Northwest Commission on College and University (NWCCU)
Annual Update for WSQA
Academic Year 2010-2011

College Name: Clark College

Contact Person: Shanda Diehl

Contact Phone: (360) 992-2421

Contact email: sdiehl@clark.edu

Accreditation recommendations to the College and year of recommendation	Actions taken by the college to address recommendations	Improvement results
Spring 2010 Recommendation: While a timeline is in place and work has begun, it is recommended the college identify and publish the expected learning outcomes for each of its degree and certificate programs. Furthermore, it is recommended the college demonstrate, through regular and systematic assessment, that students who complete their programs, no matter where or how they are offered, have achieved these outcomes. (Standard 2.B.2 and Policy 2.2)	The college did a lot of work in the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 academic years to enable the amount of significant progress to occur in the 2010-2011 academic year. The first step taken by the college was to define program consistent with the accreditation standards. Another significant step was to define the AA degree as a program and develop the learning outcomes and assessment methodologies for the AA degree. With this foundational work complete and the findings of the 2010 accreditation focused interim site visit, the Instructional Planning Team (IPT) and the Vice President of Instruction (VPI) concluded the college needed to be more aggressive in ensuring that program review and assessment was being conducted in all college programs. The college recognized that only faculty representatives could speed up the timeline and progress so that each program would have associated learning outcomes and be engaged in assessing the attainment of those outcomes among all program completers. Therefore, two significant changes were implemented prior to October 2010: 1. Two tenured faculty members were released one-hundred percent, serving as outcome-assessment liaisons, to work with faculty	Clark College has aggressively invested substantial resources to come into compliance regarding assessment. It has accelerated the original six-year timeline of full implementation of identifying and engaging in regular and systematic assessment for the purposes of documenting student achievement of degree and certificate learning outcomes. - Faculty members have led the way as the college has institutionalized the expectation of program-level outcomes and

Clark College

Accreditation recommendations to the College and year of recommendation	Actions taken by the college to address recommendations	Improvement results

	members to help them develop learning outcomes and assessment methodologies, conduct assessments, analyze results, and propose and implement necessary improvements. One faculty member was designated to work on Career Technical Education (CTE) programs. The other faculty member was designated to work on academic/transfer programs. The new faculty outcomes-assessment liaisons were standing members of IPT and had served as members of the IPT assessment sub-committee, which had developed the AA degree learning outcomes for approval the year before.
	
	2. IPT and the VPI requested that the charge and scope of the Outcomes Assessment Committee (OAC) change. The college approved the change through its shared governance process. The change specifically allowed IPT to delegate the oversight and coordination of the development of program-level assessment plans for all academic/transfer and CTE degree and certificate programs to the OAC. Because of the nature and scale of developing the college's outcomes-assessment system, IPT could not balance both the work of coordinating the development of all program learning outcomes and its regular contractually defined work; the two full-time released outcome-assessment liaisons both serve on IPT and co-chaired the OAC.
	
	Over the course of the 2010-2011 academic year, substantial progress was accomplished within each program in developing learning outcomes (if none existed), developing assessment methodologies, conducting assessments, and identifying needed improvements throughout many programs. College faculty became aware of the expectations for their work in program assessment through emails from the VPI outlining the faculty charge, during the 2010 Fall Focus presentation, and in one-on-one meetings with the outcome-assessment liaisons. Additionally, the assessment liaisons individually contacted all program-lead faculty members and coordinated the development of program outcomes and assessment projects.
		assessment. This will be documented and written into policies and procedures during the 2011-2012 academic year.
		
		• The college has provided faculty with many different opportunities for program assessment training, including:
		
		    o Fall Focus
		
		    o Spring Assessment institute
		
		    o Assessment Day
		
		• 71% of all CTE programs have outcomes and assessment methods developed and documented.
		
		• Assessment methods of general education outcomes within CTE programs have been developed.
		
		• The Associate of Arts degree has identified learning outcomes, piloted assessment methodologies, and

Clark College

Accreditation recommendations to the College and year of recommendation	Actions taken by the college to address recommendations	Improvement results

	Program assessment work for the 2010-2011 academic year began with an emphasis on program assessment during the Fall 2010 Faculty Focus, Clark College's intensive two-day training for faculty, which occurs just before the start of fall quarter each year. The assessment liaisons led a three-hour workshop for all faculty during Fall Focus outlining the history of outcomes assessment at Clark College and the challenges presented by the out-of-compliance NWCCU finding. Faculty were provided a program assessment overview, assessment definitions, examples of well-written outcomes, time to work with fellow faculty on assessment projects, and an opportunity to schedule appointments for future consultation with the assessment liaisons. The assessment liaisons developed a 2010-2011 schedule for activities to be completed within the year and convened the OAC to help lead and facilitate the work. Because of the scale of the work and the need to complete projects as quickly as possible, the OAC opted to meet every-other-Tuesday, instead of the previous once-a-month schedule outlined in the Clark College Association of Higher Education (CCAHE) contract (i.e., the faculty union contract).
	
	OAC members developed an understanding of accreditation requirements related to program assessment and how to identify effective program-level outcomes in October and November of 2010. The role of the OAC is to approve learning outcomes and mentor faculty groups in assessment methodologies when assistance is requested; OAC members feel faculty groups should be allowed flexibility in determining the best way to assess particular outcomes but also actively communicate with faculty groups as they develop outcomes and carry out yearly assessment projects. Furthermore, the liaisons' responsibilities are to actively provide guidance when needed. OAC members were trained during these months by the assessment liaisons, based on the expertise the liaisons had gained from past experience on IPT and the AA assessment sub-committee and research of the NWCCU standards and both internal and external program assessment best practices. OAC members then developed a rubric to determine the effectiveness of program-level outcomes; this rubric also assisted faculty groups in creating their
		completed one full cycle of assessment.
		
		• Initial implementation of the assessment software, SPOL, has begun to:
		
		    o Document all aspects of program-level assessment;
		
		    o Connect course-level assessment work as it supports program-level outcomes; and
		
		    o Tie assessment findings to the strategic plan, budget process, and accreditation self-study process.
		
		The college will continue to make significant progress during 2011-2012. The improvements the college has made during 2010-2011 have created the foundation to ensure that full cycles of assessment for each program, no matter how or where the programs are offered, will be assessed and improvement strategies implemented. By

Accreditation recommendations to the College and year of recommendation	Actions taken by the college to address recommendations	Improvement results
	learning outcomes. Also during October and November, the OAC worked to identify the number of official programs that required assessment, i.e. an area of study that leads to a certificate or degree. The number of academic/transfer programs identified was three; consisting of the Associate of Arts (AA) degree, the Associate of Science Transfer 1 (AST1), and the Associate of Science Transfer 2 (AST2). The OAC determined that 90 CTE programs fell within the definition of a program. The OAC, and hence IPT, expected that these programs would develop full and ongoing assessment cycles which include robust learning outcomes, assessment methodologies, data collection, result analysis, improvement strategies based on assessment results, and process and findings documentation. The assessment liaisons engaged faculty in different program assessment workshops. One of the most successful, the Spring Assessment Institute, was an all-day workshop that occurred during the 2011 spring break. Forty-seven faculty members attended to learn about the "learning college" (the student-centered college), how assessment is essential to determining student success, how all programs link with other programs in the Clark College system, and how various learning and teaching styles relate to effective assessment. Assessment Day was another workshop that occurred in June 2011. Assessment Day was an all-day workshop where all faculty members were invited to attend to work on program-assessment projects in their area of expertise. Faculty groups were able to complete different components of the assessment cycle, including developing learning outcomes, designing assessment methodologies, analyzing data, and identifying improvement strategies for their programs. The assessment liaisons and other OAC members were available to assist faculty throughout the day. The OAC worked diligently with program faculty in CTE programs during 2010-2011. Since the AA outcomes had already been	2012-2013, the college expects that all programs will have completed cycles of assessment and that assessment findings and improvements will be documented in the SPOL software. Moreover, the college also expects that curricular changes, program modifications and enhancements, and budget requests will be prioritized for implementation based on assessment findings.

Accreditation recommendations to the College and year of recommendation	Actions taken by the college to address recommendations	Improvement results
	approved by IPT the prior year, this allowed the OAC to focus on the development of outcomes and assessment projects in CTE programs. One new role the OAC served, based on the change in scope, was to review, critique, and approve program-level outcomes presented to the committee by program faculty. Faculty members submitted program-learning outcomes to the OAC prior to each committee meeting for initial review. A program-lead faculty member presented the outcomes to the OAC at the next meeting; the outcomes were then approved, after discussion and revision, by simple majority vote. **Academic/Transfer Programs** Assessment work pertaining to the academic/transfer degree focused solely on the AA degree during the 2010-2011 academic year and those outcome areas common to the AA, AST 1, and AST 2 degrees. Because of the size of the assessment projects, the OAC and the academic/transfer assessment liaison believed that if the college could successfully complete one full cycle of assessment for all 10 outcome areas in the AA degree, that the evidence compelling the college faculty community to engage in this work would be positive and helpful in fully implementing assessment for all programs in the future. Moreover, the OAC decided to fully implement the assessment cycle because the learning outcomes of the academic/transfer degrees overlap. Outcomes unique to the AST 1 and AST 2 degrees have been identified and are scheduled for development in the fall of 2011 and assessment in the winter and spring of 2012. Faculty members performed pilot projects for each of the 10 AA degree learning outcome areas in the fall and winter quarters of 2010-2011; these pilot projects assessed student work but focused primarily on the viability of rubrics developed by faculty teams the previous year. Faculty members fully implemented the assessment methodology on a larger scale in spring 2011, using the revised rubrics and student work sampling strategies recommended by the college's institutional researchers. As a part of the process, faculty identified improvement strategies for each of the 10 learning outcomes, which they then	

Accreditation recommendations to the College and year of recommendation	Actions taken by the college to address recommendations	Improvement results
	implemented. These were large-scale projects, and numerous academic/transfer faculty members throughout the college contributed to the assessment of the learning outcomes. For example, 40 faculty members developed three separate assessment projects to support the AA communication outcome in 2010-2011: the first involved every member of the English Department, the second involved every member of the Communication Studies Department, and the third involved an interdisciplinary team of 20 faculty members from a dozen different college departments. Faculty members used the program outcome assessment reporting guide to document assessment activities. Faculty members will have completed full assessment cycles for the three academic/transfer programs by the end of the 2011-2012 academic year; this includes the completion of two full assessment cycles for the AA. A new outcomes-assessment page in is development for the Clark College website, and approved program learning outcomes will be published on the website by the end of September 2011. **Career and Technical Education Programs** The CTE faculty assessment liaison worked with CTE programs throughout the college to develop and document learning outcomes. Among the CTE programs without established learning outcomes, the deans, instructional directors, and members of the OAC assisted the CTE program-lead faculty in developing learning outcomes and/or assessments. As a guide, faculty members can use the CTE Program Learning Outcomes Post-Assessment to help frame their assessment work. However, some CTE programs had already completed full assessment cycles and had been engaging in this work for many years. The CTE programs with advanced assessment practices include all the programs that hold third party accreditation credentials. Most CTE programs (77 of the 90) have fully developed program-specific learning outcomes. Of those, 60 CTE programs have had their learning outcomes reviewed by the OAC. Sixty-four programs (71%) have developed assessment methodologies. Nineteen programs have completed at least one full assessment cycle. Full assessment cycles	

Clark College

Accreditation recommendations to the College and year of recommendation	Actions taken by the college to address recommendations	Improvement results
	will be complete for all CTE programs by the end of 2012-2013. The program learning outcomes will be published on the outcomes-assessment page of the Clark College website by the end of December 2011. After the successful completion of the assessment cycle for the AA learning outcomes, the assessment liaisons wanted to use this information to develop ways to both identify and assess the general education learning outcomes associated with CTE programs. During the summer of 2011, nine faculty teams representing transfer and CTE distribution areas volunteered to work on general education outcomes and assessments for the college's CTE programs, also known as the Related Areas of Instruction. The assessment liaisons led the faculty teams, and used the AA degree learning outcomes as the starting place. The faculty groups unanimously agreed that the general education learning outcomes of the AA degree were appropriate for the general education outcomes of the CTE programs. A tag will be added to the end of each AA outcome specifying the CTE program. The tag will read: "as appropriate for a career and technical program." With appropriate project planning and student sampling, this will allow the college to assess how well CTE students are being served in courses simultaneously fulfilling AA transfer and CTE general education requirements without developing additional assessment projects. Faculty will take two approaches in assessing general education learning outcomes within CTE programs. First, faculty members will sample and assess student work in existing AA courses that fulfill general education requirements for CTE programs. Second, prior to graduation from a CTE program, each CTE student will respond to an exit survey where he or she will be asked to rate, on a Likert scale, how a specific course contributed to their learning of a particular general education learning outcome. For example, a student who took Sociology 101 to fulfill the social science related general education learning outcome[1] will	

---

[1] Social Science Outcome: Evaluate, analyze, and explain events, behaviors, and institutions using perspectives and methods in the Social Sciences as appropriate for a career and technical education program.

Clark College

Accreditation recommendations to the College and year of recommendation	Actions taken by the college to address recommendations	Improvement results
	receive a survey with a question that reads: *"Sociology 101 enhanced my ability to recognize and apply Social Science concepts to my career and technical field of study."*	