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The assessment materials were reviewed by the following committee members: Ron Adams, Carol Fisher, Sue Winchester, Sharon Church, Dave Harris, Denise Tridle and Mike Parker.

There were twenty-one courses assessed.

There were twenty-two on-campus instructors teaching the assessed courses. Eighteen of those instructors submitted their assessment materials to the assessment committee. This was a submission rate of 82%. This figure was lower than the fall semester when eighteen of the nineteen instructors submitted materials with a submission rate of 94%.

There were fifty-three regional instructors who had received requests to submit assessment materials. Only five sent in materials to the committee. This was a 9% submission rate compared to the fall semester when twenty-one of the fifty-eight regional instructors submitted materials with a 36% submission rate.

For the fall assessment 50% of the materials were collected and assessed for the designated classes for the entire campus. For the spring 31% were submitted and reviewed. For the 2000/2001 term 88% of on-campus instructors submitted their materials and 23% of regional instructors submitted their materials. The total submission rate for the entire campus for the term was 40%.

Reviewers found that all the courses assessed had a standard course syllabus on file with competency statements and assessments listed. Now that syllabi are going to be available on-line the regional instructors will have more efficient access to the standard course syllabus.

A recurring concern of the committee is that many regional instructors are not following the standard course syllabus. Of the 5 submitted, 3 had not followed the standard syllabus as evidenced by the syllabus they had submitted. A recommendation was made that the Assistant Dean of Instruction contact these adjunct faculty along with any faculty that had been designated as having problems with their assessment materials.

The competency statements on the syllabi are less vague than the past but some still need clarification and active language. It is recommended that there be more training for writing competencies.

Materials need to be labeled to correspond with the specific competency that is being assessed. This will clarify the process for the reviewer. If tests are being used, they need to be linked to the competencies they are assessing. If a student has passed the class, the assessment materials need to demonstrate mastery of the stated competencies. This will be addressed in the Fall 2001 In-service and also explained in the letter sent to faculty describing how assessment materials are to be submitted.

It had been recommended that there be assessment training at the regional sites. Several training sessions were scheduled but there was no response from adjunct faculty. The Assessment Committee recommends that an explanation of assessment been included in the regional training session for adjunct faculty. The committee also recommends that the regional coordinators be members of the Assessment Committee to improve understanding and communication about assessment in the region.
The committee also believes that the non-receipt of assessment materials from faculty is an administrative matter and should be given serious and careful consideration for a policy to address this problem.

To make the process more meaningful, the committee has changed their review sheet.

The committee is also recommending a General Education Assessment. This will be discussed with the entire faculty body at the Fall, 2001 In-service along with a discussion on how each faculty member is involved with teaching critical thinking in their courses. Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATs) will also be presented at the In-service.

A process to use the findings from the In-Course Assessment to make meaningful changes will be implemented in the fall departmental meetings.