

Executive Summary

The Student Learning Committee (SLC) had two goals for the 2014-15 academic year. Those goals were to 1.) Assess the TMCC General Education outcomes and 2.) Assess the TMCC assessment process. Based on the assessment of the General Education outcomes and the assessment of the TMCC assessment process, the SLC formed the following recommendations:

1. Provide professional development opportunities on course, program/degree and institutional assessment to all TMCC faculty, staff and administration.
2. Provide professional development specific to culture/diversity (the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa) to TMCC faculty, staff and administration.
3. Review each general education outcome and write clear and measureable general education outcomes as needed.

As the assessment of student learning at all levels has been identified as a budget priority with funds allocated to support the effort, these recommendations will be carried out in academic year 2015-2016 in an effort to move TMCC from an assessment climate of compliance to an assessment climate centered on the improvement of student learning.

Introduction

At the end of Academic Year 2013-14, changes in leadership positions at TMCC were witnessed with the retirement of the Academic Dean and the Faculty Assessment Coordinator as well as the resignation of the Dean of Student Affairs and the Teacher Education Department Chair. This fundamentally impacted assessment efforts at TMCC as three of these positions were largely responsible for institutional, program and course level assessment. The beginning of the 2014-15 academic year was strained as new leadership was orientated to the positions of Academic Dean and Teacher Education Department Chair. The position of the Faculty Assessment Coordinator was not active during the fall semester. In November 2014, the Director of Research, Assessment and Planning was hired and orientated into her position.

Also in November 2014, TMCC administration established a team of faculty, staff and administrators to attend an Academy for the Assessment of Student Learning provided under the direction of the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). The team attended the training and upon return to TMCC, discussed the team's purpose. The team requested a meeting with the faculty department chairs and the result of the meeting was to combine the former Faculty Assessment Committee (consisting of department chairs) with the newly developed team to form the Student Learning Committee (SLC). The composition of the SLC would continue to include department chairs but in addition, it would also include faculty members,

administrators, and the Director of Research, Assessment and Planning. The purpose of the SLC would be the same as it was under the name of the Faculty Assessment Committee.

Based on assessment education and experience, the Director of Research, Assessment and Planning was named the chair of the SLC for the remainder of the academic year. During a May 2015 meeting, there was a unanimous vote to continue with this leadership structure through the fall 2015-16 semester, as the assessment process of change remained in a developmental stage.

Meetings were scheduled on a bi-weekly basis beginning in January 2015 through May 2015 for a total of eight meetings. At the onset, the SLC determined the committee goals for the remaining academic year to include the assessment of the general education program and the assessment of the TMCC assessment process. This plan was written and submitted in January to, and as a condition of, participation in the Academy for the Assessment of Student Learning.

Assessment of the General Education Outcomes

There are three departments included in the assessment of the TMCC General Education outcomes. Those departments are 1.) Arts and Humanities, 2.) Math and Science, and 3.) Social Science. As noted earlier, all Department Chairs are members of the SLC. In addition, faculty from departments are also members of the SLC.

Beginning in January 2015, the SLC made the decision to assess the TMCC general education outcomes assessment as the General Education outcomes were scheduled for assessment on the TMCC assessment calendar for the academic year (2014-2015). There were approximately three to five months, dependent upon department chairs and department meetings held, to prepare for the assessment of the general education outcomes. Despite this brief time period, Department Chairs and faculty produced findings and recommendations; in doing so, they also became more familiar with general education assessment and the process involved.

The Plan

All departments agreed to the assessment of the seven general education outcomes (see Appendix A for a complete listing of the TMCC General Education Outcomes). Further, all departments agreed to assess for 1.) Communications, 5.) Culture/Diversity, 6.) Critical Thinking and 7.) Technology. Each department also selected one additional outcome of their choice. The total number of outcomes to assess for each department was five; all outcomes were assessed at least once. All department reports were due at the end of the spring 2015 semester.

The Expected Results

The SLC did not set a range, or standard, per each outcome. Rather, the expected results were left to the discretion of each department. Of the departments, the Math and Science set an average of 70% per course as the minimum in meeting each general education outcome. Upon receipt of the department reports, the SLC summarized all the results into a collective whole and through discussion, made a determination of whether the general education outcomes had been met.

Tools Used

After extensive review and discussion of rubrics, the SLC decided that each department would determine which tools of measurement to use. As a result, each department employed a variety of assessment tools, including but not limited to rubrics. Upon receipt of the department reports, the SLC compared the department reports to the description of the general education outcomes (see Appendix B) and discussion was held per each general education outcome. This was the basis for the final determination of whether the general education outcomes were met. The SLC did not use any additional tools of measurement.

The SLC Findings

At the end of the semester, two of the three departments presented their reports. One department chair did not present as the faculty in that department had not finished their FARM reports. Another meeting was scheduled in June 2015 to complete the assessment of the general education outcomes (See Appendix C for Department Reports).

The TMCC General Education outcomes were discussed in detail by the SLC. While each department agreed to the assessment of five general education outcomes, the results provided show that the number of faculty assessing varied per department (see Table 1). The following narrative summarizes the general education outcome assessment:

1. Communication- Each department assessed and provided evidence for the outcome of communication. The SLC discussed this and it was determined that the evidence provided was not sufficient to determine whether the outcome was met as it was sporadic with multiple meanings.
2. Mathematics- The Math and Science (M&S) department was the only department to assess mathematics and their goal was for students to achieve a 70% mastery, on average. The M&S did not reach a consensus on whether the outcome was achieved as some class averages did not reach the 70% mastery. The SLC discussed this and it was determined that the outcome was not met.

3. Science- The Math and Science (M&S) department was the only department to assess science and the goal was for students to achieve a 70% mastery. The M&S did not reach a consensus on whether the outcome was achieved as some class averages did not reach the 70% mastery. The SLC discussed this and it was determined that the outcome results were inconclusive.
4. Humanities and Social Science- The Social Science department was the only department to assess for this outcome and of the six faculty listed, only one faculty attempted to measure it. However, the evidence provided by the one faculty member was not specific to the Humanities and Social Science outcome. The SLC discussed this and it was determined that the outcome was not met.
5. Culture/Diversity- Each department planned to assess for culture. With regard to the evidence presented however, only a handful of faculty assessed culture and the results were sporadic. The SLC discussed this and it was determined that the outcome was not met as the evidence was patchy.
6. Critical Thinking- The outcome of critical thinking was assessed by all departments. Most faculty attempted to assess for this outcome; the results provided show that there is a lack of uniformity within faculty perceptions of critical thinking. As a result, while each department provided evidence, the evidence was not defined. The SLC discussed this and it was determined that while evidence was provided, the evidence couldn't be pieced together. The outcome was not met.
7. Technology- Each department planned to assess technology; the reports show that two out of three departments provided findings. Of the findings presented, the M&S department reported meeting the outcome of technology as it was defined throughout their department, to include the use of lab equipment. The department of A&H reported two out of three faculty assessing technology. One faculty member provided definitions of what was assessed. The SLC discussed this and it was determined that, while evidence was provided, it was inconclusive as to whether the outcome was met.

Table 1: Number of faculty assessing for each outcome

Department:	General Education Outcome:						
	Communication	Math	Science	Humanities and Social Science	Culture/ Diversity	Critical Thinking	Technology
Arts & Humanities	3 out of 3 (3/3) faculty	Not Applicable (N/A)	N/A	1/3 faculty assessed	1/3 faculty assessed	1/3 faculty assessed	2/3 faculty assessed
Math & Science	3/7 faculty assessed	5/7 faculty assessed	3/7 faculty assessed	N/A	2/7 faculty assessed	6/7 faculty assessed	5/7 faculty assessed
Social Science	4/5 faculty assessed	N/A	N/A	1/5 faculty assessed	2/5 faculty assessed	5/5 faculty assessed	0/5 faculty assessed
Total	10/15 faculty assessed communication	5/15 faculty assessed math	3/15 assessed science	2/15 assessed hum. & ss	5/15 assessed culture	12/15 assessed critical thinking	7/15 assessed technology

Interpretation of Findings

Based on the evidence provided, uniformity is absent throughout the departments when assessing for general education. As general education is woven throughout the TMCC curriculum in a fixed description, a lack of uniformity is a definite barrier. While each department is reporting findings to some degree, it is often unknown how the findings were attained or what the findings mean. In turn, it is exceedingly difficult to measure and determine whether the general education outcomes were met. This also speaks to the next issue, professional development.

As noted within the HLC evaluation report, 100% of TMCC faculty are doing assessment at the course level and they are commended for their time and effort. However, at the program/degree level, TMCC faculty has had little to no experience with assessment. Through the brief training sessions held during SLC meetings and the task of assessing the general education outcomes, SLC members are now more attuned as to what assessment involves at the general education level. That said, a gap continues to exist in knowledge and experience for SLC members and that gap is exacerbated when considering the rest of TMCC faculty that are not a part of the SLC. This becomes evident through the processes used and the findings presented from each department.

Recommendations:

The SLC Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on the findings of the general education outcomes assessment:

1. Provide professional development opportunities on program/degree assessment to all TMCC faculty, staff and administration.
2. Provide professional development specific to culture/diversity (the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa) to TMCC faculty, staff and administration.
3. Review each general education outcome and write clear and measureable general education outcomes as needed.

The Department Recommendations

As noted earlier, there are three departments at TMCC that deliver general education courses. Those three departments include Arts and Humanities, Math and Science and Social Science. The following are summaries of each department's recommendations:

Arts and Humanities Department-

Course Level Recommendations- The Arts and Humanities Department provided many recommendations at the course level. In academic year 2015-2016, and with vital attention, the Department Chair and faculty will need to follow-up on these course level recommendations in the FARM report to determine whether the proposed changes made a difference. This follow-up step will close the assessment loop for each respective course per each course recommendation(s).

Department Recommendations-

1. Revise the General Education outcome of Technology to "reflect changes in the skills of the students we now have" (Arts and Humanities Department Report, no page number listed).
 - a. Action Taken- The SLC will review and revise the General Education outcomes during academic year 2015-2016.

Math and Science Department-

Course Level Recommendations- The Math and Science Department provided many recommendations at the course level. In academic year 2015-2016, and with vital attention, the Department Chair and faculty will need to follow-up on these course level recommendations in the FARM report to determine whether the proposed changes made a

difference. This follow-up step will close the assessment loop for each respective course per each course recommendation(s).

Department Recommendations-

Math Outcome:

1. Math tutoring by the college is strongly advised (Math and Science Department Report, p. 1).
 - a. Action Taken- No action taken as the findings presented do not match the recommendation. There is no evidence.

Culture/Diversity Outcome:

1. A number of instructors would like to see a bank of ideas for inclusion or perhaps some tutorial workshops (Math and Science Department Report, p. 2)
2. Since students engage in a cultural pre-test administered by the college, it might be beneficial to bring the actual test to the attention of instructors, so that they can emphasize the same material (Math and Science Department Report, p. 2)
 - a. Action Taken- A professional development course/workshop is in development to address culture/diversity based on the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa. As a matter of evidence, only 5 out of 15 faculty assessed for this general education outcome. This remains the lowest number of faculty assessing a general education outcome that was meant to be assessed by all departments and consequently, all faculty. Further, the general education outcome of culture/diversity is also measured at the institutional level.

Institutional Recommendations-

1. Change Chem 116 Introduction to Organic Chemistry and Biochemistry into a 2-semester course (Math and Science Department Report, p. 3).
 - a. Action Taken- Referred to Academic Standards Committee
2. Math personnel feel that Math 100 could be dropped, since math basics could be included with intermediate Algebra 102 and Technical Math 130, resulting in a great deal of time being saved since it does not take an entire semester to work through math basics (Math and Science Department Report, p. 3).
 - a. Action Taken- Referred to Academic Standards Committee
3. Since science instructors have notices poor scores in metric conversion, significant figures operations, scientific notation, and factor labeling, it is suggested that all Associate of Science majors who cannot pass a technical math placement test be required to take Technical Math 130 prior to chemistry and physics classes.

Science instructors have also noted very poor algebra skills in Chem 115 despite the prerequisite of Intermediate Algebra 102 or placement into Algebra 111. It is suggested that the math placement test be updated (with a “math for science” component), that high school courses not be given preference over placement scores, and that Technical Math 130 be required for students who do not pass the “math for science” placement test; this implies that Technical Math 130 will also contain an algebra review with emphasis on science-based text problems (Math and Science Department Report, p. 3 & 4).

- a. Action Taken- Referred to Academic Standards Committee
4. Require a grade of “C” or above to continue to the next course in science sequential courses (Math and Science Department Report, p. 4).
 - a. Action Taken- Referred to Academic Standards Committee
 5. Have school counselors visit developmental classes and supply students with information on technical or vocational study programs as well as academic, and present an overview of degrees and related job opportunities, and what is involved in different jobs (Math and Science Department Report, p. 4).
 - a. Action Taken- Referred to Academic Standards Committee
 6. Research opportunities for undergraduates must be increased, since it has been shown in national literature, as well as at TMCC (Padmanabhan, LaVallie paper presented at American Society Engineering Educators in 2013) that research opportunities are correlated with increased student success in STEM areas as well as increased retention of these students in STEM and movement into 4-year programs and beyond (Math and Science Department Report, p. 4).
 - a. A TMCC Research Department will be developed in academic year 2015-2016. Research opportunities for students will be a priority.

Social Science Department

Of the six faculty members included in this department, five faculty members were included in the assessment of general education outcomes based on the general education courses taught. The last faculty member taught and assessed a course not classified as a general education course.

Course Level Recommendations- All six faculty members provided a narrative of course assessment. Of the six, one faculty listed recommendations for course improvement. This raises a red flag as the purpose behind assessment is improvement at all levels. Without recommendations, there is no plan to improve. That said, it should also be noted that no FARM reports were submitted with the department report but FARM reports were noted in faculty course reports. It may be that faculty only provided recommendations on their FARM reports.

At any rate, the Department Chair and faculty will need to follow-up on course-level recommendations. If course-level recommendations are absent in the FARM report, recommendations will need to be built in according to the course findings. The next step will be to follow-up on course-level recommendations as only the inclusion of this step will provide evidence as to whether the changes proposed made a difference in student learning. If course-level recommendations are listed in the FARM report, follow-up will also need to occur to ascertain whether changes proposed made a difference. Follow-up in both scenarios is a necessary step to close the assessment loop.

Department Recommendations-

1. Develop department rubric to measure “Native American cultural and traditional student learning,” (Social Science Department Report, p. 3).
 - a. Action Taken- Department will assume this task in fall 2015.
2. TMCC General Education Outcomes to be “stated in simpler terms making assessment more manageable,” (Social Science Department, p. 3).
 - a. Action Taken- The SLC will review and revise the General Education outcomes during academic year 2015-2016.
3. Gap identified in CTE students not taking Social Science department courses but still included in the graduate cultural assessment (Social Science Department, p. 3 & 4).
 - a. Action Taken- Referred to Academic Standards Committee

Budget Recommendations-

1. Funding for books and other materials to incorporate new content and resources such as can be found on the internet and the media related to the Ojibway.
 - a. No action taken as the findings presented do not match the recommendation. There is no evidence.
2. Funding for resource speakers such as community elders with special knowledge of our tribal history and fluent speakers of the Ojibway language to speak in class.
 - a. No action taken as the findings presented do not match the recommendation. There is no evidence.
3. Funding for student field trips to sacred places and ceremonies.
 - a. No action taken as the findings presented do not match the recommendation. There is no evidence.
4. Travel monies for Chippewa/Ojibway history, language conferences and cultural workshops.

- a. No action taken as the findings presented do not match the recommendation. There is no evidence.
5. Funding for audio and visual equipment in the TMCC library for student check out to record the tribal elders.
 - a. No action taken as the findings presented do not match the recommendation. There is no evidence.

Assessment of the TMCC Assessment Process

The Plan

In an effort to assess the TMCC assessment process, a plan was formed in conjunction with the assessment of the general education plan. Through the assessment of the general education outcomes, faculty would use observations and action research to experience assessment at the program level. This would provide an opportunity to assess the assessment process that is currently in place. This was done in part to address the issue that while TMCC faculty do 100% assessment at the course level, they do little to none at the program/degree level.

The Expected Results

The expected result from this practice was to expose the SLC to assessment at the program/degree level. SLC members would emerge with knowledge and experience that was absent prior to the assessment.

Tools Used

Observations and action research were identified as the methods that would be employed through this process. SLC members were asked to be mindful and to keep notes on how the process worked or didn't work as they experienced it. SLC faculty members reported back to the SLC during the last two meetings (May and June) on their findings.

Findings

As many faculty noted, the time frame from implementation to delivery of assessment results was less than a semester. Yet, even within this brief period, the SLC provided multiple findings applicable to the assessment process. The following findings are presented in the form of questions and comments that emerged during this process:

1. How many objectives should an instructor have for a course?
2. What about course or program goals?
3. How do course objective and course goals work together? What are the differences?

4. How do the Institutional Goals fit in?
5. Do we need nine Institutional goals?
6. How do the Seven Teachings fit in? How are they incorporated into the curriculum?
7. Are they aligned with the General Education Student Learning Outcomes?
8. How do they all map together (Institutional Goals, Seven Teachings, General Education outcomes, Course Goals and Objectives)?
9. Does there need to be a department consensus on whether each department met their outcomes? For example, the M&S department was conflicted with this determination as some faculty reported meeting the outcome and some faculty reported not meeting the outcome.
10. The recommendation provided from each department has to be directly linked to the findings presented in each report.
11. The assessment process has to include set dates and procedures for the Department Chairs to turn in department goals/plans, FARM, reports, etc.

Interpretation of Findings

Two issues arose as a result of the findings associated with the assessment of the TMCC assessment process. The issues are 1.) Assessment as it unites course, program and institutional levels and 2.) Assessment as it relates to the TMCC process and procedures.

Questions related to course, program and institutional levels of assessment were present throughout the SLC discussions. Many questions were addressed in SLC meetings as SLC members researched various higher education institutions and general education processes used. However, as the Department Chair and their faculty members became more entrenched in the assessment process, additional questions become more widespread about how each level of assessment is aligned with the next level. These questions point to the need for additional time and resources dedicated to finding answers.

The second issue is directly related to the TMCC assessment process and procedures. Even though SLC members committed time to researching other institutions of higher education and the assessment processes used, there remained a gap from theory to application that only the experience of the general education assessment process would provide. At the conclusion of the general education assessment process, SLC members expressed concern and frustration as they recounted the lack of, or the inadequacies of, procedures in place within the TMCC assessment process, including Department consensus, dates, standardized method or the FARM report.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on the findings of the assessment of the TMCC assessment process:

1. Provide professional development opportunities on course, program/degree and institutional assessment to all TMCC faculty, staff and administration.
2. Review the Faculty Assessment Manual and develop and revise procedures as needed.

The SLC Plan for Academic Year 2015-16

The following plan was developed based on the TMCC assessment calendar along with the findings and recommendations of the assessment reports. The plan will be presented to the SLC for approval in fall 2015.

1. General Education Assessment
 - a. Provide professional development to the SLC and TMCC faculty, staff and administrators on course, program and institutional level assessment.
 - i. Paid presenters at the beginning of fall 2015.
 - ii. Faculty exchange with Southwestern Community College- fall 2015.
 - iii. Invite HLC mentor to visit TMCC and present on assessment- spring 2016.
 - iv. HLC Conference attendance by various TMCC employees- spring 2016.
 - b. Provide professional development to the SLC and TMCC faculty, staff and administrators on culture/diversity.
 - i. Develop a class for all TMCC employees in which the culture/diversity of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa is addressed.
 - c. Continue with the assessment of the TMCC general education outcomes
 - i. Departments will present assessment plans to SLC in September 2015.
 - ii. Department reports will follow a standard procedure.
 - iii. Department reports will be due in May 2016.
 - d. Develop a sub-committee to review and revise General Education outcomes- September 2015. Updates provided to the SLC on a quarterly basis. Final document will be presented to SLC in April 2016.
 - e. Develop a sub-committee to review and revise the Faculty Assessment manual- September 2015. Updates provided to the SLC on a quarterly basis. Final document will be presented to the SLC in April 2016.
2. Graduate Cultural Assessment
 - a. Administer pre-cultural assessment tool to new students- August 2015.
 - b. Analyze results- September and October 2015.
 - c. Review graduate cultural assessment tool; revise as needed- spring 2016.
3. Create a Culture of Assessment

- a. Provide professional development to the SLC and TMCC faculty, staff and administrators on course, program and institutional level assessment.
 - i. Paid presenters at the beginning of fall 2015.
 - ii. Faculty exchange with Southwestern Community College- fall 2015.
 - iii. Invite HLC mentor to visit TMCC and present on assessment- spring 2016.
 - iv. HLC Conference attendance by various TMCC employees- spring 2016.

Other:

The CTE Co-Chair, Marilyn Delorme, submitted a department report with program and budget recommendations. The recommended program changes were referred to the appropriate channels and the budget recommendation was approved by the SLC (refer to May 18, 2015 SLC meeting minutes for additional detail).

Report Submitted by:

Terri Martin-Parisien
Director of Research, Assessment and Planning
SLC Chair/Assessment Coordinator
Academic Year 2014-2015

Appendix A- Turtle Mountain Community College General Education Outcomes

General Education Student Learning Outcomes

Philosophy

Turtle Mountain Community College's philosophy of general education is grounded in the belief that a multi-faceted array of concepts and experiences enhances and broadens students' abilities to contribute to a more vibrant, ethical, progressive, and responsible society. The General Education program at TMCC will produce students who can think critically, use technology effectively, understand the culture of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians, as well as the Mitchif people and their culture and heritage. Students will learn to solve concrete problems and apply their skills and competencies to benefit themselves and their society, with an emphasis upon contributing to the culture and heritage of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa and Mitchif people.

a. Communication: Students will attain competencies in the design and delivery of public speeches. Students will also be able to accurately interpret and critically analyze written media and express themselves in writing, utilizing various expository writing strategies.

b. Mathematics: Students will be able to apply arithmetical, geometric, statistical, and algebraic principles of mathematics and problem solving at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies.

c. Science: Students will be conversant with the general knowledge bases and the procedures and techniques by which knowledge are generated and accessed through the life, physical and earth sciences, and they will be able to select and apply the techniques and procedures of the sciences at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies.

d. Humanities and Social Science: Students will be conversant with the general knowledge bases and the procedures and techniques by which knowledge and artistic expressions are generated and accessed in the two divisions of (1) the humanities and fine arts, and (2) the social and behavioral sciences, and they will be able to select and apply the techniques and procedures of these two areas at level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies. 15

e. Culture/Diversity: Students will be able to consider a variety of perspectives based on differences such as those stemming from culture, heritage, gender, ethnicity, historical development, community and leadership, and they will apply this awareness at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies.

f. Critical Thinking: Students will be able to raise vital questions and problems, gather and assess relevant information, come to well-reasoned conclusions and solutions, and test those solutions against relevant criteria, think open-mindedly about their assumptions, consider the practical consequences and communicate effectively to find solutions at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies.

g. Technology: Students will be conversant with the general knowledge bases and the procedures and techniques by which knowledge is generated and accessed through the use of technology, and they will be able to select and apply the techniques and procedures of technology at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies.

Appendix B- Description of General Education Outcomes

Learning Objectives/Outcomes	Objectives	Assessments/Method	Timeline	Responsibilities
1. Communication:				
Students will have developed sufficient skills with the English language such that they can read, accurately interpret, critically analyze written material, express themselves effectively through narrative, explanatory, and investigative writing utilizing standard rhetorical techniques in the styles and formats, and at the level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies.	1a. Students will demonstrate the ability to formulate a thesis statement and use facts, statistics, anecdotes, and examples in written work.	1a. Pre-tests Post-Tests Course tests/quizzes	1a. Beginning of Semester End of Semester During courses	1a. Course Instructors
		1a. Written essays Evaluation of lab work.	1a. During semester courses	1a. Course Instructors
		1a. *CHASE Grad. Assess. Survey	1a. Fall/Spring Semester End of Spring Sem.	1a. assessment committee
	1b. Students will formulate a speech design with accuracy in writing mechanics and crediting supportive sources	1b. Evaluations of internet research & WebCT Assignments, Group work	1b. During semester	1b. Course Instructors
	1c. Students will complete at least one service learning and leadership project	1c. Evaluation of reports on service learning and leadership projects	1c. During all semesters	1c. Course Instructors
2. Mathematics				
Students will be able to apply arithmetical, geometric, statistical, and algebraic principles of mathematics and problem solving at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies.	2a. Students will simplify, factor, and perform operations on polynomials	2a. Pre-tests Post-Tests Course tests/quizzes	2a. Beginning of Semester End of Semester During courses	2a. Course Instructors
	2b. Students will solve equation and inequalities.	2b. Pre-tests Post-Tests Course tests/quizzes	2b. Beginning of Semester End of Semester During semester	2b. Course Instructors
	2c. Students will draw and communicate conclusions generated from applying mathematical concepts	2c. Pre-tests Post Tests 2c. CHASE Grad. Assess. Survey	2c. Beginning/end of semester 2c. End of Spring Semester	2c. Course Instructors 2c. assessment committee
	2d. Students will complete at least one service learning & leadership	2d. Evaluation of reports on service learning and leadership	2d. During all semesters	2d. Course Instructors
3. Science				
Students will be conversant with the general knowledge bases and the procedures and techniques by which knowledge is generated and accessed through the life, physical, and earth sciences, and they will be able to select and apply	3a. Students will use logic and mathematics in the scientific method	3a. Pre-tests Post-Tests Course tests/quizzes 3a. CHASE Grad. Assess. Survey	3a. Beginning/end of semester 3a. End of Semesters Spring Semester	3a. Course Instructor 3a. assessment committee
	3b. Students will use lab skills such as measurement, safety, equipment use, and interpretation of data	3b. Pre-tests Post-Tests Course tests /quizzes Skills Tests - Lab work	3b. Beginning of semesters End of semesters during semesters	3b. Course Instructor
	3c. Students will complete at least one service learning and leadership project	3c. Evaluation of reports on service learning and leadership	3c. Fall & Spring End of Spring Semester 3c. During all semesters	3c. Course Instructor

4. Humanities and Social Science				
Students will be conversant with the general knowledge bases and the procedures by which knowledge and artistic expressions are generated and accessed in the two divisions of (1) the humanities and fine arts, and (2) the social and behavioral sciences, and they will be able to select and apply the techniques and procedures of these two areas at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies	4a. Students will describe the broad outlines of history and its connections to current personal, social, and political situations and developments at the community and global level	4a. CBASE Grad. Assessment Survey	4a. Fall & Spring Semester	4a. curriculum committee
		4a. Tests and quizzes	4a. During semester	4a. Course Instructors
		4a. Evaluation of research papers	4a. During semester	4a. Course Instructors
	4b. Students will describe aspects of traditional and contemporary culture of The Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa	4b. Evaluation of forums on tribal and global issues	4b. Spring semesters	4b. Instructors participating in interdisciplinary projects
	4c. Students will demonstrate skills and knowledge related to the fine arts	4c. portfolios/projects Concerts & performances reflection/research papers	4c. End of semesters	4c. Course Instructors
	4d. Students will interpret the process of human behavior and social interaction using social and behavioral science perspectives	4d. Evaluation of group projects Evaluation of group discussions	4d. During semesters	4d. Course instructors
	4e. Students will analyze the basic structures, procedures, rights, and responsibilities of governance	4e. Evaluation of role-play and simulations 4e. CBASE Grad. Assessment Survey	4e. During all semesters 4e. Beginning of semesters End of semesters	4e. Course instructors 4e. assessment committee
	4f. Students will complete at least one service learning and leadership project	4f. Evaluation of reports on service learning and leadership projects	4f. End of semesters During semester courses	4f. Course instructors
5. Culture/Diversity:				
Students will be able to consider a variety of perspectives based on differences such as those stemming from culture, class, gender, ethnicity, historical development, and community, and they will apply this awareness at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies	5a. Students will analyze the concepts of multiculturalism	5a. Pre-tests/Post-tests	5a. Fall and spring End of spring semester	5a. Course instructors
		5a. Evaluation of research	5a. During all semesters	5a. Course instructors
		5a. Reports; skills tests	5a. During all semesters	5a. Course instructors
	5b. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the Ojibwa culture in relation to the Seven Teachings	5b. Evaluation of group projects (pow-wows, etc.); lang. interviews		
	5c. Students will complete at least one service learning and leadership project	5c. CBASE Grad. Assessment Survey		5c. assessment committee
		5c. Evaluation of service learning and leadership projects		5c. Course instructors

6. Critical thinking:				
Students will be able to raise vital questions and problems, gather and assess relevant information, come to well-reasoned conclusions and solutions, and test those solutions against relevant criteria, think open-mindedly about their assumptions, consider the practical consequences, and communicate effectively to find solutions, at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies	6a. Students will solve problems in various content areas by applying an appropriate problem-solving model	6a. Pre-tests Post-tests	6a. Beginning of semester End of Semester	6a. Course instructors
	6b. Students will analyze data, assumptions, arguments, and inferences	6a. CBASE Grad. Assessment Survey	6a. Beginning/end of semester spring semester	6a. assessment committee
		6b. Pre/ Post-tests	6b. Beginning/end of semesters	6b. Course instructors
6c. Students will participate in at least one service learning and leadership project	6b. Evaluation of interdisciplinary forums on tribal and global issues (pending)	6c. Evaluation of reports on service learning and leadership projects.	6b. End of semester courses	6b. Instructors involved in interdisciplinary projects
			6c. During all semesters	6c. Course instructors
7. Technology				
Students will be conversant with the general knowledge bases and the procedures and techniques by which knowledge is generated and accessed through the use of technology, and they will be able to select and apply the techniques and procedures of technology at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies.	7a. Students will operate computer systems to use windows, dialog boxes, files, and folders.	7a. Pre-tests/Post-tests	7a. Beginning /end of semesters	7a. Course instructors
		7a. Tests and quizzes	7a. During semesters	7a. Course instructors
		7a. Evaluation of lab work	7a. During semesters	7a. Course instructors
	7b. Students will use word processing, including formatting, creating, and storing text.	7b. Pro/Post-tests	7b. Beginning/ end of semesters	7b. Course instructors
		7b. Tests and quizzes	7b. During semesters	7b. Course instructors
		7b. Grad. Assess. Survey	7b. End of spring semester	7b. assessment committee
	7c. Students will use basic E-mail skills to set up E-mail accounts, create address folders, send attachments, and send and receive E-mail.	7c. Grad. Assess. Survey	7c. Beginning /end semesters	7c. assessment committee
		7c. Pre/Post-tests Evaluation of simulations, group work, internet research	7c. During semesters	7c. Course instructors
	7d. Students will participate in at least one service learning and leadership project	7d. Evaluation of reports on service learning and leadership projects	7d. During all semesters	7d. Course instructors

Program Level: The assessment committee gives a cohort of students the CBASE each year. They administer the Graduate Assessment Survey each spring to all college graduates. The assessment committee collects the data from these and other program level assessment instruments, analyzes them, and compiles a report for the faculty. At the end of the academic year, the faculty meet with the Dean of Academic Programs and the assessment committee to discuss the data and decide how to best improve the general education curriculum and their course work based on the data. The information is then used to plan and budget for future academic needs.

Appendix C- Department Reports

Arts and Humanities Assessment Report Spring 2015

The Arts and Humanities Department instructors met to decide how to assess the general education outcomes for their department. They decided to take Terri Martin-Parisien's suggestion and assess students' performance in three courses within the department: English 120 (Composition I), Communications 101 (Fundamentals of Public Speaking), and Humanities 202 (Fine Arts and Aesthetics). Two of these courses (English 120 and Communications 101) are ones all students are required to take to receive associate degrees, and the third one (Humanities 202) is one that many students in the associate programs choose and that is required for students seeking admission into an education cohort. Assessing these three courses also worked well for the department since each of the three full-time instructors in the department teaches one of the three courses, so the job of assessing the general education outcomes could be shared equally by all.

The members of the department discussed various ways to assess student performance in the designated classes and decided using rubrics to assess final work in each course would be the most effective method of assessment. They considered but rejected using objective tests, feeling that assessing final projects, papers, and speeches would be more valid, given the nature of the courses and the skills involved. Each instructor found or developed a rubric to use. However, all agree that while it is helpful to have a rubric that articulates expectations for assignments by listing criteria, identifying specific criteria for each level of the rubric does not work well. All prefer articulating expectations and then rating student performance with numbers representing excellent, above average, average, below average, and unacceptable performance.

The department chose to assess with the general education outcomes one, four, five, six, and seven in mind:

General Education Outcome #1 (Communication): "Students will have developed sufficient skills with the English language such that they can read, accurately interpret, critically analyze written material, express themselves effectively through narrative, explanatory, and investigative writing utilizing standard rhetorical techniques in the styles and formats, and at the level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies."

General Education Outcome #4 (Humanities and Social Science): "Students will be conversant with the general knowledge bases and the procedures by which knowledge and artistic expressions are generated and accessed in the two divisions of (1) the humanities and fine arts, and (2) the social and behavioral sciences, and they will be able to select and apply the techniques and procedures of these two areas at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies."

General Education Outcome #5 (Culture/Diversity): "Students will be able to consider a variety of perspectives based on differences such as those stemming from culture, class, gender, ethnicity, historical development, and community, and they apply this awareness at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies."

General Education Outcome #6 (Critical Thinking): “Students will be able to raise vital questions and problems, gather and assess relevant information, come to well-reasoned conclusions and solutions, and test those solutions against relevant criteria, think open-mindedly about their assumptions, consider the practical consequences and communicate effectively to find solutions, at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies.”

General Education Outcome #7 (Technology): “Students will be conversant with the general knowledge bases and the procedures and techniques by which knowledge is generated and accessed through the use of technology and procedures of technology at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies.”

The following are each instructor’s assessment report:

Erik Kornkven’s Spring 2015 Assessment: Composition II

Introduction

I have conducted an assessment based on the final papers of my composition II courses. I taught two courses of Composition II, each of which followed the same curriculum. The final paper that was assessed was a social commentary assignment. The student was asked to identify a pattern or trend in society, use data to prove that the trend exists, then draw conclusions about larger society based on the existence of the trend. The paper was required to be 4-7 pages in length, with a minimum of three unique sources used.

Methods

I assessed the papers according to five student learning outcomes as expressed in the TMCC Self Study page 70.

1. **Communication:** Students will demonstrate the ability to formulate a thesis statement and use facts, statistics, anecdotes, and examples in a written work.
2. **Humanities and Social Science*:** Students will make effective use of outside sources to engage in knowledge creation within an academic discourse.
3. **Culture/Diversity*:** Students will bring their own culture and experiences to bear on issues connected to larger society.
4. **Critical Thinking:** Students will analyze data, assumptions, arguments, and inferences.
5. **Technology:** Students will use word processing, including formatting, creating and storing text.

** When possible I used existing language for specific goals within the outcomes, but in two instances (culture/diversity, and humanities and social science) I adapted the language to better reflect the course and assignment learning outcomes.*

I scored each paper on a scale of 1-5 with 1 being very little proficiency shown, to 5 being student shows high proficiency.

Results

A total of 26 papers were assessed with the following results:

Criteria	Average
Communication	3.19
Humanities and Social Science	2.73
Culture/Diversity	3.07
Critical Thinking	3.15
Technology	3.65

Analysis

This assessment gives me some insight into where my students were at the end of my course. The numbers reveal that my students' largest struggle is with integrating sources to build on existing knowledge. Anecdotally, I had many students express their confusion as we studied citation methods, with some explaining that they had not been required to make use of sources in their previous writing courses. I take that with a grain of salt, but it does suggest that source integration should perhaps get more attention in my course.

In addition to the criteria listed above, I also have some general observations about the students and their writing skills based on their total body of work over the course of this semester.

Strengths

- The students demonstrate an ability to follow directions, and reproduce genres based on samples and examples. This shows me that they have many of the rhetorical skills we are looking for when they enter the classroom.
- Students for the most part demonstrate an aptitude for basic academic writing genres such as the five-paragraph essay.

Places for Improvement

- Students at times struggle working in groups.
- Students are comfortable with reporting information, but struggle when asked to create their own data (this is a typical first-year writing challenge).

Suggestions for the future

This assessment has helped lead me to ideas of ways I can improve my future courses to help meet these realities.

1. Emphasize source integration earlier and assign tasks where students practice the entire research process
2. Allow more freedom for students to design their own documents since they already seem comfortable following step-by-step directions.
3. Incorporate more reading into my courses to encourage analytical thinking.

Stuart Rieke's Spring 2015 Assessment: Fundamentals of Public Speaking

Item Assessed: a 30-point rubric was used to grade students on their final persuasive or informative speech.

General Education Outcome Assessed: #1 (Communication) Addressed: “Students will have developed sufficient skills with the English language such that they can read, accurately interpret, critically analyze written material, express themselves effectively through narrative, explanatory, and investigative writing utilizing standard rhetorical techniques in the styles and formats, and at the level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies.”

Number of Students in Final Grading Pool: 16
 Average Total Score on 30-point Rubric: 24
 (Plus 10-points for Dialogical Listening and Feedback for Classmates)
 Average Total Percentage of Points on Final Speech: 85%
 High Score(s) on 30-point Rubric: 30
 Low Score on 30-point Rubric: 18

Rubric Categories	Mean	Median
Preparation	4	
Introduction	4	
Body	5	
Conclusion	3	
Organization	4	
Delivery	4	

Narrative Assessment on Class and Rubric:

The rubric I designed needed to sound less punitive and be more “congratulatory” as many students struggled with the assignments and the act of public speaking. On the whole, students preferred my using the rubric to a flat score. They wanted as much feedback as possible, so it was an effective tool. I need more experience utilizing a rubric also, I scored directly onto the rubric rather than taking notes, jotting suggestions, and grading while speeches were going on. I will do it differently next time in that way.

My assignments need to be looked at because the first few were far too easy and required little. In Sisseton, when I taught, the first assignments were more rigorous—and the speeches were better to begin. Speeches were on a range of topics from local and personal issues, to global and national issues, to tribal issues.

Peggy Johnson’s Spring 2015 Assessment: Fine Arts and Aesthetics

I considered the following general education outcomes when evaluating final projects submitted for the course:

General Education Outcome Assessed: #4 (Humanities and Social Science): “Students will be conversant with the general knowledge bases and the **procedures by which knowledge and artistic expressions are generated** and accessed in the two divisions of (1) **the humanities and fine arts**, and (2) the social and behavioral sciences, and they will be able to **select and apply the techniques and procedures of these two areas at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies.**”

General Education Outcome Assessed: #5 (Culture/Diversity): “**Students will be able to consider a variety of perspectives** based on differences such as those stemming from culture, class, gender, ethnicity, historical development, and community, **and they apply this awareness at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies.**”

General Education Outcome Assessed: #6 (Critical Thinking): “Students will be able to raise vital questions and problems, gather and assess relevant information, come to well-reasoned conclusions and solutions, and test those solutions against relevant criteria, think open-mindedly about their assumptions, consider the practical consequences and communicate effectively to find solutions, at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies.”

General Education Outcome Assessed: #7 (Technology): “Students will be conversant with the general knowledge bases and the procedures and techniques by which knowledge is generated and accessed through the use of technology and procedures of technology at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies.”

Objectives for Fine Arts and Aesthetics include that students who take the course will

- Develop critical thinking skills and problem-solving skills as they relate to artistic creativity
- Acquire and demonstrate an understanding of the creative process
- Through an individual project creatively present a message that is meaningful to them and their community

Criteria Used to Evaluate Projects	Mean	Median
Understanding of Creative Process	2.9	3
Craftsmanship/Skill	4.1	4.4
Creative Expression/Originality	2.93	3
Effort/Time Dedicated to Project	4.2	4.4
Areas Used to Assess Technology Skills	Mean	Median
Accesses/Responds to Email	4.2	5
Posts and Responds to Others' Posts	4.3	5
Demonstrates Ability to Upload and Submit Files in Appropriate Formats	4.4	5
Successfully Navigates Jenzabar Course--Accessing Handouts, Bookmarks,	4.6	5

Quizzes/Tests, Assignment page, Forum, Gradebook		
--	--	--

Analysis:

- Overall the projects submitted this semester were better than ones I have received in previous semesters. Nearly all of the students had spent a great deal of time on their projects, and the craftsmanship/skill shown by the results impressed me. Many of the students clearly have talent and artistic ability. The areas of greatest weakness are in understanding the creative process and in creativity/originality. For examples, many students produced very attractive projects but had done so imitating someone else’s work rather than creating their own designs. In addition, many students struggled to explain why they chose to create something in a certain way or what the significance of the project was to them. When I teach the course again, I will emphasize the importance of originality in the creative process and also have students submit “in progress” reports on their project both to discourage last minute projects and to provide feedback at a time when changes to projects are still possible. While I have been requiring students to submit a project proposal early in the semester, I have not required them to submit progress reports.

Since the students I assessed were all taking an online class, they may have better technology skills than those who choose face-to-face classes. Most know how to use technology, but a few did struggle with some types of work. For example, a few even at the end of the semester were uploading files in inappropriate formats or uploaded work but forgot to click “submit.” At one time those assignments would not have been submitted at all, but Jenzabar now automatically submits any uploaded files after the due dates passes. Perhaps it is because there is no penalty anymore that a few students continued to forget to “submit” even after being told they needed to do so.

I believe the general education technology outcome should be revised to reflect changes in the skills of the students we now have. Most seem comfortable using technology. However, are they aware of how to use technology legally and ethically, and are they fully aware of issues of Internet safety? Some of the assignments I’ve had students do throughout the semester concerning use of technology suggest some have never considered the implications of technology use and problems that can result.

While many of the projects students submitted reflected their Native American culture and heritage, not all of the projects did so, nor was that a requirement for the project. I observed that those who chose creative projects that reflected their heritage often did so without seeming to consider why their heritage or the skills associated with their heritage are important to them. For example, one explained that it was important for Native Americans to know how to do beadwork because a lot of non-Natives make and sell beadwork when Native Americans should

be the ones making money in this way instead. Others chose to make jingle dresses for their daughters but didn't explain why this tradition is important to them.

Cultural Assessment for Arts and Humanities Spring 2015- (Updated, Submitted
by Department Chair on June 15, 2015)

Students in the Children's Literature class were assigned to critique Louise Erdrich's children's book *The Birchbark House*. Five students submitted the critique, while two students did not do the assignment. Grades on the critiques submitted ranged from 72% to 94%, with the mean score being 83.4%. The median score was 84%.

Students in English 110 did a number of assignments related to Ojibway literature. One assignment required them to write an essay in which they compared and contrasted two short stories by Louise Erdrich. Twelve students submitted the essay. Six did not do it. Grades on the essay ranged from 54% to 92%, with the mean score being 79.2% and the median score being 80%.

Students in Fine Arts and Aesthetics did a number of assignments relating to Ojibway stories and art. One assignment required them to listen to *The Elders Speak* and then respond to the stories. They also took a test over the stories. Eighteen students responded to the stories, while three did not. Grades on the response to the stories ranged from 65% to 100%, with the mean score being 86.4 and the median score being 80%. Twenty-one students took the test over the stories, while one did not. Grades on the test ranged from 60% to 100%, with the mean score being 83% and the median score being 80%.

Student Learning Report (Assessment 2015) TMCC Science and Math Department- (Updated, Submitted by Department Chair on June 22, 2015)

Goals

The plans/goals of the Science/Math Department in terms of assessment include looking for a 70% average mastery of competencies in Science and Math. This can either be determined from averaging all tests, or averaging post-tests, which have representative questions of all competencies, and involve fewer data. We also extended the 70% goal to evaluation of other general education outcomes, if assessed within the individual courses.

A 70% mastery level is basically the bottom of “C” level achievement in most academic courses, or “average.” At the heart of assessment is determining whether we are satisfied with half of the students in a course being within or above the “average” classification, and half below “average,” which is statistically the definition of 70% average mastery.

Idealistically, we believe that there are no limits to student achievement when faculty and administrators are very pro-education, as is evidenced at TMCC in terms of the quality of the courses, and as long as students are willing to work very hard. Realistically, there are a few roadblocks, some of which are documented. Placement tests and pre-tests show low mastery in a number of areas, particularly communication and math. The students are usually here only for two years, and many students have interrupted educations or take care of family and outside jobs. This all conspires to compete with student study time.

Results (Please see table 2 below for more detail)

Science: 2/3 of instructors (all of whom teach science) found students below the 70% average mastery.

Recommendations included:

- Attendance/grades made available to students on a weekly basis in class
- Lab activities and PowerPoints on study skills
- Peer tutoring

Math: 2/5 of instructors who teach or use math found students below the 70% average mastery (one of these instructors is a math instructor).

Recommendations:

- Math tutoring by the college strongly advised
- Less lecture and more practice on problems in class
- Absenteeism addressed (although method was not discussed)

Communication: 1/3 instructors who evaluated communication skills found that students were deficient in written expression (below 70% average mastery)

Recommendations:

- Offering more opportunities to write in class
- Reviewing of common mistakes and how to correct them with the entire class

Critical thinking: 3/6 instructors who evaluated for critical thinking found students deficient in critical thinking (students short of the 70% average mastery).

Recommendations:

- Increase the number of text-based critical thinking problems
- Increase the number of multi-step math problems involving critical thinking

Technology: 5/5 instructors found students proficient (above 70% average mastery) in the use of technology. Note: Technology was defined differently based on the course: Scientific technology mastery involved laboratory equipment and instruments, as well as data manipulation via computer software in some cases, while mathematical technology involved use of calculators and computers in computational situations.

Instructors still felt that improvement could be achieved:

Recommendations:

- Monitor students on one-to-one basis to make sure each student successfully uses technology correctly
- Spend more time on technology concepts, not just manipulation
-

Culture: 2/2 instructors found that students scored above a 70% average mastery of their own definition. There was a large gap between the number of instructors evaluating cultural orientation and the number expected to do this, since it is a mission statement of the college to include some cultural material within each course. Recommendations were confined to those who actually evaluated for this:

Recommendations:

- A number of instructors would like to see a bank of ideas for inclusion or perhaps some tutorial workshops.
- Since students engage in a cultural pre-test administered by the college, it might be beneficial to bring the actual test to the attention of instructors, so that they can emphasize the same material

Assessment instruments (Please see table 2 below for more detail)

Individual assessment tools varied for each instructor. For most instructors, the general education outcome which is their area of expertise was evaluated by pre- and post-test instruments, which were essentially shortened forms of what is contained in the semester tests. For non-expertise areas,

instructors in the science and math department used writing assignments, essays and individual test questions, usually listed as evidence within each of their assessment reports. Some used entire tests, feeling that the test not only illustrated science or math principles, but also showed critical thinking and technology skills at the same time.

Interpretation of Findings

Technology was the only general education outcome which was interpreted as being above 70% mastery in all courses which were evaluated by a consensus of instructors. Cultural diversity was also unanimously evaluated as exceeding 70% mastery, but only two instructors actually had an assessment tool for culture, which is not nearly enough. For the rest of the general education outcomes, 1/3 to 2/3 of the instructors agreed that students as a group did not achieve a 70% average. Instructors often recommended that more critical thinking, more math, more science, more technology and communication be put into their repertoire, but the fact remains that there is only so much instructional time, and students can only take in so much information during a semester. Emphasizing one skill may be at the expense of another. A number of remedial strategies may involve requiring additional courses, either developmental or as part of the major.

Other reflections:

1. Notification of having to supply gen ed assessment was very late in the semester. Department meetings resulted in faculty knowing what to do for next year, but many could not produce all gen ed statistics for this year.
2. Department meetings resulted in giving faculty some ideas on what to do for critical thinking, technology, culture and communication assessment activities and assessment tools.
3. Some gen ed assessments have 30% of the students in the "poor" category. Is this OK? However, nearly every instructor on the FARM showed huge gains between pre- and post-test, so work is being accomplished. Maybe this should be a major category in a report to HLC.
4. Let's address some student issues: Lack of attendance, lack of homework completion, apparent lack of study time. Some students may lack a serious approach to school, but are there other things causing problems: jobs, children, transportation? Is there a problem with putting high-risk students into only 12 hours full-time? There seems to be a big rush to get them through, even if they are not viable when they are done.

Every semester several instructors produce tables like the one below, showing correlation of lower grades with High absence and low homework output:

Table 1: Spring 2015 Chem 116:

Grade	avg. absences	avg. homework grade	avg. lab grade
A	3	92	100
B	4	86	100
C	9	54	91
D			
F			

Institutional Recommendations:

1. Change Chem 116 Introduction to Organic Chemistry and Biochemistry into a 2-semester course. Advantages: Both subjects explored thoroughly- important for nursing students especially. Rationale: Please see attached report page 7.
2. Math personnel feel that Math 100 could be dropped, since math basics could be included with Intermediate Algebra 102 and Technical Math 130, resulting in a great deal of time being saved since it does not take an entire semester to work through math basics.
3. Since science instructors have noticed poor scores in metric conversion, significant figures operations, scientific notation, and factor labeling, it is suggested that all Associate of Science majors who cannot pass a technical math placement test be required to take Technical Math 130 prior to chemistry and physics classes. Please see attached report for rationale page 8.

3

Science instructors have also noted very poor algebra skills in Chem 115 despite the prerequisite of Intermediate Algebra 102 or placement into Algebra 111. It is suggested that the math placement test be updated (with a “math for science” component), that high school courses not be given preference over placement scores, and that Technical Math 130 be required for students who do not pass the “math for science” placement test; this implies that Technical Math 130 will also contain an algebra review with emphasis on science-based text problems. Please see attached report for rationale page 8 and 9.

4. Require a grade of "C" or above to continue to the next course in science sequential courses . Please see rationale for this in attached report page 10 and 11.
5. Have school counselors visit developmental classes and supply students with information on technical or vocational study programs as well as academic, and present an overview of degrees and related job opportunities, and what is involved in different jobs. This could also be done during an orientation session or study skills course. Anecdotally, instructors have noted that a number of students seem to know little about the college programs available and what type of work is related to them. Perhaps courses like “vocational survey” (akin to “science survey”) might allow students to do short projects in a number of CTE areas, such that they could evaluate these disciplines in terms of what they personally prefer.
6. Research opportunities for undergraduates must be increased, since it has been shown in national literature, as well as at TMCC (Padmanabhan, LaVallie paper presented at American Society of Engineering Educators in 2013) that research opportunities are correlated with increased student success in STEM areas as well as increased retention of these students in STEM and movement into 4-year programs and beyond. However, an

average of only three instructors (the same ones) per semester write grants and conduct research here on campus.

Research does not have to be in science and math, and, since it is a stated goal in the mission statement of

TMCC, all departments should be researching, writing and conducting grant work.

Table 2: Department Statistics

Assessment of Student Learning Report TMCC Science and Math Department
Spring 2015

Science Assessment	Faculty	area of expertise and # competencies	Class and #students	assessment instrument	Results percent average	Results good fair poor %	Achieve 70% mastery?
spring 2015 target: 70% average mastery	A LaVallie	yes- 10	Intro org chem- 19	pre/post	75%	37, 31, 32	yes
	D Hunter	yes- 10	Microbiology- 15	pre/post			
	S Blue	yes- 4	sci survey- 7	exams	66%	38, 27, 35	no
	C Hill	yes- 3	Geog 121- 11	pre/post usually post not given exams used		39, 0, 61 Lab 79%	no yes
Math Assessment spring 2015 target 70% average mastery	M Pfahl	Yes- 5	Math 112- 12	pre/post	84%	77% by tests	yes
	L Olson	Yes- 5	Math 111	pre /post	60%	60% by tests	no
	D Henry	Yes- 7	Applied Math - 11	pre/post	87%	89% by tests	yes
	A LaVallie	No	intro org chem- 19	lab section		80, 20, 0	yes
	C Hill	No	geog 121- 11	Midterm Qs		22, 0, 78	no
Critical Thinking Assess. Spring 2015 target 70% average	A LaVallie	Gen Ed	as above	lab problems		32, 47, 21	yes
	D Hunter						
	S Blue			tests- all		38, 27, 35	no
	M Pfahl					56, 22, 22	yes

mastery

L Olson
D Henry
C Hill

problems

problems
tests, chap 6,9
Final test Qs

86%

24, 27, 48
22, 0, 78

no
yes
no

5

Technology

Assess. Spring
2015
target 70%
average mastery

A LaVallie
D Hunter
M Pfahl
L Olson
D Henry
C Hill

Gen Ed as above

overall lab grade

94%

yes

test chap 7

75%

yes

problems

49, 32, 20

yes

tests chap 6,9

86%

yes

overall lab grade

79%

yes

Communication

Assess. Spring
2015
target 70%
average mastery

A LaVallie
D Hunter
C Hill
M Pfahl

Gen Ed as above

research; essay

31, 53, 16

yes

tests- short ans

18, 0, 82

no

journaling

83, 8, 8

yes

Cultural Assess.

Spring 2015
target 70%
average mastery

A LaVallie
D Hunter
C Hill

Gen Ed as above

PP present; quiz

85%

yes

midterm Qs

50, 20, 30

yes

Evidence for Recommendation

Recommendation: Changing Chem 116 “ Introduction to Organic Chemistry and Biochemistry” from a one-semester course to a two-semester course:

From 2007 onward, both Deborah Hunter and I have noticed that it is extremely difficult to cover all the material proscribed for the course within one semester, often squeezing biochemical chapters into a scant few weeks at the end of the semester. Because most of the students have had no prior organic chemistry experience, it takes the majority of the semester to cover just the fundamentals of organic chemistry.

In spring 2015, I did not cover the last three chapters of the textbook (some of the biochemical material) because I had taken more time and trouble on the organic portions of the course, as well as having the students take one more test than usual.

When all tests over the organic material of the class were averaged for the entire class, the following means were noted for 2015 (extra time on organic material) and 2014 (no extra time):

2014: 74 mean

2015: 81 mean

Another result was that in the spring 2015 class, the following low grades were noted:

2015: no D or F grade

This is different from prior semesters, where lower grades appeared:

2014: 2 D

2012: 1 F

2009: 1 F

2007: 3 D

Another consideration here is that biochemistry should be treated with an entire semester, which would allow instructors to introduce material on the growing science of genetic expression. Right now, the majority of our students in Chem 116 are nursing students, and over half of them are not able to pass the final nursing exam; a longer and more thorough course in biochemistry would only improve their chances.

Evidence for Recommendation

Recommendation: Upgrading math placement tests and assigning more math prerequisites for science courses.

Evidence from A. LaVallie:

The first two weeks in Chem 115 are spent on “review” of basic math skills of metric conversion, factor labeling, significant figures and operations with them, scientific notation, and instrumental scale interpolation (these are called “technical math” skills by math instructors).

In every Chem 115 class it has been found that the majority of students are so deficient in these skills that even with a two-week review, the quiz over the material results in an average low score:

2012: 57% 10 out of 26 students had 70% or above

2015: 53% 6 out of 26 students had 70% or above

Chem 115 courses in other years displayed similar quiz results. Many of the deficient students would benefit from a course in “technical math” prior to enrolling in any chemistry course. The same students are probably weak in algebra, and algebraic skills should also be reviewed in Technical Math 130.

Algebra skills in general are not always up to par with so-called intermediate algebra skills, which are prerequisite to the course.

The tests from Chem 115 in 2014 show typically weak results for [math-based](#) problems:

1. “If there are 15 g of C in a sample of CaCO_3 , how many grams of oxygen are there?”

[40% of the students](#) answered correctly. Solution of this problem depends on understanding percentages and ratios.

2. “If 18 g of C, 3 g of H and 24 g of O react together to form a molecule, what is the empirical formula of this molecule?”

[36% of the students](#) answered correctly. Solution of this problem depends on ratios and division.

3. “Using the reaction: $2 \text{KClO}_3 \rightarrow 2 \text{KCl} + 3 \text{O}_2$

- a) If we start out with 1.5 g of KClO_3 , how many grams of KCl will we produce?
b) If we actually get 0.57 g of KCl at the end of the reaction, what is the percent yield?”
33% of the students could only answer half the question, and only 8% could answer parts a and b. Solution of this problem depends on finding a multiplicative factor and applying it to all species.
4. “In the reaction: $2\text{SO}_2 + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow 2\text{SO}_3$
If 0.5 moles of O_2 are reacted with 1.5 moles SO_2 , how many grams of excess reagent are left?”
One student, or 4% of the total 24 students, could answer this question. The solution to this problem depends on finding a limiting reagent by auditioning multiplicative factors and then applying the correct one to all species in the equation.
5. “ You have 0.5 L of a 0.2 M solution of NaOH . You want to end up with 100 ml of a 0.15 M solution. What volume of the 0.2 M solution will you have to dilute?”
32% of the students could answer this question. The solution to this problem depends on a simple algebraic manipulation with four variables (one unknown).
6. “ If 0.010 L of 0.5 M NaOH is neutralized by 0.024 L of H_2SO_4 . What is the molarity of the H_2SO_4 ?”
36% of the students could answer this question. The solution to this problem also depends on a simple algebraic manipulation with four variables (one unknown) and then a simple division problem.

Discussion: These are poor results, particularly since mastery of a great deal of inorganic chemistry does depend upon mathematical ability. They are also typical results, although tests from prior years are no longer available to peruse. Granted, there is a certain amount of conceptual knowledge in setting up the mathematical equation, but experience in algebra should lend some problem-solving ability in this area.

There is also some ambiguity as to whether students just plain cannot do math well, or are avoiding the math-based problems, content to earn a “C” on an exam by doing only problems that depend more on subjective recall.

It is recommended that the absence of these skills be looked for more closely, by upgrading the math placement tests to include a section designed by science teachers. It is also a common practice to allow priority of student high school courses over placement results, which should be reversed.

When students cannot pass the placement test for technical skills and simple algebraic word-based skills, it is recommended that they attend the Technical Math 130 course prior to electing science courses- particularly chemistry courses.

Evidence for Recommendation

Recommendation: Requiring students to have a “C” or better grade before proceeding to the next science or math course in a series.

Evidence from A. LaVallie is limited:

In going from Chem 115 to Chem 116:

In 2008, four students had a “D” grade in Chem 115 and none moved on to Chem 116 or Chem 121.

In 2010, three students had a “D” grade in Chem 115 and none moved on to Chem 116 or Chem 121.

In 2011, four students had a “D” grade in Chem 115 and none moved on to Chem 116 or Chem 121.

In 2013, two students in Chem 115 had a “D” grade and only one of them attempted Chem 116, and withdrew.

In 2014, five students had a grade of “D” in Chem 115; only two attempted Chem 116, but achieved the grade of “C” for the class.

It could be argued that due to the nature of Chem 115, which is primarily inorganic in theme, and the completely different emphasis in Chem 116, centered on organic chemistry, that students often handle the two very differently in terms of math ability and preference. I am only partially convinced that a “D” in one spells the same limitation in the other.

For Chem 121 and Chem 122, the two-semester suite of freshman inorganic chemistry, the success or nonsuccess in the one could be surmised to definitely influence the success in the next. However, actual evidence is very limited:

In 2008, three students had a “D” grade in Chem 121, and one did elect to move on to Chem 122, in which he/she earned an “F.”

In 2009, one student had a “D” grade in 121, and did not elect to take 122.

In 2012, two students had a “D” grade in 121, and did not elect to take 122.

In 2013, one student had a “D” grade in 121 and also did not elect to take 122.

In 2014, one student had a “D” in 121 and also did not take 122 the following semester.

It would appear that because of the difficulty encountered by these students in the first semester, they themselves felt it would not be a successful move for them to continue onto Chem 122.

In physics classes, only a few students who had difficulty made it to the end to receive a "D;" most students are very prepared for the difficulty of the class. None of the few students who received a "D" in physics 211 or 251 elected to go onto the next course of 212 or 252.

However, in the biological studies, a good number of students who do receive a grade of "D" in Biol 150 or in A&P 121 do apparently attempt to move onto the next semester. Dr. Hunter has found that there are problems with the "D" students achieving any success in the next course.

In 2014, two students with a "D" grade in Biol 220 went on to receive a grade of "F" in BIOL 221 out of a class of 11 students.

To: Terri Martin Parisien, Research, and Assessment Director

Dept. of Social Science Assessment Report, Spring 2015

Leslie W. Peltier, Dept. Social Sciences Chair

This Spring Semester, 2015 all TMCC faculty focused on the assessment of General Education Outcomes, to use alternative methods of assessment including the use of rubrics and to think in terms of closing the assessment gap within the entities of the college. With that in mind, what follows is the Social Science faculty attempt to do so. Turtle Mt. Community College

Department of Social Science and Ojibway Language faculty that contributed to this report are; Brian Bercier, Dr. Ann Brummell, Leslie LaFountain, Cecelia Myerion, Tasha Morin, and Leslie Peltier. This department report covers the collective assessments of the spring semester 2015.

These courses fulfill the following Student Learning Outcomes of TMCC General Education and the goals of the Associate of Arts and Associate of Sciences Degrees which are:

TMCC General Education Outcomes:

Humanities and Social Science: Students will be conversant with the general knowledge bases and procedures and techniques by which knowledge and artistic expressions are generated and accessed in the two divisions of (1) the humanities and fine arts, and (2) the social and behavioral sciences, and they will be able to select and apply the techniques and procedures of these two areas at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies.

Culture/Diversity: Students will be able to consider a variety of perspectives bases on differences such as those stemming from culture, culture heritage, class gender, ethnicity, historical development, community and leadership and they will apply this awareness at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies.

Critical Thinking: Students will be able to raise vital questions and problems, gather and assess relevant information, come to well-reasoned conclusions and solutions, and test those solutions against relevant criteria, think open-mindedly about their assumptions, consider the practical consequences and communicate effectively to find solutions at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies.

Communication: Students will have developed sufficient skills with the English language such that they can read, accurately interpret, critically analyze written material, express themselves effectively through narrative, explanatory, and investigative writing utilizing standard rhetorical techniques in the styles and formats, and at the level of complexity, appropriate to their TMCC studies.

Technology: Students will be conversant with the general knowledge bases and the procedures and techniques by which knowledge is generated and accessed through the use of technology, and they will be able to select and apply the techniques and procedures of technology at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies.

Associate of Arts and Associate of Sciences Objectives and Goals:

The Department of Arts and Humanities, and the Social Science offer curricula which give TMCC students a broad perspective of the world of knowledge while providing specific pre-professional curriculum sequences which may qualify the student for admission as a junior at the college to which he/she will transfer. Courses in these departments offer specific knowledge of Indian people, particularly the Turtle Mountain Chippewa. An Associate of Arts degree is awarded upon completion of the general education courses and the basic curriculum.

Recommendations:

After due consideration of various rubrics for measuring Native American cultural and traditional student learning, the Social Science faculty decided that we need to develop our own rubric because this important topic is so closely tied in with the TMCC Mission Statement and with five of the TMCC Institutional Goals. Social Science faculty discussed the benefits that could be gained from sharing in this work to improve our assessment methods and to apply the Native traditional method of reaching consensus in doing so. We propose to begin work on this in Fall, 2015 when most faculty will be available.

Discussion on the length and comprehensiveness of the TMCC General Education Outcomes led to a resolve that these could be stated in simpler terms making assessment more manageable. Other institutions such as the Southwestern Community College in Iowa, which Les learned about at the HLC conference, has an student enrollment similar to ours and they have successfully addressed assessment of their precise and clear general education outcomes in 2006. After looking at their HLC presentation and website (www.swcciaowa.edu) we propose a faculty exchange whereby we could learn from Southwestern assessment experiences, to be arranged within the next academic year.

As faculty, we need the assistance of Student Support Services tutors, technology, on-line staff, vocational rehabilitation program, student learning centers and retention counselors in the institution-wide effort to teach and graduate the student. Faculty discussed the required courses for students enrolled in the Certificate or Career & Technical Education (CTE) Associate of

Graduate Cultural Assessment:

Applied Science degree programs compared to students enrolled in courses required for the Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degrees as related to assessment of culture. A review of latest 2014-2015 TMCC catalogue CTE programs of study; pages 66-91, reveals that students in CTE do not necessarily have to take specific tribal cultural or social science courses involving Ojibwe/Indian content. The catalog states that students "...must satisfy the minimum general education credit requirement of 15 credits". The General Education courses most often cited within CTE programs of study include; Composition I or II, Fundamentals of Public Speaking, College Algebra, Human Relations in Organizations, Computer Literacy or Introduction to Computers. Some CTE degrees such as the LPN and Clinical/Medical Lab Technician AAS prerequisites mention Chippewa History I, Indian or Michif History, but most CTE programs of study only require "General Education electives" for a varying number of credits. There is a concern that the cultural expectations as stated in the TMCC Mission and Goals may not be accurately assessed for all TMCC graduates.

Budget Recommendations:

Please consider additional financial resources to improve the courses such as:

1. Funding for books and other materials to incorporate new content and resources such as can be found on the internet and the media related to the Ojibway.
2. Funding for resource speakers such as community elders with special knowledge of our tribal history and fluent speakers of the Ojibway language to speak in class.
3. Funding for student field trips to sacred places and ceremonies.
4. Travel monies for Chippewa/Ojibway history, language conferences and cultural workshops.
5. Funding for audio and visual equipment in the TMCC library for student check out to record the tribal elders.

PSYC 111 Introduction to Psychology – Spring 2015

Assessment Report by Brian Bercier

In addition to the fall semester the Spring semester of 2015 was one in which this instructor attempted to use more critical thinking in an applied sense with 2 classes in particular. In **Abnormal Psychology** student were required to read and test on the textbook, and also apply what they read and learned to characters in a book authored by a tribal member. Students had to read the book and make a clinical diagnoses on a character of choice in the book “Round House” by Louise Erdrich. In the papers that were turned in the students showed a good understanding of the particular disorder they chose to focus on. This task was accompanied by the use of the DSM –V (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of the Social Sciences, which is a diagnostic book published by the APA to diagnose disorders as well as Global Level of Function overall.

In Psychology 111b students were assigned papers and either power point’s or poster boards that explained and defined in lay terms what any particular aspect of the course they chose. 3 students chose to do poster boards and papers, while 6 chose to complete power point presentation. These exercises demonstrated that given tasks such as these students can and do develop a greater sense of the subject matter as it makes it more “real” to them , rather than just reading and listening to a lecture. These [projects empowered the students to seek information, write down, information and to better remember the material than rote memory testing. They were responsible for the data collection, the construction of the material in a presentation format. Unfortunately due to time constraints the students were unable to present these projects to the class. This has given me a better insight however, into how to ask the rights questions, and to put the onus more on reading and being prepared for the study of psychology.

Future plans would likely be to have students participate in presenting material from the lectures which are available to them via power point. We thus can all be teachers, and it may well serve as an impetus for students to gain a greater interest in reading, thinking about what they read and most importantly ask questions about those things that they may have issues with, or that may or may not apply to this particular culture. As such they will search for what aspects of western cultural psychology they believe, and what applies to our Turtle Mountain culture.

See attached FARM.

HIST 261 History of North Dakota -- Spring 2015

Assessment Report by Dr. Ann Brummel

Outcomes Assessed: (1) Critical Thinking; (2) Communication; (3) Multicultural and Global Experience;

A major assignment in History of North Dakota is the Oral History Project. This involves students preparing a theme for oral history interviews, an interviewee likely to have knowledge of life in North Dakota, preparation of questions for the interview, and a presentation in class which classmates may critique for content and contribution of knowledge of life in North Dakota and the Turtle Mountain Reservation.

Prior to students beginning the project, I demonstrated with a student interviewing me how to conduct good interview. The main idea was that they understand the value of oral history, and how to get the most information through well prepared initial questions and good “probing” questions relating their interviewee’s history and their place in North Dakota history. They were to observe cultural and other social etiquette as they contacted and interviewed individuals they chose.

Course enrollment was 14 students. Eleven students completed the assignment.

Critical thinking:

Understanding **Good** – the majority of the students understood the main idea of oral history interviews, and arranged and organized their interviews well.

Application **Good** – the majority of the students understood the symbolic and multi-culturally different meanings of responses interviewees often gave, and were able reason about the responses and apply their meaning to the context of elements we had studied about North Dakota history.

Analysis **Good** -- Several students eagerly conducted interviews early, and expressed the desire to conduct more interviews at some point. The majority felt free to critique one another’s work, and commented on cultural differences reflected in interview responses.

Communication:

Structure **Good** – generally the introductions and theses of the oral history interview presentations were well stated. Summaries and conclusions were good. Some students expressed themselves very well in presentations.

Content **Fair** – Some students need prompting during their presentations to be able to extrapolate and explain fully the content of the interviews.

Grammar/Spelling **Fair** – the grammar in the write-ups of the interviews was not always good, and sentences were not always complete.

HIST 104 United States History, Spring 2015

Assessment Report by Les LaFountain

U.S. History Syllabus: TMCC General Education Outcomes, Humanities and Social Science, Communication, Critical Thinking, and Cultural/Diversity

The course assessed is **HIST 104: United States History 1877 to the Present** and the initial enrollment included ten (10) students at the start of the semester. Eight of the ten student remained in the course throughout the semester with two student withdrawals. Of the eight students that finished the semester six completed both a pre-assessment and post-assessment; and all six passed the course.

The pre and post assessments were identical formats and included ten (10) open-ended essays; thirty-six (36) multiple choice questions with four possible responses; sixteen (16) matching content statements and four geographical and political maps including a world map, European map, Middle East map and a North Dakota map relative to the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa.

The six students that completed the post assessment ended up with the following outcomes: Student A (64%), Student B (66%), Student C (66%), Student D (83%), Student E (81%), Student F (64%) and two students did not take the post assessment and consequently failed the course.

Students in **HIST 104: U.S. History 1877 to the Present** were expected to demonstrate progress in the areas of Humanities and Social Science, Communication, Critical Thinking, and Cultural Diversity based on the post assessment results.

Humanities and Social Science: students will be conversant with the general knowledge bases and the procedures and techniques by which knowledge and artistic expressions are generated and accessed in the two divisions of (1) the humanities and fine arts, and (2) the social and behavioral sciences, and they will be able to select and apply the techniques and procedures of these two areas at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies.

Communication: students will have developed sufficient skills with the English language such as they can read, accurately interpret, critically analyze written material, express themselves effectively through narrative, explanatory, and investigative writing utilizing standard rhetorical techniques in the styles and formats, and at the level of complexity, appropriate to their TMCC studies.

Critical Thinking: students will be able to raise vital questions and problems, gather and assess relevant information, come to well-reasoned conclusions and solutions, and test those solutions against relevant criteria, think open-mindedly about their assumptions, consider the practical consequences and communicate effectively to find solutions at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies.

Cultural Diversity: students will be able to consider a variety of perspectives based on differences such as those stemming from culture, cultural heritage, class, gender, ethnicity, historical development, community and leadership and they will apply this awareness at a level of complexity appropriate to their TMCC studies.

Although the course content was extensive and highly structured it is speculative to conclude that the student learning outcomes were met at **fair rating** on a rubric schematic ranging from Good (at the high end) and Poor (at the low end). However, nearly all students made progress in terms of content acquired at significant levels considering the state of abilities and knowledge they possessed upon entering the course; the actual outcome is pointed out in the individual analyses below.

Student A (64%)

Pre-assessment essay questions 1-10 the student had almost no responses. Multiple choice questions (36 possible) the correct responses were 13 (36%); and the matching (16 possible) included 7 (44%) accurate responses; finally the maps skills included (43 possible) and the student had 6 (14%) accurate placements.

Post-assessment essay questions 1-10 were very well-reasoned conclusions. Multiple choice questions (36 possible) the correct responses were 19 (53%); and the matching (16 possible) included 11 (69%) accurate responses; finally the maps skills included (43 possible) and the student had 19 (44%) accurate placements.

Student B (66%)

Pre-assessment essay questions 1-10 the student had no responses or poorly reasoned conclusions. Multiple choice questions (36 possible) the correct responses were 14 (39%); and the matching (16 possible) included 0 (0%) accurate responses; finally the maps skills included (43 possible) and the student had 20 (47%) accurate placements.

Post-assessment essay questions 1-10 were very well-reasoned conclusions. Multiple choice questions (36 possible) the correct responses were 16 (44%); and the matching (16 possible) included 10 (63%) accurate responses; finally the maps skills included (43 possible) and the student had 43 (100%) accurate placements.

Student C (66%)

Pre-assessment essay questions 1-10 the student had no responses. Multiple choice questions (36 possible) the correct responses were 10 (28%); and the matching (16 possible) included 2 (16%) accurate responses; finally the maps skills included (43 possible) and the student had 2 (5%) accurate placements.

Post-assessment essay questions 1-10 were fairly well-reasoned conclusions. Multiple choice questions (36 possible) the correct responses were 18 (50%); and the matching (16 possible) included 10 (63%) accurate responses; finally the maps skills included (43 possible) and the student had 33 (77%) accurate placements.

Student D (83%)

Pre-assessment essay questions 1-10 the student had no responses. Multiple choice questions (36 possible) the correct responses were 25 (69%); and the matching (16 possible) included 9 (56%) accurate responses; finally the maps skills included (43 possible) and the student had 0 (0%) accurate placements.

Post-assessment essay questions 1-10 were somewhat reasoned conclusions. Multiple choice questions (36 possible) the correct responses were 21 (58%); and the matching (16 possible) included 14 (88%) accurate responses; finally the maps skills included (43 possible) and the student had 43 (100%) accurate placements.

Student E (81%)

Pre-assessment essay questions 1-10 the student had somewhat reasoned conclusions but lacked evidence to support general ideas. Multiple choice questions (36 possible) the correct responses were 13 (36%); and the matching (16 possible) included 14 (88%) accurate responses; finally the maps skills included (43 possible) and the student had 26 (60%) accurate placements.

Post-assessment essay questions 1-10 were very well-reasoned conclusions. Multiple choice questions (36 possible) the correct responses were 16 (44%); and the matching (16 possible) included 10 (63%) accurate responses; finally the maps skills included (43 possible) and the student had 37 (86%) accurate placements.

Student F (64%)

Pre-assessment essay questions 1-10 the student had no responses or poorly reasoned conclusions. Multiple choice questions (36 possible) the correct responses were 11 (31%); and the matching (16 possible) included 14 (88%) accurate responses; finally the maps skills included (43 possible) and the student had 27 (63%) accurate placements.

Post-assessment essay questions 1-10 were fairly well-reasoned conclusions. Multiple choice questions (36 possible) the correct responses were 17 (47%); and the matching (16 possible) included 6 (38%) accurate responses; finally the maps skills included (43 possible) and the student had 33 (77%) accurate placements.

Admittedly, the instructor concludes that a more plausible assessment tool(s) need to be applied to the course to improve the assessment of the general education outcomes.

LANG 125A Ojibwa Language I – Spring 2015

Course Assessment by Cecelia Myerion

Outcomes assessed: (1) Communication (2) Listening skills and Observation (3) language and cultural knowledge and experience

In this course the major assignment for the student is knowing the tools s/he has, and to be able to use those tools in a rightful manner. The tools are the gift of vision, hearing, heart and mind. Along with these tools we have the Seven Teaching Values which go hand in hand with the other tools of life.

The students in LNG 125A Ojibwa Language know very little about the Language of the Turtle Mountain which is the Ojibwa Language. They know nothing of the Turtle Mountain Culture. The Ojibwa introduction that I use for the student to become familiar with language is very useful, it seems to put the student more at ease. I incorporate the Seven Teachings in this class as I do in all classes. I tell the students about my people – the Turtle Mountain Chippewa people who are the carriers of those Seven Teachings along with the Ojibwa language and the Turtle Mountain Chippewa Culture in the hopes that it will break the wall they have built around themselves where the language and culture is concerned.

The students in this class made an improvement in the course, they now know some of the basic Ojibwa language and are able to introduce themselves using the language. I see their self-esteem rise, the confidence of each student improves a great deal. They have respect for the value System and want to know more about the ceremonies such as the clan system, naming ceremonies etc.

Course enrollment of 8 students, all 8 completed the assignment.

Critical thinking:

Understanding

Good – at the beginning of LNG 125A Ojibwa language, the Student did not know any words with an exception of a few knowing the word miigwech (thank you). They all knew nothing of the Seven Teachings and their self-esteem was very low. The majority of the students can now translate the Ojibwa language into English, they can introduce themselves using the Ojibwa Language. They are able to recognize the mistakes I purposely put on their assignments. The students are now eager to learn more.

Application:

Fair – Some students need extra help learning the Ojibwa Language. The Ojibwa grammar was not always good because it is not spoken in the home. The understanding of the Ojibwa language and the culture of TMBC put the student more at ease during their oral test, it has become better with each passing week. They have applied a lot of the Ojibwa Language in their

lives and took what they learned in class into their homes and started teaching their children these things of great importance.

Analysis:

Good – a few of the students have questions about why they were not taught the Ojibwa language. They are able to conduct themselves in a better way today. They have expressed the desire to learn more of the Ojibwa language. In the final reports I now see more understanding of the Ojibwa language and more understanding of the Seven Teachings.

Communication:

Structure

Good - the oral exam using the Ojibwa language was good. The students expressed themselves very well in the final reports. They are able to now understand the basic Ojibwa language. They now know the Seven Teachings in both English and Ojibwa.

Content

Fair - some students need a little extra help pronouncing the Ojibwe words right during the readings to fully understand and possibly be of help. They can explain to the other students how the attitude of self, changes when you know your language the Turtle Mountain Ojibwa language.

Good – some of the students were fully able to recognize the written Ojibwa language as well understanding the basic spoken Ojibwa language. They are no longer afraid to ask about what they do not understand. They ask me to speak slower so that they can hear the language and be able to properly pronounce the Ojibwa words

Grammar/spelling

Fair - the reviews and midterm test results was not always good. The final exam results could be better. The Ojibwa Language is not written but an oral language so the grammar in the final reports are not always good but it has gotten better in the language and understanding the culture of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa.

CJ 240 Policing and Police-Community Relations – Spring 2015

Assessment Report by Tasha Morin

The Criminal Justice 240 – Policing and Police-Community Relations course began the semester with nine students enrolled. Of those nine students, one received an “A,” two received a “B,” four received a “C,” and one received an “F.” The student who received an “F” stopped attending class after three weeks, and did not officially withdraw. One student officially withdrew.

Student learning and understanding of the course objectives were assessed using various methods, including writing assignments, guest speakers, cultural integration, a research paper/presentation, and written exams.

Writing assignments throughout the semester required students to apply what they had learned to “real world” scenarios, as well as, societal issues our local police agency is currently faced with. To integrate our community and examine culture, students were tasked with applying Sir Robert Peel’s Nine Principles of Policing to our community and Police Agency. They were also asked to apply the Broken Windows Theory to the Turtle Mountain Area, and asked to identify crime hot spots. As the semester progressed, they were asked to identify issues that would be raised if our police force became privatized, and how unemployment rates are correlated to crime. Students also learned how to compare unemployment rates and crime for our community and state with those of other parts of the country. A specific section dedicated to multicultural policing was covered, and students were able to identify culturally specific problems and special populations related to policing.

In addition to the culture related writing assignments, students completed a course section covering police reports. The section included explanations of proper reporting procedures, and practice exercises with grammar, spelling and punctuation. The last assignment for the police report writing section was the completion of a police report. The students were given a scenario, and instructed to draw a conclusion for the scenario. They then wrote a report based on what they created. Assessment of the students’ understanding was measured by the successful completion of the practice exercises, and ultimately by the completion of the scenario based report.

A guest speaker was brought in to discuss federal law enforcement and tribal policing issues. Jurisdiction and arrest procedures were of particular interest to the students.

A research paper/presentation assignment was also incorporated into the course design. Students were able to choose their own topic related to policing. The topics chosen included domestic violence towards women and men, drug crimes on the Turtle Mountain Reservation, nature of police work, pursuit policies of various agencies, and police misconduct. Students were required to cite their sources using APA format, and develop a presentation to deliver to the class based off of what they researched. The research paper was required to be 3-4 pages in length (findings and argument), and the presentation requirement was ten minutes with one prop minimum. The presentation portion of the assignment was graded using a rubric made up of preparedness, content, speech clarity, time-limit, and use of props. Points were assigned to each category, with five points being fully prepared, and one point being not prepared at all.

Lastly, two written exams were given. The exams included multiple choice, fill in the blank, true/false, and essay questions. The exam questions were derived from topics covered in the textbook and those discussed in class. The exam one high score was a 102%, the low score was an 80%, and the mean score was a 93%. The exam two high score was a 105%, the low score was a 20%, and the mean score was a 77%.

Overall, the students gave positive feedback on the assignments and topics that were covered. They also participated in class discussions, and worked together on assignments.

Also see attached FARM

Oral Presentation Rubric : Policing Presentation

Teacher Name: **Tasha Morin**

Student Name: _____

CATEGORY	4	3	2	1
Preparedness	Student is completely prepared and has obviously rehearsed.	Student seems pretty prepared but might have needed a couple more rehearsals.	The student is somewhat prepared, but it is clear that rehearsal was lacking.	Student does not seem at all prepared to present.
Content	Shows a full understanding of the topic.	Shows a good understanding of the topic.	Shows a good understanding of parts of the topic.	Does not seem to understand the topic very well.
Speaks Clearly	Speaks clearly and distinctly all (100-95%) the time, and mispronounces no words.	Speaks clearly and distinctly all (100-95%) the time, but mispronounces one word.	Speaks clearly and distinctly most (94-85%) of the time. Mispronounces no more than one word.	Often mumbles or can not be understood OR mispronounces more than one word.
Time-Limit	Presentation is 5-6 minutes long.	Presentation is 4 minutes long.	Presentation is 3 minutes long.	Presentation is less than 3 minutes OR more than 6 minutes.
Props	Student uses several props (could include costume) that show considerable work/creativity and which make the presentation better.	Student uses 1 prop that shows considerable work/creativity and which make the presentation better.	Student uses 1 prop which makes the presentation better.	The student uses no props OR the props chosen detract from the presentation.

Date Created: **May 13, 2015 05:43 pm (CDT)**

HIST 252 Chippewa History II - Spring, 2015

Assessment Report by Leslie W. Peltier

Originally there were twenty-three, (23) students enrolled in this course, five (5) students withdrew and two, (2) students failed due to absences and incomplete assignments. One of these two students never attended and did not withdraw from the course and the other student stopped attending class after earning a low grade the midterm test. Deficiencies were sent out to all failing students at midterm. A total of eighteen, (18) students completed the course.

The final grades of the eighteen students that completed the course is broken down as follows: 7 A, 4 B, 3 C, 2 D, and 2 F. I interpret this to mean that 14 out of the 18 students or 77% passed the course with an A or B or C and 22% earned a D or failed. This is approximately the same number of students that passed the course as in the spring semester of 2014.

Analysis of Pre and Post Tests:

Identical course assessment tests of knowledge were administered to students as a Pre-test on January 21, 2015 and Post-test on May 6, 2015. A total of fifteen (15) students took the Pre-test and a total of thirteen (13) students completed the Post-test.

Question one: Just two students correctly listed all seven of the Ojibwe Seven Teachings on the Pre-test, while three (3) correctly listed all seven on the Post-test. This result was a little disconcerting, but I later realized that I did not spend a lot of time on this topic. Six students that left the Seven Teachings question blank on the Pre-test and three students left it blank on the Post-test which is a slight improvement.

Second question: There were eight (8) students who correctly listed 1–2 cultural or traditions they had learned from their family or friends and seven (7) students who left this blank on the Pre-test. There were twelve students that correctly listed 1-2 cultural or traditions and only one student left it blank on the Post-test. This may be interpreted as meaning that students now recognize some life-experiences as cultural or as traditions.

Third question: There were no students that correctly listed any cultural or traditions learned from this course on the Pre-test, all 15 students left it blank. There were twelve (12) students that correctly listed 3-4 cultural or traditions and one student who correctly listed 1-2 on the Post-test. No one left this question blank on the Post-test.

Fourth multiple-part question: Pow wows: Twelve (12) students out of the fifteen listed something correctly about Pow Wows on the Pre-test. Ten (10) students out of the thirteen listed something about Pow wows on the Post-test. This topic remained constant and had the most responses of all topics for this question. **Ceremonies:** Eight (8) students listed something correctly about ceremonies on the Pre-test. Eleven (11) students listed something correctly about ceremonies on the Post-test. **Tribal History & Legends:** Only six (6) student correctly listed

something on Tribal History & Legends on the Pre-test. All thirteen, (100%) students correctly listed something on Tribal History & Legends on the Post-test, a great improvement. **Foods, Hunting Traditions:** Seven students correctly listed something about Foods, Hunting Traditions on the Pre-test. All thirteen, (100%) students correctly listed something on the Post-test. Another increase of knowledge. **Chippewa Treaties:** Just five out of fifteen students listed correctly something about Chippewa treaties on the Pre-test. All thirteen, (100%) students correctly listed something about treaties on the Post-test. Another great increase of knowledge. **Any other Chippewa Customs:** Only two students correctly answered this on the Pre-test, while seven (7) students correctly answered this last question on the Post-test. Overall results show a great student increase in cultural and historical knowledge after taking the course. These results provide evidence of having fulfilled course objectives and goals as well as those of TMCC General Educational Outcomes of Social Sciences, Cultural Diversity and Critical Thinking.

Final Essay Question Assessment:

TMCC should require HIST 251, Chippewa History I and/or HIST 252, Chippewa History II as a standard for all graduates. This course embodies the major historical and cultural events of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa and fulfills the **outcomes of the Social Sciences**. The course requirements are centered on the sovereign land-owning rights of the Pembina Chippewa as established by the Old Crossing Treaty of 1863 and the “Ten Cent Treaty” or McCumber Agreement of 1892-1904. Each student must make an in-depth study of the treaties and pass tests covering those documents and history. The Final Test essay question for HIST 252 requires students to cover 1) all the details of the negotiations for the McCumber Agreement including 2) lands ceded to the U.S. government, 3) Chippewa leaders and government commissioners, 4) proposed government offsets, 5) the role of the Pembina Treaty Committee and the TMBCI Tribal Council, 6) the present-day Chippewa bands that participated in the distribution and financial awards. The final essay question requires students to **think critically** about how the treaty funds were spent by individual tribal members and the TMBCI Tribal Council. This final essay question also requires **Communication:** student’s use of **effective written language to express themselves**. All but one student who took the final test addressed this essay question and the majority of students earned extra points by answering beyond the expected basic knowledge. The students who failed this essay did not answer or their answers were incomplete and not well organized and poorly written grammatically.

Students who complete the course show an increase in traditional knowledge and they develop a sense of responsibility for the preservation of our tribal customs for future generations, which is a major part of the **TMCC Mission and Goals**. This course helps students achieve a sense of self-identity and self-esteem as a member of a strong tribal entity. These courses are essential to graduates of TMCC and as my mother, Elma Wilkie used to always say; “You don’t know where you’re going unless you know who you are.” Also see attached FARM.