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INTRODUCTION
SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

Commission Action

This self study report for a focus visit addresses the three areas identified in the Report of a Visit to Central Ohio Technical College by the consultant evaluators on May 11-13, 1998. In section V.B.4, pages 48-49, the committee report states “However, concerns are raised because of the lack of any committee or College staff with the responsibility to coordinate the College’s assessment plan and efforts. In fact, the assessment program was found to be disjointed, fragmented, and incapable of being integrated into a whole. There is little evidence that measures of institutional effectiveness are being implemented. Also, the learning tools and equipment, especially in engineering and business laboratory areas, are old, inadequate, and jeopardize the quality of technical education available. In addition, a new General Education core has been developed with implementation schedules for the Fall 1998 Quarter. ... It is because of the vital importance of assessment, instructional equipment, and General Education at Central Ohio Technical College that the North Central Association consultant evaluator team recommends a focus visit in 2001 on these issues. This focus visit will validate the quality, comprehensive, and successful resolution of the College’s assessment, instructional equipment, and General Education development”.

Preparation of Report

The Focus Visit Self Study Report was prepared by the Assistant Dean for Curriculum & Instruction with information and materials provided by the Academic Assessment Committee, the Service Areas Assessment Committee, the Purchasing Department, the Information Technology Services Department and in consultation with the President and other members of the Leadership Team (Vice President & Dean of Faculty; Academic Director of Business, Engineering, Mathematics and Technology; and Academic Director of Health, Education and Public Services).
Organization of Report

The report is organized in sections beginning with an introduction, a section on the explanation of the structure of the Newark Campus and a section on organizational changes since the May 13-14, 1998 visit which provides background information upon which the areas of the focus visit were addressed. The three areas under review in the focus visit are organized into three sections, one section for each area under review. Following the sections under review, assessment, instructional equipment and General Education, a concluding section will summarize the strengths, concerns, recommendations and future directions. The final portion of the report contains the appendices.
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SECTION II: NEWARK CAMPUS STRUCTURE

The Newark Campus

The Newark Campus is comprised of two individual state-assisted post-secondary institutions of higher education: Central Ohio Technical College (COTC) and The Ohio State University at Newark (OSU-N). The Newark Campus, located approximately 30 miles east of Columbus, Ohio, in Newark, consists of 225 acres, approximately 300,000 square feet of building area, 1500 parking spaces, in addition to hundreds of trees and miles of walkways. The physical facilities include four major academic buildings, the Baker house (selected programs, administrative and faculty offices), a child development center, student housing, and a presidential residence. Currently, the Newark Campus is preparing to break ground for the J. Gilbert Reese Center, a 70,000 square foot conference and technology center which will also include eleven additional classrooms, faculty offices and the offices of the Newark Campus Business & Industry Institute. Most recently, the Newark Campus was the recipient of a very generous gift of 4.5 million dollars, the largest in the history of the campus, from Mr. & Mrs. John Warner as the initial funds for the construction of the John & Christine Warner Library and Student Center. Due to suburban migration and employment opportunities, an increasing population is afforded higher education opportunities ranging from clusters of courses, technical education, transfer education, selected baccalaureate programs, graduate courses as well as non-credit courses and training for businesses and industries. This wide range of educational opportunities is available on the Newark Campus as a result of each institution's unique mission and the role of the Business and Industry Institute.

Today, both OSU-N and COTC have a student enrollment of approximately 2000 students each for a total student body of over 4000. Each institution maintains its respective faculty and academic dean and cost shares a staff of approximately 150 persons. On a weekly basis, the senior staff and mid-level managers in two separate meetings meet with the President of the Newark Campus, Anne Cairns Federlein, Ph.D., to provide input and direct activities in all areas. The current senior staff of the Newark Campus is comprised of Bonnie L. Coe, Ph.D., Vice President & Dean of Faculty of
Central Ohio Technical College; Paul Panek, Ph.D., Associate Dean of The Ohio State University at Newark; Mr. David Brillhart, Chief Financial Officer of the Newark Campus; Mr. John Berry, Director of Student Services of the Newark Campus; Mr. Tyrome Alexander, Director of Human Resources of the Newark Campus; Mr. Timothy Link, Chief Information Officer of the Newark Campus and Mr. Calvin Roebuck, Special Assistant to the President of the Newark Campus. The hierarchal structure of the shared Newark Campus is presented in the Newark Campus Organizational Chart (Appendix, A)

Since the founding of Central Ohio Technical College in 1971, COTC has shared the campus with The Ohio State University at Newark. Both institutions have found sharing of the physical facilities and personnel in certain positions to be both cost effective and functionally efficient. It is important to highlight the fact that each institution is separate in its mission, organizational structure, function and faculty. Specifically, "the mission of Central Ohio Technical College is to meet the technical education and training needs of students and employers in the service area" (COTC Web Page).

The organizational structure of COTC consists of two major areas: academics which includes COTC faculty and academic administrators and services which consists of COTC only services personnel in admissions/recruitment, academic advising and student records as well as cost shared Newark Campus services personnel.

The hierarchal structure of COTC as displayed on the organizational chart of COTC (Appendix, B) shows the chief executive officer of COTC to be the President of the Newark Campus, a cost-shared position. Reporting directly to the President is the Vice President and Dean of Faculty, a COTC position only. Reporting to the Vice President and Dean of Faculty are the Enrollment Manager of the Newark Campus, a cost-shared position; the Director of the Learning Assistance Center/Disability Services, a cost-shared position reporting to both COTC and OSU-N academic deans; the Registrar, a COTC position only; the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction, a COTC position only; the Academic Director of Business, Engineering Technologies, Mathematics and Technology (BEMT), a COTC position only; and the Academic Director of Health, Education and Public Services (HEPS), a COTC position only. To assist the Vice President and Dean of Faculty with the academic operations of COTC, the Vice President and Dean of Faculty utilizes a
Leadership Team comprised of the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction; the Academic Director of Business, Engineering Technology, Mathematics and Technology; and the Academic Director of Health, Education and Public Services. The COTC faculty report to their respective Academic Director.

The Leadership Team meets weekly with the Vice President and Dean of Faculty to provide input and to share in the making of academic decisions. To facilitate the work of the Leadership Team, monthly one at a time the Chief Financial Officer, the Enrollment Manager, the Registrar and the Director of the Business and Industry Institute are invited to meet with the Leadership Team for the purposes of sharing ideas, concerns, issues and planning. To assure that the technology needs of COTC Academics are being addressed, the Assistant Dean and the two Academic Directors maintain weekly meetings with the Chief Information Officer and the Manager of Network Operations.

In summary, COTC is a unique post-secondary educational institution with its own Board of Trustees who sets policies and oversees the operation of the institution. Academically, COTC is separate from The Ohio State University at Newark but for efficiency and functional effectiveness shares physical facilities and certain cost-shared personnel. An illustration of the efficient utilization of resources and the community's support of the cost-shared campus is the recent single donation of 4.5 million dollars by Mr. & Mrs. John Warner to the Newark Campus as the initial funds for the construction of the John and Christine Warner Library and Student Center (Appendix C). Another current example of outstanding community support for the shared Newark Campus is the community response to the capital fund drive for the construction of the J. Gilbert Reese Center, a state of the art building which will house the Business and Industry Institute, a conference facility, a performing arts theater, high technology classrooms and faculty offices.
ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES
SECTION III: ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES

Administration: 1998-2001

At the time of the Commission’s Consultant/Evaluator Team’s Site Visit in May of 1998, the college administration and selected staff (* indicates cost-shared with The Ohio State University-Newark) of Central Ohio Technical College were as follows:

*President, COTC & Dean, The Ohio State University-Newark: Rafael L. Cortada, Ph.D.
Vice President & Dean of Faculty: Rosalie J. Hine, Ed.D.
*Vice President for Financial Affairs/Board Treasurer: Katherine Fay
*Vice President for Student Support Services: David F. Thomson
Division Chair, Allied Health & Public Services Technologies: Judith D. Rayburn, Ph.D.
Division Chair, Business Technologies: Jay Jacquet
Division Chair, Engineering Technologies/General Education/Tech Prep: David Kirwin
Division Chair, Nursing Technology: Tamar Gilson
Director, Enrollment Management: Deborah Zabloudil
*Manager, Institutional Research: Robert Adebayo, Ph.D.
*Director of Human Resources: Jerry Boyles
*Director, Computer & Telecommunications Services: J. Richard Harris
*Director, Marketing & Public Affairs: Teri Holder
*Director, Financial Aid: Faith Phillips
*Head, Learning Resources Center (Library): Louisa Straziuso
*Program Manager, Learning Assistance Center: Phyllis Thompson, Ph.D.
*Director, Business & Industry Institute: Mike Styer

During the 1998-99 academic year, the same individuals remained in the same positions except the Head of the Learning Resources Center. During the late Spring quarter of 1999, the position of Coordinator of Instructional Design was created and filled. Due to a policy of The Ohio State University, Dr. Rafael Cortada was required to retire from the position of Dean of The Ohio State University-Newark at the conclusion of the 1998-99 fiscal year. Recognizing the impending
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retirement, the Board of Trustees of Central Ohio Technical College, the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University-Newark and the Provost of The Ohio State University decided to establish the position of President of the Newark Campus as the chief executive officer of the campus which included both Central Ohio Technical College and The Ohio State University-Newark. Having established the position and identified the role and responsibilities of the combined chief executive officer, a search was initiated early in the 1998-99 academic year.

In July of 1999, Anne Cairns Federlein, Ph.D., assumed the role of the President of the Newark Campus. During the 1999-2000 fiscal year many changes occurred in the administration and selected cost-shared staff positions. During the summer of 1999, the Director of Computer & Telecommunications Services, a cost-shared position, and the Director of Marketing & Public Affairs, a cost-shared position, resigned. During the winter of 2000, the Vice President of Student Support Services and the Director of Human Resources (both cost-shared positions) were separated from the Newark Campus. As of December 31, 1999, the COTC Enrollment Manager had resigned and the position became a cost-shared position with the Director of Admissions for The Ohio State University-Newark being appointed to the newly created position of Director of Enrollment for the Newark Campus.

These changes resulted in a restructuring of the report lines for the remaining members of the President’s Cabinet. As of June 30, 2000, COTC’S Vice President & Dean of Faculty resigned her position. Other resignations or separations from the Newark Campus were the Manager of Institutional Research, Director of Computer & Telecommunications Services, Director of Marketing & Public Affairs and the Coordinator of Instructional Design.

Of these last four positions, the decision was made not to fill the position of Institutional Research Officer. The decision was influenced by the fact that the faculty and staff of The Ohio State University at Newark had access to the research support services of the main campus of The Ohio State University in Columbus. Further, with the recent change of the Director of Enrollment Management becoming a cost-shared position, an interim Dean of Faculty for COTC, and a need to reorganize COTC’s academic administrative structure, it was the belief that the role and
responsibilities of an institutional research officer were not sufficiently effective.

The 2000-01 fiscal year began with an Interim Dean of Faculty and the newly created position of Assistant Dean for Curriculum & Instruction. Following a national search, the Assistant Dean for Curriculum & Instruction was filled by an internal candidate, the Division Chair of Allied Health & Public Services, Judith D. Rayburn, Ph.D.. The duties of the Division Chair of Allied Health and Public Services continued to be part of the responsibilities of the Assistant Dean for Curriculum and Instruction as well as the responsibility for the College’s Assessment Program.

During the autumn quarter of 2000, the Vice President for Financial Affairs/Board Treasurer was separated from the Newark Campus. An Interim Director of Finance was named and served until the search for the Director of Finance was completed in the winter quarter of 2001.

Effective January 2, 2001, the Acting Division Chair of Engineering Technologies chose to return to faculty leaving a vacancy in the Division Chair. The decision was made to include the duties and responsibilities of the Division Chair of Engineering Technologies in the responsibilities of the Assistant Dean for Curriculum and Instruction along with the responsibilities of the Division Chair of Allied Health and Public Services, and the College’s Assessment Program.

As of January 2001, the college administration and selected staff (* indicates cost-shared with The Ohio State University-Newark) of Central Ohio Technical College were as follows:

*President, Newark Campus: Anne Cairns Federlein, Ph.D.
Interim Dean of Faculty: Calvin Roebuck
*Interim Director of Finance: Doug Warthen
*Director of Student Support Services: John Berry
Assistant Dean for Curriculum & Instruction: Judith D. Rayburn, Ph.D.
Division Chair, Allied Health & Public Services Technologies: Judith D. Rayburn, Ph.D.
Division Chair, Business Technologies: Jay Jacquet
Division Chair, Engineering Technologies: Judith D. Rayburn, Ph.D.
Coordinator of General Education: Cindy Ravitsky
Division Chair, Nursing Technology & Related Programs: Tamar Gilson
During the 2000-01 fiscal year, the decision was made to restructure the academic area of the College. The positions of the four Division Chairs and Coordinator of General Education were eliminated and replaced with two Academic Area Directors. One Academic Director would be responsible for the academic programs and disciplines in Business, Engineering Technologies, Mathematics and Technology (Computer Science) and the other Academic Director would be responsible for the programs and disciplines in Health, Education and Public Services. During the Spring of 2001, searches for a Vice President and Dean of Faculty to replace the Interim Dean of Faculty and the two Academic Directors were conducted. On July 16, 2001, Bonnie L. Coe, Ph.D., assumed the role of Vice President and Dean of Faculty. Also, on July 16, 2001, Ramona Calhoun, Ph.D., Academic Director of Business, Engineering Technologies, Mathematics and Technology, and Carolyn Wulfhorst, Ph.D., Academic Director of Health, Education and Public Services assumed their respective positions. Thus, since July 16, 2001, the college administration and selected staff (* indicates cost-shared with The Ohio State University-Newark) of Central Ohio Technical College are as follows:

*President, Newark Campus: Anne Cairns Federlein, Ph.D.
Vice President & Dean of Faculty: Bonnie L. Coe, Ph.D.
*Chief Financial Officer: David Brillhart
*Director, Student Affairs: John Berry
   Assistant Dean for Curriculum & Instruction: Judith D. Rayburn, Ph.D.
   Academic Director of Business, Engineering Technologies,
In summary from May 1998 to July 16, 2001, there has been a total of eleven existing administrative and professional staff changes, the addition of an Instructional Designer position with one staff change since inception, the addition of the position of Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction and the elimination of the positions of the four Division Chairpersons and Coordinator of General Education which were replaced by the positions of two Academic Directors. Of the fourteen selected administrative and professional staff positions existing today, two individuals have remained in the same position since the NCA site visit in May of 1998. One individual moved from a Division Chairperson position to the newly created position of Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction. Thus, there are eleven new individuals in key administrative roles since the NCA site visit in May 1998.
As of September 2000, The Newark Campus organizational structure reflected a Presidential Cabinet of an Interim Dean of COTC, a Dean of Academics for OSU-N, a Director of Student Services, a Vice President and Director of Business and Finance, a Chief Information Officer and a Director of Human Resources. In addition, the position of Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction for COTC was implemented with the incumbent retaining the duties of Division Chairperson of Allied Health and Public Services. Upon the return to faculty by the Interim Division Chairperson of Engineering Technology, the responsibilities of the Chairperson of Engineering Technology were added to the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction. Further, the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction was also assigned the responsibility of Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes and Institutional Effectiveness for COTC.

On July 16, 2001, a revised organizational structure for COTC was implemented as reflected on the current COTC organizational chart (Appendix B). The major changes implemented were the replacement of the four Division Chairpersons and the Coordinator of General Education and Human Services with two Academic Directors and the replacement of the Interim Dean of COTC with a Vice President and Dean of Faculty. With the employment of the two Academic Directors, the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction was relieved of the responsibilities of the Division Chairperson for Allied Health and Public Services and the Chairperson of Engineering Technology. Thus, the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction was able to concentrate on the assessment of student learning, curriculum development and institutional effectiveness which was one of the main reasons for the change in the organizational structure. President Federlein wanted an organizational structure that would emphasize the significance of assessment of student learning and institutional effectiveness as being key elements in the organization. Therefore, in the new structure, the decision was made to make assessment of student learning outcomes and institutional effectiveness a major responsibility of the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction.
Recent Newark Campus Changes

Just as many public institutions of higher education across the nation are experiencing decreased state funding, so, also, is the Newark Campus. In January 2002, both Central Ohio Technical College and The Ohio State University at Newark faced a decrease in state funding due to legislation that was adopted by the State of Ohio in November of 2001. The resultant six percent (6%) reduction combined with an annual statewide subsidy adjustment of three tenths of a percent (0.3%) produced a permanent total budget reduction of six and three tenths percent (6.3%). The revenue impact on each institution was $272,000 for COTC and $391,000 for OSU-N.

To accommodate the reduced budgets, the President’s Cabinet utilized input from the Newark Campus faculty and staff in developing a comprehensive plan that would have the least impact on the students and each academic institution’s ability to meet the higher education needs of the students. Briefly, the comprehensive plan included 1) capital spending reductions for both COTC and OSU-N, 2) a six percent (6%) increase in COTC’s student tuition and fees effective spring quarter 2002, 3) a decrease in the funding for cost-shared and COTC non cost-shared student wages, 4) COTC part-time faculty budget savings and 5) position reductions of both cost-shared staff and COTC staff and faculty. Of the $272,000 reduction in revenue for COTC, approximately $150,000 was realized from savings in the part-time faculty budget and the elimination of two vacant faculty positions.

On January 11, 2002, President Federlein announced the comprehensive plan to the Newark Campus faculty and staff via a mailbox memorandum and an e-mail (Appendix, G). For those individuals whose positions were eliminated, the staff of the Newark Campus Human Resources Office provided services and information relative to job placement and reassignment assistance, continuation of benefits and counseling opportunities. By the beginning of March, the position reductions and resulting change in services had been implemented. As with any change, there will be an adjustment period with the greatest effect on faculty occurring during the spring quarter. An early observed effect related to the decrease in the number of staff is an increase in the use of
electronic communications. Thus, the reductions have forced more individuals to consider the benefits of the electronic age.

Even in these times of reduced state support for higher education, the generosity of a most supportive community continues to provide the cost-shared Newark Campus with funds to proceed with the capital construction projects of the J. Gilbert Reese Center and the John and Christine Warner Library and Student Center.
INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT
SECTION IV: INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT

Commission Statement

In the *Report of a Visit to Central Ohio Technical College* on May 11-13, 1998, by an Evaluation Team of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA), major challenge number five on page 44 stated that “Even though an assessment plan exists, it lacks leadership, cohesiveness, and commitment”. In section V. B. 4. of the team recommendation and rationale, the team states “…concerns are raised because of the lack of any committee or College staff with the responsibility to coordinate the College’s assessment plan and efforts. In fact the assessment program was found to be disjointed, fragmented, and incapable of being integrated into a whole. There is little evidence that measures of institutional effectiveness are being implemented”. Therefore, one element of a focus visit to be conducted in 2001-02 would be to validate the quality and comprehensiveness of the implementation of the College’s assessment plan and activities.

Assessment: 1995-1998

Prior to the 1998 visit by the NCA Evaluation Team, the College submitted to NCA in March of 1995 *The Central Ohio Technical College Plan for the Assessment of Student Outcomes* which was based upon the five evaluative criteria identified in the NCA’s *1994-96 Handbook of Accreditation*. A ten person Assessment Committee comprised of six faculty, one academic advisor, one senior administrator, the institutional research officer and one division chairperson who chaired the committee developed the Assessment Plan with consultation from faculty, staff and administration. Of the ten committee members, only the committee chairperson and two faculty members have had continuous employment at COTC since 1995 and one of the two faculty members was on a one year sabbatical leave during 1999-2000. A third faculty member of the original committee left COTC for three years and returned to COTC July 16, 2001, as the Academic Director for Health, Education and Public Services. The remaining six members of the
committee are no longer at COTC due to retirement of four, death of one and one separation from the institution.

The 1995 Assessment Plan document presented a flow chart of Assessment and Planning at COTC; a table of academic instruments used, being developed or plan to be developed for the assessment of students' academic abilities upon entering COTC, during their academic endeavors and exiting COTC; and a table of programs, services and operations provided at COTC. The document also presented a time line for implementation of the Assessment Plan over a span of five academic years. Between 1995 and 1998, elements of the plan continued to function and some of the planned development of assessment instruments and activities were completed while other planned development and activities did not occur.

During the 1996-97 academic year, the Assessment Committee was replaced by an Assistant to the Vice President for Assessment. This Assistant to the Vice President assumed the duties and responsibilities of the Assessment Committee and those established by the Assessment Committee. Also, the Assistant to the Vice President for Assessment served as a co-chairperson of the NCA Self Study Steering Committee during 1996-97. At the conclusion of the summer quarter of 1997 the person in the role of Assistant to the Vice President for Assessment was removed from the position of co-chair of the NCA Self Study Steering Committee along with the role of Assistant to the Vice President for Assessment.

As of autumn quarter 1997, the person who had been removed from the role of Assistant to the Vice President for Assessment returned to a full-time faculty position. For the 1997-98 academic year, the only assessment committee was the NCA Self-Study Sub-Committee on Assessment. The Self-Study Sub-Committee on Assessment researched the methods used at COTC to assess all aspects of its operations by reviewing the academic and institutional support services. From the submission of the Assessment Plan until the NCA evaluation visit in May of 1998, the emphasis of assessment activities was the continued collection of data and the development of new assessment instruments in selected areas. A few programs and disciplines used the data to make changes in the delivery of course content to improve student learning. The major areas that
used some type of assessment to make decisions were the health programs of diagnostic medical sonography, nursing, physical therapist assistant and radiography. The faculty in the academic area of pre-college and the disciplines of mathematics and natural sciences, specifically the Human Anatomy and Physiology courses, utilized the results of assessment of student learning in determining the changes to implement in the respective courses to enhance student learning and success in the courses. Examples of the utilization of student learning assessment data to direct change in the delivery of course content are provided by the pre-college, the mathematics and the natural sciences faculty.

During the 1998-99 academic year, the pre-college communications' instructors distributed a four item comment survey (Appendix, H-1) at the end of each quarter. The Reading Skills full-time faculty analyzed the first question which addressed the students' perception of the appropriateness of the text for the course and each student's educational background. From the results, the full-time faculty made the decision that the text needed to be changed. The faculty changed the text which dictated a change in the instructional methodology which is explained in the memorandum dated 12-3-01 (Appendix, H-2).

A second example is provided by the mathematics faculty. From a study of the retention rate and pass rate for all the mathematics courses offered from Autumn 1996 through Summer 2000, the faculty made decisions regarding techniques for improving the success rate in the mathematics courses. With an interest in determining achievement of course to course success, the faculty compared two groups of students in two different math courses: Business Mathematics and College Algebra, (Appendix, I). The students were divided either into the group who were required to complete pre-college math or the group who were placed directly into college math. Based upon the number of students in each group who passed the college math courses with a grade of "C" (2.0) or better, the faculty determined that there was a greater discrepancy between the two groups when comparing grades in college algebra versus business mathematics. With this basic information, the faculty analyzed the course content of college algebra compared to the course content in the pre-college math courses. The faculty proposed that there may be several reasons for the lower percentage of students in the pre-college group receiving a grade of "C"
(2.0) or better. However, the faculty made the decision to add two additional topics to the pre-college algebra course to better prepare the students for college algebra. Currently, the mathematics faculty are utilizing a pre-test and post-test for college algebra and plan to perform an item analysis to determine discrepancies and where and how to adjust the instruction to reduce the discrepancies between the two groups of students.

The third example is provided by the natural sciences faculty relative to improvement in the presentation of the course content related to the heart in the Human Anatomy & Physiology course (Appendix, J). For the academic period from 1995-96 through 1999-2000, the two faculty selected questions about the heart from the national standardized Human Anatomy & Physiology (HAP) examination. A result of the analysis was the upgrading of the HAP lectures, the addition of 4 pages of information about cardiac physiology and the addition of homework assignments that cover cardiovascular functions. They, also, analyzed the students’ knowledge of respiratory function by selecting specific respiratory questions from the national standardized HAP examination. The result was the addition of homework practice problems for determining respiratory values. The faculty continue to utilize selected questions from the national standardized HAP examination to analyze the presentation of the course content.

However, the majority of faculty did not utilize assessment of student learning data to aid in making decisions or to support specific academic changes.

**Assessment: 1998-1999**

Recall, that the 1998-99 academic year was the final year Dr. Rafael Cortada could serve as President of COTC and Dean/Director of OSU-N due to a policy of the Ohio State University. Thus, a national search was initiated and continued through the autumn and winter quarters and into the spring quarter of 1999. With the impending change in the chief executive officer position, there was a hesitancy to begin any major initiatives including a campus wide assessment process. The Vice President & Dean of Faculty, the chief instructional officer, made the decision
to wait until the chief executive officer was in office as the newly created position of President of the Newark Campus (Central Ohio Technical College and The Ohio State University at Newark). Since the Vice President and Dean of Faculty at that time left Central Ohio Technical College as of July 1, 2000, one can only surmise as to why the decision to begin a campus wide assessment process was not initiated during the 1998-99 academic year. Remember, the newly established position, President of the Newark Campus, created a chief executive officer to oversee both COTC and OSU-N. Given that the chief executive officer of the Newark Campus was a new position and no one knew the exact authority lines, roles and responsibilities that would be established for the new structure, one would speculate that the Vice President and Dean of Faculty was not sure of her authority to impose a campus wide assessment process at the time. In addition, with the impending change in the chief executive officer, there was uncertainty about the existing administrative officers and reporting lines. Therefore, the decision may have been to wait until the new chief executive officer was established in office and the roles, responsibilities and authority of the other administrative officers were defined.

Without a Director of Assessment or an Assessment Committee, the assessment process at COTC was without direction or coordination during the 1998-99 academic year. The programs and areas that routinely collected data on student outcomes and customer service continued to collect data. A few programs and disciplines used the data to make changes in the delivery of course content to improve student learning as was presented in the previous section (Appendices, H-2, I, J). In addition there will be more data available in the document room. However, there was little widespread use of the data to direct change even though in some areas there was data that could have been analyzed and the results used to support specific changes.

**Assessment: 1999-2000**

As a point of reference, it is important to remember that Dr. Anne Cairns Federlein assumed the newly created position of President of the Newark Campus in July 1999. Throughout the 1999-2000 fiscal and academic year, many changes occurred in the administration and selected cost-
shared staff positions which resulted in a total of eight positions being vacated and seven being filled.

At the beginning of the 1999-2000 academic year, the Vice President and Dean of Faculty at COTC assigned the responsibility of Institutional Assessment to a full-time junior faculty member who was given the title of Director of Assessment. During the 1999-2000 academic year, a year of many administrative and staff changes, the Director of Assessment presented to the faculty a workshop on course assessment, mentored individual faculty on the development of primary trait analysis as a course assessment tool and participated in an assessment conference. All of the faculty in the Division of Allied Health and Public Services did identify a primary trait for one course. Other faculty worked on identifying one primary trait for one course. Since there was no committee to review the identified trait, the Director of Assessment reviewed each faculty members selected primary trait and utilization plan.

For the 1999-2000 academic year, the programs and areas that routinely collected data on student outcomes and customer service continued to collect data. The programs and disciplines that routinely utilized the data collected on student learning outcomes to make changes continued to adjust the delivery of course content to improve student learning. However, there was still little widespread use of the data to direct change even though in some areas there was data that could have been analyzed and the results used to support specific changes.

Assessment Overview: 2000-Present

With the resignation of the Vice President and Dean of Faculty effective July 1, 2000, an Interim Dean of Faculty was employed. Further, the President of the Newark Campus established the position of Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction in July 2000 and assigned the responsibility for Assessment at COTC to the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction. At the beginning of the autumn quarter of 2000, the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction established an Academic Assessment Committee (AAC) with representation from four of the five
academic areas as Nursing & Related Programs was not able to assign a faculty member. The newly established Academic Assessment Committee was chaired by the Director of Assessment, the faculty release time position that had been established during the 1998-99 academic year.

In February 2001, the Director of Assessment position was eliminated and replaced by two faculty as co-chairpersons of the Academic Assessment Committee. Since minimal progress in instituting a college wide assessment plan was accomplished between May of 1998 and February 2001, one of the first activities of the four member Academic Assessment Committee was the development of an Assessment Plan Flowchart (Appendix, K) and the establishment of an Assessment Plan Timeline (Appendix, L) in preparation for the NCA Focus Visit in May of 2002. The Assessment Plan Flowchart that was developed by the AAC contained the same elements as the 1995 Assessment Plan Flowchart submitted to NCA. Between February 2001 and June 2001, the AAC developed sample program/discipline statements of purpose or mission statement (Appendix, M), sample student learning outcome goals (Appendix, N), a two part student learning outcomes assessment worksheet (Appendix, O) and a sample completed part one student learning outcomes assessment worksheet (Appendix, P). The AAC, also, advised the full-time faculty as they developed the requested assessment materials.

During the winter quarter of 2001, the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction met with the Newark Campus President’s Cabinet to review the NCA report of findings of the May 1998 site visit to COTC and to present the materials and Assessment Plan timeline developed by the AAC. Also, the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction briefed the COTC Board of Trustees on the Assessment program being implemented at COTC and reminded the members of the Board of Trustees of the report of findings of the May 1998 site visit by the NCA.

The Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction, AAC and a few other faculty and staff attended the Ohio Assessment Forum in March of 2001. In addition, the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction, attended the Academic Quality Improvement Project Conference in Indianapolis, Indiana March 8 & 9, 2001. On March 29, 30 and 31, 2001, the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction attended the Assessment Institute in Cincinnati, Ohio. Updates on the
conferences were presented to the faculty during Faculty Council meetings at the end of winter quarter and the beginning of spring quarter.

The AAC met once during the summer quarter of 2001 for the purposes of reviewing submitted materials, reviewing a checklist for recording committee activities, discussing a speaker and the role of the AAC in the activities of Faculty Development Week prior to the beginning of the autumn quarter of 2001 and approving a COTC Assessment Logo (Appendix, Q) to be unveiled during Faculty Development Week. In addition, at the summer meeting, the AAC discussed the use of the Academic Assessment Committee’s document folders and related subfolders on the “Common/K:” drive of the Newark Campus Network, the intranet, by the Service Areas Assessment Committee. Since the AAC established the intranet folder to make COTC assessment documents more readily available, the AAC agreed that the Service Areas Assessment Committee (SAAC) should utilize the “Common/K:” drive of the Newark Campus Network for their assessment documents. The folders and subfolders housed on the Newark Campus Network continue to evolve throughout the 2001-02 academic year with the current folders and subfolders depicted in the diagram presented in Appendix R. Access to the “Common/K:” drive of the Newark Campus Network, the intranet, will be made available in the document room.

As requested by the AAC, the program for Faculty Development Week included one day of activities devoted to assessment of student learning outcomes and institutional effectiveness (Appendix, S). The activities included a presentation on Institutional Effectiveness, Introduction of the Assessment Committee’s folder and subfolders on the “Common/K:” drive of the Newark Campus Network, a presentation on Assessment Methodology and Metrics and a Methodology Workshop where faculty worked on their Assessment Worksheets.

Relative to the Service Areas, the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction and one of the cochairpersons of the AAC met with the directors of three of the Service Areas which are closely aligned with academics in February of 2001. The three areas of COTC Admissions, the Newark Campus Learning Assistance Center/Disability Services and Student Support Services were selected as the initial services areas to include in the assessment process since the services
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provided easily correlated with the academic programs.

During the summer quarter of 2001, the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction met with the professional staffs of the COTC offices of Admissions, Advising and Student Records to explain the assessment process and the assessment expectations of each Service Area. Also, the Director of the Learning Assistance Center/Disability Services and the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction conferred about the role of the service areas relative to student learning outcomes. The discussions included identification of appropriate goals and suggested measurements that related to assisting the students in their pursuit of meeting their learning outcome goals.

Throughout the autumn quarter of 2001, the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction met with the professional staff of the remainder of the Service Areas to explain the assessment process and the role and expectations of the Service Areas in assisting students in meeting their learning outcome goals. By the conclusion of the autumn quarter of 2001, all the Service Areas except the COTC Math Lab, Facilities, Project Manager and Public Safety had been informed of the assessment process and all either had completed or were in the process of completing their purpose statement and goals that related to student learning outcomes.

Assessment Activities: 2000-2001 Academic Year

Faculty

In accordance with the NCA-CTHE, March 2000, Addendum to the Handbook of Accreditation, Second Edition, the AAC requested, that by the end of winter quarter 2001, each program or discipline submit a statement of purpose or mission statement and five or six educational goals that define the student learning outcomes for the program or discipline relative to the College's mission and institutional goals (Appendix, T). Following the newly developed Assessment Plan and the established Assessment Plan time-line, the faculty of the majority of programs and disciplines, with the guidance of the Academic Assessment Committee members, developed a
mission or purpose statement and defined student learning outcome goals for each academic program or discipline during the winter quarter of 2001.

Throughout the winter quarter, the four faculty of the AAC met with program or discipline full-time faculty to explain the assessment process and review the sample program purpose statement and student learning goals with the respective faculty. The full-time faculty of the programs and disciplines responded to the request with all but the nursing programs meeting the deadline. For all the programs without full-time faculty except Digital Media Design, the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction and the co-chairpersons of the AAC developed the program statement of purpose and the programmatic educational goals for student learning outcomes and asked the part-time faculty to review and approve the materials. The statement of purpose or mission statement and the programmatic student learning goals for each program or discipline will be available in the document room as well as on the “Common/ K:” drive of the Newark Campus Network.

Also, during the winter quarter of 2001, the committee developed an assessment statement that would be required on part one of each course syllabus beginning with the spring quarter of 2001. The syllabus statement is “As part of COTC’s campus-wide assessment initiatives (quality assurance program), samples of student performance such as test results, projects, papers, etc. may be used. The data gathered will not identify students and is not related to the student’s grade for the course, but will be used to improve student learning at COTC.” Since Part I of the course syllabus is distributed to each student in the course, the required statement informs the students that assessment is an integral part of COTC and that samples of their course work may be used for assessment purposes. Such use in no way affects an individual’s grade for the course. Examples of syllabus Part I will be available in the document room and the Academic Area Office.

During the spring quarter of 2001, the AAC maintained weekly meetings in order to meet all their goals. The AAC reviewed each program’s or discipline’s mission or purpose statement and student learning outcome goals to assure that all academic programs and disciplines were establishing appropriate and measurable goals consistent with their missions or purpose.
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statements and in concert with the College's mission and goals. Feedback was provided to the faculty. The AAC also developed a student learning outcomes assessment worksheet comprised of two parts (Appendix, O) to be used to record performance indicators, measurement methods, measurement criteria, time lines, analysis, strategies for change and time line for change. To aid the faculty in the use of the worksheet, the AAC created samples that could be used for the development of the program's or discipline's worksheets. Once again, the members of the AAC met with the full-time faculty in their respective areas to explain the worksheets and provide guidance to the faculty. Further, a member of the AAC worked with a staff member of Information Technology Services to establish an assessment site on the campus Intranet.

Based upon the feedback provided by the AAC and where appropriate, the program faculty revised their purpose statement and goals for student learning outcomes. Following acceptance of the original or revised program’s or discipline’s mission or purpose statement and student learning goals, the faculty began the next step in establishing an assessment process during the spring quarter of 2001. The faculty began to identify performance indicators (student behaviors), measurement methods, time lines for measurement, measurement criteria and analysis time lines for each student learning outcome goal of the program or discipline. Being very aware of the significance of establishing sound, valid and reliable methods of measurement, the AAC requested of the college administration that a faculty development program on methodology be presented during faculty development week prior to the beginning of the autumn quarter of 2001.

The AAC met once during the summer quarter of 2001 (August 22, 2001) for the purposes of reviewing submitted materials, reviewing a checklist for recording committee activities, discussing the use of the Assessment Committee’s folder and subfolders on the “Common/K:” drive of the Newark Campus Network by the services areas, discussing a speaker and role of the AAC in the activities of Faculty Development Week prior to the beginning of the autumn quarter of 2001 and to approve a COTC Assessment Logo (Appendix, Q) to be unveiled during Faculty Development Week.
Service Areas

Prior to July 2000, there was only minimal involvement in the assessment process from selected COTC service areas and the cost-shared service areas of the Newark Campus (refer to Section II for a description of the Newark Campus). The service areas that were minimally involved in assessment were the areas that provided direct student support, such as, the Learning Assistance Center/Disability Services, Student Support Services, Library, COTC Records and COTC Enrollment Management. Staff in these selected areas were collecting data and making decisions based on the data but no formal plan leading to improved institutional effectiveness was instituted.

On February 14, 2001, an initial meeting was held with representatives from COTC Admissions, The Learning Assistance Center/Disability Services (LAC/DS), one of the co-chairs of the AAC and the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction to begin incorporating the Service Areas into the assessment process. The Director of the Learning Assistance Center/Disability Services submitted a purpose statement and student learning goals for the Learning Assistance Center. On February 28, 2001, the Director of Student Support Services, the other co-chair of the AAC and the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction met to begin the incorporation of the assessment of student learning outcomes into the normal operations of Student Support Services(current title: Student Affairs).

On March 7, 2001, the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction met with the President’s Cabinet (COTC Interim Dean of Faculty, OSU-N Academic Dean, Newark Campus Chief Financial Officer, Newark Campus Human Resources Director, Newark Campus Chief Information Officer) to present and discuss COTC’s assessment process: Assessment at COTC: An Interactive Process. The Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction and the Co-Chairpersons of the AAC held an initial meeting with the COTC Registrar, the Newark Campus Bursar and the Newark Campus Director of Financial Aid on March 16, 2001. The Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction presented COTC’s assessment process: Assessment at COTC: An Interactive Process to the Board of Trustees of Central Ohio Technical College on March 20, 2001.
During the summer of 2001, the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction met with a few service areas to explain the Assessment Process and the expectations of the service areas. On July 23 and 26, 2001, meetings were held with all the COTC Admissions, Advising, Student Records and Off-Campus Operations staff and the Coordinator of Career Services to explain COTC's assessment process and the expectations of each area in developing a purpose statement, goals and worksheets for each area’s assessment procedures as a part of *Assessment at COTC: An Interactive Process*.

**Assessment Activities: 2001-02 Academic Year**

**Faculty**

The 2001 autumn quarter activities of the AAC were initiated with participation in the Faculty Development Week program from September 12 through September 18, 2001. On September 13, 2001, the members of the AAC presented the session on the Assessment Committee’s “Common/K.” drive on the Newark Campus Network and the session on the Methodology Workshop. During these two sessions, the committee members presented the material and were available to assist the faculty.

Beginning with the autumn quarter of 2001, the co-chairperson structure of the AAC was changed to a single chairperson with the other co-chair becoming the secretary for the committee. At the first committee meeting on October 1, 2001, the AAC met with the new COTC Leadership Team (Vice President and Dean of Faculty; Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction; Academic Director of Business, Engineering Technologies, Mathematics and Technology; and Academic Director of Health Education and Public Services) to brief the Team on the role and responsibilities of the AAC and the progress of the program/discipline faculty in preparing and implementing assessment within a program or discipline. The role of the Leadership Team relative to the Assessment Process was also discussed at the meeting.

Since assessment was the assigned responsibility of the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and
Instruction, it was decided that the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction would work directly with the Academic Assessment Committee in the continued development of the assessment of student learning at the faculty level. In turn the Vice President and Dean of Faculty and the two Academic Directors would be briefed on the progress of the faculty in implementing the assessment of student learning. Further, as part of each faculty member’s non-instructional hours for the academic year, the faculty member would provide each respective Academic Director with a narrative describing assessment activities including results and recommendations.

Throughout the remainder of the autumn quarter the AAC maintained regular weekly meetings to review the Assessment Worksheets submitted by the various program and discipline faculty. As the committee began the evaluation of the worksheets for appropriate student behaviors, methods of measurement, timeline for measurement, measurement criteria and timeline for analysis, the committee realized that they needed to dialogue with the respective program and discipline faculty. Therefore, a one half hour meeting was established with the faculty of each respective program or discipline. The meeting afforded a forum for the faculty and committee members to explore the proposed measurement plan relative to appropriateness and ability to complete the plan.

On October 25, 2001, the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction and one of the co-chairpersons of the AAC attended the meeting of the Assessment Support Group of the Ohio Association of Two Year Colleges.

By the middle of the winter quarter of 2002, the AAC chairperson proposed to the committee members that the committee would not be able to continue meeting with the faculty of each respective program or discipline due to the amount of time that would be required. Therefore, the AAC devoted three meetings during February and March of 2002 to the establishment of a vision and graphic representation of the vision of the role of the AAC during the 2002-03 academic year. The graphic of the vision proposed by the AAC (Appendix, U) depicts the roles and interactions of the Leadership Team, the Academic Assessment Committee, the Curriculum Committee, the
On March 22, 2002, the chairperson of the AAC, Linda Benefield, PhD, met with the Vice President and Dean of Faculty and the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction to present the committee’s vision and graphic representation of the vision of the role of the AAC for 2002-03 and to update and brief the Vice President and Dean of Faculty on the committee’s activities and recommendations. Further, the chairperson explained that the AAC’s role is advisory to the faculty and not approval or disapproval of a particular change strategy and timeline. It is the expectation that the committee will continue to review the mission or purpose statement and student learning outcome goals of any new program and assist any new program in the development of the assessment worksheets. As would be expected, the committee will continue to review the assessment materials which were developed by the committee for currency and appropriateness and where deemed necessary make the appropriate changes.

Since the Vice President and Dean of Faculty is the Chief Academic Officer of COTC and is ultimately responsible for the academic operation of the college, it is important to note that all academic actions flow through the Vice President and Dean of Faculty for assignment of resources. Bonnie L. Coe, Ph.D., the current Vice President and Dean of Faculty, is committed to student learning and is very supportive of a process that assures academic quality in all the educational opportunities afforded COTC students. With a strong background in curriculum development and being very knowledgeable of assessment of student learning outcomes, Dr. Coe is well prepared to provide the support needed to assure the integration of assessment of student learning with curriculum revision and development as a whole process. Further, it is the vision of the Vice President and Dean of Faculty and the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction to move COTC forward into the Academic Quality Improvement Process.

Recall that on July 16, 2001, a new academic organizational structure was implemented with three of the four members of the academic Leadership Team beginning their employment at COTC. It is important to note that all four members of the Leadership Team and the faculty chairperson of the Academic Assessment Committee hold the doctorate of philosophy as a terminal degree. The
five highly credentialed individuals in the key academic roles will provide the leadership for the implementation of the assessment-curriculum process depicted in the graphic representation (Appendix, U) proposed by the Academic Assessment Committee. The interrelationship between assessment and curriculum should be seamless with the assessment data being used in the curriculum process to assure that each curriculum supports the student learning outcomes of each program or discipline.

In viewing the graphic representation, it is evident that interaction must occur between the various components. The three major areas are the Leadership Team (Vice President and Dean of Faculty, Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction, the Academic Director of Business, Engineering Technologies, Mathematics and Technology, the Academic Director of Health, Education and Public Services), the programs and disciplines and the faculty committees. As can be seen in the visual, there was a deliberate design of overlapping areas to assure the necessary interactions. In addition to the overlaps of the Leadership Team, the faculty workgroups include an Academic Director and the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction along with eight to twelve faculty. The faculty workgroups comprised of faculty from similar but different programs and disciplines provide a mechanism for the faculty to share and learn from each other while at the same time developing an understanding of each other's program or discipline. By utilizing the faculty workgroup concept, a better understanding of the overall impact of one program or discipline upon the whole operation of COTC should be realized.

**Service Areas**

Again some of the service areas were either formally or informally collecting and using data to make decisions about services being offered in specific areas. An example of data driven decision making in the Enrollment Management Area of COTC's Admissions was the decision to eliminate the "Explore COTC" programs and use the time allotted to that activity to offer more time for "walk-ins." The data used to make the decision was quantitative from the Explore sessions and anecdotal from staff conversations with individuals who walked into the Admissions Office. From the results of these two collections of data, the decision was made to redirect time to
A second data collection and reporting effort that will be formally incorporated into the assessment process is the increased retention effort initiated by one of the COTC Academic Advisors. During the registration period for spring of 2001, two academic advisor experimented with the strategy of mailing a personalized schedule reminder letter and course schedule for the spring quarter of 2001 to inactive student advisees. One advisor mailed to 55% of his inactive student advisees leaving 45% as a control group. The results showed a 14.8% increase in retention when compared against a control group who did not receive the reminder and schedule (Appendix, W). The retention strategy was employed with selected academic programs during the registration period for the summer of 2001 with a demonstrated retention rate of 19.7% (Appendix, X). Based upon these results, the academic advisors decided to implement the mailing of the schedule reminder letter (Appendix Y) and a course schedule as a customer service goal for Academic Advising.

Relative to Autumn 2001 activities of incorporating the Assessment Process into the Service Areas, the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction continued to meet with the professional staff of the majority of the cost-shared Newark Campus service areas to explain COTC's assessment process and the participation expectations of each area. The cost-shared service areas were the Newark Campus Library, Child Development Center, Student Support Services, Information Technology Services, Marketing, Finance, Fees & Deposits, Financial Aid, Purchasing and Travel, Services Center, Human Resources and Business and Industry Institute. Each area was asked to develop a purpose statement and two to four goals that focused upon the role and responsibilities of the respective area in assisting students in meeting learning outcomes. All service areas' purpose statements and goals were due by December 31, 2001.

As materials from the service areas began to be submitted to the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction, a Service Areas Assessment Committee (SAAC) was established. Five professionals representing the COTC only and the cost-shared areas readily agreed to be members of the SAAC which operates with direct supervision of the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and
Instruction. The five members of the SAAC are a COTC Academic Advisor, the Director of the Learning Assistance Center/Disabilities Services, the Director of Career Services, the Director of Purchasing and Travel and the Newark Campus Instructional Designer.

At the first meeting of the SAAC on November 8, 2001, one of the co-chairpersons of the AAC attended the meeting to provide assistance and guidance as the SAAC established its functions and responsibilities. The AAC co-chairperson shared forms and explained how the AAC was operating. The SAAC members voted to utilize the forms and materials developed by the AAC with slight modifications in terms. The co-chairperson of the AAC made the modifications and arranged for the SAAC to have its own sub-folders under the COTC Assessment folder on the "Common/K:" drive of the Newark Campus Network. Further, the co-chairperson of the AAC attended the November 15th and 21st meetings of the SAAC to assist the SAAC members as they began the review of the submitted purpose statements and goals from the Service Areas represented on the committee.

The committee reviewed each member’s respective area’s purpose statement and goals for appropriateness relative to a focus on student learning outcomes. Upon the approval of the purpose statement and goals, the approved version was placed in the Service Areas Goals sub-folder located on the "Common/K:" drive of the Newark Campus Network within the COTC Assessment folder as a sample for other Service Areas as they developed their purpose statement and goals. As on the AAC, one member of the SAAC is responsible for maintaining the SAAC sub-folder on the "Common/K:" drive of the Newark Campus Network. Through the winter quarter of 2002, as much as possible, the SAAC maintained regular weekly meetings which were devoted to meeting with one or more representatives of each service area to review each area’s purpose statement and goals. Additionally, the members of the SAAC serve as advisors to the staff of the other service areas as they develop their respective purpose statement and area goals.

Beginning with the winter quarter of 2002 on January 7, 2002, as each service area’s statement of purpose and goals are approved, the respective service area will complete assessment worksheet Part I for each goal by identifying at least one performance indicator, a method of measurement, a
timeline for measurement, measurement criteria and a timeline for analysis. Examples of the Service Areas' statement of purpose, goals and assessment worksheets Part I are presented in Appendix Z. By the first part of the spring quarter of 2002, all the service areas' Part I Assessment Worksheets will be completed and reviewed by the SAAC with the plan to complete an analysis of results and presentation of recommendations to the appropriate administrator during the summer quarter at the latest.
Assessment of Student Academic Achievement: Levels of Implementation

To identify the progress of implementing an assessment process at COTC, the “Levels of Implementation-Patterns of Characteristics” as presented in the Addendum to the Handbook of Accreditation, second edition, March 2000, of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools Commission of Institutions of Higher Education was used to measure the implementation throughout the institution including each academic program and each service area.


Since July 2000, there has been a definite movement toward collective and shared values in understanding the purposes, advantages and limitations of assessment across the institution including administrative, academic and service areas. As previously stated, the instructional component demonstrated the greatest increase in the implementation of the assessment process during the 2000-01 academic year. The administrative and service areas were introduced to the significance of the assessment process and in some areas there was an initial understanding of the process.

In the academic areas and some of the service areas, student learning and assessment of student academic achievement was always considered to be of prime importance. However, beginning in July 2000 with the assignment of the responsibility for assessment at COTC to the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction, assessment at COTC was brought to the forefront and a concerted effort to implement an institutional wide assessment program was instituted. As of June 2001, the faculty of all academic programs except the new program of Digital Media Design had developed a program purpose or mission statement that reflected the College’s Mission Statement, “...to meet the technical education and training needs of students and employers in the area” (Appendix, T). In aligning the academic programs’ goals with the institutional goals (Appendix, T), the academic programs directly align with the institutional goals that refer to high quality, accessible programs of technical education, core general education, and course work to meet the needs of the underprepared student. In addition, the academic programs refer to lifelong education and/or
continuing professional education which is also an institutional goal. As of December 2001, the new program of Digital Media Design had developed a mission statement and program educational goals that reflect the same institutional goals as the other academic programs. Further, since the Spring of 2001, each COTC course syllabus contains a standard statement about assessment and that the purpose of assessment is to improve student learning.

Beginning in the Autumn of 2001, each service area developed a statement of purpose that supports the College’s Mission Statement, “...to meet the technical education and training needs of students and employers in the area.” The goals of specific service areas align with specific institutional goals. In total, the service areas align with the institutional goals that refer to designing and providing workplace training and development, continuing professional education opportunities, non-credit programs for personal growth and quality of life goals, community economic development, opportunities which enhance students’ personal, professional, leadership and cultural development and efficient student centered services which support the academic programs.

Overall, the college is making progress in implementing an institution wide assessment process (level two) and in some instances is beginning to move toward maturing in the assessment process to assure continuous improvement (level three). It is most evident that all the full-time faculty, the professional staff both COTC and cost-shared and the administration of COTC understand the purpose of assessment. Recall the faculty have been consistently involved in establishing student learning outcome goals and developing methods of measurement, measurement criteria, measurement timelines, and analysis timelines since the winter quarter of 2001. During Faculty Development Week activities at the beginning of the autumn quarter of 2001, all the activities for Thursday, September 13, 2001, (Appendix, S) were devoted to institutional effectiveness and assessment of student learning. The faculty of each academic program have developed a statement of purpose or mission statement and student learning outcome goals that align with the institution’s mission statement and goals. Examples of program/discipline statement of purpose or mission statement, student learning outcome goals and assessment worksheets Part I are in Appendices M, N and O. The statement of purpose or mission statement, student learning
outcome goals and assessment worksheets Part I and some Part II for each program will be available in the document room.

All of the professional staff of both the COTC and cost-shared service areas have developed a statement of purpose and service area goals that reflect the services that either directly or indirectly assist students in meeting their learning outcome goals. Further, the professional staff have completed Part I of the assessment worksheets with methods of measurement, measurement criteria, measurement timelines, and analysis timelines. Examples of statement of purpose, service area goals related to either direct or indirect services to students and the assessment worksheets Part I are in Appendix Z. The statement of purpose, service area goals related to student learning outcomes and assessment worksheets Part I for each service area and some assessment worksheets Part II will be available in the document room.

II. Shared Responsibility: a. Faculty

As of Autumn 2001, for each academic program goal, the faculty of each academic program have identified at least one performance indicator with one or two methods of measurement including direct and indirect measures, a timeline for each method of measurement, measurement criteria for each performance indicator and a timeline for analysis of the data collected for each method of measurement. Examples of the methods of measurement identified on the completed worksheets or currently being used include portfolio assessment in digital media design, standardized test in human anatomy and physiology, performance on national registry examinations in diagnostic medical sonography and radiography, performance on state licensure examinations in nursing, performance on state credentialing examinations in law enforcement, employer surveys, alumni surveys and job placement data. The document room will contain the aforementioned examples. Other data related to retention, transfer, length of time to degree, graduation rates and transfer rates are included in the statewide data base maintained by the Ohio Board of Regents. To date COTC has done little with the statewide data relative to assessment of student learning.

By the Spring of 2002, the program faculty will have analyzed the data for one performance indicator for one program goal and presented a report of results which includes strategies for
change if necessary and the timeline for implementing the change. For each program goal, the faculty are expected to continue to refine and identify performance indicators with measurement methods, a timeline for each measurement method, measurement criteria for each measurement, and a timeline for analysis of the data. The faculty will be asked to develop and submit to the Academic Assessment Committee a measurement rotation plan to assure the ability to collect, analyze, report and utilize the assessment process to improve student learning and provide information for institutional planning and budget development.

The Faculty Council Officers, Academic Assessment Committee, the College Curriculum Committee and individual faculty especially program directors and lead program or discipline faculty as well as those faculty who are interested in the assessment process are knowledgeable of the assessment process and keep current in the field of assessment through reading, research and participating in assessment programs and conferences. Overall, the faculty are making progress in implementing assessment programs and are moving into level two of implementation.

II. Shared Responsibility:  b. Administration and Board and c. Students
As stated earlier, as of July 2000, the President of the Newark Campus assigned responsibility for assessment at COTC to the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction who reports directly to the Chief Academic Officer, the Vice President and Dean of Faculty. The Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction has presented information about the significance of assessment and the assessment process at COTC to the Board of Trustees of the College with the most recent formal presentation on November 27, 2001. On November 27, 2001, The COTC Board of Trustees was presented the Flow Chart of Assessment and Planning (Appendix, K) which depicts the incorporation of assessment information into institutional planning and budget development as well as the flow and utilization of assessment information at the academic and service area levels. During the presentation, the three areas of COTC’s interactive assessment process were identified as academics, service areas and administration and that the focus of assessment is student learning outcomes as depicted in the Assessment Logo (Appendix, Q). The role of each area in the interactive assessment process was explained with the expectations of the administrative area being highlighted relative to the assurance of sufficient allocation of time for assessment
activities, provision of an adequate assessment budget and the significance of the incorporation of assessment data into institutional planning and decision making.

Again, as presented earlier in this document, the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction has met with the President's Cabinet, President's Council and individually with the manager or director of each service area. Additionally, the Leadership Team (Vice President and Dean of Faculty, Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction, Academic Director of Business, Engineering Technologies, Mathematics and Technology, and Academic Director of Health, Education and Public Services) met with the Academic Assessment Committee to discuss the assessment process and the role of the Leadership Team in the assessment process. Given that the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction was assigned the responsibility of assessment, it was decided that the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction would work directly with the Academic Assessment Committee in the continued development of the assessment of student learning at the faculty level. The remaining members of the Leadership Team would be briefed on the progress of the faculty in implementing the assessment of student learning. Additionally, each faculty member would provide each respective Academic Director with a narrative describing assessment activities with results and recommendations.

Relative to the Academic Areas, the Academic Directors will be developing an Academic Area wide purpose statement, goals, performance indicators with measurement methods, timeline for measurement, measurement criteria and a timeline for analysis which will be used to assess the effectiveness of an academic program or discipline relative to quality, financial stability, resources and ability to meet student and employer needs. The data collected and analyzed will be used to develop strategies for change or continued improvement and an implementation timeline.

It is important to recall that the Chief Academic Officer supports the assessment-curriculum process depicted in the graphic representation (Appendix, U) proposed by the Academic Assessment Committee. In viewing the graphic representation, it is evident that interaction must occur between the various components. The three major areas are the Leadership Team (Vice President and Dean of Faculty, Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction, the Academic
Director of Business, Engineering Technologies, Mathematics and Technology, the Academic Director of Health, Education and Public Services), the programs and disciplines and the faculty committees. As can be seen in the graphic, there was a deliberate design of overlapping areas to assure the necessary interactions. In addition to the overlaps of the Leadership Team, the faculty workgroups include an Academic Director and the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction along with eight to twelve faculty. Thus, the proposed model presents a seamless interrelationship between assessment and curriculum with the assessment data being used to assure that each curriculum supports the student learning outcomes of each program or discipline.

Support for the assessment process is evidenced by the assignment of faculty non-instructional hours to assessment activities, the recognition that the faculty members of the AAC need to only function on that one committee and the provision of an assessment budget managed by the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction. The assessment budget, which is separate from the accreditation budget, is available for conference fees to the annual one day Ohio Assessment Forum held in March, supplies for the Academic Assessment Committee and the Service Areas Assessment Committee and a recognition luncheon for the members of the AAC and SAAC.

Relative to the implementation of the assessment process for each academic program or discipline and each service area, the responsibility to assure that the process is followed begins at the program or discipline or service area level with the program director or lead faculty or the service area manager. The Academic Directors must ensure that the faculty submit the analysis report with strategies for change and the implementation timeline included prior to the annual budget process. The Service Area Manager is responsible for submission to the appropriate member of the President’s Cabinet the analysis report with strategies for change and the implementation timeline prior to the budget process.

Although the students are aware of the assessment process relative to the use of sample course materials for assessment purposes, student government members have not become involved with the Academic Assessment Committee or the Service Areas Assessment Committee as of the conclusion of the winter quarter of 2002. However, at the conclusion of the winter quarter of
2002, a student representative was selected to join the combined COTC assessment committee comprised of the members of the academic and service areas assessment committees. In the early part of the spring quarter of 2002, there will be a meeting of the combined committees with the expectation that the combined committee will meet at least twice during the academic year. As implementation of the assessment process increases, it is anticipated that the student participation will increase.

Overall, the administration is supportive of the assessment process and its implementation. The COTC Board of Trustees has an understanding of the assessment process and supports the assessment process verbally and financially by approving a separate budget for assessment. At this time, the students are aware of the assessment process and are only minimally involved with a student representative to the combined assessment committee. The Academic Assessment Committee has discussed the inclusion of a student on the Academic Assessment Committee once the assessment process becomes more grounded in the daily operations of the college. Therefore, the Board of Trustees, the President and the President’s Cabinet are moving into level two of the implementation of the assessment program. Given that students are aware of the assessment process but are in the early stages of developing an understanding of the significance of the assessment process and are just becoming involved in the combined assessment committee, the students would be classified at level one of the implementation of the assessment program.

III. Institutional Support: a. Resources
Since the assessment process at COTC was not developed or assigned as an administrator’s responsibility until July 2000, the level of institutional support has matched the growth and development of the assessment process. As stated above there is an assessment budget managed by the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction who is responsible for the assessment process and promotion of its incorporation into institutional planning and budgeting through the Chief Academic Officer. The Chief Academic Officer has stated that if there is a need for specific workshops such as a methodology workshop there are additional funds to provide the
needed workshop(s) or training(s). An example of funds other than the assessment budget being used to support assessment was the funding for the activities of Faculty Development Week. Although, there was no cost for a speaker, the refreshments and some of the handouts provided were covered from the budget of the Chief Academic Officer.

Since there is no Institutional Research Officer, the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction has been assigned the responsibility of institutional assessment with the understanding that a statistician may be retained to assist with the analysis of data. For example, if a faculty member has collected data throughout the academic year or longitudinally across a few years related to a particular student learning outcome and wants to analyze demographic variables related to the success of the students in meeting a specific learning outcome, a statistician would assist the faculty in selecting the appropriate statistical procedure and in interpreting the results. The results of the analysis with recommendations would be forwarded to and discussed with the appropriate Academic Director who in turn would present the information to the Leadership Team for action.

An example of a Leadership Team action that would need to be included in budget planning would be the determination that another course needs to be added to the curriculum to provide the specific content that aids the students in meeting the desired learning outcome. With the addition of another course, it may be necessary to employ an adjunct faculty with expertise in the specific content. Another possible Leadership Team action that might occur is that the findings of a study of the ability of the law enforcement students to meet the learning outcome of proficiency in the use of firearms requires more firearm training opportunities. The results of the data analysis would be used to support the request for the development of a college owned firearms range which would require a capital investment. The same type of data utilization will be employed by the service areas to support requests for personnel or capital expenditures.

Related to faculty release time for providing statistical services, the current faculty contract does address a special one time assignment for a quarter. Faculty may, also, be given an academic assignment such as statistical analysis to fulfill a full-time instructional load. Any faculty may
ask for release time to compensate for committee work or special projects that exceed the normal expectations of a faculty member. Remember, assessment is an expectation of all faculty as part of the regular workload. The Chief Academic Officer has addressed the utilization of assessment to assure continued improvement in student learning and institutional effectiveness.

Professional development funds are set aside for each faculty and are approved by the Faculty Professional Development Committee, the respective Academic Director and the Chief Academic Officer. As stated earlier funds are available through the assessment budget managed by the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction to cover the registration costs for faculty and staff to attend the annual one day Ohio Assessment Forum in March of each year. Related to the support of the Academic Directors, an Academic Director may approve a substitute instructor or guest speaker or exam proctor for a faculty member's class to allow the faculty member to participate in assessment activities and conferences.

Since COTC is in the initial implementation phase of a comprehensive institutional assessment process, the need for resources to support assessment activities has been minimal. Based on past assessment experiences of selected programs, the college has provided the requested resources such as survey mailings and student or office personnel to prepare the mailing and organize the data into a data base which may be used for analysis purposes.

III. Institutional Support:  b. Structures
As stated earlier, there is a COTC Flow Chart of Assessment and Planning (Appendix, K) which is in the initial stages of implementation. Due to the early stages of implementation of the assessment process, the assessment data will not be available for planning the 2002-03 academic year budget as the process begins during the winter quarter of 2002. However, the Academic Assessment Committee will be establishing a 2002-03 assessment timeline which will be shared with the combined COTC Assessment Committee for incorporation in the institution wide assessment process. In addition, the graphic representation (Appendix, U) illustrates the interrelationship between curriculum and assessment. Further, the graphic presents the necessary interactions of the Leadership Team, Academic Assessment Committee, Curriculum Committee,
program and discipline faculty and external advisory groups and individuals. The model will be piloted in the spring quarter of 2002 during the review of course pre-requisites and with any curriculum activities. It is the plan to implement the assessment-curriculum process in the autumn of 2002.

As stated previously, the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction who reports directly to the Chief Academic Officer has been assigned the responsibility of the institutional assessment process. The Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction established an Academic Assessment Committee in Autumn 2000 and a Service Areas Assessment Committee in Autumn 2001. In the winter of 2002, the Newark Campus Student Government Association selected a student representative for the combined COTC Assessment Committee. At the current time, the two assessment committees function independently of each other with the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction as the liaison between the two committees. One of the co-chairperson's of the AAC attended the initial meetings of the SAAC to provide guidance, advice and forms to the SAAC as the committee began its work. When available a representative from the AAC attends the SAAC meetings and there is an invitation for a representative from the SAAC to attend the AAC meetings. During the spring quarter of 2002, the first meeting of the combined committees including the student representative will be held for the purpose of addressing total institutional coordination and general assessment issues. As previously stated, the plan is to hold a minimum of two combined meetings per academic year.

In the absence of an Office of Institutional Research and an Institutional Research Officer, the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction has been assigned the responsibility of COTC's assessment process. The Chief Academic Officer has stated that funds will be made available to provide the necessary instruction and consultation relative to methodology and data interpretation and analysis. The position descriptions of the academic program director, nursing program administrator, the academic area director and the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction contain assessment as a responsibility with the overall responsibility for assessment being specific to the Assistant Dean of Curriculum and Instruction.
As stated earlier, all academic actions flow through the Vice President and Dean of Faculty for assignment of resources. Bonnie L. Coe, Ph.D., the current Vice President and Dean of Faculty, is committed to student learning and is very supportive of a process that assures academic quality in all the educational opportunities afforded COTC students. With a strong background in curriculum development and being very knowledgeable of assessment of student learning outcomes, Dr. Coe is well prepared to provide the support needed to assure the integration of assessment of student learning with curriculum revision and development as a whole process.

Since implementation of the assessment process, all faculty are required to include the assessment statement on each syllabus. Further, each syllabus contains specific performance objectives, evaluation measures and standards. As the assessment process matures, the faculty will be asked to better define the specific assessment measures utilized within the respective curriculum and academic programs. For the past year, each member of the AAC has been responsible for assisting the faculty of specific programs in the development of the program mission/purpose statement and program goals. The AAC met with the faculty of each program or discipline to review, discuss and advise the faculty in the development of performance indicators, measurement methods, a timeline for measurement, measurement criteria and a timeline for analysis.

As assessment becomes more imbedded within each curriculum, the Academic Assessment Committee’s role will be advisory to the faculty and not approval or disapproval of a particular change strategy and timeline. The AAC will continue to review the mission or purpose statement and student learning outcome goals of any new program and assist any new program in the development of the assessment worksheets. As would be expected, the committee will continue to review the assessment materials which were developed by the committee for currency and appropriateness and where deemed necessary make the appropriate changes. In the spring of each year, the AAC will develop an annual assessment activities timeline to be utilized in the next academic year. The plan is that assessment will be a continuous process without shut-down or start-up time. The AAC developed a vision and graphic representation of the vision (Appendix, U) of the role of the AAC relative to the roles and interactions of the Leadership
Team, the Academic Assessment Committee, the Curriculum Committee, the faculty, the faculty workgroups, Program Advisory Committees and program consultants. Further, the AAC discussed the significance of the assessment process relative to budget development and institutional planning.

Relative to feedback loops, the AAC has discussed the importance of utilizing the collected data and analysis for program or discipline improvement to assure student learning. Examples of the past use of assessment data were presented earlier in the document. Recall, that the faculty in the academic area of pre-college and the disciplines of mathematics and natural sciences, specifically the Human Anatomy and Physiology courses, utilized the results of assessment of student learning in determining the changes to implement in the respective courses to enhance student learning and success in the courses (Appendices, H-2, I, J). Additional past utilization of assessment to make changes in the delivery of course content to assist the students in meeting the learning outcomes will be available in the document room.

A current assessment example is the item analysis performed on one item of the final examination in the Advanced RPG programming course. The item analyzed a specific student performance that addressed the program educational goal that “Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze and modify existing programs in a variety of languages.” (Appendix, AA). An example of a current assessment activity is the assessment of writing apprehension that is being performed in the communications courses which utilize the laptop computers during instruction. More information about this activity will be available in the document room. Since the college is in the early stages of implementation of the assessment process, the document room will have additional current examples of the utilization of assessment results in making academic and institutional changes which may or may not have budget impact.

IV. Efficacy of Assessment

In selected academic programs and disciplines, faculty members have been engaged in interpreting assessment results, discussing their implications, recommending changes and implementing changes to improve student learning. Two specific examples of utilizing the
assessment process for improvement of student learning are the Pre-College Communications and Natural Sciences.

Since the autumn quarter of 1998, the Pre-College Communications' instructors have employed an end of quarter Pre-College designed course evaluation and a comment survey to assess the course assignments, textbooks, course instruction and student skill development (Appendix, H-1, H-2). From the analysis of the 1998-99 data, one resultant change was the need to change textbooks to better meet the goals of the course.

The Natural Science faculty utilize the nationally standardized Human Anatomy & Physiology examination to assess the COTC Human Anatomy and Physiology (HAP), lectures and courses (Appendix, J). The faculty collected data from 1995, 1996, 1997 an 1998 to assess the effectiveness of student learning of specific concepts. Based upon the analysis, the faculty upgraded the HAP lectures to include more information on cardiac physiology. The faculty then collected data during 1999 and 2000 and compared the results. A spurious variable that affected the comparison was that in the academic years from 1995/96 through 1998/99, all nursing students had taken Pathophysiology following their first quarter of HAP. For the comparative academic years of 1999/2000 and 2000/01, many of the students completed HAP prior to taking Pathophysiology. The faculty plan to continue to collect and analyze this data to assist them in improving student learning in the HAP courses.

Throughout the academic areas, there are other programs and disciplines utilizing some form of assessment to determine the effectiveness of the program or discipline in improving student learning. An example of another area where assessment of student learning is a routine activity is the Radiographic Technology program. The radiographic technology faculty developed a radiography assessment plan in 1997 which has been evolving since its development. Utilizing information collected from graduate and employer surveys, the radiography faculty made the decision to reduce the number of clinical hours of the Radiographic Technology program. Also, in the past, assessment findings relative to student learning were used in the five year review process for the professionally accredited programs and a few other programs or disciplines.
With an institution-wide emphasis on utilizing assessment to improve student learning, all academic and service areas are implementing similar assessment strategies to assure improvement in student learning. As presented in the Flow Chart of Assessment and Planning (Appendix, K), assessment information is included in the process of institutional planning and budget planning.

With reference to documentation of changes instituted as a result of assessment of student learning, the faculty in Pre-College Communications and Natural Sciences are continuing to document the effects of the changes on student learning. Each academic program and discipline has been asked to keep a record of the data analysis, recommendations and implemented changes and to forward a copy of the results, recommended changes and implemented changes to the appropriate Academic Director for inclusion in decision making, institutional planning and budgeting. Further, the professional staff have also been asked to follow the same process as faculty and make recommendations to the appropriate member of the President’s Cabinet for inclusion in decision making, institutional planning and budgeting.
In the Report of a Visit to Central Ohio Technical College on May 11-13, 1998, by an Evaluation Team of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, major challenge number three on page 44 stated that “Instructional equipment, especially in engineering and business technology, is often antiquated and needs to be updated to accomplish the technical mission of Central Ohio Technical College.” In section V. B. 4. of the team recommendation and rationale, the team states “…the learning tools and equipment, especially in the engineering and business laboratory areas, are old, inadequate, and jeopardize the quality of technical education available.” Therefore, one element of a focus visit to be conducted in 2001-02 would be to validate the updating of instructional equipment, especially in engineering and business technologies, to assure that the technical mission of COTC could be accomplished.

At the time of the May 1998 site visit, the Director of the Newark Campus Computer Services Area had been in the position for about 25 months and was very busy trying to implement a much needed administrative computer system and integration of a total campus computer service. During the 1997-98 academic year there was a campus-wide (COTC and OSU-N) Computer Advisory Group comprised of 13 individuals. COTC faculty were represented by one faculty from the academic program of Computer Programming and an Engineering Technology staff person who was responsible for the engineering technologies’ laboratory computers and software. The committee was charged with advising the Director of the Newark Campus Computer Services and the Newark Campus Chief Executive Officer (President of COTC & Dean/Director of OSU-N), prioritizing the computer needs of the campus community and communicating with campus computer users on issues relating to computer system policies. The major emphasis during the 1997-98 academic year was to upgrade the administrative and operational computer system and begin to upgrade the infrastructure of the Newark Campus computer systems.
On December 15, 1997, an Academic Three Year Computer Plan (Appendix, BB) was approved by the Newark Campus Senior Staff. Sources of funding for the Three Year Plan were identified as COTC capital funds, Ohio Board of Regents Instructional Equipment allocations and the Newark Campus Development Fund. Although the first year of the plan was 1997-98, the equipment purchases occurred during the 1998-99 fiscal year since the final request was presented on May 29, 1998. Thus, during the summer of 1998, the much needed replacement of the existing low power instructional computers in Engineering Technologies and Business Technologies and the addition of instructional computers in Pre-college and Allied Health was initiated. In addition to the instructional plan, there was an understanding that the COTC faculty computer needs would be addressed by either purchasing new personal computers or redeploying the replaced very functional computers from the instructional labs. The faculty were also on a three year computerization plan.

A total of 100 personal computers were purchased and installed: 26 in the CAD labs (LeFevre Hall 144 and 140), 24 in each Office Administration lab (LeFevre Hall 220 and 250), 16 in the Microcomputer lab (LeFevre 265), 5 in the Allied Health computer lab (Hopewell 140), 3 in COTC Math lab (Founders 196) and 2 in COTC Pre-College lab (Hopewell 120) Also, during the summer of 1998, the AS400 in the Computer Programming Lab was upgraded and a VAX printer was added. The 20 old 286 computers in the Nursing lab were replaced with 20 reallocated 486 computers from the CAD labs and the remaining three computers from the CAD lab were redeployed to faculty. Along with the installation of more powerful computers in the respective labs, the existing software in the CAD lab was much more functional and the software in the Office Administration labs was upgraded.

Since the Three Year Academic Computer Plan was initiated with the 1998-99 fiscal year, one year later than approved, the second year of the plan was addressed in the 1999-2000 fiscal year. The replacement of the less powerful computers in the instructional labs was continued with 60 new more powerful computers and eight high speed printers being purchased and installed. The instructional labs in which the computers were replaced and the high speed printers added were as follows: 20 computers and one high speed printer for the Electronics Networking lab (LeFevre
115), 18 computers and one high speed printer for a Business Technologies lab (LeFevre 260), 4 computers and one high speed printer for the COTC Math lab (Founders 196), four high speed printers for the Business Technologies' labs (LeFevre 220, 250, and 265), 18 computers and one high speed printer for the Open lab (Founders 106), and 10 computers for the COTC lab at the Knox County Career Center. In addition, 18 computers and printers were purchased and installed in COTC faculty offices (15 existing faculty plus three new faculty). Two existing COTC faculty received redeployed computers which were an upgrade over their existing computers.

During the 2000-01 fiscal and academic year, there was about an eight month hiatus in the continued replacement and upgrading of COTC instructional labs since there was only an Interim Director of Information Technology Services, an Interim Dean of Faculty of COTC and a vacancy in the Instructional Designer position. Following the employment of the Director of Information Technology Services (current title: Chief Information Officer) and an Instructional Designer to work with faculty in preparing for the multimedia delivery of instruction including Distance Education, a computer refresh plan was initiated for all academic labs and faculty. Within the approximate four months remaining in the 2000-01 fiscal year and the beginning of the 2001-02 fiscal year prior to the autumn quarter of 2001, 108 new computers were purchased and installed in five instructional labs and one open lab: 11 in LeFevre 140 (CAD lab), 24 in LeFevre 144 (CAD lab), 21 in Founders 96B (Computer Programming lab), 17 in LeFevre 260 (Business Technologies lab), 17 in LeFevre 265 (Microcomputer lab), and 18 Founders 106A (COTC open lab).

As a result of the installation of the 108 new computers, the very functional replaced computers were redeployed as upgraded computers in areas where lower ended or no computers were located (other instructional labs, faculty offices or support staff offices). Specifically, 18 of the replaced computers from the Engineering Technologies’ CAD lab (LeFevre 144) were moved and installed in the Engineering Technologies’ drafting lab (LeFevre 136) which did not have any computers. Since the beginning CAD course did not require as powerful computer capabilities as the advanced CAD programs, the redeployed computers allowed the drafting faculty to
integrate beginning CAD into the beginning drafting course. At the same time as the new more powerful computers were installed in the CAD labs, the College entered into an annual lease agreement with a vendor of the CAD programs to assure that the CAD programs being utilized by the faculty were the latest versions.

The Engineering Technologies' Electronics lab received additional redeployed CAD lab computers to bring the number of computers in the lab to ten which permitted the inclusion of computer simulation within the appropriate electronics courses. With the addition of the redeployed CAD computers, the software for Electronic Workbench was purchased and installed. Another three of the redeployed CAD lab computers were added to the Engineering Technologies' Electromechanical lab which gave a total of six student computers and one instructor computer for the lab.

As of Autumn 2001, all the Engineering Technologies' labs had either received new high power computers or redeployed medium to high power computers which expanded the computer capabilities in all the Engineering labs. Also, additional removable hard drives were purchased for the computers in the networking and general Engineering Technologies' lab (LeFevre 115). The additional removable hard drives that were added to LeFevre 115 gave four different hard drives for each of the 20 computers in the lab which increased the instructional capabilities for the lab. In addition to hardware, the Engineering Technologies' software in the labs was upgraded or new specific software was added. Further, as a result of a Newark Campus agreement with Microsoft Corporation, all Newark Campus computers have the Microsoft Campus software program installed. The agreement allows the Newark Campus faculty and staff to have the Microsoft Campus software programs installed on their personal home computers. The agreement includes the latest PC operating system and the latest software versions of Office, Visio, Publisher, Front Page and Visual Studio Pro.

Again, as of Autumn 2001, the computers in the Business Technologies' labs are either new computers (LeFevre 260 and Founders 96B) or have added memory, network cards and increased license capabilities (LeFevre 220, 250 and 265). Following the computer refresh plan, the
computers in LeFevre 220, 250 and 265 are scheduled for replacement in the summer of 2002. As in Engineering Technologies either new software has been added or existing software has been upgraded to the current standard found in the industry.

With funds from a 1999/2000 collaborative Ohio Board of Regents grant with the University of Cincinnati, COTC established a teleconferencing room for distance education during the 2000/01 academic year. The campus did have one other distance education room which was an OSU-N room. As of December 2001, the Newark Campus has three teleconferencing rooms plus two multimedia rooms for a total of five rooms available for multimedia presentations. The equipment in these rooms range from basic equipment of computer, monitor, visual presenter and VCR to a much more advanced multimedia instructional system consisting of a video controller, visual presenter, fax combo, laptop computer, desktop computer, LCD projector, monitor, two remote cameras, receiver, amplifier, drawing board, TV, printer, color camera and a VCR. For detailed information refer to Appendix, CC. Since the compilation of the equipment list, there have been upgrades to some of the multimedia rooms. The upgrade information will be available in the document room.

The faculty continue on the three year computer refresh plan and all new COTC faculty receive a new computer. Each faculty member has the choice of a desktop or a laptop computer with a docking station. Since implementing the choice of a desktop or laptop, the majority of faculty select the laptop which gives them more flexibility. With the renovation of classrooms to multimedia classrooms, the faculty are integrating computer presentations and web instruction into their courses. In addition, a few faculty have begun to utilize distance education including web-based and telecommunications in their instruction. Further, the College is in the early stages of collaborative distance education programs with other higher education institutions or local service businesses. Examples of these collaborative programs are COTC and Hocking College for Surgical Technology and COTC and Mt. Carmel Health for Radiographic Technology.

In considering students’ educational opportunities, the Newark Campus Development Fund provided funds to give ten COTC students a personal laptop computer. With three or four
different manufacturers being represented, the COTC administration and funding committee members asked the ten students to provide data as to how they used the computers, the value the computers added to their educational experience and specifics about the functionality and operation of their respective computer. In exchange for the data, the students were allowed to keep the personal laptop computers. The Campus administration was most anxious to collect information on the different computers as the Campus was planning on developing and implementing a Newark Campus Laptop Initiative.

In the autumn of 2001, as a result of another Newark Campus Development Fund grant, a Dell Computer Cart holding 24 computers was purchased to initiate the Student Laptop Initiative. With the advice of the Chief Information Officer and the Newark Campus Instructional Designer, the College administration decided that it would be best to begin with one class to pilot the initiative. The faculty selected for the pilot project was a Diagnostic Medical Sonography faculty member as there were plans to create a collaborative Diagnostic Medical Sonography program with another Ohio Technical College in the autumn of 2002. The pilot program would allow the instructional designer, ITS staff, faculty member and students to work through the problems associated with utilizing laptop computers as an instructional aid in the classroom. The Diagnostic Medical Sonography faculty continued with the use of the Laptop Computer cart during the winter quarter and spring quarter. In addition, during the spring quarter of 2002, each of the three communications faculty are piloting the use of the Laptop Computer Cart with one or two of their respective sections of Composition I.

During the winter quarter of 2002, The Ohio State University at Newark Board of Trustees approved the allocation of one million dollars from the reserve funds of The Ohio State University at Newark for the purpose of upgrading and enhancing the technology infrastructure of the Newark Campus with the stated understanding that both COTC and OSU-N would equally benefit from the improvements.

In addition to the major thrust of funding the upgrading of the college's computer equipment and computer infrastructure, funds from the Newark Campus Development Fund, some of COTC's
capital funds and the Ohio Board of Regents equipment funds were utilized to improve or add other laboratory equipment. Funds from the Newark Campus Development Fund were utilized to purchase automation lab equipment for the Electromechanical Engineering Technology lab and the Link Projection System for the Business Technologies' labs in LeFevre Hall (rooms 220, 250 and 260).

COTC capital funds or Ohio Board of Regents equipment funds were used to purchase and install the following laboratory equipment: coordinate measurement machine, transfer line equipment, bar code equipment and plotter in Engineering Technologies; digital camera for Early Childhood Development Technology; Advanced Life Support Trainer, HeartSim with monitor interface, Advanced Life Support baby, cricothyrotomy equipment and laryngoscope with blades for Emergency Medical Services Paramedic program; camcorder with tripod, digital camera and copy stand for the Human Services program; UV/VIS spectrophotometer, multiple Spectronic 20 D+ spectrophotometer, digital camera, drug screening detectors, extraction vacuum manifold and mini crime scope for the Forensic Science program; shotguns for the Criminal Justice Program; intravenous arm and hospital bed accessories for Nursing Technology; major general surgical instruments, minor general surgical instruments, electro-surgical unit, used D & C set, used prep stand, used intravenous pole, suction unit and kick bucket for Surgical Technology. Also, some of these funds were utilized to add specialized software (obstetrical package) for the MedSim unit in Diagnostic Medical Sonography. In addition to the COTC capital funds and OBR equipment funds, COTC and OSU-N cost-shared capital funds and OBR equipment funds were used to purchase a new cadaver, instructional models and a microscope projection system for the Natural Sciences to outfit the added biology laboratory.

A summary table of added and upgraded instructional aids and equipment purchased since the summer quarter of 1998 through the winter quarter of 2002 is provided in Appendix DD.
SECTION VI: GENERAL EDUCATION

In the Report of a Visit to Central Ohio Technical College on May 11-13, 1998, by an Evaluation Team of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, major challenge number four on page 44 stated that "The General Education core is in a major state of transition, and the College needs to document if its centrality is embraced and understood by all instructional staff." In section V. B. 4. of the team recommendation and rationale, the team states, "there is no way to currently evaluate the General Education core without one or two graduating classes completing the new General Education sequence." Therefore, one element of a focus visit to be conducted in 2001-02 would be to validate if the centrality of the General Education core is embraced and understood by all instructional staff.

On October 27, 1997, the Vice President and Dean of Faculty, sent a memorandum (Appendix, EE) to COTC full-time faculty and the professional staff to inform all parties that the autumn quarter of 1998 would be the effective implementation date of the general education core that had been approved by the five Division Chairpersons. The approved required general education core consisted of 11 credit hours of communication courses to include writing and speaking, a minimum of 3 credit hours of college mathematics, one college level laboratory science course and a minimum of 3 credit hours of college level social and behavioral sciences.

Although the faculty knew the general education core was a requirement, the Business Technologies' faculty did not agree with the requirement of a laboratory science. Recognizing that the Business Technologies faculty did not agree with the science requirement, the science faculty and their Division Chairperson met with the Division Chairperson of Business Technologies to discuss the integration of business examples into the environmental science course. Even with the effort to utilize business examples within the environmental science course, the Business Technologies' faculty continued to not be supportive of requiring a laboratory science course in the business plans-of-study. Today, in the spring of 2002, it appears
that the Business Technologies’ faculty have reluctantly accepted the laboratory science requirement even if they do not see the need.

With reference to the faculty of the other academic programs, the core general education requirements were accepted and supported. Due to the nature of two of the health programs (Nursing and Radiographic Technology), the core mathematic requirement became a requirement for admission to the two programs. Since the students in the Human Services program must take three human services communication skills courses (interpersonal skills, counseling skills and group counseling skills), they are not required to complete another oral communications course.

Overall, there are faculty that are very supportive of the general education core while there are other faculty that agree to meet the requirement with reluctance. It is the perception that the faculty are adhering to the required general education core that was implemented in the Autumn of 1998.

At the present time, the requirement of adding a minimum three credit humanities course to the general education core is beginning to be discussed. A humanities course is required for the students enrolled in the teaching option of the Early Childhood Development program. Further, the addition of a required humanities course for all COTC students would enhance transfer opportunities of COTC students and graduates.

To be in compliance with the Ohio Board of Regents mandate that all public two year colleges in Ohio meet the requirements of the Transfer Module, COTC must provide each student with the opportunity to complete the Transfer Module. The elements of the Transfer Module are minimum of five quarter hours of English, three quarter hours of mathematics, nine quarter hours of arts/humanities, nine quarter hours of social sciences, nine quarter hours of natural sciences and nine quarter hours of interdisciplinary studies. Since COTC shares a campus with OSU-N and there is a cross-registration policy between the two institutions, a COTC student is able to enroll in the OSU-N arts/humanities courses and thus meet all the requirements of the Transfer Module. Relative to assessment of the general education core across the curriculum, the
members of the Academic Assessment Committee discussed the need to define the seven or eight general education competencies that a graduate of COTC should meet. At the first spring quarter meeting of the AAC, the members determined that they would request that the identification of seven or eight general education competencies be one of the first autumn quarter 2002 activities of the assessment-curriculum faculty workgroups. Upon completion of the identification of the core general education competencies, the AAC proposed that a matrix be established that would allow each faculty member to match individual course content against the core general education competencies. The purpose would be to determine where the core competencies are addressed across the curriculum. Upon completing the across the curriculum determinations, assessment of the core general education competencies could be instituted with the possibility of using primary trait analysis as one method of assessment.

In conclusion, as the faculty become more involved in the assessment-curriculum process and the identification of core general education competencies that a graduate of COTC should possess, it is anticipated that the faculty will fully support and appreciate the importance of general education for any college graduate.