Core Theme Three: Data and Scoring Criteria	Year	Value(s)	Below Mission Expectation	Meets Mission Expectation	Surpasses Mission Expectation	Score: 1 = Below Expectations 3 = Meets Expectations 5 = Exceeds Expectations
3.1 Students agree that Lane provides a high quality educational environment.	2016-17	**49 -** Lane's CCSSE average of 5 benchmark scores	<49	49-58	>58	3
3.2 Percentage of degree-seeking students accessing advising and academic planning to create clear roadmaps to learning and success.	2016-17	**88%** Reported using academic advising or planning services during the current academic year (CCSSE). **52%** Reported that an advisor helped them to develop an academic plan by the end of their first term at Lane.	<89%	90-95%	>95%	1
3.3 Percentage of employees that participate in professional development related to their roles and responsibilities, which contributes to a quality educational environment.	2018-19	**87%** Reported PD activities* **89%** Reported PD activities enhanced their ability to contribute to Lane's quality educational environment. * Exclusive of Spring Conference and Fall Inservice	<75%	75%-90%	>90%	3
3.4 Percentage of educational programs that are aligned with Core Learning Outcomes (CLOs) through course-level and/or program-level learning outcomes.	2017-18	**20%** Completed some level of alignment mapping to CLOs	<50% of programs have established curriculum maps at course and/or program level	50% of programs have established curriculum maps at course and/or program level	>50% of programs have established curriculum maps at course and/or program level	1
3.5 Percentage of educational programs that have systematically developed and implemented student learning assessment plans.	2017-18	**13%** Established assessment plans or assessment goals	<50% of programs have student learning assessment plans or goals	50-75% of programs have student learning assessment plans or goals	>75% of programs have student learning assessment plans or goals	1
3.6 Services and programs are systematically reviewed and revised to reflect current disciplinary and industry practices and workforce needs with the aim of continuously improving the teaching and learning environment.	2017-18	**39% Weighted average for all programs** **Rate - Group** 35% - Academic Programs 20% - Student Affairs Programs 90% - College Services	<85% reviewed and revised	85-90% reviewed and revised	>90% reviewed and revised	1

Core Theme Three: Scoring Rationale and Comments	Criteria for Below Mission Expectation	Criteria for Meets Mission Expectation	Criteria for Surpasses Mission Expectation
3.1 Students agree that Lane provides a high quality educational environment.	<49	49-58	>58

Rationale for Criteria: The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) is an established instrument with several years of data that can be used to focus on good educational practice and identify areas in which we can improve programs and services for students. Evaluation criteria were set based on review of comparison data shown below.

Comments: The metric is an average of all five CCSSE Benchmark Scores:

Score	Lane	(Large Colleges)	[Average of Highest Performing Schools]	{Oregon Colleges}
Active & Collaborative Learning:	**49.3**	(49.4)	[58.8]	{49.0}
Student Effort:	**51.8**	(49.9)	[57.9]	{49.7}
Academic Challenge:	**48.3**	(49.5)	[56.1]	{49.3}
Student-Faculty Interaction:	**48.9**	(48.8)	[58.5]	{51.2}
Support for Learners:	**46.0**	(49.0)	[58.4]	{48.4}

	Below	Meets	Surpasses
3.2 Percentage of degree-seeking students accessing advising and academic planning to create clear roadmaps to learning and success.	<89%	90-95%	>95%

Rationale for Criteria: Proactive consultations with academic advisors are a part of new student orientations and should be happening for all. New award seekers are required to complete an initial plan as part of new student advising. Evaluation criteria were set based on the goal of all students completing such advising with a recognition that inevitably some will avoid it or simply fail to report having done so.

Comments: After reviewing new data, the committee is no longer comfortable with the score from the previous year. A new system of tracking this advising step has been implemented using the SARS database which will be used in the future to assess progress, rather than relying on the self-reported rates from CCSSE or SENSE.

	Below	Meets	Surpasses
3.3 Percentage of employees that participate in professional development related to their roles and responsibilities, which contributes to a quality educational environment.	<75%	75%-90%	>90%

Rationale for Criteria: Active engagement with professional development enables our staff to stay on top of recent developments in their disciplines and/or new thinking about teaching within that discipline. Evaluation criteria were set using a consensus process to determine appropriate cut points for mission fulfillment.

Comments: We have new data for this from a survey of Lane employees that suggests we are performing very well. There is some concern that differential survey response rates may skew the results. For example, much lower response rates for PT/hourly classified, who reported less professional development activities, may mean that overall results are biased upwards. This weighed into our evaluation.

	Below	Meets	Surpasses
3.4 Percentage of educational programs that are aligned with Core Learning Outcomes (CLOs) through course-level and/or program-level learning outcomes.	<50% of programs have established curriculum maps at course and/or program level	50% of programs have established curriculum maps at course and/or program level	>50% of programs have established curriculum maps at course and/or program level

Rationale for Criteria: The "meets mission" expectation value is set at 50% to reflect an aspirational goal for having at least 50% of programs involved in student learning and assessment work within the next five years.

Comments: There is a potential for an increase in student learning assessment activities, such as curriculum mapping, as Academic Program Review becomes more systematic, and as student learning assessment is better integrated. This number (14/71 programs) was derived from Assessment Team records. A program was counted as having a curriculum map if only one course was noted as having been mapped. Considering this information, findings indicate the college will need to focus more energy on supporting development of curriculum mapping, which is an important pre-assessment activity. Mapping provides a visual means for indicating alignment among course-level learning outcomes, program-level learning outcomes, and CLOs. It also indicates how student attainment of learning outcomes will be assessed (direct evidence). In-depth curriculum maps may also indicate indirect evidence to be used in conjunction with direct assessment, including such tools as end-of-course evaluations, student surveys, and data related to enrollment and completion.

	Below	Meets	Surpasses
3.5 Percentage of educational programs that have systematically developed and implemented student learning assessment plans.	<50% of programs have student learning assessment plans or goals	50-75% of programs have student learning assessment plans or goals	>75% of programs have student learning assessment plans or goals

Rationale for Criteria: The "meets mission" expectation value reflects an aspirational goal that at least 50% of academic programs will have developed multi-year student learning assessment plans.

Comments: This number (9/71 programs) was derived from Assessment Team records and implementation plans from Academic Program Review (APR) teams. These documents may include assessment goals and do not necessarily rise to the level of "plan". However, a program was counted as having a "plan" if at least one assessment goal was stated. Findings indicate a need to improve support for development of assessment plans and assessment goal-setting. This work has already started, with addition of a required assessment inquiry question in the APR self-study phase. Additionally, the Assessment Team is building a peer liaison structure by which to aid faculty in developing assessment plans and assessment goals during Year 2 of APR, which is when implementation plans are written.

	Below	Meets	Surpasses
3.6 Services and programs are systematically reviewed and revised to reflect current disciplinary and industry practices and workforce needs with the aim of continuously improving the teaching and learning environment.	<85% reviewed and revised	85-90% reviewed and revised	>90% reviewed and revised

Rationale for Criteria: The criteria were set with the goal of all programs completing a scheduled review by the end of 2022 but an allowance that one or two programs may not finish in any given year. Currently programs in the three areas are on somewhat different timelines and planning processes, so it was challenging to pick evaluation criteria for an overall completion rate.

Comments: Planning and tracking for program review across the three areas has been evolving rapidly over the last year, and currently we need a better shared system to assess progress for programs in all areas. In addition, we need to re-evaluate annual progress metrics versus a metric for achievement of the ultimate goal that all programs will eventually complete reviews as part of a sustainable system of ongoing assessment.

Academic Program Review (APR) Comments: In 2015-16 6/8 completed; in 2016-17 7/8 completed; in 2017-18 12/12 completed. We expect an average of one program may not complete each year.

Student Affairs Program Review Comments: 20% (3 of 15) of Student Affairs have begun program review, and the remaining programs are scheduled. Student Affairs is using the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) process for reviews (https://www.cas.edu/generalstandards). CAS represents professional standards of practice (https://www.cas.edu/programreview). Programs that undertake a review make changes to services and programs based on the findings of the CAS self-study process.

College Services Program Review Comments: 90% (9 of 10) of College Services have participated in at least 1 program review and some are beginning a 2nd review. College Services uses a review process that includes: "identifying global issues, opportunities and areas of analysis," external "environmental scanning," and "CAS/industry standards," which reflect current practices (https://www.lanecc.edu/sites/default/files/collegeservices/program-review-process-timeline.pdf). Services that undertake a review make changes to services based on the findings of the self-study process.