

Mission and Objectives Development Worksheet #1

Academics

Academics - Yap Campus

Unit/Office/Program

Fall 2011 – Summer 2012

Assessment Period Covered

Date Submitted

Institutional Mission/Strategic Goal:

Mission: Historically diverse, uniquely Micronesian and globally connected, the College of Micronesia-FSM is a continuously improving and student centered institute of higher education. The college is committed to assisting in the development of the Federated States of Micronesia by providing academic, career and technical educational opportunities for student learning.

Strategic Goal (which strategic goal(s) most support the services being provided):

- # 1. Promote learning and teaching for knowledge, skills, creativity, intellect, and the abilities to seek and analyze information and to communicate effectively.
- #9. Provide for continuous improvement of programs, services and college environment.

Administrative Unit/Program Mission Statement (First present a philosophical statement related to your units/program/office followed by a listing of the services you provide)

Mission: To promote student education at Yap Campus by providing learning centered services in a nurturing and safe environment:

- Maintain and manage classes and students
- Deliver courses that meets the needs of degree level, vocational level, and certificate level students
- Help tutor students
- Provide short term training
- Plan coursework and materials
- Participate in student activities
- Conduct library workshops to new students
- Promote personal growth and enrichment through field trips and guest speakers
- Conduct academic administrative functions

Administrative Unit/Program Objectives:

Objective 1: To continue to increase Post-test scores by 3% through development and implementation of academic success plan.

Strategies:

1. Encourage good attendance in all remedial classes by decreasing midterm deficiency to 47%
2. Work closely with tutors to increase student participation by 25% in the RSC and to improve the program itself

3. Recognize and celebrate student and faculty success with awards ceremony at the end of each semester
4. Work closely with student government to increase student=faculty interaction inside and outside classrooms by having POWWOW for faculty and advisors at the beginning of each semester and at least twice during the beginning and at after midterm.
5. Do Pre/Post tests in 75% of classes in each semester.

Objective 2: To continue to increase retention rate by 5% overall in all classes.

Strategies:

1. Instructor identifies students “at-risk” in his/her class
 - Students with poor attendance
 - Students with poor grades on coursework
 - Students with family issues
2. Counsel “at-risk” students
 - Instructor counsels students first
 - If student still at-risk, then student meets with Chair of department

Objective 3: To increase by 3% the number of students who get grades of “C” or better.

Strategies:

1. 75% of students will pass their classes with a “C: or better
2. Advisors will meet with advisees during POWWOW and at least twice during beginning of semesters and after midterm
3. Work with tutors to increase student participation in RSC by 25%
4. Recognize and celebrate student success with award ceremony at end of each semester.

Assessment Plan Worksheet #2

Academics

Academics - Yap Campus

Unit/Office/Program

Formative Assessment

Summative Assessment

Fall 2011 – Summer 2012

Assessment Period Covered

Date Submitted

Institutional Mission/Strategic Goal:

Mission: Historically diverse, uniquely Micronesian and globally connected, the College of Micronesia-FSM is a continuously improving and student centered institute of higher education. The college is committed to assisting in the development of the Federated States of Micronesia by providing academic, career and technical educational opportunities for student learning.

Strategic Goal (*which strategic goal(s) most support the services being provided*):

- # 1. Promote learning and teaching for knowledge, skills, creativity, intellect, and the abilities to seek and analyze information and to communicate effectively.
- #9. Provide for continuous improvement of programs, services and college environment.

Administrative Unit/Program Mission Statement :

Mission: To promote student education at Yap Campus by providing learning centered services in a nurturing and safe environment:

Administrative Unite/Program Objectives:

Objective 1: To continue to increase Post-test scores by 3% through development and implementation of academic success plan.

Strategies:

1. Encourage good attendance in all remedial classes by decreasing midterm deficiency to 47%
2. Work closely with tutors to increase student participation by 25% in the RSC and to improve the program itself
3. Recognize and celebrate student and faculty success with awards ceremony at the end of each semester
4. Work closely with student government to increase student=faculty interaction inside and outside classrooms by having POWWOW for faculty and advisors at the beginning of each semester and at least twice during the beginning and at after midterm.
5. Do Pre/Post tests in 75% of classes in each semester.

Objective 2: To continue to increase retention rate by 5% overall in all classes.

Strategies:

1. Instructor identifies students “at-risk” in his/her class
 - o Students with poor attendance

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Students with poor grades on coursework ○ Students with family issues <p>2. Counsel “at-risk” students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instructor counsels students first ○ If student still at-risk, then student meets with Chair of department
<p>Objective 3: To increase by 3% the number of students who get grades of “C” or better.</p> <p><u>Strategies:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 75% of students will pass their classes with a “C: or better 2. Advisors will meet with advisees during POWWOW and at least twice during beginning of semesters and after midterm 3. Work with tutors to increase student participation in RSC by 25% 4. Recognize and celebrate student success with award ceremony at end of each semester.

Evaluative Questions	Data sources	Sampling	Analysis
<p>Objective 1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did posttest scores increase by 3%? 2. Did midterm deficiency decrease by 47% 3. Did student participation in RSC increase by 25%? 4. Were student and faculty success celebrated at award ceremony at the end of each semester? 5. Did each advisor have a POWWOW and meet at least twice with advisees during the beginning of semester and after midterm? 6. Were pre and post tests given in 75% of classes each semester? 	<p>Pre/Post test results for FY11</p> <p>Midterm Def. List At Risk list contact sheet RSC</p> <p>Attendance sheet Award Ceremony</p> <p>Attendance Sheet at POWWOW and contact sheet</p> <p>Faculty Assessment Report</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>Descriptive statistics</p>

<p>Objective 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is retention rate increased by 5% overall in all classes? 2. Is retention rate increased by 5% for each instructor? <p>Objective 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the number of students who earned C or better increase by 3%? 2. Did advisors meet with advisees during POWWOW and at least twice during the semester? 3. Did student participation increase in RSC by 25%? 4. Was student success celebrated at awards ceremony at the end of each semester? 	<p>Grade sheets</p> <p>Grade sheets</p> <p>Grade sheets</p> <p>Advisor contact sheets</p> <p>RSC Activities</p> <p>Calendar and Award ceremony</p>		
---	--	--	--

Timeline

Activity	Who is Responsible?	Date
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To increase the post-test scores by 3%: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Encourage good attendance in all remedial classes by decreasing midterm deficiency to 47%. ◦ Work closely with tutors to increase student participation by 25% in the RSC and to improve the program itself ◦ Recognize and celebrate student and faculty success with awards ceremony at the end of each semester. ◦ Work closely with student government to increase student-faculty interactions inside and outside classrooms by having POWWOW for faculty and advisors at the beginning of each semester and at least twice during the beginning and at after midterm. 	<p>Faculty Tutors, SSC, Peer Center, IC</p> <p>IC, faculty, tutors, SS, Peer Center</p> <p>IC, tutors, SSC, Peer Center, faculty</p> <p>IC, Tutors, SSC, Peer Center Faculty, SBA</p>	<p>Fall 2011</p> <p>Week two of each semester (Fall, Spring, Summer)</p> <p>End of each semester (Fall, Spring, Summer).</p> <p>Beginning of each semester, week 4 and week 8 during each semester.</p> <p>By 2nd week of each semester</p> <p>Throughout all</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identify “at risk” students at end of week two b. Work closely with RSC c. Schedule POWWOW at beginning of semester and meetings with advisors after midterm <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do Pre/post tests in 75% of classes each semester. • To increase the retention rate overall by 5%: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Hold faculty training session on identifying students “at-risk” ○ Counsel “at-risk” students • Increase by 3% the number of students who get grades of “C” or better. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% of students will pass their classes with a “C” or better. • Advisors will meet with advisees during POWWOW and at least twice during beginning of semester and after midterm. • Work with tutors to increase student participation in RSC by 25% • Recognize and celebrate student success with award ceremony at end of each semester. 	<p>IC, tutors, SSC, Peer Center, faculty</p> <p>IC, tutors, SSC, Peer Center, faculty</p> <p>IC, tutors, SSC, Peer Center, faculty</p> <p>IC, faculty (part and full time)</p> <p>IC, tutors, SSC, Peer Center, faculty</p> <p>IC, tutors, SSC, Peer Center, faculty</p> <p>IC, tutors, SSC, Peer Center, faculty</p> <p>IC, tutors, SSC, Peer Center, faculty</p> <p>IC, tutors, SSC, Peer Center, faculty</p> <p>IC, SSC, Peer Center, faculty</p>	<p>semesters (Fall, Spring, Summer). Throughout all semesters (Fall, Spring, Summer). 1st week and last week of each semester</p> <p>By 2nd week of each semester</p> <p>Throughout all semesters (Fall, Spring, Summer).</p> <p>Throughout all semesters (Fall, Spring, Summer).</p> <p>By 2nd week of semester. Throughout all semesters (Fall, Spring, Summer).</p> <p>Throughout all semesters (Fall, Spring, Summer).</p> <p>End of each semester (Fall, Spring, Summer).</p>
--	--	---

Comments:

Assessment Report Worksheet #3

Academics

Instructional

Unit/Office/Program

Fall 2011 – Summer 2012

Assessment Period Covered

Formative Assessment

Summative Assessment

Date Submitted

Administrative Evaluation Question (Use a different form for each evaluation question):

Objective 1: To increase in Post-test scores by 3% through development and implementation of academic success plan.

1. Did post test scores increase by 3%?
2. Did midterm deficiency decrease by 47%?
3. Did student participation in RSC increase by 25%?
4. Were student and faculty success celebrated at award ceremony at the end of each semester?
5. Did each advisor have a POWWOW and meet at least twice with advisees during the beginning of semester and after midterm?
6. Were pre and post tests given in 75% of classes each semester?

Objective 2: To increase retention rate by 5% overall in all classes.

1. Is retention rate increased by 5% overall in all classes?
2. Is retention rate increased by 5% for each instructor?

Objective 3: To increase by 3% the number of students who get grades of "C" or better.

1. Did the number of students who earned C or better increase by 3%?
2. Did advisors meet with advisees during POWWOW and at least twice during the semester?
3. Did student participation increase in RSC by 25%?
4. Was student success celebrated at awards ceremony at the end of each semester?

First Means of Assessment for Evaluation Question Identified Above (from your approved assessment plan):

1a. Means of Unit Assessment & Criteria for Success:

Objective 1: Increase in Post-test scores by 3% through development and implementation of academic success plan.

1. Encourage good attendance in all remedial classes by decreasing midterm deficiency to 47%
2. Work closely with tutors to increase student participation by 25% in the RSC and to improve the program itself
3. Recognize and celebrate student and faculty success with awards ceremony at the end of each semester
4. Work closely with student government to increase student=faculty interaction inside and outside classrooms by having POWWOW for faculty and advisors at the beginning of each semester and at least twice during the beginning and at after midterm.
5. Did Pre/Post tests in 75% of classes in each semester?

1b. Summary of Assessment Data Collected:

Objective 1: Increase in Post-test scores by 3% through development and implementation of academic success plan.

Evaluation Question 1: Did Post-tests scores increase by 3%?

Baseline data : No. of Classes with Pre-Post Tests ---- **79 courses**

Average Difference in Percentage between
Pre Test and Post Test Scores ----- **20.30%**

As shown in Table 1, the average difference in percentage between Pre Test and Post Test in Fall 2011- Summer 2012 is **15.83 %**. Compared to the **20.30%** average difference in Fiscal Year 2010-2011, it can be said that target increase of 3% was not met, it is short by 7.47 % . Supporting data are presented in detail in Tables 2-11 below.

Table 1. Summary of Pre-Post Tests by Semester, Fall 2011- Spring 2012

1 Semesters	2 No. of Courses Offered	3 No. of Courses with Pre-Post Test	4 Percentage (%) (3/2)	5 Average Difference in Percentage between Pre Test and Post Test
Fall 2011	48	23	47.92	17.52%
Spring 2012	42	16	38.09	14.13 %
Summer 2012	No report	No report	No report	No report
Total	90	39	86.01	
Overall Average	45	19.5	43	15.83%

Table 2. Comparison of pre-post test results by courses group between Fall 2010-Summer 2011 and Fall 2011-Summer 2012

1 Courses Group	2 Difference in Percentage Fall 2010- Summer 2011	3 Difference in Percentage Fall 2011- Summer 2012	4 Total No. of Courses with Pre-Post Test Report, Fall 2010-Summer 2011	5 Total No. of Courses with Pre-Post Test Report, Fall 2011-Summer 2012
ESL	19.56	27.83	11	6
Education	16.83	38	6	2
Vocational	11.60	10.5	7	8
Gen. Ed.	22.8	12.7	45	21
Other Courses	30.7	17.5	10	2
CHS	No Report	No report	No Report	No report
AVERAGE	20.30%	21.31%	79	39

Table 3. Pre-Post test report during Fall 2011

1 Course No.	2 Instructor Name	3 No. of students	4 Pre-Test Average (%)	5 Post-Test Average (%)	6 Difference in Percentage (5-4)
1. ESL 88	Vincent Parren	30	29	43	14
2. ESL 89	Rosa Tacheliol	16	28	48	20
3. ESL 98	Vincent Parren	21	39	69	30
4. ESL 79	Jerry Fagolimul	19	No report		
5. ESL 99	Rosa Tacheliol	16	43	62	19
6. ESL 91	Jovita Masiwemai	19	12	84	72
7. ESL 92A	Jovita Masiwemai	6	66	78	12
8. EN 120 A	Jovita Masiwemai	22	59	87	28
9. EN 110	Rosa Tacheliol	33	63	65	2
10. EN 120B	Jovita Masiwemai	15	58	85	27
11. EN/CO 205	Rosa Tacheliol	19	50	62	12
12. MS 92 A	Brandi Fichtner	20	43	64	21
13. MS 91A	Brandi Fichtner	17	31	44	13
14. MS 96	Virginia Fenenigog	22	No report		
15. MS 99	James DeRidder	20	No report		
16. MS 100	Brandi Fichtner	24	45	76	31
17. MS 104	Raymond Permitez	21	75	78	3
18. MS/ED 210A	Virginia Fenenigog	15			

19. SC 101	Joy Guarin	31	74	80	6
20. SC 98	Joy Guarin	12	62	84	22
21. SC 112	Joy Guarin	24	70	76	6
22. SC 120	Joy Guarin	24	72	81	9
23. SS 150	Robert Yangerlou	32	No report		
24. SS 120	Robert Yangerlou	25	No report		
25. SS 170	Robert Yangerlou	16	No report		
26. SS 100	Robert Yangerlou	9	No report		
27. PY 201	Robert Yangerlou	11	No report		
28. ESS 102V	Martin Ruwniyol	10	No report		
29. AR 101	Vicky Laetman	29	No report		
30. FL 101	Serphin Ilesiyalo	35	No report		
31. ED 292	Rosa Tacheliol	3	NA		
32. CA 105	James DeRidder	20	No report		
33. CA 100 Y2	James DeRidder	23	No report		
34. CA 100 Y1	James Deridder	29	No report		
35. AG 84	Steven Young-Uhk	7	No report		
36. BK 95	Gertrude Gootinan	12	No report		
37. BU 95	Geraldine Mitagyow	17	No report		
38. Law 215	Chang Bruce	9	No report		
39. Law 238	Chang Bruce	9	No report		
40. CHS 231	James Edilyong	6	No report		
41. CHS 233	Cindy Lefagopal	6	No report		
42. CHS 234	Dr. Yolwa	6	No report		
43. VEE 110	Raymond Permitez	21	67	73	6
44. VSP	Raymond Permitez	21	72	80	8
45. VEE 103	Raymond Permitez	21	65	78	13
46. VEE 100	Raymond Permitez	21	65	70	5
47. VEE 125	Raymond Permitez	7	42	66	24
Total					403
Total number of Courses with Pre-Post Test results					23
AVERAGE					17.52%

Table 4. Pre-post test report during Spring 2012

1 Course No.	2 Instructor Name	3 No. of students	4 Pre-Test Average (%)	5 Post-Test Average (%)	6 Difference in Percentage (5-4)
1. ESL 79	Josede Figirliyong	15	No report		
2. ESL 89	Vince Masincupp	24	No report		
3. ESL 98	Jerry Fagolimul	19	No report		
4. ESL 91	Jovita Masiwemai	3	No report		
5. ESL 92	Jovita Masiwemai	21	No report		
6. ESL/BU 95	Geraldine Mitagyow	14	No report		
7. EN 110	Rosa Tacheoliol	30	37	48	11
8. EN 120A	Jovita Masiwemai	25	53	70	17
9. EN 120 B	Jovita Masiwemai	24	61	75	14
10. EN 201	Rosa Tacheoliol	18	77	78	1
11. EN 208	Paul Kasiano	23	No report		
12. MS 96	Virginia Fenenigog	15	No report		
13. MS 99	Virginia Fenenigog	25	No report		
14. MS 100	Dana Gigirliyong	20	41	50	9
15. MS 106	Raymond Permitez	18	62	68	6
16. ESS 102V	Martin Ruwniyol	25	No report		
17. FL 101	Serphin Ilesiyualo	30	No report		
18. CA 100 Y1	Pius Mirey	10	No report		
19. CA 100 Y2	Pius Mirey	7	No report		
20. AR 101	Vicky Laetman	29	No report		
21. SC 101	Joy Guarin	25	71	80	9
22. SC 111	Joy Guarin	26	67	81	14
23. SC 120	Joy Guarin	22	78	84	6
24. SS 100	Robert Yangerlou	12	No report		
25. SS 130	Robert Yangerlou	24	No report		
26. SS 150	Robert Yangerlou	30	No report		
27. PY 101	Robert Yangerlou	27	No report		

28. BU 98	Dana Figirliyong	16	21	44	23
29. AG 88	Francis Ruegorong	12	No report		
30. AG 90	Peter Tairuwepiy	11	No report		
31. AG 92	Joy Guarin	5	67	79	12
32. AG 94	Peter Tairuwepiy	11	No report		
33. CHS 240	James Edilyong	5	No report		
34. CHS 241	Dr. Yolwa	5	No report		
35. CHS 251	Dr. Yolwa	4	No report		
36. ED 210	Rosa Tacheliol	16	41	85	44
37. ED 213	Rosa Tacheliol	6	59	91	32
38. ED 292	Rosa Tacheliol	3	No report		
39. Law 210	Luther Jeremiah	9	No report		
40. Law 232	Matthew Mannisto	9	No report		
41. VEE 104	Raymond Permitez	19	60	67	7
42. VEE 110	Raymond Permitez	10	80	95	15
43. VEE 135	Raymond Permitez	19	60	66	6
Total					226
Total number of Courses with Pre-Post Test results					16
AVERAGE					14.125

Table 6. Pre-Post Test results per course grouping for Fall 2011 (ESL Courses)

1 School Year	2 Course No.	3 Instructor Name	4 # of students	5 Pre-Test Average (%)	6 Post-Test Average (%)	7 Difference in Percentage (5-4)
Fall 2011	1. ESL 88	Vincent Parren	30	29	43	14
	2. ESL 89	Rosa Tacheliol	16	28	48	20
	3. ESL 98	Vincent Parren	21	39	69	30
	4. ESL 99	Rosa Tacheliol	16	43	62	19
	5. ESL 91	Jovita Masiwemai	19	12	84	72
	6. ESL 92A	Jovita Masiwemai	6	66	78	12
Spring 2012	No Report					
Total			85	217	384	167
Total number of Courses with Pre-Post Test report			6	6	6	6
AVERAGE			14.17	36.17	64	27.83%

Table 7. Pre-Post Test results per course grouping for Spring 2012 (Education Courses)

1 School Year	2 Course No.	3 Instructor Name	4 # of students	5 Pre-Test Average (%)	6 Post-Test Average (%)	7 Difference in Percentage (5-4)
Spring 2012	1. ED 210	Rosa Tacheoliol	16	41	85	44
	2. ED 213	Rosa Tacheoliol	6	59	91	32
Total			22	100	176	76
Total number of Courses			2	2	2	2

with Pre-Post Test results						
AVERAGE			11	50	88	38%

**Table 8. Pre-Post Test results per course grouping for Fall 2011-Summer 2012
(Vocational Courses)**

1 School Year	2 Course No.	3 Instructor Name	4 # of students	5 Pre-Test Average (%)	6 Post-Test Average (%)	7 Difference in Percentage (5-4)
Fall 2011	1. VEE 110	Raymond Permitez	21	67	73	6
	2. VSP	Raymond Permitez	21	72	80	8
	3. VEE 103	Raymond Permitez	21	65	78	13
	4. VEE 100	Raymond Permitez	21	65	70	5
	5. VEE 125	Raymond Permitez	7	42	66	24
Spring 2012	6. VEE 104	Raymond Permitez	19	60	67	7
	7. VEE 110	Raymond Permitez	10	80	95	15
	8. VEE 135	Raymond Permitez	19	60	66	6
Total			146	511	595	84
Total number of Courses with Pre-Post Test results			8	8	8	8
AVERAGE			18.25	63.88	74.38	10.5%

**Table 9. Pre-Post Test result per course grouping for Fall 2011-Summer 2012
(General Education Courses)**

1 School Year	2 Course No.	3 Instructor Name	4 No. of students	5 Pre-Test	6 Post-Test Average	7 Difference in
------------------	-----------------	----------------------	----------------------	---------------	------------------------	--------------------

				Average (%)	(%)	Percentage (5-4)
Fall 2011	1. EN 120 A	Jovita Masiwemai	22	59	87	28
	2. EN 110	Rosa Tacheliol	33	63	65	2
	3. EN 120B	Jovita Masiwemai	15	58	85	27
	4. EN/CO 205	Rosa Tacheliol	19	50	62	12
	5. MS 92 A	Brandi Fichtner	20	43	64	21
	6. MS 91A	Brandi Fichtner	17	31	44	13
	7. MS 100	Brandi Fichtner	24	45	76	31
	8. MS 104	Raymond Permitez	21	75	78	3
	9. SC 101	Joy Guarin	31	74	80	6
	10. SC 98	Joy Guarin	12	62	84	22
	11. SC 112	Joy Guarin	24	70	76	6
	12. SC 120	Joy Guarin	24	72	81	9
Spring 2012	13. EN 110	Rosa Tacheoliol	30	37	48	11
	14. EN 120A	Jovita Masiwemai	25	53	70	17
	15. EN 120 B	Jovita Masiwemai	24	61	75	14
	16. EN 201	Rosa Tacheoliol	18	77	78	1
	17. MS 106	Raymond Permitez	18	62	68	6
	18. SC 101	Joy Guarin	25	71	80	9
	19. SC 111	Joy Guarin	26	67	81	14
	20. SC 120	Joy Guarin	22	78	84	6
	21. MS 100	Dana Figirliyong	20	41	50	9
Total			445	1249	1516	267
Total number of						

Courses with Pre-Post Test results			21	21	21	
AVERAGE			21.19	59.48	72.19	12.7%

Table 10. Pre-Post Test results per course grouping for Fall 2011-Summer 2012 (Other Courses)

1 School Year	2 Course No.	3 Instructor Name	4 # of students	5 Pre-Test Average (%)	6 Post-Test Average (%)	7 Difference in Percentage (5-4)
Spring 2012	1.AG 92	Joy Guarin	5	67	79	12
	2.BU 98	Dana Figirliyong	16	21	44	23
Total						
Total number of Courses with Pre-Post Test results						
AVERAGE			10.5	44	61.5	17.5

Evaluation Question 2: Did Midterm deficiency decrease by 47%?

Table 12 shows the comparative number of students with midterm deficiency between Fall 2010 to Summer 2011 and Fall 2011 to Summer 2012. Data show that in FY Fall 2010 to Summer 2011, the average percentage of mid-term deficiency was 54.13% while in this FY Fall 2011 to Summer 2012, it is 36.08%, which is a decrease of 18.05% lower than the 47% target. This means that there are less students with midterm deficiency than in the previous assessment cycle. Summer 2012 registered the smallest percentage of midterm deficiency with 10.19% as compared to Summer 2011 with 63.11%. There is also decrease in the midterm deficiency last Spring 2012 of 37.10% compared to the 50.25% of Spring 2011. There is no data available on the remedial classes conducted, as an strategy to decrease the mid-term deficiency.

Table 12. Comparative number of students with midterm deficiency between FY 2010 to 2011 and FY 2011 to 2012

1 Semester	2 Total enrolled students	3 Total number of students with midterm deficiency	4 Percentage (%) (3/4)	1 Semester	2 Total enrolled students	3 Total number of students with midterm deficiency	4 Percentage (%) (3/4)
Fall 2010	208	102	49%	Fall 2011	228	108	47.36%
Spring 2011	203	102	50.25%	Spring 2012	221	82	37.10%
Summer 2011	206	130	63.11%	Summer 2012	108	11	10.19%
TOTAL	617	334			557	201	
AVERAGE	205.67	111.33			185.67	67	
PERCENTAGE			54.13%				36.08%

Evaluation Question 3: Did student participation in RSC increase by 25%?

Table 13. Student participation in RSC, Fall 2011-Summer 2012

Semester	Total No. of Students Registered	Total No. of Members of RSC	No. of Members who participated in RSC Activities
Fall 2011		Will be updated by SSC	Will be updated by SSC
Spring 2012		Will be updated by SSC	Will be updated by SSC
Summer 2012		Will be updated by SSC	Will be updated by SSC
Total		Will be updated by SSC	Will be updated by SSC

Evaluation Question 4: Were student and faculty success celebrated at award ceremony at the end of each semester?

Table 14. Recipients of student and faculty awards

Semester	Category	Award	No. of Students
Fall, Spring Semesters 2011	Student	Good Academic Performance	No data available from SSC
		Most Improved	
		Perfect Attendance	

Evaluation Question 5: Did each advisor have POWWOW and meet at least twice with advisees during the beginning of semester and after midterm?

Table 15. POWWOW events, Fall 2010-Summer 2011

Semester	Date of POWWOW	Advisor	No. of Advisees	No. of Attendees
Fall 2011	No data available from SSC	No data available from SSC	No data available from SSC	No data available from SSC
Spring 2012	No data available from SSC	No data available from SSC	No data available from SSC	No data available from SSC

Evaluation Question 6: Were pre- and post tests given in 75% of classes each semester?

Table 16 shows the pre-post test given by semester--Fall 2011, Spring 2012, and Summer 2012. Data revealed that in Fall 2011, 47.92% or 23 classes out of 48 classes had Pre-Post tests. During the Spring 2012 only 38.09% or 16 out of 42 classes had Pre-Post tests. The target was not met in Fall 2011 and Spring 2012. This assessment year, the Pre/Post tests were administered to an average of 43 % of classes.

Table 16. Pre-Post Test Reports by Semester, Fall 2011-Summer 2012

1 Semesters	2 No. of Courses Offered	3 No. of Courses that had Pre-Post Test report	4 Percentage (%) (3/2)	5 Is it given in 75% of classes
Fall 2011	48	23	47.92	No
Spring 2012	42	16	38.09	No
Summer 2012	No report	No report	No report	
Total	90	39	86.01	
Overall Average	45	19.5	43	No

1c: Use of Results to Improve Unit Services:

1. To improve on the post test scores, an item analysis of all the questions given in the pre-test should be done by the instructor in order to identify what topics the students need to know more. These topics should be given emphasis during the lecture. Item analysis workshop can be scheduled before the start of the semester.
2. An early identification of “at risk” students should be done by the instructor. These “at risk” students should be referred to tutors to help them in areas/topics where they are having difficulties. Faculty should provide course outline/syllabus to tutors so that they could not only help answer class assignments but give lectures, if necessary. Instructors should also provide hand-outs or study guides to help the students.
3. Instructors should be involved in planning of the POWWOW
4. There is a need to improve documentation and data collection.
5. There should be a strict implementation of giving pre/post test by all instructors—full time and part time—every semester.
6. Identify the number of students for tutoring before and after the midterm exam.

Second Means of Assessment for Evaluation Question Identified Above (from your approved assessment plan):

2a. Means of Unit Assessment & Criteria for Success:

Objective 2: To continue to increase retention rate by 5% overall in all classes.

Strategies:

1. Instructor identifies students “at-risk” in his/her class
 - Students with poor attendance
 - Students with poor grades on coursework

- Students with family issues
- 2. Counsel “at-risk” students
 - Instructor counsels students first
 - If student still at-risk, then student meets with Chair of department

2b. Summary of Assessment Data Collected:

Evaluation Question 1: Is retention rate increased by 5% overall in all classes?

Baseline data: Fall 2010 to Summer 2011 = 88.6%

The average percentage of retention rate from Fall 2011 to Summer 2012 did increase by 6.16% overall in all classes. Table 1 shows the summary of the retention rate in all classes per semester: Fall 2011- 96.07%, Spring 2012 – 91.63%, Summer 2012- 96.57%. The average percentage of retention rate or percentage of students that remain in class for Fall 2010 to Summer 2011 is 88.6%. Tables 2 to 4 show the retention rate of classes during Fall 2011, Spring 2012 and Summer 2012.

Note: Retention rate refers to the number of students who remain in class at the end of the semester. The formula used in getting the retention rate is by dividing the average number of students enrolled without “W” and the average overall number of students with and without “W”.

Table 1. Summary of the retention rate in all classes per semester, Fall 2011 to Summer 2012

1 Semester	2 Average No. of students enrolled without “W”	3 Average No. of students Enrolled with “W”	4 Average Overall No. of students (with and without “W”)	5 Average Retention rate in all classes (% of students remain in class)
Fall 2011	17.82	0.86	17.12	96.07
Spring 2012	17.21	1.02	15.77	91.63
Summer 2012	9.61	0.33	9.28	96.57
Total	44.64	2.21	42.17	284.27
Average	14.88	0.74	14.06	94.76

Table 2. Fall 2011 Retention Rate per Course

1 Course No.	2 Instructor Name	3 No. of students enrolled without “W”	4 No. of students Enrolled with “W”	5 Overall No. of students (with and without	6 Retention rate / course (% of students remain in class) (3/5)
-----------------	----------------------	---	--	--	--

				“W”)	
1. ESL 91B	Jovita Masiwemai	15	0	15	100
2. ESL 88	Vincent Parren	30	1	29	96.7
3. ESL 89	Rosa Tacheoliol	16	2	14	87.5
4. ESL 98	Vincent Parren	21	1	20/2(AU)	95.23
5. ESL 79	Jerry Fagolimul	19	1	18	94.74
6. ESL 99	Rosa Tacheoliol	16	2	14	87.5
7. ESL 91	Jovita Masiwemai	19	0	19	100
8. ESL 92A	Jovita Masiwemai	6	0	6	100
9. EN 120 A	Jovita Masiwemai	22	1	21	95.45
10. EN 110	Rosa Tacheoliol	33	2	31	93.94
11. EN 120B	Jovita Masiwemai	15	1	14	44.73
12. EN/CO 205	Rosa Tacheoliol	19	0	19	100
13. MS 92 A	Brandi Fichtner	20	2	18	90
14. MS 91A	Brandi Fichtner	17	0	17	100
15. MS 96	Virginia Fenenigog	22	2	20	90.9
16. MS 99	James DeRidder	20	2	18	90
17. MS 100	Brandi Fichtner	24	5	19	79.17
18. MS 104	Raymond Permitez	21	0	21	100
19. MS/ED 210A	Virginia Fenenigog	15	0	15	100
20. MS 91	Brandi Fichtner	17	0	17	100
21. SC 101	Joy Guarin	31	1	30	96.8

22. SC 98	Joy Guarin	12	0	12	100
23. SC 112	Joy Guarin	24	2	22	91.7
24. SC 120	Joy Guarin	24	0	24	100
25. SS 150	Robert Yangerlou	32	2	30	93.75
26. SS 120	Robert Yangerlou	25	0	25	100
27. SS 170	Robert Yangerlou	16	0	16	100
28. SS 100	Robert Yangerlou	9	1	8	88.9
29. PY 201	Robert Yangerlou	11	0	11	100
30. ESS 102V	Martin Ruwniyol	10	1	9	90
31. AR 101	Vicky Laetman	29	0	29	100
32. FL 101	Serphin Ilesiyalo	35	2	33	94.3
33. ED 292	Rosa Tacheoliol	3	0	3	100
34. CA 105	James DeRidder	20	3	17	85
35. CA 100 Y2	James DeRidder	23	5	18	78.3
36. CA 100 Y1	James Deridder	29	3	26	89.7
37. AG 84	Steven Young-Uhk	7	0	7	100
38. BK 95	Gertrude Gootinan	12	0	12	100
39. BU 95	Geraldine Mitagyow	17	0	17	100
40. Law 215	Chang Bruce	9	0	9	100
41. Law 238	Chang Bruce	9	0	9	100
42. CHS 231	James Edilyong	6	0	6	100
43. CHS 233	Cindy Lefagopal	6	0	6	100

44. CHS 234	Dr. Yolwa	6	0	6	100
45. VEE 110	Raymond Permitez	21	0	21	100
46. VSP	Raymond Permnitez	21	0	21	100
47. VEE 103	Raymond Permitez	21	0	21	100
48. VEE 100	Raymond Permitez	21	0	21	100
49. VEE 125	Raymond Permitez	7	0	7	100
Average		17.82	0.86	17.12	96.07%

Table 2. Spring 2012 Retention Rate per Course

1 Course No.	2 Instructor Name	3 No. of students enrolled without “W”	4 No. of students Enrolled with “W”	5 Overall No. of students (with and without “W”)	6 Retention rate / course (% of students remain in class) (3/5)
1. ESL 79	Josede Figirliyong	15	0	15	100
2. ESL 89	Vince Masincupp	24	5	19	79
3. ESL 98	Jerry Fagolimul	19	0	19	100
4. ESL 91	Jovita Masiwemai	3	0	3	100
5. ESL 92	Jovita Masiwemai	21	0	21	100
6. ESL/BU 95	Geraldine Mitagyow	14	2	12	85.7
7. EN 110	Rosa Tacheoliol	30	2	28	93.33
8. EN 120A	Jovita Masiwemai	25	0	25	100
9. EN 120 B	Jovita Masiwemai	24	2	22	91.67

120 B					
10. EN 201	Rosa Tacheoliol	18	1	17	94.44
11. EN 208	Paul Kasiano	23	1	22	95.65
12. MS 96	Virginia Fenenigog	15	2	13	86.67
13. MS 99	Virginia Fenenigog	25	0	25	100
14. MS 100	Dana Gigirliyong	20	4	16	80
15. MS 106	Raymond Permitez	18	0	18	100
16. ESS 102V	Martin Ruwniyol	25	3	22	88
17. FL 101	Serphin Ilesiyualo	30	3	27	90
18. CA 100 Y1	Pius Mirey	10	4	6	60
19. CA 100 Y2	Pius Mirey	7	1	6	85.7
20. AR 101	Vicky Laetman	29	3	26	89.66
21. SC 101	Joy Guarin	25	1	24	96
22. SC 111	Joy Guarin	26	1	25	96.15
23. SC 120	Joy Guarin	22	0	22	100
24. SS 100	Robert Yangerlou	12	1	11	91.67
25. SS 130	Robert Yangerlou	24	1	23	95.83
26. SS 150	Robert Yangerlou	30	3	27	90
27. PY 101	Robert Yangerlou	27	2	25	95.60
28. BU 98	Dana Figirliyong	16	1	15	93.75
29. AG 88	Francis Ruegorong	12	0	12	100

30. AG 90	Peter Tairuwepiy	11	0	11	100
31. AG 92	Joy Guarin	5	0	5	100
32. AG 94	Peter Tairuwepiy	11	0	11	100
33. CHS 240	James Edilyong	5	0	5	100
34. CHS 241	Dr. Yolwa	5	0	5	100
35. CHS 251	Dr. Yolwa	4	0	4	100
36. ED 210	Rosa Tacheliol	16	0	16	100
37. ED 213	Rosa Tacheliol	6	0	6	100
38. ED 292	Rosa Tacheliol	3	0	3	100
39. Law 210	Luther Jeremiah	9	0	9	100
40. Law 232	Matthew Mannisto	9	0	9	100
41. VEE 104	Raymond Permitez	19	0	19	100
42. VEE 110	Raymond Permitez	10	0	10	100
43. VEE 135	Raymond Permitez	19	0	19	100
Average		17.21	1.02	15.77	91.63%

Table 2. Sumer 2012 Retention Rate per Course

1 Course No.	2 Instructor Name	3 No. of students enrolled without "W"	4 No. of students Enrolled with "W"	5 Overall No. of students (with and without "W")	6 Retention rate / course (% of students remain in class) (3/5)
1. ESL 79	Josede Figirliyong	8	0	8	100
2. ESL 89	Heidi Colins	10	0	10	100
3. ESL 99	Andy Choor	9	1	8	88.89
4. EN 110	Vince Masincupp	14	1	13	92.86
5. EN 120A	Vince Masincupp	8	1	7	87.5
6. EN 220	Richard Masiwemai	7	0	7	100
7. ESS 101	Frank Lifang	9	0	9	100
8. SC 101	Joy Guarin	10	1	9	90
9. SC 130	Joy Guarin	13	2	11	84.62
10. SS 150	Paul Kasiano	6	0	6	100
11. Law 236	Douglas Jennings	6	0	6	100
12. ED 215	Richard Masiwemai	18	0	18	100
13. ED 302	Josede Figirliyong	8	0	8	100
14. ED/PY 300	Josede Figirliyong	6	0	6	100
15. CA 100	Mirey Pius	25	0	25	100
16. CHS 220	Dr. Yolwa	10	0	10	100
17. CHS 242	Dr. Yolwa	3	0	3	100
18. CHS 235	Cindy Lefagopal	3	0	3	100
Average		9.61	0.33	9.28	96.57%

Evaluation Question 2 : Is retention rate increased by 5% for each instructor?

Table 5 shows the comparison between the average retention rate of students in their courses by instructor for Fall 2010-Summer 2011 and Fall 2011 to Summer 2012. Results show that out of 23 instructors only 9 have shown an increase in their retention rate in their classes by 5%. Five instructors had the same retention rate of 100% in both fiscal years. It is noteworthy to mention that only instructors with teaching loads in both fiscal years were compared.

Table 6 shows the retention rate of instructors in their classes during Fall 2010 to Summer 2011.

Table 5. Comparison between the average retention rate of students in their courses by instructor for Fall 2010-Summer 2011 and Fall 2011 to Summer 2012.

FALL 2010-SUMMER 2011			FALL 2011-SUMMER 2012			Is retention rate increased by 5%
Instructor	Average Retention Rate	No. of Courses	Instructor	Average Retention Rate	No. of Courses	
Dr. Yolwa	100%	4	Dr. Yolwa	100%	5	The same
Paul Kasiano	81.56%	2	Paul Kasiano	97.85%	2	Yes
Vicky Laetman	89%	2	Vicky Laetman	94.82%	2	Yes
Dana Figirliyong	91.5%	4	Dana Figirliyong	86.9%	2	No
Joy Guarin	97.21%	10	Joy Guarin	95.53%	10	No
Jovita Masiwemai	93.5%	12	Jovita Masiwemai	97.82%	9	Yes
Robert Yangerlou	92.2%	5	Robert Yangerlou	94.79%	9	No
Virginia Fenenigog	93.8%	4	Virginia Fenenigog	94.5%	4	No
Jerry Fagolimul	78.25%	2	Jerry Fagolimul	97.35%	2	Yes
Martin Ruwniyol	83.3%	1	Martin Ruwniyol	88.2%	2	Yes
Josede Figirliyong	96.6%	3	Josede Figirliyong	100%	4	No
Brandi Fitchner	91.7%	9	Brandi Fitchner	92.30%	4	No
Serphin Ilesiyalo	97%	1	Serphin Ilesiyalo	92.15%	2	No
Steven Young Uhk	100%	1	Steven Young Uhk	100%	1	The same
Bruce Chang	83.3%	1	Bruce Chang	100%	2	Yes
Geraldine Mitagyow	82.5%	2	Geraldine Mitagyow	92.86%	2	Yes
Vince	97.35%	2	Vince	86.67%	3	No

Massincup			Massincup				
Manisto Matthew	100%	1	Manisto Matthew	100%	1	The same	
Cindy Lefagopal	100%	1	Cindy Lefagopal	100%	2	The same	
Heidi Collins	100%	1	Heidi Collins	100%	1	The same	
Pius Mirey	100%	1	Pius Mirey	81.9%	3	Yes	
Raymond Permitez	94.88%	9	Raymond Permitez	100%	9	Yes	

Table 2. Retention rate of each instructor for Fall 2011 to Summer 2012

Semester	Course No.	Instructor Name	No. of students enrolled without "W"	No. of students Enrolled with "W"	Overall No. of students (with and without "W")	Retention rate / course (% of students remain in class)
Fall 2011	ESL 91B	Jovita Masiwemai	15	0	15	100
	ESL 91	Jovita Masiwemai	19	0	19	100
	ESL 92A	Jovita Masiwemai	6	0	6	100
	EN 120 A	Jovita Masiwemai	22	1	21	95.45
	EN 120B	Jovita Masiwemai	15	1	14	93.33
Spring 2012	ESL 91	Jovita Masiwemai	3	0	3	100
	ESL 92	Jovita Masiwemai	21	0	21	100
	EN 120A	Jovita Masiwemai	25	0	25	100
	EN 120 B	Jovita Masiwemai	24	2	22	91.67
					Average	97.82%
Fall 2011	ESL 89	Rosa Tacheoliol	16	2	14	87.5
	ESL 99	Rosa Tacheoliol	16	2	14	87.5
	EN 110	Rosa Tacheoliol	33	2	31	94

	ED 292	Rosa Tacheoliol	3	0	3	100
	EN/CO 205	Rosa Tacheoliol	19	0	19	100
Spring 2012	EN 110	Rosa Tacheoliol	30	2	28	93.3
	EN 201	Rosa Tacheoliol	18	1	17	94.4
	ED 210	Rosa Tacheoliol	16	0	16	100
	ED 213	Rosa Tacheoliol	6	0	6	100
	ED 292	Rosa Tacheoliol	3	0	3	100
					Average	95.67%
Fall 2011	MS 92 A	Brandi Fichtner	20	2	18	90
	MS 91A	Brandi Fichtner	17	0	17	100
	MS 100	Brandi Fichtner	24	5	19	79.17
	MS 91	Brandi Fichtner	17	0	17	100
					Average	92.30%
Fall 2011	SS 150	Robert Yangerlou	32	2	30	93.8
	SS 120	Robert Yangerlou	25	0	25	100
	SS 170	Robert Yangerlou	16	0	16	100
	SS 100	Robert Yangerlou	9	1	8	88.89
	PY 201	Robert Yangerlou	11	0	11	100
Spring 2012	SS 100	Robert Yangerlou	12	1	11	91.7
	SS 130	Robert Yangerlou	24	1	23	95.8
	SS 150	Robert Yangerlou	30	3	27	90
	PY 101	Robert Yangerlou	27	2	25	93
					Average	94.79%

Fall 2011	SC 101	Joy Guarin	31	1	30	96.8
	SC 98	Joy Guarin	12	0	12	100
	SC 112	Joy Guarin	24	2	22	91.7
	SC 120	Joy Guarin	24	0	24	100
Spring 2012	SC 101	Joy Guarin	25	1	24	96
	SC 111	Joy Guarin	26	1	25	96.2
	SC 120	Joy Guarin	22	0	22	100
	AG 92	Joy Guarin	5	0	5	100
Summer 2012	SC 101	Joy Guarin	10	1	9	90
	SC 130	Joy Guarin	13	2	11	84.6
					Average	95.53%
Fall 2011	MS 99	James DeRidder	20	2	18	90
	CA 105	James DeRidder	20	3	17	85
	CA 100 Y2	James DeRidder	23	5	18	78
	CA 100 Y1	James Deridder	29	3	26	90
					Average	85.75%
Fall 2011	VEE 110	Raymond Permitez	21	0	21	100
	VSP	Raymond Permnitez	21	0	21	100
	VEE 103	Raymond Permitez	21	0	21	100
	VEE 100	Raymond Permitez	21	0	21	100
	VEE 125	Raymond Permitez	7	0	7	100
Spring 2012	VEE 104	Raymond Permitez	19	0	19	100
	VEE 110	Raymond Permitez	10	0	10	100
	VEE 135	Raymond Permitez	19	0	19	100
	MS 104	Raymond Permitez	21	0	21	100
					Average	100%
Fall 2011	ESL 88	Vincent Parren	30	1	29	96.7

	ESL 98	Vincent Parren	21	1	20/2(AU)	95.2
					Average	95.95%
Fall 2011	ESL 79	Jerry Fagolimul	19	1	18	94.7
Spring 2012	ESL 98	Jerry Fagolimul	19	0	19	100
					Average	97.35%
Fall 2011	MS 96	Virginia Fenenigog	22	2	20	90.9
	MS/ED 210A	Virginia Fenenigog	15	0	15	100
Spring 2012	MS 96	Virginia Fenenigog	15	2	13	87
	MS 99	Virginia Fenenigog	25	0	25	100
					Average	94.5%
Fall 2011	ESS 102V	Martin Ruwniyol	10	1	9	90
Spring 2012	ESS 102V	Martin Ruwniyol	25	3	22	88
					Average	88.2%
Fall 2011	AR 101	Vicky Laetman	29	0	29	100
Spring 2012	AR 101	Vicky Laetman	29	3	26	89.65
					Average	94.82%
Fall 2011	FL 101	Serphin Ilesiyalo	35	2	33	94.3
Spring 2012	FL 101	Serphin Ilesiyalo	30	3	27	90
					Average	92.15%
Fall 2011	AG 84	Steven Young-Uhk	7	0	7	100%
Fall 2011	BK 95	Gertrude	12	0	12	100%

		Gootinan				
Fall 2011	BU 95	Geraldine Mitagyow	17	0	17	100%
Spring 2012	ESL/BU 95	Geraldine Mitagyow	14	2	12	85.71%
					Average	92.86%
Fall 2011	Law 215	Chang Bruce	9	0	9	100
	Law 238	Chang Bruce	9	0	9	100
					Average	100%
Fall 2011	CHS 231	James Edilyong	6	0	6	100
Spring 2012	CHS 240	James Edilyong	5	0	5	100
					Average	100%
Fall 2011	CHS 234	Dr. Yolwa	6	0	6	100
Spring 2012	CHS 241	Dr. Yolwa	5	0	5	100
	CHS 251	Dr. Yolwa	4	0	4	100
Summer 2012	CHS 220	Dr. Yolwa	10	0	10	100
	CHS 242	Dr. Yolwa	3	0	3	100
					Average	100%
Fall 2011	CHS 233	Cindy Lefagopal	6	0	6	100
Summer 2012	CHS 235	Cindy Lefagopal	3	0	3	100
					Average	100%
Spring 2012	ESL 79	Josede Figirliyong	15	0	15	100
Summer 2012	ESL 79	Josede Figirliyong	8	0	8	100
	ED 302	Josede Figirliyong	8	0	8	100
	ED/PY 300	Josede Figirliyong	6	0	6	100
					Average	100%
Spring 2012	ESL 89	Vince	24	5	19	79.2

		Masincupp				
Summer 2012	EN 110	Vince Masincupp	14	1	13	92.83
	EN 120A	Vince Masincupp	8	1	7	88
					Average	86.67%
Spring 2012	EN 208	Paul Kasiano	23	1	22	95.7
Summer 2012	SS 150	Paul Kasiano	6	0	6	100
					Average	97.85
Spring 2012	MS 100	Dana Gigirliyong	20	4	16	80
	BU 98	Dana Figirliyong	16	1	15	93.75
					Average	86.9%
Spring 2012	CA 100 Y1	Pius Mirey	10	4	6	60
	CA 100 Y2	Pius Mirey	7	1	6	85.7
Summer 2012	CA 100	Mirey Pius	25	0	25	100
					Average	81.9%
Spring 2012	AG 88	Francis Ruegorong	12	0	12	100%
Spring 2012	AG 90	Peter Tairuwepiy	11	0	11	100
	AG 94	Peter Tairuwepiy	11	0	11	100
					Average	100%
Spring 2012	Law 210	Luther Jeremiah	9	0	9	100%
Spring 2012	Law 232	Matthew Mannisto	9	0	9	100%
Summer 2012	ESL 89	Heidi Colins	10	0	10	100%

Summer 2012	ESL 99	Andy Choor	9	1	8	88.9%
Sumer 2012	EN 220	Richard Masiwemai	7	0	7	100
	ED 215	Richard Masiwemai	18	0	18	100
					Average	100%
Summer 2012	Law 236	Douglas Jennings	6	0	6	100%

2c: Use of Results to Improve Unit Services:

1. An early identification of “at risk” students should be done by the instructor. These “at risk” students should be referred to tutors to help them in their assignments, review them in their quizzes and in their exams, and even give them lectures.

2. Instructors should require students to give their reasons for withdrawing the class. All these reasons should be properly documented and analyzed by the IC in coordination with the Student Services Coordinator.

Third Means of Assessment for Evaluation Question Identified Above (from your approved assessment plan):

3a. Means of Unit Assessment & Criteria for Success:

Objective 3: To increase by 3% the number of students who get grades of “C” or better.

1. 75% of students will pass their classes with a “C: or better
2. Advisors will meet with advisees during POWWOW and at least twice during beginning of semesters and after midterm
3. Work with tutors to increase student participation in RSC by 25%
4. Recognize and celebrate student success with award ceremony at end of each semester.

3b. Summary of Assessment Data Collected:

Objective 3: To increase by 3% the number of students who get grades of “C” or better.

Evaluative Question 1 : **Did the number of students who earned C or better increase by 3%?**

Baseline Data: Fall 2010 to Summer 2011 = 84.3%

Table 1 presents the comparison of good academic standing percentage of students between Fall 2010 to Summer 2011 and Fall 2011 to Summer 2012. Results show that the average percentage of good academic standing in Fall 2011 to Summer 2012 is 81.4%, a decrease of 3.27%. Table 2 is a detailed summary of the abovementioned data. Tables 3 -5 present the percentage of students (stds) with a grades of “C” or better, “D” and “F” per semester, i.e. Fall 2011 to Summer 2012.

Table 1. Comparison between the percentage of good academic standing of students between Fall 2010 to Summer 2011 and Fall 2011 to Summer 2012.

Semester	Good Academic Standing (grade of “C” or better)	Semester	Good Academic Standing (grade of “C” or better)
Fall 2010	83.57	Fall 2011	76.3
Spring 2011	82.06	Spring 2012	82.74
Summer 2011	90.08	Summer 2012	85.1
AVERAGE	84.3%		81.4%

Table 2. Summary of percentage of students (stds) with a grades of “C” or better, “D” and F” during Fall 2011, Spring 2012, and Summer 2012

1 Semester	2 No. of Courses	3 Total No. of stds	4 No. of stds with “W”	5 Total No. of stds minus the stds with W (3-4)	6 No. of stds with a grade of “C” or better	7 (%) (6/5)	8 No. of stds with a grade of “D”	9 (%) (8/5)	10 No. of stds with a grade of “F”	11 (%) (10/5)
Fall 2011	49	873	42	831	634	76.3	61	7.3	136	16.4

Spring 2012	43	721	43	678	561	82.7 4	48	7.08	69	10.18
Summer 2012	18	173	6	167	142	85.1	13	7.9	12	7.0
Average	36.7	589	30.3	558.7	445.7	79.8 %	40.7	7.3 %	72.3	12.9%

Table 3 Percentage of students (stds) with a grades of “C” or better, “D” and “F” during Fall 2011

1 Course No.	2 Instructor Name	3 Overa ll No. of stds	4 No. of stds with “W”	5 Overall No. of stds minus the stds with W (3-4)	6 No. of stds with a grade of “C” or better	7 (%) (6/5)	8 No. of stds with a grade of “D”	9 (%) (8/5)	10 No. of stds with a grade of “F”	11 (%) (10/5)
1. ESL 91B	Jovita Masiwemai	15	0	15	9	60	0	0	6	40
2. ESL 88	Vincent Parren	30	1	29	10	35	3	10	16	55
3. ESL 89	Rosa Tacheoliol	16	2	14	4	29	5	36	5	36
4. ESL 98	Vincent Parren	21	1	20/2(A U)	7	39	3	17	8	44
5. ESL 79	Jerry Fagolimul	19	1	18	15	83	0	0	3	17
6. ESL 99	Rosa Tacheoliol	16	2	14	6	43	3	21	5	36
7. ESL 91	Jovita Masiwemai	19	0	19	9	47	0	0	10	53
8. ESL 92A	Jovita Masiwemai	6	0	6	4	67	0	0	2	33
9. EN 120 A	Jovita Masiwemai	22	1	21	16	76	3	14	2	10
10. EN 110	Rosa Tacheoliol	33	2	31	25	81	2	6	4	13
11. EN 120B	Jovita Masiwemai	15	1	14	10	71	3	21	1	7
12. EN/CO 205	Rosa Tacheoliol	19	0	19	18	95	0	0	1	5
13. MS 92 A	Brandi Fichtner	20	2	18	14	78	0	0	4	22

14. MS 91A	Brandi Fichtner	17	0	17	13	77	0	0	4	23
15. MS 96	Virginia Fenenigog	22	2	20	16	80	0	0	4	20
16. MS 99	James DeRidder	20	2	18	7	39	2	11	9	50
17. MS 100	Brandi Fichtner	24	5	19	15	79	1	5	3	16
18. MS 104	Raymond Permitez	21	0	21	21	100	0	0	0	0
19. MS/ED 210A	Virginia Fenenigog	15	0	15	14	93	0	0	1	7
20. MS 91	Brandi Fichtner	17	0	17	13	77	0	0	4	23
21. SC 101	Joy Guarin	31	1	30	29	97	0	0	1	3
22. SC 98	Joy Guarin	12	0	12	12	100	0	0	0	0
23. SC 112	Joy Guarin	24	2	22	22	100	0	0	0	0
24. SC 120	Joy Guarin	24	0	24	22	92	2	8	0	0
25. SS 150	Robert Yangerlou	32	2	30	15	50	5	17	10	33
26. SS 120	Robert Yangerlou	25	0	25	18	72	3	12	4	16
27. SS 170	Robert Yangerlou	16	0	16	9	56	6	38	1	6
28. SS 100	Robert Yangerlou	9	1	8	6	75	1	12	1	13
29. PY 201	Robert Yangerlou	11	0	11	8	73	3	27	0	0
30. ESS 102V	Martin Ruwniyol	10	1	9	9	100	0	0	0	0
31. AR 101	Vicky Laetman	29	0	29	28	97	1	3	0	0
32. FL 101	Serphin Ilesiyalo	35	2	33	25	76	3	9	5	15
33. ED 292	Rosa Tacheoliol	3	0	3	2	67	0	0	1	33
34. CA 105	James DeRidder	20	3	17	14	82	2	12	1	6
35. CA 100 Y2	James DeRidder	23	5	18	13	72	1	6	4	22

Y2										
36. CA 100 Y1	James Deridder	29	3	26	25	96	0	0	1	4
37. AG 84	Steven Young- Uhk	7	0	7	6	86	1	14	0	0
38. BK 95	Gertrude Gootinan	12	0	12	6	50	3	25	3	25
39. BU 95	Geraldine Mitagyow	17	0	17	12	70	4	24	1	6
40. Law 215	Chang Bruce	9	0	9	6	67	0	0	3	33
41. Law 238	Chang Bruce	9	0	9	7	78	1	11	1	11
42. CHS 231	James Edilyong	6	0	6	5	83	0	0	1	17
43. CHS 233	Cindy Lefagopal	6	0	6	5	83	0	0	1	17
44. CHS 234	Dr. Yolwa	6	0	6	5	83	0	0	1	17
45. VEE 110	Raymond Permitez	21	0	21	20	95	0	0	1	17
46. VSP	Raymond Permnitez	21	0	21	20	95	0	0	1	17
47. VEE 103	Raymond Permitez	21	0	21	20	95	0	0	1	17
48. VEE 100	Raymond Permitez	21	0	21	20	95	0	0	1	17
49. VEE 125	Raymond Permitez	7	0	7	7	100	0	0	0	0
Total		873	42	831	634		61		136	
Percentage						76.3 %		7.3 %		16.4 %

Table 3 Percentage of students (stds) with a grades of “C” or better, “D” and “F” during Spring 2012

1 Course No.	2 Instructor Name	3 Overall No. of stds	4 No. of stds with “W”	5 Overall No. of stds minus the stds with W (3-4)	6 No. of stds with a grade of “C” or better	7 (%) (6/5)	8 No. of stds with a grade of “D”	9 (%) (8/5)	10 No. of stds with a grade of “F”	11 (%) (10/5)
--------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------------	--	--	-------------------	--	-------------------	---	---------------------

1. ESL 79	Josede Figirliyong	15	0	15	15	100	0	0	0	0
2. ESL 89	Vince Masincupp	24	5	19	13	68.4	2	10.5	4	21.1
3. ESL 98	Jerry Fagolimul	19	0	19	18	95	0	0	1	5
4. ESL 91	Jovita Masiwemai	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	100
5. ESL 92	Jovita Masiwemai	21	0	21	0	0	0	0	13	100
6. ESL/BU 95	Geraldine Mitagyowl	14	2	12	9	75	3	25	0	0
7. EN 110	Rosa Tacheoliol	30	2	28	27	96.4	0	0	1	3.57
8. EN 120A	Jovita Masiwemai	25	0	25	20	80	3	12	2	8
9. EN 120 B	Jovita Masiwemai	24	2	22	22	100	0	0	0	0
10. EN 201	Rosa Tacheoliol	18	1	17	13	76.5	3	17.6	1	5.9
11. EN 208	Paul Kasiano	23	1	22	20	95	1	5	0	0
12. MS 96	Virginia Feninigog	15	2	13	11	85	1	7.5	1	7.5
13. MS 99	Virginia Feninigog	25	0	25	21	84	2	8	2	8
14. MS 100	Dana Gigirliyong	20	4	16	7	44	3	19	6	37
15. MS 106	Raymond Permitez	18	0	18	18	100	0	0	0	0
16. ESS 102V	Martin Ruwniyol	25	3	22	19	100	0	0	0	0
17. FL 101	Serphin Ilesiyalo	30	3	27	25	96	2	4	0	0
18. CA 100 Y1	Pius Mirey	10	4	6	2	2	0	0	0	0
19. CA 100 Y2	Pius Mirey	7	1	6	4	80	0	0	1	20
20. AR 101	Vicky Laetman	29	3	26	23	100	0	0	0	0
21. SC 101	Joy Guarin	25	1	24	22	92	2	8	0	0
22. SC 111	Joy Guarin	26	1	25	24	100	0	90	0	0
23. SC 120	Joy Guarin	22	0	22	20	91	2	9	0	0
24. SS 100	Robert Yangerlou	12	1	11	6	54.5	1	9	4	36

25. SS 130	Robert Yangerlou	24	1	23	9	39	4	17	10	44
26. SS 150	Robert Yangerlou	30	3	27	11	41	7	26	9	33
27. PY 101	Robert Yangerlou	27	2	25	17	68	3	12	5	20
28. BU 98	Dana Figirliyong	16	1	15	12	80	1	7	2	13
29. AG 88	Francis Ruegorong	12	0	12	8	67	1	8	3	25
30. AG 90	Peter Tairuwepiy	11	0	11	11	100	0	0	0	0
31. AG 92	Joy Guarin	5	0	5	5	100	0	0	0	0
32. AG 94	Peter Tairuwepiy	11	0	11	11	100	0	0	0	0
33. CHS 240	James Edilyong	5	0	5	3	60	1	20	1	20
34. CHS 241	Dr. Yolwa	5	0	5	5	100	0	0	0	0
35. CHS 251	Dr. Yolwa	4	0	4	4	100	0	0	0	0
36. ED 210	Rosa Tacheliol	16	0	16	11	69	4	25	1	6
37. ED 213	Rosa Tacheliol	6	0	6	6	100	0	0	0	0
38. ED 292	Rosa Tacheliol	3	0	3	3	100	0	0	0	0
39. Law 210	Luther Jeremiah	9	0	9	7	78	1	11	1	11
40. Law 232	Matthew Mannisto	9	0	9	8	89	1	1	0	0
41. VEE 104	Raymond Permitez	19	0	19	19	100	0	0	0	0
42. VEE 110	Raymond Permitez	10	0	10	10	100	0	0	0	0
43. VEE 135	Raymond Permitez	19	0	19	19	100	0	0	0	0
Total		721	43	678	561		48		69	
Average						82.7%		7.1%		10.2%

Table 3 Percentage of students (stds) with a grades of “C” or better, “D” and “F”

during Summer 2012

1 Course No.	2 Instructor Name	3 Overall No. of stds	4 No. of stds with "W"	5 Overall No. of stds minus the stds with W (3-4)	6 No. of stds with a grade of "C" or better	7 (%) (6/5)	8 No. of stds with a grade of "D"	9 (%) (8/5)	10 No. of stds with a grade of "F"	11 (%) (10/5)
19. ESL 79	Josede Figirliyong	8	0	8	7	88	1	12	0	0
20. ESL 89	Heidi Colins	10	0	10	5	50	3	30	2	20
21. ESL 99	Andy Choor	9	1	8	8	100	0	0	0	0
22. EN 110	Vince Masincupp	14	1	13	9	69.2	3	25	1	8
23. EN 120A	Vince Masincupp	8	1	7	4	57	2	28.6	1	14.3
24. EN 220	Richard Masiwemai	7	0	7	6	86	0	0	1	14
25. ESS 101	Frank Lifang	9	0	9	7	78	1	11	1	11
26. SC 101	Joy Guarin	10	1	9	9	100	0	0	0	0
27. SC 130	Joy Guarin	13	2	11	11	100	0	0	0	0
28. SS 150	Paul Kasiano	6	0	6	6	100	0	0	0	0
29. Law 236	Douglas Jennings	6	0	6	5	83	0	0	1	17
30. ED 215	Richard Masiwemai	18	0	18	17	94	0	0	1	16
31. ED 302	Josede Figirliyong	8	0	8	7	87	1	13	0	0
32. ED/PY 300	Josede Figirliyong	6	0	6	5	83	0	0	1	17
33. CA 100	Mirey Pius	25	0	25	23	92	0	0	2	8
34. CHS 220	Dr. Yolwa	10	0	10	9	90	1	10	0	0
35. CHS 242	Dr. Yolwa	3	0	3	2	67	1	33	0	0
36. CHS 235	Cindy Lefagopal	3	0	3	2	67	0	0	1	33
Total		173	6	167	142		13		12	
Average						85.1 %		7.9%		7.0%

Evaluation Question 2 : Did advisors meet with advisees during POWWOW and at least twice during the semester?

Please refer to data presented Table 15 in Objective 1, Evaluation Question 5

Evaluation Question 3 : Did student participation increase in RSC by 25%

Please refer to Table 13 in Objective 1, Evaluation Question 3

Evaluative Question 4: Was student success celebrated at awards ceremony at the end of each semester?

Please refer to answer presented in Objective 1, Evaluation Question 4

3c: Use of Results to Improve Unit Services:

1. Continue the good teaching practices that the instructors are using in their classes. Conduct remedial classes in coordination with tutors.
-

