

OCEAN COUNTY COLLEGE
Toms River, NJ 08753

Progress Letter
October 1, 2007

Introduction

In a letter dated June 23, 2006, the Chair of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) wrote to inform Ocean County College of its action (taken on June 22, 2006) on the college's Monitoring Report, submitted on April 1, 2006, as follows:

To accept the monitoring report and the progress letter submitted by the institution; to request a progress letter, due October 1, 2007, that documents further progress in the implementation of a comprehensive plan for student learning outcomes assessment and evidence that results are being used to improve teaching and learning. The Periodic Review Report is due June 1, 2009.

It is our pleasure to report and document continued and marked progress in the implementation of our college's learning assessment plan for student learning outcomes assessment and for the improvement of teaching and learning. Our progress is discussed in this letter based on the four criteria identified in the MSCHE publication *Assessing Student Learning and Institutional Effectiveness: Understanding Middle States Expectations*, MSCHE: 2005, 5:

- Clear statements of key goals, including expected student learning outcomes;
- An organized and sustained assessment process;
- Assessment results demonstrating that students are achieving key goals; and
- Uses of assessment results to improve student learning.

Clear Statements of Student Learning Goals

As reported in the *Monitoring Report* to the Commission (April 2006), Ocean County College (OCC) responded to the recommendations of the visiting team with regard to the clarification and visibility of learning goals as follows:

- In AY 2004-05, all course goals and objectives were revised and clarified in preparation for the course assessment process that requires measurement instruments and analysis of outcomes data that are both based on the course learning objectives;
- In SP 2005, all Professors' Course Syllabi (distributed to each student enrolled in all courses) were revised to include the learning outcomes for the course (see Appendix I, Course Outline, p. 9 as an example);
- In SP 2005, all course syllabi were revised to include the general education goals addressed by the course (see Appendix II, General Education Goals, p. 14);
- In SP 2005, all program goals and objectives were reviewed and a common language and format were developed, including the statement of program goals (see Appendix III, Program Evaluation Model, p.17).

In addition, in SP 2007, the new Academic Master Plan was developed using the college's general education goals as its organizing principle (see Appendix IV, Academic Master Plan, p. 21).

An Organized and Sustained Assessment Process

Ocean County College conducts an organized and sustained assessment process based on its outcomes assessment plan, composed of five major component parts: Program Evaluation, Course Assessment, General Education Assessment, Developmental Skills Assessment, and Assessment of Learning Technologies.

1. Program Evaluation:

In 2005, the existing Program Evaluation Model was refined to focus on program effectiveness and the assessment of student learning. The model outlines a process with seven basic components: I) Program Description, II) Assessment of Student Learning at the Program Level, III) Program Evaluation Data, IV) Assessment of Program Related Factors, V) Program Evaluation Summary (identifying strengths, weaknesses, and actions to be taken immediately and in the future), VI) Attachments, and VII) Approval of the Program Evaluation (see Appendix III, Program Evaluation Model, p. 17). Program Evaluations (PEs) are due to be completed on a five-year cycle, and the approvals process begins with a vigorous review by the Learning Assessment Committee. Both the Assistant Vice President for Assessment and Curriculum and the Assistant to the President for Institutional Effectiveness sit on the Learning Assessment Committee. In the event there are questions or requests by the committee, the review is returned to the Department Dean for emendation.

The document then moves from the Chair of the Learning Assessment Committee through the Vice President of Academic Affairs to the President of the College. In this way, program oversight receives strategic emphasis because it is integrated into the college's strategic planning, decision-making, and resource allocation processes as a result of review at the leadership level. In addition, a process sheet, with timelines for the twelve-month review period, is given to each dean to guide the process and encourage a timely response. The Assistant Vice President for Assessment and Curriculum oversees the PEs from inception to completion and keeps a compilation table of all Program Evaluations in the current cycle (see Appendix V, Program Evaluation Summary Chart, p. 22).

The college still actively employs capstone courses, portfolio development and assessment, licensing exams, service learning and internships, and other external measures of student learning in some of our programs for program-specific courses not captured in the course assessment process (see below). Success in the Nursing Program, as one obvious example, has long had as one of its ultimate measures the successful completion of the nursing licensure (NCLEX) examination by nursing students. It is also our belief that a sound general education outcomes measure (see below) serves best to assess student learning in our highly populated AA Liberal Arts and AA/AS General Studies transfer programs.

2. Course Assessment

The college's process for course evaluation includes the assessment of student learning based on course goals and measurable objectives and is designed to gather concrete data that points the way for developing practices to improve teaching/learning. Designed over the summer of 2004 and initiated in the fall 2004 semester, the assessment initiative requires the learning

assessment of a representative sample of students in forty-one (41) courses at the 100-level across all college departments, courses that are graduation or distribution requirements and that have multiple sections with very large enrollments each semester. In the fall of 2004, each academic department reviewed the course syllabi for each of the courses identified for assessment, clarified or revised all learning objectives, and then selected those objectives that were measurable to use as the basis for developing or selecting assessment instruments. They then identified or created what they felt to be an appropriate outcome measure for each of the identified courses and developed a set of rubrics with which to assess the outcomes for each course. The assessment tests were given during the last two weeks of the SP 05 semester. All f/t and adjunct faculty members teaching these courses performed the assessment in at least one, often all, of the relevant classes.

This process has been repeated in the SP 06 and SP 07 semesters (given most recently in SP 2007 in 122 sections to 5668 students taught by 305 faculty members) with occasional testing in the fall semesters when circumstances have warranted. In some instances, assessment instruments have been modified in large ways or small, as needed. Outcomes data is collected and analyzed and recorded by each academic department and then reported to the Assistant Vice President for Assessment and Curriculum who tabulates the data on the Assessment of Student Learning chart for each course, each academic year (see Appendix VI, Course Level Assessment of Student Learning, SP 2007, p. 30). The summary charts are shared with the Learning Assessment Committee and are also posted to the Institutional Effectiveness/Key Performance Indicators section of the college's Institutional Effectiveness web page. (<http://www.ocean.edu/effectiveness.http>).

As part of the analysis process each year, the academic deans look at the course objectives for which action plans for course improvements have been developed and report on the success (or lack thereof) of the plans in achieving the desired improvements in student learning from year to year. For the most part, improved outcomes have resulted, but the departments are also becoming aware of and have begun to identify and target a few "troubled courses" for which more intensive attention and action seem merited. For example, because of the failure of remedial reading and writing courses to develop the desired improvements in student learning outcomes through traditional course improvement actions, these courses have been targeted for a complete redesign through a major integration of the reading/writing courses and a reorganization of the remedial reading/writing curriculum, targeted for pilot offerings in SP 08 and full transition by FA 2009 when sufficient lab space will be available (see Appendix VII, ENGL 091 Course Syllabus, p. 55).

In addition, the college is also rethinking its responsibility for making a more vigorous commitment to these habitually "troubled courses" by designing and funding a program to address identified needs with resources beyond the borders of our campus, for example, through the use of external institutes to train master teachers in certain targeted areas. After three years of intense course evaluation, we are recognizing that using data analysis to improve teaching/learning can have its limits and requires a greater institutional commitment if we are to provide more intensified efforts for the improvement of teaching/learning. It is expected that the Assistant Vice President for Assessment and Curriculum and a newly-developed position, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, will work collaboratively with deans and faculty to develop these focused and intensive action plans for our more troubled courses.

In addition, the college continues to pursue quality effectiveness methods for its academic programs through annual performance reviews of faculty, class visitations, student evaluations of course/teaching, support for faculty professional development, instructional

development grants, and a newly-established scholarship/research program for faculty wherein institutional support is provided by the college to encourage and nurture outstanding faculty scholarship (see Appendix VIII, Faculty Scholarship Plan, p. 63).

3. General Education Assessment

General education assessment continues to be our most difficult challenge. We were deeply disappointed with the results of our efforts with both the Johnson County Community College model and, following that, the widely-used *Academic Profile* exam (which has since been changed by ETS to the MAPP test). We were also discouraged by what we found in other national commercial test offerings, so we turned to various external academic groups (like the New Jersey County College Project on General Education—NJCCPGE), also working on general education assessment, only to find their frustrations were similar to and as great as our own and that they had few practical solutions to offer.

The problems for us with the commercial test products are that: 1) they require enormous amounts of time to administer (difficult to achieve at a community college); 2) they are very costly if one is to obtain results from more than a token sample; and 3) it is almost impossible to get a valid sample of “volunteers” to be tested and equally difficult to schedule a testing time or times if the test is made a graduation requirement for all students. Faculty are giving over significant class time for course evaluation testing as it is and cannot be required to surrender as many as three more class periods for general education testing, while students are reluctant to volunteer to take a test (in some cases requiring as many as six hours or a *series* of six-hour periods) outside of their normal class schedule.

As a result, in September of 2005, we composed a General Education Assessment Test of our own at Ocean County College with questions classified under the categories that parallel our General Education Goals (see Appendix IX, General Education Test Design, p. 66). In our judgment, the questions on our exam are better written and are more reflective of current curricular trends than those questions in ETS’s *Academic Profile* (its questions composed twenty years ago). The format and design of our test are similar to the *Academic Profile*’s “short version” and we designed the test (33 items) to be administered in 50 minutes. We identified a sample of students similar to that to which we administered the *Academic Profile* and gave our own test first in December 2005 to ca. 300 students (who had completed more than half of their degree credits) as a pilot. The purpose of this pilot was primarily to test the test rather than to measure student outcomes in depth and then to revise the test based on student responses.

After this initial pilot, we clarified three test items which seemed confusing in retrospect, have given the test to two more sample groups, and have also administered it once to students in a four-year college setting to see if we could establish a control group for norming purposes. Our student scores were almost identical to the norming group’s (ca. 50th percentile) and led us to believe that since the bulk of general education courses are completed in the first two years of college, we probably didn’t need to have senior-student control data. At one point, we considered using the results of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) as a general education assessment, as some colleges are doing nationally. We have already administered CCSSE twice on our campus and have used the results positively (see Appendix X, CCSSE Outcomes Report, p. 67). In our judgment, however, CCSSE is not a test of general education knowledge. We have recently joined a consortium of regional community colleges designed to obtain and administer the CCSSE exam every three years at reduced cost.

In the meantime, we have learned something about our own students' general education proficiencies (see Appendix XI, Gen Ed Proficiencies, p. 70) and make these findings available to the academic deans and faculty. We will continue to try to administer our own test and learn from it what we can until we can find a reasonably-priced, effective commercial product with national norms. Our most recent initiative to improve students' general education skills has been to refine our approach to writing across the curriculum (inclusive of critical thinking). We recently passed a policy on writing intensive courses at OCC (see Appendix XII, Policy #7110, p. 72) and we also focused on the topic of writing across the curriculum at the FA 2007 Colloquium (8/30/07) where we had a guest speaker and two well-attended workshops on the topic.

4. Developmental Skills Assessment

When we initiated our course assessment design in FA 2004, we purposely included all of our developmental skills courses in the process (MATH 011, MATH 012, ENGL 010, ENGL 011, ENGL 020, and ENGL 021), so all our developmental students in all developmental courses are assessed annually. We also continue to track placement and success data for our developmental reading, writing, and math students (see Appendix XIII, Developmental Skills Tracking, p.73), but our outcomes data for the improvement of teaching/learning comes primarily from our analysis of course assessment testing (see item 2, above and Appendix VI, p. 30).

5. Assessment of Learning Technologies

The assessment of learning technologies at Ocean County College has three components: (a) assessment of distance learning and on-site/online (OSOL/Hybrid) courses, (b) assessment of technology-based instruction in the traditional classroom, and (c) assessment of adaptive technology for handicapped and learning-disabled students.

(a) Online Courses: As with our developmental skills courses, our online courses are assessed within the course assessment model (see item 2, above). We do, in addition, collect comparative data related to course grades (on-site and online) and course success (on-site and online), defining success as persistence to course completion, earning course credit with a passing grade. In our three-year longitudinal study, we have found no significant difference between on-site and online grades (see Appendix XIV, DL Grade Comparisons, 05-07, p. 77). The student success comparisons, however, are far less comforting (see Appendix XV, DL Success Comparisons, 05-07, p. 78). While student success in on-site courses is at 61% overall, success in online courses is only 44%, 17 points lower and significantly below the 69% national standard quoted by the national *Community College Benchmark Program Report*¹.

As an institution, we cannot be satisfied with this outcome and have initiated a number of short- and long-term measures. In the short term, we plan to improve our orientation and log-on procedures, encourage increased faculty log-ons and general vigilance, train all deans to do "class observations" for online classes, and continue to monitor our success rates closely (see Appendix VXI, DL Student Success Report, p. 80).

As a longer-term solution, we have trained twenty-three full-time faculty members and staff in the *Quality Matters*² online learning assessment model and will embark in FA 2007 on the

¹ NCCBP 2005 Report for PSTC College:
http://www.pstcc.edu/departments/institutional_research/documents/UpdatedReport2216432005revised.doc, Form 17B, p. 11.

² <http://www.QualityMatters.org>

revision of all online courses to address the quality matters rubrics and then to conduct faculty team assessments of each of our online offerings over a clearly-defined time frame. In addition, the Board has approved a position description for an Executive Director of E-Learning and the position will be posted shortly. This position should add the necessary administrative focus and leadership for our distance learning offerings (see Appendix XVII, E-Learning Director, p. 81).

(b) Classroom Technology: Assessment of technology-based instruction in the traditional classroom is done informally, through surveys, and anecdotally, through deans' class observations. We continue to note that a relatively small number of full-time faculty use classroom technology more sophisticated than overhead transparencies, power point, or video, although a growing number, especially in the English and Social Sciences departments, are using internet connections and projection through laptops as the classroom technology becomes more available and more user friendly. Our fully staffed and highly accessible Faculty Innovation Center (FIC) remains open and available for all faculty members who wish to develop online courses or classroom technology skills. In addition, we offer an Online Teaching Workshop (online) two or three times a year at no cost for any full-time or adjunct faculty members who are interested in exploring online instruction.

Four English classrooms have been equipped with portable laptop carts to support computer-based instruction with web interfaces and internal networking. Fifty English course sections now use this computer-based instruction involving approximately 1000 students per semester. In addition, the college received a PEW Foundation Grant in FA 2004 to incorporate web-based instruction into fifteen sections of PSYC 172, General Psychology. This two-year pilot program was concluded in SP 2006 and rejected for its use of large class sections with small web-based satellites. Although the mode itself was ineffective for our student population, practice in the use of web-based learning tools carried over into many of our PSYC 172 classes. In addition, two English faculty members tested an electronic portfolio product in AY 2005-06, *Criterion* (from Educational Testing Services), which, while proving too costly for our purposes, began an ongoing interest in electronic portfolios in our English composition classes.

(c) Adaptive Technology: To assess student learning (including the use of adaptive technology), the Center for Academic Services (CAS) at OCC combines the documentation of the disability with the tracking of student achievement through the academic advising process. Written documentation, provided by medical, rehabilitation or learning assessment specialists, is used to develop an ADA/504 Accommodation Plan which includes notation of required or recommended adaptive technologies. Academic advisors meet with students to discuss issues beyond the scheduling of classes, issues such as how the student is using the technology in his or her course work. Special attention is given to students who are not achieving satisfactory academic results and who are not using recommended adaptive technologies. A technical assistant is available to instruct students in the use of adaptive technologies.

Assessment Results Demonstrating that Students are Achieving Key Goals / Use of Assessment to Improve Student Learning

Our various assessment activities reveal these key concerns:

- Academic deans responsible for program management (four out of seven deans) have not to date accomplished the following: (a) conducting and completing program evaluation in a timely manner and with attention to deadlines; (b) conceiving of

- program evaluation as more than a status report; and (c) using program evaluation for program improvement (see Appendix XVIII, Program Evaluation Chart, p. 84);
- Our developmental reading and writing students have not shown measurable improvement in several instances over three years wherein they have fallen short of the faculty's expected outcomes, which has necessitated major program revisions;
 - There is a disconnect between some of the course outcomes analyses in business and social sciences courses and the action plans designed to improve teaching/learning;
 - The faculty in the Science Department has been somewhat disinterested in course assessment, but the new Dean of Science has now been mandated to move the process forward;
 - The Deans of the Social Science and Science Departments have not led faculty, consistently and in a timely manner, to generate useful course assessment data, an inconsistency borne out by general education test results (see, again, Appendix XI, p. 71, shaded items);
 - There have been poor retention rates in online courses;
 - There has been difficulty in identifying available, cost-effective, and satisfactorily normed general education assessment tools; and
 - There has been a somewhat desultory pace in the implementation of classroom technologies.

As we have discussed in this letter and shown in its *Appendixes*, we are paying attention to these issues and have taken and will continue to take strong measures to respond to them.

We also have many successes to be proud of:

- The outstanding tests and measures in the Mathematics department and significant improvements in student learning;
- The well-managed course assessment process in the English department and the developmental curricular revision resulting from negative data;
- The recognition that, as an institution, we need to go beyond our current plans for improvements in teaching/learning to serve the needs of our troubled courses;
- Our growing extensive knowledge of and experience with available general education assessment instruments;
- A markedly increased awareness of a "culture of assessment" and an "on-going self study attitude" by most academic deans and many more faculty than in the past;
- The emergence of several key faculty members with knowledge of and experience in learning assessment who have taken on leadership roles in the process;
- An increased understanding of the learning assessment process by the members of the Learning Assessment Committee;
- The involvement of the adjunct faculty in course assessment;
- The very strong and continuing administrative support for learning assessment.

We plan to make the assessment of student learning a focal point in our Periodic Review Report, due to be submitted in June of 2009.

List of Appendixes

<u>Appendix</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
Appendix I, Course Syllabus.....	9
Appendix II, General Education Goals.....	14
Appendix III, Program Evaluation Model.....	17
Appendix IV, Academic Master Plan Introduction.....	21
Appendix V, Program Evaluation Summary Chart.....	22
Appendix VI, Course-Level Assessment, SP 07.....	30
Appendix VII, ENGL 091, Developmental Reading and Writing.....	55
Appendix VIII, Faculty Scholarship Plan.....	63
Appendix IX, OCC General Education Test Design.....	66
Appendix X, CCSSE Outcomes Report.....	67
Appendix XI, General Education Proficiencies, Outcomes.....	70
Appendix XII, OCC Policy #7110, Writing across the Curriculum.....	72
Appendix XIII, Developmental Skills Tracking Chart, SP 06.....	73
Appendix XIV, Distance Learning and Onsite Course Grade Comparisons, 05-07.....	77
Appendix XV, Distance Learning and Onsite Success Comparisons.....	78
Appendix XVI, DL Student Success Report.....	80
Appendix XVII, Position Description, Executive Director of E-Learning.....	81
Appendix XVIII, Program Evaluation Calendar.....	84

APPENDIXES FOR PROGRESS LETTER

Appendix I, Sample Course Syllabus

OCEAN COUNTY COLLEGE
OFFICIAL COURSE DESCRIPTION
DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

1. Course Number and Title: MATH-240: Business Calculus
2. Semester Hours: 4 Contact Hours: $\frac{(4 \quad + \quad 0)}{\text{Lecture} \quad \text{Lab}}$
3. Catalog Description:
The topics of limits, continuity, derivatives, antiderivatives, definite and indefinite integrals, and area between curves will be discussed with applications to business concepts. Technology will be used with applications, and interpretations will be emphasized. This course is designed to fulfill the calculus requirements for a BS in Business and an AAS in Engineering Technology. This course is not a substitute for MATH-265.
4. Prerequisites:
Prerequisite of MATH-191 with a minimum grade of C, or appropriate placement score.
5. Maximum Class Size: 30 Course Fee Code: 2 Differential Funding
Category: A

Course Type for Perkins Reporting: ___ vocational x non-vocational
6. Justification
 - a. Describe the need for this course.
This course is designed to provide students with the mathematical knowledge needed to successfully integrate mathematics into their chosen area of study or career path. New Jersey colleges and universities have stated that if our business graduates have completed a 3 credit calculus course they will be moved to the top of the transfer list for business majors.
 - b. Relationship to courses within the College:
 - i. Does this course satisfy a general education requirement? x yes ___ no
If yes, mark with an "x" the appropriate category below.

 ___ Communication ___ Social Science ___ Lab Science
 x Mathematics ___ Humanities

- ii. Does this course satisfy a Group A or Group B Humanities/Literature requirement for the AA in Liberal Arts degrees? yes no

If yes, mark with an “x” the appropriate category. Group A Group B

- iii. If the course does not satisfy a general education requirement, which of the following does it satisfy:

Program-specific requirement for the following degree program:

Elective

- iv. Does this course satisfy the diversity requirement for the AA in Liberal Arts degree?

yes no

[The diversity requirement is defined as “any course whose primary purpose is to help students analyze the implications of the commonalities and differences among culturally diverse people(s). This requirement may include courses in gender studies or in non-western history and thought.”]

If yes, please explain:

- v. Does this course satisfy the computer literacy requirement? yes no

c. Related courses in other institutions:

[NOTE: The two charts below need to be completed when submitting a new course proposal. They do not need to be completed for most course revisions, unless an Official Course Description is so old that the course’s transferability needs to be reconsidered, as in the case of an obsolete course which may be reactivated.]

- i. List any comparable course(s) by completing the table below. Insert “None” if there are no comparable courses.

Comparable Courses at NJ Community Colleges				
Institution	Course Title	Course Number	Number of Credits	Comments

- ii. If “None” was inserted, please explain.

iii. Complete the table below. The institutions listed comprise the top six institutions queried on NJTransfer by OCC students.

Transferability of Proposed Course				
Institution	Course Code, Title, and Credits	Transfer Category (Major, General Ed., or Elective)	Will NOT Transfer (Place an "x" in box)	Unable to Determine Status (Place "U" in box)
Rutgers – New Brunswick				
Georgian Court University				
Richard Stockton College				
Monmouth University				
Kean University				
Rowan University				

iv. If a "U" was inserted above, document the course transferability by providing either (a) the name of a contact person at the four-year institution, or (b) an email from the contact person (attach to this proposal).

v. If not transferable to any institution, explain.

d. Consistency with the vision and mission statements, the Academic Master Plan, and the strategic initiatives of the College

This course helps to prepare students to become intentional learners who will be able to understand and employ quantitative analysis to solve problems, and demonstrate intellectual agility in mathematics.

e. Mark with an "x" the General Education goal(s) addressed by this course:

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Independent Thinking | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Science & Social Science | <input type="checkbox"/> 9. Global Perspective |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Communication | <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Aesthetic Appreciation | <input type="checkbox"/> 10. Health & Well Being |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3. Problem Solving | <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Historical Consciousness | <input type="checkbox"/> 11. Civic Responsibility |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Ethical Judgment | <input type="checkbox"/> 8. Diversity | <input type="checkbox"/> 12. Technology |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> 13. Lifelong Learning |

7. Specific Course Learning Objectives:

Students who successfully complete this course will be able to:

a. Evaluate limits: algebraically, graphically and numerically.

- b. Discuss the concept of Continuity
 - c. Apply the theory and determination of change, percent change, average rate of change and instantaneous rate of change.
 - d. Determine derivatives and extrema (algebraically, graphically, numerically) with applications to finance, marginal analysis of cost, revenue, profit and the point of diminishing returns.
 - e. Determine integrals (algebraically, graphically, numerically) with applications to income streams (present and future values), the economics of consumer's expenditure/surplus, and the economics of producer's revenue/surplus.
8. Methods of Instruction:
- a. Lecture
 - b. Class discussion
 - c. Labs
 - d. Computer applications
9. Instructional Materials / Technology Needs / Human Resource Needs (Presently Employed vs. New Faculty)
- a. Contact the department for current adoptions.
 - b. Handouts
 - c. Computer software
 - d. Calculator
10. Tentative Topical Outline:
- a. Review of functions
 - b. Limits
 - c. Determination of continuity and discontinuities with applications to business
 - d. Change, percent change, average rate of change, instantaneous rate of change
 - e. Introduction to the derivative
 - f. The formal definition of the derivative
 - g. Basic derivatives
 - h. Derivative of $\ln(x)$, e^x , b^x with applications in finance
 - i. Chain rule, product rule and quotient rule
 - j. Applications of the derivative in extrema, marginal cost, marginal revenue, marginal profit.
 - k. The second derivative with applications to business: graphical relationships between $f(x)$, $f'(x)$, $f''(x)$, inflection point, concavity change and point of diminishing returns.
 - l. The Fundamental Theorem of Calculus
 - m. Antiderivatives
 - n. Definite integrals and improper integrals
 - o. Area between two curves with applications to income streams (present and future values)

p. Integrals in economics: consumer's expenditure/surplus, producer's revenue/surplus

11. Grade Determinants:

The final grade in the course will be the cumulative grade based on the following letter grades or their numerical equivalents for the course assignments and examinations:

A	Excellent	C	Average	I	
	Incomplete				
B+	Very Good	D	Below Average	W	
	Withdrawn				
B	Good	F	Failure	R	Audit
C+	Above Average	P	Passing	NC	No
	Credit				

12. Number of Papers and Examinations:

A minimum of three major examinations and one major written assignment, or the equivalents

APPROVAL PROCESS FOR A REVISED COURSE PROPOSAL (SYLLABUS)

Revision of the Following Items Must Be Sent to the Curriculum Committee	Revision of the Following Items Require No Approval
#1 Course Number & Title	#8 Methods of Instruction
#2 Semester Hours/Contact Hours	#9 Instructional Materials
#3 Catalog Description	#10 Tentative Topic Outline
#4 Prerequisites & Co- requisites	#11 Grade Determinants
#5 Maximum Class Size/Lab Fee Code/ Differential Funding Category	#12 Number of Papers and Examinations
#6 Justification	
#7 Course Objectives	

Reviewed/Revised: December 1990; February 27, 1996; April 30, 1996; December 1998; March 2004; May 4, 2004; November 2004; February 28, 2006; March 8, 2006; June 2006

Board of Trustees Approval Date: November 6, 2006

Appendix II, General Education Goals

General Education Goals	Learning Objectives	General Education Skill Areas
1. To develop the ability to become an independent thinker through mathematical, scientific, and philosophical thinking.	1. a. Use critical and logical methods of thinking. b. Examine how observations, hypothesis testing and problem solving are used to develop theories in various disciplines. c. Demonstrate skills in inductive, deductive and analogous reasoning in various disciplines. d. Demonstrate basic arithmetic, algebraic, geometric & statistical skills in various disciplines. e. Demonstrate basic understanding of the relationship among the physical, social and behavioral sciences, mathematics and other disciplines.	1. Independent Thinking A. Across Disciplines B. In Mathematics
2. To develop the ability to communicate effectively through reading, listening, speaking, and writing.	2. a. Read and listen analytically, with understanding and openness toward other points of view. b. Write and speak standard American English with clarity, continuity, fluency and accuracy. c. Find and use a personal style of communication. d. Receive, analyze and present information in order to develop and support a main point or to persuade an audience.	2. Communication A. Oral Communication B. Writing
3. To develop the ability to solve problems by collecting, organizing, and evaluating information.	3. a. State a problem clearly. b. Gather information from libraries and other educational sources. c. Develop a hypothesis. d. Select a research methodology. e. Conduct the research. f. Observe, classify, analyze, synthesize and evaluate data. g. Interpret results and draw conclusions in terms of the stated problems h. Demonstrate competency with computers and other educational tools in using information to solve problems. i. Recognize the relationships among information, theories and applications.	3. Problem Solving
4. To develop both the ability and moral sensitivity needed to make informed judgments concerning ethical issues.	4. a. Recognize an ethical issue. b. Gather objective information pertinent to the issue. c. Analyze and evaluate differing points of view related to the issue. d. Evaluate the possible consequences of	4. Ethical Judgment

	judgments. e. Make informed judgments.	
5. To develop an understanding of the concepts, theories and fundamental principles of the natural and social sciences.	5. a. Describe how scientists use physical and mathematical models to develop scientific theories. b. Explain the basic principles, concepts and methods of a science. c. Identify biological and social factors affecting human behavior. d. Identify social problems, outline their possible causes, and analyze the potential effects of suggested remedies.	5. Knowledge of the Natural & Social Sciences
6. To develop an understanding of the aesthetic and intellectual experience of literature and the arts and appreciate creative expression.	6. a. Identify and analyze the essential characteristics of a work of literature or art. b. Make informed judgments regarding the value of a work relative to its art form. c. Evaluate the historical and cultural significance of a work of literature or art. d. Participate in an aesthetic experience either as a creator-performer or as an informed observer.	6. Aesthetic Response
7. To develop a historical consciousness, including the ability to reflect thoughtfully and accurately about historical and contemporary issues of local, national and global importance.	7. a. Identify principal historical eras during which major world civilizations developed. b. Discover cross-cultural influences among major civilizations during principal historical eras. c. Describe those social institutions, movements, individuals, ideas, beliefs and issues which were dominant in each major area. d. Describe the experiences of groups identified by race, gender, and/or ethnicity as examples of historical evolution. e. Recognize differing interpretations in evaluating the past and present. f. Recognize historical events and movements that are directly relevant to understanding the contemporary world. g. Apply a global perspective in evaluating twentieth century historical development.	7. Historical Reflection
8. To develop an understanding and appreciation of diversity among cultures, including respect for various ways of viewing the world.	8. a. Explain the concept of culture and the characteristics that distinguish one culture from another. b. Analyze his or her own culture and compare it other cultures. c. Recognize prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory actions. d. Recognize the cultural heterogeneity of the United States by characterizing its racial, ethnic, linguistic and religious diversity.	8. Understanding of Culture and Diversity

	e. Describe several value differences among cultures with the goal of articulating accurate perceptions about cultural pluralism in our world.	
9. To develop a global perspective on problems and issues that humankind faces, and to explore solutions which are morally, socially, economically, politically and ecologically sound.	9. a. Demonstrate a basic knowledge of world physical geography. b. Understand how regional problems and their solutions may have global impact. c. Identify political and economic realities as they impact on moral, social and ecological issues in a major power country and in a third world country.	9. Global Perspective
10. To develop the understanding of health and well being necessary to confront the challenges facing individuals, families, and communities.	10. a. Identify important issues of health and well being. b. Analyze and evaluate how issues of health and well being affect the individual, community and humankind at large. c. Evaluate his/her own health and fitness level through current procedures. d. Identify and apply healthful practices and conditioning techniques toward the attainment and maintenance of optimal health and fitness through life. e. Appreciate and demonstrate knowledge and basic skill levels of various lifetime physical activities for social and recreational enrichment.	10. Health and Well Being
11. To develop and demonstrate civic and social responsibility.	11. a. Recognize and respond to social needs. b. Understand and participate in the political process. c. Behave as an efficient citizen in dealing with institutions and officials in the public and private sectors. d. Demonstrate an awareness of current events, social changes and trends. e. Behave cooperatively and responsibly in various social situations by showing respect for the norms and mores of the group.	11. Citizenship
12. To develop an understanding of technology and its impact on society and the environment.	12. a. Use appropriate sources to keep abreast of current technological advances. b. Examine the ethical implications of technological advances which may hinder as well as help the individual and society. c. Analyze the impact of at least one recent (<10 yr.) technological advance on the economic, political, moral, social and ecological life of: (1) an urban and a rural community. (2) a major power and a third world country.	12. Understanding of Technology
13. To foster the curiosity, creativity	13. a. Understand basic theories of human motivation	13. Life Long Learning

and desire to become
autonomous learners for life.

- and learning.
- b. Identify various learning processes that take place outside of the educational setting.
 - c. Engage in creative self-expression.
 - d. Recognize intellectual curiosity as a motivation for life-long learning.

Appendix III, Program Evaluation Model

Ocean County College Program Evaluation

Degree Program Title

I. Program Description

- ♦ Examine the program description in the college catalog and publications and on the college website to determine accuracy and completeness. Revise as needed.

II. Assessment of Student Learning at the Program Level

A. Statement of Program Goals

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

B. List of Program Objectives

Students who successfully complete this program will be able to perform the following program-specific skills:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.

9.

Students who successfully complete this program will be able to demonstrate the following general education skills:

10.

11.

12.

C. Assessment Strategy

Direct Assessment Method

The program evaluation should include one direct assessment method. Direct methods evaluate actual student learning. Examples include capstone experiences, internship performance, research project(s), field work, portfolio assessment, service learning, exhibits, and comprehensive exams (objective or essay). Many of these can be scored using a set of rubrics.

Indirect Assessment

The program evaluation should include one indirect assessment method. Indirect methods evaluate implied student learning. Examples include surveys of program graduates, interviews, questionnaires, and focus groups. Since every program evaluation involves the sending of surveys to program graduates, deans can use these surveys as the indirect assessment.

Qualitative and Quantitative Data

The program evaluation should be presented quantitatively and qualitatively. Quantitative data are expressed in numerical terms. For example, “85% of the students tested achieved a score of satisfactory or better,” or “85% of the students answered this test item on the comprehensive exam correctly.” Qualitative data are expressed in narrative form, such as a summary of comments from the student surveys. Qualitative assessment might also be provided through an annual summary of overall student accomplishment, such as transfer numbers (including scholarship dollars awarded), student awards and recognition, and career placements.

D. Findings

E. Immediate Actions

F. Follow-up Actions Recommended

III. Program Evaluation Data

A. Program Enrollment

B. Enrollment in Program-Specific Courses

C. Institutional Retention and Graduation Rates

D. Fall Applications and Graduation Data

E. Program Cost

F. Student Surveys

IV. Assessment of Program Related Factors

A. Faculty Expertise

Consider qualifications, professional development opportunities, orientation/mentoring for full-time and part-time faculty, and the proportion of full-time to part-time faculty.

B. Curriculum Review

Consider displaying the existing program of study (curriculum guide) with suggested revisions, if any. Also, consider the currency of the course description, texts and materials, pedagogical approaches, and use of classroom assessment techniques.

C. Recruitment and Publicity

Consider advisory committee involvement, high school and community contacts, and marketing on the website and through the distribution of brochures.

D. Resources

Consider the availability of computers and lab facilities/equipment.

E. Program Integrity

Examine the college catalog, brochures, policies, advertisements, and promotions for currency and accuracy. Determine whether grades in program courses are related to program objectives.

V. Program Evaluation Summary

A. Program Strengths

B. Program Weaknesses

C. Use of the Evaluation for Program Improvement: Immediate Actions

D. Use of the Evaluation for Program Improvement: Follow-up Actions Recommended

VI. Attachments

A. Advisory Committee comments

B. Report by External Consultant (as necessary)

C. Response of the Learning Assessment Committee

VII. Approval of the Program Evaluation

A. By the Academic Dean

Dean of

B. By the VP of Academic Affairs

Vice President of Academic Affairs

C. By the College President

President, Ocean County College

Appendix IV, Academic Master Plan Introduction

OCEAN COUNTY COLLEGE ACADEMIC MASTER PLAN 2007-2012

Background

The first Academic Master Plan was developed at Ocean County College in 2003 by a widely representative committee of faculty, administration, and staff, and was based loosely on goals established by a report by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) titled *Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College* (2002).

While the AACU report was both vigorous and visionary, and while it inspired the OCC Academic Master Plan Committee to develop a mission and a wide range of worthy goals and objectives, both the local and national record of student outcomes in higher education in the past three years has been, to say the least, disappointing. College graduates across America are showing an increasing decline in basic skills competencies and the number of years to degree completion continues to grow. As a result, the current US Education Secretary, Margaret Spellings, has suggested that American colleges and universities need to focus on an outcomes-based approach to academic planning and assessment and engage in a structured master planning process that is directly tied to institutional goals with measurable outcomes. These, in turn, will feed into the learning assessment process.

Academic Mission

While it is still desirable to embrace, as we did in our former Master Plan, the AACU's vision of "intentional learners, individuals who become engaged citizens, empowered, informed and responsible," it is also desirable to state a more concrete academic mission: *Ocean County College graduates will demonstrate competencies in skills associated with the college's General Education core goals as well as successfully completing course and program requirements in their chosen curriculum.* Students who have mastered the content knowledge of their program emphasis and who can demonstrate competence in the general education core skills will be well-prepared to transfer or to enter the job market and thus begin to fulfill a meaningful vision for their lives. The community college mission has been historically based on the transfer/career qualifications of its graduates. It seems important, now more than ever, that we return to these basics. Students who cannot competently read, write and compute, students who lack basic information about our nation's history, politics and culture, students who cannot locate places of international significance on a world map or identify international interrelationships, students who cannot make informed and logical decisions based on

accurate and adequate resources, students who have not discovered their particular academic or career niche—students who cannot do these things, historic hallmarks of an educated person, can never be said to be “empowered.”

The bases that we have established as requisite for our graduates are:

- ⦿ Effective Communication Skills
- ⦿ Effective Computation (Arithmetic and Algebraic Manipulations)
- ⦿ Critical Thinking/Problem Solving Skills
- ⦿ The Ability to Gather and Interpret Information (Information/Technological Literacy)
- ⦿ Familiarity with the Paradigms of the Natural, Social, and Technical Worlds
- ⦿ A Knowledge of the Historical Underpinnings of American Social and Political Culture
- ⦿ Familiarity with Gender and Cultural Diversity and a Global Perspective
- ⦿ A Sense of Personal and Social Ethics
- ⦿ An Awareness of the Arts
- ⦿ Knowledge and Practice in the Components of Physical Health and Well-Being
- ⦿ Content Knowledge in the Chosen Curriculum
- ⦿ Engagement with Institutional Initiatives that Contribute to the Enhancement of Learning

We are aware that no one of these items stands independent of the others, but that all are interrelated and combine to produce what we see as an educated person. As a result, the 2007 Master Plan is organized by these core competencies and targets new academic goals and objectives commensurate with their outcomes. As we continue to do all the things that we already do to achieve our goals, we propose either new initiatives or the re/vision of existing initiatives to improve the overall success of our students by improving the teaching/learning process.

Appendix V, Program Review Summary Chart

**OCEAN COUNTY COLLEGE
PROGRAM EVALUATION STATUS**

ACADEMIC PROGRAM	ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING	PROGRAM STRENGTHS & WEAKNESSES
Criminal Justice AAS Degree Department:	Instead of focusing on student learning assessment, this program evaluation focused on enrollment data, retention, graduation rate, space utilization, student achievement based on awards, and progress since the last evaluation.	<u>Strengths:</u> Articulation with Ocean County Police Academy. Clear educational and programmatic goals. Coherent sequence of courses. Excellent gender equity ratio. Expanded Advisory Board membership and

<p>Social Science</p> <p>Dean Marilyn Kralik, PhD</p> <p>Evaluation Year: 1999-2000</p>		<p>activity. Faculty participation in county and statewide professional associations. Internships for students in 10 locations. Specialized counseling for high risk students.</p> <p><u>Weaknesses:</u> High ratio of P/T to F/T faculty. Historical emphasis on policing and limited emphasis on training for employment in other areas of Criminal Justice.</p>
	<p style="text-align: center;">ACTION PLAN FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design a CJ exit or capstone course. 2. Develop a required internship experience. 3. Develop guidelines for a student portfolio. 4. Establish criteria of computer literacy/technical proficiency. 5. Establish criteria to document participation in a field practicum. 6. Emphasize employment opportunities in a wider range of CJ options. 7. Increase outreach to secondary and baccalaureate partners as well as to potential career advisors. 8. Incorporate required computer literacy component into every course. 9. Increase writing requirements in at least two CJ courses. 10. Design a four-semester, off-campus rotation of CJ courses so that off-campus students have an opportunity to complete their degree. 11. Create online courses for distance learning. 12. Institute a Criminal Justice Career Day on campus, with representatives from the following constituencies: (1) four-year institutions; (2) local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies; (3) corrections; and (4) private security. 	<p style="text-align: center;">FOLLOW UP ACTIONS</p>

**OCEAN COUNTY COLLEGE
PROGRAM EVALUATION STATUS**

<p>ACADEMIC PROGRAM</p> <p>Visual Communications Technology</p> <p>AAS Degree</p> <p>Department: Humanities</p> <p>Dean Martin Novelli, PhD</p> <p>Evaluation Year: 2000-2001</p>	<p>ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING</p> <p>Assessment of student learning was based on student achievement of two program objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students enrolled in the program will satisfactorily complete an exit course. 2. Students will be evaluated as "satisfactory" by their internship sponsors. 3. In responding to an Alumni Survey, students will express satisfaction with the program. 4. In responding to an Alumni Survey, 60% will indicate that they successfully transferred to a four-year institution. 	<p>PROGRAM STRENGTHS & WEAKNESSES</p> <p><u>Strengths:</u> Three clearly defined options. Coherent course sequencing. Strong involvement with OC VoTech and with Tech Prep. Ongoing Perkins support. Tutoring assistance. Expanded lab hours.</p> <p><u>Weaknesses:</u> Absence of strong internship programs for all three options. Limited classroom and lab space.</p>
	<p>ACTION PLAN FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase outreach to secondary and baccalaureate schools and, thus, expand on the 2+2+2 concept. 2. Expand the pool of intern partners. 3. Develop a remedial program to better prepare students to go directly into the job market and to identify students whose visual skills are lacking. 	<p>FOLLOW UP ACTIONS</p>
<p>ACADEMIC PROGRAM</p> <p>Engineering</p> <p>AS Degree</p> <p>Department: Business, Engineering, & Computer Studies</p> <p>Dean Francis Polk</p> <p>Evaluation Year: 2001-2002</p>	<p>ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING</p> <p>Assessment of student learning was based on student achievement of three program objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The program will have a retention rate of 80%. Result: There was a 78% retention rate. 2. At graduation, 60% of the students who were enrolled in the program will have achieved a GPA of 3.0 or higher. Result: 82% met the standard. 3. Of all program graduates responding to an Alumni Survey, the majority will report that they successfully transferred to a four-year institution. Result: 90% met the standard. 	<p>PROGRAM STRENGTHS & WEAKNESSES</p> <p><u>Strengths:</u> Unprecedented marketing and recruitment efforts through networking, letters, and brochures.</p> <p><u>Weaknesses:</u> Low graduation rates (5-10 students between 1997 and 2001). Inadequate lab space and facilities.</p>
	<p>ACTION PLAN FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT</p>	<p>FOLLOW UP ACTIONS</p>

	1. Eliminate SC-274: Physics IV. 2. Continue marketing and recruitment efforts.	
--	--	--

OCEAN COUNTY COLLEGE PROGRAM EVALUATION STATUS

ACADEMIC PROGRAM	ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING	PROGRAM STRENGTHS & WEAKNESSES
<p>Civil/Construction Engineering Technology (Including Surveying Option)</p> <p>AAS Degree</p> <p>Department: Business, Engineering, & Computer Studies</p> <p>Dean Francis Polk</p> <p>Evaluation Year: 2001-2002</p>	<p>Assessment of student learning was based on student achievement of three program objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Of all students enrolled in the program, 90% will achieve a GPA of 3.0 or higher. Result: 72% met the standard. 2. Of all program graduates responding to an Alumni Survey, 60% will report that they found employment in the field. Result: 88% met the standard. 3. Of all program graduates responding to an Alumni Survey, 40% will report that they successfully transferred to a four-year institution. Result: 63% met the standard. 	<p><u>Strengths:</u> High quality, relevant instruction preparing students for employment. Balance of course work and lab experience.</p> <p><u>Weaknesses:</u> Low and declining program enrollment (56 students in 1998SP and 39 in 2002SP). Low graduation rates (11 students in 1997 and 2 in 2001). Inadequate lab space and facilities.</p>
	ACTION PLAN FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT	FOLLOW UP ACTIONS
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Intensify recruitment through networking in the community and by distributing letters and brochures to potential applicants. 2. Intensify internal marketing and recruitment through OCC counselors, advisors, and science/math faculty. 	<p>On 3-13-03 Dean Polk recommended that the program be terminated. On 12-10-03, Dr. Larson mandated a restructuring of the program. Subsequently, the program became the AAS in Civil Construction Technology with no surveying option.</p>
ACADEMIC PROGRAM	ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING	PROGRAM STRENGTHS & WEAKNESSES
<p>Administrative Office Management</p> <p>AAS Degree</p> <p>Department: Business, Engineering & Computer Studies</p> <p>Dean Francis Polk</p> <p>Evaluation Year:</p>	<p>Assessment of student learning was based on student achievement of two program objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Of all students enrolled in the capstone course BUSN-270: Office Management, 80% will achieve a grade of "B" or better. Result: 100% met the standard. 2. Of all program graduates responding to an Alumni Survey, 70% will indicate that they found employment in administrative office management or in a related field. 	<p><u>Strengths:</u> State-of-the-art office setting laboratory and instructional equipment. Faculty excellence based on formal classroom observations and on student comments. Faculty commitment to recruitment efforts. Faculty participation in program-related professional development. Ongoing review and revision of curriculum.</p> <p><u>Weaknesses:</u> Program options could be expanded to include a Records Management Option and a Library Technician Option.</p>

2002-2003	Result: 67% met the standard.	
	<p style="text-align: center;">ACTION PLAN FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT</p> <p>1. The department will continue with its recruitment efforts. 2. The department will explore the possibility of developing options in Records Management and Library Technician.</p>	FOLLOW UP ACTIONS

OCEAN COUNTY COLLEGE PROGRAM EVALUATION STATUS

ACADEMIC PROGRAM	ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING	PROGRAM STRENGTHS & WEAKNESSES
<p>Business: Banking/Financial Services Option</p> <p>AAS Degree</p> <p>Department: Business, Engineering, & Computer Studies</p> <p>Dean Francis Polk</p> <p>Evaluation Year: 2002-2003</p>	<p>Assessment of student learning was based on student achievement of two program objectives:</p> <p>1. Of all students enrolled in BU-271: Principles of Management and BU-275: Principles of Finance, 80% will achieve a grade of "B" or better. Result: 100% met the standard.</p> <p>2. Of all program graduates responding to an Alumni Survey, 80% will indicate that they found employment in a field related to legal assistant work. Result: 100% met the standard.</p>	<p><u>Strengths:</u> Quality of instruction. Relevant course work preparing students for employment.</p> <p><u>Weaknesses:</u> Low and declining program enrollment (25 students in 1990SP and 13 in 2003SP). Low graduation rates (0-3 each year between 1998 and 2003).</p>
	ACTION PLAN FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT	FOLLOW UP ACTIONS
	The department will intensify its marketing efforts.	
ACADEMIC PROGRAM	ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING	PROGRAM STRENGTHS & WEAKNESSES
<p>Business: Legal Assistant Option</p> <p>AAS Degree</p> <p>Department: Business, Engineering, & Computer Studies</p> <p>Dean Francis Polk</p>	<p>Assessment of student learning was based on student achievement of two program objectives:</p> <p>1. Of all students enrolled in the capstone course LA-203: Law Office Management, 75% will achieve a grade of "B" or better. Result: 80% met the standard.</p> <p>2. Of all program graduates responding to an Alumni</p>	<p><u>Strengths:</u> Quality of instruction. Relevant course work preparing students for employment.</p> <p><u>Weaknesses:</u> Low and declining program enrollment (68 students in 1998FA and 46 in 2003SP). Transfer options insufficiently communicated to students (though this is not a transfer program). Internship experiences for students need further development.</p>

Evaluation Year: 2002-2003	Survey, 70% will indicate that they found employment in a field related to legal assistant work. Result: 73% met the standard.	
	<p style="text-align: center;">ACTION PLAN FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT</p> <p>1. The department will intensify its marketing of the program to law offices, bar associations, and legal related businesses.</p> <p>2. The department will explore new opportunities for student interns.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">FOLLOW UP ACTIONS</p>

OCEAN COUNTY COLLEGE PROGRAM EVALUATION STATUS

ACADEMIC PROGRAM	ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING	PROGRAM STRENGTHS & WEAKNESSES
Visual Communications Technology AAS Degree Department: Humanities, Fine Art, & Media Studies Dean Martin Novelli, PhD Evaluation Year: 2005-2006	Assessment of student learning involves portfolio evaluation in a capstone course, COCG-165: Graphics Portfolio. The portfolio is scored using a rubric which addresses all program-specific and general education goals. While all portfolios are scored by the students' faculty members, a random sample of portfolios is selected for scoring by colleagues. In addition, students make a brief oral presentation of their work. The presentation is critiqued by peers and graded by faculty.	<u>Strengths:</u> State-of-the-art computer graphics option. Record of student achievement and success. New TV studio. Campus opportunities for student internships. <u>Weaknesses:</u> Poor condition of the labs. Lack of adequate funding and staff. Low program enrollment and graduation rates. Arts foundation courses taught primarily by adjuncts. Advising committee not fully utilized.
	ACTION PLAN FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT	FOLLOW UP ACTIONS
	The capstone course has not run in several semesters, thus preventing initiation of program-level assessment. However, the assessment will take place in Spring 2007, and an action plan will subsequently be developed.	Recommendations: (1) Hire an outside consultant to evaluate physical resources and equipment. (2) Develop a checklist for ongoing maintenance of the VCT area, to be used in cooperation with the Physical Plant. (3) Explore possible expansions in such Fine Arts areas as Fashion and Interior Design, both of which involve OCC in paying charge-backs. (4) Redesign the curriculum involving digital photography.
ACADEMIC PROGRAM	ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING	PROGRAM STRENGTHS & WEAKNESSES
Business Administration AS Degree	Assessment of student learning involves a 50-item assessment test administered in the capstone course, BUSN-271: Principles of Management. The test addresses all program specific and general education	<u>Strengths:</u> Strong preparation for careers in general business, accounting, economics, law, management, and marketing. Excellent faculty expertise, teaching, and professional

Department: Business, Economics & Computer Science Dean Francis Polk Evaluation Year: 2005 – 2006 Completion Date: 2006SP	objectives. However, because of flaws in the testing instrument, it cannot be used to identify program strengths and weaknesses. Some test questions were insufficiently connected to course objectives. Also, most questions involved mere definitions while the course objectives focus on complex skills and knowledge.	development. Retention rate exceeds the college-wide rate. High student satisfaction. Graduation rate exceeds college-wide rate. High rate of transfer. High employment rate of program graduates. <u>Weaknesses:</u> One significant weakness in the curricular design of the program is the absence of adequate prerequisites. For example, students can enroll in the so-called "capstone" course without having completed Business Law I and II, Principles of Accounting I and II, and Principles of Marketing.
	<p style="text-align: center;">ACTION PLAN FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revise the assessment instrument so that test questions align with course objectives. 2. Revise course pre-requisites so that students have taken the following courses prior to the capstone: BUSN-131; ECON-151; ECON-152; BUSN-134; BUSN-251; BUSN-252; ACCT-161; ACCT-162. 	<p style="text-align: center;">FOLLOW UP ACTIONS</p> <p>The program will be re-assessed in Fall 2007 using a new assessment instrument. Following that assessment, revising the prerequisites will again be considered.</p>

OCEAN COUNTY COLLEGE PROGRAM EVALUATION STATUS

ACADEMIC PROGRAM	ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING	PROGRAM STRENGTHS & WEAKNESSES
Environmental Technology AAS Degree Department: Science & Engineering Dean John Nawn Evaluation Year: 2005 - 2006 Completion Date: 2006SP	Although an assessment method was developed (group projects presented orally and in writing demonstrating program specific and general education skills and scored with a rubric), it could not be implemented because the program has not been viable. Out of 8 Environmental Science courses, only ENVI-152: Environmental Science ran each semester, and of the program specific courses only CHEM-283: Organic Chemistry has consistently run each fall semester.	<u>Strengths:</u> N/A <u>Weaknesses:</u> low enrollment; lack of viability
	<p style="text-align: center;">ACTION PLAN FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reconvene the Advisory Committee (inactive for 3 years). 2. Substitute MATH-168: Technical Math for MATH-201: Pre-calculus Techniques and Applications. 3. Eliminate CHEM 283 & 284: Organic Chemistry I & II. 4. Design a new one-semester Organic Chemistry course for Environmental Science students. 5. Add 2 additional field experience practicum courses (2 s.h. each) to replace the Organic Chemistry II. 6. Work with the Director of the Center for Coastal Environmental Studies in order to develop this program. 7. Engage students in center activities which will constitute the Field Experience / Practicum (ENVI-255) scheduled in the summer term. 	<p style="text-align: center;">FOLLOW UP ACTIONS</p> <p>A new dean met with the Advisory Committee in the Spring 2007 Semester. Instead of reducing the program requirements, as recommended by the previous dean, he plans to add Calculus I and II as alternative math courses, thus promoting transfer opportunities for students who wish to transfer.</p>
ACADEMIC	ASSESSMENT OF	PROGRAM

PROGRAM	STUDENT LEARNING	STRENGTHS & WEAKNESSES
<p>Allied Health</p> <p>AAS Degree</p> <p>Department: Health Science & Human Performance</p> <p>Dean Jim Brown, PhD</p> <p>Evaluation Year: 2005 – 2006</p> <p>Completion Date: 2006SP</p>	<p>Students will produce an allied health portfolio, an organized collection of documents chronicling their career and education. The initial portfolio will be created and submitted with the certificate, license, or evidence of work experiences that establish professional competency. This portfolio will be expanded upon and improved during the course of the students' attendance at OCC. A final portfolio will again be used to assess students' learning over the course of their tenure at OCC. A 10 point assessment rubric will be applied to the student portfolio. The rubric will assess the 14 competencies or skills associated with the 14 program-specific and general education goals.</p>	<p><u>Strength:</u> The program provides a way for para-professionals in health care to convert their certificates and licenses into college credit and to complete an associate degree.</p> <p><u>Weakness:</u> The program has limited transferability. Nonetheless, many para-professions would be interested in obtaining the AAS as a terminal degree.</p>
	<p style="text-align: center;">ACTION PLAN FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop articulation with CPE training programs in Med. Office Specialist, Med. Billing, and Med. Records Coding Specialist. 2. Develop articulation with OC VoTech Health Tech Programs. 3. Develop an Allied Health Portfolio for admissions purposes and as the major assessment tool. 4. Market this program as an option for students who have been unsuccessful in the Nursing program. 5. Offer selected courses (AHAH-115 & AHEC-130) online to increase enrollment. 6. Form a new advisory committee with a broad perspective in e-studies, clinical evaluations, and interviews. 	<p style="text-align: center;">FOLLOW UP ACTIONS</p> <p>Articulation with CPE training programs is stalled because of the temporary absence of the designated CPE staff member who would assist students in converting their certificates and experience into degree credit through the portfolio process. Also, in December 2006, Dean Brown learned that a HERN grant which would have provided monies to enhance this program was unsuccessful. Therefore, program revision is temporarily delayed.</p>

**OCEAN COUNTY COLLEGE
PROGRAM EVALUATION STATUS**

ACADEMIC PROGRAM	ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING	PROGRAM STRENGTHS & WEAKNESSES
<p>Business: Management Option</p> <p>AAS Degree</p> <p>Department: Business, Economics, & Computer Studies</p> <p>Dean Francis Polk</p> <p>Evaluation Year: 2006-2007</p>	<p>Assessment of student learning involves a 50-item test administered to students in the capstone course, BUSN-271: Principles of Management. The test, which includes 5-6 questions for each of the program-specific objectives, was administered to 56 students taught by 2 full-time faculty and 1 adjunct.</p> <p>Assessment data indicated that students strongly achieved one program-specific goal (86% proficiency) and adequately achieved the remaining seven goals (70% - 83% proficiency).</p>	<p><u>Strengths</u> Qualified, dedicated faculty. Faculty engagement in professional development, graduate degree programs, and faculty orientation/mentoring. Ongoing course revision. Engaged advisory committee. Ongoing recruitment in the high schools and community. Availability of Perkins and grant funding. Program prepares students for entry-level employment and transfer. Faculty and student involvement in business fraternities.</p> <p><u>Weaknesses</u> Low and steadily declining enrollment (72 students in 2000-01; 54 in 2005-05). Low and declining applications for admission. Low graduation rate (1-5 students annually from 2000-2004). Retention rate lower than the college-wide average. Program is not fully distinguished from the A.S. in Business Administration program.</p>

	ACTION PLAN FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT	FOLLOW UP ACTIONS
	<p>1. Consider replacing this AAS degree program with a 33-credit Certificate of Proficiency in Management, leaving the A.S. in Business Administration the one transfer program.</p> <p>2. Change BUSN-170: Small Business Management and BUSN-151: Introduction to HR Management from being "Management Electives" to required courses.</p>	

Appendix VI, Course Level Assessment SP 07

Course-Level Assessment of Student Learning – Spring 2007

Courses Selected	Assessment Instruments	Assessment Analysis	Action Plan For Course Improvements
ENGL-010: Fundamentals of Reading & Study I	35-item Companion, a written form of the ETS Computerized Placement Test	<p>The assessment involved 55 students in 5 sections taught by 5 full-time and adjunct faculty.</p> <p>The assessment focused on the following objective: Students who successfully complete ENGL-010 will achieve reading comprehension and vocabulary skills needed to enter ENGL-011.</p> <p>Out of a possible raw score of 35, the highest score was 27, the lowest was 9, and the average was 17. The target score was 21, equivalent to a converted score to 63 which students should attain in order to enter ENGL-011. Of the 55 students tested, 18% achieved the target score or higher,</p>	<p>Strategies implemented in preparation for the Spring 2007 assessment seem not to have improved student performance. These strategies included</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Practice in reading comprehension skills (vocabulary, main idea, specific details, inference, and contextual relevance of information). 2. Practice in sustaining independent reading and interpretation. 3. Practice in applying the skills learned in this course to college-level reading expectations in other disciplines.

		<p>compared to 10% in Spring 2005 and 28.5% in Spring 2006.</p> <p>Noting the low correlation with the success rate determined by passing grades, faculty questioned whether the assessment instrument accurately assessed the ENGL-010 course objectives and suggested that the test might identify a relatively small group of students who are adept test-takers.</p>	<p>4. Practice in standardized test-taking. 5. Encouraging of additional tutoring and conferencing.</p> <p>In preparation for the Spring 2008 assessment, the department will develop two combined Developmental Reading and Writing courses (Part I and II) and will analyze the test items to determine their correlation with the revised curriculum. Subsequently, the department might design or select an alternate assessment instrument, one that will more accurately test the learning objectives.</p> <p>For the Spring 2008 assessment, the department will also use an increased sample size.</p>
ENGL-011: Fundamentals of Reading & Study II	<p>35-item Companion, a written form of the ETS Computerized Placement Test</p>	<p>The assessment involved 151 students in 12 sections taught by 5 full-time and adjunct faculty.</p> <p>The assessment focused on the following objective: Students who successfully complete ENGL-011 will achieve college-level reading and vocabulary skills needed to discontinue remediation.</p> <p>Out of a possible raw score of 35, the highest score was 33, the lowest was 4, and the average median score was 20, up from 18 in 2005 and 2006. The target score was raised from 21 in 2006 to 25 in 2007, the latter representing a conversion score of 79 which students need to discontinue remediation. Of the 151 students tested, 13% achieved the target score or higher.</p> <p>Noting the low correlation with the success rate determined by passing grades, faculty questioned whether the assessment instrument accurately assessed the ENGL-011 course objectives and suggested that the test might identify a relatively small group of students who are adept test-takers.</p>	<p>Strategies implemented in preparation for the 2007 assessment seem not to have improved student performance. These strategies included the same set identified for ENGL-010 (see above).</p> <p>In preparation for the Spring 2008 assessment, the department will develop two combined Developmental Reading and Writing courses (Part I and II) and will analyze the test items to determine their correlation with the revised curriculum. Subsequently, the department might design or select an alternate assessment instrument, one that will more accurately test the learning objectives.</p> <p>In addition, the department will obtain statistical data from the Research Office to compare the GPAs of students who have completed reading remediation with those who needed no remediation.</p>
ENGL-020: English Fundamentals I	<p>48 long paragraphs blind scored using a common set of rubrics. Eight paragraphs were randomly selected from the full set submitted by each of 6 faculty members.</p>	<p>The assessment involved 48 students papers selected randomly from 6 sections taught by 6 full-time and adjunct faculty.</p> <p>The assessment required each student to write a paragraph demonstrating his/her achievement of 5 course objectives. Instructors exchanged papers and scored the paragraphs using a rubric.</p> <p>Test data indicated the following student proficiency rates:</p> <p>Obj. A: Clear topic sentence: 79%. Obj. B: Logical paragraph organization:</p>	<p>One strategy implemented in preparation for the 2007 assessment seems to have improved student performance: Practice in creating effective topic sentences for a variety of paragraph assignments.</p> <p>Other strategies which seem not to have improved student performance include the following:</p> <p>1. Practice in analyzing and writing coherent paragraphs that demonstrate varied organizational modes, effective use of logical transitions, and purposeful repetition of</p>

		<p>56%. Obj. C: Adequate paragraph development: 69%. Obj. D: Specific supporting detail: 83%. Obj. E: Adequate basic sentence-level skills: 33%.</p> <p>Notably, student proficiency dropped in four of the 5 objectives from Spring 2005 to Spring 2006, and proficiency dropped modestly in one objective and significantly in another objective from 2006 to 2007. Student proficiency in writing clear topic sentences increased from 66% to 79% between 2006 and 2007.</p> <p>Regarding objective B, logical paragraph development, improved mastery may depend on involvement in other composition courses. In 2007, student achievement of logical essay development in ENGL 151 and 152, respectively, was 80% and 77%.</p>	<p>key ideas.</p> <p>2. Practice to reach an 80% level of mastery in fundamental sentence-level skills: maintaining standard verb and pronoun agreement, using standard verb tenses, writing complete sentences, constructing and punctuating compound and complex sentences, using accurate spelling and capitalization.</p> <p>3. Practice in purposeful revising and editing of single-paragraph and essay drafts.</p> <p>In preparation for the Spring 2008 assessment, the department will develop two combined Developmental Reading and Writing courses (Part I and II), an effort which will engage faculty in common literacy objectives and instructional methodologies for developmental students as syllabi for the new courses are developed.</p> <p>In addition, to improve student learning of basic writing skills, the department will identify a common set of goals for grammatical skills in ENGL 020 and develop relevant instructional materials, including focused activities.</p> <p>Also, faculty will more readily refer students for tutoring and to the Disabilities Resource Center.</p>
<p>ENGL-021: English Fundamentals II</p>	<p>65 essays blind scored using a common set of rubrics. Eight essays were randomly selected from the full set submitted by each of 8 faculty members.</p>	<p>The assessment involved 65 student papers selected randomly from sections taught by 8 full-time and adjunct faculty.</p> <p>The assessment required each student to write an essay demonstrating his/her achievement of 5 course objectives. Instructors exchanged papers and scored the essays using a rubric.</p> <p>Test data indicated the following student proficiency rates:</p> <p>Obj. A: Clear topic sentences and thesis statement: 64%. Obj. B: Logical paragraph organization: 66%. Obj. C: Logical essay organization: 75%. Obj. D: Adequate development with specific support: 47%. Obj. E: Adequate basic skills: 66%.</p> <p>Faculty noted a substantial drop in four of the objectives and little improvement in the</p>	<p>Strategies implemented for the Spring 2007 assessment which seem not to have improved student performance include the following:</p> <p>1. Practice in developing essay paragraphs with varied types of supporting detail.</p> <p>2. Practice to reach a 90% level of mastery in fundamental sentence-level skills: maintaining standard verb and pronoun agreement, using standard verb tenses, writing complete sentences, constructing and punctuating compound and complex sentences, using accurate spelling and capitalization.</p> <p>3. Practice in purposeful revising and editing of essay drafts.</p>

		<p>final objective.</p> <p>Faculty noted that looking at a statistical analysis across the four writing courses may offer a fuller perspective on complex skills than concentrating on annual skills fluctuations within individual courses.</p> <p>Also, the relatively new course placement method, computerized scoring of Accuplacer essays, may have inflated placement essay scores. As a result, students needing fundamental logical skills taught in ENGL 020 may have been erroneously placed into ENGL 021.</p>	<p>In preparation for the Spring 2008 assessment, the department will develop two combined Developmental Reading and Writing courses (Part I and II), an effort which will engage faculty in common literacy objectives and instructional methodologies for developmental students as syllabi for the new courses are developed.</p> <p>In addition, to improve student learning of basic writing skills, the department will identify a common set of goals for grammatical skills in ENGL 021 and develop relevant instructional materials, including focused activities.</p> <p>Also, faculty will more readily refer students for tutoring and to the Disabilities Resource Center.</p> <p>In addition, placement testing protocols and cutoff scores will be analyzed and revised in the light of current performance.</p>
ENGL-151: English I	166 essays blind scored using a common set of rubrics. Seven or eight essays were selected randomly from each of 21 faculty members.	<p>The assessment involved 166 student essays selected randomly from sections taught by 21 full-time and adjunct faculty. Each instructor submitted a single class set of essays. The essays were assessed anonymously using a rubric.</p> <p>The assessment focused on 6 course objectives. Test data indicated the following student proficiencies: Obj. A: Clear, focused thesis: 69% Obj. B: Functional essay structure: 80% Obj. C: Development with details: 83% Obj. D: Use of source material: 61% Obj. E: MLA documentation: 48% Obj. F: Coherence and standard grammatical usage: 78%.</p> <p>Student proficiency improved in only one objective (C: Development with details) between 2006 and 2007 and dropped significantly in one objective (E: MLA documentation).</p> <p>Regarding performance of objectives D and E, faculty noted that faculty readers who were unfamiliar with the source materials of other instructors' students may have withheld certification of proper source use and documentation. Also, not all students used sources in their assessment essays and, thus, could not be credited with having achieved objectives D and E.</p>	<p>The department will continue to conduct norming sessions prior to the next assessment.</p> <p>Faculty will continue to use the following strategies (which were implemented prior to the Spring 2007 assessment) to improve student performance with regard to using source materials and MLA documentation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Practice in fundamental skills of source reference in essays: coherent positioning, use of lead-in phrases, correct quoting and paraphrasing, and adequate source analysis. 2. Practice to achieve a minimum 80% mastery level in parenthetical citations and works cited format for references from books, articles, anthologies, and Internet databases. <p>In preparation for the Spring 2008 assessment, faculty will also identify a common set of course research goals and create appropriate instructional materials, including focused exercises.</p> <p>Also, assessment essay parameters and expectations will be better aligned, the assessment rubric will be rephrased as needed, and reader response codes will be expanded and better defined.</p>
ENGL-152:	173 essays	The assessment involved 173 student	The following strategies, which were

English II	analyzing a short story were blind scored using a common set of rubrics. Seven or eight essays were randomly selected from the full set submitted by each of 22 faculty members.	<p>essays selected randomly from sections taught by 22 full-time and adjunct faculty. Each instructor submitted a single class set of essays. The essays were assessed anonymously using a rubric.</p> <p>The assessment focused on 6 course objectives. Student performance dropped in every objective between 2006 and 2007. However, this drop may have resulted from the increased cohort size of 173 essays. Inflated outcomes in 2006 may have resulted because only 47 essays had been submitted for review, and 12 of these were from an Honors section.</p>	<p>implemented prior to the Spring 2007 assessment, seem not to have improved student performance include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Practice in developing literary assertions with sufficient detail, especially through the relevant quotation and explication of primary texts. 2. Practice in fundamental skills of secondary source reference: coherent positioning, use of lead-in phrases, correct quoting and paraphrasing, and adequate source analysis. 3. Practice to achieve a minimum 80% mastery level in parenthetical citations and works cited format for references from literary sources (fiction, poetry, and drama) and critical sources (books, articles, anthologies, and Internet databases). <p>In preparation for the Spring 2008 assessment, faculty will identify a common set of goals for source use and documentation and create appropriate instructional materials, including focused exercises.</p> <p>Also, assessment essay parameters and expectations will be better aligned, the assessment rubric will be rephrased as needed, and reader response codes will be expanded and better defined.</p>
ACCT-161: Principles of Accounting I	A 44-item cumulative multiple choice test given in the last week of the semester.	<p>The assessment involved 104 students in 6 sections taught by 2 FT faculty and 3 adjuncts. The assessment focused on 10 course objectives. Each objective was addressed by a minimum of three and by a maximum of seven test items.</p> <p>Data indicated the percentage of students who correctly answered each test item. All test items directly addressing a given objective were placed into a set, and an average percentage of students correctly answering the set of questions was determined. This figure thus represented the average percentage of students who apprehended each course objective.</p> <p>Student proficiency was less than 70% for 5 objectives: Obj. C (67%) – Journalize adjustment entries. Obj. G (66%) – Compute inventory values.</p>	<p>Prior to the Spring 2007 assessment, faculty implemented the following strategy to improve student learning in objective G: The assigning of exercises E6-3 and E6-10 and problems P6-6A and P6-7A found in the text at the end of the chapter. Student proficiency increased from 61% in 2006 to 66% in 2007.</p> <p>Prior to the Spring 2008 assessment, faculty will focus on improving student learning in objectives C, G, H, J, and M by directing students to the Self-Study Questions and Brief Exercises in the text and by assigning and reviewing the following textbook exercises:</p> <p>Obj. C – Ch. 3, ex. 1, 2, 3; problems 1A, 3A. Obj. G – Ch. 6, ex. 1, 6; problems 1A, 2A., 6A Obj. H – Ch. 6, ex. 4, 5, 10; problems 3A, 4A., 6A</p>

		<p>Obj. H (64%) – Prepare income statements. Obj. J (50%) – Record transactions in journals. Obj. M (67%) – Tangible assets and resources.</p> <p>Objective G was also targeted for improvement prior to the Spring 2007 assessment.</p>	<p>Obj. J – Ch. 7, ex. 1, 2, 3, 4, 7; problems 1A, 3A., 4A Obj. M – Ch. 10, ex. 1, 2, 3, 4; problems 1A, 2A., 4A, 5A.</p>
<p>ACCT-162: Principles of Accounting II</p>	<p>A 52-item cumulative multiple choice test given in the last week of the semester.</p>	<p>The assessment involved 123 students in 7 sections taught by 3 FT faculty and 2 adjuncts. The assessment focused on 9 course objectives. Each objective was addressed by a minimum of three and by a maximum of seven test items.</p> <p>Data indicated the percentage of students who correctly answered each test item. All test items directly addressing a given objective were placed into a set, and an average percentage of students correctly answering the set of questions was determined. This figure thus represented the average percentage of students who apprehended each course objective.</p> <p>Student proficiency was less than 70% for 6 objectives: Obj. B (50%) – Record transactions - partnership. Obj. C (66%) – Record transactions - corporation. Obj. E (65%) – Accounting practices - investments. Obj. F (69%) – Prepare statement of cash flow. Obj. G (57%) – Compare financial statements. Obj. H (53%) – Cost-Volume-Profit relationships.</p> <p>Objectives F and H were targeted for improvement prior to the Spring 2007 assessment, in addition to objectives D and I.</p>	<p>Prior to the Spring 2007 assessment, faculty implemented successful strategies to improve student learning in objective D and I. Between 2006 and 2007, student proficiency in objective D increased from 68% to 80%, and in objective I from 68% to 71%.</p> <p>However, the Spring 2007 assessment indicated that proficiency in objective F remained below 70%, and proficiency in objective H dropped from 67% to 53%.</p> <p>Prior to the Spring 2008 assessment, faculty will focus on improving student learning in all the objectives noted in the left column by directing students to the Self-Study Questions and Brief Exercises in the text and by assigning and reviewing the following textbook exercises:</p> <p>Obj. B – Ch. 13, ex. 1-4; problems 1A, 2A. Obj. C – Ch. 14, ex. 1-3; problems 1A, 5A. Obj. E – Ch. 17, ex. 2, 3, 5; problems 1A, 5A Obj. F – Ch. 18, ex. 1, 2, 8, 9; problems 1A-3A Obj. G – Ch. 19, ex. 1, 2, 3, 5; problems 1A, 2A Obj. H – Ch. 23, ex. 1, 3, 4; problems 1A, 3A.</p>
<p>BUSN-131: Introduction to Business Adminis- tration</p>	<p>A 50-item cumulative multiple choice test given in the last week of the semester.</p>	<p>The assessment involved 231 students in 8 sections taught by 3 FT faculty and 3 adjuncts. The assessment focused on 8 course objectives. Each objective was addressed by a minimum of four and by a maximum of ten test items.</p> <p>Data indicated the percentage of students who correctly answered each test item. All test items directly addressing a given objective were placed into a set, and an average percentage of students correctly answering the set of questions was determined. This figure thus represented</p>	<p>Prior to the Spring 2007 assessment, faculty implemented a strategy to improve student learning in objective G from 62% in 2006 to 68% in 2007. However, additional improvement is needed.</p> <p>Prior to the Spring 2008 assessment, faculty will revise the assessment instrument. To improve proficiency, faculty will assign the following:</p> <p>“Developing Workplace Skills” - #1, p 399 and #2, p. 451.</p>

		<p>the average percentage of students who apprehended each course objective.</p> <p>Data indicted that only one objective was apprehended by less than 70% of the students:</p> <p>Obj. G (68%) – Examine the marketing function; describe concepts and processes involved in designing strategies for product, promotion, distribution, and pricing.</p> <p>This objective was also targeted for improvement prior to the Spring 2007 assessment.</p>	
BUSN-134: Principles of Marketing	A 50-item cumulative multiple choice test given in the last week of the semester.	<p>The assessment involved 177 students in 7 sections taught by 1 FT faculty and 4 adjuncts. The assessment focused on 10 course objectives. Each objective was addressed by a minimum of three and by a maximum of nine test items.</p> <p>Data indicated the percentage of students who correctly answered each test item. All test items directly addressing a given objective were placed into a set, and an average percentage of students correctly answering the set of questions was determined. This figure thus represented the average percentage of students who apprehended each course objective.</p> <p>The Spring 2007 assessment indicated that only one objective fell below 70%:</p> <p>Obj. H: Nature and scope of the business market.</p>	<p>Although the course objectives were revised and re-numbered between 2006 and 2007, all three objectives targeted for improvement prior to the Spring 2007 assessment improved significantly, i.e., from 67% to 76%, from 69% to 76%, and from 68% to 81%.</p> <p>Prior to the Spring 2008 assessment, faculty will focus on improving student leaning in objective H by assigning "Marketing Applications" exercises 1-3 on page 220 of the text.</p>
BUSN-251: Business Law I	A 50-item cumulative multiple choice test given in the last week of the semester.	<p>The assessment involved 144 students in 6 sections taught by 2 FT faculty and 4 adjuncts. The assessment focused on 10 course objectives. Each objective was addressed by a minimum of three and by a maximum of eight test items.</p> <p>Data indicated the percentage of students who correctly answered each test item. All test items directly addressing a given objective were placed into a set, and an average percentage of students correctly answering the set of questions was determined. This figure thus represented the average percentage of students who apprehended each course objective.</p> <p>Between 2006 and 2007, course objectives and test questions were better aligned.</p>	<p>One objective which faculty targeted for improvement following the 2006 assessment was Objective N. Student proficiency increased from 74% in 2006 to 83% in 2007.</p> <p>Faculty did not identify any strategies to improve student leaning in preparation for the 2008 assessment because proficiency in the course objectives ranged from satisfactory to very good.</p>

		In Spring 2007, student performance on the 10 objectives ranged from 74% to 87%. Five objectives were in the 80% - 87% range.	
BUSN-252: Business Law II	A 40-item cumulative multiple choice test given in the last week of the semester.	<p>The assessment involved 81 students in 4 sections taught by 1 FT faculty and 3 adjuncts. The assessment focused on 7 course objectives. Each objective was addressed by a minimum of five and by a maximum of ten test items.</p> <p>Data indicated the percentage of students who correctly answered each test item. All test items directly addressing a given objective were placed into a set, and an average percentage of students correctly answering the set of questions was determined. This figure thus represented the average percentage of students who apprehended each course objective.</p> <p>Student proficiency in the 7 objectives ranged from 72% to 91%. For 4 objectives, the range was 82% to 91%.</p>	<p>Two objectives which faculty targeted for improvement following the 2006 assessment were Objectives C and H. Between 2006 and 2007, student proficiency for Objective C increased from 61% in 2006 to 77% in 2007, and for Objective H from 66% to 72%.</p> <p>Faculty did not identify any strategies to improve student leaning in preparation for the 2008 assessment because proficiency in the course objectives ranged from satisfactory to very good.</p>
CSIT-171: Computer Programming I	A cumulative multiple choice test given in the last week of the semester.	This course was not offered in Spring 2006 or in Spring 2007. Therefore, the assessment will take place at the end of the Fall 2007 Semester.	N/A
CSIT-172: Computer Programming II	A 50-item cumulative multiple choice test given in the last week of the semester.	<p>The assessment involved 29 students in two sections taught by a full-time faculty member and one adjunct. The assessment focused on the first 11 course objectives. All objectives were addressed by 3-4 test questions, except for Objective G which was addressed by 15 questions because approximately 50% of the teaching time is devoted to this objective.</p> <p>Data indicated the percentage of students who correctly answered each test item. All test items directly addressing a given objective were placed into a set, and an average percentage of students correctly answering the set of questions was determined. This figure thus represented the average percentage of students who apprehended each course objective.</p> <p>Between 2006 and 2007, course objectives and test questions were better aligned.</p> <p>Student proficiency in the 11 course objectives ranged from 70% to 85%, with 5 objectives ranging from 80% to 85%.</p>	<p>Because course objectives were revised and the testing instrument changed between 2006 and 2007, little comparative data can be presented.</p> <p>Prior to the Spring 2008 assessment, faculty will focus on improving student leaning in objectives B, C, and D, by assigning a common set of exercises and problems from the text book.</p> <p>In addition, faculty are presently revising the curriculum for CSIT 171 and CSIT 172 according to recommendations by the Computer Science Advisory Committee.</p>
ECON-151: Macro-	A 40-item cumulative	The assessment involved 80 students in 8 sections taught by 2 FT faculty and 3	Prior to the Spring 2008 assessment, faculty will focus on improving student learning in

<p>economic Principles</p>	<p>multiple choice test given in the last week of the semester.</p>	<p>adjuncts. The assessment focused on 7 course objectives. Each objective was addressed by a minimum of three and by a maximum of ten test items.</p> <p>Data indicated the percentage of students who correctly answered each test item. All test items directly addressing a given objective were placed into a set, and an average percentage of students correctly answering the set of questions was determined. This figure thus represented the average percentage of students who apprehended each course objective.</p> <p>Between 2006 and 2007, the course objectives were revised to make them more measurable.</p> <p>Student proficiency in the 7 course objectives ranged from 68% to 83%. Student proficiency for only 1 objective fell below 70%:</p> <p>Obj. D – American market system; economy; and principles underlying the global economy.</p>	<p>Objective D by assigning a common set of exercises and problems from the text book.</p>
<p>ECON-152: Micro-economic Principles</p>	<p>A 40-item cumulative multiple choice test given in the last week of the semester.</p>	<p>The assessment involved 222 students in 8 sections taught by 2 FT faculty and 6 adjunct. The assessment focused on 8 course objectives. Each objective was addressed by a minimum of three and by a maximum of nine test items.</p> <p>Data indicated the percentage of students who correctly answered each test item. All test items directly addressing a given objective were placed into a set, and an average percentage of students correctly answering the set of questions was determined. This figure thus represented the average percentage of students who apprehended each course objective.</p> <p>Between 2006 and 2007, the course objectives were revised to make them more measurable.</p> <p>Student proficiency in the 8 course objectives ranged from 79% to 88%.</p>	<p>Faculty did not identify any strategies to improve student leaning in preparation for the 2008 assessment because proficiency in the course objectives ranged from above average to very good.</p>
<p>COMM-154: Fundamentals of Public Speaking</p>	<p>30-question comprehensive exam administered at the end of the term.</p> <p>34-question "Anxiety"</p>	<p>The comprehensive exam involved 181 students in 11 sections taught by 3 full-time faculty and 1 adjuncts. Each of the 30 exam questions represented a specific objective. The objectives were grouped into 4 sets. The percentage of students who achieved each set of objective at a satisfactory level or higher was as follows:</p>	<p>Two significant assessment problems surfaced in the Spring 2007 assessment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Despite the concerted efforts of the one FT faculty member leading course-level assessment, a full 50% of the sections were not involved in the assessment, suggesting that some faculty (probably adjuncts) did not participate.

	<p>Survey administered at the beginning and end of the semester</p>	<p>Objective Set A (Research and Content) – 76%</p> <p>Objective Set B (Elements of Speech Delivery) 93%</p> <p>Objective Set C (Ethical and Civil Dialog) – 70%</p> <p>Objective Set D (Persuasion and Reasoning) – 85%</p> <p>Efforts to improve student learning should focus on part of Objective A and part of Objective C:</p> <p>Obj. A4 (68%) – Plagiarism Obj. A 5 (66%) – Evaluating internet data Obj. C20 (69%) – Definition of civility Obj. C24 (66%) – Exclusive vs. inclusive language</p> <p>All of the above were also targeted in 2006 but showed no substantial improvement in 2007.</p> <p>In the “Anxiety” Survey, which involved 270 students, there was a 21% decrease in the number of students expressing high/moderately high anxiety between the beginning and the end of the term. In 2005 and 2006, the decrease was 70% and 35%, respectively. Ideally, this percentage should be high, but it has dropped steadily for three years.</p>	<p>2. The following strategies devised to improve student learning failed to do so, possibly because of a lack of faculty involvement in assessment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Devote classroom instruction to clarifying the difference between uncivil/unethical communication vs. civil discourse. Instruct students to view videotaped performances of both civil and uncivil presentations and debates available on the textbook website. View parts of these performances in class and foster discussion regarding appropriate/inappropriate language choices and delivery. Devote classroom instruction to the evaluation of scholarly resources, citations of these resources, and distinguishing between global, patchwork, and incremental plagiarism. Develop activities using Turnitin.com so that students can identify original vs. plagiarized work. Devote classroom instruction to reinforcing the importance of active visualization, positive affirmations, and cognitive restructuring. Demonstrate the basic principles of systematic desensitization. <p>Prior to the 2008 assessment, faculty will implement strategies a-e above, in addition to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Develop activities with the college librarians so that students learn how to evaluate resources Inform all FT and PT faculty about the library's Bibliographic Instruction sessions. Provide a link to famous speeches on videotape. The link will also provide access to the textbook website, to a glossary of terms and definitions, and to various study guides.
<p>PHIL-191: Intro to Philosophy</p>	<p>1000-2000 word final paper or exam requiring students to</p>	<p>The assessment involved 155 students in 8 sections taught by 4 faculty members. The assessment focused on 6 objectives: (1) Place a philosophical problem(s) within a</p>	<p>Prior to the 2007 assessment, faculty implemented the following strategies which were successful in improving proficiency for Objectives 3 and 5 but not Objectives 1 and</p>

	<p>respond knowledgeably, critically, and creatively to a historical period within a philosophical area about a philosophical problem.</p>	<p>historical context(s); (2) Identify a general type of problem and/or philosophical area related to the chosen topic; (3) Identify a specific problem(s) related to the chosen topic; (4) Re-present and formulate different types of arguments, answers, and responses; (5) Employ methods of argument to demonstrate critical thinking, analysis and/or evaluation of a philosopher's argument; and (6) Draw conclusion based on supporting arguments. Student achievement of each objective was scored using a rubric.</p> <p>The percentage of students who achieved each objective at a satisfactory level or higher is as follows: #1: 62%; #2: 78%; #3: 81.4%; #4: 76%; #5: 76%; and #6: 65%.</p> <p>Student proficiency increased for objective 3 from 68% in 2006 to 81% in 2007, and for objective 5 from 66% to 76%. Improvement for Objective 3 might have resulted from the use of the vocabulary proficiency exam. Unfortunately, this exam did not improve scores for Objective 1 and 2, as hoped.</p> <p>Faculty concluded that students are especially weak in achieving objectives 1 and 6.</p> <p>Faculty noted that in Spring 2006, students were weak in Objectives 1 and 6, and in 2005, they were weak in Objective 6.</p>	<p>2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Faculty might improve student performance in Objectives 1 & 2 by devoting classroom instruction to reinforcing the historical context of philosophers and helping students to develop the necessary vocabulary used in philosophical discussion. 2. Develop a shared test focusing on basic concepts and vocabulary to be given to all students in PHIL-191. The test could be available through an internet link developed using Soccio WebTutor for WebCT and reduced to the bare essentials for assessment purposes. Students would be able to take the test throughout the semester and must achieve a score of 70% or higher. 3. In addition to the test, the link could provide access to three learning tools: a philosophy timeline, a tool for studying concepts within the areas of philosophy, and a glossary of terms. 4. To ensure that all faculty members are participating in the assessment, identify the number of students enrolled in each section and the number who submitted the final paper or project. <p>Faculty will continue to use these strategies in preparation for the Spring 2008 assessment.</p>
<p>SPAN-152: Elementary Spanish II</p>	<p>Common final exam questions plus essay based on textbook exam bank.</p>	<p>The SPAN-152 assessment was invalid for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The sample size was insufficient. In contrast to the 103 students tested in Spring 2006, only 12 were tested in Spring 2007. 2. No report was submitted, only a half-page grid showing raw scores for each objective. 3. The categories of student performance changed from the 2006 assessment, making scores from 	<p>Following the invalid assessment, faculty submitted no strategies to improve student learning.</p> <p>The Assistant VP for Assessment and Curriculum recommended that the assessment be performed again in Fall 2007, that the format for data reporting used in 2006 be used again in Fall 2007, and that a report accompany the data.</p>

		<p>70-61 "Acceptable." 4. Student performance in Cultural Understanding was reported as 58% excellent and 42% "60 or lower" with no scores between these extremes.</p>	
<p>ARTS-181: Art History I</p>	<p>A 30-item multiple choice final exam plus an essay</p>	<p>The assessment involved 82 students in 3 sections taught by 2 FT faculty. The assessment focused on three objectives:</p> <p>Obj. 1: Correctly identify major art works and their cultural period or artistic school. Obj. 2: Correctly define key art historical techniques, media, and terminology. Obj. 3: Demonstrate college-level writing, thinking, and analytical skills when discussing art works.</p> <p>Student proficiency for each objective was as follows:</p> <p>Obj. 1: Highest = 100%; lowest = 89%; average = 90%. Obj. 2: Highest = 99%; lowest = 76%; average = 90%. Obj. 3: 64% demonstrated satisfactory or better writing skills; 28% demonstrated weak skills; 8% demonstrated unacceptable skills.</p> <p>a. Written analysis of art works: 72% satisfactory or higher. b. Justification of art works: 77% satisfactory or higher. c. Comparison/contrast of art works: 52% satisfactory or higher. d. Correct use of art historical vocabulary: 53% satisfactory or higher. e. Critical/independent thinking: 47% satisfactory or higher.</p>	<p>Prior to the 2007 assessment, faculty implemented the following strategies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Re-examine the testing instrument to clearly analyze student performance. 2. Develop worksheets to clarify specific areas needing improvement. 3. Create and post on faculty websites comprehensive lists of relevant vocabulary words for every period. 4. Conduct vocabulary assessments at intervals. 5. Develop an essay template and devote class time each semester to explaining instructor expectations regarding essays. 6. Post the essay template, with a link to the College Writing Center, on the instructor web pages. 7. In the Course Syllabus, include the grading rubric (identifying the five learning objectives) to be used in scoring student essays. 8. Conduct interval administration of assessments in each class. 9. Develop intensive remediation instruments as needed in those areas requiring immediate attention. 10. Prepare review worksheets for immediate use in specific content areas which have had problematic assessments to date (i.e., Arts of the Ancient Near East and Early Christian Art). <p>Faculty will continue to use these strategies in addition to the following which focus specifically on Objective 3 c, d, and e:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In-class group analysis projects with written reports for grading as interval assessment. 2. Short 10-15 minute writing analysis at the end of class sessions.

			<p>3. Post to the college website an example of a good short project report, analysis, and essay.</p> <p>4. Student driven assessment of writing with students exchanging papers for critique.</p>
ARTS-182	A 35-item multiple choice final exam plus an essay	<p>The assessment involved 30 students in 1 section taught by 1 FT faculty. The assessment focused on four objectives:</p> <p>Obj. 1: Identify the historical period of major art works.</p> <p>Obj. 2: Identify artists and their works.</p> <p>Obj. 3: Define key art historical techniques, media, and terminology</p> <p>Obj. 4. Demonstrate college-level writing, thinking, and analytical skills when discussing art works.</p> <p>Student proficiency for each objective was as follows:</p> <p>Obj. 1: Highest = 100%; lowest = 83%; average = 95%.</p> <p>Obj. 2: Highest = 100%; lowest = 87%; average = 95%.</p> <p>Obj. 3: Highest = 100%; lowest = 43%; average = 86%.</p> <p>Obj. 4: 77% demonstrated satisfactory or better writing skills; 23% demonstrated weak skills; 0% demonstrated unacceptable skills.</p> <p>a. Written analysis of art works: 80% satisfactory or higher.</p> <p>b. Justification of art works: 87% satisfactory or higher.</p> <p>c. Comparison/contrast of art works: 70% satisfactory or higher.</p> <p>d. Correct use of art historical vocabulary: 80% satisfactory or higher.</p> <p>e. Critical/independent thinking: 70% satisfactory or higher.</p>	<p>Prior to the 2007 assessment, faculty implemented the following strategies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Re-examine the testing instrument to clearly analyze student performance. 2. Develop worksheets to clarify specific areas needing improvement. 3. Create and post on faculty websites comprehensive lists of relevant vocabulary words for every period. 4. Conduct vocabulary assessments at intervals. 5. Develop an essay template and devote class time each semester to explaining instructor expectations regarding essays. 6. Post the essay template, with a link to the College Writing Center, on the instructor web pages. 7. In the Course Syllabus, include the grading rubric (identifying the five learning objectives) to be used in scoring student essays. 8. Conduct interval administration of assessments in each class. 9. Develop intensive remediation instruments as needed in those areas requiring immediate attention. 10. Prepare review worksheets for immediate use in specific content areas which have had problematic assessments to date (i.e., Arts of the Ancient Near East and Early Christian Art). <p>Faculty will continue to use these strategies in addition to the following which focus specifically on Objective 4 c, d, and e:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In-class group analysis projects with written reports for grading as interval assessment. 2. Short 10-15 minute writing analysis at the end of class sessions. 3. Post to the college website an example of

			a good short project report, analysis, and essay. 4. Student driven assessment of writing with students exchanging papers for critique.
MATH-011: Basic Mathematics	An 18-item semi-final exam administered during the last two weeks of the term.	<p>The assessment involved 94 students, 31% of the total 305 remaining in MATH-011 at the end of the term. The 2 FT faculty and 16 adjuncts teaching 24 sections of MATH-011 each submitted 5 student papers selected at random.</p> <p>The assessment focused on three course objectives. Ten test items addressed obj. #1, and four test items addressed obj. #2 and obj. #3.</p> <p>Test results indicated the mean score of students responding to each test item. All test items addressing a given objective were placed in a set in order to determine a mean score of student responses to each course objective.</p> <p>Student achievement of the objectives was as follows:</p> <p>Obj. #1: Perform operations with real numbers. Mean score: 9.61 out of 10 pts. Target score: 7; 95% achievement.</p> <p>Obj. #2: Solve linear equations. Mean score: 6.28 out of 8 pts. Target score: 5; 83% achievement.</p> <p>Obj #3: Operations with polynomials. Mean score: 6.08 out of 8 pts. Target score: 5; 81% achievement.</p>	<p>Faculty attributed student proficiency to the use of the following strategies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased group work activities. 2. A stronger review of basic arithmetic at the beginning of the course. <p>Faculty will continue to use these strategies in preparation for the Spring 2008 assessment.</p>
MATH-012: Introduction to Algebra II	15 course embedded assessment items inserted into each test.	<p>The assessment involved 180 students, 25% of the total 735 enrolled in MATH-012. The 8 FT faculty and 13 adjuncts teaching 36 sections of MATH-012 each submitted 5 student papers selected at random.</p> <p>Each test item represented one of the 15 course objectives. Test results indicated the percentage of students who correctly answered each test item. Thus, the data captured student levels of proficiency in achieving course objectives.</p> <p>Strong skill levels were set at 85% proficiency (and above). Average skill levels were set at 70% - 84% proficiency. Weak skill levels were set at below 70% proficiency.</p> <p>Students demonstrated strong skill levels in three objectives and average skill levels in three objectives.</p> <p>Students demonstrated weak skill levels in</p>	<p>Faculty used the following strategies prior to the Spring 2007 assessment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Small groups of students working the problems at the board. 2. Homework was either collected or corrected in class. 3. More Arithmetic examples were presented before moving on to the required algebraic topics. <p>Faculty will continue to use these strategies in preparation for the Spring 2008 assessment. In addition, they will use small group work activities to increase student proficiency.</p>

		<p>the following nine objectives:</p> <p>Obj. #3 – Determining magnitude to the roots of third-degree equations (68%). [+9% over 2006]</p> <p>Obj. #5 - Obtaining equivalent algebraic fractions when performing addition (61%) [-9%]</p> <p>Obj. #6 – Eliminating fractions when solving equations (57%). [0%]</p> <p>Obj. #7 – Simplifying radical expressions completely (46%). [-15%]</p> <p>Obj. #8 -- Multiplying radical expressions (63%) [+12%]</p> <p>Obj. #10 – Determining the slope of a line (68%) [0%]</p> <p>Obj. #11 – Graphing linear equations (68%). [0%]</p> <p>Obj. #12 – Determining equation of a line (43%). [0%]</p> <p>Obj. #14:-- Solving a quadratic equation using the slope and y-intercept (64%) [-9%]</p>	
<p>MATH-151: Survey of Mathematics</p>	<p>12 course embedded assessment items inserted into multiple choice chapter tests on sets, logic, and probability.</p>	<p>The assessment involved 210 students, 29% of the total 627 enrolled in MATH-151. The 5 FT faculty and 10 adjuncts teaching 21 sections of MATH-151 each submitted 10 student papers selected at random.</p> <p>Each test item represented one of the 12 course objectives. Test results indicated the percentage of students who correctly answered each test item. Thus, the data captured student levels of proficiency in achieving course objectives.</p> <p>Strong skill levels were set at 85% proficiency (and above). Average skill levels were set at 70% - 84% proficiency. Weak skill levels were set at below 70% proficiency.</p> <p>Students demonstrated strong skill levels in six objectives and average skill levels in four objectives.</p> <p>Students demonstrated weak skill levels in the following two objectives:</p> <p>Obj. #7 – Given specific criteria, determine the truth value of a statement (68%). [+2% over 2006]</p>	<p>Faculty attributed the increases in student proficiency to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Faculty carefully examined the 2006 assessment results, identified areas in which student learning could be improved, and focused their efforts on those areas. 2. Faculty increased their checking of homework problems. 3. Forty-six NJStars enrolled in this course in 2007 against only 29 in 2006. <p>Faculty will continue using strategies 1 and 2 above in preparation for the Spring 2008 assessment. In addition, they will use small group work activities to increase student proficiency in Objectives 7 and 11.</p>

		<p>Obj. #11 – Determine a compound probability value (58%). [+14%]</p> <p>Two objectives in which students demonstrated strong skills increased 13% over 2006, and one objective in which students demonstrated average skills increased 11% over 2006. Also, as noted above, both objectives in which students demonstrated weak skills increased over last year, one increasing by 14%.</p>	
<p>MATH-156: Introduction to Statistics</p>	<p>15 course embedded assessment items inserted into tests throughout the term.</p>	<p>The assessment involved 176 students, 26% of the total 645 enrolled in MATH-156. The 4 FT faculty and 10 adjuncts teaching 21 sections each submitted 8 student papers selected at random.</p> <p>The assessment focused on 8 course learning objectives. Some objectives were addressed by a single test item; others were addressed by more than one. Test results indicated the percentage of students who correctly answered each test item. Where an objective was addressed by more than one question, an average percentage of students correctly answering the set of questions was determined. Thus, the data captured student levels of proficiency in achieving course objectives.</p> <p>Successful skill levels were set at 75% proficiency and above. Moderate skill levels were set at 60% - 74% proficiency.</p> <p>Student proficiency for 2 objectives was in the 81%-82% range and for 2 objectives in the 75%-76% range.</p> <p>Student proficiency for 3 objectives in the 67%-69% range :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summarize data (67%) Probability distributions (67%) Illustrative statistical data (69%) <p>Student proficiency for 1 objective was 59%: Apply appropriate probability formulae.</p>	<p>Prior to the Spring 2007 assessment, faculty encouraged students to use statistics worksheets with audio CDs that are posted already on Ocean Cruiser under Shared Files in My Class.</p> <p>In preparation for the Spring 2008 assessment, faculty will also use the following strategies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Present examples that are directly relevant and meaningful and which emphasize computational skill. 2. Use more test questions that require a written response in addition to demonstration of a mathematical skill.
<p>MATH-161: College Algebra for Math, CS, & Engineering Majors and</p>	<p>Common test administered in the 12th week</p> <p><u>Note:</u> Because students from MATH 161 and</p>	<p>The assessment involved 56 students (27% of the total 205 enrolled in MATH-151) and 4 FT faculty and 2 adjuncts teaching 9 sections of MATH-161 and MATH-165.</p> <p>The assessment focused on 20 course objectives. Strong skill levels were set at 70%</p>	<p>In preparation for the Spring 2008 assessment, faculty will examine the course calendar to reallocate time on topics so that pre-requisite skills are reviewed more quickly in order to allow additional time for master of advanced topics.</p> <p>Faculty will also focus on developing student</p>

<p>MATH- 165: College Algebra</p>	<p>MATH 165 are eligible for enrollment in Precalculus, assessment data for both courses was collected using the same instrument.</p>	<p>proficiency (and above). Moderate skill levels were set at 50% - 69% proficiency. Weak skill levels were set at below 50% proficiency.</p> <p>Students demonstrated strong skill in 15 objectives.</p> <p>Students demonstrated moderate skill in 4 objectives: Simplify rational expression (69%) Determine the vertex of a parabola (67%) Square a binomial expression (64%) Determine equation using point & slope (59%)</p> <p>Students demonstrated weak skill in one objective: Eliminate extraneous solutions (30%)</p>	<p>ability to successfully utilize processes with recall of multiple steps needed to identify a solution.</p>
<p>MATH-171: Finite Mathematics</p>	<p>Course embedded assessment items inserted into the last two tests</p>	<p>The assessment involved 8 students taught by 1 FT faculty and 1 adjunct teaching 3 sections of MATH-171. The assessment focused on fourteen specific objectives clustered within six broad learning goals. Each objective was addressed by a test question. Test results indicated the percentage of students who answered each test item in either a strong, adequate, or inadequate manner. Thus, the data captured student levels of proficiency in achieving course objectives.</p> <p>Students who have a strong or adequate command are considered to have successfully met a particular learning objective.</p> <p>Faculty defined the proficient student as one who demonstrated strong or adequate achievement of at least 80% of all objectives; a marginally proficient student as one who demonstrated strong or adequate achievement of 50% to 80% of the objectives; and a weak (non-proficient) student as one who demonstrated strong or adequate proficiency on less than 50% of the objectives.</p> <p>Faculty determined that 79% of the students were proficient; 15% were marginally proficient; and 6% were not proficient.</p> <p>Faculty will focus on improving student learning in two objectives:</p> <p>Obj. 4 – Interpreting results Obj. 14 – Evaluating final tableau</p>	<p>Prior to the Spring 2007 assessment, faculty identified the following strategies to improve student learning:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More instructional examples will be provided. 2. More student worksheets will be required. 3. More application review problems will be assigned. 4. More emphasis will be placed on how the pivot is chosen. <p>In preparation for the Spring 2008 assessment, faculty will</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review students' work related to Objectives 4 and 14 to determine whether the answers were incomplete, wrong, or blank. 2. Hold team meetings for faculty teaching this course in order to align the teaching of difficult concepts. 3. Consider the possibility of creating a new assessment tool for Objectives 4 and 14.

<p>BIOL-161: Biology I</p>	<p>30-item cumulative exam administered during the final week</p>	<p>This assessment involved 15 sections, 182 students, 5 FT faculty, and 13 adjuncts. The assessment focused on 14 course objectives.</p> <p>Faculty revised the course objectives and the assessment instrument in preparation for the Spring 2007 assessment. The 30 test questions were aligned with the objectives, and 2-4 test questions focused on each objective. The embedding of assessment test questions into an existing test motivated student performance.</p> <p>Student performance ranged from 38% to 88%, up from 7% to 64% in 2006. The average performance was 68%.</p> <p>For 3 objectives, student performance was in the 85%-88% range. For 5 objectives, in the 70%-79% range, and for 6 objectives in the 38% to 65% range.</p> <p>Efforts to improve student learning should focus on the following objectives:</p> <p>Obj. 3 – Structure and function of macromolecules (53%) Obj. 4 – Role of DNA (60%) Obj. 5 – Origin of life (61%) Obj. 7 – Mitosis in plants and animal cells (65%) Obj. 8 – Meiosis in plant and animal cells (38%) Obj. 13 – Theory of evolution (55%)</p>	<p>Prior to the Spring 2007 assessment, faculty developed the following strategies to improve student learning:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement engaging lecture practices to include: a. Lecture/Rhetorical Questioning, b. Surveys with Exemplifier, c. Chanting, d. Guided Lecture, e. Immediate Mastery Quiz, f. Story Telling, g. Halting Time, h. Analyzing Passages from the Text and Providing Critical Commentary. 2. Use case studies to illustrate a scientific dilemma and stimulate discussions of alternative solutions to the problem. 3. Reward learner participation by supporting learner actions with effective and well-timed positives. 4. Promote cooperative and collaborative group activities in the laboratory by assigning formal cooperative tasks. 5. Use simulations and games where learners can practice coping with stressful, unfamiliar, or complex situations. <p>Faculty will continue to use these strategies in preparation for the Spring 2008 assessment. They will also validate test questions #7, #19, and #28.</p>
<p>BIOL-162: Biology II</p>	<p>30-item cumulative exam administered during the final week</p>	<p>This assessment involved 14 sections, 198 students, 4 FT faculty, and 7 adjuncts. The assessment focused on 14 course objectives.</p> <p>Faculty revised the course objectives and the assessment instrument in preparation for the Spring 2007 assessment. The 30 test questions were aligned with the objectives, and 1-5 test questions focused on each objective. The embedding of assessment test questions into an existing test motivated student performance.</p> <p>Student performance ranged from 46% to 96%, up from 38% to 88% in 2006. The average performance was 68%.</p> <p>For 3 objectives, student performance was in the 82%-96% range. For 3 objectives, in the 70%-76% range, for 6 objectives in the</p>	<p>Prior to the Spring 2007 assessment, faculty developed the following strategies to improve student learning:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement engaging lecture practices to include: a. Lecture/Rhetorical Questioning, b. Surveys with Exemplifier, c. Chanting, d. Guided Lecture, e. Immediate Mastery Quiz, f. Story Telling, g. Halting Time, h. Analyzing Passages from the Text and Providing Critical Commentary. 2. Use case studies to illustrate a scientific dilemma and stimulate discussions of alternative solutions to the problem. 3. Reward learner participation by supporting learner actions with effective and well-timed positives. 4. Promote cooperative and collaborative group activities in the laboratory by assigning formal cooperative tasks.

		<p>62% to 69% range, and for 2 objectives in the 46% to 51% range.</p> <p>Efforts to improve student learning should focus primarily on the following objectives: Obj. 4 – Features of flatworms (46%) Obj. 6 – Classes of Annelids (62%) Obj. 12 – DNA and proteins (51%) Obj. 13 – Mendel's principles and genetic problems (64%)</p> <p>Efforts to improve student learning should focus secondarily on the following objectives: Obj. 1 – Characteristics of Protists (65%) Obj. 7 – Subphyla and arthropods (69%) Obj. 9 – Animal kingdom: fish & amphibians (66%) Obj. 14 – Ecosystem and biosphere (65%)</p>	<p>5. Use simulations and games where learners can practice coping with stressful, unfamiliar, or complex situations.</p> <p>Faculty will continue to use these strategies in preparation for the Spring 2008 assessment. They will also validate test questions #3, #9, and #24.</p>
CHEM-181: General Chemistry I	22-item cumulative exam administered during the final week	<p>This assessment was designed to involve 5 sections, 81 students, 1 FT faculty, and 4 adjuncts.</p> <p>Faculty revised the course objectives and the assessment instrument in preparation for the Spring 2007 assessment. The 22 test questions were aligned with the objectives. The embedding of assessment test questions into an existing test was meant to motivate student performance.</p> <p>The Spring 2007 assessment was invalid because the student answer sheets showed answers to 30 questions while the assessment instrument was designed to include 22 questions.</p> <p>The assessment will be re-administered in Fall 2007.</p>	<p>Prior to the Spring 2007 assessment, faculty developed the following strategies to improve student learning:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement engaging lecture practices to include: a. Lecture/Rhetorical Questioning, b. Surveys with Exemplifier, c. Chanting, d. Guided Lecture, e. Immediate Mastery Quiz, f. Story Telling, g. Halting Time, h. Analyzing Passages from the Text and Providing Critical Commentary. 2. Use case studies to illustrate a scientific dilemma and stimulate discussions of alternative solutions to the problem. 3. Reward learner participation by supporting learner actions with effective and well-timed positives. 4. Promote cooperative and collaborative group activities in the laboratory by assigning formal cooperative tasks. 5. Use simulations and games where learners can practice coping with stressful, unfamiliar, or complex situations. <p>Faculty will continue to use these strategies in preparation for the Fall 2007 assessment.</p>
CHEM-182: General Chemistry II	20-item cumulative exam administered during the final	<p>This assessment involved 3 sections, 43 students, 2 FT faculty, and 0 adjuncts. The assessment focused on 10 course objectives.</p>	<p>In preparation for the Spring 2008 assessment, faculty will validate test question #5 and use the following strategies to improve student learning:</p>

	week	<p>Faculty revised the course objectives and the assessment instrument in preparation for the Spring 2007 assessment. The 20 test questions were aligned with the objectives, and 2 test questions focused on each objective. The embedding of assessment test questions into an existing test motivated student performance.</p> <p>Student performance ranged from 45% to 93%, up from 38% to 88% in 2006. The average performance was 85%, up from 50% in 2006.</p> <p>For 4 objectives, student performance was in the 92%-93% range. For 3 objectives, in the 83%-86% range, for 2 objectives in the 70%-79% range, and for 1 objective performance was 45%.</p> <p>Efforts to improve student learning should focus primarily the following objective: Obj. 5 – Kinetics of chemical reactions (45%).</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use case studies to illustrate a scientific dilemma and stimulate discussions of alternative solutions to the problem. 2. Promote cooperative and collaborative group activities in the laboratory by assigning formal cooperative tasks.
HEHP-225: Contemporary Health	20-question pre-test/post-test	<p>The assessment involved 591 students in 39 sections taught by 4 FT faculty, and 13 adjunct faculty. The assessment focused on 11 objectives.</p> <p>Faculty revised the course objectives in preparation for the Spring 2007 assessment. The 20 test questions were aligned with these objectives, and 1-3 test questions focused on each objective.</p> <p>The average score on the pre-test was 40.5%, indicating a high degree of difficulty for students entering HEHP-225. The average score on the post-test was 90%, up from 78% in 2006.</p> <p>Overall, there was a 49 point gain from pre-test to post-test.</p> <p>For all course objectives, student proficiency was over 85%. For 7 objectives, student proficiency was in the 90%-93% range, and for 4 objectives, student proficiency was in the 86%-89% range.</p>	<p>Prior to the Spring 2007 assessment, faculty developed the following strategies to improve student learning:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement engaging lecture practices to include: a. Lecture/Rhetorical Questioning, b. Surveys with Exemplifier, c. Chanting, d. Guided Lecture, e. Immediate Mastery Quiz, f. Story Telling, g. Halting Time, h. Analyzing Passages from the Text and Providing Critical Commentary. 2. Use case studies to illustrate a scientific dilemma and stimulate discussions of alternative solutions to the problem. 3. Reward learner participation by supporting learner actions with effective and well-timed positives. 4. Promote cooperative and collaborative group activities in the laboratory by assigning formal cooperative tasks. 5. Use simulations and games where learners can practice coping with stressful, unfamiliar, or complex situations. <p>Faculty will continue to use these strategies in preparation for the Spring 2008 assessment.</p>

EDUC-175: Foundations of American Education	A 40-item multiple choice test scored by Scantron	<p>The assessment involved 146 students in 6 sections taught by 1 full-time faculty member and 3 adjuncts. The assessment focused on 13 course objectives.</p> <p>Data indicated the percentage of students who correctly answered each test item. All test items directly addressing a given objective were placed into a set, and an average percentage of students correctly answering the set of questions was determined. This figure thus represented the average percentage of students who apprehended each course objective.</p> <p>For 4 objectives, student achievement was in the 70%-79% range. For 9 objectives, student achievement was in the 80%-97% range. Student achievement increased between 2006 and 2007 in all objectives.</p> <p>Data indicated that 2 of the 13 course objectives were apprehended by less than 75% of the students:</p> <p>Obj. 6 (47%) – School funding at federal, state, local levels Obj. 10 (72%) – Designing lesson plans</p>	<p>Based on the 2006SP assessment, faculty had implemented the following strategies to improve student learning during 2007SP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create a PowerPoint presentation on current school funding. [Obj. #6] 2. Conduct class discussions based on students' field experiences in order to foster understanding of how local schools are using computers in the classroom. [Obj. #10] <p>The following actions were also identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The dean would meet with all faculty members to emphasize the course learning objectives. 2. The test would become a department-wide examination for all students enrolled in EDUC-175 <p>Through the implementation of these strategies, student achievement increased from 10% to 47% in objective #6 between 2006 and 2007, and from 13% to 72% in objective #10.</p> <p>These strategies will continue to be used during the 2007-2008 academic year.</p>
EDUC-178: Introduction to the Education of Exceptional Students	A 30-item objective test	<p>The assessment involved 48 students in 3 sections taught by 2 full-time faculty members and 1 adjunct. The assessment focused on 10 course objectives.</p> <p>Data indicated the percentage of students who correctly answered each test item. All test items directly addressing a given objective were placed into a set, and an average percentage of students correctly answering the set of questions was determined. This figure thus represented the average percentage of students who apprehended each course objective.</p> <p>For 3 objectives, student achievement was 75% or lower. For 7 objectives, student achievement was in the 83%-97% range.</p>	<p>Based on the 2006SP assessment, faculty had implemented the following strategies to improve student learning during 2007SP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create a slide exhibiting a completed Individual Education Plan (IEP) with names, district, and other identifying information removed. [See objectives 5 & 6.] 2. Review each aspect of the IEP with reference to the law, parent/student involvement, and Least Restrictive Environment. [See objectives 5 & 6.] 3. Develop critical thinking exercises. <p>The following actions were also identified:</p>

		<p>Student achievement increased between 2006 and 2007 in 9 objectives.</p> <p>Data indicated that 2 of the 10 course objectives were apprehended by less than 75% of the students.</p> <p>Obj. 2 (72%) – Describe the causes and contributory factors of exceptional children.</p> <p>Obj. 8 (61%) – Adulthood and lifespan issues.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The dean would meet with all faculty members to emphasize the course learning objectives. 2. The test would become a department-wide examination for all students enrolled in EDUC-178. <p>Through the Implementation of the strategies noted above, student achievement increased from 37% to 72% in objective #2 between 2006 and 2007. Student achievement increased from 45% to 61% in objective #10.</p> <p>To improve student learning in objective #8 during 2007-2008, faculty will create a slide presentation focusing on the transition from school to work. The presentation will be uploaded into each instructor's Ocean Cruiser course shell.</p>
HIST-171: Western Civilization I	A 38-item multiple choice and T/F test scored by Scantron.	<p>The assessment involved 433 students in 15 sections taught by 1 full-time faculty member and 14 adjuncts. The assessment focused on 12 course objectives.</p> <p>Data indicated the percentage of students who correctly answered each test item. All test items directly addressing a given objective were placed into a set, and an average percentage of students correctly answering the set of questions was determined. This figure thus represented the average percentage of students who apprehended each course objective.</p> <p>Due to poor results in 2006, the course learning objectives and the assessment instrument were revised.</p> <p>Data indicated that student achievement in all objectives was in the 81%-98% range.</p>	<p>Based on the 2006SP assessment, faculty had implemented the following strategies to improve student learning during 2007SP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide review activities prior to final examinations and post these to Ocean Cruiser. 2. Share URL sites to reinforce points of emphasis covered by the assessment instrument. <p>The following actions were also identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The dean would meet with all faculty members to emphasize the course learning objectives. 2. The test would become a department-wide examination for all students enrolled in HIST-171. <p>These strategies will continue to be used during the 2007-2008 academic year.</p>
HIST-172: Western Civilization II	A 41-item multiple choice test scored by Scantron.	<p>The assessment involved 505 students in 23 sections taught by 2 full-time faculty members and 16 adjuncts. The assessment focused on 11 course objectives.</p> <p>Data indicated the percentage of students who correctly answered each test item. All test items directly addressing a given objective were placed into a set, and an average percentage of students correctly answering the set of questions was determined. This figure thus represented</p>	<p>Based on the 2006SP assessment, faculty had implemented the following strategies to improve student learning during 2007SP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide review activities prior to final examinations and post these to Ocean Cruiser. 2. Share URL sites to reinforce points of emphasis covered by the assessment instrument. <p>The following actions were also identified:</p>

		<p>the average percentage of students who apprehended each course objective.</p> <p>Due to poor results in 2006, the course learning objectives and the assessment instrument were revised.</p> <p>For 2 objectives, student achievement was in the 62%-68% range. For 7 objectives, student achievement was in the 76%-77% range. For 5 objectives, student achievement was in the 82%-92% range.</p> <p>Data indicated that 2 of the 11 course objectives were apprehended by less than 75% of the students: Obj. 4 (62%) – Age of Enlightenment. Obj. 8 (68%) – World War I and II.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The dean would meet with all faculty members to emphasize the course learning objectives. 2. The test would become a department-wide examination for all students enrolled in HIST-172. <p>These strategies will continue to be used during the 2007-2008 academic year. In addition, to improve student learning in objectives#4 and #8, faculty will develop review documents to be placed on Ocean Cruiser.</p>
HIST-173: US History I	A 40-item multiple choice and T/F test scored by Scantron.	<p>The assessment involved 184 students in 7 sections taught by 1 full-time faculty members and 6 adjuncts. The assessment focused on 11 course objectives.</p> <p>Data indicated the percentage of students who correctly answered each test item. All test items directly addressing a given objective were placed into a set, and an average percentage of students correctly answering the set of questions was determined. This figure thus represented the average percentage of students who apprehended each course objective.</p> <p>Due to poor results in 2006, the course learning objectives and the assessment instrument were revised.</p> <p>For 6 objectives, student achievement was in the 75%-78% range. For 5 objectives, student achievement was in the 80%-90% range.</p>	<p>Based on the 2006SP assessment, the following strategies were implemented to improve student learning during 2007SP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide review activities prior to final examinations and post these to Ocean Cruiser. 2. Share URL sites to reinforce points of emphasis covered by the assessment instrument. <p>The following actions were also identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The dean would meet with all faculty members to emphasize the course learning objectives. 2. The test would become a department-wide examination for all students enrolled in HIST-173. <p>These strategies will continue to be used during the 2007-2008 academic year.</p>
HIST-174: US History II	A 41-item multiple choice and T/F test scored by Scantron.	<p>The assessment involved 183 students in 5 sections taught by 1 full-time faculty member and 4 adjuncts. The assessment focused on 11 course objectives.</p> <p>Data indicated the percentage of students who correctly answered each test item. All test items directly addressing a given objective were placed into a set, and an average percentage of students correctly answering the set of questions was determined. This figure thus represented</p>	<p>Based on the 2006SP assessment, the following strategies were implemented to improve student learning during 2007SP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide review activities prior to final examinations and post these to Ocean Cruiser. 2. Share URL sites to reinforce points of emphasis covered by the assessment instrument. <p>The following actions were also identified:</p>

		<p>Data indicated the percentage of students who correctly answered each test item. All test items directly addressing a given objective were placed into a set, and an average percentage of students correctly answering the set of questions was determined. This figure thus represented the average percentage of students who apprehended each course objective.</p> <p>For 3 objectives, student achievement was in the 61%-67% range. For 2 objectives, student achievement was in the 77%-78% range. For 3 objectives, student achievement was in the 80%-82% range.</p> <p>For the following 3 objectives, student achievement was below 75%:</p> <p>Obj. 1 (61%) – Research techniques, vocabulary, and statistical concepts. Obj. 2 (67%) – Theories of development. Obj. 5 (67%) – Social-behaviorist theory.</p>	<p>examinations and post these to Ocean Cruiser.</p> <p>The following actions were also identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The dean would meet with all faculty members to emphasize the course learning objectives. 2. The test would become a department-wide examination for all students enrolled in this course. <p>These strategies will continue to be used during the 2007-2008 academic year. In addition, faculty will develop review documents and PowerPoint presentations to be placed on Ocean Cruiser in an effort to improve student achievement of objectives 1, 2, and 5.</p>
POLI-183: Introduction to Political Science	A 50-item multiple choice test scored by Scantron.	<p>The assessment involved 31 students in 2 sections taught by 1 full-time faculty member and 1 adjunct. The assessment focused on 8 course objectives.</p> <p>Data indicated the percentage of students who correctly answered each test item. All test items directly addressing a given objective were placed into a set, and an average percentage of students correctly answering the set of questions was determined. This figure thus represented the average percentage of students who apprehended each course objective.</p> <p>For all 8 of the objectives, student achievement was in the 82%-94% range.</p>	<p>Based on the 2006SP assessment, the following strategy was implemented to improve student learning during 2007SP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Display on Ocean Cruiser a graphic presentation that compares and contrasts democratic and authoritarian systems. <p>This strategy will continue to be used during the 2007-2008 academic year.</p>
SOCI-181: Introduction to Sociology	A 38-item multiple choice test scored by Scantron.	<p>The assessment involved 517 students in 24 sections, all taught by adjuncts. The assessment focused on 21 course objectives.</p> <p>Data indicated the percentage of students who correctly answered each test item. All test items directly addressing a given objective were placed into a set, and an average percentage of students correctly answering the set of questions was determined. This figure thus represented the average percentage of students who apprehended each course objective.</p>	<p>Based on the 2006SP assessment, the following strategies were implemented to improve student learning during 2007SP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide review activities prior to final examinations and post these to Ocean Cruiser. 2. Develop a set of key terms and concepts to be distributed as a handout and/or used for review. <p>The following actions were also identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The dean would meet with all faculty

		<p>Prior to the 2007 assessment, the course learning objectives and the assessment instrument were revised.</p> <p>For 3 objectives, student achievement was in the 52%-69% range. For 8 objectives, student achievement was in the 72%-79% range. For 6 objectives, student achievement was in the 80%-87% range. For 4 objectives, student achievement was in the 90%-93% range.</p> <p>For the following 5 objectives, student achievement was below 75%:</p> <p>Obj. 2 (52%) – Sociological theory. Obj. 10 (61%) – Ideas of Cooley and Merton. Obj. 14 (72%) – Major theoretical perspectives. Obj. 18 (69%) – Cultural universals. Obj. 19 (74%) – Subcultures and countercultures.</p>	<p>members to emphasize the course learning objectives.</p> <p>2. The test would become a department-wide examination for all students enrolled in this course.</p> <p>These strategies will continue to be used during the 2007-2008 academic year. In addition, faculty will develop review documents and PowerPoint presentations to be placed on Ocean Cruiser in an effort to improve student achievement of objectives 2, 10, 14, 17, and 19.</p>
--	--	---	---

Appendix VII, ENGL 091(new), Developmental Reading and Writing

OCEAN COUNTY COLLEGE
COURSE PROPOSAL FORM #7100-1
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LITERATURE

1. Course Number and Title: ENGL 091 Developmental Reading and Writing I
2. Semester Hours: 4 Contact Hours: (4+0)
Lecture Lab
3. Catalog Description: This course is required for students whose placement test results indicate they need to develop their reading and writing skills before

Program-specific requirement for the following degree program:

Elective

v. Does this course satisfy the diversity requirement for the AA in Liberal Arts degree?

yes no

[The diversity requirement is defined as “any course whose primary purpose is to help students analyze the implications of the commonalities and differences among culturally diverse people(s). This requirement may include courses in gender studies or in non-western history and thought.”]

If yes, please explain:

vi. Does this course satisfy the computer literacy requirement? yes no

h. Related courses in other institutions:

[NOTE: The two charts below need to be completed when submitting a new course proposal. They do not need to be completed for most course revisions, unless an Official Course Description is so old that the course’s transferability needs to be reconsidered, as in the case of an obsolete course which may be reactivated.]

ii. List any comparable course(s) by completing the table below. Insert “None” if there are no comparable courses.

Comparable Courses at NJ Community Colleges				
Institution	Course Title	Course Number	Number of Credits	Comments
Bergen CCC	Developmental. Skills & Practicum I	EBS 014-015;	5 (3+2)	Linked courses, each taught by a single instructor. Reading and writing are fully integrated into both class and lab sessions.
	Developmental. Skills & Practicum II	EBS 016-017;	5 (3+2)	
	Developmental. Skills & Practicum III	EBS 023-024	5 (3+2)	
Hudson CCC	Basic Reading I/ Basic Writing I	RDG 071 ENG	6 (3+3)	Linked courses, each taught by a single instructor.

	Basic Reading I/ Basic Writing II	071 RDG 072 ENG 072	6 (3+3)	Reading and writing are fully integrated into both class and lab sessions.
	Basic Reading I/ Basic Writing III	RDG 073 ENG 073	6 (3+3)	
Middlesex CC	Reading Skills for College / Writing Skills for College I	ENG 009 RDG 009	8 (4+4)	
	Reading Skills for College / Writing Skills for College I	ENG 010 RDG 011	6 (3+3)	Some sections are taught as learning communities, often by a single instructor.
Out of state community colleges:				
Community College of Philadelphia	Fundamentals of Reading/ Basic W Writing Skills	ENG 089 ENG 097	6 (3+3)	Linked courses, each taught by a single instructor. Reading and writing are fully integrated in both class and lab sessions.
	Reading Improvement/ Fundamentals of Writing	ENG 099 ENG 098	6 (3+3)	
Massachusetts Bay CC	Introduction to Language		(3+4)	
	College Writing	LN 090	4 (3 +1)	A reading/writing course, in spite of the title.
Manchester (CT) CC	Foundations for College Study/ Reading and	WR 100	6	

Dean College (MA)	Writing	_____	3	
	Introduction to College Reading and Writing	English 066		
	_____	English 093	_____	
	Developmental Reading and Writing	_____	3	
		ENG 097		

iii. If “None” was inserted, please explain.

iv. Complete the table below. The institutions listed comprise the top six institutions queried on NJTransfer by OCC students.

Transferability of Proposed Course				
Institution	Course Code, Title, and Credits	Transfer Category (Major, General Ed., or Elective)	Will NOT Transfer (Place an “x” in box)	Unable to Determine Status (Place “U” in box)
Rutgers – New Brunswick				
Georgian Court University				
Richard Stockton College				
Monmouth University				
Kean University				
Rowan University				

- v. If a “U” was inserted above, document the course transferability by providing either (a) the name of a contact person at the four-year institution, or (b) an email from the contact person (attach to this proposal).
- vi. If not transferable to any institution, explain.

Developmental course credits are not transferable.

- i. Consistency with the vision and mission statements, the Academic Master Plan, and the strategic initiatives of the College

This course helps prepare students to become intentional learners, who will be able to “effectively communicate orally...and in writing,” appreciate “the diversity of the human imagination and the variety of its expressions across...cultures,” “interpret and evaluate information from a variety of sources,” “demonstrate intellectual agility and the ability to manage change,” and “transform information into knowledge.”

- j. Mark with an “x” the General Education goal(s) addressed by this course:

Perspective Being Responsibility	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Independent Thinking	<input type="checkbox"/> 5. Science & Social Science	<input type="checkbox"/> 9. Global
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. Communication	<input type="checkbox"/> 6. Aesthetic Appreciation	<input type="checkbox"/> 10. Health & Well
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3. Problem Solving	<input type="checkbox"/> 7. Historical Consciousness	<input type="checkbox"/> 11. Civic
	<input type="checkbox"/> 4. Ethical Judgment	<input type="checkbox"/> 8. Diversity	<input type="checkbox"/> 12. Technology <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 13. Lifelong Learning

7. Specific Course Learning Objectives:

Students who successfully complete this course will be able to:

- a. Recognize the importance of proficient reading and writing to diverse career paths.
- b. Read college-level material with improving comprehension.
- c. Understand and correctly use a wider vocabulary.
- d. Summarize textual materials accurately in oral discussion and in writing.
- e. Respond to others’ spoken or written perspectives with increasing critical capability.
- f. Write coherent personal and analytical responses to texts.
- g. Demonstrate basic information literacy.

- h. Demonstrate improved study skills and attitudes (purposeful reading, note-taking, assignment planning, time management, test-taking, etc.).
- i. Use language confidently as a tool for reflection and for the expression of thoughts about their individual life situations and experiences.

8. Methods of Instruction:

- a. Lecture, discussion, and small-group work in fundamental language and reading skills, the writing process, and information literacy.
- b. Reading assignments from the textbook, a sustained fiction or non-fiction work, current periodicals, or the Internet.
- c. Appropriate in-class and out-of-class writing assignments, e.g., reflective journals, article summaries, single-paragraph or short-essay analytic compositions, and collaborative reading and writing projects (a minimum of 2000 words of finished writing).
- d. Instructor-student conferences.
- e. Use of appropriate instructional media in the class or lab setting.
- f. Case studies or other real world situations.
- g. Guest speakers.
- h. Support services, e.g., Writing Skills Lab, Writing Computer Lab, ESL program, Center for Academic Services programs and counseling staff, and EOF programs.

9. Instructional Materials / Technology Needs / Human Resource Needs (Presently Employed vs. New Faculty)

- a. Text: An appropriate text will be selected. Contact the department for current adoptions.
- b. Technology: A dedicated computer lab supports independent student work in literature classes. Classroom projectors are used regularly by instructors to demonstrate useful techniques of literary interpretation, composition, and research to students.
- c. Tutors: Professional tutors, working closely with English faculty, provide support for students as they compose and revise course essays.

10. Tentative Topical Outline:

The following reading and writing proficiencies should be taught in an integrated manner whenever possible.

Reading:

- a. Study skills: listening; note-taking; outlining; keeping a notebook; studying; time-management; test-taking
- b. Vocabulary skills: spelling; prefixes-roots-suffixes; etymologies; context study
- c. Comprehension: Cloze procedure; thesis and development; paragraph patterns; SQ3R technique
- d. Flexibility: surveying; skimming; scanning
- e. Reading college texts: headings; tables and charts; specialized vocabulary; content notes; annotating text chapters; using chapter study questions; preparing for chapter tests
- f. Basic information literacy: books; periodicals; reference materials; Internet resources
- g. Reading for pleasure: personal and aesthetic benefits

Writing:

- a. Audience awareness
- b. Effective topic sentences
- c. Developing paragraphs: invention strategies; specific supports; paragraph unity
- d. Organizing paragraphs: modes of development; transitions and pronouns; purposeful repetition
- e. Revision, editing, and proofreading strategies
- f. Word and sentence skills (grammar, usage, punctuation, spelling, mechanics)
- g. Writing text summaries and responses
- h. Introductory source use: basic quotations with accompanying in-text citation

11. Grade Determinants:

The final grade in the course will be the cumulative grade based on the following letter grades or their numerical equivalents for the course assignments and examinations:

Sample

A	Excellent	C	Average	I	
	Incomplete				
B+	Very Good	D	Below Average	W	
	Withdrawn				
B	Good	F	Failure	R	Audit
C+	Above Average	P	Passing	NC	No
	Credit				

12. Number of Papers and Examinations:

- Paragraphs and/or short essays in various modes will be assigned. Expository writing will be emphasized, and some of the writing should be text-based.
- Students will produce a minimum of 2000 words of finished writing during the semester, including 6-10 single and/or multi-paragraph compositions.
- Vocabulary, reading comprehension, grammar, or source documentation quizzes may be included in the assessment of student progress.

APPROVAL PROCESS FOR A REVISED COURSE PROPOSAL (SYLLABUS)

Revision of the Following Items Must Be Sent to the Curriculum Committee	Revision of the Following Items Require No Approval
#1 Course Number & Title	#8 Methods of Instruction
#2 Semester Hours/Contact Hours	#9 Instructional Materials
#3 Catalog Description	#10 Tentative Topic Outline
#4 Prerequisites & Co- requisites	#11 Grade Determinants
#5 Maximum Class Size/Lab Fee Code/ Differential Funding Category	#12 Number of Papers and Examinations
#6 Justification	
#7 Course Objectives	

Appendix VIII, Faculty Scholarship Plan

OCEAN COUNTY COLLEGE

Vice President of Academic Affairs' Task Force on Faculty Scholarship

Report to the President, SP 07

Members of the Task Force: Jim Brown, Martin Novelli, Dan Baker, Maysa Hayward, Jayanti Tamm, Kathleen McCormick, Xiao-Ming Yang, Bill Rickert, Ken Garrison, Ed Kissling, Marilyn Kralik, Don George, Mike Zahler, Janet Hubbs.

Members of the Vice President’s Task Force on Faculty Scholarship met with Dr. Wetta throughout the spring 2007 semester and developed the following report for the President.

1. The categories for faculty scholarship are as follows:

<i>Category</i>	<i>Examples</i>	<i>Notes</i>
Traditional Scholarship	Research in the academic discipline, writing, publication in journals, oral presentation of findings	The published work need not necessarily be juried or refereed; the discipline need not necessarily be the teaching discipline of the faculty member.
Pedagogical Scholarship	Research and publication of significant classroom and teaching innovations	The work of Cross and Angelo might be referenced to more fully define the parameters of this approach regarding pedagogical breakthroughs.
Creative Scholarship	Original works of art, music, literature, other of the creative arts, as well as computer software design, technological innovations, exhibits and/or concerts that expand the boundaries of creativity	This work should probably have some verifiable credence in the art, literary, or technological world.
Service Scholarship	Contributions made to the profession or to society such as leadership of scholarly associations, annual conferences, institutes, or leadership of community service groups. Applied scholarship is particularly appropriate for this category.	Fuller definitions of service scholarship are available in descriptions of Rutgers and Penn State University’s statements on faculty scholarship.
Interdisciplinary (or Synthesized) Scholarship	Combining any two or more of the four categories above to create a synthesized approach to scholarship.	Use of this category is a good way to erase artificial boundaries.

2. The resources to be requested from the college may be summarized as: time, money, facilities, recognition, secretarial support, technical assistance, editing and software. Some specific requests might be for:

- Space on the web site to identify/present faculty scholarship;
- Publishing an OCC Journal for faculty scholarship;
- Providing quiet space for scholarly pursuits;
- Encouraging forums for both presentation and/or idea exchange;
- Supporting “works in progress” or long-term projects in need of completion;
- Board of Trustees recognition/awards for outstanding scholarship;
- Funding for travel to national presentations;
- Released time;
- Release from certain professional responsibilities;
- Stipends;
- Special teaching schedules;

- A means by which students involved in faculty research can receive credit hours for their work;
- Public relations announcements of faculty achievements;
- The creation of an “academic climate” on campus through the establishments of a premier lecture/concert/film series;
- Enhanced library resources/access to university libraries.

3. The process to be followed is:

Faculty Scholarship Project Application Procedure

Any full-time or adjunct faculty member(s) who is/are currently employed at Ocean County College may apply for scholarship assistance from the college in line with the following procedure:

1. Applications for an academic year or any part thereof must be filed with the department dean by either October 1 or March 1 of the preceding year using the attached application form.
2. The department dean will circulate the application to all department faculty members for review and discussion at the October and/or March department meetings. Recommendations and critiques will be offered during this review.
3. Following departmental review, the department dean will forward the application to the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) with specific comments on the project and on the suitability of the institutional support requested. The VPAA will forward a recommendation to the President for a final decision. The applicant will be notified of the disposition of the application by November 15 or April 15.
4. Successful applicants will submit a progress report to the department dean and the VPAA in each semester of the duration of the scholarship award. Extensions for cause may be granted. The VPAA in consultation with the faculty member and the department dean will determine if and when it becomes necessary to terminate an award for cause prior to its completion.
5. When the project is completed, the college will determine what resources will be made available to disseminate the project to appropriate members of the college community and/or the larger academic community.

Attached to this document find the scholarship categories that are appropriate and the type(s) of institutional support that you may request from the college.

Faculty Scholarship Project Application

Name _____

- Independent/Critical Thinking, including Mathematical Reasoning (Goal #1)
 - For independent/critical thinking - 6 questions measuring interpretive, strategic, and adaptive reasoning based on material from the humanities, the natural sciences, and the social sciences.
 - For Mathematical Reasoning - 3 questions
- Problem Solving (part of Goal #3: Problem Solving and Information Literacy) – 2 test items
- Science and Social Science (Goal #5) – 6 items
- Aesthetic Appreciation (Goal #6) – 3 items
- Historical Consciousness (Goal #7) – 3 items
- Diversity Appreciation (Goal #8) – 3 items
- Global Perspective (Goal #9) – 3 items
- Health and Well Being (Goal #10) – 3 items
- Technology (Goal #12) - 1 item

Three general education goals (in addition to the second part of Goal #3) will be assessed through the college's course-level assessment process:

- Communication (Goal #2)
 - Writing: All full-time and adjunct English faculty will use a set of rubrics to blind score student essays.
 - Oral Communication: Faculty will select one of the following methods: (a) blind scoring of taped student speeches using a set of rubrics, or (b) item analysis of a graded final exam in Public Speaking.
- Information Literacy (part of Goal #3: Problem Solving and Information Literacy)
 - Included in the rubrics used for assessing writing skills.
- Ethical Judgment (Goal #4)
 - Questions evaluating ethical judgment skills may be included in the rubrics used to assess writing. These questions would apply only to student essays requiring a demonstration of ethical judgment.

Two other general education goals will be assessed through student responses on the Sophomore Student Attitude Survey (SSAS) administered to students preparing for graduation:

- Civic Responsibility (Goal #11)
- Life Long Learning (Goal #13)

In addition to the general education assessment plan outlined above, the college has identified general education requirements for all degrees and specified courses which will satisfy these requirements at OCC and at transfer institutions.

Appendix X, CCSSE Outcomes Report

**Assistant to the President for Institutional Effectiveness
REPORT**

Janet Hubbs



Strategies for Intentional Engagement
Engagement by Design, 2004-06 Findings, CCSSE

Research shows that the more actively engaged students are—with college faculty and staff, with other students, and with the subject matter they study—the more likely they are to learn and persist toward achieving their academic goals. Student engagement, therefore, is a valuable yardstick for assessing whether, and to what extent, an institution is employing educational practices likely to produce successful results. Engagement by Design, Findings, 3

Intentional Engagement Strategies

1. Engage Early, Engage Often: Community Colleges typically lose about half of their students prior to the beginning of the sophomore year. Colleges can counteract this by developing engagement activities that start from the moment of the students' first interactions with the college.
2. Stress Academic Advising: Having a plan plays a critical role in students' choosing to return to school the next day, the next month, the next year. Thus engagement efforts that encourage students to set and meet goals can have a significant impact on student retention.
3. Emphasize Effective Developmental Education: Almost 50% of all first-time community college students are assessed as under prepared for the academic demands of college-level courses. Included in any effective developmental course sequence is a course in study skills.
4. Redesign Educational Experiences: Due to the typical community college student's lack of time on campus, the most successful engagement strategies occur in the classroom. Every interaction with students has the potential to engage them; however, community colleges can make engagement "inescapable" by promoting it through each syllabus—assignments, requirements, and modes of assessment. Group projects, service learning, scheduled visits with faculty, learning communities, required activities outside the classroom all work to further engage students in their own learning.

These strategies are data-driven. They are predicated on the willingness of the college to work within a culture of evidence. Better educational outcomes do not just happen. They are the result of using data wisely, having the institutional will to be honest about

student performance, and implementing strategies designed to achieve improvement in the teaching/learning process.

Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)
Benchmark Categories 2006

NOTE: OCC students were below the mean in all items and in all categories; they were significantly (.2/item) below the mean in the bolded items.

Active and Collaborative Learning

Scores **OCC: 43.6, Large Colleges: 49.5; Cohort: 50.0**

- Asked questions in class or participated in class discussion
- Made a class presentation
- Worked with other students on a project
- **Worked with classmates outside of class**
- **Tutored or taught other students**
- Participated in a community-based project as part of a regular course
- Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, friends, family, co-workers, etc.)

Student Effort

Scores **OCC: 43.9, Large Colleges: 49.7, Cohort: 50.0**

- Prepared two or more drafts of a paper before turning it in
- Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources
- Came to class without completing readings or assignments
- Number of books read on your own (not assigned)
- **Preparing for class**
- **Frequency of use: peer or other tutoring**
- **Frequency of use: skill labs (writing, math, etc.)**
- **Frequency of use: computer lab**

Academic Challenge

Scores **OCC: 47.5, Large Colleges: 50.0, Cohort: 50.0**

- Worked harder than you thought you could to meet a professor's expectations or standards
- Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory
- Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information and experiences in a new way
- Making a judgment about the value or soundness of information, arguments, methods
- Applying theories or concepts to practical problems
- Using information you have heard or read to perform a new skill
- Number of assigned textbooks, manuals, books or book-length pack of course readings
- Number of written papers or reports of any length
- **The extent to which your exams have challenged you to do your best work**

- Encouraged to spend significant amounts of time studying

Student-Faculty Interaction

Scores **OCC: 46.6, Large Colleges: 49.2, Cohort: 50.0**

- Used email to communicate with professor
- **Discussed grade or assignment with professor**
- Talked about career plans with professor
- Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with professor outside of class
- Received prompt feedback from professor on your performance
- Worked with professors on activities other than coursework

Support for Learners

Scores **OCC: 44.4, Large Colleges: 48.9, Cohort: 50.0**

- **Provides the support you need to help you succeed in college**
- Encourages contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds
- Helps you cope with non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)
- Provides the support you need to thrive socially
- Provides the financial support you need to afford your education
- Frequency: Academic advising
- Frequency: Career Counseling

Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)
 Benchmark Summary Table—All Students
2004-2006 Comparison
 Large Colleges: 57 Respondents: 47,794

Benchmark	Ocean County College, 2004	Ocean County College, 2006
Active and Collaborative Learning	-5.3	-5.9 ↓
Student Effort	-3.9	-5.8 ↓
Academic Challenge	-2.1	-2.5 ↓
Student-Faculty Interaction	-4.4	-2.6 ↑
Support for Learners	-1.6	-4.4 ↓

Appendix XI, General Education Proficiencies, Outcomes

General Education Assessment
 OCC General Education Skills Test - Spring 2007 Semester

Student Success in Achieving General Education Goals

General Education Goals	Student Performance
Critical Thinking (test items 1-6)	67%
Mathematics Mathematical knowledge, reasoning, and calculation (test items 7-9)	72%
Problem Solving Mathematical problem solving using knowledge and reasoning (test item 10) Mathematical problem solving using knowledge, reasoning, and calculation (test item 11)	54%
Science Scientific knowledge (test item 12) Scientific reasoning (test item 13) Scientific knowledge (test item 14)	42%
Social Science Social science knowledge (test item 15) Critical thinking using a social science text (test items 16-17)	40%
Aesthetics Aesthetic knowledge of visual art (test item 18) Aesthetic knowledge of literary art (test item 19) Language (test item 20)	77%
History Historical research (test item 21) Historical knowledge (test item 22) Historical knowledge and reasoning (test item 23)	71%
Diversity Knowledge of cultural diversity (test item 24) Critical thinking using a "gender issues" text (test items 25-26)	63%
Global Perspective Knowledge and understanding of global issues (test items 27-29)	72%
Health and Well Being Knowledge of health issues (test items 30-31)	69%

Technology Understanding of technology (test item 32)	92%
---	-----

Test items in which the average student score was below 70%:

- #2 (27%) Critical Thinking (involving "irony")
- #8 (54%) Mathematics: knowledge, reasoning, and calculation
- #10 (46%) Problem Solving: Mathematical problem solving using knowledge and reasoning
- #12 (46%) Scientific knowledge (hypothesis)
- #13 (54%) Scientific reasoning (involving hypothesis)
- #14 (27%) Scientific knowledge (dependent variable)
- #15 (35%) Social Science knowledge (behaviorist theory)
- #16 (50%) Critical Thinking using a social science text
- #17 (35%) Critical Thinking using a social science text
- #19 (54%) Aesthetic knowledge of literary art (definition of literary "point of view")
- #22 (54%) Historical knowledge (definition of communism, anarchism, capitalism, and fascism)
- #25 (50%) Critical thinking using a "gender issues" text
- #30 (38%) Critical thinking using a "gender issues" text

Appendix XII, OCC Policy #7110, Writing Across the Curriculum

POLICY PROPOSAL

Ocean County College, Toms River, NJ

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS
COURSES AND CURRICULUM
Writing Across the Curriculum

#7110

Effective Date: Spring 2008

Semester

POLICY 7110

To foster intentional learners who are empowered to communicate effectively in writing, Ocean County College developed a Writing across the Curriculum process in which students are required to generate at least 1200 words of written, graded work in courses designated as "writing intensive." These courses, whose goal is "writing to learn," are listed in the document "Writing Intensive Courses for Writing across the Curriculum." Department deans, at their discretion, may designate additional courses as writing intensive.

The possibilities for writing assignments are endless and are best generated by faculty members in the various disciplines. Assignments might take the form of narrative lab reports in science classes, class room observations in education classes, detailed explanations of a mathematical process or of a problem-solving process in mathematics or engineering classes, reviews of a concert or a film or an annotated museum visit in humanities classes, an analysis of a company's annual report in business classes, an explanation of a complex social issue in social science classes, an original documented essay generated by information from three or more print or electronic sources, an explanation of various body functions or malfunctions in health and human performance classes, an editorial on a controversial environmental issue in science or social science classes, clinical reports or patient histories in nursing classes.

Appendix XIII, Developmental Skills Tracking Chart, SP 06

Date: 08/19/2006
Time: 09:54

OCEAN COUNTY COLLEGE
Basic Skills Effectiveness Report (XBSE)
Cohort Term 2005SP For 993 Cohorts

Table A: Testing and Placement of Students

(F) DEV. STUDENT SCORE	(A) COHORTS		(B) EXEMPTED SAT / TRFR ENROLLED		(C) NOT TESTED ENROLLED		(D) # TESTED		(E) IDENTIFIED FOR DEVELOPMENTAL COURSE				MEAN
	ST. DEVIATION		FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	%	PT	%	
READING	277	716	50/29	61/44	19	366	172	238	78	45.3	101	42.4	62.04
	60.22	12.24	14.18	56	57	22	44						
WRITING	277	716	50/29	61/44	19	366	168	227	108	64.3	131	57.7	76.17
	75.00	25.09	25.09	79	77	29	53						
ALGEBRA	277	716	53/11	68/28	19	366	188	244	144	76.6	177	72.5	36.06
	36.64	10.10	10.91	116	109	27	67						

* A - B - C = D

* E - F = G

* Identified for developmental course % = identified / tested

Date: 08/19/2006
 Time: 09:54

OCEAN COUNTY COLLEGE
 Basic Skills Effectiveness Report (XBSE)
 Cohort Term 2005SP For 993 Cohorts

Table B: Successful Completion of Remedial Requirements

(D) STUDENTS COMPLETING	(A) IDENTIFIED FOR DEVELOPMENTAL COURSE REQUIREMENTS			(E) STILL INCOMPLETE				(B) COMPLETED COURSE WORK IN 2006FA				(C) COURSE WAIVERS				ALL FT
	%	PT	FT %	FT FT	%	FT PT	%	PT	%	FT FT	%	PT	%	FT		
READING	29.5	35	34.7	101	70.5	20	25.6	28	27.7	3	3.8	7	6.9	23		
				55		66	65.3									
WRITING	33.3	43	32.8	131	66.7	34	31.5	40	30.5	2	1.9	3	2.3	36		
				72		88	67.2									
ALGEBRA	25.7	39	22.0	177	74.3	35	24.3	34	19.2	2	1.4	5	2.8	37		
				107		138	78.0									

- * B + C = D
- * A - D = E
- * Completed course work % = completed course work / identified
- * Course waiver % = receiving waivers / identified
- * All completion % = (completed + waived) / identified
- * Still incomplete % = not completed / identified

Date: 08/19/2006
 Time: 09:54

OCEAN COUNTY COLLEGE
 Basic Skills Effectiveness Report (XBSE)
 Cohort Term 2005SP For 993 Cohorts

Table C: Follow Up Through 2006FA

(C) CUMULATIVE DATA AT END OF 2006FA				(B) 4TH TERM DATA							
TOTAL ENROLLED			GPA		MEAN MEAN			SRVIVL		GPA	
MEAN	MEAN	SRVIVL	MEAN	#	MEAN	MEAN	ATT	CMPT	RATE	MEAN	#
>=2.00	>=2.00%	ATT	CMPT	RATE	>=2.00	>=2.00%					

FULL-TIME											

READING											
Not required											
30	93.8	3	3	93.8	30	93.8	3	3	93.8	3.25	

Completed		6		2.75	6	100.0	3	3	100.0	2.75
6	100.0	3	3	100.0						
Incomplete		5		3.50	5	100.0	4	3	100.0	3.50
5	100.0	4	3	100.0						
WRITING										
Not required		27		3.19	25	92.6	3	3	92.6	3.19
25	92.6	3	3	92.6						
Completed		12		3.13	12	100.0	3	3	100.0	3.13
12	100.0	3	3	100.0						
Incomplete		4		3.63	4	100.0	4	3	100.0	3.63
4	100.0	4	3	100.0						
ALGEBRA										
Not required		21		3.26	19	90.5	3	3	90.5	3.26
19	90.5	3	3	90.5						
Completed		15		3.10	15	100.0	3	3	100.0	3.10
15	100.0	3	3	100.0						
Incomplete		7		3.29	7	100.0	3	3	100.0	3.29
7	100.0	3	3	100.0						
PART-TIME										

READING										
Not required		48		3.01	44	91.7	3	3	91.7	3.01
44	91.7	3	3	91.7						
Completed		10		2.85	9	90.0	3	3	90.0	2.85
9	90.0	3	3	90.0						
Incomplete		24		3.04	23	95.8	3	3	95.8	3.04
23	95.8	3	3	95.8						
WRITING										
Not required		44		2.92	40	90.9	3	3	90.9	2.92
40	90.9	3	3	90.9						
Completed		11		3.09	11	100.0	3	3	100.0	3.09
11	100.0	3	3	100.0						
Incomplete		27		3.09	25	92.6	3	3	92.6	3.09
25	0.0	3	3	92.6						
ALGEBRA										
Not required		45		3.17	43	95.6	3	3	95.6	3.17
43	95.6	3	3	95.6						
Completed		13		2.85	13	100.0	3	3	100.0	2.85
13	100.0	3	3	100.0						
Incomplete		24		2.77	20	83.3	3	3	83.3	2.77
20	83.3	3	3	83.3						

Date: 08/19/2006
Time: 09:54

OCEAN COUNTY COLLEGE
Basic Skills Effectiveness Report (XBSE)
Cohort Term 2005SP For 993 Cohorts

Table D: Performance of Full-Time Students in First College-Level Courses Through 2006FA or 2007FA

SUMMARY REPORT

First College Level Courses	# Enrolled	#
Passed % Passed		

READING: HIST-171 Western Civil I		
PSYC-172 General Psychology		
SOCI-181 Intro Sociology		

77	70.6	Required no remediation	109
11	78.6	Completed remediation	14

WRITING: ENGL-151 English I

42	68.9	Required no remediation	61
16	88.9	Completed remediation	18

ALGEBRA: MATH-151 A Survey of Mathematics
MATH-156 Intro Statistics
MATH-165 College Algebra
MATH-171 Finite Mathematics
MATH-181 Intro to Probability

39	68.4	Required no remediation	57
17	68.0	Completed remediation	25

Date: 08/19/2006
Time: 09:54

OCEAN COUNTY COLLEGE
Basic Skills Effectiveness Report (XBSE)
Cohort Term 2005SP For 993 Cohorts

Table E: Performance of Full-Time Students in First College-Level Courses Through 2006FA or 2007FA

DETAIL REPORT

First College Level Courses Passed	% Passed		# Enrolled	#
------------------------------------	----------	--	------------	---

READING:

39	HIST-171 Western Civil I	72.2	Required no remediation	54
5		62.5	Completed remediation	8
27	PSYC-172 General Psychology	65.9	Required no remediation	41
6		100.0	Completed remediation	6
11	SOCI-181 Intro Sociology	78.6	Required no remediation	14
0		0.0	Completed remediation	0
88		71.5	READING TOTALS:	123

WRITING:

42	ENGL-151 English I	68.9	Required no remediation	61
16		88.9	Completed remediation	18
58		73.4	WRITING TOTALS:	79

ALGEBRA:

18	MATH-151	A Survey of Mathematics	Required no remediation	25
	72.0		Completed remediation	10
8	80.0			
13	MATH-156	Intro Statistics	Required no remediation	19
	68.4		Completed remediation	9
6	66.7			
6	MATH-165	College Algebra	Required no remediation	11
	54.5		Completed remediation	6
3	50.0			
2	MATH-171	Finite Mathematics	Required no remediation	2
	100.0		Completed remediation	0
0	0.0			
0	MATH-181	Intro to Probability	Required no remediation	0
	0.0		Completed remediation	0
0	0.0			
56	68.3	ALGEBRA TOTALS:		82

Appendix XIV, Distance Learning and Course Grade Comparisons, AY 05-07

COURSES IDENTIFIED FOR ASSESSMENT & TAUGHT BOTH ONSITE & VIA DL	Onsite Sections					
	2005		2006		2007	
	Average Gr Equiv	Average Grade	Average Gr Equiv	Average Grade	Average Gr Equiv	Average Grade
ACCT-161: Principles of Accounting I	2.2	C	2.2	C	1.8	D
ACCT-162: Principles of Accounting II	2.6	C+	2.8	C+	2.5	C+
ARTS-181: Art History I	2.3	C	2.9	C+	3.2	B
ARTS-182: Art History II	2.8	C+	3.5	B+	3.5	B+
BUSN-131: Introduction to Business Admin	3.1	B	2.9	C+	2.9	C+
BUSN-134: Principles of Marketing	2.7	C+	2.5	C+	2.7	C+
ECON-151: Macroeconomics	2.9	C+	3.1	B	3.1	B
ECON-152: Microeconomics	3.3	B	3.3	B	3.1	B

EDUC-178: Intro to Ed of Exceptional Students	3.4	B	3.2	B	3.5	B+
ENGL-151: English I	2.8	C+	2.6	C+	2.6	C+
ENGL-152: English II	2.9	C+	2.9	C+	3.0	B
HEHP-225: Contemporary Health	2.8	C+	2.8	C+	2.8	C+
HIST-171: Western Civilization I	2.1	C	2.5	C+	2.8	C+
HIST-172: Western Civilization II	2.5	C+	3.1	B	3.2	B
HIST-173: United States History I	2.7	C+	2.9	C+	2.7	C+
HIST-174: United States History II	n/a	n/a	3.1	B	2.7	C+
MATH-011: Introduction to Algebra I	2.3	C	2.3	C	2.3	C
MATH-012: Introduction to Algebra II	2.5	C+	2.4	C	2.5	C+
MATH-151: Survey of Mathematics	2.9	C+	2.9	C+	2.6	C+
MATH-156: Introduction to Statistics	2.8	C+	2.6	C+	2.7	C+
MATH-165: College Algebra	2.5	C+	2.7	C+	2.5	C+
MATH-171: Finite Mathematics	3.4	B	3.6	B+	3.2	B
PHIL-191: Introduction to Philosophy	2.3	C	2.1	C	2.3	C
POLI-183: Introduction to Political Science	n/a	n/a	2.9	C+	n/a	n/a
PSYC-172: General Psychology	2.9	C+	2.8	C+	2.7	C+
PSYC-173: Child Psychology	3.3	B	2.9	C+	2.9	C+
SOCI-181: Introduction to Sociology	n/a	n/a	2.5	C+	2.6	C+
DL = Online, OSOL, OP, and H Sections						
Average Grade for All OS Sections = 2.8 = C+						
Average Grade for all DL Sections = 2.7 = C+						

Appendix XV, Distance learning and Onsite Success Comparisons

COURSES IDENTIFIED FOR ASSESSMENT & TAUGHT BOTH ONSITE & VIA DL	ONSITE SECTIONS			
	2005	2006	2007	2005
	Success Rate	Success Rate	Success Rate	Success Rate

ACCT-161: Principles of Accounting I	51%	53%	41%	25%
ACCT-162: Principles of Accounting II	61%	60%	56%	52%
ARTS-181: Art History I	58%	68%	66%	40%
ARTS-182: Art History II	58%	75%	77%	52%
BUSN-131: Introduction to Business Admin	63%	63%	66%	45%
BUSN-134: Principles of Marketing	58%	57%	57%	39%
ECON-151: Macroeconomics	67%	69%	61%	57%
ECON-152: Microeconomics	70%	73%	74%	72%
EDUC-178: Intro to Ed of Exceptional Students	71%	76%	82%	75%
ENGL-151: English I	53%	56%	55%	27%
ENGL-152: English II	65%	64%	63%	49%
HEHP-225: Contemporary Health	67%	70%	67%	75%
HIST-171: Western Civilization I	55%	53%	60%	40%
HIST-172: Western Civilization II	65%	69%	71%	85%
HIST-173: United States History I	65%	62%	65%	55%
HIST-174: United States History II	n/a	67%	68%	n/a
MATH-011: Introduction to Algebra I	39%	43%	39%	17%
MATH-012: Introduction to Algebra II	40%	41%	41%	21%
MATH-151: Survey of Mathematics	61%	66%	61%	33%
MATH-156: Introduction to Statistics	52%	52%	59%	35%
MATH-165: College Algebra	40%	53%	58%	11%
MATH-171: Finite Mathematics	77%	73%	68%	74%
PHIL-191: Introduction to Philosophy	55%	48%	45%	45%
POLI-183: Introduction to Political Science	n/a	75%	n/a	n/a
PSYC-172: General Psychology	65%	57%	66%	38%
PSYC-173: Child Psychology	72%	74%	78%	54%
SOCI-181: Introduction to Sociology	n/a	62%	66%	n/a

Success Rate in Onsite Sections:

The # of students achieving a passing grade in onsite sections divided by the total # of students in all onsite sections, including th

Success Rate in DL Sections:

The # of students achieving a passing grade in DL sections divided by the total # of students in all DL sections, including those rec

Passing Grade: In non-developmental courses: D or higher. In developmental courses: C or higher.


Failing Grade: In developmental courses, "D" and "F" grades.

DL = Online, OSOL, OP, and H Sections

Average Success Rate in Onsite Sections: 61%

Average Success Rate in DL Sections: 44%

Appendix XVI, DL Student Success Report

	<h1>NOTES</h1> <h2>Institutional Effectiveness</h2>	<p>Janet Hubbs 732-255-0400 X2195 jhubbs@ocean.edu</p>
---	---	--

Distance Learning: Student Success
A Report/Ocean County College
Summer 2007

DATA

Success Data: In a recent three-year (2005-2007) study of student success in distance learning courses at Ocean County College, it was discovered that the comparative success rates for students taking the same courses in a face to face environment differed by seventeen (17) percentage points (61%:44%) where student success in DL courses was lower. Success is defined as persistence to completion and receipt of course credit with an A, B, C, or D grade.

Grade studies were also made showing no significant difference in GPAs (F2F, 2.8:DL, 2.7).

National data on assessment of this population is not readily accessible, but the available studies posit either “no significant difference” between distance and face to face (f2f) learning or higher rates of student success in distance learning modes.

Enrollments have increased 44% in DL courses over the same period, so increasing numbers of students are included in the 56% who do not successfully complete their distance learning courses.

CONCLUSION

While it might be possible to use student exit surveys to some advantage to refine the data and discover the reasons for the significant percentage difference between the successes of the two populations, it would seem that taking some interim actions might help to address the improvement of student success rates and course retention rates.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Develop a short orientation program to Web CT and make completion of this orientation part of the initial student login procedure;
 2. Examine carefully all initial login issues to insure that we capture all students who have registered for online classes;
 3. Encourage all online faculty to log in to the course frequently, twice daily during the first three weeks of the course so that they can respond to student problems in a timely manner;
 4. Train all Deans in Web CT so that they can begin to do “class observations” for online courses;
 5. Target the courses with the lowest rates of student success for the first Quality Matters assessment process.
-

Appendix XVII, Executive Director E-Learning, Position Description

**OCEAN COUNTY COLLEGE
OFFICIAL POSITION DESCRIPTION**

POSITION TITLE: Executive Director of E-Learning

POSITION CONTROL NUMBER:

CLASSIFICATION: Administrative

SALARY GUIDE LEVEL:

REPORTS TO: Vice President for Instructional Technologies

FUNDING SOURCE: College Budget

I. NARRATIVE: The Executive Director of E-Learning is responsible for the development and enrichment of the college's distance learning, related faculty, and course development initiatives. This includes management of the college's e-learning and tele-learning offerings, computer-based instruction, technology-enhanced course design and development, and related faculty development. The Executive Director establishes policies regarding the use of the college's internet-based instructional technology and distance learning offerings. All responsibilities of this job description shall be considered essential unless noted as marginally essential (M. E.).

II. QUALIFICATIONS:

Required:

- A. Master's Degree in educational technology, instructional design, administration, or an academic discipline required. A Doctorate degree is preferred.
- B. A minimum of five (5) years experience in higher education required;
- C. Experience in academic technology, instructional design required and online teaching;
- D. Working knowledge of: HTML, Web editing applications, CMS systems, preferably Web CT, required;
- E. Demonstrated administrative capability required;
- F. Strong communication (verbal and written) and consultation skills required;
- G. Experience with online research tools;
- E. Experience directing and working with teams.

III. FUNCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES:

Management/Administrative Operations

1. Develop and manage the college's distance learning program, including e-learning, tele-learning, and hybrid-online offerings;
2. Develop and/or recommend policies, procedures, standards, and practices related to online, hybrid-online, and internet-enhanced courses;
3. Assist the Vice President of Academic Affairs in the recruitment, screening, hiring, orientation, training, monitoring and evaluation of Distance Learning faculty.
4. Work closely with relevant divisions and departments to provide required services and support for distance learning students and faculty;
5. Working in consultation with the Academic Affairs Division, develop and administer appropriate assessment, evaluation, and monitoring processes for the Distance learning program, courses, and support services;
6. Provide assistance to faculty in the design and development of appropriate and pedagogically sound computer mediated learning modules and courses;
7. Maintain contracts and service-level agreements with software course providers, programming producers, and telecommunications service providers, as they pertain to the operation of distance learning services at the college;
8. Work with appropriate departments and individuals to market and promote the Distance Learning program;
9. In consultation with administrators, faculty, students and consultants, provide leadership in determining the distance learning, computer mediated instructional needs of the college;

10. Hire, schedule, supervise and evaluate department staff;
11. Maintain appropriate competencies in existing and emerging program-related technologies and practices;
12. Perform other duties as assigned.

B. Training and Faculty Development

1. Provide for the initial training of faculty for the Distance Learning faculty;
2. Provide for regular and systematic training opportunities for the Distance Learning faculty;
3. Provide orientation and training for the Distance Learning students;
4. Provide for professional development opportunities for faculty and staff.

C. Financial Accountability

1. Develop and administer an annual operational budget for the department;
2. Develop capital equipment specifications and budget requests for program related instructional technology equipment and systems;
3. Maintain contracts and accounting records for consortia, software, leases, and distance learning applications;
4. Maintain accurate enrollment and statistical records and prepare appropriate reports as needed or requested.

D. Public Relations/Communications

1. As directed by the Vice President, serve on various campus, state, regional and national committees and working groups as they pertain to the continued development of distance learning applications, and the technology-related faculty development needs of the college;
2. Make relevant presentations to promote the college and its distance learning initiatives.

IV. LENGTH OF CONTRACT

The Executive Director of E-Learning shall be employed on a twelve-month basis, normally working Monday-Friday. Compensation and benefits shall be in accordance with pertinent Board of Trustees Policies. Regular, prompt attendance shall be considered an essential job responsibility.

Approvals: (New)

Appendix XVIII, Program Evaluation Calendar

PROGRAM EVALUATION CALENDAR, 2005-2008

DEAN	DEPARTMENT	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
NOVELLI	Humanities, Fine Arts, & Media Studies	AAS.VCT (due SU 07)	AAS.PBJ	
BROWN	Science, Engineering, Nursing, Health, and Human Performance	AAS.ET AS.ES AS.ES.EP AAS. AH	AAS.CCT AAS.CCT.SUR AS.ENGR	AS.BT
STRADA	Social Science, Education, & Public Service	AS.HST (due FA 03) AS.HST.GER (due FA 03) AS.TACC (due FA 04)	AAS.FS	AS.CJ
POLK	Business, Economics, & Computer Science	AS.BA AAS.BUS.MNGT	AAS.CS AAS.BUS.ACCT AS.CS	AAS.BUS.MKT AAS.BUS.MPR
Color Code:		NOT COMPLETED		