



6101 Grayson Drive ♦ Denison, Texas 75020

Monitoring Report

Prepared for the
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges
April 15, 2013

Committee Visit: October 10-12, 2011

Prepared by:

Dr. Jeremy McMillen
President
903-463-8600
mcmillenj@grayson.edu

Dr. Debbie Smarr
Institutional Effectiveness Director and SACSCOC Liaison
903-415-2592
smarrd@grayson.edu



3.3.1.1

The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in the following areas: (Institutional Effectiveness)

3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

3.3.1.2 administrative support services

3.3.1.3 educational support services

3.3.1.4 research within its educational mission, if appropriate

3.3.1.5 community/public service within its educational mission, if appropriate

Visiting Committee Recommendation

Recommendation 2: The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee recommends that the institution demonstrate that it assesses the extent to which it achieves its identified program-level outcomes to include student learning outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results.

Institutional Response Summary for Response Report

Grayson College identified Program Learning Outcomes for all of its Academic Studies and Workforce Education degree/certificate programs. It has mapped course learning outcomes assessments to each program's learning outcomes. Grayson provided evidence of learning outcomes assessment and improvement plans (Use of Results) based upon those assessments along with a detailed description of its assessment cycles. In addition, the college detailed its assessment review process.

Commission Request

The institution has not demonstrated compliance because evidence of assessment and the use of results for improvement are not yet available for many of the programs. By the institutions own definition, a full assessment cycle has not been completed. The institution should demonstrate how the results for a sample of programs assessed during an assessment cycle are used for improvement.

Institutional Monitoring Report Response

At the time of the site visit, Grayson College (GC) had not documented evidence of assessment and the use of results for improvement in all of its programs. GC has now documented evidence of assessment and the use of results for all academic and workforce education programs for three cycles of assessment. Beginning with the Fall 2012 semester, oversight of the institutions assessment processes has been moved under the direction of the Director of Institutional Effectiveness. Throughout the Fall 2012 semester a complete audit of all academic

and workforce education program assessments was completed with 100% of all [academic](#) studies and [workforce education](#) assessment artifacts or explanations for missing documentation being provided. All certificate programs, which are contained within an academic or workforce educational program curriculum, are assessed as a component of the complete degree program. An updated list of [degree programs/certificates](#) to be assessed is provided along with assessment artifacts for each academic and workforce education program as evidence of our assessment for every program. The assessment artifacts consist of program learning outcomes (PLO), a curriculum map, and an assessment report containing: the results of the assessment, the identification of an improvement plan based on these results, and documentation of improvement for each program. **The completion of this audit and the documentation of these artifacts for all programs provide evidence of assessment and the use of results for improvement for all of the College's programs.**

Following best practices, Grayson has adopted a double-loop assessment process. A [detailed assessment cycle](#) and [chart](#) has been developed to show this process. In order to demonstrate the completion of three complete assessment cycles, assessment reports for each program are provided for Spring 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011 and Fall2011/Spring 2012. Contained in these assessment reports are a current curriculum map, a list of program learning outcomes, assessment results for each cycle with improvement plans for each assessment, and a documentation of improvement for each assessment cycle's improvement plans. To view each program's complete assessment reports, click on the program name in the list below and scroll through the artifacts.

Academic Studies

[Biology](#), [Business Administration](#), [Chemistry](#), [Computer Science](#), [Economics](#), [Engineering](#), [English](#), [Fine Arts](#), [Forensic Science](#), [Geology](#), [Mathematics](#), [Music](#), [Physics](#), [Psychology](#), [Sociology](#), [Spanish](#), and [Theatre](#).

Associate of Arts in Teaching

[Secondary Education](#) and [Physical Education](#)

Associate of Applied Sciences

Career Services: [Child Development](#), [Collision Repair](#), [Criminal Justice](#), [Culinary Arts](#), [Heating, Air Conditioning & Refrigeration Technology](#), [Hospitality Management](#), [Viticulture & Enology](#), and [Welding](#). Business and Computer: [Accounting](#), [Business and Management](#), [Computer Aided Drafting](#), [Computer Maintenance and Technology](#), [Computer Software and Systems](#), and [Office and Computer Technology](#). Health Sciences: [Associate Degree Nursing](#), [Drug and Alcohol Abuse Counseling](#), [Dental Assisting](#), [Paramedicine](#), [Medical Lab Technician](#), and [Radiologic Technology](#). Certificates: [Cosmetology](#), [Mechatronics](#), [Police Academy](#), and [Licensed Vocational Nursing](#).

A [sample step-by-step documentation of assessment, use of results](#) and documentation of improvement through all three cycles of assessment is provided from the AS in Mathematics assessment artifacts. The first three steps are documented below:

Step 1:

Spring 2010 the Mathematics program identified the following outcome: *“The student will solve problems involving logarithms, exponential expressions, and polynomial equations”* to assess program learning outcome #1. At the end of the Spring 2010 semester, they reported that 67% of the students were at or above the 75% proficiency target for this outcome. As a result of 33% of their students being below the 75% targeted performance, they developed and submitted an improvement plan that stated: *“We will focus on restructuring the SLO’s for MATH 1314 as a means to fine tune instructional goals and give better direction to instructors. We will also focus on doing a better job incorporating adjuncts into the process. While we actively invite their participation, we didn’t do enough to make it clear how important their support is to our mission.”* (See Step 3 for documentation of this improvement plan).

Step 2:

The improvement plan identified in step 1 is implemented in the Fall 2010 semester and an additional program learning outcome is identified. An assessment report on the new program learning outcome is submitted with an improvement plan based on the assessment results identified for implementation during the Spring 2011 semester.

Step 3:

Documentation of Improvement from the outcome assessed during Step 1 in the Spring 2010 assessment is provided. The Mathematics department reports that there was no measureable improvement and that the outcome will be changed.

This same step-by-step process for each program learning outcome is followed for each cycle of assessments in all programs.

On [February 13, 2013](#), the [Instructional Services Assessment Committee \(ISAC\)](#), [composed of faculty from both the Academic Studies Division and the Workforce Education Division](#), completed its review of the Spring 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011 assessment reports for each program. The ISAC review consisted of a review of each program’s curriculum map and whether a curriculum map is present, accurate and complete, and demonstrates where each program learning outcome is introduced, reinforced, and mastered. The second component of was a review of each program’s program learning outcomes (PLO’s). The program PLO’s were assessed to determine whether there were program learning outcomes identified, that an appropriate number had been identified, that they appear to be program specific, and what quality the PLO exhibited. Quality was judged using Bloom’s Taxonomy for action verb usage at the appropriate level, an expected level of competency was stated, and that the PLO appeared to be measurable as it is written. A standard rubric for assessing the curriculum map and PLO’s was developed and training was facilitated to ensure that all committee members were using the same standards for its individual reviews. The results of the ISAC review revealed that 60% of its program’s learning outcomes were deemed to be of “Basic” quality, 30% were “Better”,

and 9% were “Best.” Based on these results, improvements have been identified and are being implemented to enhance the quality of the College’s assessment activities. An [Annual Assessment of Assessments Report](#) was completed.

The documentation of three cycles of assessments including assessment results, use of results, documentation of improvement, and the ISAC review **demonstrates the completion of not only one but three complete cycles of assessment at Grayson College.**

Finalizing our process for improvements in assessment of program learning outcomes, the College Effectiveness Council (CEC) met on [March 28, 2013](#). The ISAC co-chairs presented the CEC with a copy of their annual review of assessments and its recommendations for improvement. The Council [voted](#) unanimously to accept this report. [The ISAC Annual Assessment of Assessments Report](#) was provided to the Vice President for Instruction with the completed ISAC reviews for [Academic Studies](#) programs and [Workforce Education](#) programs. A copy of the ISAC Review for each program, which includes recommendations for improvement, has been shared with each program coordinator for implementation through the Vice President for Instruction and the Director of Institutional Effectiveness and each Dean. **The completion of these three cycles of assessments including the use of results for improvement and the documentation of improvements demonstrates that Grayson College assesses at the program level and uses these results for improvement at the program level.**