rate also had a positive indicator that learning has taken place. Additionally, it 'implies' and demonstrates that the instructor and the student were collaborating and interacting each class period or meeting or on each project to accomplish the stated objective (LEAP). The data collected by the instructor using the evaluation instrument is additionally a very positive component for the accomplishment of this LEAP.

It is apparent that when looking at the high quality computer literacy LEAP(s) listed above, the data and analysis clearly show that, in most cases, students had an accomplishment rate that was well above the initial level established in the LEAP criteria.

Moderate Quality - LEAP(s) outcome and results would appear to be related to the specific general education outcome listed, but the outcome statement, measurement method, discussion of results, or proposed changes were off target, but making modification to this would make this an acceptable outcomes. Below is a course that assessed computer literacy as a moderate quality LEAP(s):

COURSE NAME	# OF MODERATE QUALITY OUTCOMES
Agriculture	1
TOTAL	1

Only one or 4% of the 25 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of moderate quality. LEAP(s) rated as moderate quality specified a student learning outcome that clearly related to a component or components of computer literacy, but left something out.

In Agriculture, the outcome stated that students should be able to demonstrate an understanding of the use of an electronic heat or estrus detection system on cattle which determines the appropriate time to artificially inseminate the female. The student will have actual on hands experience demonstrating their understanding of what they have read and their acquired knowledge of the computerized estrus detection fertilization system. The LEAP definitely has computer-based activities designed to access information and solving problems and the students ability to use the device confirms that they are utilizing computer-based

technology in accessing and communicating information.   It also demonstrates that the students have had a change in learning and have had collaboration with the faculty member, including piers, and others in the learning process. The students gain an understanding of the outcome in the course, by the reading of documents, class and instructor interaction, practice in the attaching the electronic transmitters to cows, and using the computer software that collects the data on each animal. The student can then interpret the data collected by the transmitter and determine when the fertilization period is most appropriate. Although there are no major weaknesses in the outcome, it would be nice to see the actual results of what the students learned, maybe conducting a pre and post test scenario would better capture the success of students learning.

Poor Quality - LEAP(s) outcome and results would be an outcome plan that DOES NOT appear to be related to the specific general education outcome listed, and/or the measurement DOES NOT clearly demonstrate how the institution is accomplishing the outcome, which would require modification or changing of the entire outcome. Below is a course that assessed computer literacy as a poor quality LEAP(s):

COURSE NAME	# OF POOR QUALITY OUTCOMES
Fire Science	2
TOTAL	2

Only two or 8% of the 25 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of poor quality. They clearly did not show a relation to computer literacy, therefore they would need to be rewritten in order to be considered a high or moderate quality LEAP(s). In a Fire Science course, the outcome is designed to educate the student to the fact that Hazardous Materials are at the heart of our technology-based society and that we have entered into a different world since 9/11.That world is considerable more dangerous with terrorist using. The General Education Goal is to utilize computer-based technology in accessing, solving problems, and communicating information.

In evaluating the outcome, there seems to be a disconnect between the general education goal and the use of technology in the formulation of this objective. Hazardous materials are at the heart of our technology-based society, however, the disconnect is that it cannot be found where the computer or computer based technology is used to access information, solve problems or communicate the information. There is collaboration in the implementation strategy and discussion of relevant material and ideas but no mention of the use of computer technology. Films and slides are used when appropriate but that is not computer-based technology, or it is not mentioned as being presented by computer technology. One hundred percent of the students demonstrated an understanding of the desired learning outcome on the assessment, but it could not be determined if computer based technology was used to better understand the material in the goal.

*Note – We are not judging how well the planning unit achieved its Assessment Criteria listed (e.g. 50% of students were able to write an argumentative essay), only whether it is a plausible way to measure this General Education Outcome (assessing an argumentative essay using a rubric that identifies the key components of an essay and student strengths and weaknesses is an appropriate way to measure the general education outcome of writing).

DATA QUALITY REVIEW - OTHER RELEVANT DATA

While the overall qualities of the LEAP(s) themselves were high, benchmark data from the 2007-2009 TVCC Graduating Student Survey results also revealed that students do perceive that their computer literacy skills improved after their tenure at TVCC. On a scale of one ("I learned nothing") to seven ("I learned a great deal"), 542 Students 19% of vocational students, 44% of AAS (vocational) students, and 37% of AA (transfer) students selected a 5 or 6 in ranking their improvements resulting in a 5.19 mean average.

When the TVCC instructors established outcomes that were of high quality, the objectives were specifically stated, the instructors followed through with good implementation strategies, and they established good assessment methods and measurable criteria, the computer literacy objective was accomplished with a high rate of completion.

I believe that the evaluation of the data shows that we are having success in providing computer literacy training that meets the General Education Outcome.

EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT

SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENT When the information discussed above is combined with the positive results achieved from the analysis of the LEAP(s), one can conclude that TVCC students are learning computer literacy skills and that the institution is accomplishing the computer literacy outcome related to the General Education Goal.

SUMMARY OF WEAKNESSES - The poor LEAP(s), 2 in total, represented 8% of the total computer literacy LEAP(s). It is apparent that there are weaknesses in the processes associated with the development of LEAP(s). One weakness is directly related to the instructors' understanding/misunderstanding of how to write a computer literacy desired outcome. Another weakness is determining what tools to use in the implementation strategy. Additionally, how to assess, what assessment method to use, and what criteria to set for acceptable completion are other problems with the process of developing LEAP(s). In conclusion, many of the high-quality LEAP(s) needed no revision and were very much on target. The faculty members that wrote these LEAP(s) had a very good understanding of what they were trying to accomplish from the beginning. However, other faculty members need much improvement in their skills related to writing computer literacy LEAP(s).

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT – Perhaps each faculty member's supervisor/division chairperson should make a point of carefully reading each LEAP(s) and discussing with the faculty member any problems with the LEAP(s) before it is submitted further. In addition, continued training (perhaps during the division meetings) would be appropriate, but it is believed that it is best to work one-on-one with

those who seem to be having difficulty. Small group sessions can be scheduled with the Assistant Vice President of Research, Planning and Effectiveness or the Institutional Research Director for faculty to get a better understanding of how to properly write and evaluate a LEAP(s). After training has taken place, when each LEAP(s) is submitted to the appropriate supervisor, the LEAP(s) will be approved or it will be rejected and sent back for additional modifications. The institutional research department is in the process of redoing the assessment database for easier use to the user and tracking for the research department. Every TVCC instructor must be on the same page when it comes to the development and implementation of LEAP(s).

Critical Thinking

DATA ANALYZED

FY08 LEAP(s) Results, CAAP Reading, Graduating Student Survey, Community College Survey of Student Engagement

DATA QUALITY REVIEW - Learning Enhancement Annual Plans LEAP(s) Results

Quality of LEAP(s) Submitted:

High Quality – LEAP(s) outcome and results had to convincingly demonstrates that we are measuring how well students engage in this specific learning outcome (e.g. Reading Pre and Post tests in developmental reading courses measure specific outcomes related to reading skills) a high quality outcome includes measurement, the discussion of results, and proposed changes. Below is a list of courses that assessed critical thinking as a high quality LEAP(s):

COURSE	# OF HIGH QUALITY OUTCOMES
Associate Degree Nursing	3
Chemistry	2
Developmental Math	1
English	1
Fire Science	1
Foreign Language	1
Mathematics	3
TDCJ-Auto Mechanics	2
TDCJ-Welding	1
Total	**15**

Fifteen or 23% of the 71 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of high quality. LEAP(s) rated as high quality specified a student learning outcome that clearly related to a component or components of critical thinking.

An example of one high quality outcome was in Spanish. Since students in SPAN 1411 were required to learn the Spanish language as they are exposed to and instructed in the use of the language, by asking them to write a paper in Spanish as an assessment seemed a valuable and reasonable way to assess their

achievement. Additionally, asking them to 'convert' their systemic knowledge to prose requires them to think critically, making a determination about how to best express themselves. The prose-writing sample revealed a valuable and valid result for this outcome.

Moderate Quality - LEAP(s) outcome and results would appear to be related to the specific general education outcome listed, but the outcome statement, measurement method, discussion of results, or proposed changes were off target, but making modification to this would make this an acceptable outcomes. Below is a list of courses that assessed critical thinking as a moderate quality LEAP(s):

COURSE	# OF MODERATE QUALITY OUTCOMES
Agriculture	3
Computer Science	1
Cosmetology	3
Criminal Justice	3
Developmental Math	2
English	1
Government	1
History	1
Horticulture	1
Humanities	1
Legal Assistant	3
Medical Office Technology	2
Nail Technology	1
Physics	2
Psychology	1
Ranch Management	1
Sociology	3
TDCJ-AC/Ref	3
TDCJ-Auto Mechanics	1
TDCJ-Computer Maintenance	3
TDCJ-Welding	1
TOTAL	38

Thirty-eight or 53.52%, of the 71 LEAP(s) submitted that were considered to be of moderate quality. LEAP(s) rated as moderate quality generally had student learning outcomes with some connection to aspects of critical thinking. Some LEAP(s) needed clearer and more precise wording in the outcome in order to show the goal truly involved more in-depth critical thinking skills and abilities. Words and phrases such as, "The student will be able to read a passage, write a sentence, identify certain elements, continue learning, and will know" leave some doubt about the target goal of developing critical thinking. For some of these LEAP(s), the critical thinking component is explained more fully in the "Relationship to General Education Goals" section. Most moderate-quality LEAP(s) had appropriate implementation strategies

specified, but these did not always clearly relate to developing the critical thinking component specified in the outcome. Appropriate assessment methods and measurement criteria were outlined in most of the moderate LEAP(s). Data analysis and changes which resulted from that analysis often needed more discussion and explanation. In many of the moderate LEAP(s), these sections consisted of only one or two sentences.

Poor Quality - LEAP(s) outcome and results would be an outcome plan that DOES NOT appear to be related to the specific general education outcome listed, and/or the measurement DOES NOT clearly demonstrate how the institution is accomplishing the outcome, which would require modification or changing of the entire outcome. Below is a list of courses that assessed critical thinking as a poor quality LEAP(s):

COURSE	# OF POOR QUALITY OUTCOMES
Automotive Technology	2
Biology	3
Chemistry	1
Fire Science	2
History	1
Medical Office Technology	1
Philosophy	2
TDCJ-Masonry	5
TOTAL	17

Seventeen or 23.94%, of the 71 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of poor quality. They clearly did not show a relation to critical thinking, therefore they would need to be rewritten in order to be considered a high or moderate quality LEAP(s). One outcome in Biology 1407 and 2401 stated that students should be familiar with structure, function, and relative complexity of organ systems of organisms. There is potential for this LEAP to improve critical thinking skills, as students will read and discuss material that requires them to interpret instructions given by medical professionals and make a decision based on what they read. But the results revealed how well students improved their reading skills but did not reveal how efficient they were at drawing a conclusion or making a determination based on evidence. Students were not tested on their ability to make a decision based on what they read.

Poor quality LEAP(s) did not demonstrate a clear relationship between the student learning outcome and critical thinking. Many of the learning outcomes involved lower-level, or learning that did not relate to components of critical thinking. While most of these LEAP(s) indicated the learning outcome related to the TVCC competency of critical thinking, there was no explanation, discussion, or demonstration of this relationship. Poor-quality LEAP(s) often had limited implementation strategies and assessment methods. The data analysis section and changes which resulted from that analysis needed more discussion and explanation. These sections usually consisted of only one or two sentences.

*Note – We are not judging how well the planning unit achieved its Assessment Criteria listed (e.g. 50% of students were able to write an argumentative essay), only whether it is a plausible way to measure this General Education Outcome (assessing an argumentative essay using a rubric that identifies the key components of an essay and student strengths and weaknesses is an appropriate way to measure the general education outcome of writing).

DATA QUALITY REVIEW - OTHER RELEVANT DATA

While the overall qualities of the LEAP(s) themselves were high or moderate, benchmark data from the 2007-2009 TVCC Graduating Student Survey results also revealed that students do perceive that their critical thinking improved after their tenure at TVCC. On a scale of one ("I learned nothing") to seven ("I learned a great deal"), 499 Students 20% of vocational students, 44% of AAS (vocational) students, and 36% of AA (transfer) students selected a 5 or 6 in ranking their improvements resulting in a 5.76 mean average. In addition, results from the 2008 CAAP of all Critical Thinking taken nationally, provide another perspective. Composite critical thinking scores reflect that on average face-to-face students scored 47% nationally and TVCC graduates performed better at 54%. Distance education graduates scored 59% nationally and TVCC graduates performed better at 64% of all Critical Thinking CAAP students tested.

The quality of data used to assess critical thinking skills varied from excellent to poor. A variety of assessment methods were used in data collection including objective testing, essay testing, writing assignments, oral presentations, skills demonstration, lab experiments, and portfolios. In the higher-quality LEAP(s), these assessments provided clear data linked to the outcome demonstrating that critical thinking skills were being assessed appropriately. In the weaker LEAP(s), the assessment criterion was not always clear and definitive, which led to limited and vague data analysis. One of the problems with data quality seems to be the lack of understanding about what true critical thinking involves. Without this understanding, writing critical thinking student outcomes and assessing those outcomes are problematic. This issue will be addressed in the final section of this report.

EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT

SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS - For the 71 LEAP(s) related to critical thinking, 76.06% of the LEAP(s) were of high or moderate quality, indicating from the data analysis that the established assessment criteria was met and that achievement of the student learning outcome was successful. In addition, results from the 2008 CAAP of all Critical Thinking taken nationally, provide another perspective. Composite critical thinking scores reflect that on average face-to-face students scored 47% nationally and TVCC graduates performed better at 54%. Distance education graduates scored 59% nationally and TVCC graduates performed better at 64% of all Critical Thinking CAAP students tested. While the 76.06% achievement of LEAP(s) is encouraging, it is clear that not all LEAP(s) were related to critical thinking.
SUMMARY OF WEAKNESSES - As stated in the previous section, 24% of LEAP(s) related to critical thinking indicated that the assessment criterion was not met. However, in the data analysis section, many of the LEAP(s) discussed the possible reasons that the student learning outcome was not achieved at the desired

level, and anticipated changes made as a result of this analysis were outlined. One of the major weaknesses with critical thinking LEAP(s) seemed to be a lack of understanding concerning what truly constitutes critical thinking activities and strategies. This results in student learning outcomes being written without a clear focus on critical thinking. When the outcome is not clearly written and focused on critical thinking, constructing the other sections of the LEAP(s) dealing with implementation strategies, assessment, and criteria becomes difficult to construct, apply, and implement. Some LEAP(s) seemed to incorporate critical thinking as an afterthought. The real focus of the outcome may have been on writing, speaking, reading comprehension, computer usage, etc., but sometimes the outcome tried to incorporate critical thinking as part of that focus without establishing a clear and needed connection.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT- The TVCC general education program needs to focus more on improving critical thinking skills since critical thinking is one of the cornerstones of being a learning-centered college. This recommendation is supported by the CCSSE data on "academic challenge" which shows TVCC scoring below other community colleges in the following areas:

-Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory --Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences --Making judgments about the value or soundness of information, arguments, or methods --Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations --Using information you have read or heard to perform a new skill

All of these areas clearly relate to critical thinking, and faculty need to incorporate course content and teaching strategies designed to enhance these skills and abilities. More training and one-on-one help will be provided to the person responsible for writing the LEAP(s). Each LEAP(s) submitted to the appropriate supervisor, will be approved or rejected and sent back for additional modifications. The institutional research department is in the process of redoing the assessment database for easier use to the user and tracking for the research department. However, before this system can be made to work properly, the faculty member must know how to write a LEAP(s) and need more training in what truly constitutes critical thinking. A good starting point would be to define critical thinking.

Scriven and Paul state that "[c]ritical thinking is the intellectually disciplined process of actively and skillfully conceptualizing, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and/or evaluating information gathered from, or generated by, observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication, as a guide to belief or action." These authors provide a good explanation of three elements which do not usually involve critical thinking despite being common educational pedagogy. These elements are "(1) the mere acquisition and retention of information alone, because it involves a particular way in which information is sought and treated; (2) the mere possession of a set of skills, because it involves the continual use of them, and (3) the mere use of those skills (as an exercise) without acceptance of their results." Discussing and debating these statements by Scriven and Paul would be an excellent activity for the Lunch and Learn Forums or for other faculty activities. Critical thinking could also be a focus of sessions incorporated in activities such as faculty in-service and Learning Day.

Sessions are being scheduled on different campuses and at different times to educate the faculty on how to properly write an outcome and how to implement a strategy to make the LEAP(s) successful. In addition, assessment methods must also be discussed and implemented to make the process successful. Small group sessions can be scheduled with the Assistant Vice President of Research, Planning and Effectiveness and the Institutional Research Director for faculty to get a better understanding of how to properly write and evaluate a LEAP. Peer group work sessions can also be schedule within a division so those faculty who know how to write a LEAP(s) can guide those faculty who need clarification. Small group sessions will be the best way to accomplish this task. Every TVCC instructor must be on the same page when it comes to the development and implementation of LEAP(s).

Although, poor quality LEAP(s) were revealed in the evaluation of LEAP(s), in 2008, the CAAP Critical Thinking Exam was administered to graduates. Those results yielded positive valuable data on how TVCC students compared with other two-year college students throughout the nation in the area of critical thinking. Results reflected that on average face-to-face students scored 47% nationally and TVCC graduates performed better at 54%. Distance education graduates scored 59% nationally and TVCC graduates performed better at 64%. This is a clear indication that TVCC is performing well in the area of critical thinking.

MATHEMATICS

DATA ANALYZED

FY08 LEAP(s) Results, Graduating Student Survey, 2008 CAAP

DATA QUALITY REVIEW - Learning Enhancement Annual Plans (LEAP(s)) Results

Quality of LEAP(s) Submitted

High Quality – LEAP(s) outcome and results had to convincingly demonstrates that we are measuring how well students engage in this specific learning outcome (e.g. Reading Pre and Post tests in developmental reading courses measure specific outcomes related to reading skills) a high quality outcome includes measurement, the discussion of results, and proposed changes. Below is a list of courses that assessed mathematics as a high quality LEAP(s):

COURSE	# OF HIGH QUALITY OUTCOMES
Accounting	1
Agriculture	1
Business and Office Administration	1
Developmental Math	3
Drafting Technology	1
Mathematics	3
Physics	1
Ranch Management	1
TDCJ-Masonry	1
Vocational Nursing	1
TOTAL	**14**

Fourteen or 48.28%, of 29 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of high quality. They all clearly show

relation to the mathematics General Education Goal.

On one outcome it stated that students in Physics classes will demonstrate the ability to solve physics related mathematical problems using calculators. This outcome is clearly related to mathematical skills, and that is noted. Implementation, assessment, criteria for 3 related outcomes, results, and changes were reported. The standards were high and students came close to meeting them. Only one campus, one instructor, and one group of students could be evaluated since we do not offer physics on the Palestine or Terrell campuses. The goals were not met, therefore this will be carried over to the next year.

Their measurement strategies are clear, and TVCC can accomplish these measurements. Their discussions of results give definitive outcomes of the evaluation. Additionally, some of these LEAP reports give information showing the comprehensiveness of the evaluation, with numbers of students tested, numbers of class sections tested, and campus locations included.

Moderate Quality - LEAP(s) outcome and results would appear to be related to the specific general education outcome listed, but the outcome statement, measurement method, discussion of results, or proposed changes were off target, but making modification to this would make this an acceptable outcomes. Below is a list of courses that assessed mathematics as a moderate quality LEAP(s):

COURSE	# OF MODERATE QUALITY OUTCOMES
TDCJ-Auto Body	4
TDCJ-Drafting	1
TDCJ-Electronics	3
TDCJ-Masonry	2
TOTAL	10

Ten or 34.48%, of 29 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of moderate quality LEAP(s) rated as moderate quality specified a student-learning outcome that clearly related to a component or components of mathematics.

TDCJ Auto Body had four outcomes that were of moderate quality. One outcome stated that mathematics was used to successfully demonstrate auto body skills, and it seems logical that this should be true since the outcome description clearly states that the student will have the skill to apply plastic body fillers to damaged areas of cars and understand the mixing ratios in various temperatures and humidity. The outcome clearly would use mathematical skills, however, the observed results were not listed, which appeared to be the main problem and why it received a moderate quality rating. If the results were listed these outcomes would be of high quality.

Poor Quality - LEAP(s) outcome and results would be an outcome plan that DOES NOT appear to be related to the specific general education outcome listed, and/or the measurement DOES NOT clearly demonstrate how the institution is accomplishing the outcome, which would require modification or changing of the entire outcome. Below is a list of courses that assessed mathematics as a poor quality LEAP(s):

COURSE	# OF POOR QUALITY OUTCOMES
TDCJ-Drafting	2
TDCJ-Electronics	1
TDCJ-Masonry	2
TOTAL	**5**

Five or 17% of the 29 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of poor quality. LEAP(s) rated as poor quality specified a student learning outcome that clearly did not relate to a component or components of mathematics.

TDCJ Drafting had two outcomes that were rated as poor quality. One outcome stated that given the prerequisites learned in Drafting I, the student would be able to create a complete set of working plans for a small apparatus of five or more parts including both details and assembly drawings and measurements. This might be part of this outcome and mentioning them could have shown that this outcome was related to mathematics, but no specific results were given. The outcome did lists criteria for success except in two areas and included changes made as a result of the evaluation, but it did not list any results to prove that it was successful. This outcome needs to be looked at and improved upon in order for it to be considered a high or moderate quality outcome.

> *Note – We are not judging how well the planning unit achieved its Assessment Criteria listed (e.g. 50% of students were able to write an argumentative essay), only whether it is a plausible way to measure this General Education Outcome (assessing an argumentative essay using a rubric that identifies the key components of an essay and student strengths and weaknesses is an appropriate way to measure the general education outcome of writing).

DATA QUALITY REVIEW - OTHER RELEVANT DATA While the overall qualities of the LEAP(s) themselves were high or moderate, benchmark data from the 2007-2009 TVCC Graduating Student Survey results also revealed that students do perceive that their critical thinking improved after their tenure at TVCC. On a scale of one ("I learned nothing") to seven ("I learned a great deal"), 499 Students 20% of vocational students, 44% of AAS (vocational) students, and 36% of AA (transfer) students selected a 5 or 6 in ranking their improvements resulting in a 5.76 mean average. In addition, results from the 2008 CAAP of all Math taken nationally, provide another perspective. Composite mathematic scores reflect that on average face-to-face students scored 30% nationally and TVCC graduates performed better at 38%. Distance education graduates scored 52% nationally and TVCC graduates performed better at 65% of all Mathematic CAAP students tested.

EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT
SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS – Twenty-four (82.76%) of the 29 LEAP(s) submitted related to mathematics were of high or moderate quality, indicating from the data analysis that the established assessment criteria was met and that achievement of the student learning outcome was successful. In addition, results from the 2008 CAAP of all Math taken nationally, provide another perspective. Composite mathematic scores reflect that on average face-to-face students scored 30% nationally and

TVCC graduates performed better at 38%. Distance education graduates scored 52% nationally and TVCC graduates performed better at 65% of all Mathematic CAAP students tested. While the 82.76% achievement of LEAP(s) is encouraging, it is clear that not all LEAP(s) were related to mathematics.

Most of those programs reporting success with LEAP(s) where mathematics skills were necessary were programs other than mathematics itself. One outcome each for accounting, agriculture, AAS business and office administration, drafting technology, ranch management, TDCJ masonry and vocational nursing, three outcomes each for mathematics and developmental mathematics reported success. TVCC students do seem to be successful at applying mathematics general education skills to other academic and vocational programs.

SUMMARY OF WEAKNESSESS - Five (17.24%) of the 29 LEAP(s) submitted related to mathematics indicating that the assessment criteria was not met by receiving a poor quality rating. This included two TDCJ drafting outcomes, one TDCJ electronics (non-credit) outcome and two TDCJ masonry (non-credit) outcomes.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT - Perhaps each faculty member's supervisor/division chairperson should make a point of carefully reading each LEAP(s) and discussing with the faculty member any problems with the LEAP(s) before it is submitted further. In addition, continued training (perhaps during the division meetings) would be appropriate, but it is believed that it is best to work one-on-one with those who seem to be having difficulty. Small group sessions can be scheduled with the Assistant Vice President of Research, Planning and Effectiveness or the Institutional Research Director for faculty to get a better understanding of how to properly write and evaluate a LEAP(s). After training has taken place, when each LEAP(s) is submitted to the appropriate supervisor, the LEAP(s) will be approved or it will be rejected and sent back for additional modifications. The institutional research department is in the process of redoing the assessment database for easier use to the user and tracking for the research department. Every TVCC instructor must be on the same page when it comes to the development and implementation of LEAP(s).

Cultural and Ethnic Diversity

DATA ANALYZED

FY08 LEAP(s) Results, Graduating Student Survey, Student Evaluation of Course and Instructor

DATA QUALITY REVIEW - Learning Enhancement Annual Plans (LEAP(s)) Results

Quality of LEAP(s) Submitted

High Quality – LEAP(s) outcome and results had to convincingly demonstrates that we are measuring how well students engage in this specific learning outcome (e.g. Reading Pre and Post tests in developmental reading courses measure specific outcomes related to reading skills) a high quality outcome includes measurement, the discussion of results, and proposed changes. Below is a list of courses that assessed mathematics as a high quality LEAP(s):

COURSE	# OF HIGH QUALITY OUTCOMES
AAT- Education	1
Fire Science	1
Foreign Language	1
Government	1
History	1
Psychology	1
TOTAL	6

Six or 100%, of 6 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of high quality, there were no moderate or poor quality LEAPs in this general education outcome. They all clearly show an understanding and appreciation of cultural and ethnic diversity. Their measurement strategies are clear, and measurements can be accomplished. Their discussions of results gave definitive outcomes of the evaluation. Additionally, some of these LEAP(s) reports give information showing the comprehensiveness of the evaluation, with numbers of students tested, numbers of class sections tested, and campus locations included.

DATA QUALITY REVIEW - OTHER RELEVANT DATA

While the overall qualities of the LEAP(s) themselves were high benchmark data from the 2007-2009 TVCC Graduating Student Survey results also revealed that students do perceive that their understanding and appreciation of cultural and ethnic diversity improved after their tenure at TVCC. On a scale of one ("I learned nothing") to seven ("I learned a great deal"), 537 students 19% of vocational students, 43% of AAS (vocational) students, and 38% of AA (transfer) students selected a 5 or 6 in ranking their improvements resulting in a 5.51 mean average.

EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT

SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS – Six or 100%, of 6 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of high quality, there were no moderate or poor quality LEAPs in this general education outcome. They all clearly showed an understanding and appreciation of cultural and ethnic diversity. This indicates from the data analysis that the established assessment criteria was met and that achievement of the student learning outcome was successful.

SUMMARY OF WEAKNESSESS – The number of LEAP(s) submitted is low, therefore this could be considered a weakness. Additional training and brainstorming is needed on better ways to assess the understanding and appreciation of cultural and ethnic diversity.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT - Perhaps each faculty member's supervisor/division chairperson should make a point of carefully reading each LEAP(s) and discussing with the faculty member any problems with the LEAP(s) before it is submitted further. In addition, continued training (perhaps during the division meetings) would be appropriate, but it is believed that it is best to work one-on-one with those who seem to be having difficulty. Small group sessions can be scheduled with the Assistant Vice President of Research, Planning and Effectiveness or the Institutional Research Director for faculty to get a better understanding of how to properly write and evaluate a LEAP(s). After training has taken place, when each LEAP(s) is submitted to the appropriate supervisor, the LEAP(s) will be approved or it will be rejected and sent back for additional modifications. The institutional research department is in the process of redoing the assessment database for easier use to the user and tracking for the research department. Every TVCC instructor must be on the same page when it comes to the development and implementation of LEAP(s).

Artistic Achievements in the Visual and Performing Arts

DATA ANALYZED
FY08 LEAP(s) Results

DATA QUALITY REVIEW - Learning Enhancement Annual Plans (LEAP(s)) Results

Quality of LEAP(s) Submitted
High Quality – LEAP(s) outcome and results had to convincingly demonstrates that we are measuring how well students engage in this specific learning outcome (e.g. Reading Pre and Post tests in developmental reading courses measure specific outcomes related to reading skills) a high quality outcome includes measurement, the discussion of results, and proposed changes. Below is a list of courses that assessed artistic achievements in the visual and performing arts as a high quality LEAP(s):

COURSE	# OF HIGH QUALITY OUTCOMES
Humanities	1
Music	1
Theater	2
TOTAL	4

Four or 57.14%, of 7 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of high quality. They all clearly show relation to recognize and evaluate artistic achievements in the visual and performing arts general education goal. Their measurement strategies are clear, and TVCC can accomplish these measurements. Their discussions of results give definitive outcomes of the evaluation.

Moderate Quality - LEAP(s) outcome and results would appear to be related to the specific general education outcome listed, but the outcome statement, measurement method, discussion of results, or proposed changes were off target, but making modification to this would make this an acceptable outcomes. Below is a list of courses that assessed artistic achievements in the visual and performing arts as a moderate quality LEAP(s):

COURSE	# OF HIGH QUALITY OUTCOMES
Art	2
Music	1
TOTAL	3

Three or 42.86%, of 7 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of moderate quality. They all clearly show relation to recognize and evaluate artistic achievements in the visual and performing arts General Education Goal.
One outcome stated that students in ARTS 1301 (Art Appreciation)will be able to 1) identify significant works of art, 2) describe the artist's style, and 3)name the medium used to produce that piece of art. The outcome appears to clearly define the learning goal of enabling students to recognize and evaluate artistic achievements, and it establishes an effective method of assessment. Students are exposed to and instructed on various artists, their creative styles, media utilized, and museums where the artworks are housed. The assessment tool assesses several components, as it requires students to identify artists, artistic styles, media utilized, etc., but the results do not delineate between these components. I think it would be beneficial to compare students' proficiency in the various components.

Poor Quality - LEAP(s) outcome and results would be an outcome plan that DOES NOT appear to be related to the specific general education outcome listed, and/or the measurement DOES NOT clearly demonstrate how the institution is accomplishing the outcome, which would require modification or changing of the entire outcome.

There were no courses that assessed artistic achievements in the visual and performing arts that were considered to be of poor quality in this General Education data.

QUALITY REVIEW - OTHER RELEVANT DATA
The overall qualities of the LEAP(s) themselves were high, but additional data is needed in evaluating the quality of the artistic achievements in the visual and performing arts. After the review in FY06, this general education outcome was added. In FY2010, data should yield positive results on the TVCC Graduating Student Survey.

EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT
SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS – Seven or 100% of the 7LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of high or moderate quality, indicating that students successfully met the assessment criteria. There were no LEAP(s) that were considered to be of poor quality in the general education review data, which should be considered an accomplishment.

SUMMARY OF WEAKNESSESS –The number of LEAP(s) submitted is low, therefore this could be considered a weakness. Additional training and brainstorming is needed on better ways to assess the artistic achievements in the visual and performing arts.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT - Perhaps each faculty member's supervisor/division chairperson should make a point of carefully reading each LEAP(s) and discussing with the faculty member any problems with the LEAP(s) before it is submitted further. In addition, continued training (perhaps during the division meetings) would be appropriate, but it is believed that it is best to work one-on-one with those who seem to be having difficulty. Small group sessions can be scheduled with the Assistant Vice President of Research, Planning and Effectiveness or the Institutional Research Director for faculty to get a better understanding of how to properly write and evaluate a LEAP(s). After training has taken place, when each LEAP(s) is submitted to the appropriate supervisor, the LEAP(s) will be approved or it will be rejected and sent back for additional modifications. The institutional research department is in the process of redoing the assessment database for easier use to the user and tracking for the research department. Every TVCC instructor must be on the same page when it comes to the development and implementation of LEAP(s).

Demonstrate Knowledge of the Physical Universe and Living Systems

DATA ANALYZED

FY08 LEAP(s) Results, Graduating Student Survey, Student Evaluation of Course and Instructor

DATA QUALITY REVIEW - Learning Enhancement Annual Plans (LEAP(s)) Results

Quality of LEAP(s) Submitted

High Quality – LEAP(s) outcome and results had to convincingly demonstrates that we are measuring how well students engage in this specific learning outcome (e.g. Reading Pre and Post tests in developmental reading courses measure specific outcomes related to reading skills) a high quality outcome includes measurement, the discussion of results, and proposed changes. Below is a list of courses that assessed knowledge of the physical universe and living systems as a high quality LEAP(s):

COURSE	# OF HIGH QUALITY OUTCOMES
Biology	2
Chemistry	4
Horticulture	1
Kinesiology	1
Physics	3
Vocational Nursing	1
TOTAL	**12**

Twelve or 66.67%, of 18 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of high quality. They all clearly show relation to demonstrate knowledge of the physical universe and living systems.

One outcome in vocational nursing stated that by the end of VNSG 1320 in Level I, the student would be able to identify the structure and function of each of the major body systems. This outcome plan indicates

a clear relation to knowledge of the physical universe and living systems - living systems in particular. The implementation, assessment, criteria, and results were included. The criteria used a nationally normed test and two campuses which offer Vocational Nursing contributed results. The results were high and met the goal of the outcome plan.

Moderate Quality - LEAP(s) outcome and results would appear to be related to the specific general education outcome listed, but the outcome statement, measurement method, discussion of results, or proposed changes were off target, but making modification to this would make this an acceptable outcomes. Below is a list of courses that assessed knowledge of the physical universe and living systems as a moderate quality LEAP(s):

COURSE	# OF HIGH QUALITY OUTCOMES
Horticulture	2
TDCJ-Horticulture	2
TOTAL	4

Four or 22.22%, of 18 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of moderate quality. They all clearly show relation to demonstrate knowledge of the physical universe and living systems.

One outcome in Horticulture stated that the students would be able to demonstrate a practical knowledge of basic horticulture including identification of plant structures, soil components, plant nutrients, and horticultural pest management. The goal was clearly related to knowledge of the physical universe and living systems. Implementation, assessment, criteria, results and considered changes were noted. The plan reports and gives results that show that the goal was met.

Poor Quality - LEAP(s) outcome and results would be an outcome plan that DOES NOT appear to be related to the specific general education outcome listed, and/or the measurement DOES NOT clearly demonstrate how the institution is accomplishing the outcome, which would require modification or changing of the entire outcome. Below is a list of courses that assessed knowledge of the physical universe and living systems as a poor quality LEAP(s):

COURSE	# OF HIGH QUALITY OUTCOMES
Biology	1
TDCJ-Horticulture	1
TOTAL	2

Two or 11.11% of the 18 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of poor quality. They clearly did not show or demonstrate knowledge of the physical universe and living systems. Biology had one outcome that did not include outcome data and analysis, nor did it include changes made as a result of the evaluation.

DATA QUALITY REVIEW - OTHER RELEVANT DATA
Sixteen (88.89%) of the 18 LEAP(s) submitted were of high or moderate quality demonstrating knowledge

of the physical universe and living systems. This indicates from the data analysis that the established assessment criteria was met and that achievement of the student learning outcome was successful.

EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT

SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS – Sixteen (88.89%) of the 18 LEAP(s) submitted showed a relation on how to demonstrate knowledge of the physical universe and living systems.

 SUMMARY OF WEAKNESSESS - Two (11.11%) of the 18 LEAP(s) reports indicated that the assessment criteria were not met. The number of LEAP(s) submitted is low; therefore this could be considered a weakness. Additional training and brainstorming is needed on better ways show or demonstrate knowledge of the physical universe and living systems.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT - Perhaps each faculty member's supervisor/division chairperson should make a point of carefully reading each LEAP(s) and discussing with the faculty member any problems with the LEAP(s) before it is submitted further. In addition, continued training (perhaps during the division meetings) would be appropriate, but it is believed that it is best to work one-on-one with those who seem to be having difficulty. Small group sessions can be scheduled with the Assistant Vice President of Research, Planning and Effectiveness or the Institutional Research Director for faculty to get a better understanding of how to properly write and evaluate a LEAP(s). After training has taken place, when each LEAP(s) is submitted to the appropriate supervisor, the LEAP(s) will be approved or it will be rejected and sent back for additional modifications. The institutional research department is in the process of redoing the assessment database for easier use to the user and tracking for the research department. Every TVCC instructor must be on the same page when it comes to the development and implementation of LEAP(s).

Improve Basic Understanding of Political, Economic, and Social Systems

DATA ANALYZED

FY08 LEAP(s) Results, Graduating Student Survey, Student Evaluation of Course and Instructor

DATA QUALITY REVIEW - Learning Enhancement Annual Plans (LEAP(s)) Results

Quality of LEAP(s) Submitted

High Quality – LEAP(s) outcome and results had to convincingly demonstrates that we are measuring how well students engage in this specific learning outcome (e.g. Reading Pre and Post tests in developmental reading courses measure specific outcomes related to reading skills) a high quality outcome includes measurement, the discussion of results, and proposed changes. Below is a list of courses that assessed improvement on the basic understanding of political, economic, and social systems as a high quality LEAP(s):

COURSE	# OF HIGH QUALITY OUTCOMES
AAT- Education	1
Government	2
History	1
Philosophy	1
TOTAL	5

Five or 62.50%, of 8 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of high quality. They all clearly show improvement on the basic understanding of political, economic, and social systems. One History outcome stated that students would be able to understand and recognize basic ideas, terms, or persons from U.S. history. This outcome relates to students ability to develop competencies in written and oral communication and to apply critical thinking skills to the analysis of historical documents. I also believe that demonstrates critical thinking skills as well. The students exceeded the target scores in all areas except slavery, so additional peer discussions and group work will be incorporated to increase the supplementation on slavery pedagogy. Students will be able to understand and to recognize basic ideas, terms, or persons from U.S. history.

Moderate Quality - LEAP(s) outcome and results would appear to be related to the specific general education outcome listed, but the outcome statement, measurement method, discussion of results, or proposed changes were off target, but making modification to this would make this an acceptable outcomes. Below is a list of courses that assessed improvement on the basic understanding of political, economic, and social systems as a moderate quality LEAP(s):

COURSE	# OF HIGH QUALITY OUTCOMES
Government	1
Psychology	1
TOTAL	2

Two or 25%, of 8 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of moderate quality. They all clearly show improvement on the basic understanding of political, economic, and social systems. One Psychology outcome stated that students should be able to demonstrate an ability to understand and critically analyze the major theoretical perspectives in psychology. The assessment was met, but more questions might measure it better and divide distance and face-to-face results. The results of the assessments need to be included as well to accurately evaluate this LEAP.

Poor Quality - LEAP(s) outcome and results would be an outcome plan that DOES NOT appear to be related to the specific general education outcome listed, and/or the measurement DOES NOT clearly demonstrate how the institution is accomplishing the outcome, which would require modification or changing of the entire outcome. Below is a list of courses that assessed improvement on the basic understanding of political, economic, and social systems as a poor quality LEAP(s):

COURSE	# OF HIGH QUALITY OUTCOMES
Government	1
TOTAL	1

One or 12.5% of the 8 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of poor quality. They clearly did not show improvement on the basic understanding of political, economic, and social systems. One Government course outcome stated students would demonstrate an understanding of the concepts of majoritarian democracy and pluralist democracy. This outcome needs to be deleted, it is a repeat of one of the moderate quality LEAP(s)

DATA QUALITY REVIEW - OTHER RELEVANT DATA
Seven (87.5%) of the 8 LEAP(s) submitted were of high or moderate quality demonstrating knowledge artistic achievements in the visual and performing arts This indicates from the data analysis that the established assessment criteria was met and that achievement of the student learning outcome was successful.

EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT
SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS – Seven (87.5%) of the 8 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of high or moderate quality, indicating that students successfully met the assessment criteria.

SUMMARY OF WEAKNESSESS - One (12.5%) of the 8 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of poor quality, indicating that the assessment criteria were not met, however this outcome was a repeat of one of the moderate quality outcomes and should be deleted. Additional training and brainstorming is needed on better ways to assess the artistic achievements in the visual and performing arts.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT - Perhaps each faculty member's supervisor/division chairperson should make a point of carefully reading each LEAP(s) and discussing with the faculty member any problems with the LEAP(s) before it is submitted further. In addition, continued training (perhaps during the division meetings) would be appropriate, but it is believed that it is best to work one-on-one with those who seem to be having difficulty. Small group sessions can be scheduled with the Assistant Vice President of Research, Planning and Effectiveness or the Institutional Research Director for faculty to get a

better understanding of how to properly write and evaluate a LEAP(s). After training has taken place, when each LEAP(s) is submitted to the appropriate supervisor, the LEAP(s) will be approved or it will be rejected and sent back for additional modifications. The institutional research department is in the process of redoing the assessment database for easier use to the user and tracking for the research department. Every TVCC instructor must be on the same page when it comes to the development and implementation of LEAP(s).

Develop Skills to Become an Engaged Learner

DATA ANALYZED
FY08 LEAP(s) Results, Graduating Student Survey, Student Evaluation of Course and Instructor

DATA QUALITY REVIEW - Learning Enhancement Annual Plans (LEAP(s)) Results, General Education Review of LEAP(s)

Quality of LEAP(s) Submitted
High Quality – LEAP(s) outcome and results had to convincingly demonstrates that we are measuring how well students engage in this specific learning outcome (e.g. Reading Pre and Post tests in developmental reading courses measure specific outcomes related to reading skills) a high quality outcome includes measurement, the discussion of results, and proposed changes. Below is a list of courses that assessed skills to become an engaged learner as a high quality LEAP(s):

COURSE	# OF HIGH QUALITY OUTCOMES
Accounting	3
Agriculture	1
Business and Office Administration	4
Chemistry	1
Child Development	3
Cosmetology	2
Developmental Math	1
Developmental Writing	2
English	1
Management	3
Mathematics	1
Nail Technology	2
Physics	1
Ranch Management	3
TDCJ-AC/Ref	1
TOTAL	**29**

Twenty-nine or 72.50%, of 40 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of high quality. They all clearly show relation to in developing skills and strategies to become an engaged learner.
One outcome in a Management course stated that the student would demonstrate a mastery of how manners contributed to improved interpersonal relations in the workplace and explain the importance of professional presence. This outcome did involve engaged learning because of the class interactions, discussions, and presentations. Though exams do assess student success, it is recommended that other

assessment tools be considered that would add to the engagement of students. Students could role-play, do demonstrations, or give group presentations for grades that would add to the engagement of learners. Though this goal was successfully met, it is recommended that consideration be given to raising the academic challenge. In addition, it is recommended that other assessment tools be used that would enhance the engagement of learners. The goal was more than met and students were successful in fulfilling the outcome, however there were no distance learning involved.

Moderate Quality - LEAP(s) outcome and results would appear to be related to the specific general education outcome listed, but the outcome statement, measurement method, discussion of results, or proposed changes were off target, but making modification to this would make this an acceptable outcomes. Below is a list of courses that assessed skills to become an engaged learner as a moderate quality LEAP(s):

COURSE	# OF HIGH QUALITY OUTCOMES
Automotive Technology	1
Cosmetology	1
History	1
Horticulture	1
Humanities	1
TDCJ-AC/Ref	2
TDCJ-Horticulture	1
	8
TOTAL	

Eight or 20%, of 40 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of moderate quality. They all clearly show relation to in developing skills and strategies to become an engaged learner. On outcome in the TDCJ AC/Refrigeration course stated that the course is structured to acquaint the student with an understanding of a/c controls. There was significant emphasis on the hands-on aspects of this training so it strongly supported the General Ed. goal. The proposed changes were reasonable and fitting to support this goal. Though there were results, the results did not seem to directly relate to the criteria. The results were a bit unclear for this particular goal. A rubric for this particular skill set would be of great benefit in determining if the student had acquired the needed hands-on skills to pass the course. The basis goal to perform a particular skill set was an excellent goal. The hands-on aspect was much in line with engaging the learners. The proposed changes were very fitting for this goal. The weak issues with this goal were centered on the lack of information about how the data would be collected and then analyzed. A measurement rubric would give some direction to specific skills needed and how to measure them. This kind of data would be easier to evaluate. Distance learning was not a consideration for this course.

Poor Quality - LEAP(s) outcome and results would be an outcome plan that DOES NOT appear to be related to the specific general education outcome listed, and/or the measurement DOES NOT clearly demonstrate how the institution is accomplishing the outcome, which would require modification or changing of the entire outcome. Below is a list of courses that assessed skills to become an engaged learner as a poor quality LEAP(s):

COURSE	# OF HIGH QUALITY OUTCOMES

Business and Office Administration	2
Horticulture	1
TOTAL	**3**

Three or 7.5%, of 40 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of poor quality. They clearly did not show a relation in developing skills and strategies to become an engaged learner. One outcome in the Business and Office Administration course stated that students would demonstrate a mastery of skill in identifying the partners in originating effective communication, the elements of the communication cycle, and potential barriers that affect producing clear, complete written and spoken messages. Student engagement was certainly used through the class interaction and demonstrations. There was no assessment besides exams. Though exams do assess, it would benefit the goal of engagement to give a grade on a demonstration also. There was no results and no changes noted, therefore this is considered a poor quality leap even though the goal established was attainable, but without results we can't be sure it was attained.

DATA QUALITY REVIEW - OTHER RELEVANT DATA

While the overall qualities of the LEAP(s) themselves were high, benchmark data from the 2007-2009 TVCC Graduating Student Survey results also revealed that students are satisfied with the learning environment and support for learning after their tenure at TVCC. On a scale of one ("Strongly Disagree") to five ("Strongly Agree"), 556 students 62% of vocational students, 57% of AAS (vocational) students, and 56.23% of AA (transfer) students chose "Strongly Agree" at how satisfied they are with the opportunities they were given to learn by developing skills and strategies to become an engaged learner.

EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT

SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS – Thirty-seven (92.5%) of the 40 LEAP(s) submitted were considered to be of high or moderate quality. They all clearly show relation to in developing skills and strategies to become an engaged learner. On the graduating student survey, and average of 58.41% indicated that they strongly agreed that they were given the opportunity to learn by developing skills and strategies to become an engaged learner.

SUMMARY OF WEAKNESSESS - Three (7.5%) of the 40 LEAP(s) reports indicated that the assessment criteria were not met. For the most part, these were not met because results were not indicated. The LEAP(s) were attainable, but we did not have results to show that they were attained.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT - Perhaps each faculty member's supervisor/division chairperson should make a point of carefully reading each LEAP(s) and discussing with the faculty member any problems with the LEAP(s) before it is submitted further. In addition, continued training (perhaps during the division meetings) would be appropriate, but it is believed that it is best to work one-on-one with those who seem to be having difficulty. Small group sessions can be scheduled with the Assistant Vice President of Research, Planning and Effectiveness or the Institutional Research Director for faculty to get a better understanding of how to properly write and evaluate a LEAP(s). After training has taken place, when each LEAP(s) is submitted to the appropriate supervisor, the LEAP(s) will be approved or it will be rejected and sent back for additional modifications. The institutional research department is in the

process of redoing the assessment database for easier use to the user and tracking for the research department.

Appendix A

Trinity Valley Community College
General Education Outcomes Evaluation
of Learning Enhancement Annual Plans (LEAPs)

Fiscal Year: Date Reviewed: Lead Evaluator:

GenED Goal#:   Outcome ID#:   Department:

EVALUATION OF LEARNING CENTERED NATURE OF OUTCOME

1. Rate the degree to which this is a learning-centered outcome:
○ Authentically learning-centered
○ Somewhat learning-centered
○ Not learning-centered

To be **authentically learning centered,** *an outcome must include* evidence that it fulfills three or more of the following: engages and changes the learner, assists the learner to collaborate, offers options for the learning process, or provides ways to document learning.

To be a **somewhat learning centered,** *an outcome must include* evidence of at least one or two of the previously mentioned qualities.

To be rated as **not learning centered,** *an outcome includes none* of the previously mentioned qualities.

2. In your judgment, does this Outcome Plan positively contribute to the Learning Initiative (Engaged Learning: Pathways to Success-Improving reading comprehension through the enhancement of student engagement)?
○ Does not contribute
○ Contributes to Reading Comprehension
○ Contributes to Student Engagement
○ Contributes to both Reading & Student Engagement

DATA QUALITY REVIEW

3. Rate the quality of the Outcome Plan:
○ High Quality
○ Moderate Quality
○ Poor Quality

High Quality: LEAP Outcome Plans that convincingly demonstrates that we are measuring how well students engage in this specific learning outcome (e.g. Reading Pre and Post tests in developmental reading courses measure specific outcomes related to reading skills). A High Quality Outcome includes measurement, the discussion of results, and proposed changes.

Moderate Quality: LEAP Outcome Plans that appear to be related to the specific general education outcome listed, but the Outcome Statement, measurement method, discussion of results, or proposed changes are off target. Correction of the off target item would make this a High-Quality Outcome.

Poor Quality: A LEAP Outcome Plan that does not appear to be related to the specific General Education Outcome listed, and/or the measurement does not clearly demonstrate how the institution is accomplishing the Outcome. Modification or changing of the entire Outcome is needed.

Note: We are not judging how well the planning unit achieved its listed assessment criteria (e.g. 50% of students will be able to write an argumentative essay). We are judging whether the criteria is a plausible way to measure the General Education related Outcome.

Appendix A (continued)

General Education Goals

(1) To communicate clearly and effectively in both oral and written English.

(2) To improve reading skills focused on comprehending, analyzing, interpreting, and evaluating printed materials.

(3) To understand mathematical information and utilize mathematical skills.

(4) To demonstrate qualitative and quantitative critical thinking skills.

(5) To understand and appreciate cultural and ethnic diversity.

(6) To utilize computer-based technology in accessing information, solving problems, and communicating.

(7) To recognize and evaluate artistic achievements in the visual and performing arts.

(8) To improve basic understanding of political, economic, and social systems.

(9) To demonstrate knowledge of the physical universe and living systems.

(10) To develop skills and strategies to become an engaged learner.

4. Why? What are the _strengths_ of the quality of the outcome as it relates to the general education outcome you are reviewing?

Limit answer to 2500 characters

5. Why? What are the _weaknesses_ of the quality of the outcome as it relates to the general education outcome you are reviewing?

Limit answer to 2500 characters

EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT OF OUTCOMES

6. Rate the quality of the Outcome Plan Results:

○ High Quality

○ Moderate Quality

○ Poor Quality

High Quality: LEAP Outcome Results that convincingly demonstrate that the desired result listed in the plan is being met. Criteria include data collection, analysis, and evaluation for both distance and non-distance learning results and the inclusion of on-target changes where required.

Moderate Quality: LEAP Outcome Results that somewhat demonstrate that the desired result identified in the plan is being met. One or more of the items listed above is off target and requires modification.

Poor Quality: LEAP Outcome Results that clearly do not demonstrate that the desired result listed in the plan is being met. Modifying or changing the entire Outcome Results is required.

Note: We are judging how well the planning unit achieved its listed assessment criteria for this Outcome.

7. Why? What are the _strengths_ in how this outcome contributes to the specific general education goal that you are evaluating?

Limit answer to 2500 characters

8. Why? What are the _weaknesses_ in how this outcome contributes to the specific general education goal that you are evaluating?

Limit answer to 2500 characters

AT THE BOTTOM

FINISHED means, send it to the IR databse (no additional edits can be made)

SAVED means, add it to your bookmarks(you can edit it at a later date)

Page 1 | Finish | Save