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# **Executive Summary**

This report describes Lansing Community College (LCC) student learning outcomes assessment results for the Spring 2017 reporting period. This reporting period captures data collected during the Spring 2016 and Fall 2016 semesters. Comparisons are offered to LCC’s Spring 2016 reporting period that captured data collected during the Fall 2015 semester.

LCC Programs of Study reported program-level learning outcomes, methods of assessment, and connections from program-level learning outcomes to a common set of institutional learning outcomes. This evidence was analyzed by the Center for Data Science (CDS) with oversight of the Committee for Assessing Student Learning (CASL) to gain insight into:

* How we align program curriculums to a common set of institutional learning outcomes
* What we expect our students to learn and to what degree
* How we assess our students’ learning throughout a curriculum
* How well those assessment methods are aligned to our learning expectations

A summary of the assessment results follows:

**Result 1**: **92%** of LCC Programs of Study report curriculum alignment to a common set of institutional student learning outcomes. An increase of 14% from Spring 2016 to Spring 2017 reporting periods and 7% higher than the AAC&U benchmark of 85%.

**Result 2: 98%** of LCCPrograms of Study report program-level learning outcome statements for associate-level awards. An increase of 12% from Spring 2016 to Spring 2017 reporting periods and 11% higher than the AAC&U benchmark of 85%.

**Result 3:** Over half (**59%**) of A&S and HHS Program of Study learning outcomes require students to use moderate-level cognitive skills, with the greatest emphasis on applying or transferring learning from the classroom to other contexts. An increase of 6% from Spring 2016 to Spring 2017.

**Result 4: 90%** Programs of Study report one or more methods of assessment for each student learning outcome statement. An increase of 2% from Spring 2016 to Spring 2017 reporting periods and 3% higher than the AAC&U benchmark of 87%.

**Result 5**: LCC faculty primarily (**83%**) use performance-based assessments to assess students’ learning across the curriculums. No change from Spring 2016 to Spring 2017.

**Result 6: 95%** of identified assessment methods selected by LCC faculty are aligned to the Program of Study learning outcome statement. An increase of 19% from Spring 2016 to Spring 2017 reporting periods.

## **Assessment Scorecard**

The assessment scorecard shows results by the percentage that met the target and by color coding those results for a quick view of the current status. The targets are established through benchmarks of AAC&U member institutions. The green represents results at or above the target. The yellow represents results that fall within ten points below the target. These results are within range of the target, and are monitored for improvement. The red represents results that fall eleven or more points below the target. These results are outside the range of the target and may require priority improvement.



**Performance Targets and Ranges Legend**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Metric** | **Target** | **Green** | **Yellow** | **Red** |
| ELO Reported  | 85% | ≥85% | 75% - 84% | ≤74% |
| PROS Reported  | 87% | ≥87% | 77% - 86% | ≤76% |
| Cognitive Skill Level  | 50% | ≥50% | 40% - 49% | ≤39% |
| Assessment Method Reported  | 87% | ≥87% | 77% - 86% | ≤76% |
| Aligned Assessment Method  | 80% | ≥80% | 70% - 79% | ≤69% |

# **LCC Assessment Results**

## **Institutional-Level Assessment Results**

**Result 1**: **92%** of LCC Programs of Study report curriculum alignment to a common set of institutional student learning outcomes. An increase of 14% from Spring 2016 to Spring 2017 reporting periods and 7% higher than the AAC&U benchmark of 85%.

LCC adopted the Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) four essential learning outcomes (ELOs) as institutional outcomes. ELOs describe LCC’s shared outcomes of student learning with **92%** of our Programs of Study identifying how they uniquely contribute to preparing students for twenty-first-century challenges. Our result is currently above a benchmark of 85% of AAC&U member institutions that report “a common set of intended learning outcomes for all undergraduate students” (AAC&U, 2016).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIVISION** | **AAC&U Member Institutions** | **LCC Programs of Study Reporting Links to ELOs** | **LCC Total** |
| Arts & Sciences  | $\geq $ 85% | 87% (48/55) | **92%** (95/103) |
| Technical Careers | $\geq $ 85% | 100% (36/36) |
| Health & Human Services | $\geq $ 85% | 92% (11/12) |

**Performance Target and Range Legend**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Metric** | **Target** | **Green** | **Yellow** | **Red** |
| ELO Reported  | 85% | ≥85% | 75% - 84% | ≤74% |

## **Program-Level Assessment Results**

**Result 2: 98%** of LCCPrograms of Study report program-level learning outcome statements for associate-level awards. An increase of 12% from Spring 2016 to Spring 2017 reporting periods and 11% higher than the AAC&U benchmark of 85%.

Program-level learning outcome statements define what we expect students to achieve in the Program of Study. By the end of the Fall 2016 semester, **98%** of all LCC Programs of Study reported program-level learning outcome statements that defined what LCC students can be expected to know, do, or be like upon successful completion of a Program of Study. Our result is above a benchmark of 85% of AAC&U member institutions that report program-level learning outcome statements.

Results reflect the analysis of the number of Programs of Study that offer associate-level awards divided by the number of Programs of Study reporting program-level student learning outcome statements.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIVISION** | **AAC&U Member Institutions** | **Programs of Study Reporting Learning Outcomes** | **LCC Total** |
| Arts & Sciences  | $\geq $ 85% | 96% (53/55) | **98%** (101/103) |
| Technical Careers | $\geq $ 85% | 100% (36/36) |
| Health & Human Services | $\geq $ 85% | 100% (12/12) |

**Performance Target and Range Legend**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Metric** | **Target** | **Green** | **Yellow** | **Red** |
| PROS Reported  | 87% | ≥87% | 77% - 86% | ≤76% |

**Result 3:** Over half (**59%**) of A&S and HHS Program of Study learning outcomes require students to use moderate-level cognitive skills, with the greatest emphasis on applying or transferring learning from the classroom to other contexts. An increase of 6% from Spring 2016 to Spring 2017 reporting periods.

Each reported learning outcome was analyzed to demonstrate the learning expectations of LCC students as defined by faculty. Bloom’s Taxonomy was used to classify the level of cognition identified for each outcome.

**Cognitive Skills Required of LCC Students**

Moderate Level Cognition = 59%

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Lower Cognitive Skill Levels** | **Higher Cognitive Skill Levels** |
| Knowledge | Comprehension | Application | Analysis | Synthesis | Evaluation |
| 12% | 9% | 47% | 12% | 12% | 8% |
| **68%** | **32%** |

**Performance Target and Range Legend**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Metric** | **Target** | **Green** | **Yellow** | **Red** |
| Cognitive Skill Level  | 50% | ≥50% | 40% - 49% | ≤39% |

**Result 4: 90%** Programs of Study report one or more methods of assessment for each student learning outcome statement. An increase of 2% from Spring 2016 to Spring 2017 reporting periods and 3% higher than the AAC&U benchmark of 87%.

An assessment method is required for each program-level student learning outcome statement. Analysis was performed by dividing the total number of program-level student learning outcome statements with assessment methods identified for each.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIVISION** | **AAC&U Member Institutions** | **% Assessment Methods Reported** | **LCC Total** |
| Arts & Sciences  | $\geq $ 87% |  88% (267/305) | **90%** (406/449) |
| Technical Careers | $\geq $ 87% | 100% (36/36) |
| Health & Human Services | $\geq $ 87% |  95% (103/108) |

**Performance Target and Range Legend**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Metric** | **Target** | **Green** | **Yellow** | **Red** |
| Assessment Method Reported  | 87% | ≥87% | 77% - 86% | ≤76% |

**Result 5**: LCC faculty primarily (**83%**) use performance-based assessments to assess students’ learning across the curriculums. No change from Spring 2016 to Spring 2017 reporting periods.

Authentic, or performance-based assessments, require students to be active participants in their learning by demonstrating knowledge, skills, abilities, and learning processes. Some examples of how LCC faculty may use performance-based testing in the classroom include:

* Projects that enable the use of critical thinking, problem solving, and decision-making skills
* Capstones to assess the students’ achievement of program-level learning outcomes
* Collections of students’ work and demonstrate learning progression throughout the curriculum
* Demonstrations that give students the opportunity to show their mastery of the learning content

**Use of Performance-Based Assessment by Division**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIVISION** | **% Performance-Based Assessment** | **% Non-Performance-Based Assessment** | **LCC Total** |
| Arts & Sciences  | 80% | 20% | **83%** **Performance-Based Assessment** |
| Technical Careers | 100% | 0% |
| Health & Human Services | 93% | 7% |

The following pie chart shows the methods of assessment that are used across the curriculums by LCC faculty and the percentage of use for each method of assessment.

**Types and Percentage of Use of LCC Assessment Methods**

\*Other assessment methods include: Demonstration, Jury, Internship, Presentation, Case Study, Group/Role Play, and Observation

**Top Assessment Method(s) by Division**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Arts & Sciences**  | **Technical Careers** | **Health & Human Services** |
| Project **(37%)**  | Capstone **(100%)** | Clinical Evaluation **(29%)**  |
| Exam/Quiz/Test **(20%)**  |  | Demonstration **(20%)**  |
| Portfolio **(10%)** |  | Lab **(10%)** |

**Result 6: 95%** of identified assessment methods selected by LCC faculty are aligned to the Program of Study learning outcome statement. An increase of 19% from Spring 2016 to Spring 2017 reporting periods.

The majority of the assessment methods selected by faculty are aligned to the learning outcome statement. This may be interpreted as the selected type of assessment is matched to the learning expectations of students. Research demonstrates when there is an alignment between the learning outcome and the assessment method, students show evidence of deeper learning and an increase in skill development. Likewise, when students perceive this alignment, they perceive their learning to be more authentic (Gulikers, et al., 2006).

Each cognitive level and assessment type of was analyzed to determine the match rate. The match rate is determined by analyzing the possible number of learning outcome statements divided by the number of identified and aligned assessment methods. The highest cognition level and highest assessment method was used in the analysis. The following table shows the percentage of match by Division and for LCC total.

**Percentage of Match Between Assessment Method and Learning Outcome**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **DIVISION** | **% Match** | **LCC Total** |
| Arts & Sciences  | 92% (245/267) | **95%** (384/406) |
| Technical Careers | 100% (36/36) |
| Health & Human Services | 100% (103/103) |

**Performance Target and Range Legend**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Metric** | **Target** | **Green** | **Yellow** | **Red** |
| Aligned Assessment Method  | 80% | ≥80% | 70% - 79% | ≤69% |

# **Assessment Plan Measurement Strategy**

**CASL**: Committee for Assessing Student Learning **CDS**: Center for Data Science **CC**: Curriculum Committee  **CTE**: Center for Teaching Excellence

|  |
| --- |
| **BUSINESS OPERATIONS** |
| **Measures** | **Sources** | **Methods** | **Analysis** |
| % Programs of Study report alignment from Program-level student learning outcomes to Institutional-level student learning outcomes  | CASL, Faculty, Staff, Administration  | ELO Template  | # Programs of Study/# Programs of Study reporting alignment to ELOs |
| % Programs of Study report Program-level student learning outcome statements  | CASL, Faculty, Staff, Administration | Program of Study Learning Outcomes Template | # Programs of Study/# Programs of Study reporting learning outcomes |
| **STUDENT** |
| % Cognitive level of student learning outcome statement | CASL, Faculty, Staff, Administration | Program of Study Learning Outcomes Rubric  | Bloom’s Cognitive level/# of learning outcomes; Aligned with Program Review cycles |
| **ASSESSMENT PROCESSES** |
| % Programs of Study report assessment methods  | CASL, Faculty, Staff, Administration | Program of Study Learning Outcomes Template | # Reported Programs of Study learning outcomes/# Programs of Study reporting learning assessment methods |
| % Selected methods of assessment aligned to student learning outcome statement | CASL, Faculty, Staff, Administration | Program of Study Learning Outcomes Rubric  | Bloom’s cognitive level/# assessment method alignment matches |
| **LEARNING & GROWTH** |
| % Program of Study plans for collecting, compiling, analyzing, and using student learning evidence | CDS, CASL, Faculty, Staff, Administration  | Focus Groups; Data Collection Worksheet; Annual Improvement Plan Template; Program review meeting  | # Program of Study/# Programs of Study assessment plans; Aligned with Program Review cycles |
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