Executive Summary

"The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals" Criterion 4.B.

Higher Learning Commission, Criteria for Accreditation

In the summer of 2017, the Office of Outcomes Assessment (OOA) became the Office of Assessment, Evaluation and Institutional Outcomes. The mission of the Office continues with commitment to supporting faculty in assessment and program review. Added to those responsibilities are now the support of the administrative review processes of the campus as well as working with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness on accreditation issues.

During the 2017-18 academic year, the campus participated in a site visit from peer reviewers of the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). The Office and the overall campus focused on federal compliance reporting, the Quality Update to the System’s Portfolio, and preparing the campus for the site visit.

Sheri Barrett, EdD, Director of the Office of Assessment, Evaluation and Institutional Outcomes, and John Clayton, Executive Director of Institutional Effectiveness, spent many hours giving presentations around campus to various constituencies. The Offices also developed and implemented a communications plan for the year leading up to the site visit, with messages coming to the campus through various mediums. A website was developed to house information on the College’s submissions to HLC and information about the accreditation process.

The staff in the Office of Assessment, Evaluation and Institutional Outcomes oversaw the logistics of the site visit, working closely with the chair of the site team. The visit took place successfully on April 30-May 2, 2018. There was wide participation in both invited and open forum meetings, as well as a strong turnout at the community meeting.

In October 2017, Dr. Barrett was one of the hosts in the in the Faculty and Administrators Exchange Program, known as the Dutch Exchange. Michel Jehee, a Dutch research scholar from MBORijnland School, a career and technical college in the Netherlands, and his colleagues spent two weeks at Johnson County Community College participating in educational activities at the College and in the region.

Dr. Barrett and colleagues from the College reciprocated with a visit to the Netherlands in May 2018. The opportunities to meet with higher education colleagues in Europe and to understand new perspectives of educating students and new organizational structures was a wonderful experience. Additionally, the chance to experience the culture and history of the region was encouraging.
General Education Assessment Results

The 2017-18 academic year marks the fourth year since the implementation of the assessment cycle for the general education curriculum across the College. The first two charts show the results of assessments across the curriculum for general education by level of mastery for each of the general education student learning outcomes (SLOs). There are eight (8) general education SLOs:

1) Access and evaluate information from credible sources
2) Collaborate respectfully with others
3) Communicate effectively through the clear and accurate use of language
4) Demonstrate an understanding of the broad diversity of the human experience and the individual’s connection to society
5) Process numeric, symbolic, and graphic information
6) Comprehend, analyze, and synthesize written, visual, and aural material
7) Select and apply appropriate problem-solving techniques
8) Use technology efficiently and responsibly

This year the college assessed over 10,000 students in the general education curriculum.

As noted in previous years, no general education courses chose SLO 2) Collaborate respectfully with others. This issue has been referred to the Educational Affairs Committee which is putting together a committee to re-examine general education outcomes. Additionally, two other learning outcomes either had very low assessments or were not assessed in the 2017-18 academic year: SLO 3) Communicate effectively through the clear and accurate use of language, and SLO 8) Use technology efficiently and responsibly.

The chart below shows the overall distribution of assessments by learning outcomes. As in previous years, SLO 6) Comprehend, analyze and synthesize written, visual and aural material was assessed with the greatest frequency.
The following charts show the aggregated results of four years of assessment data on the general education curriculum. Over the last four years almost 40,000 students were assessed on seven (7) of the eight (8) SLOs in the general education curriculum.
As in previous years, the level of mastery is still quite high for introductory courses. Some departments are now in the process of moving to new assessment tools as their current projects have reached fruition. This may lead to high levels of progressing over the next two cycles.
Career and Technical Education and Non-General Education Curriculum Assessment Data

Career and Technical Education (CTE) and non-general education courses and programs reporting assessment results in the last academic year decreased overall. Students in CTE programs are more likely to be assessed in culminating coursework or nationally standardized tests for the profession.

Those CTE programs reporting assessment results in the 2017-18 academic year include:

- Administration of Justice
- Automotive Technology
- Dental Hygiene
- Engineering
- Entrepreneurship
- Fashion Merchandising
- Marketing
- Music

The adoption of new Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) in the spring of 2018 should help promote more participation from non-general education programs and courses. The process for developing and adopting the new ILOs is featured later in the report.

Non-general education courses and CTE programs chose to assess in three (3) of the eight (8) learning outcomes. Starting with the 2018-19 cycle, these courses and programs will align and report on the Institutional level learning outcomes.
Career, Technical, and Non-General Education 2015-16, 2016-17, and 2017-18 Combined Results

- Mastery
- Progressing
- Low/No skills

Percentage by Student Performance:
- Mastery: 51%
- Progressing: 34%
- Low/No skills: 15%
Significant Assessment Findings

Along with the Assessment Progress Reports, departments report on assessment findings during the Program Review process each year. Highlights below reveal some of the curricular decisions programs made based on assessment results:

- Originally, the JCCC assessment was an in-class assignment that was somewhat independent from the direct 30-hour course content. Consequently, no points were dedicated towards its completion. As a result, numerous students returned their forms blank. In 2015, the process was modified to award either 60 points or 0 points, depending merely on a student's participation. The actual scoring of "correct" or "incorrect" responses was communicated to not be a factor in obtaining the points. This approach encouraged participation, which has been virtually 100%. In addition, with each student applying their name to their pages to obtain the credit, they have consistently applied considerable effort (perhaps out of pride?).

- To create a discussion on how to expand assessment in a meaningful way for all in the department, these assessments have been shared, and have helped to establish a baseline for faculty to measure student learning from semester to semester & course to course.

- Thanks to the changes made in December of 2016, the teamwork and dedication of the faculty, students were able to have great success after graduation, achieving the goal of SLO #6. The goal of SLO#7: Select and apply appropriate problem-solving techniques, was also achieved as students demonstrated successful completion of both the program as well as the licensing exam. In reflection of the success of the previous achievements, the ultimate goal is to maintain the rigor of the program.

- To meet Student Learning Objective #4, demonstrate an understanding of the broad diversity of the human experience and the individual’s connection to society, faculty are working with external stakeholders to develop and implement new simulation scenarios and increase clinical time within simulation.

- During the fall 2016 semester, we piloted a new instrument (short reading and a writing prompt, along with a scoring rubric) in two sections. Student submissions for the pilot were scored by both department co-chairs (for inter-rater reliability). Using these scores and submissions, we revised the rubric to firm up boundaries between scores. Additionally, we selected student essays to exemplify the high and low ends of each score. These were distributed to individual instructors in order to facilitate consistency in scoring.

- Assigning a point value to the post-test seems to have helped significantly in getting students to take the assessment seriously. We now have much higher completion rates, and it seems likely that these numbers provide us with more accurate data on how well our students think about the relationship between materials presented in a variety of formats. We are working on developing a worksheet that can help students practice these skills as they work through the labs throughout the semester.
Office Name Change & Expanded Focus

On July 1, 2017, the Office of Outcomes Assessment (OOA) moved into the Institutional Effectiveness branch of the College and officially expanded its focus to include accreditation and administrative program review.

The College leaned heavily on the Assessment office to help write the Systems Portfolio that was submitted in late May 2017 to the HLC. As the College reviewed the future direction of accreditation and HLC’s continued growth and new demands, OOA changed its name and expanded its mission. The new name is the Office of Assessment, Evaluation and Institutional Outcomes.

While we will continue to provide leadership and guidance in fostering a culture of assessment, we will also formally add oversight for the College’s program review processes (both academic and administrative) and support for the College’s accreditation and institutional planning processes.

Assessment by Design

The Assessment by Design (ABD) workshops were offered both internally to JCCC faculty and externally to faculty from around the region. The ABD workshop continues to receive favorable reviews, provide development opportunities to JCCC faculty, and attract faculty from other two-year and four-year institutions with a blend of theoretical framework and practical applications.

The face-to-face external June 2018 offering was so popular the office had to develop a wait list of faculty wishing to participate. The session was full with 25 faculty and administrators from nine two-year and four-year institutions in Missouri, Kansas, Arkansas, Iowa, and the University of West Indies in the Bahamas.

The Office received numerous request to offer ABD as an online class from faculty and institutions who are unable to attend the live workshop due to time and/or budget constraints. We listened and made it happen. Assessment by Design Online launched to JCCC faculty in January 2018 and to external faculty June 2018.

Using the new learning management system, CANVAS, our Office created an interactive online class for those unable to attend the live workshops. By means of interactive modules, staff from JCCC guide course participants through the Cycle of Assessment with exercises to develop practical assessment strategies and plans.

ABD Online for external faculty was offered through the Continuing Education branch of JCCC, and the enrollment for the first ever offering included 13 students from primarily two-year institutions in seven states: Georgia, Arkansas, Massachusetts, Iowa, Missouri, Virginia, and Texas. The online class opened to students on June 22, 2018, and allowed four weeks for completion. Early feedback from participants of
the online course has been very positive. The Office will make changes to the online offering over the next couple of months based on feedback and offer additional external offerings next summer.

Assessment and Program Review Initiatives on Campus

In addition to the Assessment by Design workshops offered to both internal and external academic groups, the Office engaged in multiple training events on campus. These included offerings during Professional Development Days in August and January as well as throughout the Academic year:

- Comprehensive Program Review session
- Multiple accreditation presentations to varied constituencies
  - Worse Case Scenarios
  - Ask a Peer Reviewer
  - What is Accreditation
  - What to Expect when you are Expecting a Site Visit
  - Board Retreat presentation on accreditation
  - Town Hall meetings on accreditation
- Poster session following All Faculty Meeting
- World Café (August and January)
- Assessment by the Book (Club)
- From Good Grades to Good Learning using Bloom’s Taxonomy
- Administrative and Services Area Review Process
- Program Review Reporting for Academic Review
- Assessment and Curriculum: Understanding the Connections (Adjuncts)

Throughout the year the Office also offered consultation, focused training, and services to a variety of programs and departments. These included:

- Processing more than 3,500 rubrics and assessment instruments
- Participation in program and department meetings to support assessment activities
- Mini-grant processing
- Internal newsletter – Spotlight on Assessment
- Blog Site – Assessment by Design, as well as Twitter updates
Canvas Workshops

During the fall semester of 2017, the College started its migration to a new learning management system, Canvas. The offices of Assessment, Evaluation and Institutional Outcomes; Educational Technology and Distance Learning; and Faculty Development saw this as a great opportunity to host a series of workshops for faculty on integrating assessment with Canvas.

The Office invited presenters from Kansas State University, Dr. Fred Burrack, Director of Assessment, and Chris Urban, Assistant Director of Assessment to give a series of one-hour sessions on April 4, 2018 focused on using Canvas to gather assessment data. The topics included assessing in Canvas using rubrics; assessing in Canvas using selected response questions; reporting by outcome from courses to program level analysis; and open lab time where participants could receive targeted help. Positive feedback was received from the attendees.

Institutional Learning Outcomes

The College launched an Academic Quality Improvement Project (AQIP) during the spring 2017 semester on Institutional Learning Outcomes that was completed during the 2017-18 academic year. The project sought to develop Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) that support both the general education and program level outcomes as well as align with reporting requirements of the Kansas Board of Regents.

The AQIP project was staffed by faculty across campus, as well as across transfer and Career and Technical disciplines. The work of the team was led by Professor Valerie Mann, PhD, Director of Learning Strategies. The team worked through developing ILOs and vetting them through multiple constituencies including Faculty Associate, Faculty Senate, Ed Affairs, Assessment Council, and campus-wide listening sessions.

Approval for the new ILOs was achieved in late fall, and during spring Professional Development Days week the Assessment Council provided the faculty with sessions on the College’s newly adopted ILOs mapped to the current Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). Moving forward, programs and courses that are not part of the general education curriculum can use the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) for assessment activities.

The Assessment Council made alterations to and approved a draft document of mastery definitions for each ILO during their March 2018 meeting. These definitions were developed using the mastery language from the VALUE rubrics and will be shared and edited with feedback from the faculty in the fall 2018 semester.
Institutional Learning Outcomes

Successful Johnson County Community College students will be prepared to demonstrate proficiency in the following areas:

Quantitative Literacy
• Use quantitative skills to analyze and process information.

Critical Thinking
• Acquire, interpret, and analyze information and apply appropriate problem-solving techniques to determine and evaluate solutions.

Communication
• Communicate effectively with clarity and purpose.

Social Responsibility
• Be prepared to practice community engagement that reflects democratic citizenship, environmental responsibility, diversity, and international awareness.

Personal Responsibility
• Be independent lifelong learners who have the skills necessary for economic, physical, social, mental and emotional wellness.
Excellence in Outcomes Assessment Award Winners

The award for Excellence in Outcomes Assessment is given in recognition of exemplary use of assessment to improve student learning by part-time or full-time faculty in the instructional branch.

Professors Eve Blobaum and Brian Zirkle of the Sociology department were recipients of this year’s assessment award. The external reviewer was impressed with the assessment work undertaken by the co-chairs of the department in a pilot, through multiple revisions, and then rolling out through multiple sections of the curriculum. The reviewer noted the packet represented a strategy that was “a well thought-out and applied assessment plan that met all of the criteria for excellence.” Eve Blobaum and Brian Zirkle were recognized at the BNSF luncheon on May 5, 2018.

Mini-Grant Award Recipients 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Mini-Grant Name</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Senter &amp; Monica Hogan</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Comp II Assessment tabulation</td>
<td>Faculty retreat to assess students writing.</td>
<td>$480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Rhodes</td>
<td>Fashion Merchandising &amp; Design</td>
<td>Faculty Retreat</td>
<td>Review results of pilot assessment project.</td>
<td>$260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai Edwards</td>
<td>History/Political Science</td>
<td>Faculty Retreat</td>
<td>Re-design assessment methods</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External Presentations


Dr. Sheri Barrett, “Maturing Accountability: Academic and Administrative Program Review.” Community College Leadership Institute hosted by JCCC on October 20th, 2017

Site Visits for Accrediting Bodies in the 2017-18 Academic Year:

- Specialized Accrediting - Colleges in Illinois and Florida
- Regional Accrediting - Colleges in Michigan and Iowa
Regional Accreditation

The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) maintains three pathways for institutions to maintain accreditation. AQIP (Academic Quality Improvement Program) is the pathway JCCC has chosen. Like the other pathways, it is focused on quality assurance and institutional improvement but with an added emphasis on helping institutions achieve continuous quality improvement. The AQIP Pathway follows an eight-year accreditation cycle.

Johnson County Community College participated in a comprehensive evaluation process to ensure the College is meeting the Criteria for Accreditation, pursuing institutional improvement, and complying with requirements set by the U.S. Department of Education. The evaluation included the submission of a Systems Portfolio, a review of Federal Compliance Requirements, a student opinion survey, a Quality Update, and an on-site visit by a team of HLC peer reviewers.

The portfolio was the primary document by which the College demonstrated it meets the Criteria for Accreditation. In the portfolio, the College documented its approach to performance excellence and provided evidence of continuous improvement. The Systems Portfolio consisted of an Institutional Overview and sections on each of the AQIP Categories.

The site team visit was conducted April 30-May 2, 2018, and had a team of six (6) team members from both two-year and four-year institutions. The team met with internal and external constituents during the three-day visit. The Office staff took the lead in coordinating accreditation activities leading up the visit as well as logistics during the site visit. These included preparing the multi-day agenda, catering, facilities requests, preparing and coordinating team member resource materials, communications across campus and with various internal and external constituents, planning campus escorts for site team members, and preparation for an external reception with community members.

The report of the site team will go to the Institutional Actions Committee of the Higher Learning Commission in the August meeting, and the College should receive the status of affiliation notification following that meeting.
Comprehensive Academic Program Review, Planning and Development

The Office continues to make improvements to the program review processes for academic programs. This year’s updates included more direct access to course and program data through the Data Warehouse and its interface with Cognos. Department chairs were given direct access to run both the data reports for program review as well as updates throughout the academic year. This year’s data also included information from the Activity-Based Costing project at the program/department level. This information gave the departments a better understanding of the overall costs of overhead related to the programs.

Comprehensive Program Review sessions were held during Fall Personal Development Days, providing an overview of review processes and changes from the previous academic year. Hands-on training sessions in the computer lab were also offered on program review software and criterion expectations for academic representatives from programs currently in comprehensive review.

Vitality Reflection

Within the program review processes, the instructional deans review and address the vitality self-assessments completed by the departments, which measure demand, quality, and resource utilization. The dean provides feedback to the department, which spurs future goals and action plans. Summary data on academic programs annual reviews are published on the College website. The program review process, specifically the vitality assessment, has processes and policies in place for revitalization and discontinuance of programs. The figure below shows a summary of the vitality recommendations of the deans for the academic year 2016-17.

![Program Vitality Recommendations](AY 17)
Programs completing Academic Comprehensive Program Review 2017-18

Academic Achievement Center  
Anatomy Open Lab  
Architecture  
Auto Technology  
Business Office Technology  
Computer Information Systems  
Cosmetology  
Drafting  
Electronics Technology  
Emergency Medical Science  
Entrepreneurship  
Floriculture  
Graphic Design  
Healthcare Occupations  
HVAC  
Horticulture  
Industrial Technology  
Interior Design & Floriculture  
Legal Interpreting  
Math Resource Center  
Metal Fabrication and Welding  
Music  
Photography  
Practical Nursing  
Science Resource Center  
Sociology  
Sustainable Agriculture  
Theater  
Web Development & Digital Media  
Writing Center

This year also marks the implementation of the Administrative Program Review process. Development of this project stemmed from the strategic planning initiative from the 2014-2017 Strategic Plan, Goal 4, Task 1 to “reduce administrative costs as a percentage of total expenditures through streamlining business processes, service area reviews and reallocation of resources from administrative functions toward direct student success initiatives.”

The review is completed by administrative and service areas every three years. During the intervening years on an annual basis, areas will complete an abbreviated version of this process with the focus on continuous improvement. Areas are encouraged to include other relevant data as part of this reflection. In both the comprehensive and annual components, a written narrative accompanies actions plans, significant findings, significant trends, department vitality, fiscal resources requests, and adjustments.

The overall goals of administrative review include:

- Reduce administrative costs as a percentage of total expenditures
- Streamline business processes
- Reallocate resources from administrative functions toward direct student success activities
- Ensure that area priorities are consistent with the college’s mission and strategic plan.

An Administrative Review Committee (ARC) was appointed with a primary focus in providing formative feedback to help administrative departments focus on success, staff involvement, currency, and relevancy. Representatives to the ARC come from the various divisions and departments within the administrative and service sectors of the College.
Academic Technology Services  
Access Services  
Accounts Payable  
Admissions  
Audit & Advising Services  
Career and Transfer Services  
Center for Sustainability  
Child Development Center  
Client Support Services  

Continuing Education Programs  
Dining Services  
Grants & Leadership Development  
Institutional Research  
Insurance/Risk Management  
Payroll*  
Performing Arts  
Student Services & Success  

*pilot group

Dr. Sheri Barrett presenting “Assessing Program and Course Learning Outcomes” hosted by JCCC and sponsored by KCPDC
Assessment Support Committees, Program Review, and Accreditation Activities

Assessment Council Representatives, 2017-18 Academic Year

Sheri Barrett, Director, Office of Assessment, Evaluation and Institutional Outcomes, Co-chair
Darla Green, Associate Professor, Interior Design, Co-chair
Ginny Radom, Professor, Practical Nursing
Nancy Holcroft-Benson, Professor, Biology
Judith Vaughn, Professor/Librarian
Sam Bell, Associate Professor, English
Brian Zirkle, Associate Professor, Sociology
Donna Helgeson, Associate Professor, Math
Jason Lamping, Associate Professor, Industrial Technology
Ashley Vasquez, Associate Professor, Speech
Amanda Kraus, Associate Professor, Medical Information Revenue Management

Program Review Committee Division Representatives, 2017-18 Academic Year

Andrew Lutz, CSIT
Barry Bailey, Academic Support
Csilla Duneczky, VPAA appointment (retired)
Dan Eberle, Technology
Donna Duffey, Business
Ed Ronnenbaum, Healthcare
Gurbushan Singh, VPAA appointment
Jack Ireland, Technology
Janette Funaro, Communications
Jean Ann Vickers, Science
Kitz Siebert, Math
Larry Reynolds, VPAA appointment, Co-chair
Luann Wolfgram, Science
Mark Swails, Academic Support, Co-chair
Maureen Fitzpatrick, English
Michelle Goebel, Cosmetology
Michelle Salvato, AHSS
Mindy Ritter, Nursing
Ron Symansky, Communications
Steve Werkmeister, English
Tai Edwards, AHSS
Tom Renfro, Business
Administrative Review Committee Department Representatives, 2017-18 Academic Year

Anthony Funari, Grants, Leadership & Development
Cathy Mahurin, Career & Transfer Services
Deanne Belshe, Digital
Gayle Callahan, Bursar Operations
Julie Vivas, Human Resources
Kathy Wing, Compensation/HR Systems
Leslie Quinn, Records, chair
Marilee Nickelson, General Counsel
Mary Ann Dickerson, Testing & Assessment Services
Mike Souder, Continuing Education
Robyn Albano, Campus Services
Sandra Warner, Administrative Computer Services

One of the technical colleges in the Netherlands participating in the Dutch Exchange.
“Assessment data has legs only if the evidence collected rises out of extended conversations across constituencies about (a) what people hunger to know about their teaching and learning environments and (b) how the assessment evidence speaks to those questions.”

Dr. Charles Blaich and Dr Kathleen Wise