

Academic Affairs Program Review
Spring Semester - 2009

INPUTS:

Input measures are institutional resources provided for a program of study to achieve stated mission goals and objectives. Main resources are facilities, equipment, teacher qualifications and capacity, and professional development.

A. Facilities:

1a. Is the facility large enough for the current program to allow for any projected growth?

The increase in enrollment over the past five years is an indication that the American Samoa Community College has grown and will continue to grow. This current trend with increasing enrollment reflects the academic departments' to conclude that the current facilities would not be suitable for any projected growth.

The demand on scheduling classrooms each semester is becoming more and more of a challenge. Besides the college's regular sessions it must also accommodate classroom space for ASTEP, Upward Bound Program, and the UH-Cohort for BEd program which starts at 4:00pm ending at 6:00pm from Monday to Friday.

During the summer sessions from the end of May to the beginning of August the scheduling of classrooms even becomes more difficult because ASTEP, Upward Bound, and the Regular session request classrooms during the 8:00 am to no later than 3:00pm which makes it more and more difficult to accommodate each academic year. With the increase of enrollment and hiring of more faculties has placed a demand on more classrooms and offices for faculty.

Refer to Table – 1 for data on the increased enrollment from semester to semester. Tables - 2, 3, and 4 reflect the increased number of faculties teaching and the classroom usage data for the past two years demonstrates the need for classroom renovations, increased space for daily operations of programs supporting instruction.

Table – 1: Enrollment:

- Includes ASTEP students

Enrollment by Semesters:	2005	2006	2007	2008
Fall	1,160	1,607	1,767	1,826
Spring	1,352	1,495	1,494	1,621
Summer	1,050	1,032	1,100	1,149
Totals: (equal one school/academic year)	3,562	4,134	4,361	4,596

Table – 2: Summary of Personnel

Academic Affairs Personnel:	2004-06	2006-08	2008-09
Instructional (faculties, administrators, staff)	84	78	88.5
Library (administrators and staff)	06	08	10
Admissions & Records (administrators and staff)	06	06	06
Total Personnel for Academic Affairs			

Table – 3: Number of Faculty for each Department (data taken from ASCC catalogs)

Departments: Catalog	2004 – 2006	2006 – 2008	2008 – 10
Offices:	Number of faculty	Number of faculty	Number of faculty
1. Agriculture and Life Science	8 Part-time (.10FTE)	7 Part - time (.10FTE)	5 Part – time (.10FTE)
2. Business	2	3 & 2 adjuncts	3
3. College and Life Planning	3 Part – time (.20 FTE)	3 Part – time (.20 FTE)	4 Part - time (.20FTE)
4. Criminal Justice	2	3	2
5. Education	1	1 & 1 Adjunct	4 & 3 Adjuncts
6. ELI	5	6	6
6. Fine Arts	2	4	4
7. Health and Human Services	2	2 & 1 Adjunct	2 & 1 Adjunct
8. Language and Literature	5	4	5 & 1 Adjunct
9. Mathematics	3	5	6 & 2 Adjuncts
10. Nursing	2 & 13 Adjuncts	2 & 3 adjuncts	3 & 2 adjuncts
11. Physical Education	1 & 3 Adjuncts	1 & 3 adjuncts	2 & 3 adjuncts
12. ROTC	1	1	2
13. Samoan Studies	3	3	6
14. Science	3 & 2 Part-time (.20FTE)	4 & 1 Adjunct	5 & 1 Adjunct
15. Social Science	5	4	4.5 & 2 Adjuncts
16. Trades and Technology	5 & 6 Adjuncts	3 & 1 adjunct	8 & 2 adjunct
17. Information Communication and Technology (ICT)	2 & 3 Adjuncts	2 & 3 Adjuncts	(Combined w/ITT)
BREAKDOWN:			
Full – time faculty	46	55	62
Part – time faculty	13	10	09.5
Adjunct faculty	25	13	17
TOTAL:	84	78	88.5

2a. Is the facility cleaned and well maintained?

Based on the number of classrooms, department offices, and academic affairs office the academic program review data indicate faculty offices are somewhat to not cleaned and well maintained.

Refer to Table – 4: Classroom usage per semester. The classrooms are used from Monday to Friday from 8:00 am to 3:00 pm with regular session (16 weeks) and ASTEP uses classrooms (10 weeks) from 4:00 pm to 6:00 pm. The UH-BEd Cohort uses 4 to 6 classrooms from 4:00 to 6:00 for 4 weeks and the Upward Bound Program uses 2 – 3 classrooms from 3:00 pm to 5:00 during regular semesters.

During the summer sessions classrooms are used for regular session, and ASTEP has two sessions from the end of May to beginning of August which is a total of 20 to 22 courses 8:00 am to 4:00 pm for 6 week and the usage of offices are also based on the use of classrooms for our on campus programs.

Table – 4: Classroom Usage by Semesters: Includes ASTEP courses

Number of Courses Scheduled :	#of classrms.	Fall-06	Spr.-07	Sum-07	Fall-07	Spr-08	Sum-08	Fall-08	*Total Usage 2 yrs.
1. Main Quad Area	09	98	104	35	103	102	36	89	567
2. East Wing (Malae Area)	05	54	48	09	30	41	13	36	231
3. Science and Math Bldg.	07	72	76	31	79	72	32	67	429
4. ELI Classrooms (old library bldg.)	04	36	33	17	35	35	15	39	210
5. Education Classrooms (T-1, TED 1&2,Lecture Hall)	04	00	00	00	05	06	01	16	28
6. Institute of Trades & Tech. (ITT) (Auto,ADT,ELE,PICTA)	11	17	21	01	14	13	04	34	104
7. Gymnasium & ROTC	02	10	11	02	11	10	01	12	57
8. Nursing Dept. (on campus)	03	01	01	00	02	03	01	05	13
9. Other sites: (off-campus) (SSS Lab., SBDC, Tennis Court, Golf Course, LBJ, Public Health, etc)	11	05	06	02	05	11	04	10	43
10. Land Grant (CNR)	04	08	08	00	07	07	01	05	36
11. Distant Learning Classes	01	06	07	02	00	01	00	00	16
*CLASSROOM TOTALS: (per semester/session)	61	307	315	99	291	301	107	308	*1,734

- *Academic Affairs data – scheduling of courses and classroom assignments (q.failauga)*

Table – 4: Usage of Classrooms during a two (2) period indicates the need to renovate and increase the number of classrooms due to the enrollment and other programs/college initiative need for more classrooms e.g. ASTEP, UH Co-Hort, DOE College Pathways, Upward Bound, ITT, Nursing Bound, etc.

4a and 5a. Are there any safety hazards in the facility?

Safety codes and emergency evacuation plan for the campus is not in place. Violation of safety codes and Compliance with Federal grants on ADA accessibility should become a priority for ASCC.

B. Equipment:

Table – 5: Scheduling of Distant Learning Courses

Number of Courses Scheduled : P2K - Project	#of classrms.	Fall- 06	Spr.- 07	Sum- 07	Fall- 07	Spr- 08	Sum- 08	Fall- 08	*Total Usage 2 yrs.
1. Distant Learning Classes (rm.10)	01	06	07	02	00	01	00	00	16

*Academic Affairs data Scheduling of courses-Historic file (q.failauga)

Table – 6: DL Courses

Distant Learning Courses Offered: 2005	Enrollment:
HIS170 World Civilization I	22
HEA150 Medical Terminology	27
GEO 160 Intro. to Geography	22
HIS171 World Civilization II	28
HSV155 Introduction to Guidance and Counseling	15

* **Fact Book 2005**

The data (Tables 5 and 6) from the previous Distant Learning P2K Project should be revisited and develop a plan to re-introduce Distant Learning instruction as part of the academic focus and technology planning.

Currently with the fiber optic cable capacity in American Samoa should provide an opportunity for the college should review and update the previous Technology plan. As noted above we have offered DL courses and we should have small group of instructors who can train faculty to deliver DL courses. Currently the college is using the MOODLE capacity with ICT courses and a few other courses (e.g. HEA250) who have this capacity to deliver their course. This capacity was limited because of the width band technology problem on island now with the new optic fiber and the new Datatel computer system should provide access to instructors, staff, and students to the network by setting up DL courses, MOODLE on-line registration, academic advising to expand the technology areas of instruction and services to students .

Courses such as TED 240 Instructional Technologies and ACC220 Automated Accounting, Information, Communication and Technology (ICT) courses, ADT 160 Introduction to AUTOCAD, and ADT 260 Advanced AUTOCAD courses.

Equipment from the P2K project is still in Rm. 10 and some other equipment has been loaned out to assist with instructional needs. A current inventory of P2k equipment should be conducted to evaluate and structure how Academic Affairs can re-introduce Distant Learning. Table - 7 below reflect the use of technology in the classroom as part of the methodology used by Instructors to deliver course learning objectives and student learning outcomes.

Table – 7: INSTRUCTIONAL USE OF TECHNOLOGY IN THE CLASSROOM

N = 263 courses – Total Number of courses and percentage

Lecture	Group Discussion	Hand-on	Guest Speakers	Service Learning	Technology	Other
258	246	255	70	117	216	15
98%	94%	97%	27%	44%	82%	6%

** Academic Program Review (2006-08) data.*

Table – 8: FACULTY USAGE OF LAP-TOPS AND POWER POINT PROJECTS

Teaching Methodology- Equipment Usage Data:	# of Faculty	# of Courses
Jan. – Dec. 2007	79	102
Jan. – Dec. 2008	44	066
Jan. – May 2009	22	038
TOTALS:	145	206

- *Academic Affairs Sign Out Equipment Log (q.failauga)*

Table – 8 is a log on the use of Academic Affairs equipment of 2 lap-tops and 2 power point projectors by instructors from January 2007 to May 2009. The use of this equipment is to enhance the delivery of instruction through the use of technology. With our Student Learning Outcomes on Communication instructors use the equipment for students to demonstrate presentation skill in Communication. This equipment is from the P2K Project due to the limited funding to provide this access to all instructors and students.

Creating smart classrooms equipped with power point projectors, electronic boards, and internet access and a media room where instructors and students can get access to lap-tops for instructional and learning purposes would increase to quality of instructional programs.

Table – 9: STUDENT COMPUTER USERS

N – 40 computers (30 Student Lab. plus 10 from ITT Mini Lab.)

STUDENT COMPUTER USAGE: 2005 – ASCC FACT BOOK:	Students Labs. (40 computers)
Type and Research	2,078
Emails	5,931
FAFSA (Fin-Aid Apps)	1,252
TOTALS:	9,261

**Fact Book 2005*

Table – 10: LIBRARY AND COMPUTER USERS (10 computers for student use)

SESSION-YEAR:	LIBRARY USERS:	COMPUTER USERS:
Fall - 2006	30,300	4,556
Spring - 2007	46,727	7,190
Summer - 2007	19,022	2,186
Fall - 2007	54,862	5,217
Spring - 2008	26,047	4,376
Summer - 2008	16,593	2,897
Totals:	167,504	26,422

***Library Log for Quarterly Reports (2006-08)**

Availability of computer use by students is required since instructors require students to do research papers, Internet search and research, and power point presentations. As of 2006-08 Academic Program review out of 263 courses offered 82% uses technology as an instructional method (see Table -7) yet students have access to a total of 78 computers (30 – Student Lab., 10 ITT Mini Lab., 10 Library, and twenty plus computers in department labs.) for 1,600 students on campus is a ratio of 23 students per computer per day between to hours of 8:00am to 4:00 time allowed to use a computer is 22 minutes of usage per student.

Since this data is from 2005 Fact Book update on current count of computers available to students, including usage time and days of the week ratio should determine student access to computers to match instructional courses requirement for assessing student success.

C. Materials and Supplies:

Funding to purchase materials and supplies is not an issue its follow-up (tracking), and receiving goods in a timely manner has been a continued problem. One example is the purchase requisite (PR) for ordering textbooks has been an ongoing problem with delays in receiving textbooks in time for instruction to begin.

The PR process should be reviewed to eliminate barriers from delivery of high quality educational programs and service through an integrated plan with representative stakeholder from the college.

D. Professional Development:

Table – 11: NUMBER OF YEARS TEACHING AT ASCC

** This does not include Adjunct Faculty*

SCHOOL YEAR:2008 - 10 Number of Years At ASCC:	Less than 1 yr.	Less than 5 yrs.	Less than 10 yrs.	Less than 15 yrs.	Less than 20 years.	Less than 30 yrs.	Less than 35 yrs.	Totals # of Faculties
Number of Faculties:	6	17	20	9	6	1	3	62*

- Count does not include adjunct and part-time faculties
- Data provided from ASCC Catalog 2008-10 (refer to Table-3)
- Educational Qualifications: 80% hold a Master’s degree, 10% hold a doctorate, and 10% are at the Bachelor’s level

Summary on the Length of Time Faculties have Taught At ASCC:

Less than 10 years = 43 (69%)
 More than 10 years = 19 (31%)

Table – 12: FACULTIES SENT OFF-ISLAND FOR TRAINING:

2007– 09 Whose been Trained:	Assessment	Accreditation	Pedagogy	Degree	TOTAL
Department Chairpersons	08	01	0	0	09
Faculty	03	0	01	01	05
Administration	02	02	0	01	05
TOTALS:	13	03	01	02	19

***14 (less than 30%) out of 62.5 full-time faculties were provided the opportunity for Professional Development.**

Tables 11 and 12 indicate the need to continue Professional Development training outlined in the Academic Affairs Professional Development Plan for 2008-09. As part of the WASC Standards to provide professional development for faculties to understand and implement new assessment requirements for Student Learning Outcomes, and the Accreditation process.

The three goals of the Academic Affairs Professional Development Plan is 1) Provide assessment training on measuring SLOs; 2) training for faculties in pedagogy; and 3) training in the use of technology.

Funding has been provided for Professional Development for Academic Affairs and for FY2009 an increase of \$10,000 was added to the previous \$20,000. With the cost of travel Academic Affairs has been able to fund 19 faculty and administrators (Dean and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs) for Professional Development in Assessment, and some pedagogy. Prior to 2007 various department chairpersons have been sent off to an Assessment training but with the turn over of chairpersons resigning from ASCC and promotions of chairpersons to other divisions has created more faculties to be trained with the limited funding even with the \$10,000 increase it cost at least \$4,000 for travel, per-diem, registration fees, and land transportation per one faculty member sent out island for training.

PROGRAM OPERATIONS:

Program Operations includes the following components: scheduling history, student learning outcomes, methods of instruction, assessment methods, articulation, academic focus, and enrollment.

Scheduling History:

The data reflects courses offered in the semesters of the review cycle beginning Fall 2006 to Spring 2007. (see attachment Table – 1)

Table – 13: Summary of the number of courses offered from Fall – 2006 to Spring 2007:

** N = Out of 333 courses listed in catalog*

Fall - 2006	Spring - 2007	Summer - 2007	Fall - 2007	Spring - 2008	Summer - 2008
168	174	92	271	260	95
50%	52%	31%	90%	87%	32%

Methods of Instruction:

Methods of Instruction identified are lectures, group discussions, hands-on activities, guest speakers, service learning, technology and/or other appropriate instructional methods which are not included in the list:

Table – 14: Methodology Used in the Classroom

N = 263 courses – Total Number of courses and percentage

Lecture	Group Discussion	Hand-on	Guest Speakers	Service Learning	Technology	Other
258	246	255	70	117	216	15
98%	94%	97%	27%	44%	82%	6%

**taken from the Academic Affairs Program Review (2006-08)*

Assessment Methods:

Assessment Methods used to assess course learning objectives are test/exams, quizzes, homework, rubrics, portfolio, special projects, and other methods no included on the list:

Table – 15: Assessment methods Used

N = 263 total courses

Test/Exams	Quizzes	Homework	Rubrics	Portfolio	Special Projects	Other
253	226	246	152	90	137	90
96%	86%	94%	58%	34%	52%	34%

**taken from Academic Affairs Program Review (2006-08)*

Academic Focus:

Academic courses that identify courses that satisfy degree and certification program/core requirements, general education requirements, electives, and remedial requirements:

Enrollment:

- Includes ASTEP

Enrollment by Semesters:	2005	2006	2007	2008
Fall	1,160	1,607	1,767	1,826
Spring	1,352	1,495	1,494	1,621
Summer	1,050	1,032	1,100	1,149
Totals: (equal one school/academic year)	3,562	4,134	4,361	4,596

Table – 16: Courses Applying to Degree/Certificate Programs

N = 280 Total courses

Program/Core	General Education	Electives	Remedial
233	100	147	18
83%	36%	53%	6%

Table – 17: ELI Enrollment:

*** Table does not include continuing students in ELI**

Semesters:	ELI Totals:	N=Enrollmt.	% ELI
Fall 2005	694	1,601	43%
Spring 2006	285	1,495	19%
Summer 2006	236	1,032	23%
Fall 2006	882	1,607	55%
Spring 2007	605	1,494	40%
Summer 2007	306	1,100	28%
Fall 2007	1,020	1,767	58%

Table – 18: Enrollment by Majors:

Top 10 Majors with highest enrollment:

Semesters:	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Fall 2007
Enrollment:	1,550	1,601	1,607	1,767
1. Liberal Arts	570	654	765	709
2. Education	198	102	118	261
3. Criminal Justice	99	108	133	137
4. Business Management	77	59	46	61
5. Pre - Law	41	29	34	32
6. Health Science	40	38	27	22
• ELI Students do not declare a major until complete ENG 80	525	611	484	545

Table 19: Enrollment by Department:

DEPARTMENTS	Spring 2005	Fall 2005	Spring 2006	Fall 2006	Spring 2007	Fall 2007
Agriculture & Life Science	43	48	28	64	31	85
Business	164	212	206	208	226	224
College Life Planning	115	161	123	220	102	163
Criminal Justice	181	247	243	278	284	288
English Language Institute (ELI)	743	852	741	927	677	872
Fine Arts	270	329	277	362	312	355
Health & Human Services	109	137	108	122	108	105
Information & Communication Technology	87	224	146	157	173	169
Languages and Literature	464	516	495	521	488	588
Mathematics	302	530	450	625	625	717
Nursing	47	47	25	31	32	32
Physical Education Department	169	296	242	300	206	286
Reserve Officer Training Courses	70	66	50	38	16	31
Samoan Language & Culture	204	342	325	361	344	431
Science	264	282	318	237	304	270
Social Science	524	603	602	588	616	706
Teacher Education	123	98	78	93	33	197
Trades and Technology	82	184	151	152	94	154

Table 20: Enrollment by Course:

DEPARTMENTS:	Spring 2007	Summer 2007	Fall 2007	Total Courses Offered:	Enrollment Totals:
Agriculture & Life Science	31	36	85	16	152
Business	226	36	224	34	486
College Life Planning	102	64	163	14	329
Criminal Justice	284	58	288	31	630
English Language Institute	677	430	872	84	1,979
Fine Arts	312	42	355	48	709
Health & Human Services	108	11	105	21	224
Information and Communication	173	41	169	22	383
Languages & Literature	488	221	588	49	1,297
Mathematics	625	341	717	71	1,683
Nursing	32	13	32	7	77
Physical Education	206	31	286	24	523
Reserve Officer Training Course	16	0	31	4	47
Samoan Language & Culture	344	162	431	39	937
Science	304	131	270	41	705

Social Science	616	325	760	71	1,647
Teacher Education	33	22	197	16	252
Trades and Technology	94	0	154	35	248

Course Articulation:

Fall 2006 – Spring 2007

***Percentage of courses per program is articulated to a four-year university, vocational technical institution, and professional/staff development:**

Table – 21: Course Articulation

Departments:	Transferable 4 - year	Transferable Voc/Tech.	Professional/Staff Development
Agriculture and Life Science	100%	-	33%
Business	-	100%	100%
College Life Planning	-	-	60%
Criminal Justice	100%	-	81%
Education	-	7%	81%
Fine Arts	100%	24%	100%
Health and Human Services	-	8%	83%
Information and Communication Tech.	100%	33%	76%
Language and Literature	100%	-	40%
Physical Education	100%	-	-
Science	100%	-	-
Social Science	100%	100%	-
Samoan Studies	-	20%	100%
Mathematics	-	11%	78%
Nursing	-	28%	11%
Trades and Technology	-	-	100%

Table - 22: Courses Articulated to the Following Universities

Articulation of ASCC Courses @ other Universities	Program Core requirements	General Education Requirements	Electives
University of Hawaii - Manoa	-		
University of Hawaii - Hilo			
Chaminade University of Hawaii			
Brigham Young University - Hawaii			
Alfred State College			

**** Need to identify specific general education courses that are transferable to each institution and dissemination information.***

OUTPUT MEASURES:

Output measures are specific student characteristics developed after the completion of an academic program of study or course. The areas identified are tracking, course and degree/certificate rates, and the assessment of student learning outcomes.

Tracking Data of Graduates:

Information is from Transcript Request Form requested by students after graduation. The data was taken from the transcript request from graduates for Fall – 2006 and Spring 2007.

Table – 23: Tracking Data

Request:	Fall 2006	Spring 2007
UH – Cohort (BEd)	5	2
Employment	4	3
Military	2	1
Personal	7	10
Scholarships	26	24
Transfer (4-year)	46	29
TOTAL:	90	69

Table – 24: Program Retention: Course and degree/certificate completion rates

Semester	Number of Continuing Students	Retention Rates	Number of Graduates
Spring 2005	1,032	125%	81
Fall 2005	811	79%	76
Spring 2006	1,192	147%	90
Fall 2006	937	79%	120
Spring 2007	1,206	129%	93
Fall 2007	953	79%	131
Total:	6,959	106%	686

The table above reflects the continuation rates of students from the previous semester as well as the number of graduates for each semester:

- There is an average of 133% retention from Spring to Fall semesters (including students enrolled in the Summer term)
- There is an average of 79% retention from Spring to Fall Semesters. (Spring Graduation)
- The ratio of the number of continuing students and the number of students who graduate is 7:71, meaning for every 71 continuing students, there is one graduate among them.

Table – 25: DEGREE AND CERTIFICATE COMPLETION RATES

Degree/Certificate Awarded:	SPRING 2005	FALL 2005	SPRING 2006	FALL 2006	SPRING 2007
Associate of Arts	43 (57%)	43 (54%)	57 (63%)	61 (50%)	43 (45%)
Associate of Science	23 (28%)	17 (22%)	19 (21%)	39 (32%)	38 (40%)
Certificate of Proficiency	-	05 (6%)	01 (1%)	04 (3%)	03 (3%)
Double Majors	11 (14%)	14 (18%)	12 (13%)	09 (7%)	11 (11%)
Triple Majors	01 (1%)	-	01 (1%)	09 (7%)	01 (1%)
Totals:	81 (100%)	79(100%)	90 (100%)	122(100%)	96 (100%)

***Overall Percentage for Awarding Degree/Certificate:**

- 49% - A.A. degree
- 27% - A.S. degree
- 3% - Certificates
- 11% - Double Majors
- 2% - Triple Majors

Table – 26: DEGREE DURATION RATES:

SPRING 2005 TO SPRING 2007 460 GRADUATES	NUMBER OF GRADUATES	PERCENTAGE
Within 2 - years	79	17%
Within 3 – years	154	33%
Within 4 – years	100	22%
More than 4 - years	127	28%
TOTALS:	460	100%

- *2007 – FACT BOOK*

*Fifty-percent (50%) completed their degree within three years or less and fifty (50%) completed their degree within four (4) years or more.

Table – 27: ELI Completion Rates:

READING	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer
ENG 70:	2005	2006	2006	2006	2007	2007	2007	2008	2008
Enrolled	72	43	21	73	43	30	76	47	0
Passed	31(43%)	23(53%)	17(81)	26(36%)	28(65%)	28(93%)	31(68%)	30(64%)	0
ENG 80 :									
Enrolled	58	18	17	165	44	67	161	127	77
Passed	44(76%)	14(78%)	14(84%)	123(74%)	23(52%)	46(69%)	63(39%)	58(46%)	42(52%)
ENG 90									
Enrolled	170	156	-	180	152	60	170	27	169
Passed	17(69%)	87(56%)	-	114(63%)	90(69%)	51(85%)	105(62%)	22(81%)	86(51%)

WRITING	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer
ENG 71:	2005	2006	2006	2006	2007	2007	2007	2008	2008
Enrolled	38	16	0	43	15	0	21	-	27
Passed	23(61%)	08(50%)	0	27(63%)	11(73%)	0	07	-	15(54%)
ENG 81:									
Enrolled	180	47	83	170	100	77	178	168	65
Passed	97(54%)	27(57%)	63(76%)	128(75%)	53(53%)	69(90%)	112(63%)	97	49(75%)
ENG 91									
Enrolled	176	97	111	181	187	72	170	196	36
Passed	124(87%)	40(41%)	101(91%)	121(67%)	123(66%)	65(90%)	118(69%)	121	26(72%)

** FACT BOOK 2007 AND 2008*

Table – 28: ELI DURATION RATES:

TIME SPENT IN	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall
REMEDIAL ENGLISH:	2005	2005	2006	2006	2007	2008
# of Semesters:						
ENG150 or above	23(28%)	25(33%)	32(36%)	38(32%)	33(36%)	
1 semester	31(38%)	14(18%)	17(19%)	24(20%)	16(17%)	
2 semesters	16(20%)	19(25%)	15(17%)	30(25%)	17(18%)	
3 semesters	10(12%)	8(11%)	15(17%)	9(8%)	17(18%)	
4 semesters	1 (1%)	4(5%)	6(6%)	10(7%)	4(4%)	
5 semesters	0	5(7%)	4(4%)	6(5%)	5(6%)	
6 semesters or more	0	1(1%)	1(1%)	3(3%)	1(1%)	
Total Number of Students:	81	76	90	120	93	

**Need to figures on duration in ELI from Fact Book*

Table – 29: Alignment of Student Learning Outcomes to Academic Courses:

In the Fall – 2007 to Summer 2008 the Academic Programs assessed Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in the Communication Domain.

The Assessment Planning Committee recommended three (5) rubrics to assess student learning outcomes in the Communication domain. These instruments are: (1) Oral/Individual Presentation, (2) Group Presentation, and (3) Research Paper Writing, (4) Essay Writing, and (5) Book Report were used to assess Fall 2007, Spring 2008, and Summer 2008 semesters.

In the Fall semester of 2007 was the first pilot where the rubrics were introduced and implemented by sampling a group of courses and departments. The pilot group were the departments who participated in the Assessment Planning Committee. The committee departments were asked to assess one or two of the rubrics to be used to assess Communication SLOs. Of the 271 courses offered in the Fall 2007, 46 (20%) courses were assessed at the end of the semester and the results were calculated using the Excel program.

Spring 2008 semester, faculties were asked to employ at least two (2) courses out of their scheduled courses to be assessed with the rubrics. The English Language Institute (ELI) created two rubrics to address the Communication SLOs in the developmental courses. They are Essay Writing and Writing A Book Report. One of the goals of the Assessment Planning Committee is to have all academic departments develop an assessment instrument appropriate for their program courses in order to collect performance data. The data results for the Spring and Summer 2008 semesters were calculated in the SSPS 16.0 program.

Eight departments (8) were not included in this assessment implement phase because these particular departments needed further training in Writing and Assessing SLOs in the classroom.

Courses Syllabi's addressing Student Learning Outcomes domains in Communication, Job Skills and Life Skills

N = 333 courses list in catalog for 2006 - 08

SLO Domains:	<i># of courses</i>	<i>% of courses</i>
Communication Skills:		
1. Speaking and Writing	222	83%
2. Reading Skills	222	83%
3. Listening Skills	224	83.3%
Job Skills:		
1. Transferable skills	243	91%
2. Adaptive skills	216	81%
3. Job specific skills	202	75%
Life Skills:		
1. Personal Responsibility	200	74%
2. Respect and Diversity	214	79.8%
3. Problem solving	213	79.5%
4. Technology	197	73.5%

Table – 30: RUBRIC SUMMARY: GROUP PRESENTATIONS

Criterion	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Content or Objective	582	3.363	.8022
Subject Knowledge	582	3.277	.8527
Group Work	582	3.224	.8742
Time Management	582	3.157	.8582
Appearance	582	3.339	1.0951

A total of 582 students were assessed during the Spring and Summer semesters of 2008. In the Spring of 2008 a total of 87 courses used the rubrics in measuring Student Learning Outcomes in Communication. Overall performance in Communication with Group Presentation data results is **3.266 Slightly Above the Accomplished Level**. According to the specific performance indicators for Group Presentation the students **highest mean of 3.363** was in **“Content or Objective”** at the **Accomplished Level** and **“Time Management”** was the lowest mean of performance at **3.157 Slightly Above Accomplished Level** all other performance indicators mean are within **3.0 to 3.33**.

Table – 31: RUBRIC SUMMARY: RESEARCH WRITING

Criterion	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Statement of the Thesis	546	2.909	1.041
Content	546	3.008	1.022
Organization	546	2.948	1.039
Language and Structure	546	2.848	1.013
Resources	546	2.651	1.305
Writing Format	546	2.260	1.342

The data results on Research Writing specific performance indicator for 546 students highest mean is **3.00** at the **Accomplished Level** in the area of **“Content”**. The lowest mean **2.26** is in **“Writing Format”** area with all other indicators in the mean area above **2.5 to 2.94**. Overall performance mean for Research Writing is **2.07** entering the **Developing Level**.

Table – 32: RUBRIC SUMMARY: INDIVIDUAL ORAL PRESENTATION

Criterion	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Organization	657	3.363	.901
Subject knowledge	657	3.305	.870
Graphics	657	2.728	1.400
Mechanics	657	2.843	1.262
Eye Contact	657	3.061	1.003
Elocution	657	3.283	.902

The data results for 657 students in Individual Oral Presentation rated “**Organization**” mean as the highest performance indicator of **3.36** (Accomplished Level) compared to “**Graphics**” **2.72** as the lowest indicator, and “**Mechanics**” mean was at **2.8**. All other performance indicators were rated **3.0 to 3.30**.

Table – 33: RUBRIC SUMMARY: ESSAY WRITING

Criterion	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Thesis Statement	407	2.95	1.216
Content	407	2.98	1.223
Organization	407	3.19	1.204
Essay Structure	407	2.45	1.245
Spelling/Grammar	407	3.14	1.211
Presentation	407	3.56	1.166
Timeline	407	2.55	1.473
Recommendations	76	-	-

The data results for overall Essay Writing for 407 ELI students mean of **2.97** (Above Developing Level). Specific performance indicators mean of **3.56** in the area of “**Presentation**” rated highest among the other indicators and **2.45** mean was the lowest rating which all other indicators were from **2.55 to 3.19**.

Table – 34: RUBRIC SUMMARY: BOOK REPORT WRITING

Criterion	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Title Page	240	2.90	1.303
Introduction	240	2.89	1.312
Main Characters	240	3.01	1.289
Setting	240	2.93	1.338
Brief Summary	240	2.77	1.301
Turning Point	240	2.68	1.259
Outcome	240	2.74	1.281
Spelling/Grammar	240	2.70	1.180
Originality	240	2.95	1.299
Presentation	240	3.01	1.310
Timeline	216	3.19	1.379
Recommendations	192	2.09	1.691

The highest mean for “**Writing A Book Report**” is **3.19 (Accomplished Level)** in the skills area of **Timeline** and the lowest mean is **2.09 (Entering the Developing Level)** in the area of **Recommendations**. The overall performance mean for Writing a Book Report is **2.82 (Above the Developing Level)**.

The rating scale used by all Communication Rubrics was standardized using the following scale:
***Rating Scale: Levels of Student Performance**

0-1	points	Beginning Level
2	points	Developing Level
3	points	Accomplished Level
4	points	Exemplary Level

Table – 35: OVERALL RESULTS: Communication Learning Outcomes

Overall Performance Ratings:	N	Std. Deviation	Mean	Performance Level:
1. Group Presentation	582	.8964	3.266	Slightly above Accomplished
2. Individual Oral Presentation	657	1.056	3.097	Entering Accomplished
3. Writing Research Paper	546	1.127	2.077	Entering Developing
4. Essay Writing	407	1.070	2.974	Above Developing
5. Book Report	240	1.328	2.821	Above Developing

Conclusion:

Based on the overall performance means from measuring Communication SLOs our students are performing at the “**Accomplished Levels**” with **Group Presentation** and **Individual Oral Presentation**. **Essay Writing** and **Book Report Writing** was at the “**Above Developing Level**” of performance and the lowest area of Communication is with **Writing Research Paper**.

To improve on specific performance indicators in Communication the data results from the individual rubrics should be used by specific departments for discussion on addressing areas of weaknesses.

ALUMNI SURVEYS: SPRING – 2007 TO FALL - 2008

Table – 36: SURVEY RESULTS: ADVISING

SURVEY CATEGORIES, QUESTIONS AND RATING RESULTS:	Spring 2007 N – 67 Per-Cent	Fall 2007 N – 111 Per-Cent	Spring 2008 N – 87 Per-Cent	Fall 2008 N – 77 Per Cen	Overall Average:
I. ADVISING:					
1. To what extent was your advisor available or helpful during your years at ASCC?					
<i>Never</i>	.0	4.5	3.4	1.3	2.3
<i>Seldom</i>	4.5	2.7	10.3	2.6	5.0
<i>Sometimes</i>	13.4	18.0	20.7	9.1	15.3
<i>Often</i>	16.4	15.3	26.4	31.2	<u>22.32</u>
<i>Always</i>	64.2	59.5	39.1	55.8	<u>54.65*</u>
2. To what extend were your instructors available for consultation outside class?					
<i>Never</i>	.0	2.7	.0	.0	2.7
<i>Seldom</i>	3.0	6.3	6.9	7.8	6.0
<i>Sometimes</i>	13.4	19.8	25.3	14.3	18.2
<i>Often</i>	37.3	26.1	34.5	28.6	<u>31.6</u>
<i>Always</i>	46.3	45.0	33.3	49.4	<u>43.5*</u>
3. To what extent did your instructors show they care for you as the person/advisee.					
<i>Never</i>	.0	1.8	.0	.0	.0
<i>Seldom</i>	.0	2.7	5.7	3.9	3.0
<i>Sometimes</i>	9.0	14.4	20.7	10.4	13.6
<i>Often</i>	28.4	22.5	39.1	27.3	<u>29.32</u>
<i>Always</i>	62.7	58.6	31.0	57.1	<u>52.35</u>

Table – 37: SURVEY RESULTS: SYLLABI & SLOs

SURVEY CATEGORIES, QUESTIONS AND RATING RESULTS:	Spring 2007 N – 67 Per-Cent	Fall 2007 N - 111 Per-Cent	Spring 2008 N-87 Per-Cent	Fall 2008 N - 77 Per-Cent	Overall Average:
II. SYLLABI & SLOs					
4. To what extent did the syllabi reflect the reality of the courses?					
<i>Never</i>	.0	.9	.0	.0	.9
<i>Seldom</i>	.0	3.6	5.7	2.6	2.9
<i>Sometimes</i>	13.4	13.5	20.7	14.3	15.4
<i>Often</i>	28.4	37.8	39.1	41.6	<u>36.7</u>
<i>Always</i>	58.2	43.2	31.0	41.6	<u>43.5</u>
5. To what extent did the instructor articulate their Learning Outcomes at the beginning of the Semester?					
<i>Never</i>	.0	?	.0	.0	.0
<i>Seldom</i>	.0	?	3.4	1.3	1.1
<i>Sometimes</i>	1.5	?	12.6	11.7	8.6
<i>Often</i>	37.3	?	48.3	42.9	<u>42.8</u>
<i>Always</i>	58.2	?	32.2	44.2	<u>44.8</u>
6. To what extent were assignments congruent with course Learning Outcomes?					
<i>Seldom</i>	.0	2.7	2.3	1.3	1.5
<i>Sometimes</i>	10.4	21.6	12.6	13.0	14.4
<i>Often</i>	38.8	27.0	40.2	36.4	<u>35.6</u>
<i>Always</i>	50.7	47.7	41.4	49.4	<u>47.3*</u>
7. To what extent did the instructor assess your performance based on the Learning Outcomes?					
<i>Seldom</i>	.0	.9	3.4	.0	1.0
<i>Sometimes</i>	9.0	14.4	17.2	15.6	14.0
<i>Often</i>	31.3	43.2	43.7	39.0	<u>39.3</u>
<i>Always</i>	59.7	40.5	32.2	45.5	<u>44.4</u>
14. To what extent did grading procedures reflect what was on the course syllabi?					
<i>Never</i>	.0	.0	.0	1.3	1.3
<i>Seldom</i>	1.5	3.6	2.3	3.9	2.8
<i>Sometimes</i>	6.0	12.6	19.5	10.4	12.1
<i>Often</i>	38.8	36.0	47.1	42.9	<u>41.2</u>
<i>Always</i>	53.7	45.9	26.4	41.6	<u>41.9*</u>

Table – 38: SURVEY RESULTS: METHODOLOGY

SURVEY CATEGORIES, QUESTIONS AND RATING RESULTS:	Spring 2007 N - 67	Fall 2007 N - 111	Spring 2008 N - 87	Fall 2008 N - 77	Overall Average:
III. METHODOLOGY:					
8. To what extent did the instructor vary their teaching methodologies to accommodate various learning styles?					
<i>Seldom</i>	.0	2.7	3.4	.0	6.1
<i>Sometimes</i>	9.0	22.5	17.2	20.8	17.3
<i>Often</i>	31.3	27.0	43.7	32.5	<u>33.6</u>
<i>Always</i>	59.7	46.8	32.2	46.8	<u>46.3</u>
9. To what extent did faculty present current research related to the subject matter?					
<i>Seldom</i>	.0	6.3	5.7	6.5	4.6
<i>Sometimes</i>	9.0	19.8	20.7	18.2	16.9
<i>Often</i>	31.3	27.0	37.9	32.5	<u>32.1</u>
<i>Always</i>	59.7	45.0	32.2	41.6	<u>44.6</u>
10. To what extent were you required placing research into your presentations/assignments?					
<i>Seldom</i>	.0	.9	2.3	1.3	1.1
<i>Sometimes</i>	11.9	15.3	16.1	20.8	16.0
<i>Often</i>	32.8	36.9	40.2	31.2	<u>35.2</u>
<i>Always</i>	53.7	45.9	36.8	46.8	<u>45.8</u>
11. To what extent was theory made practical in coursework?					
<i>Seldom</i>	.0	4.5	2.3	5.2	3
<i>Sometimes</i>	16.4	21.6	25.3	15.6	19.7
<i>Often</i>	41.8	32.4	44.8	39.0	<u>39.5</u>
<i>Always</i>	41.8	40.5	21.8	40.3	<u>36.1*</u>
12. To what extent were the materials of your courses relevant and helpful in meeting learning objectives?					
<i>Never</i>	1.5	.0	.0	.0	1.5
<i>Seldom</i>	.0	7.2	3.4	1.3	2.9
<i>Sometimes</i>	10.4	12.6	13.8	13.0	12.4
<i>Often</i>	29.9	26.1	29.9	31.2	<u>29.2</u>
<i>Always</i>	58.2	53.2	48.3	54.5	<u>53.5*</u>
13. To what extent was technology appropriately integrated into your courses?					
<i>Never</i>	.0	.9	.0	1.3	4
<i>Seldom</i>	3.0	4.5	4.6	1.3	3.3
<i>Sometimes</i>	11.9	15.3	17.2	18.2	15.6
<i>Often</i>	35.8	30.6	33.3	26.0	<u>31.4</u>
<i>Always</i>	49.3	47.7	41.4	53.2	<u>47.9</u>

Table – 39: SURVEY RESULTS: INSTRUCTION AND SERVICES

SURVEY CATEGORIES, QUESTIONS AND RATING RESULTS:	Spring 2007 N - 67	Fall 2007 N-111	Spring 2008 N-87	Fall 2008 N - 77	Overall Average:
IV. INSTRUCTION AND SERVICES					
16. To what extent were course assignments within the Fall/Spring semester timeframe realistic?					
<i>Seldom</i>	.0	4.5	2.3	2.6	4
<i>Sometimes</i>	25.4	19.8	26.4	23.4	23.7
<i>Often</i>	43.3	42.3	46.0	50.6	<u>45.5</u>
<i>Always</i>	31.3	32.4	21.8	20.8	<u>26.5</u>
18. To what extent were course assignments within the Summer semester timeframe realistic?					
<i>Never</i>	.0	1.8	2.3	.0	1.0
<i>Seldom</i>	.0	3.6	3.4	1.3	2.0
<i>Sometimes</i>	17.9	24.3	36.8	28.6	2.6
<i>Often</i>	50.7	40.5	40.2	45.5	<u>44.2</u>
<i>Always</i>	29.9	24.3	11.5	20.8	<u>21.6*</u>
19. Rate your overall level with the education you Received from ASCC?					
<i>Poor</i>	.0	.9	.0	.0	.9
<i>Fair</i>	6.0	4.5	6.9	10.4	6.9
<i>Good</i>	49.3	43.2	55.2	54.5	<u>40.5</u>
<i>Excellent</i>	44.8	47.7	33.3	32.5	<u>39.5</u>
20. Rate the overall quality of faculty at ASCC?					
<i>Poor</i>	.0	2.7	.0	2.6	1.3
<i>Fair</i>	9.0	7.2	12.6	15.6	11.1
<i>Good</i>	44.8	46.8	58.6	46.8	<u>35.2</u>
<i>Excellent</i>	46.3	39.6	24.1	32.5	<u>35.6</u>
21. Rate your overall level of satisfaction with the education you received in the General Education programs					
<i>Poor</i>	.0	2.7	.0	.0	2.7
<i>Fair</i>	4.5	7.2	6.9	10.4	7.2
<i>Good</i>	44.8	43.2	58.6	55.8	<u>50.6</u>
<i>Excellent</i>	50.7	42.3	29.9	31.2	<u>38.5</u>
22. Rate your overall level of satisfaction with the education you received in the degree/certificate Program at ASCC?					
<i>Fair</i>	3.0	8.1	2.3	11.7	6.2
<i>Good</i>	32.8	36.0	59.8	53.2	<u>45.4</u>
<i>Excellent</i>	62.7	52.3	32.2	32.5	<u>44.9*</u>

Alumni Survey Page: INCOMPLETE

Need to:

1. Analyze data from each category
2. Need Conclusion & recommendations
3. Missing 5th category from survey results on Services