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# Introduction

## Current focus and understanding of assessment

This year Big Bend Community College (BBCC) started a new seven-year assessment cycle. This first year in the cycle had no specific Institutional Outcome (IO) focus but instead focused on transitioning to a programmatic/departmental level view and approach to assessment for the whole campus. There was still a continued effort to connect to larger campus data and professional development, as well as continued one-on-one support throughout the year.

As a college, BBCC continued to assess for improvement by having each program/department identifying an issue, challenge, achievement gap, etc. in the program/department first, then decided on type of intervention, implemented the intervention, reflected and decided next steps (repeat, adapt, budget, PD, etc.), and submit this as a plan at the beginning of the year with a report once the assessment work concluded. At the end of the year, a small group provided feedback on each assessment report.

BBCC plans to continue to push towards a programmatic/departmental level focus. During the 2025-26 academic year the majority of the campus will focus on assessing IO 1 (students will be able to communicate clearly and effectively). Faculty will be encouraged to use one of the templates created by Assessment Committee over the past year.

## Addressing Assessment Committee plans/goals from 2023-2024 report

The previous years’ goal of re-arranging this new seven-year cycle to have the “catch all” seventh year become our first year and give programs/departments time to switch focus of assessments to the programmatic/departmental level appears to have been a wise decision and very successful (at least 26 of the 28 programs/departments assessed program outcomes). Many faculty appreciated not needing to report on every single course as well as more time given towards approaching assessing their respective areas from a broader programmatic/departmental view.

By shifting the new cycle around, this allowed the Assessment Committee (AC) to gather institutional qualitative data on the potential concerns relating to student success for IO 1 in the Fall of this past year. The AC then compiled and analyzed this data to create templates for faculty to use in the 25-26 school year addressing the two core concerns of academic vocabulary and the integration of AI. These were refined over Winter and shared with faculty in the Spring.

In addition, assessment work during Week Zero and preparing for programmatic/departmental level assessment plans were addressed in the following ways. During Fall In-Service, feedback from the assessment rubric was given to faculty for the assessment plans they had submitted along with trends and goals for the year. Faculty had time to reflect, look at institutional data, and then develop assessment plans for the year focused on the programmatic/departmental level. Then the deans or director checked off on these. Like in previous years, the Annual Assessment Report was made public on the website. Throughout the year, especially in the Winter and Spring, AC members met one-on-one with their respective areas to provide support for the current assessments. This was a continued effort over the past two years to help make assessment work more meaningful for each faculty member and deepen their confidence.

# Assessments

This year there was not a specific focus on one particular IO but rather a transition year focused on assessing at the programmatic/departmental level compared to assessing strictly at the classroom or course level. As mentioned already, a vast majority (over 90%) of the assessments this year did this! This is perhaps one of BBCC’s greatest accomplishments related to assessment this school year. Following are two examples of this switch in how BBCC thinks about assessment, as well as some highlights in specific patterns seen in programs/departments. See the Appendix for the full details of all assessment reports submitted.

The Medical Assistant program saw a recurring issue of enrollment and retention and identified issues of the length of the clinical program and lack of readiness for courses. Amid other changes, the program combined two courses into one and moved courses to meet on Saturdays instead of Fridays. This resulted in 90% of MA 115 students completing MA 116 and the program wants to continue these changes with HED courses.

The Manufacturing and Processing Technology department assessed across the program students’ retention regarding technical drawing nomenclature, symbols, notes, and abbreviations. Through multiple forms of assessment (quizzes, projects, reflective discussions, labs) no specific gaps were found among demographic subgroups, but students did show a need for substantial review and prompting to engage in critical independent thinking. The department plans to include more assignments directly requiring students to focus on analysis and use a flipped classroom model with interactive quizzes early in the program.

## Follow up from previous assessments/closing the loop

As part of the “catch all” year and no specific IO to assess, some programs/departments used the year to close the loop on assessments from previous years. Following are a couple examples from across campus. Between either following up from a previous year or planning to close the loop next year, over two thirds of programs/departments made this part of their reports.

In the Biology department, specifically the pre-nursing series, last year’s intervention in BIOL& 241 of restructuring unit sequencing in the curriculum was implemented in BIOL& 242 to help students better understand pattern recognition and biological feedback loops. Implemented over two quarters, a year-to-year comparison showed student learning growth in both lab and lecture as well as overall increased competency of 80%. These changes in curriculum sequencing across the program will continue.

The Ag program saw a gap in student understanding and ability to use spreadsheets and intervened with general and advanced tutorials combined with assessments. These resulted in students improving Excel skills from around 50-60% to 70-80%, based upon the assessment rubric used. The assessment also showed that this gap in understanding is not being addressed before the students get to AGR 120 Introduction to Precision Agriculture. The program suggests students first be required to take or pass Business Information Management (BIM) course(s) to be well prepared for the Ag program needs.

In the Academic Support department, the counselors assessed students’ understanding of the AA&S DTA (transfer program) diversity requirement by surveying students during winter. They found that most students did know about the requirement and that almost half had already completed it. They also found that the most common reason for why students had not completed it was due to scheduling issues, followed by students not knowing how to identify which courses fulfill the diversity requirement. The department wants to close the loop on this assessment next year and already started doing so by working with the annual scheduling workgroup to ensure enough offerings in course selections, modalities, and times.

## Connections to institutional/programmatic/departmental data

At least 12 programs/departments focused on either connecting to institutional/programmatic/departmental data or goals. Around one quarter of the programs/departments explicitly focused their assessments on achievement gaps in their program/department. This extended the trend that the institution has been moving toward over the past few years both in terms of assessing for improvement rather than compliance as well as using data to find achievement gaps to inform assessment plans. Following are a variety of program/department highlights.

The Philosophy department looked at the gap between Hispanic and overall students in success of the PHIL 210 Ethics course and chose an intervention of changing the time class was offered while keeping hybrid modality the same. The success rates increased fairly significantly for both Hispanic and overall students over the past couple years with this year 100% of Hispanic students and 96% of overall students passing. Though it is not entirely clear that the change in time the class was offered was the main factor, the department has decided to try offering all philosophy seminar courses in the mornings to see if similar improvements occur.

When looking at programmatic data from the previous year, the Accounting program saw an achievement gap in their economically disadvantaged students. This year in the ACCT 262 course, a comprehensive project was added as an intervention near the end of the quarter to help students synthesize their learning. This led to student growth as shown in the comprehensive final averages increasing from 83% to 90%. The program plans to continue using the comprehensive project in ACCT 262 and, as appropriate, include them throughout the program.

The Physics department looked at the achievement gap in passing rates of PHYS& 221between Running Start (RS) and non-RS students and hypothesized that concurrent enrollment and learning of MATH& 151 Calculus I was a key issue. The department intervened by adapting the weekly homework assignments to focus beyond applied calculus and algebra skills and adding context-rich problems. While this did not close the achievement gap this year, it was still beneficial for students as they were better able to make sense of and connect the math with the physical phenomena, and the department plans on closing the loop next year by including more scaffolding and teaching of expectations.

The Aviation program continued previous assessment work focused on gaps in program enrollment, success rates, and time to completion between Historically Underrepresented Groups (HUG) and non-HUG students. Over this multi-year assessment and report, the program found that in the past couple years the gap widened and has steadily decreased with this year 100% of AVF 252 stage 5 completion! Moreover, both AVF 252 and 253 saw large reductions in time to completion (30% and 70%, respectively). By the end of AVF 253, the program saw roughly equal success rates between HUG and non-HUG students coupled with a greater number of HUG students.

# Reflection and Response to Faculty Assessment Reports

BBCC made great progress towards programmatic/departmental level reflection, analysis, and response. Furthermore, as hoped, since only courses that best address a program outcome are needed to be assessed over the next seven years, it streamlined and simplified assessment for programs/departments. This should allow them to better focus on assessing at the program/departmental level rather than course level.

Also, the logistical changes to the assessment database for submitting reports that were made this year did make the submission, compilation, and analysis of the reports much easier. We will continue to use the new format this coming year.

The move to focus on programmatic/departmental level assessment instead of course level might have distracted faculty in the writing of the reports from clearly assessing for improvement rather than just compliance. In addition, we need faculty to make it explicitly clear in the report what their intervention was. These had been focused on in previous years and can be re-emphasized this coming year.

After this year’s assessment reports were submitted, a small group of faculty and administrators provided feedback recognizing and encouraging these changes. This coming school year there will be more specific institutional and instructional assessment focus on IO 1 which will hopefully mean assessing for improvement will occur more naturally and be communicated more explicitly in the reports.

# Goals and Direction for the Future

**Assessment focus for 2025-2026 school year:** This will be the first of two consecutive years with a campus wide focus on IO 1. Based upon campus qualitative data from this past year, there is special focus on academic vocabulary and the integration of AI. In addition, there is still a need to encourage assessments to focus on assessing at the programmatic/departmental level, assessing for student improvement, and making the interventions clear in writing the reports.

**Goals for Faculty:** These remain relatively unchanged. Reflect on assessment feedback and continue to assess for improvement. Continue to make use of campus data in designing assessment plans for the program/department by identifying an achievement gap to focus on and try to intentionally synthesize work with Program Audit to make it more meaningful. Improve connecting assessment to closing the loop year to year, addressing budgetary needs, professional development, or other ways admin can help.

**Goals for the Assessment Committee:** Continue providing one-on-one support with the faculty in their respective areas and spreading the purpose of assessment to the campus. Continue to deepen confidence and understanding of assessment work in committee members. Update the BBCC Assessment Handbook. This has not been updated in over five years and much has changed. It will also hopefully tie-in with deepening confidence and understanding of assessment work. Analyze and provide potential updates for the assessment sections of the BBCC Program Audit.

**Ideas for Professional Development:** Use time during In-Services and Week Zero to address the specific to needs of faculty and institution such as providing continued time for programs/departments to analyze data, reflect on feedback from previous assessments and Program Audits, and have time to work with support from the assessment committee, Deans, Director, and VP. Continue offering a Year 2 Assessment Summit to help newer faculty better understand and engage with assessment work.