

Core Theme - Teaching and Learning

Results and Suggested Improvements

UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVE 1.1 Enhance student success by continually improving the curricular, co-curricular, and extracurricular programs					
<i>Outcomes</i>	Indicators	Expected Performance Level (Criterion)	Responsible Reporting Unit	Key Strategies/ Initiatives	Budget/Resource Analysis
1.1.1 Students will achieve programmatic learning outcomes	1.1.1.1: Student performance data and outcomes achievement as described in annual program assessment reports and standardized exams.	100% annual program reporting 80% reported programmatic outcome attainment At or above selected peer averages on standardized major field tests	Reported by Associate Provost	Professional Development (e.g., teaching and assessment)	Release time, goods and services, and secretary costs for Coordinator of Assessment
	1.1.1.2: Post-grad job and graduate school placement Rates	Baseline to be determined	Reported by Dean of Student Success	Cooperative Education	Staff, goods and services, and secretary costs Strategic initiative funding should be sought for support for gathering this data
<p>Results/Findings</p> <p>Annual Program Assessment Reports</p> <p>2010-2011: 100% (119/119) of degree programs completing annual reports or updated plans in 2010-2011 assessment cycle. This is the third straight year of increased report submission (from 75% in 2007-2008 to 86% in 2008-2009 to 91% in 2009-2010).</p> <p>2010-2011: 334 programmatic outcomes (74 graduate and 260 undergraduate) were assessed this year. 261 of the 334 (78%) programmatic outcomes were reported as students meeting and/or exceeding stated outcome mastery/criterion levels. Trend was stronger at the graduate level (69 of 74, 93%) and improved from 2009/2010 when 67 of 78 or 86% of student learning goals were met. At the undergraduate level, 192 of 260 learning goals (74%) were met. This is down from 2009/2010 when 244 of 292 goals (84%) were met.</p> <p>2011-2012 Education Testing Service Major Field Test Results</p>					

	Business	Economics	Computer Science	Physics	Psychology	Totals*
CWU Average Score	157	168	149	151	154	
Percent of Institutions Below CWU	79%	89%	50%	63%	43%	68%
Number of CWU Test Takers	356	15	29	10	143	553

U.S. averages from (month/year):	9/10-6/11	9/08-6/11	2/06-6/11	2/04-6/11	9/10-4/11	
Number of Institutions	438	68	232	141	167	
Number of U.S. examinees	32,982	2,829	9,095	3,267	4,603	52,776

* The CWU institution-wide "percent below" is an average of department percentiles weighted by the number of examinees in each department. "Percent below" data is from ETS institutional mean tables.

Suggested Improvements, outcomes, indicators, criterion, strategies, activities budget

Programmatic student learning outcomes assessment reporting finally met the 100% level across the university - with a significant positive trend of improvement over the past few years. Further emphasis and accountability from Deans should assist in departments and programs maintaining the 100% reporting mark this coming year. In addition, a partial faculty release position (Coordinator of Academic Assessment) was created/funded to assist departments in their assessment efforts for 2012-2013 and beyond. Programmatic and student attainment of learning outcomes was below 80% in terms of institutional average. Despite these results, CWU students tend to do better than the national average on standardized tests. In response to these results and in improving the teaching and learning process, a partial faculty release position (Coordinator of Faculty Development) was created/funded to assist departments in improving the teaching and learning experience.

It is recommended that with respect to programmatic outcomes attainment, reporting of undergraduate and graduate student results should be analyzed separately and a criterion be established at 80% for undergraduate students and 90% for graduate students as these levels differ. Also, there is a need to obtain results for all standardized tests given at CWU. This will allow for a more complete and accurate analysis and better overall comparison with peers. The Office of Assessment (i.e., Dr. Tom Henderson) will be directed to determine all departments that administer standardized tests and ensure that data is reported each year. It is also recommended that the department of Student Success and Alumni Office work together to obtain relevant data on job placement. In addition, it will be the work of the Teaching and Learning Core Theme Committee to work with these offices this coming year to establish a meaningful and obtainable criterion.

UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVE 1.1 Enhance student success by continually improving the curricular, co-curricular, and extracurricular programs

Outcomes	Indicators	Expected Performance Level (Criterion)	Responsible Reporting Unit	Key Strategies/ Initiatives	Budget/Resource Analysis
1.1.2 Students will persist to graduation with increased efficiency and rate	1.1.2.1: Freshman-to-sophomore persistence rates	80%	Reported by Director of Organizational Effectiveness	Early Alert System/ MapWorks	C-Port and Student Achievement Personnel
	1.1.2.2: Graduation rates	4 yr – 30% 5 yr – 54% 6 yr – 62%	Reported by Director of Organizational Effectiveness	Living Learning Communities	Faculty release, Housing staff, goods and services, and secretary costs
	1.1.2.3: Time-to-graduation	High School (FTIC) Mean: 4.6 yrs Median: 4.2 Transfers (DTA): Mean: 2.9 yrs Median: 2.2	Reported by Director of Organizational Effectiveness	First Year Experience (FYE) Learning Commons	Staff, goods and services, and secretary costs
	1.1.2.4: Number of degrees awarded per full-time equivalent instructional faculty member	Baseline to be determined	Reported by Director of Organizational Effectiveness	Small class sizes	Cost per full-time equivalent student
	1.1.2.5: Number of full-time equivalent students taught per full time equivalent faculty	Baseline to be determined in terms of % of classes less than 30 students	Reported by Director of Organizational Effectiveness		

Results/Findings

2011:

First year persistence rate = 77.6%

Graduation rate =

4 yr – 27.7%

5 yr – 49.5

6 yr – 55.9%

Time-to-graduation

Native student Mean: 4.5 years

DTA Mean: 2.5 years

Number of degrees awarded per full-time equiv instructional faculty

6.75:1 in 2008

6.68:1 in 2011

Course sections taught: 1,249 with 833 (67%) = below 30 enrollment.

Student to faculty ratio: 21 (based on 10,324 students and 481 faculty)

Suggested Improvements, outcomes, indicators, criterion, strategies, activities budget

While the first year persistence rate is below the set criterion, it is rather close. Thus, the committee felt the target was appropriate. In terms of improvement, all departments and programs would be encouraged through Deans to address retention in their newly developed strategic plans in the fall, 2012. It would be further recommended that all faculty would be provided with a copy of the Education Advisory Board's "Next Generation Advising" and that some level of professional development opportunity accompany the booklet.

Data as related to graduation rates and time-to-degree do not seem to match. A reanalysis of this information will be performed during the fall, 2012 quarter.

The theme committee is recommending:

1.1.2.4 indicator should be eliminated – as the relevancy of the number of degrees awarded per full-time equivalent faculty member was not seen as strong an indicator as 1.1.2.5 – number of full-time equivalent students taught per full-time equivalent instructional faculty.

There is a need for 1.1.2.5 to obtain data for the entire year and for several years on the percentage of classes with enrollment less than 30 students; obtain comparison data from other public institutions in WA state and national peer institutions; disaggregate graduate and undergraduate courses from calculation; determine an expected performance level.

UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVE 1.1 Enhance student success by continually improving the curricular, co-curricular, and extracurricular programs					
Outcomes	Indicators	Expected Performance Level (Criterion)	Responsible Reporting Unit	Key Strategies/ Initiatives	Budget/Resource Analysis
1.1.3 Students and faculty will be increasingly engaged in the learning process in and outside of the classroom.	1.1.3.1: Student participation in SOURCE, as presenters and attendees	6% of total students presenting; 10% of total students participating	Office of Graduate Studies	SOURCE Cooperative Education Graduate Assistant	Faculty release costs, staff, goods and services, and secretary costs
	1.1.3.2: Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) results	At or above selected peer averages	Reported by Director of Organizational Effectiveness	Program	Staff, goods and services, and secretary costs
	1.1.3.3: National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) results	At or above selected peer/national averages	Reported by Director of Organizational Effectiveness	Work Study	Graduate assistantship costs
	1.1.3.4: Student participation in internships, teaching assistantships, and research assistantships	Internships: 15% of total students Teaching assistantships: 135 total Research Assistantships: 40 total	Career Services Graduate Studies		Work study funding
	1.1.3.5: Percentage of work study students employed in areas related to their academic studies	Baseline needs to be calculated	Student Employment Office		
Results/Findings					
2012 SOURCE -		2011 SOURCE -			
335 presentations: 163 oral		315 presentations: 150 oral			
17 creative expression		18 creative expression			
127 poster		138 poster			
18 creative works		0 creative works			
5 video		0 video			
5 business plan		9 business plans			
1 fashion show		1 fashion show			
0 musical performance evening		1 musical performance evening			

2011-2012

Student engagement

925 internships – less than 10% of students

TAs – 128

RAs – 31

2012

NSSE Questions

Student Response: Percentage of students that responded to how often they did the following at their institution during current school year.	% that reported “often to very often”
Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions	55% LDS* 79% HDS**
Made a class presentation	24% LDS* 71% HDS**
Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in	60% LDS 53% HDS**
Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or info. From various sources	80% LDS 91% HDS**
Come to class without completing readings or assignments	22% LDS** 24% HDS**
Worked with other students on projects during class	36% LDS* 59% HDS**
Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments	45% LDS 68% HDS**
Tutored or taught other students	13% LDS* 23% HDS**
Participated in a community-based project as part of a regular course	12% LDS* 18% HDS*
Discussed ideas from readings or classes with others outside of class	21% LDS 32% HDS
Number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more (% 1 or more)	73% LDS 81% HDS**
Number of written papers or reports between 5-19 pages (% 1 or more)	95% LDS**

	95% HDS**
Number of written papers or reports fewer than 5 pages (% 1 or more)	100% LDS** 96% HDS**
Complete a practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment (% plan to do or have done)	77% LDS* 75% HDS**
Completed community service or volunteer work (% plan to do or have done)	82% LDS 72% HDS*
Worked on a research project with a faculty member outside of a course (% plan to do or have done)	36% LDS 33% HDS
Completed study abroad (% plan to do or have done)	40% LDS 18% HDS*
Time preparing for class (% reporting more than 20 hrs. per week)	16% LDS* 30% HDS**
Time spent participating in co-curricular activities (% reporting more than 5 hrs. per week)	27% LDS* 21% HDS*
Time spent studying and on academic work (% reporting quite a bit or very much)	80% LDS* 77% HDS*

*student results lower than Far West Public peer , Carnegie Class, and/or National comparison groups

**student results higher than Far West Public peer , Carnegie Class, and/or National comparison groups

NSSE Summary: In the 20 NSSE questions analyzed for students, lower division students (LDS) demonstrated results that were significantly lower for nine questions, higher for three questions, and no different for eight questions when compared to Far West Public peer , Carnegie Class, and/or National comparison groups. Higher division students (HDS) demonstrated results that were significantly lower for five questions, higher for thirteen questions, and no different for two questions when compared to Far West Public peer , Carnegie Class, and/or National comparison groups.

2012

FSSE Questions

Faculty Response: Percentage of faculty who reported engagement in the learning process in and outside of the classroom.	Hrs. per week doing each of the following.....
Grading papers and exams (% reporting 5 or more hrs. per week)	60% LDS 73% HDS
Giving other forms of feedback to students (other than grading papers and exams) (% reporting 5 or more hrs. per week)	40% LDS 62% HDS
Working with undergraduates on research (% reporting 1 or more hrs. per week)	46% LDS 68% HDS
Supervising internships or other field experiences	36% LDS

(% reporting 1 or more hrs. per week)	56% HDS
Working with students on activities other than course work (% reporting 1 or more hrs. per week)	60% LDS 68% HDS
Interacting with student outside of class (% reporting 1 or more hrs. per week)	77% LDS 85% HDS

FSSE Summary: In the seven FSSE questions analyzed, faculty tended to spend proportionally less time per week engaging with lower division students (LDS) than higher division students (HDS) in the learning process in and outside of the classroom. Specifically, faculty reported spending more time providing feedback, working on research projects, supervising internships, and generally interacting in activities other than course work and outside of class with upper division students more than lower division.

Suggested Improvements, outcomes, indicators, criterion, strategies, activities budget

The theme committee is recommending:

Eliminate 1.1.3.1 because data already collected and analyzed in 3.1.1.1.

Expand internships to include practicum, field experiences, student teaching, and other external experiences. In light of this proposed definition change, the expected performance level of students would be raised to 50% of total students. Also, the reporting unit would be changed from Career Services to Organizational Effectiveness with data coming primarily from Faculty Survey of Student Engagement and National Survey of Student Engagement. In addition, an initiative should be proposed that closely ties with alumni office to create internship sites for students

Examine the criterion for TAs and RAs in terms of percentage of students to full student body, rather than absolute numbers to make data more meaningful.

Greater analysis of NSSE and FSSE variables should occur within the theme committee. Also, FSSE criterion levels will need to be revised in coming year as trend and peer related data is not available.

UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVE 1.1 Enhance student success by continually improving the curricular, co-curricular, and extracurricular programs

Outcomes	Indicators	Expected Performance Level (Criterion)	Responsible Reporting Unit	Key Strategies/ Initiatives	Budget/Resource Analysis
1.1.4 Students will be increasingly engaged in high quality extracurricular offerings.	1.1.41: National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) results	At or above selected peer/national averages	Reported by Director of Organizational Effectiveness	Cultural and Student Life Programming and Speaker Series	Programming and staff costs
	1.1.4.2: Extracurricular offering participant usage and satisfaction survey results	Baseline needs to be calculated	Reported by Dean of Student Success	Recreation and Athletic Programming	Coach, staff, goods and services, and secretary costs

Results/Findings

2012

NSSE Questions

Student Response: Percentage of students that responded to how often they did the following at their institution during current school year.	% that reported "often to very often"
Attended an art exhibit, play, dance, music, theater, or other performance	35% LDS** 22% HDS
Exercised or participated in physical fitness activities	72% LDS** 56% HDS**
Participated in co-curricular activities like organizations, government, intercollegiate and intramural sports. (% reporting 1 or more hrs. per week)	61% LDS 49% HDS*

*student results lower than Far West Public peer , Carnegie Class, and/or National comparison groups

**student results higher than Far West Public peer , Carnegie Class, and/or National comparison groups

NSSE Summary: In the three NSSE questions analyzed, lower division students (LDS) demonstrated greater engagement than higher division students (HDS). In addition, lower division students demonstrated results that were significantly higher as compared to Far West Public peer , Carnegie Class, and/or National comparison groups for two of the three areas. Higher division students (HDS) exhibited results that were significantly higher for one area, similar for another, and lower for one.

Suggested Improvements, outcomes, indicators, criterion, strategies, activities, budget

Greater analysis, consensus for questions of NSSE and FSSE variables should occur within the theme committee.

UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVE 1.2 Enhance the effectiveness of student support services					
Outcomes	Indicators	Expected Performance Level (Criterion)	Responsible Reporting Unit	Key Strategies/ Initiatives	Budget/Resource Analysis
1.2.1 Increase student use and impact of relevant and effective support services.	1.2.1.1 Participant usage, impact, and satisfaction survey results	Baseline needs to be calculated	Dean of Student Success	Math Center Writing Center SSS/WaTEP Supplemental Instruction	Programming and staff costs Director, staff, goods and services, and secretary costs
<p>Results/Findings</p> <p>2009-2010</p> <p>Academic Achievement Programs (AAP) - provided Tutoring, Supplemental Instruction (SI), Drop-In Tutoring, and Study Groups to a total of 1,167 undergraduate students out of the approximately 9,315 (full-time FTE undergraduates as per CWU Institutional Research) (i.e., 12.6% of undergraduate enrollment population), with contact hours totaling 3,974.</p> <p>Tutoring – Academic Achievement Program - provided tutoring (mostly individual) for 167 students (SSS, WaTEP, CAMP, MSS, STAR, WA, and STEP participants) in 25 different subjects (i.e., ACCT, BIOL, CHEM, MATH, etc.), sometimes many different courses in each. The following analysis is based on students attending one or more tutoring sessions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 72% of the students receiving any tutoring (i.e. at least one session) met the objective of earning a grade of C- or better in the tutored course. • Combined average course grade for students in tutored classes is 1.91. <p>Supplemental Instruction (SI) - was provided for students in 14 courses over the 2009-2010 academic year, most having multiple sections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mean course grade of all classes supported by SI for those attending SI was 2.49 as compared to 2.30 for those who did not attend. • The DFW rate for the SI group was 20% as compared to 32% for the non-SI group. <p>Study Group sessions - were originally set up for “Key Courses” in which enrollment was recommended to all SSS and WaTEP students by advisors, although all CWU students can attend these sessions. Study Groups were set up for chemistry, english (grammar), history, industrial and engineering technologies, math, music (theory), philosophy (logic), physics, and psychology courses. The Study Group tutor for each targeted course conducts two sessions per week. Unlike SI leaders, Study Group tutors do not attend any of the targeted classes. The number of students who attend these sessions range from two to five students, so the setting is still intimate and productive as it would be with individual tutoring but with the added benefit of cooperative learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One-hundred-eighty-one students attended at least one Study Group session, 62% of which met the objective of earning a grade of C- or better in the tutored course. The total number of student contact hours was 504. 					

TRIO – Student Support Services (SSS) -

The Student Support Services (SSS) and Washington TRIO Expansion Program (WaTEP) together served 623 students during the 2009-2010 academic year.

- Of the 254 SSS participants, 97% of those students were retained from spring 2010 to fall 2010.
- Of the freshmen students in the SSS program, 92% were retained from spring 2010 to fall 2010.
- Of the 254 SSS students, 97% were in good standing at the end of spring quarter 2010.
- Of the 369 WaTEP participants, 98% of those students were retained from spring 2010- fall 2010.
- Of the 369 WaTEP students, 95% were in good standing at the end of spring quarter 2010
- SSS 6 year overall (federal) graduation rate for 2009-2010 was 82%.
- The 6 year SSS freshman graduation rate for 2009-2010 was 78 %.

Math Lab Attendance -

	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11
Fall	227	410	464	446	824	866	894	895	680
Winter	267	497	470	528	850	722	960	766	776
Spring	423	462	267	528	769	830	839	693	911
Total	917	907	1,201	1,502	2,443	2,418	2,693	2,354	2,367

Developmental Math Passing Rates (Grade of C or Better)

	100A	100B	100C
2002-2003	83.3%	85.8%	82.6%
2003-2004	88.9%	85.2%	82.2%
2004-2005	96.0%	91.0%	83.1%
2005-2006	98.0%	87.6%	75.6%
2006-2007	100.0%	89.7%	87.5%
2007-2008	98.1%	86.1%	86.9%
2008-2009	81.7%	72.1%	83.8%
2009-2010	76.5%	78.3%	67.7%
2010-2011	84.8%	89.8%	62.5%

The following are the passing rates in subsequent courses (both Math 100 and college level) from Fall 2002 through Summer 2010 (with Fall 2007 and on being students using the new Math 100 curriculum).

FROM	TO	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010
100A	100B*	85%	92%	91%	89%	84%	64%	56%	61%
100B	100C*	67%	75%	83%	93%	81%	84%	67%	57%
	101	97%	98%	94%	97%	87%	90%	86%	84%
	130	100%	71%	95%	76%	88%	91%	78%	63%

	164	96%	97%	100%	100%	91%	79%	91%	57%
100C	153	91%	96%	95%	88%	88%	79%	80%	79%

*Passing with a grade of C or better

Writing Center (One-on-one Writing Consultations)

Campus	2009-2010 Total	2008-2009 Total	Percent Change From Previous Year
Ellensburg	3,046	2,826	+8%
Des Moines	904	979	-2%
Everett	11	1	+91%
Kent Station/ Green River	167	24	+86%
Lynnwood	271	197	+11%
Moses Lake	1	0	na
Pierce	300	142	+49%
Wenatchee	19	5	+280%
Yakima	78	57	+37%
Total	4,797	4,231	+13%

One-on-One Writing Consultations over time

Academic Year	Total Consultations	Percent Change
2007-2008	3,811	na
2008-2009	4,231	11%*
2009-2010	4,797	13%*

*Exceeded national benchmark standard of service to 10% of campuses

Suggested Improvements, outcomes, indicators, criterion, strategies, activities, budget

While data exists to reflect some support service usage and success, there is still a need to identify all support service units and collect consistent information from

each. For example, CAMP, STAR, advising, and other support related units need to be included in future examinations. Also, while data has been collected in the past, data was not available for most recent year(s). Student usage numbers are needed for most areas as are data in terms of impact and success. This would also include perception data in terms of service satisfaction. These areas of development and refinement will especially need to be a priority for the Student Success department this year as it completes its own strategic planning process.

