# Focused Assessment Plan

**2011-2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOME TO ASSESS</th>
<th>OUTCOME MEASURE</th>
<th>ACPE STANDARD</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT CYCLE</th>
<th>GROUP RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION ON RESULTS</th>
<th>ACTION - changes made based on results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011-2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Student Achievement | Percentage of students: | • with program QPA ≥ 3.0  
• progressing to next year in program  
• on the Dean’s list (QPA ≥3.5) | 15 | • ≥75% of students with QPA of 3.0 or higher  
• ≥95% of student progressing to next year  
• ≥10% of students on Dean’s list | Annual | Curriculum Committee | Targets met for student progression and dean’s list but not QPA≥3.0 (54.4%). Committee agreed to collect 4 years of data and re-evaluate the target. |
| Admission Criteria as a Predictor of Student Success | Correlation of admission criteria to academic performance in program  
• aggregated Admission Screening Score to program QPA | 17 | r² ≥ 0.80 | Annual | Admissions Committee (Office of Student Affairs) | Admission ranking was compared to P1 GPA and r²=0.13. Data was shared with Office of Student Affairs. Will revisit target after reviewing x3 more years. |
| Student Services | AACP student survey rating of our student services  
• financial aid  
• counseling  
• advising  
• IT  
• student organizations | 19 | ≥75% of ratings are “agree” or higher for these categories | Every two years | Office of Student Affairs | ‘Advising’ did not meet our goals, so P1 students were assigned faculty advisors earlier, and time was provided during P1 orientation for advisor/student meetings |
| Teaching Effectiveness | Student evaluations of:  
• overall effectiveness  
• availability  
• fairness  
• clarity of presentation | 11 | ≥75% of SOP faculty will score at or above the college’s “middle 60%” for these categories | Annual | Leadership Team | Targets met in Sp2012, showing improvement from F2011. Review will continue – will ask for training from FDC if weak in any category. |
| Faculty Development | Self-identification of faculty needs reported through faculty development plan | 26 | 100% of faculty have an individualized development plan that was created in collaboration with their chair | Annual | Faculty Development Committee, Leadership Team | (deferred x1 year due to revision of form) |
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