

Mission and Objectives Development Worksheet #1

Academics

Academics - Yap Campus

Unit/Office/Program

Fall 2010 – Summer 2011

Assessment Period Covered

December 10, 2010

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 2010 – Summer 2011

Assessment Period Covered

December 10, 2010

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. 6. Did each advisor have a POWWOW and meet at least twice with advisees during the beginning of semester and after midterm? 7. Were pre and post tests given in 75% of classes each semester? 	<p>Pre/Post test results for FY11</p> <p>Midterm Def. List</p> <p>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>IRPO</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. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identify “at risk” students at end of week two b. Work closely with RSC c. Schedule POWWOW at 	<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>IC, tutors, SSC, Peer Center, faculty</p> <p>IC, tutors, SSC, Peer Center, faculty</p>	<p>Fall 2010</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>

<p style="text-align: center;">beginning of semester and meetings with advisors after midterm</p> <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, 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). By 2nd week of semester.</p> <p>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 2010 – Summer 2011 _____

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 ---- **122 courses**
 Average Difference in Percentage between
 Pre Test and Post Test Scores ----- **34.43%**

As shown in Table 1, the average difference in percentage between Pre Test and Post Test in Fall 2010- Summer 2011 is **20%**. Compared to the **34.43%** average difference in Fiscal Year 2009-2010, it can be said that target increase of 3% was not met, it is short by 17.43% . Supporting data are presented in detail in Tables 2-11 below.

Table 1. Summary of Pre-Post Tests by Semester, Fall 2010- Summer 2011

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 2010	43	39	90.70	25.15
Spring 2011	46	33	71.74	19.15
Summer 2011	23	7	30.43	16.3
Total	112	79	70.54	60.75
Average	37.3	26.3	70.5	20%

Table 2. Comparison of pre-post test results by courses group between Fall 2009-Summer 2010 and Fall 2010-Summer 2011

1 Courses Group	2 Difference in Percentage Fall 2009- Summer 2010	3 Difference in Percentage Fall 2010- Summer 2011	4 Total No. of Courses with Pre-Post Test Report, Fall 2009-Summer 2010	5 Total No. of Courses with Pre-Post Test Report, Fall 2010-Summer 2011
ESL	10.6	19.5	18	11
Education	36.3	16.3	13	6
Vocational	60.3	11.5	12	7
Gen. Ed.	30.5	22.7	79	46
Other Courses	-	31.7	No available data	9
CHS	No report	No Report	No Report	No Report
AVERAGE	34.43%	20%	122	79

Table 3. Pre-Post test report during Fall 2010

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. AG 94	Steven Young-Uhk	18	29	63	34
2. AG 92	Joy Guarin	18	63	78	15
3. ED213	Suzanne Acord	11	53	99	46
4. ED 292	Suzanne Acord	13	NA	NA	-
5. EN 110	Jovita Masiwemai	26	68	73	5
6. EN 120a	John Mafel	20	41	55	14
7. EN 120b	Jovita Masiwemai	16	73	84	11
8. EN 201	John Mafel	7	15	64	49
9. EN/CO-205	Ross Perkins	16	41	70	29
10. ESL 79	Jovita Masiwemai	24	59	82	23
11. ESL 87	Jovita Masiwemai	22	69	80	11
12. ESL 88	John Mafel	28	25	37	12
13. ESL 89 Y1	John Mafel	17	66	75	9
14. ESL 89 Y2	John Mafel	19	70	83	13
15. ESL 91	Ross Perkins	13	56	79	23
16. ESL 92	Ross Perkins	3	-	-	-
17. ESL 98	Jovita Masiwemai	20	60	78	18
18. ESL 99 Y1	Suzanne Acord	4	45	100	55

19. ESL 99 Y2	John Mafel	17	29	43	14
20. ESS-101	Frank lifang	17	30	83	53
21. FL 101	Serphin Ilesiyalo	29	56	87	31
22. MS 92A	Brandi Fichtner	9	31	69	38
23. MS 95	Jerry Fagolimul	8	30	55	25
24. MS 96	Jerry Fagolimul	13	21	50	29
25. MS 99	Virginia Fenenigog	18	34	73	39
26. MS 100	Brandi Fichtner	22	30	56	26
27. MS 104	Raymond Permitez	20	69	84	15
28. MS/ED 210	Suzanne Acord	11	45	100	55
29. PY 101	Paul Kasiano	13	52	73	21
30. SC 94	Anna Boily	8	48	74	26
31. SC 98	Joy Guarin	16	69	81	12
32. SC 101	Joy Guarin	29	75	83	8
33. SC 120	Joy Guarin	20	70	83	13
34. SS 120	Robert Yangerlou	18	29	78	49
35. SS 150	Robert Yangerlou	18	27	66	39
36. VEE 100	Raymond Permitez	8	68	85	17
37. VEE 103	Raymond Permitez	12	65	84	19
38. VEM 110	Raymond Permitez	8	72	85	13
39. VSP 121	Raymond Permitez	15	70	86	16
40. AR 101	Vicky Laetman	25	No report	No report	-
41. BU 101	Southwick Leelkan	16	Not given	Not given	-
42. CA 101 Y1	Ross Perkins	25	38	65	27
43. CA 100 Y2	Ross Perkins	28	37	66	29
Total					981
Total number of Courses with Pre-Post Test results					39
Average					25.15

Table 4. Pre-post test report during Spring 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. BU 95	Geraldine Mitagyow	6	47	70	23
2. BU 97	Geraldine Mitagyow	9	43	82	39
3. BU 98	Dana Figirliyong	8	4	52	48
4. CA 100 Y1	Ross Perkins	16	34	59	25
5. CA 100Y2	Ross Perkins	19	45	73	28

6. CHS 232	Hancock T.	12	No report	No report	-
7. CHS 234	J. Edilyong	1	No report	No report	-
8. CHS 244	Dr. Yolwa	12	No report	No report	-
9. CHS 251	Dr. Yolwa	3	No report	No report	-
10. ED 210	Jovita Masiwemai	20	65	82	17
11. ED 211	Jovita Masiwemai	7	63	86	23
12. ED 292	Jovita Masiwemai	6	79	76	-3
13. ED 110	Jovita Masiwemai	27	64	72	8
14. EN 120 A	John Mafel	14	No report	No report	-
15. EN 120B	Jovita Masiwemai	15	68	69	1
16. EN 208	John Mafel	16	No report	No report	-
17. ESL 79	Ross Perkins	20	28	61	33
18. ESL 87	John Mafel	13	No report	No report	-
19. ESL 89	John Mafel	21	No report	No report	-
20. ESL 91A	Ross Perkins	7	No report	No report	-
21. ESL 92A	Ross Perkins	10	No report	No report	-
22. ESL 99	John Mafel	14	No report	No report	-
23. ESS 120V	Martin Ruwniyol	15	45	93	48
24. Law 200	Bruce Chang	10	NA	NA	-
25. Law 224	Johnson R.	13	85	80	-5
26. MS 91	Brandi Fichtner	6	26	53	27
27. MS 92A	Brandi Fichtner	10	29	48	19
28. MS 95	Dana Figirliyong	10	12	42	30
29. MS 96	Virginia Fenenigog	12	21	68	47
30. MS 99	Virginia Fenenigog	17	24	60	36
31. MS 100	Brandi Fichtner	25	19	52	33
32. MS 101	Brandi Fichtner	1	20	40	20
33. MS 106	Raymond Permitez	8	64	72	8
34. PY 201	Robert Yangerlou	13	43	50	7
35. SC 98	Joy Guarin	13	69	84	15
36. SC 111	Joy Guarin	28	69	81	12
37. SC 112	Joy Guarin	28	66	76	10
38. SC 130	Joy Guarin	23	71	80	9
39. SS 98	Robert Yangerlou	11	51	63	12
40. SS 100	Brian Southwick	23	48	85	37
41. SS 120	Robert Yangerlou	20	33	38	5
42. SS 150	Robert Yangerlou	26	52	56	4
43. SS 170	Josede Figirliyong	29	Not given	Not given	-
44. VEE 104	Raymond Permitez	8	62	68	6
45. VEE 110	Raymond Permitez	9	65	67	2
46. VEE 135	Raymond Permitez	7	57	65	8
Total					632
Total number of Courses					22

with Pre-Post Test results					
AVERAGE					19.15

Table 5. Pre-post test results during Summer 2011

1 Course No.	2 Instructor Name	3 # of students	4 Pre-Test Average (%)	5 Post-Test Average (%)	6 Difference in Percentage (5-4)
1. MS 99	Brandi Fichtner	19	50	79	29
2. MS 100	Brandi Fichtner	20	36	71	35
3. MS 96	Virginia Fenenigog	8	No report	No report	-
4. EN 201	Brandi Fichtner	12	73	83	10
5. EN 120a	Vince Masincupp	18	No report	No report	-
6. ESL 79	Josede Figirliyong	16	No report	No report	-
7. ESL 89	Heidi Collins	16	No report	No report	-
8. SS 150	Josede Figirliyong	26	No report	No report	-
9. EN 110	Vince Masincupp	26	No report	No report	-
10. ED 213	Jovita Masiwemai	10	67	74	7
11. ED 304	Dana Figirliyong	10	No report	No report	-
12. ED 330	Dana Figirliyong	6	No report	No report	-
13. PY 101	Paul kasiano	18	No report	No report	-
14. SC 130	Joy Guarin	15	68	81	13
15. SC 111	Joy Guarin	19	71	87	16
16. ESS 101w	Frank Lifang	16	No report	No report	-
17. AR 101	Vicky Laetman	17	No report	No report	-
18. ESL 99	Jovita Masiwemai	18	80	84	4
19. CHS 242	Dr. Yolwa	5	No report	No report	-
20. CHS 220	Dr. Yolwa	7	No report	No report	-
21. CHS 235	Cindy Lefagopal	3	No report	No report	-
22. CA 100	Pius Mirey	26	No report	No report	-
23. Law 220	Manisto Matthew	12	No report	No report	-
Total					114
Total number of Courses with Pre-Post Test Results					7
AVERAGE					16.3

**Table 6. Pre-Post Test results per course grouping for Fall 2010-Summer 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 2010	1. ESL 79	Jovita Masiwemai	24	59	82	23
Fall 2010	2. ESL 87	Jovita Masiwemai	22	69	80	11
Fall 2010	3. ESL 88	John Mafel	28	25	37	12
Fall 2010	4. ESL 89 Y1	John Mafel	17	66	75	9
Fall 2010	5. ESL 89 Y2	John Mafel	19	70	83	13
Fall 2010	6. ESL 91	Ross Perkins	13	56	79	23
Fall 2010	7. ESL 92	Ross Perkins	3	-	-	-
Fall 2010	8. ESL 98	Jovita Masiwemai	20	60	78	18
Fall 2010	9. ESL 99 Y1	Suzanne Acord	4	45	100	55
Fall 2010	10. ESL 99 Y2	John Mafel	17	29	43	14
Spring 2011	11. ESL 79	Ross Perkins	20	28	61	33
Spring 2011	12. ESL 87	John Mafel	13	No report	No report	-
Spring 2011	13. ESL 89	John Mafel	21	No report	No report	-
Spring 2011	14. ESL 91A	Ross Perkins	7	No report	No report	-
Spring 2011	15. ESL 92A	Ross Perkins	10	No report	No report	-
Spring 2011	16. ESL 99	John Mafel	14	No report	No report	-
Summer 2011	17. ESL 79	Josede Figirliyong	16	No report	No report	-
Summer 2011	18. ESL 89	Heidi Collins	16	No report	No report	-
Summer 2011	19. ESL 99	Jovita Masiwemai	18	80	84	4
Total						215

Total number of Courses with Pre-Post Test report						11
AVERAGE						19.5%

Table 7. Pre-Post Test results per course grouping for Fall 2010-Summer 2011 (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)
Fall 2010	1. ED213	Suzanne Acord	11	53	99	46
Fall 2010	2. ED 292	Suzanne Acord	13	NA	NA	-
Spring 2011	3. ED 210	Jovita Masiwemai	20	65	82	17
Spring 2011	4. ED 211	Jovita Masiwemai	7	63	86	23
Spring 2011	5. ED 292	Jovita Masiwemai	6	79	76	-3
Spring 2011	6. ED 110	Jovita Masiwemai	27	64	72	8
Summer 2011	7. ED 213	Jovita Masiwemai	10	67	74	7
Summer 2011	8. ED 304	Dana Figirliyong	10	No report	No report	-
Summer 2011	9. ED 330	Dana Figirliyong	6	No report	No report	-
Total						98
Total number of Courses with Pre-Post Test results						6
AVERAGE						16.3%

**Table 8. Pre-Post Test results per course grouping for Fall 2010-Summer 2011
(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 Percentag e (5-4)
Fall 2010	1. VEE 100	Raymond Permitez	8	68	85	17
Fall 2010	2. VEE 103	Raymond Permitez	12	65	84	19
Fall 2010	3. VEM 110	Raymond Permitez	8	72	85	13
Fall 2010	4. VSP 121	Raymond Permitez	15	70	86	16
Spring 2011	5. VEE 104	Raymond Permitez	8	62	68	6
Spring 2011	6. VEE 110	Raymond Permitez	9	65	67	2
Spring 2011	7. VEE 135	Raymond Permitez	7	57	65	8
Total						81
Total number of Courses with Pre-Post Test results						7
AVERAGE						11.5%

**Table 9. Pre-Post Test result per course grouping for Fall 2010-Summer 2011
(General Education Courses)**

1 School Year	2 Course No.	3 Instructor Name	4 No. of students	5 Pre-Test Average (%)	6 Post-Test Average (%)	7 Difference in Percentage (5-4)
Fall 2010	1. MS 92A	Brandi Fichtner	9	31	69	38
Fall 2010	2. MS 95	Jerry Fagolimul	8	30	55	25
Fall 2010	3. MS 96	Jerry Fagolimul	13	21	50	29
Fall 2010	4. MS 99	Virginia Fenenigog	18	34	73	39
Fall 2010	5. MS 100	Brandi Fichtner	22	30	56	26

Fall 2010	6. MS 104	Raymond Permitez	20	69	84	15
Fall 2010	7. MS/ED 210	Suzanne Acord	11	45	100	55
Fall 2010	8. EN 110	Jovita Masiwemai	26	68	73	5
Fall 2010	9. EN 120a	John Mafel	20	41	55	14
Fall 2010	10. EN 120b	Jovita Masiwemai	16	73	84	11
Fall 2010	11. EN 201	John Mafel	7	15	64	49
Fall 2010	12. EN/CO-205	Ross Perkins	16	41	70	29
Fall 2010	13. SC 94	Anna Boily	8	48	74	26
Fall 2010	14. SC 98	Joy Guarin	16	69	81	12
Fall 2010	15. SC 101	Joy Guarin	29	75	83	8
Fall 2010	16. SC 120	Joy Guarin	20	70	83	13
Fall 2010	17. SS 120	Robert Yangerlou	18	29	78	49
Fall 2010	18. PY 101	Paul Kasiano	13	52	73	21
Fall 2010	19. SS 150	Robert Yangerlou	18	27	66	39
Fall 2010	20. CA 101 Y1	Ross Perkins	25	38	65	27
Fall 2010	21. CA 100 Y2	Ross Perkins	28	37	66	29
Spring 2011	22. CA 100 Y1	Ross Perkins	16	34	59	25
Spring 2011	23. CA 100Y2	Ross Perkins	19	45	73	28
Spring 2011	24. EN 120 A	John Mafel	14	No report	No report	-
Spring 2011	25. EN 120B	Jovita Masiwemai	15	68	69	1
Spring 2011	26. EN 208	John Mafel	16	No report	No report	-
Spring 2011	27. MS 91	Brandi Fichtner	6	26	53	27
Spring 2011	28. MS 92A	Brandi Fichtner	10	29	48	19
Spring 2011	29. MS 95	Dana Figirliyong	10	12	42	30
Spring 2011	30. MS 96	Virginia Fenenigog	12	21	68	47
Spring 2011	31. MS 99	Virginia Fenenigog	17	24	60	36
Spring 2011	32. MS 100	Brandi Fichtner	25	19	52	33
Spring 2011	33. MS 101	Brandi Fichtner	1	20	40	20
Spring 2011	34. MS 106	Raymond Permitez	8	64	72	8
Spring 2011	35. PY 201	Robert Yangerlou	13	43	50	7

Spring 2011	36. SC 98	Joy Guarin	13	69	84	15
Spring 2011	37. SC 111	Joy Guarin	28	69	81	12
Spring 2011	38. SC 112	Joy Guarin	28	66	76	10
Spring 2011	39. SC 130	Joy Guarin	23	71	80	9
Spring 2011	40. SS 98	Robert Yangerlou	11	51	63	12
Spring 2011	41. SS 100	Brian Southwick	23	48	85	37
Spring 2011	42. SS 120	Robert Yangerlou	20	33	38	5
Spring 2011	43. SS 150	Robert Yangerlou	26	52	56	4
Spring 2011	44. SS 170	Josede Figirliyong	29	Not given	Not given	-
Summer 2011	45. MS 99	Brandi Fichtner	19	50	79	29
Summer 2011	46. MS 100	Brandi Fichtner	20	36	71	35
Summer 2011	47. MS 96	Virginia Fenenigog	8	No report	No report	-
Summer 2011	48. EN 201	Brandi Fichtner	12	73	83	10
Summer 2011	49. EN 120a	Vince Masincupp	18	No report	No report	-
Summer 2011	50. SS 150	Josede Figirliyong	26	No report	No report	-
Summer 2011	51. EN 110	Vince Masincupp	26	No report	No report	-
Summer 2011	52. PY 101	Paul Kasiano	18	No report	No report	-
Summer 2011	53. SC 130	Joy Guarin	15	68	81	13
Summer 2011	54. SC 111	Joy Guarin	19	71	87	16
Summer 2011	55. CA 100	Pius Mirey	26	No report	No report	-
Total						1026
Total number of Courses with Pre-Post Test results						46
AVERAGE						22.7%

**Table 10. Pre-Post Test results per course grouping for Fall 2010-Summer 2011
(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)
Fall 2010	1. AG 94	Steven Young-Uhk	18	29	63	34
Fall 2010	2. AG 92	Joy Guarin	18	63	78	15
Fall 2010	3. ESS-101	Frank Lifang	17	30	83	53
Fall 2010	4. FL 101	Serphin Ilesiyalo	29	56	87	31
Fall 2010	5. AR 101	Vicky Laetman	25	No report	No report	-
Fall 2010	6. BU 101	Southwick Leelkan	16	Not given	Not given	-
Spring 2011	7. BU 95	Geraldine Mitagyow	6	47	70	23
Spring 2011	8. BU 97	Geraldine Mitagyow	9	43	82	39
Spring 2011	9. BU 98	Dana Figirliyong	8	4	52	48
Spring 2011	10.ESS 120V	Martin Ruwniyol	15	45	93	48
Spring 2011	11. Law 200	Bruce Chang	10	NA	NA	-
Spring 2011	12. Law 224	Johnson R.	13	85	80	-5
Summer 2011	13.ESS101w	Frank Lifang	16	No report	No report	-
Summer 2011	13. AR 101	Vicky Laetman	17	No report	No report	-
Summer 2011	14. Law 220	Manisto Matthew	12	No report	No report	-
Total						286
Total number of Courses with Pre-Post Test results						9
AVERAGE						31.7%

**Table 11. Pre-Post Test result per course grouping for Fall 2010-Summer 2011
(Community Health 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 2011	1. CHS 232	Hancock T.	12	No report	No report	-
Spring 2011	2. CHS 234	J. Edilyong	1	No report	No report	-
Spring 2011	3. CHS 244	Dr. Yolwa	12	No report	No report	-
Spring 2011	4. CHS 251	Dr. Yolwa	3	No report	No report	-
Summer 2011	5. CHS 242	Dr. Yolwa	5	No report	No report	-
Summer 2011	6. CHS 220	Dr. Yolwa	7	No report	No report	-
Summer 2011	7. CHS 235	Cindy Lefagopal	3	No report	No report	-
Total						-
Total number of Courses with Pre- Post Test results						-
AVERAGE						-

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

Table 12 shows the comparative number of students with midterm deficiency between Fall 2009 to Summer 2010 and Fall 2010 to Summer 2011. Data show that in FY Fall 2009 to Summer 2010, the average percentage of mid-term deficiency was 44.83% while in FY Fall 2010 to Summer 2011, it is 54.13%, which is 9.3% more than the 47% target. This means that there are more students with midterm deficiency than in the previous assessment cycle. Summer 2011 registered the biggest percentage of midterm deficiency with 63.11% as compared to Summer 2010 with 24.43%. The data available on the number of students who attended tutoring program for Fall 2010 to Summer 2011, as an strategy to decrease the mid-term deficiency: Fall 2010- 103 or 49%, Spring 201- 77 or 38%, and Summer 2011- 48 or 23% (from SSC). These data were not identified as to the time of collection whether before midterm exam or after midterm exam.

Table 12. Comparative number of students with midterm deficiency between FY 2009 to 2010 and FY 2010 to 2011

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 2009	228	114	50%	Fall 2010	209	75	35.8%
Spring 2010	209	110	52.6%	Spring 2011	203	84	41.4%
Summer 2010	221	47	21.3%	Summer 2011	206	16	7.77%
TOTAL	658	271			618	175	
AVERAGE	219.33	90.33			206	58.3	
PERCENTAGE			41.3%				28.32%

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

Baseline Data: No data for Fall 2009-Summer 2010

Ninety (97) students initially signed up for RSC Club. Only one group of 16 students were active during Spring 2011 Semester.

Table 13. Student participation in RSC, Fall 2010-Summer 2011

Semester	Total No. of Students Registered	Total No. of Members of RSC	No. of Members who participated in RSC Activities
Fall 2010	209	No data	No data
Spring 2011	203	97	16
Summer 2011	206	No data	No data
Total	618	97	16

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 2011-Summer 2011	Student	Good Academic Performance	No data
		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 shows that one POWWOW was conducted last January 17, 2011 last Spring 2011 at the start of the semester. No sufficient data to determine the attendance of students because according to SSC, not all advisers turned in attendance sheet.

The target of conducting POWWOW at least twice with advisees during the beginning of semester and after midterm was not met.

Table 15. POWWOW events, Fall 2010-Summer 2011

Semester	Date of POWWOW	Advisor	No. of Advisees	No. of Attendees
Fall 2011	None			
Spring 2011	Jan. 17, 2011	Not all advisers turned in attendance sheet (according to SSC)		
Summer 2011	None			

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 2010, Spring 2011, and Summer 2011. Data revealed that in Fall 2010, 90.70% or 43 classes out of 39 classes had Pre-Post tests. This exceeded the targeted 75% by 15.7%. However, during the Spring 2011 and Summer 2011 semesters, which had 71.74% and 30.43% respectively, the target was not met. This assessment year, the Pre/Post tests were administered to an average of 70.5% of

classes.

Table 16. Pre-Post Test Reports by Semester, Fall 2010-Summer 2011

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 2010	43	39	90.70	Yes
Spring 2011	46	33	71.74	No
Summer 2011	23	7	30.43	No
Total	112	79	70.5	
Average	37.3	26.3	70.5	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.

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 2009 to Summer 2010 = 90.40%

The average percentage of retention rate from Fall 2010 to Summer 2011 did not increase by 5% overall in all classes, it is short by 6.32 % of the targeted increase. Table 1 shows the summary of the retention rate in all classes per semester: Fall 2010- 91.3%, Spring 2011 - 79.77%, Summer 2011- 94.73%. 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 2010, Spring 2011 and Summer 2011.

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 2010 to Summer 2011

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 2010	12	1	13	91.3
Spring 2011	13.8	1.53	17.3	79.77
Summer 2011	14.91	0.78	15.74	94.73
Total	40.71	3.31	46.04	265.8
Average	13.57	1.10	15.35	88.6%

Table 2. Fall 2010 Retention Rate per Course

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

		“W”		“W”)	(3/5)
1. AG 94	Steven Young-Uhk	18	0	18	100
2. AG 92	Joy Guarin	18	0	18	100
3. ED213	Suzanne Acord	11	1	12	92
4. ED 292	Suzanne Acord	13	0	13	100
5. EN 110	Jovita Masiwemai	26	1	27	96.3
6. EN 120a	John Mafel	20	1	21	95.2
7. EN 120b	Jovita Masiwemai	16	1	17	94.1
8. EN 201	John Mafel	7	3	10	70
9. EN/CO-205	Ross Perkins	16	4	20	80
10. ESL 79	Jovita Masiwemai	24	3	27	88.9
11. ESL 87	Jovita Masiwemai	22	0	22	100
12. ESL 88	John Mafel	28	2	30	93.3
13. ESL 89 Y1	John Mafel	17	2	19	89.5
14. ESL 89 Y2	John Mafel	19	0	19	100
15. ESL 91	Ross Perkins	13	0	13	100
16. ESL 92	Ross Perkins	3	0	3	100
17. ESL 98	Jovita Masiwemai	20	3	23	87
18. ESL 99 Y1	Suzanne Acord	4	6	10	60
19. ESL 99 Y2	John Mafel	17	0	17	100
20. ESS-101	Frank Lifang	17	0	17	100
21. FL 101	Serphin Ilesiyalo	29	1	30	97
22. MS 92A	Brandi Fichtner	9	0	9	100
23. MS 95	Jerry Fagolimul	8	2	10	80
24. MS 96	Jerry Fagolimul	13	4	17	76.5
25. MS 99	Virginia Fenenigog	18	2	20	90
26. MS 100	Brandi Fichtner	22	6	28	79
27. MS 104	Raymond Permitez	20	0	20	100
28. MS/ED 210	Suzanne Acord	11	1	12	92
29. PY 101	Paul Kasiano	13	6	19	68.42
30. SC 94	Anna Boily	8	1	9	89
31. SC 98	Joy Guarin	16	0	16	100
32. SC 101	Joy Guarin	29	1	30	96.7
33. SC 120	Joy Guarin	20	0	20	100

34. SS 120	Robert Yangerlou	18	1	19	95
35. SS 150	Robert Yangerlou	18	1	19	94.7
36. VEE 100	Raymond Permitez	8	1	9	89
37. VEE 103	Raymond Permitez	12	1	13	92.3
38. VEM 110	Raymond Permitez	8	0	8	100
39. VSP 121	Raymond Permitez	15	1	16	93.8
40. AR 101	Vicky Laetman	25	5	30	83.3
41. BU 101	Southwick Leelkan	16	0	16	100
42. CA 101 Y1	Ross Perkins	25	5	30	83.3
43. CA 100 Y2	Ross Perkins	28	2	30	93.3
AVERAGE		16.7	1.58	18.3	91.26

Table 3. Spring 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 "W")	6 Retention rate / course (% of students remain in class)
1. BU 95	Geraldine Mitagyow	6	2	8	75
2. BU 97	Geraldine Mitagyow	9	1	10	90
3. BU 98	Dana Figirliyong	8	0	8	100
4. CA 100 Y1	Ross Perkins	16	2	18	88.9
5. CA 100Y2	Ross Perkins	19	1	20	95
6. CHS 232	Hancock T.	12	0	12	100
7. CHS 234	J. Edilyong	1	0	1	100
8. CHS 244	Dr. Yolwa	12	0	12	100
9. CHS 251	Dr. Yolwa	3	0	3	100
10. ED 210	Jovita Masiwemai	20	1	21	95.2
11. ED 211	Jovita Masiwemai	7	1	8	87.5
12. ED 292	Jovita Masiwemai	6	0	6	100
13. ED 110	Jovita Masiwemai	27	3	30	90
14. EN 120 A	John Mafel	14	5	19	73.68

15. EN 120B	Jovita Masiwemai	15	2	17	88.2
16. EN 208	John Mafel	16	8	24	66.7
17. ESL 79	Ross Perkins	20	3	23	87
18. ESL 87	John Mafel	13	2	15	87
19. ESL 89	John Mafel	21	4	25	84
20. ESL 91A	Ross Perkins	7	0	7	100
21. ESL 92A	Ross Perkins	10	1	11	91
22. ESL 99	John Mafel	14	5	19	73.7
23. ESS 120V	Martin Ruwniyol	15	3	18	83.3
24. Law 200	Bruce Chang	10	2	12	83.3
25. Law 224	Johnson R.	13	0	13	100
26. MS 91	Brandi Fichtner	6	0	10	100
27. MS 92A	Brandi Fichtner	10	0	10	100
28. MS 95	Dana Figirliyong	10	0	10	100
29. MS 96	Virginia Fenenigog	12	0	12	100
30. MS 99	Virginia Fenenigog	17	3	20	85
31. MS 100	Brandi Fichtner	25	5	30	83.3
32. MS 101	Brandi Fichtner	1	0	1	100
33. MS 106	Raymond Permitez	8	0	8	100
34. PY 201	Robert Yangerlou	13	1	14	92.9
35. SC 98	Joy Guarin	13	0	13	100
36. SC 111	Joy Guarin	28	2	30	93.3
37. SC 112	Joy Guarin	28	2	30	93.3
38. SC 130	Joy Guarin	23	0	23	100
39. SS 98	Robert Yangerlou	11	1	12	91.7
40. SS 100	Brian Southwick	23	1	24	95.8
41. SS 120	Raymond Permitez	20	2	22	91
42. SS 150	Robert Yangerlou	26	4	30	86.7
43. SS 170	Josede Figirliyong	29	2	31	93.5
44. VEE 104	Raymond Permitez	8	1	9	88.9
45. VEE 110	Raymond Permitez	9	1	10	90
46. VEE 135	Raymond Permitez	7	0	7	100
Average		13.8	1.53	17.3	79.77

Table 4. Summer 2011 Retention Rate per Course

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

		“W”		and without “W”)	class)
1. MS 99	Brandi Fichtner	19	2	21	90.5
2. MS 100	Brandi Fichtner	20	5	25	80
3. MS 96	Virginia Fenenigog	8	0	8	100
4. EN 201	Brandi Fichtner	12	1	13	92.3
5. EN 120a	Vince Masincupp	18	1	19	94.7
6. ESL 79	Josede Figirliyong	16	0	16	100
7. ESL 89	Heidi Collins	16	0	16	100
8. SS 150	Josede Figirliyong	26	1	27	96.3
9. EN 110	Vince Masincupp	26	0	26	100
10. ED 213	Jovita Masiwemai	10	0	10	100
11. ED 304	Dana Figirliyong	10	1	11	91
12. ED 330	Dana Figirliyong	6	2	8	75
13. PY 101	Paul Kasiano	18	1	19	94.7
14. SC 130	Joy Guarin	15	1	16	93.8
15. SC 111	Joy Guarin	19	1	20	95
16. ESS 101w	Frank Lifang	16	0	16	100
17. AR 101	Vicky Laetman	17	1	18	94.4
18. ESL 99	Jovita Masiwemai	18	1	19	94.7
19. CHS 242	Dr. Yolwa	5	0	5	100
20. CHS 220	Dr. Yolwa	7	0	7	100
21. CHS 235	Cindy Lefagopal	3	0	3	100
22. CA 100	Pius Mirey	26	1	27	96.3
23. Law 220	Manisto Matthew	12	0	12	100
Average		14.91	0.78	15.74	94.73%

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 2009-Summer 2011 and Fall 2010 to Summer 2011. Results show that out of 16 instructors only 4 have shown an increase in their retention rate in their classes by 5%. 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 2009-Summer 2011 and Fall 2010 to Summer 2011.

FALL 2009-SUMMER 2010			FALL 2010-SUMMER 2011			Is retention rate increased by 5%
Instructor	Average Retention Rate	No. of Courses	Instructor	Average Retention Rate	No. of Courses	
Ross Perkins	89.20%	5	Ross Perkins	95.56%	10	Yes(6.36%)
John Mafel	90.09	7	John Mafel	84.8%	11	No
Dr. Yolwa	100%	2	Dr. Yolwa	100%	4	The same
Paul Kasiano	93.33	1	Paul Kasiano	81.56%	2	No
Vicky Laetman	100%	1	Vicky Laetman	89%	2	No
Dana Figirliyong	96.15%	2	Dana Figirliyong	91.5%	4	No
Joy Guarin	91.74%	2	Joy Guarin	97.21%	10	Yes(5.47%)
Jovita Masiwemai	94.51%	10	Jovita Masiwemai	93.5%	12	No
Robert Yangerlou	91.95%	7	Robert Yangerlou	92.2%	5	Yes
Virginia Fenenigog	100%	3	Virginia Fenenigog	93.8%	4	No
Jerry Fagolimul	93.33%	1	Jerry Fagolimul	78.25%	2	No
Martin Ruwniyol	97.50%	2	Martin Ruwniyol	83.3%	1	No
Anna Boily	100%	1	Anna Boily	89%	1	No
Hancock T.	93.75%	4	Hancock T.	100%	1	Yes(6.25%)
Brian Southwick	97.50%	2	Brian Southwick	100%	1	Yes
Josede Figirliyong	90%	1	Josede Figirliyong	96.6%	3	Yes(6.6%)

Table 2. Retention rate of each instructor for Fall 2010 to Summer 2011

Semester	Instructor Name	Course No.	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 2010	Ross Perkins	EN/CO-205	16	4	20	80
	Ross Perkins	ESL 91	13	0	13	100
	Ross Perkins	ESL 92	3	0	3	100
	Ross Perkins	CA 101 Y1	25	5	30	83.3

	Ross Perkins	CA 100 Y2	28	2	30	93.3
Spring 2011	Ross Perkins	ESL 91A	7	0	7	100
	Ross Perkins	ESL 92A	10	1	11	91
	Ross Perkins	ESL 79	20	3	23	87
	Ross Perkins	ESL 91A	7	0	7	100
	Ross Perkins	ESL 92A	10	1	11	91
					Average	92.56%
Fall 2010	John Mafel	EN 120a	20	1	21	95.2
	John Mafel	EN 201	7	3	10	70
	John Mafel	ESL 88	28	2	30	93.3
	John Mafel	ESL 89 Y1	17	2	19	89.5
	John Mafel	ESL 89 Y2	19	0	19	100
	John Mafel	ESL 99 Y2	17	0	17	100
Spring 2011	John Mafel	EN120 A	14	5	19	73.68
	John Mafel	EN 208	16	8	24	66.7
	John Mafel	ESL 87	13	2	15	87
	John Mafel	ESL 89	21	4	25	84
	John Mafel	ESL 99	14	5	19	73.7
					Average	84.8%
Spring 2010	Dr. Yolwa	CHS 244	12	0	12	100
	Dr. Yolwa	CHS 251	3	0	3	100
Summer 2011	Dr. Yolwa	CHS 242	5	0	5	100
	Dr. Yolwa	CHS 220	7	0	7	100
					Average	100%
Fall 2011	Paul Kasiano	PY 101	13	6	19	68.42
Summer 2011	Paul Kasiano	PY 101	18	1	19	94.7
					Average	81.56%
Fall 2011	Vicky Laetman	AR 101	25	5	30	83.3
Summer 2011	Vicky Laetman	AR 101	17	1	18	94.4
					Average	89%
Spring 2011	Dana Figirliyong	BU 98	8	0	8	100
	Dana	MS 95	10	0	10	100

	Figirliyong					
Summer 2011	Dana Figirliyong	ED 304	10	1	11	91
	Dana Figirliyong	ED 330	6	2	8	75
					Average	91.5%
Fall 2010	Joy Guarin	AG 92	18	0	18	100
	Joy Guarin	SC 98	16	0	16	100
	Joy Guarin	SC 101	29	1	30	96.7
	Joy Guarin	SC 120	20	0	20	100
Spring 2011	Joy Guarin	SC 98	13	0	13	100
	Joy Guarin	SC 111	28	2	30	93.3
	Joy Guarin	SC 112	28	2	30	93.3
	Joy Guarin	SC 130	23	0	23	100
Summer 2011	Joy Guarin	SC 130	15	1	16	93.8
	Joy Guarin	SC 111	19	1	20	95
					Average	97.21%
Fall 2010	Jovita Masiwemai	EN 110	26	1	27	96.3
	Jovita Masiwemai	EN 120b	16	1	17	94.1
	Jovita Masiwemai	ESL 79	24	3	27	88.9
	Jovita Masiwemai	ESL 87	22	0	22	100
	Jovita Masiwemai	ESL 98	20	3	23	87
Spring 2011	Jovita Masiwemai	ED 210	20	1	21	95.2
	Jovita Masiwemai	ED 211	7	1	8	87.5
	Jovita Masiwemai	ED 292	6	0	6	100
	Jovita Masiwemai	ED 110	27	3	30	90
	Jovita Masiwemai	EN 120B	15	2	17	88.2
Summer 2011	Jovita Masiwemai	ED 213	10	0	10	100
	Jovita Masiwemai	ESL 99	18	1	19	94.7
					Average	93.5%

Fall 2010	Robert Yangerlou	SS 120	18	1	19	95
	Robert Yangerlou	SS 150	18	1	19	94.7
Spring 2011	Robert Yangerlou	PY 201	13	1	14	92.9
	Robert Yangerlou	SS 98	11	1	12	91.7
	Robert Yangerlou	SS 150	26	4	30	86.7
					Average	92.2%
Fall 2011	Suzanne Acord	ED213	11	1	12	92
	Suzanne Acord	ED 292	13	0	13	100
	Suzanne Acord	MS/ED 210	11	1	12	92
	Suzanne Acord	ESL 99 Y1	4	6	10	60
					Average	86%
Fall 2011	Brandi Fichtner	MS 92A	9	0	9	100
	Brandi Fichtner	MS 100	22	6	28	79
Spring 2011	Brandi Fichtner	MS 91	6	0	10	100
	Brandi Fichtner	MS 92A	10	0	10	100
	Brandi Fichtner	MS 100	25	5	30	83.3
	Brandi Fichtner	MS 101	1	0	1	100
	Brandi Fichtner	MS 99	19	2	21	90.5
	Brandi Fichtner	MS 100	20	5	25	80
	Brandi Fichtner	EN 201	12	1	13	92.3
					Average	91.7%
Fall 2010	Virginia Fenenigog	MS 99	18	2	20	90

Spring 2011	Virginia Fenenigog	MS 96	12	0	12	100
	Virginia Fenenigog	MS 99	17	3	20	85
Summer 2011	Virginia Fenenigog	MS 96	8	0	8	100
					Average	93.8%
Fall 2010	Jerry Fagolimul	MS 95	8	2	10	80
	Jerry Fagolimul	MS 96	13	4	17	76.5
					Average	78.25%
Summer 2011	Josede Figirliyong	ESL 79	16	0	16	100
	Josede Figirliyong	SS 150	26	1	27	96.3
Spring 2011	Josede Figirliyong	SS 170	29	2	31	93.5
					Average	96.6%
Summer 2011	Vince Masincupp	EN 120a	18	1	19	94.7
	Vince Masincupp	EN 110	26	0	26	100
					Average	97.35%
Fall 2010	Frank Lifang	ESS-101	17	0	17	100
Summer 2011	Frank Lifang	ESS 101w	16	0	16	100
					Average	100%
Spring 2011	Geraldine Mitagyow	BU 95	6	2	8	75
	Geraldine Mitagyow	BU 97	9	1	10	90
					Average	82.5%
Fall 2010	Raymond Permitez	VEE 100	8	1	9	89
	Raymond Permitez	VEE 103	12	1	13	92.3

	Raymond Permitez	VEM 110	8	0	8	100
	Raymond Permitez	VSP 121	15	1	16	93.8
	Raymond Permitez	MS 104	20	0	20	100
Spring 2011	Raymond Permitez	VEE 104	8	1	9	88.9
	Raymond Permitez	VEE 110	9	1	10	90
	Raymond Permitez	VEE 135	7	0	7	100
	Raymond Permitez	MS 106	8	0	8	100
					Average	94.88%
Fall 2010	Serphin Ilesiyalo	FL 101	29	1	30	97%
Spring 2011	Hancock T.	CHS 232	12	0	12	100%
Spring 2011	Brian Southwick	SS 100	23	1	24	95.8%
Fall 2010	Southwick Leelkan	BU 101	16	0	16	100%
Spring 2011	Martin Ruwniyol	ESS 120V	15	3	18	83.3%
Spring 2011	Johnson R.	Law 224	13	0	13	100%
Summer 2011	Manisto Matthew	Law 220	12	0	12	100%
Summer 2011	Cindy Lefagopal	CHS 235	3	0	3	100%
Summer 2011	Heidi Collins	ESL 89	16	0	16	100%
Summer 2011	Pius Mirey	CA 100	26	1	27	96.3%

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 2009 to Summer 2010 = 80.1%

Table 1 presents the comparison of good academic standing percentage of students between Fall 2009 to Summer 2010 and Fall 2010 to Summer 2011. Results show that the average percentage of good academic standing in Fall 2010 to Summer 2011 is 84.3%, an increase of 4.2% to the target increase of 3%. 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 2010 to Summer 2011.

Table 1. Comparison between the percentage of good academic standing of students between Fall 2009 to Summer 2010 and Fall 2010 to Summer 2011.

Semester	Good Academic Standing (grade of “C” or better)	Semester	Good Academic Standing (grade of “C” or better)
Fall 2009	76.3%	Fall 2010	83.57%
Spring 2010	76.1%	Spring 2011	82.06%

Summer 2010	87.8%	Summer 2011	90.08%
AVERAGE	80.1%		84.3%

Table 2. Summary of percentage of students (stds) with a grades of “C” or better, “D” and “F” during Fall 2010, Spring 2011, and Summer 2011

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 2010	42	786	68	718	600	83.57	51	7.10	67	9.33
Spring 2011	46	712	71	641	526	82.06	47	7.33	68	10.61
Summer 2011	23	362	19	343	309	90.08	17	4.96	17	4.96
Average	37	620	52.7	567.3	478.33	84.3 %	38.33	6.76 %	50.67	8.94 %

Table 3. Percentage of students (stds) with a grades of “C” or better, “D” and “F” during Fall 2010

1 Course No.	2 Instructor Name	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)
1. AG 94	Steven Young- Uhk	18	0	18	12	66.7	2	11.1	4	22.2
2. AG 92	Joy Guarin	18	0	18	17	94.4	1	5.6	0	0
3. ED213	Suzanne Acord	12	1	11	10	91	0	0	1	9
4. ED 292	Suzanne Acord	13	0	13	13	100	0	0	0	0
5. EN 110	Jovita Masiwemai	27	1	26	22	85	2	7.7	2	7.7
6. EN 120a	John Mafel	21	1	20	16	80	3	15	1	5
7. EN 120b	Jovita Masiwemai	17	1	16	12	75	0	0	4	25
8. EN 201	John Mafel	10	3	7	6	86	0	0	1	14.3
9. EN/CO- 205	Ross Perkins	20	4	16	14	88	0	0	2	12.5

10. ESL 79	Jovita Masiwemai	27	3	24	21	88	2	8.3	1	4.17
11. ESL 87	Jovita Masiwemai	22	0	22	22	100	0	0	0	0
12. ESL 88	John Mafel	30	2	28	19	68	5	17.9	4	14.3
13. ESL 89 Y1	John Mafel	19	2	17	11	65	6	35.3	0	0
14. ESL 89 Y2	John Mafel	19	0	19	15	79	3	15.8	1	5.3
15. ESL 91	Ross Perkins	13	0	13	1	7.7	0	0	12	92.3
16. ESL 92	Ross Perkins	3	0	3	2	66.7	0	0	1	33.3
17. ESL 98	Jovita Masiwemai	23	3	20	19	95	1	5	0	0
18. ESL 99 Y1	Suzanne Acord	10	6	4	4	100	0	0	0	0
19. ESL 99 Y2	John Mafel	17	0	17	14	82	2	11.8	1	5.9
20. ESS-101	Frank lifang	17	0	17	11	65	2	11.8	4	23.5
21. FL 101	Serphin Ilesiyalo	30	1	29	19	66	7	24.1	3	10.3
22. MS 92A	Brandi Fichtner	9	0	9	6	66.7	0	0	3	33.33
23. MS 95	Jerry Fagolimul	10	2	8	8	100	0	0	0	0
24. MS 96	Jerry Fagolimul	17	4	13	12	92	1	7.7	0	0
25. MS 99	Virginia Fenenigog	20	2	18	18	100	0	0	0	0
26. MS 100	Brandi Fichtner	28	6	22	17	77.3	2	9.1	3	13.6
27. MS 104	Raymond Permitez	20	0	20	20	100	0	0	0	0
28. MS/ED 210	Suzanne Acord	12	1	11	9	82	1	9	1	9
29. PY 101	Paul Kasiano	19	6	13	13	100	0	0	0	0
30. SC 94	Anna Boily	9	1	8	7	87.5	1	12.5	0	0
31. SC 98	Joy Guarin	16	0	16	15	94	0	0	1	6.3
32. SC 101	Joy Guarin	30	1	29	28	97	0	0	1	3.4
33. SC 120	Joy Guarin	20	0	20	20	100	0	0	0	0
34. SS 120	Robert Yangerlou	19	1	18	13	72	3	16.7	2	11.1
35. SS 150	Robert Yangerlou	19	1	18	11	61	3	16.7	4	22.2
36. VEE 100	Raymond Permitez	9	1	8	8	100	0	0	0	0
37. VEE 103	Raymond Permitez	13	1	12	11	91.7	0	0	1	8.3
38. VEM 110	Raymond Permitez	8	0	8	8	100	0	0	0	0
39. VSP 121	Raymond	16	1	15	11	73.3	2	13.3	2	13.3

	Permitez										
40. AR 101	Vicky Laetman	30	5	25	23	92	1	4	1	4	
41. BU 101	Southwick Leelkan	16	0	16	15	94	0	0	1	6.3	
42. CA 101 Y1	Ross Perkins	30	5	25	19	76	2	8	4	16	
43. CA 100 Y2	Ross Perkins	30	2	28	23	82.1	4	14.3	1	3.6	
Total		786	68	718	600		51		67		9.3
Percentage						83.57 %		7.10 %		9.33 %	

Table 4 . Percentage of students (stds) with a grades of “C” or better, “D” and “F” during Spring 2011

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. BU 95	Geraldine Mitagyow	8	2	6	4	66.7	0	0	2	33.3
2. BU 97	Geraldine Mitagyow	10	1	9	7	77.8	0	0	2	22.2
3. BU 98	Dana Figirliyong	8	0	8	5	62.5	0	0	3	37.5
4. CA 100 Y1	Ross Perkins	18	2	16	15	93.8	0	0	1	6.25
5. CA 100Y2	Ross Perkins	20	1	19	19	100	0	0	0	0
6. CHS 232	Hancock T.	12	0	12	12	100	0	0	0	0
7. CHS 234	J. Edilyong	1	0	1	1	100	0	0	0	0
8. CHS 244	Dr. Yolwa	12	0	12	12	100	0	0	0	0
9. CHS 251	Dr. Yolwa	3	0	3	3	100	0	0	0	0
10. ED 210	Jovita Masiwemai	21	1	20	20	100	0	0	0	0
11. ED 211	Jovita Masiwemai	8	1	7	7	100	0	0	0	0
12. ED 292	Jovita Masiwemai	6	0	6	6	100	0	0	0	0
13. ED 110	Jovita Masiwemai	30	3	27	23	85.2	3	11.1	1	3.7

14. EN 120 A	John Mafel	19	5	14	13	93	0	0	1	7
15. EN 120B	Jovita Masiwemai	17	2	15	10	66.7	2	13.3	3	20
16. EN 208	John Mafel	24	8	16	13	81.3	0	0	3	18.8
17. ESL 79	Ross Perkins	23	3	20	9	45	6	30	5	25
18. ESL 87	John Mafel	15	2	13	11	84.6	1	7.7	1	7.7
19. ESL 89	John Mafel	25	4	21	15	71.4	2	9.5	4	19
20. ESL 91A	Ross Perkins	7	0	7	7	100	0	0	0	0
21. ESL 92A	Ross Perkins	11	1	10	5	50	0	0	5	50
22. ESL 99	John Mafel	19	5	14	14	100	0	0	0	0
23. ESS 120V	Martin Ruwniyol	18	3	15	15	100	0	0	0	0
24. Law 200	Bruce Chang	12	2	10	5	50	2	20	3	30
25. Law 224	Johnson R.	13	0	13	12	92.3	1	7.7	0	0
26. MS 91	Brandi Fichtner	6	0	6	0	0	5	83.3	1	16.7
27. MS 92A	Brandi Fichtner	10	0	10	4	40	0	0	6	60
28. MS 95	Dana Figirliyong	10	0	10	10	100	0	0	0	0
29. MS 96	Virginia Fenenigog	12	0	12	11	91.7	0	0	1	8.3
30. MS 99	Virginia Fenenigog	20	3	17	11	64.7	5	29.4	1	5.9
31. MS 100	Brandi Fichtner	30	5	25	20	80	3	12	2	8
32. MS 101	Brandi Fichtner	1	0	1	1	100	0	0	0	0
33. MS 106	Raymond Permitez	8	0	8	8	100	0	0	0	0
34. PY 201	Robert Yangerlou	14	1	13	11	84.6	1	7.7	1	7.7
35. SC 98	Joy Guarin	13	0	13	11	84.6	0	0	2	15.4
36. SC 111	Joy Guarin	30	2	28	27	96.4	1	3.6	0	0
37. SC 112	Joy Guarin	30	2	28	28	100	0	0	0	0
38. SC 130	Joy Guarin	23	0	23	23	100	0	0	0	0
39. SS 98	Robert Yangerlou	12	1	11	5	45.5	2	18.2	4	36.4
40. SS 100	Brian Southwick	24	1	23	21	91.3	2	8.7	0	0
41. SS 120	Raymond Permitez	22	2	20	11	55	4	20	5	25
42. SS 150	Robert	30	4	26	18	69.2	2	7.7	6	23.1

	Yangerlou									
43. SS 170	Josede Figirliyong	31	2	29	19	65.5	5	26.3	5	26.3
44. VEE 104	Raymond Permitez	9	1	8	8	100	0	0	0	0
45. VEE 110	Raymond Permitez	10	1	9	9	100	0	0	0	0
46. VEE 135	Raymond Permitez	7	0	7	7	100	0	0	0	0
Total		712	71	641	526		47		68	
Percentage						82.06 %		7.33 %		10.61 %

Table 5 Percentage of students (stds) with a grades of “C” or better, “D” and “F” during Summer 2011

1 Course No.	2 Instructor Name	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)
1. MS 99	Brandi Fichtner	21	2	19	16	84.2	1	5.3	2	10.5
2. MS 100	Brandi Fichtner	25	5	20	17	85	2	10	1	5
3. MS 96	Virginia Fenenigog	8	0	8	6	75	2	25	0	0
4. EN 201	Brandi Fichtner	13	1	12	12	100	0	0	0	0
5. EN 120a	Vince Masincupp	19	1	18	15	83.3	2	11.1	1	5.6
6. ESL 79	Josede Figirliyong	16	0	16	15	93.8	0	0	1	6.3
7. ESL 89	Heidi Collins	16	0	16	13	81.3	2	12.5	1	6.3
8. SS 150	Josede Figirliyong	27	1	26	22	84.6	3	11.5	1	3.9
9. EN 110	Vince Masincupp	26	0	26	17	65.4	1	3.9	8	30.8
10. ED 213	Jovita Masiwemai	10	0	10	10	100	0	0	0	0
11.	Dana Figirliyong	11	1	10	10	100	0	0	0	0
12. ED 330	Dana Figirliyong	8	2	6	6	100	0	0	0	0
13. PY 101	Paul kasiano	19	1	18	18	100	0	0	0	0

14. SC 130	Joy Guarin	16	1	15	15	100	0	0	0	0
15. SC 111	Joy Guarin	20	1	19	19	100	0	0	0	0
16. ESS 101w	Frank Lifang	16	0	16	14	87.5	0	0	2	12.5
17. AR 101	Vicky Laetman	18	1	17	17	100	0	0	0	0
18. ESL 99	Jovita Masiwemai	19	1	18	15		3		0	0
19. CHS 242	Dr. Yolwa	5	0	5	5	100	0	0	0	0
20. CHS 220	Dr. Yolwa	7	0	7	7	100	0	0	0	0
21. CHS 235	Cindy Lefagopal	3	0	3	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0
22. CA 100	Pius Mirey	27	1	26	26	100	0	0	0	0
23. Law 220	Manisto Matthew	12	0	12	12	100	0	0	0	0
Total		362	19	343	309		17		17	
Percentage						90.08 %		4.96 %		4.96%

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 (Data courtesy of SSC)

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

Please refer to Table 13 in Objective 1, Evaluation Question 3 (Data courtesy of Student Services)

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 (Data courtesy of Student Services)

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.

