Addressing Team Recommendations and Actionable Improvement Plans (AIPs)

Standard II

**Introduction**

Standard II focuses on the instructional programs, student support services, and library and learning support services that facilitate and demonstrate the achievement of stated student learning outcomes.

The following are the status updates of the Actionable Improvement Plans that were identified in the ISER and recommendation from the Accreditation Team during their evaluation of the College in March 2012 relevant to Standard II:

**Team Recommendations**

1. In order to improve, the team recommends that the College develop a process for systematically evaluating non-credit courses, workshops, and training sessions for content and effectiveness, in alignment with the assessment process that is in place for credit courses. (II.A.2)

**Action Taken:** In August 2012, the Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (CE&WD) submitted a plan for the systematic evaluation of non-credit courses, workshops, and training sessions. The plan was approved by the Academic Vice-President that same month (Evidence #1). The plan was incorporated as part of the assessment of the CE & WD office. Their assessment report for Spring 2013 provided data on the plan (Evidence #2).

**Status:** Ongoing. Data has been collected and reported on the plan.

**Next Step:** Since the plan only looks at three specific training or events, CE&WD must expand the plan and make it more systematic for all non-credit courses, workshops, and training sessions.

2. In order to improve, the team recommends that the College develop a plan for distance education, including continuing education offered through distance education, and implement appropriate support services and procedures to deliver instruction online. (I.A.1, I.B.4, I.B.5,I.B.6, II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.A.7, II, B.3.a, II.C.1.c, IIIC.)

**Action Taken:** A distance education (DE) plan/scope of work has been drafted for the College under the Office of Business and Finance (Evidence #3). The draft outlines the scope of work needed to move DE forward. The scope of work includes the development of a *DE Strategic Plan* and a *DE Manual of Operating Procedures*. Two reports, a *DE Needs Assessment Report* and a *DE Capabilities Assessment Report* are due July 2014, and the *DE Manual of Standard Operating Procedures* is due October 2014. Specific details and tasks are outlined in the draft.

**Status:** Ongoing. The DE plan is in a draft form.

**Next Step:** The DE plan and scope of work needs to be approved and tasks need to begin to move DE forward at the College.

**Actionable Improvement Plans (AIP):**

1. Increase compliance rate of curriculum revision process to ensure courses and programs are not over five years old, hence remaining current with community and industry standards. (Standard II.A.1)

**Action Taken:** Members of the Job Specification/Faculty Evaluation Committee were contacted regarding the evaluation of faculty in this area since faculty members are primarily responsible for the revision of courses and programs. The current Faculty Evaluation system was reviewed. Areas relating to the curriculum revision process are in the current faculty evaluation system for department chairs (Evidence #4) and instructional faculty (Evidence #5). In addition, the Curriculum Manual 2012 (Evidence #6) states that course and program guides must be reviewed every five years. Therefore, the Academic Vice President may inform departments that courses and programs that are not in compliance cannot be offered or scheduled.

**Status:** Ongoing.Incentives to increase compliance rate are adequate.

**Next Step:** Review the revised faculty evaluation system to ensure that updating of course and program documents are still a part of the system.

1. Develop a process for the systematic evaluation of non-credit courses, workshops and training sessions, in alignment with the formalized assessment process that is already in place at the college. (Standard II.A.2)

**Action Taken:** In August 2012, the Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (CE&WD) submitted a plan for the systematic evaluation of non-credit courses, workshops, and training sessions. The plan was approved by the Academic Vice-President that same month (Evidence #1). The plan was incorporated as part of the assessment of the CE & WD office. Their assessment report for Spring 2013 provided data on the plan (Evidence #2).

**Status:** Ongoing. Data has been collected and reported on the plan.

**Next Step:** Since the plan only looks at three specific training or events, CE&WD must expand the plan and make it more systematic for all non-credit courses, workshops, and training sessions.

1. Use the online version of the IDEA rating survey for online courses, in alignment with this teaching modality’s goals of providing an alternative for students to evaluate their own learning. (Standard II.A.2c)

**Action Taken:** In Fall 2012, the Office of Assessment, Institutional Research and Effectiveness developed an online survey that mirrors the IDEA rating survey used in traditional courses. Students enrolled in the 3 online courses offered Fall 2012 were surveyed through an announcement and link in the course. Out of the 52 students enrolled, 12 students responded. The AIER staff transferred the responses from the online survey to the IDEA bubble sheet. These were then submitted along with the responses for traditional courses. This is the mechanism and process by which online courses will be evaluated.

**Status:** Ongoing. For Spring 2013, IDEA rating surveys were not administered in any courses, either traditional or online due to lack of funds. However, the Office of AIRE will continue to administer surveys consistent with traditional courses.

**Next Step:** AIRE should develop plan for increasing response rate.

1. Foster dialogue among program faculty and the Learning Outcomes Committee (LOC) to provide standards for grading and awarding of credit by strengthening language in the course guide. The awarding of credit discussion should be guided by the federal definition of credit hour. (Standard II.A.2h)

**Action Taken:** The Learning Outcomes Committee placed this on their agenda at their November meeting (Evidence #7) and discussion was held. No other action was taken by LOC at that time.

**Status:** Ongoing. Minutes from LOC for this academic year indicate that the topic was never brought up for discussion again.

**Next Step:** Ensure that LOC places this topic in the agenda for next academic year.

1. Provide a systematic process for standardizing identification, use and reporting of service learning to align with the broad goals of general education. (Standard II.A.3c)

**Action Taken:** The Chairperson of the Learning Outcomes Committee (LOC) in Fall 2013 indicated that the role of the General Education working group is to identify “the extent to which our gened [sic] program challenges students to become civically engaged” (Evidence #8). According to the Chairperson at that time, it will be the task of the General Education working group to determine whether general education courses introduce, emphasize and/or reinforce institution learning outcomes related to service learning. Minutes of LOC for Spring 2013 indicate that the nature of the General Education working group and its function is still being formulated (Evidence #9).

**Status:** Ongoing. The tasks of the General Education working group under LOC are still being formulated.

**Next Step:** Ensure that LOC places this topic in the agenda for next academic year.

1. Bolster academic advisement process and procedures for all faculty so that student support through advisement remains strong and effective. (Standard II.B.3c)

**Action Taken:** An Academic Advisement Task Force was formed Fall 2012 to look at strengthening the academic advisement process. The task force consists of faculty, including traditional and non-traditional (counselors) faculty, and the TSS Dean and Associate Dean. The task force is working on the GCC Academic Advising Model, an Academic Advisor Handbook, and a flowchart for Advising Delivery. They are obtaining documents related to all of these areas and have gathered input from the Registrar and the Associate Dean (Evidence #10).

**Status:** Ongoing. The task force is currently working on identifying resources and support for training.

**Next Step:** Task force should finalize and obtain approval from Academic Vice-President via TSS Dean on the deliverables, and then develop plan for training.

1. Evaluate the safety and security of physical records, and consider various alternative ways (including electronic means) to protect the integrity of student records at all times. (Standard II.B.3f)

**Action Taken:** The Registrar reported the Banner Group team reviews the memory to ensure that there is sufficient memory as new students and information are added. Currently, there is sufficient digital memory and files are backed up daily. The College does not have enough space to hold physical records. The College has two vaults which are fire proof, but these are at capacity. The College is using a container/office to hold some other physical records that do not fit within the vaults. More vaults, which are fire proof and climate controlled, are needed to hold records. The College is discussing alternatives, including a system where an outside vendor digitizes records so that physical records are kept to a minimum.

**Status:** Ongoing. No vaults were purchased and no alternative system to digitize physical records, reducing the need for space and vaults, has been finalized.

**Next Step:** Registrar should continue to follow up and document solutions to the lack of space to keep physical records secure and safe.

1. Revisit recommendations to examine how the survey findings have been used to implement a more efficient delivery of student programs and services. (Standard II.B.4)

**Action Taken:** All concerns on the Faces of the Future surveys have been addressed. The College has no plans to administer the Faces of the Future surveys. Information will be obtained by other means for future reports.

**Status:** Closed.

**Next Step:** None.

1. Allocate a percentage of funds for supporting additional resources in the LRC when new programs are developed or when existing programs are significantly modified. (Standard II.C.1a)

**Action Taken:** Suggestion was given last academic year to the LOC chair to add a section to the program and course guide forms that directly addresses the need for additional LRC resources (Evidence #11). Review of the Curriculum Manual indicate that this suggestion was not part of the latest revisions to the Curriculum Manual

**Status:** Ongoing. Currently, there is no mechanism to request for funding the LROC when new programs are developed or when existing programs are significantly modified.

**Next Step:** Ensure that LOC places this topic in the agenda for next academic year.

1. Research the need and demand for additional electronic resources including e-book readers and computer tablets to facilitate the use of enhanced electronic services.(Standard II.C.2)

**Action Taken:** LRC will survey faculty and students next academic year as part of its regular assessment cycle.

**Status:** Ongoing.

**Next Step:** LRC should survey, compile and report on need and demand from faculty and students next academic year.

**Directory of Evidence**

E1. Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development (CE&WD) Plan for Assessment Memo (Approved)

E2. Office of Continuing Education and Workforce Development Assessment Report - Spring 2013

E3. Distance Education Plan and Scope of Work - Draft

E4. Evaluation Rubric – Department Chairs

E5. Evaluation Rubric – Instructional Faculty

E6. Curriculum Manual – Spring 2013

E7. Learning Outcomes Committee Meeting of 11/9/2012

E8. Email from G. Hartz, LOC Chair, December 2012.

E9. Learning Outcome Committee Meeting Minutes Spring 2013

E10. Academic Advisement Taskforce Minutes 2012-2013

E11. Email to LOC 11/12/2011

# FEEDBACK: This Standard 2 report is presented in a professional and organized manner. The narratives are short and to the point. This standard committee had the most AIPs to address (10 of 25 total) and two(2) major recommendations. The evidence should be footnoted at the bottom of the pages with active links to the electronic files. *Please remember to tap on AIER as a resource for linking your electronic documents within these reports AHEAD of time.*