



Truckee Meadows Community College

Focused Interim Report

Prepared for the

Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

April 25-26, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Letter from President Ringle | 1 |
| Introduction | 2 |
| College response to recommendation 1: | 3 |
| Continuation of Existing and Development of New Planning Activities and Assessment Practices (1.B.2) | 3 |
| Creating a Culture of Evidence, Acceptance, and Engagement through Enhanced Communication (1.B.4, 1.B.8, 1.B.9) | 6 |
| College response to recommendation 2: | 8 |
| College response to recommendation 3 (Standard 9.A.3 and Policy 3.1): | 11 |
| College response to recommendation 4 (Policy A-6): | 18 |
| College response to recommendation 5 (Standards 3.B.3 and 3.D.4): | 19 |
| Conclusion | 20 |

Letter from President Ringle

The follow-up to the accreditation visit and this document represent a college-wide effort to address the recommendations made by the accreditation team. Each of the recommendations forwarded has been addressed. In the case of recommendations 1 and 2, significant progress has been made as the campus culture has continued to learn about and embrace planning, evaluation of institutional effectiveness, and assessment of learning outcomes as a necessary part of our daily work. In the case of recommendations 3, 4, and 5, the college has worked to resolve any issues of non-compliance.

If the accreditation process has as its primary purpose to assure the quality of the institution by identifying areas in need of attention and improvement, then it is clear that TMCC has benefited tremendously as we went through the self-study process and addressed the subsequent recommendations coming from the October 2005 visit. The results of our collective work will allow us to adjust the way we do business so that we can respond to the needs of an ever-changing society and move TMCC to a new level of excellence.

I want to thank Vice President Jowel Laguerre, who served as TMCC's accreditation liaison, and all of the administrators, faculty, and staff who contributed to this process and to making TMCC the high achieving, high performing community college it is. I consider it a tremendous privilege to serve as President of TMCC and look forward to working with the campus community to continue to both address the weaknesses and celebrate the strengths identified in the accreditation process.

Thank you,

Philip M. Ringle, Ph.D.
President
Truckee Meadows Community College

Introduction

Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC) is a two-year public higher education institution located in Reno, Nevada that primarily serves Northern Nevada, although students from more than 30 states have attended TMCC. Founded in 1971, TMCC has served more than half a million students.

TMCC hosted an accreditation team from the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities October 10-12, 2005. TMCC's accreditation was reaffirmed for ten years. The Commission's report included five recommendations, three of which involved non-compliance and required immediate attention (Exhibit A, "Dr. Sandra Elman's letters dated January 24, 2006 and October 10, 2006").

The focused interim report addresses the five recommendations as requested by the Commission. This report describes how TMCC has worked to address the issues raised in the recommendations and how the College has used these recommendations to improve policies, procedures, and practices to build a culture of evidence in planning, the evaluation of institutional effectiveness, and the assessment of student learning outcomes. The College has continued to build upon its conceptual framework for planning, evaluation, and assessment per recommendations 1 and 2. Similarly, in terms of addressing recommendations 3, 4, and 5, areas where the College was deemed out of compliance, the criteria for accreditation have been met.

This interim report is, like the 2005 Self Study, a product of the labor of numerous individuals representing various constituencies of the College. Administration, faculty, and staff have worked collaboratively to address each recommendation stemming from the October 2005 accreditation visit. Moreover, this interim report has been vetted by groups across the campus to generate additional input and to foster a greater collective awareness of its contents. The community has responded with support and professionalism in ensuring that TMCC meets the standards for accreditation.

Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities Recommendations and College Responses:

Northwest Recommendation 1. The Committee recommends the College continue its work in the evaluation of institutional effectiveness (Standard 1.B.2), in the use of the results of evaluation in ongoing planning processes (Standard 1.B.4), and in institutional research efforts, evaluation processes, and planning activities to document institutional effectiveness and communicate that effectiveness to its public (Standard 1.B.8, 1.B.9).

College response to recommendation 1:

In the TMCC Self Study 2005, the standard one committee noted the numerous administrative and academic planning processes that had been developed and implemented or were in the process of being developed. These processes included “a new program review process, a new process for faculty evaluations, a method of assessing general education outcomes, a new budget process, a new project request process to determine priorities for repair, additions, and renovations, and several capital projects” (Exhibit B, “Self Study 2005” p. 12). The Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities Comprehensive Evaluation Report commended TMCC for making “an excellent beginning in planning” in a number of areas: the Planning Council’s work on the mission and strategic goals, the operational goals, the Facilities Master Plan, the work of the Student Learning and Outcomes Assessment Committee, and the development of a unit planning process in Student Services (Exhibit C, “Comprehensive Evaluation Report” p. 40). However, the Comprehensive Evaluation Report also noted that “while progress is being made...assessment processes were in preliminary stages and not fully identified, nor had the processes been in place long enough to produce data that could be analyzed and used for improvement or to influence resource allocation” (Exhibit C, “Comprehensive Evaluation Report” p. 5). In other words, the conceptual framework for planning was in place, but had not been in effect long enough either to determine the strengths and weaknesses of each planning vehicle or to amass enough data through meaningful assessment to influence resource allocation.

In response to the Comprehensive Evaluation Report, the administration, faculty, and staff developed strategies for building on the conceptual framework in place: the continuation of the planning and assessment activities already implemented and the development of new activities; a collective dedication to creating a culture of evidence that turned to data in order to make a direct link between data and academic and administrative planning; and the improvement of lines of communication regarding planning activities and institutional effectiveness.

Continuation of Existing and Development of New Planning Activities and Assessment Practices (1.B.2)

Program Integrity: The College has moved into the fourth year of its Program and Discipline Review process. All TMCC programs and disciplines undergo the Program and Discipline Review process, which is designed to provide essential review and feedback of program breadth and depth and course sequencing (Exhibit 1.1, “Program, Degree and Discipline Review Guidelines and Templates”). The review process includes a comprehensive self study and the

consideration and approval of that study by a college-wide representative group or the Program and Discipline Review Committee (PDRC), the Faculty Senate Academic Standards Committee, the Faculty Senate as a whole, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the President, and the Board of Regents (Exhibit 1.2, “Program and Discipline Review Flowchart”). Faculty and administration concur that the Program and Discipline Review process is rigorous, generative of useful data for program and discipline improvement, and a direct link to resource allocation, especially in cases where new personnel may be needed (Exhibit 1.3, “2005-2006 Program and Discipline Review Self Studies with Evaluation Reports”). Therefore, the Program and Discipline Review process closes the loop from planning, implementation, evaluation, and resource allocation. As of spring 2007, 27 programs and disciplines have been reviewed since the inception of this model with 36 programs and disciplines slated for review from fall 2007 to 2013, when the cycle of review will begin anew (See Appendix F in Exhibit 1.1, “Program, Degree and Discipline Review Guidelines and Templates”).

Operational Goals, the Planning Council, and TMCC’s Strategic Plan 2006-2012: The annual creation of TMCC’s Operational Goals has undergone a process of continued growth and refinement. The Operational Goals are a product of an internal dialogue within each area of the College. Each administrative member of the President’s Cabinet brings forth the determined annual priorities for his or her area. A comparison of the 2003-2004 Operational Goals and the 2006-2007 Operational Goals demonstrates the degree to which measurable outcomes have been more central to the process (Exhibit 1.4 and 1.5, “2003-2004 Operational Goals” and “2006-2007 Operational Goals”). In 2003-2004 the Operational Goals were insulated to the internal discussions of the respective areas of the College from which they were derived. The final point of discussion of the operational goals then rested with the President’s Cabinet, which would review the goals twice a year. While the President’s Cabinet continues in this practice of reviewing operational goals twice a year, starting in 2005-2006 the Planning Council served as the public forum at which the Vice Presidents would present to the broader campus community their annual goals at the start of the year. The Vice Presidents then followed up with a report on the successful completion of these goals at the end of the academic year to the same audience (Exhibits 1.6, 1.7, and 1.8 “Planning Council 2005-2006 Minutes,” “Planning Council 2005-2006 Agendas,” and “Executive Summary: Operational Goals 2005-2006”).

TMCC’s Planning Council has representation from every College constituency (Exhibits 1.9 and 1.10, “Membership Lists for 2005-2006 and 2006-2007” and “Planning Council Charge”; see also <http://www.tmcc.edu/planningcouncil/>). The Planning Council is an advisory body charged with the responsibility of establishing strategic goals, reviewing operational goals for consistency with strategic planning objectives, establishing benchmarks for institutional effectiveness, and engaging the College community in substantive discussions about issues critical to successful planning. The Planning Council served as the oversight body for the 2005 accreditation process. At the time of the 2005 Northwest Commission visit, the Strategic Planning 2002-2005 document articulated TMCC’s mission, goals, and projected activities (Exhibit 1.11, “Strategic Plan 2002-2005”). This document functioned as a kind of stepping stone in TMCC’s establishment of its conceptual framework for planning and the evaluation of institutional effectiveness. Throughout 2005-2006, the Planning Council membership met monthly to determine the content of the next strategic planning cycle, and in September 2006 presented to the College community the TMCC Strategic Plan 2006-2012 (Exhibit 1.12 and 1.13, “Strategic

Plan 2006-2012” and “Strategic Plan 2006-2012: Executive Summary”). The Strategic Plan 2006-2012 Executive Summary was then presented at the Board of Regents October 2006 meeting for official system acceptance (Exhibit 1.14 “Board of Regents Agenda and Minutes October 2006”).

The Strategic Plan 2006-2012 as a document demonstrates quite clearly the evolution of planning at TMCC and the College’s acceptance of the Northwest Commission’s charge to continue to build upon the conceptual framework for planning and the evaluation of the institutional effectiveness noted in the Comprehensive Evaluation Report. The Strategic Plan 2006-2012 demonstrates greater depth of consideration of each strategic goal with the accompanying number of objectives and selected activities. Moreover, the new plan included an eighth goal—Student Success. Most importantly, the new strategic plan includes a list of measurable outcomes for each strategic goal. This addition stands as a clear example of the maturation of the College’s planning practices and commitment to meaningful evaluation of activities at every level.

Academic Master Plan 2006-2013: In 2003 TMCC contracted with the consulting firm of Paulien and Associates to help lead the Academic Affairs team in the first phase of the development of the Academic Master Plan. The study resulted in the following:

- An environmental scan
- A demographic study relevant to the College
- A projection of enrollment growth for each division based on clusters of disciplines
- A projection of faculty and staff needs for each division--the study specifically attempted to have the faculty need based on a ratio of sixty percent full-time to forty percent part-time
- A space needs analysis to accommodate anticipated growth

A facilities master planning process was subsequently initiated. The Facilities Master Plan took the Paulien data into consideration and anticipated the needed gross square footage for TMCC, the College’s deficit in space, and the projection of an infrastructure to meet the needs of the College in the years to come (Exhibit 1.15, “Facilities Master Plan”).

In 2003 the Vice President for Academic Affairs charged the academic deans with developing an academic master plan. At the time of the 2005 Northwest Accreditation visit, the academic master planning process was still in its early stages. The academic deans were engaged in discussions internal to their areas to generate the content for the plan, but as of October 2005, no draft existed of the actual master plan. Since that time, the department chairs, academic deans, and Vice President for Academic Affairs continued their work, compiling extensive data and campus-wide input on program development and departmental goals into the preliminary Academic Master Plan 2006-2013 (Exhibit 1.16, “Academic Master Plan 2006-2013”). This document reflects the depth of the discussion that occurred campus-wide and all the work done by committees that ultimately led to the final plan. From this work, the Academic Affairs team then generated the Academic Master Plan 2006-2013: Executive Summary, which was presented to the college community at the Planning Council, Extended Cabinet, and Faculty Senate (Exhibits 1.17, 1.18, 1.19, and 1.20, “Academic Master Plan 2006-2013: Executive Summary,” “Planning Council Agenda,” “Extended Cabinet Agenda,” and “Faculty Senate Agenda”). The

Academic Master Plan is linked directly to the findings of the Facilities Master Plan and the strategic goals listed in the Strategic Plan 2006-2012. The Academic Master Plan was approved by the NSHE Board of Regents on March 16, 2007 (Exhibit 1.21, “Board of Regents Agenda” p. 11 and “Student and Academic Affairs Committee” p. 4).

Administrative Unit Review Process: The Administrative Unit Review process was created to serve as the administrative equivalent to the Program and Discipline Review process. As of the October 2005 Northwest Accreditation visit, the first cycle of the administrative review process was underway; however, because this initial review was in mid-process, the TMCC Self Study 2005 did not contain any information about the process or present any exhibits. Since April 2005 a total of ten administrative units have either completed the review process or are currently undergoing the review process (See Appendix B in Exhibit 1.22, “Administrative Unit Review Guidelines and Templates”). The Administrative Unit Review process follows many of the same practices of the Program and Discipline Review process, including an in-depth self study process that includes employee and customer satisfaction surveys, operational and strategic planning goals, and considerations of budget and resource issues for the unit (Exhibit 1.23, “Administrative Unit Self Studies 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 with Evaluation Reports”). Each self study is then reviewed by a committee composed of representation from every area of the College. The AURC report is given to the respective Vice President for consideration and the subsequent creation of an action plan for the unit. Finally, the administrative unit then gives a public presentation of its self study and action plan to the Extended Cabinet in October of the following year.

Creating a Culture of Evidence, Acceptance, and Engagement through Enhanced Communication (1.B.4, 1.B.8, 1.B.9)

With the continuation of existing planning activities and the initiation of some new ones since October 2005, various college constituencies have become increasingly aware of the need for a data-driven decision-making process at all levels of college planning and activities. As a result, college planning documents increasingly reflect a direct link to budgetary processes (Exhibits 1.17 and 1.5, “Academic Master Plan 2006-2013: Executive Summary” and “2006-2007 Operational Goals”). Similarly, the Program and Discipline Review and Administrative Unit Review cycles include as a part of the self study process considerations for human and fiscal resources as the respective academic department or administrative unit constructs and justifies its operational and strategic goals. The campus community has incorporated a greater awareness and acceptance of the need for a culture of evidence at the operational and tactical levels. The move towards a longer term link between planning and budgetary processes is somewhat hamstrung by the Nevada legislative biennial budgeting process and a problematic enrollment projection model that has led to erratic funding patterns. However, TMCC’s administrative response to the fiscal uncertainties of the state budgetary process also demonstrates a clear link between planning and budget processes. Rather than tether the College’s operational budget to the legislature’s enrollment projections for the College, the President, the Director of Institutional Research, and the Vice President of Finance and Administrative Services worked together to determine a more plausible enrollment growth number. Subsequently, the administration used this internal number for budgeting processes while holding funds in reserve to cover the differential between the legislatively determined projected growth number and the

actual growth of the College. As a result, this academic year, instead of being substantially short of funds, the use of the alternative internal enrollment growth number and the reserve funds have allowed TMCC to stay fiscally sound in comparison to many other institutions in the state.

The administration understands that, in order to create a campus culture accepting of data-driven planning and evaluation processes, it is necessary to provide avenues and spaces for solid communication and discussion at every level. To this end, the President delivers a comprehensive state of the college address at the start of each semester during which all planning processes and budgetary concerns are presented to the campus community. The President also sends out a monthly newsletter that frequently presents on these same issues (Exhibit 1.24, “President’s Newsletters 2005-2007”). Moreover, the Vice President of Finance and Administrative Services created the ad hoc budget advisory committee, which came into being in fall 2004 with three objectives: to identify information needed to develop a broad-based understanding of the resources available to TMCC; to identify what is needed to increase the understanding of the budget development and resource allocation processes; and to generate more input and dialogue from various college constituencies in the budget process, which would allow the college to explore and discuss new ideas and methodologies to enhance the budget process. This process resulted in the creation of a Web site and the public posting of the calendar, budget, new requests, and status of the (annual and biennial) budget development (<http://www.tmcc.edu/budget/>). The Budget Office staff members also conduct training sessions to create better awareness of budgetary processes for the campus at-large.

Along with being supportive of an open and inclusive process for strategic and tactical planning processes, the administration is also fully engaged in communicating the results of those planning processes to the campus community. For example, both the 2006-2012 Strategic Plan and the 2006-2013 Academic Master Plan were presented at various campus forums, including Presidential addresses, the Extended Cabinet, and the Faculty Senate before then being presented to the Board of Regents for system-wide acceptance. Moreover, the Program and Discipline Review and Administrative Unit Review processes also include public forums wherein the chair of the respective unit or department presents to the campus the results of the self-study and evaluation process. Furthermore, in terms of the long term completion of the recommendations generated out of the Program and Discipline Review reports, the Vice President for Academic Affairs presents a follow-up report to the Faculty Senate’s Academic Standards Committee for each program and discipline (Exhibit 2.6, “Program and Discipline Review Follow-Up Reports to 2003-2004 Reviews”). Finally, the Planning Council has dedicated much of the 2006-2007 meeting schedule to a discussion of how to create broader awareness of planning processes among faculty (Exhibits 1.6 and 1.25, “Planning Council 2005-2006 Minutes” and “Planning Council Talking Points”). In keeping with this agenda, the Planning Council will convene a series of forums for the campus community in 2007-2008.

Northwest Recommendation 2. Educational program assessment remains at the preliminary stages. The institution’s student learning outcomes are identified, but the committee did not find evidence that the processes for assessing those outcomes are clearly defined, encompass all of the program’s offerings, are conducted on a regular basis, and are integrated in the overall planning and evaluation plan (Standard 2.B.1). Further, the

committee found no evidence that, through regular and systematic assessment, the College demonstrates that students who complete its programs, no matter where or how they are offered, have achieved these outcomes (Standard 2.B.2); and the committee found no evidence that assessment activities lead to the improvement of teaching and learning (Standard 2.B.3). The Committee recommends that the College take immediate action to address these issues.

College response to recommendation 2:

Since the 2005 Self Study, the College has taken several steps to address immediately the concerns articulated in recommendation 2. Administration, faculty, and staff have been committed to building a lasting conceptual framework for providing meaningful assessment and learning outcomes at TMCC. This infrastructure manifests itself in several areas: staffing, knowledge, and policy.

- Since 2005 the College has had a faculty coordinator of student learning outcomes and assessment (SLOA) who maintains regular communications concerning assessment activities to the college community and helps faculty and departments improve their expertise in learning outcomes and assessment (Exhibits 2.1 and 2.2, “Coordinator for Learning Outcomes and Assessment Job Description” and “Professional Development Day Materials”).
- The College has a new Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Web site that provides useful resources for faculty engaged in assessment (<http://www.tmcc.edu/vp/aa/Assessment/>). The College grew the number of faculty and administrators who participated in training. As an example, the number of individuals attending the last international assessment conference at the University of Indiana and Purdue University at Indianapolis increased from two to five, with evidence of a growing interest in future conference attendance. The Northern Nevada Assessment Conference attracted approximately 40 participants from TMCC this year (Exhibit 2.3, “5th Annual Northern Nevada Assessment Conference Announcement”).
- Through the shared governance process, the College has put in place policies and procedures for ongoing assessment reports.

Faculty and administrators have worked diligently to improve the processes for assessing outcomes in programs, disciplines, and courses. With respect to programs, the SLOA Coordinator held workshops in fall 2006 to assist career program coordinators, their department chairs or directors, and the academic deans in improving program outcomes and measures (Exhibit 2.4, “Assessment Workshop Presentation and Attendance List”). Additionally, the SLOA Coordinator has worked with programs individually to accomplish the same goal. These efforts have contributed to an improvement in the quality of program assessment plans and of the efforts to measure outcomes. All but one of the 2005-06 program reports document student achievement of at least one program outcome; these reports can be found at <http://www.tmcc.edu/vp/aa/Assessment/programoutcomes/plansreports/> (Exhibit 2.5, “Assessment Plans and Reports 2001-2006”).

Moreover, program, degree and discipline review reports submitted to the Program and Discipline Review Committee and division-generated submissions of content for the new

Academic Master Plan illustrate an increased attention to and participation in measuring program level outcomes in the College's evaluation and planning processes (Exhibits 1.3 and 1.17, "2005-2006 Program and Discipline Review Self Studies with Evaluation Reports" and "Academic Master Plan 2006-2013: Executive Summary"). The Vice President for Academic Affairs presented to Faculty Senate's Academic Standards Committee a summary of the program recommendations and the status of implementation of those recommendations (Exhibit 2.6, "Program and Discipline Review Follow-up Reports to 2003-2004 Reviews").

With respect to courses and disciplines, TMCC is about to complete the curriculum review process to ensure that all courses have learning outcomes and proposed measures. Additionally, the Curriculum Committee published a set of guidelines for learning outcomes and measures that apply to new courses (Exhibits 2.7 and 2.8, "Guidelines for Learning Outcomes Statements and Measures for Curriculum Development" and "Faculty Senate Motion Tracking, Academic Year 2006")

<http://www.tmcc.edu/facultysenate/downloads/documents/committees/curriculum/FacSenGuidelinesLearnOutcomeCurrDev.pdf>). These efforts improved the quality of TMCC's course outcomes and measures. In spring 2006, after approval from the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee and Faculty Senate, TMCC defined a process and established guidelines for discipline assessment reports (Exhibits 2.9 and 2.8, "Guidelines for a TMCC Discipline Assessment Report" and "Faculty Senate Motion Tracking, Academic Year 2006"). These reports require faculty within the same discipline to inform their academic deans, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the President annually of the progress made both in assessing course outcomes and in using the results to improve student learning. The first set of reports, due in spring 2007, will provide evidence of student learning and reflect the steps the College has taken to integrate assessment into planning and evaluation.

Prior to the creation of the discipline assessment reporting process, the College engaged in a pilot assessment project for general education courses in spring 2006. The pilot included eight disciplines across four divisions and attempted to develop a critical mass of faculty engaged in meaningful general education assessment. The results can be found in the General Education Pilot Report (Exhibit 2.10, "TMCC General Education Pilot Report-Fall 2006") (See also Appendix A of this report for an excerpt of the results). The report contains evidence that students are achieving general education learning outcomes in individual disciplines and that faculty members are using the results of assessment activities to improve student learning. Although the pilot only lasted for one semester, each discipline has continued to broaden and enhance their assessment procedures during the 2006-07 academic year; the annual discipline assessment reports should reflect these improvements. The broad implementation of assessment processes stemming from the results of the pilot has begun with each of four divisions selecting courses within their curricula to implement assessment.

The College also adjusted its assessment governance structure. From 2004 to 2006, the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee, which had over 25 members, was responsible for assessment in courses, disciplines, programs, and general education (Exhibit 2.11, "SLOA Committee Meeting Notes"). As the original SLOA Committee had completed the difficult work of establishing learning abilities, an assessment reporting structure, and assessment report guidelines, committee members felt that the large version of SLOA had accomplished its primary

goals. In spring 2006, SLOA changed both its membership and charge to create a smaller body to oversee the implementation of the new assessment procedures. The newly reconfigured SLOA serves as the representative institution-wide body for assessment oversight and provides policy guidance for course, discipline, and program level student learning outcomes and assessment issues. In spring 2007, SLOA is reconfiguring TMCC's graduate outcome survey so that it directly matches the current general education learning abilities and college services; the previous surveys, which can be found at <http://www.tmcc.edu/ir/survey/>, document that the vast majority of students since 2000 self-reported achieving general education learning outcomes (Exhibit 2.12, "Graduate Survey"). In spring 2007, Faculty Senate created a General Education Committee that will oversee general education assessment issues. Its initial focus will be procedures for submitting a general education course; however, in future semesters, it will construct a more comprehensive general education assessment approach to supplement the annual discipline assessment reports.

Noted Accomplishments:

- In the last two years, the College has required that courses submitted to the Faculty Senate's Curriculum Committee must contain learning outcome statements in order to be considered complete (Exhibit 2.13, "Master Course Outline"). Most courses have statements of learning outcomes. Classroom assessment, in its second year of implementation and supported by the shared governance process, is therefore one of the steps the College has taken to measure student learning.
- For over two years, the College has required that programs submitted to the Faculty Senate's Academic Standards Committee have statements of program outcomes. All approved programs have established statements of learning outcomes (Exhibit 2.14, "Program/Degree/Certificate Endorsement Tracking Form").
- On a three-year cycle, each career program submits a report of its assessment activities (Exhibit 2.15, "Program Outcomes Assessment Reporting Calendar").
- To tie assessment to relevant planning efforts, the College made two decisions: inclusion of the assessment report in the Program and Discipline Review process and the division of assessment work/responsibilities between the offices of Academic Affairs, Institutional Research and the Center for Teaching and Learning. Each office is charged with portions of the plan (Exhibits 1.1 and 2.16, "Program, Degree and Discipline Review Guidelines and Templates" p. 8 and "General Education-Learning Outcomes and Assessment Handbook" p. 36).

Over the past few years, the College has taken steps to strengthen learning outcomes and assessment. TMCC faculty members have been willing to assess student learning. However, historically their efforts have lacked proper academic leadership oversight to achieve the goal of sustained and comprehensive assessment of learning outcomes across the curriculum. However, over the past four years, the gaps between the faculty's willingness to work on assessment, the existence of the faculty leadership needed to support this activity, and sustained administrative support have begun to close. Prior to the October 2005 accreditation visit, and certainly in the subsequent year and half, a majority of faculty and an important cohort of faculty leaders have stepped up their efforts to design and implement successful assessment of program outcomes and student learning. To this end, faculty and academic administrative leaders have been working

together to make the framework for assessment processes inclusive of the following three elements (See Appendix B of this report):

1. A consistent policy
2. Committed personnel and clearly articulated assessment processes
3. Administrative and academic leadership

Program, discipline, and course assessment activities are no longer in their infancy at TMCC. The establishment of SLOA, greater faculty knowledge about learning outcomes and measures, the appointment of an assessment coordinator, new reporting processes, and the reconfigured governance structure has ensured that assessment practices at TMCC will be a continuous effort thoroughly integrated into planning and evaluation. With this conceptual framework in place, the faculty and administration, working in concert, are making assessment practices a part of the culture at TMCC.

Northwest Recommendation 3. While many statements and representations about programs and course offerings are clear, factually accurate, and current, serious exceptions were found in the catalog and course program guides and listings, most notably programs and courses which are no longer offered and inaccurate statements regarding the length of time to degree (Policy 3.1; Standard 9.A.3). The Committee recommends that the College take action to comply with Policy 3.1 and Standard 9.A.3 by updating the catalog and course program guides to accurately depict basic information on programs and courses.

College response to recommendation 3 (Standard 9.A.3 and Policy 3.1):

The College agrees there were statements in the *TMCC Course Catalog* that to a certain extent did not reflect current information regarding programs. In particular, the catalog listed programs and courses that were no longer offered and had not been submitted for deactivation. In an effort to determine the validity of a program or course, the academic deans consulted with department chairs and faculty and reviewed the history of the college course approval process and the status of those programs and courses reviewed during recent years. To be effective and thorough, a review was conducted of all courses. This review led to faculty verifying whether courses were slated to be offered in the future.

Since the release of the Northwest Comprehensive Evaluation Report, the academic deans, working closely with faculty, assumed the responsibility of updating the *TMCC Course Catalog* (Exhibit 3.1, “Academic Deans Recommended Catalog Revisions Meeting 7/20/2006”). While the statements on pages 9, 13, and 14 of the Comprehensive Evaluation Report helped to clarify required changes, the academic deans and department chairs took advantage of the evaluation team’s recommendations to make appropriate and more extensive changes in the curriculum by updating course listings and by ensuring that course descriptions and program information were accurate (Exhibit C, “Comprehensive Evaluation Report”).

The academic deans’ first action was to remove the expected salary range listings for each degree currently listed in the *TMCC Course Catalog*. While this information was useful, the academic deans and department chairs agreed that TMCC could not guarantee the accuracy or currency of the salary information. Additionally, the academic deans have implemented a plan to

include a listing of the proposed sequence of courses for each degree and certificate program. This information would then allow potential students to understand the actual length of each program offered at TMCC from general education requirements and prerequisites to required courses for the program of study itself. The course sequence information listings for each degree and certificate program will be completed by April 2008 and will be included in the course catalog for that academic year.

The Comprehensive Evaluation Report also noted that the page section and lettering format in the *TMCC Course Catalog* was confusing to follow. As a result, alphabetical sections have been inserted to manage the flow of information, and a new table of contents will establish the order of those sections. The academic deans and the Director of the Public Information Office believe these structural changes will make it faster and easier for students to locate information within the *TMCC Course Catalog*. Other significant changes to the format of the *TMCC Course Catalog* include:

- The TMCC mission statement and strategic goals have been placed more prominently toward the front in Section A, page 3 of the catalog.
- General degree information has been removed from the worksheet section and moved to the front of the catalog with the section articulating general education requirements.
- The academic disciplines worksheets have been reorganized alphabetically with degrees and/or certificates listed together in a cluster.

The establishment of a program worksheet format with specific elements for each degree, emphasis, or major ensures a consistent layout within the *TMCC Course Catalog*. The elements include: 1) title of discipline, degree; 2) an introduction that designates the program of study as a degree, emphasis, or area of study within a general degree; 3) program information; 4) general education requirements; 5) core requirements; 6) special requirements; and 7) contact information.

The Northwest Commission's Comprehensive Evaluation Report noted specific areas of concern in the catalog that needed to be rectified immediately for the College to be in compliance with Standard 9.A.3 and Policy 3.1. The following represents a list of actions taken in response to the recommendations made by the evaluation team.

Comprehensive Evaluation Report Recommendation (p. 9). The 2005-06 College Catalog includes a Certificate of Achievement in Accounting Technology. This program is being developed as a program option from the college curriculum. There have been no students officially registered in the program. Faculty have reported that when students inquire about the certificate they are encouraged into other related programs.

College response: The Accounting Technology Certificate of Achievement has been deactivated (Exhibit 3.2, "Program/Degree/Certificate Endorsement Tracking Form-Accounting Technology"). In addition, the academic deans and department chairs have deactivated or

revamped the following programs to reflect more accurately the intent of the faculty and the curriculum (See Table I).

TABLE I

| Degree/Certificate | Action taken | Date of approval |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| AAS & Certificate of Achievement-Building System Maintenance Technician | Deactivation | 4/13/06 |
| AAS-Industrial Maintenance Technology | Deactivation | 4/13/06 |
| AAS-Engineering/Drafting | Deactivation | 4/13/06 |
| AAS-Heating, Ventilation, Air Conditioning/Refrigeration | Deactivation | 4/13/06 |
| Manufacturing Training Program | Deactivation | 4/13/06 |
| Certificate of Achievement-Automotive General Service Technician | Revision | 4/13/06 |
| AAS-Transportation Technologies: Automotive Certified Technician Emphasis | Revision | 4/13/06 |
| Certificate of Achievement- Automotive ASE Technician | Revision | 4/13/06 |
| AAS-Construction Technologies: Construction Management Emphasis | Revision | 4/13/06 |
| AAS-Paralegal/Law Emphasis | Revision | 4/13/06 |
| AAS-Manufacturing Technology: Machining Emphasis | New Program | 6/8/06 |
| AA-Architecture | Revision | 5/5/06 |
| AAS-Dietetic Technician | Revision | 5/5/06 |
| AA-Landscape Architecture | Revision | 5/5/06 |
| Certificate of Achievement-Electronics | Revision | 5/5/06 |
| AAS-Transportation Technologies: Diesel Technician | Revision | 5/5/06 |
| Certificate of Achievement-Diesel General Service Technician | Revision | 5/5/06 |
| Certificate of Achievement-Heating, Ventilation, Air Conditioning/Refrigeration | Revision | 5/5/06 |
| Certificate of Achievement-Industrial Systems Technology | Revision | 5/5/06 |
| AAS-Manufacturing Technologies: Electronics Emphasis | Revision | 5/5/06 |
| Certificate of Achievement-Welding Technology | Revision | 5/5/06 |
| AAS-Construction Technologies: Welding Emphasis | Revision | 5/5/06 |
| Apprenticeship, Building Trades | Revision | 10/11/06 |
| AS-Biology | New Emphasis | 10/11/06 |
| AS-Computer Science | New Emphasis | 10/11/06 |

| | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Certificate of Achievement-Construction Management Business | Deactivation | 10/10/06 |
| Certificate of Achievement-Drafting | Revision | 10/10/06 |
| Degree/Certificate | Action taken | Date of approval |
| AAS-Manufacturing Technology: Production Systems | New Emphasis | 10/11/06 |
| AS-Chemistry Emphasis | New Emphasis | 11/6/06 |
| AS-Mathematics Emphasis | New Emphasis | 11/6/06 |
| AS-Dietetic Emphasis | New Emphasis | 11/6/06 |
| AS-Physics Emphasis | New Emphasis | 11/6/06 |
| AS-Engineering Emphasis | Revision | 11/6/06 |
| AAS-Radiologic Technology | Revision | 11/6/06 |
| AA-Fine Arts: Musical Theater Emphasis | New Emphasis | 1/8/07 |
| AA-Fine Arts: Dance Emphasis | New Emphasis | 1/8/07 |
| AS-Geoscience Emphasis | New Emphasis | 1/8/07 |
| AAS-Construction Technologies: HVAC/R Emphasis | New Emphasis | 1/8/07 |
| Certificate of Achievement-Business-Accounting Technology | Deactivation | 3/19/07 |
| AAS-Manufacturing Technologies: Electronics Emphasis | Revision | 3/19/07 |
| Certificate of Achievement-Electronics | Revision | 3/19/07 |

Comprehensive Evaluation Report Recommendation (p. 13). While the process is defined, many faculty members find the process for curricular changes confusing or express concern regarding the communication of final administrative approvals and subsequent publication of the curricular changes. In some cases, catalog changes do not reflect the changes that were presumably approved.

College response: The Chair of the Curriculum Committee, Faculty Senate Chair, and the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs discussed the need to inform the faculty and the community at large of actions taken during the curriculum approval process. To this end, those groups involved in the curriculum approval process created the Curriculum Newsletter to communicate to the entire campus significant curriculum issues and the status of programs and courses currently under review. The Vice President for Academic Affairs has supported the Chair of the Curriculum Committee in these efforts (Exhibit 3.3, “TMCC Curriculum Newsletters”). The office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs also publishes an annual report of curricula and program actions taken annually on its Web site (Exhibits 3.4, 3.5, and 3.6, “Curriculum Final Reports, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007,” “Common Course Numbering Modification Reports, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007,” and “New and Revised Program Reports, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007”). Furthermore, the Faculty Senate publishes on its Web site the results of curricula actions, and the Faculty Senate Chair reports on these actions at each Faculty Senate meeting (Exhibit 3.7, “Faculty Senate Motion Tracking, Academic Years 2006 and 2007”). The Faculty Senate Web site also has a procedures document to assist faculty with submitting programs and courses to the Curriculum Committee and the Academic Standards Committee (Exhibit 3.8, “Guide to Curriculum and Program Development Procedures”). The

Curriculum Process Chart demonstrates the path required for approval and demonstrates the complexity of the process. A proposal may be rejected, tabled, withdrawn or returned for more information or the initiator may be asked to work with another discipline (Exhibit 3.9, “Curriculum Process Chart”).

Faculty members are notified of the results of their curricula submissions in various ways: official notification via email, publication in the curriculum newsletter, and the annual report of curricula/program actions. Following the action a tracking form is submitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs with the curriculum/program proposal. Any action taken by the Vice President for Academic Affairs is noted on the form, and the decision is communicated to the faculty via the Faculty Senate Web site and in the Faculty Senate Chair’s report to the Faculty Senate.

Comprehensive Evaluation Report Recommendation (p. 13). Also, while NUTR 106 and NURS 90, 120B, 292B, 198B, 204B, 211, 240B, 260, 275B, 290B, 296, and EMTP 100B have been deleted from the program offerings, the catalog still lists them as potential course offerings.

College response: The academic deans and department chairs took the actions reflected in Table II and documented in the exhibits for some of these courses (Exhibit 3.10, “Master Course Outlines-NURS 090, NURS 275B, and NUTR 106”). For example, the nursing program is in the process of revamping its curriculum. Several of the nursing courses will become a part of the new program and will be offered on a regular basis. One weakness identified in the College’s curriculum process is the absence of a projected starting date for when a new course will be offered for the first time once it has been approved. The academic deans and department chairs are working to rectify this omission in the curriculum process to reflect the date a course or program will be offered. This addition will ensure greater accountability and monitoring of curriculum development.

TABLE II

| Course Number | College Action | Comments |
|----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| EMTP 100B | Never been taught | Reference in catalog has been removed. |
| NURS 090 | Offered spring 1997 | This course will be deactivated. |
| NURS 120B | Deactivated spring 2007 | The department has changed its curriculum and no longer needs this course. |
| NURS 198B | Deactivated spring 2007 | The department has changed its curriculum and no longer needs this course. |
| NURS 204 | Offered spring 2004 | This course will be revised and offered in spring/fall 2008. |
| NURS 211 | Never been taught | This course will be revised and offered in spring/fall |

| Course Number | College Action | Comments |
|----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | 2008. |
| NURS 240B | Offered spring 2007 | This course will be revised and offered in spring/fall 2008. |
| NURS 260 | Deactivated spring 2007 | This course will no longer be offered. |
| NURS 275B | Offered fall 2002 | This course will be deactivated. |
| NURS 290B | Deactivated spring 2007 | This course will no longer be offered. |
| NURS 292B | Deactivated fall 1977 | This course will no longer be offered. |
| NURS 296 | Deactivated spring 2007 | This course will no longer be offered. |
| NUTR 106 | Offered spring 2005 | This course will be deactivated. |

Comprehensive Evaluation Report Recommendation (p. 13). A procedure or process for acknowledging and documenting final administrative decisions would clarify the approval or non-approval of the modifications and facilitate accurate catalog changes. This process should be reviewed to ensure a clearly defined process for curricular changes.

College response: The office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies via email the final action of the curriculum approval process to the faculty member, academic dean, department chair, curriculum committee chair, and the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment (SLOA) Coordinator, if appropriate. The original materials are delivered to the Records Supervisor in the Admissions and Records Office. The office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs keeps a copy of the final materials and forwards copies to the respective academic dean’s office, Faculty Senate Office, and to the Associate Dean of Extended Day Services who serves as TMCC’s liaison for Common Course Numbering with the Nevada System of Higher Education. As mentioned earlier, the results are published in the Curriculum Newsletter and on the Faculty Senate Web site.

Comprehensive Evaluation Report Recommendation (p. 13). (1) The course catalog program information for Radiologic Technology does not include NURS 130B (6 credits) and LTE 110 (4 credits); however, since these are required courses to be accepted into the program, these courses need to be included in the degree pre-requisites.

College response: These courses will be included in future TMCC course catalogs and no later than the 2008-2009 catalog publication (Exhibit 3.11, “Program/Degree/Certificate Endorsement Tracking Form-AAS/Radiologic Technology”).

Comprehensive Evaluation Report Recommendation (p. 13). In addition, the course catalog identifies the program’s [Radiologic Technology] length as six semesters; however, seven

semesters would be necessary to complete the prerequisites (BIOL 223, 224, ENG 101, MATH 105B, and RT 100B) and the core requirements.

College response: The Radiologic Technology program offers courses throughout the year. As a health care program, the Radiologic Technology program is subject to its own discipline-specific accreditation requirements, which does extend the length of the program beyond six semesters. Therefore, students are committed to a program of study in keeping with these accreditation standards and of greater duration than other degree programs offered at TMCC. The department chair and academic dean have developed program materials and altered the catalog to reflect accurately the length of this program (Exhibit 3.12, “Radiologic Technology-AAS-Program Outline”).

Comprehensive Evaluation Report Recommendation (p. 13). (2) The program length for the Dental Hygiene AAS and AS degrees is listed as four semesters. Since the programs require 95 credit hours (AAS) and 101 credit hours (AS) for degree completion, more semesters are required to complete the degree.

College response: Faculty perceptions of the appropriate number of credits to offer in a degree program in order for students to be considered highly trained in a field are not always in accordance with the number of courses that can be offered if a program of study is to remain within the framework of a two year degree. TMCC’s Dental Hygiene programs reflect this difference of perceived need and prescribed time of completion. As a result, the academic dean and director are in the process of evaluating the length of these programs. With the program undergoing its accreditation review by the American Dental Association Commission on Dental Accreditation in spring 2008, both the director and academic dean anticipate major changes for the Dental Hygiene programs and their curriculum.

Moreover, the academic dean and director evaluated the length of TMCC’s Dental Hygiene program in comparison to those of other states. It is apparent that the number of credits for TMCC’s programs is slightly greater than others. In particular, the number of general education courses is higher for the AS program than what is required for other degree options at TMCC (Exhibit 3.13 “TMCC Course Catalog, General Education Requirements, pages B5 and B7”). The dean, the director, and the faculty will seek to streamline the course requirements for their degree options to be more consistent with the degree-time of other programs in the Northwest region. That change will be reflected in the 2008-2009 catalog.

Comprehensive Evaluation Report Recommendation (p. 13). (3) The program length for Dental Assisting AAS degree is listed as two semesters plus a five week summer session. Since 62.5 credit hours are required, more semesters are required to complete the degree.

College response: The length of the Dental Assisting program accounts only for the dental courses and not the other required courses. This program description is being corrected in program material and in the course catalog through the curriculum approval process (Exhibit 3.14, “Dental Assisting Program Layout for AAS and Certificate”).

Comprehensive Evaluation Report Recommendation (p. 13). (4) The Paramedic program requires more than the listed three semesters to complete the general education and core requirements.

College response: The Paramedic Program operates under the guidelines set forth by the State of Nevada EMS Board using the D.O.T. standards. The program prepares students to sit for the State Certification Examination as well as the National Registry Examination.

The core curriculum is built upon an integrative process that provides students with a broad and rigorous academic experience. Students receive substantial academic preparation in the areas of communication, computation, human relations, social sciences, and biological sciences. In most cases the areas cited are embedded throughout the core curriculum. However, in some cases the content is subject matter-specific such as in Special Consideration of Patients through Life-Span. Students' clinical rotations, both hospital and field experiences, provide them with the opportunity to demonstrate competency in the application and integration of instructional and practical experiences.

The core program is a maximum three semester program in which students complete the instructional portion and hospital rotations during the fall semester (first semester) and the first third of the spring semester. During the spring (second semester) session, students are engaged in field clinical rotations, which may extend into the summer (third semester) session. Those students who wish to earn the Certificate of Achievement will need to attend an additional semester (fourth semester) in order to complete the General Education requirements. Both the program and the certificate option will be revised and these revisions will be documented in program material and in the 2008-2009 catalog.

Conclusion: By taking the actions depicted in Tables I and II in this section and making the corrections described above, the College has met or has taken the appropriate steps to meet the requirements set forth in Standard 9.A. and Policy 3.1.

Northwest Recommendation 4. The College has contractual relationships with two privately owned schools of cosmetology and several apprenticeship training agreements. The Committee recommends that the College take immediate action to review these agreements to ensure that the College fulfills its responsibilities to maintain oversight of program course offerings and to appoint and validate the credentials of faculty teaching in these programs (Policy A-6).

College response to recommendation 4 (Policy A-6):

Review of contractual relationships: The contracts for Cosmetology were modified as College representatives met and discussed the issues with the owners of the schools. Appropriate changes to ensure TMCC oversight of the program's course offerings were made and new contracts signed effective November 4, 2005. New contracts were written for apprenticeship programs. These revisions were endorsed by the Western Apprenticeship Coordinators Association and signed as a part of all apprenticeship programs. Furthermore, all other contracts

where TMCC cooperates with non-accredited agencies were reviewed as they became due. In all cases, language was added to contracts to clearly identify TMCC as the responsible party for faculty oversight and for quality assurance of the curriculum and instruction (Exhibit 4.1, “Contractual Agreements”).

Change in oversight of faculty: TMCC amended its policy on minimum qualifications for faculty to ensure that faculty members possess required credentials and that there is a process for validating these credentials prior to appointment (Exhibit 4.2, “Faculty Qualification Policy”).

Northwest Recommendation 5. The Committee recommends that the Student Bill of Rights and the Student Complaint Process be well publicized and readily available to students (Standard 3.B.3) and that a policy be developed and adopted that specifies requirements for continuation in and termination from its educational programs to include an appeals process and a clearly defined policy for re-admission (Standard 3.D.4).

College response to recommendation 5 (Standards 3.B.3 and 3.D.4):

Student Bill of Rights: At the time of the 2005 Self Study, the Student Bill of Rights was only found in the Administrative Manual. The Vice President of Student Services Web page now provides a “Quicklink” to the Student Bill of Rights in its entirety and is cross-linked as a site index. The Student Bill of Rights can also be accessed from the “Current Students” Web page. Currently, each of the sections of the Student Bill of Rights is also published separately in either the *TMCC Course Catalog* appendices or on department Web pages. Also, a new appendix (T) was added to the *TMCC Course Catalog* for the Student Bill of Rights (Exhibit 5.1, “Student Bill of Rights”).

Student Complaint Policy: The Student Complaint Policy was approved last year by President’s Cabinet and the Faculty Senate. The policy is located on the Vice President of Student Services Web page within the “Quicklinks” section entitled “Student Policies and Procedures.” The complaint form can also be accessed from this page (Exhibits 5.2 and 5.3, “Student Complaint Policy” and “Student Complaint Form”).

Grievance Policy: The Grievance Policy is located in Appendix M of the *TMCC Course Catalog*. The forms can be either downloaded from the TMCC Web page or from the Equity and Diversity Web page under “Documents and Forms” (Exhibits 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6, “Grievance Form,” “Appendix M, *TMCC Course Catalog*” and “Sexual Harassment Complaint Form”).

The link from the “Student Services” section located on the Student Information Web page of the online version of the *TMCC Course Catalog* was showing an error, but has been corrected and links directly to the Student Services Web page in the online version of the *TMCC Course Catalog* and the student policies and procedures page.

Satisfactory Academic Progress Policy: The Satisfactory Academic Progress Policy was developed in the summer of 2006. It was approved by President’s Cabinet and the Academic Standards Committee of the Faculty Senate, and subsequently received full Faculty Senate

approval in the fall of 2006. Strategies are currently under development for implementation beginning in fall 2007 (Exhibit 5.7, “Satisfactory Academic Progress Policy”).

Focused Interim Report: Concluding Statement

The Comprehensive Evaluation Report provided useful directions and feedback to TMCC to evaluate several of its policies, procedures, and practices. In each case, TMCC administration, faculty, and staff moved quickly and effectively to address the concerns the visiting team noted in its report.

TMCC is in compliance in regard to Recommendations 3, 4 and 5. We have taken advantage of these recommendations to make substantive changes in our policies and practices.

APPENDIX A

| Discipline | Excerpts |
|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Anthropology | <p>The difficulty of getting the instructors to collect and submit data for the pilot was exacerbated by the lack of an in-place Anthropology Program Coordinator during the 2006 spring semester. There was confusion related to roles and responsibilities among everyone in the program during that time. This led to an initial hesitance to invest in the assessment process voluntarily. Data were not completely obtained for the spring semester until well into the summer, and they were not entirely consistently collected. In retrospect a training session for all involved regarding the new assessment collection process would have benefited the program staff. Also, it is evident that every discipline should identify staff to coordinate and facilitate the assessment process.</p> |
| Biology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General conclusions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The lower scores on the gradient test is likely the result of only counting the question correct if they answered 1 for a true question and 5 for a false question ○ Students came in with substantial understanding in some areas (questions 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 11) ○ In one case (question 9), the course resulted in a lower post-test score possibly the result of how the question was worded or due to stressing experimentation over other lines of scientific evidence ○ Overall, the results showed a small increase in understanding of the learning objectives. However, the assessment tool likely failed to assess the true impact of the course. • Modify pre/post test based on results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Considering the results overall and the information gathered on individual questions, the Biology 100 pre/post test was modified; the new version can be found in Appendix Four. ○ The updated version of the test contains 20 questions, 10 questions are true/false and 10 questions are multiple choice. The questions focus on the items that students did not come in with substantial knowledge regarding the characteristics of science and also incorporate some content knowledge and scientific reasoning. • Pre/post test was also developed for Biology 190 to be first implemented fall 2006, which can be found in Appendix Four. |
| English | <p>English 101: <i>The Issues:</i></p> <p>As this was the first course-level assessment of English 101, there are several issues that have been identified for the next assessment cycle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logistics—refine distribution and instructions for both instructors and students. • Focus of writing assignment—refine assignment to elicit stronger thesis-based essay. • Core indicators—refine definition of indicators; review indicators. |

| | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Norming—continue to work on common understanding of indicators and scoring methodology. <p>The most pressing issue will be to identify strategies to improve performance in the targeted areas and begin work with full- and part-time faculty to implement these strategies.</p> |
| Core Humanities | <p>The faculty has agreed that assessment instruments in the future need to be changed to address critical thinking. They also agreed that further workshops or seminars should be held to help part-time instructors to become more familiar with science and that administration should be asked to financially support such seminars. The results of this project should be distributed to part-time faculty so they can adjust their curriculum to improve instruction in CH 201. The next assessment project should be PHIL 101 or a different CH course.</p> |
| Psychology | <p>In order to attempt to change the deficiency noted in the spring 2005 data, a change was made to ensure that at each step in the course an emphasis was placed on application either through lab problems assigned or in class examples. Furthermore, each test now involves application type questions and the students now write a paper that involves application of research principles. The most current data (spring 2006) indicated that 18% exceed expectations, 73% meet expectation, and 9% fail to meet expectations. This data would suggest that the changes made in delivery and assignments have made a change in student outcomes.</p> |
| Political Science | <p>After reviewing the essays, it is clear that a majority of students had difficulty identifying, analyzing, and defending arguments. Future iterations of this class will devote more time to this issue. Specifically, I intend to work with students individually with writing tutorials to help them develop their analytic thinking skills. Additionally, I plan on integrating more activities that require students to identify and defend arguments into the classroom.</p> <p>In future semesters, I will use the same rubric but would like to expand the number of raters.</p> |
| Physics | <p>By comparison, nationally reported Hake gains in traditional lecture style physics courses are about 0.23 +/- 0.04 while reported Hake gains in active-learning style physics courses is about 0.48 +/- 0.14. My course results are much better than those achieved in lecture style course and on par with those achieved in active learning style courses. This is not surprising since I have been using active learning strategies in all of my courses since 1997.</p> <p>Specifically, how are you or how do you plan to use the results to improve student learning?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I plan to keep using an active learning approach in my courses. <p>Based on the results of this semester, will you revise your assessment activities? How and why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No, I plan to continue using the FCI. |

APPENDIX B

| Year | Discipline or Program | Results | Use of results | Effect on program | Reference |
|-------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| 2002 | Dental Hygiene | Positive feedback from patient survey | Policies and procedures are working | Reinforces effectiveness of our policy and procedures and methods of clinical teaching | Dental Hygiene Assessment Report Goal 3 |
| 2002 | Education Teacher Preparation | 83% of students enrolled in TMCC ETP courses during fall 2002 received an excellent evaluation on children's development | Results were disseminated to TMCC faculty and the goal is used in recruitment effort | Results contributed positively to TMCC ETP faculty awareness of an essential learning standard. | Education Assessment Report Goal 3 |
| 2002 | Engineering Drafting | 100% of employers responding to survey were satisfied with qualifications of graduates | Review and discuss at department meeting | Continue as a positive affect [sic] on program within the planned schedule | Engineering-Drafting Assessment Report Goal 3 |
| 2002 | Theatre | 50% of the graduating students transferred to a four-year degree program in theater. 50% have maintained their theater training as an avocation. 100% attended a professional level workshop in the field. 100% have | Results used to redefine portfolio requirements | Results have positively impacted the students' acceptance to higher education theater programs. Results have positively impacted the students' participation in avocation endeavors. | Theatre Assessment Report Goal 3 |

| | | | | | |
|------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | completed a theater resume. | | | |
| 2003 | Computer Information Technology | 50% of Advanced Java students scored 80% or better on portfolio project. 80% of students obtained a passing grade. Part-time instructor in Advanced Visual Basic failed to administer portfolio project. | Results indicate that assessment targets are too difficult to achieve. Inconsistency among instructors also prevented projects from being administered in all eligible classes. | Department will revise assessment targets to more accurately reflect student ability and realistic expectations. Department will also review all eligible course syllabi to ensure portfolio project is included. | Computer Information Technology Assessment Report Goal 2 |
| 2003 | Nursing | Results = 83.33% | Threshold revised to 85%, results analyzed. Possibly related to distance education program and leadership. Continue to monitor | Note: Included in previous column-Different format used. | Nursing Assessment Report Goal 4 |
| 2004 | Culinary Arts | Students demonstrated 50%-60% improvement on post-test | Define problem areas, such as English and Math comprehension. | Faculty is working to identify prospective students who can benefit from additional language and math education. | Associate of Applied Science, Culinary Arts Emphasis Assessment Report Goal 2 |
| 2004 | Dental Hygiene | Many low scores, 80% pass rate | Inter-instructor teaching/grading reliability needs to be improved. | Negatively impacts credibility. Negatively impacts students' success on State Boards. | Dental Hygiene Assessment Report Goal 3 |
| 2005 | Automotive | 25% of the students received all 8 ASE certifications | To determine final grade and competency level in each of the 8 | Was difficult to measure exact results. Did provide | Automotive Technician Educational Cooperative |

| | | | | | |
|------|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| | | (Master ASE Technician) status and 80% of the students received one or more of the 8 ASE certificates. | ASE areas. 95% goal was too high for our program. Adjust to a more realistic goal of 80% to receive at least one or more ASE certification. | employers with measured skill and grade report. | Program Assessment Report Goal 1 |
| 2206 | Dental Assisting | 2 students did not score above the national average of OJT/Schools in Radiation. Remaining students scored well above national average in main categories. | Student scores were close to target in Radiation. Instructors revised curriculum in low areas. | Scores above national average for all except two students. | Dental Assisting Program Goal 3 |
| 2006 | Welding Technology | This measurement criterion has not provided accurate data | Informal discussions with students have demonstrated that all students desiring employment in the welding field have been successful in obtaining entry level or higher position | The assessment measures and criterion need to be revisited to determine a more accurate and useful measure. | Welding Technology Program Assessment Report Goal 1 |

APPENDIX C

- A. Dr. Sandra Elman's letters dated January 24, 2006 and October 10, 2006
- B. Self Study 2005
- C. Comprehensive Evaluation Report
 - 1.1 Program, Degree and Discipline Review Guidelines and Templates
 - 1.2 Program and Discipline Review Flowchart
 - 1.3 2005-2006 Program and Discipline Review Self Studies with Evaluation Reports
 - 1.4 2003-2004 Operational Goals
 - 1.5 2006-2007 Operational Goals
 - 1.6 Planning Council 2005-2006 Minutes
 - 1.7 Planning Council 2005-2006 Agendas
 - 1.8 Executive Summary: Operational Goals 2005-2006
 - 1.9 Membership Lists for 2005-2006 and 2006-2007
 - 1.10 Planning Council Charge
 - 1.11 Strategic Plan 2002-2005
 - 1.12 Strategic Plan 2006-2012
 - 1.13 Strategic Plan 2006-2012: Executive Summary
 - 1.14 Board of Regents Agenda and Minutes, October 2006
 - 1.15 Facilities Master Plan
 - 1.16 Academic Master Plan 2006-2013
 - 1.17 Academic Master Plan 2006-2013: Executive Summary
 - 1.18 Planning Council Agenda
 - 1.19 Extended Cabinet Agenda
 - 1.20 Faculty Senate Agenda
 - 1.21 Board of Regents Agenda and Student and Academic Affairs Committee
 - 1.22 Administrative Unit Review Guidelines and Templates
 - 1.23 Administrative Unit Self Studies 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 with Evaluation Reports
 - 1.24 President's Newsletters 2005-2007
 - 1.25 Planning Council Talking Points
- 2.1 Coordinator for Learning Outcomes and Assessment Job Description
- 2.2 Professional Development Day Materials
- 2.3 5th Annual Northern Nevada Assessment Conference Announcement
- 2.4 Assessment Workshop Presentation and Attendance List
- 2.5 Assessment Plans and Reports 2001-2006
- 2.6 Program and Discipline Review Follow-up Reports to 2003-2004 Reviews
- 2.7 Guidelines for Learning Outcomes Statements and Measures for Curriculum Development
- 2.8 Faculty Senate Motion Tracking, Academic Year 2006
- 2.9 Guidelines for a TMCC Discipline Assessment Report
- 2.10 TMCC General Education Pilot Report-Fall 2006
- 2.11 SLOA Committee Meeting Notes
- 2.12 Graduate Survey
- 2.13 Master Course Outline

- 2.14 Program/Degree/Certificate Endorsement Tracking Form
- 2.15 Program Outcomes Assessment Reporting Calendar
- 2.16 General Education-Learning Outcomes and Assessment Handbook

- 3.1 Academic Deans Recommended Catalog Revisions Meeting 7/20/2006
- 3.2 Program /Degree/Certificate Endorsement Tracking Form-Accounting Technology
- 3.3 TMCC Curriculum Newsletters
- 3.4 Curriculum Final Reports, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007
- 3.5 Common Course Numbering Modification Reports, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007
- 3.6 New and Revised Program Reports, 2005-2006 and 2006-2007
- 3.7 Faculty Senate Motion Tracking, Academic Years 2006 and 2007
- 3.8 Guide to Curriculum and Program Development Procedures
- 3.9 Curriculum Process Chart
- 3.10 Master Course Outlines-NURS 090, NURS 275B, and NUTR 106
- 3.11 Program /Degree/Certificate Endorsement Tracking Form-AAS/Radiologic Technology
- 3.12 Radiologic Technology AAS-Program Outline
- 3.13 TMCC Course Catalog, General Education Requirements, pages B5 and B7
- 3.14 Dental Assisting Program Layout for AAS and Certificate

- 4.1 Contractual Agreements
- 4.2 Faculty Qualification Policy

- 5.1 Student Bill of Rights
- 5.2 Student Complaint Policy
- 5.3 Student Complaint Form
- 5.4 Grievance Form
- 5.5 Appendix M, *TMCC Course Catalog*
- 5.6 Sexual Harassment Complaint Form
- 5.7 Satisfactory Academic Progress Policy