SUMMARY REPORT ON FACULTY ASSESSMENT DAY, SPRING 2014
Thursday, May 8th, 2014

On 8th of March 2014, more than 50 faculty and staff members gathered in the Special Events Room of the SUNY Maritime College to participate in a campus-wide assessment activity. In the morning session, the following talks were given:

- Opening remarks – Dr. Timothy Lynch
- Report on Student Evaluations – Capt. Mark Woolley
- Completion Rates – Ian August

After these talks, there was a breakout session for the departments to discuss assessment items. The summary of breakout session activities of each department is as follows:

- GBAT Department: GBAT department worked on assessment of 2 General Education courses – Macro and micro economics. They also prepared the ITM External Review which is due 2014.
- Humanities Department: Humanities department invited Dr. Gene Hammond, who leads The Program in Writing and Rhetoric, in SUNY Stony Brook. He discussed student attitudes, especially of non-HUMN majors, towards writing. He focused particularly on assessing Critical Thinking in Humanities coursework and quantifying the qualitative. He talked about Bold vs. Timid Inferences, shifting roles of reading and writing in culture and the mechanics of writing.
- Engineering Department: Engineering department had a meeting on ABET Assessment and Future Requirements and worked on assessment for USCG review. The Engineering Department feels that all 1st Year Engineering students should start in MATH 101 regardless of placement testing. Assessment data has been gathered, and distributed to curriculum leaders for inclusion in reports. Continued preparation for upcoming ABET and STCW visits in the fall of 2016 are ongoing.
- PET Department: PET department created learning outcomes and made plans to measure the learning outcomes for the following new courses: PS414, PS120. They discussed ways to offer PS410/PS411 online.
- Science Department: Assessment for following courses: MATH 102, MATH 212, MATH 80, MATH 90, CHEM 121, BIO 210. Program assessment for BIO416
- Naval Science Department: Discussed staff summer turnover (continuity) and manpower. In order to promote continuity, they worked on Midshipmen Guidebook and Staff SOP development.
- MT Department: MT Department worked in preparation for the Summer Cruise
- Library: This semester we conducted a multi-faceted review of our website. Our findings were as follows: 1. The vast majority of website users visit our site looking for either our catalog, our hours, or articles in our databases. 2. The survey and in-person testing responses indicated that users like (or are neutral towards) our overall design. However, they made suggestions for small changes that they felt
would vastly improve user experience notably, using user-oriented language and adding features such as a site search and video tutorials.

In the afternoon, four departments gave presentations on their work during the breakout session:

- Humanities (GenEd and Writing Assessment)
- Science – (Natural Sciences)
- GBAT – (Social Sciences)
- Library Website Usability Assessment

I attach the slides used during the presentation for further information.

Sincerely,

Daniel An
Chair, Faculty Assessment Committee
Faculty Assessment Day

Morning Session

• Opening Remarks
  by Dr. Timothy Lynch, (Provost/VPAA)

• Report on Student Evaluations
  by Capt. Mark Woolley

• Report on Completion Rates by Ian August

• Breakout Sessions by department

*** Schedule Change: Lunch at 12:30PM
Presentation will begin with the lunch
Institutional Research and Assessment Update
Class Survey

• Problem encountered in Fall 2013 was due to poorly reproduced forms.
• New forms ordered from printing service and randomly tested prior to distribution.
• All surveys successfully scanned and processed this year with the exception of a few.
Response Rate
Spring 2014 Class Survey

- Does not include online or independent study courses
Feedback from Faculty

• Need surveys distributed earlier than we did this year (9 April) to allow sufficient time to complete
• Many Courses with Lab have same instructor and students. Do students need to fill out the survey for both the class and lab?
• Do we need additional policy?
Current Survey Policy
Minutes of the Faculty Meeting of 07 April 2010

• “Be it resolved that: The Student Policies Committee recommends approval of the attached set of survey questions to be administered at the end of each semester on pre-printed Scantron forms, and The Student Policies Committee recommends that the resulting data will be compiled and disseminated to faculty and department chairpersons by the Office of Institutional Research & Assessment for purposes of improving teaching effectiveness, but not for purposes of tenure and promotion decisions.”
Spring 2014

Completion Rates

93 submitted out of 213 possible students = 46%
Spring 2014

Completion Rates

93 submitted out of 213 possible students = 46%

Individual Course Totals

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spring 2014

Completion Rates with error rates

93 submitted out of 183 possible students (3 students per course x 10 courses) 51%
Spring 2014

Completion Rates with error rates

93 submitted out of 183 possible students (3 students per course x 10 courses) 51%

Individual Course Totals
Change with errors

1. 77% - 87%
2. 67% - 80%
3. 65% - 74%
4. 61% - 73%
5. 58% - 67%
6. 55% - 60
7. 32% - 34%
8. 11% - 12%
9. 4% - 4%
WRITING ASSESSMENT

- Dr. Gene Hammond
  - The Program in Writing and Rhetoric, SUNY Stony Brook
  - Discussion of student attitudes, especially of non-HUMN majors, towards writing
    - Particular focus on assessing Critical Thinking in Humanities coursework and quantifying the qualitative
      - Bold vs. Timid Inferences
  - Shifting roles of reading and writing in culture
  - Discussion of mechanics of writing
HUMN 202 - WESTERN CIVILIZATION
Percentages in Traditional vs. Online Courses

- Exceeding
- Meeting
- Approaching
- Not Meeting

Traditional:
- Exceeding: 6%
- Meeting: 57%
- Approaching: 16%
- Not Meeting: 6%

Online:
- Exceeding: 6%
- Meeting: 49%
- Approaching: 24%
- Not Meeting: 6%
HISTORY 102 - AM HIST/SOC SCI

The diagram shows the percentage distribution of student performance on the pre-test and post-test. The categories are Exceeding, Meeting, Approaching, and Not Meeting. The chart indicates a significant improvement in performance from the pre-test to the post-test.
CRITICAL THINKING ASSESSMENT

- Comparison of lower (freshman) and higher (seniors) writing assignments
  - Average score of both majors and non-majors on pre-test was *approaching* standards
  - Average score of both majors and non-majors on post-test was *meeting* standards
GEN ED: HUMN AND ARTS

- Regular, rolling assessment of all Humanities electives (ENGL, HIST, HUMN, CHIN, SPAN)
- Analysis of most unique course objective for each elective via a major course assignment
- Twenty-six electives assessed; almost five hundred students in sample
- Interesting divergence in students in the middle of the pack, online compared to traditional
  - Fewer students “meeting” or above in online courses
  - Combined with higher dropout rate (not included in assessment of assignments), a cause for concern
  - Goal for 2014-15, work with Ian August on this issue as we continue to develop online courses
ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES IN GENERAL EDUCATION

Social Science
GBEC 121 Macroeconomics & GBEC 122 Microeconomics

Spring 2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All</th>
<th>Exceeding</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Approaching</th>
<th>Failing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding* Goal 1, 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge** Goal 2</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Understanding of the methods social scientists use to explore social phenomena, including observation, hypothesis development, measurement and data collection, experimentation, evaluation of evidence, and employment of mathematical and interpretive analysis

**Goal 1:** Application of social sciences' methodology and model building  
**Goal 3:** Application of mathematical and interpretive analysis  
**Goal 4:** Data collection and data interpretation

**Knowledge of major concepts, models and issues of at least one discipline in the social sciences**  
**Goal 2:** Knowledge of major concepts of and issues and models of Economics
Knowledge of major concepts, models and issues of at least one discipline in the social sciences
Understanding of the methods social scientists use to explore social phenomena, including observation, hypothesis development, measurement and data collection, experimentation, evaluation of evidence, and employment of mathematical and interpretive analysis.
GenEd Natural Sciences

Department of Science
SUNY Maritime College
Learning Outcomes

1. Understanding of the methods scientists use to explore natural phenomena, including observation, hypothesis development, measurement and data collection, experimentation, evaluation of evidence, and employment of mathematical analysis

2. Application of scientific data, concepts, and models in one of the natural sciences
## Learning Outcome 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LO 1</th>
<th># Assessed</th>
<th>% Assessed</th>
<th>%Exceeded</th>
<th>%Mete</th>
<th>%Approach</th>
<th>%Not Meeting</th>
<th>%E+M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 122 (LAB)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>46.70</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>33.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>66.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 213/202 (LAB)</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METE 201</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.49</td>
<td>91.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO 201</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26.70</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>26.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>47.85</td>
<td>35.16</td>
<td>31.70</td>
<td>14.27</td>
<td>18.86</td>
<td>66.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Learning Outcome 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th># Assessed</th>
<th>% Assessed</th>
<th>%Exceeded</th>
<th>%Meet</th>
<th>%Approach</th>
<th>%Not Meeting</th>
<th>%E+M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 121</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>23.30</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>23.30</td>
<td>63.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 211/102</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METE 201</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>79.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO 201</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>26.70</td>
<td>26.70</td>
<td>26.70</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>53.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>44.38</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>34.43</td>
<td>19.02</td>
<td>19.17</td>
<td>61.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes and suggestions for future

- The assessment plan for General Chemistry I was re-written following the spring 2011 assessment. It was approved by the Faculty at SUNY Maritime College.
- Increase the number of students assessed.
- Choose a different type of assessment in order to have better assessment of GenEd learning outcomes.
Major Findings (Chemistry)

- Students had difficulty understanding how to employ PV=nRT, or more specifically how to convert to the appropriate units needed for this formula based on the units of the gas constant.

- Interestingly, the same percentage of students mastered or achieved LO#1 when this assessment was last done in Fall 2011.
Major Findings (Biology)

- With 60% of the students not meeting the expected standard there is reason for concern. The extremely high percentage of students not meeting the standard speaks to the student inability to grasp the scientific method. Three of the students not meeting the expected standard are non-science majors and a number of these students are also enrolled in remedial math. (Math 80). These two characteristics can be possible reasons for their poor performance. However, there is still a concern that so many of the students fell into this category.
Major Findings (Physics)

- Results in “exceeding + meeting” were somewhat better for calculus-based students than algebra-based students, as expected. Students in calculus-based physics seem to be better at free-body diagrams. This suggests the importance of emphasizing the first crucial steps. Still, overall “exceeding+ meeting” seems too low for an effective course. Some problems are poor algebra skills and conceptualization of the physics. There is too much desire to plug in to an equation which they don’t understand conceptually.
Library Website Evaluation

Rebecca Hyams
Cataloging, Metadata, and Systems Librarian
Why Evaluate?

- What web designers think users want isn’t always what the users really want
  - Best way to find out what users want is to ask them

- Usability testing was not done prior to launch of current site design

- Adding Discovery System to site over the summer

- New campus web server will support more dynamic elements
How did we Evaluate?

- Three-pronged evaluation approach
  - Survey Monkey
  - Google Analytics
  - In-person usability testing

- Background research on usability studies in general and case studies of library website evaluations
Website Survey

- Survey Monkey link posted on the library homepage and sent out in email
- Targeted instruction sessions
  - May have lead to overrepresentation of 4C/Freshmen students in results
- Survey consisted of 18 questions
  - Some were targeted only to certain groups
- Questions were about technology habits (frequent websites, devices, use on campus)
Survey Responses

- 47 responses, largely undergraduates

- 81% Undergraduate
- 9% Graduate
- 6% Faculty
- 2% Staff
- 2% Administration
Interesting Findings

- The majority of respondents use tablets and smartphones to connect to the internet, just not our website.
- 68.2% of respondents are not regular library users (self-reported).
- When they do come to our site, they’re looking for three main things: our catalog, our databases, and our hours.
Q: The SUNY Maritime Library Website is...

Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easy to navigate</th>
<th>Well-organized</th>
<th>User-friendly</th>
<th>Visually appealing</th>
<th>Easy to understand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Completely Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Somewhat Disagree
- Completely Disagree
Q: Which of the following features would you like to see added to the SUNY Maritime Library website?

![Bar chart showing responses to the question about library feature preferences. The options are Video tutorials, Library calendar, Additional course guides, Mobile-friendly pages, Text message reference, IM reference, More digital collections. The chart indicates the number of responses for each category with different colored bars.]

- Video tutorials: 14 responses (5 want to see, 4 would like to see, 2 don't care, 2 not interested).
- Library calendar: 14 responses (5 want to see, 4 would like to see, 2 don't care, 3 not interested).
- Additional course guides: 14 responses (9 want to see, 4 would like to see, 2 don't care, 1 not interested).
- Mobile-friendly pages: 10 responses (9 want to see, 1 would like to see, 0 don't care, 0 not interested).
- Text message reference: 8 responses (5 want to see, 3 would like to see, 0 don't care, 0 not interested).
- IM reference: 9 responses (5 want to see, 4 would like to see, 0 don't care, 0 not interested).
- More digital collections: 6 responses (5 want to see, 1 would like to see, 0 don't care, 0 not interested).
When Asked About Our Site...

- Results were mostly neutral-positive
  - No real way of knowing if the neutral response is a true neutral or the response of the apathetic
- The features our patrons want are ones that will be easy to implement
  - Our patrons aren’t as interested in the big buzzwords in the library web services (text and chat reference, social media...)
Google Analytics

- Tracking code on each page
- Special code on links to external resources to track usage
  - As an information portal, we want to see what people are using and how they’re getting to the information
- Data is anonymous
Page views

Total: 15052

- [Library Homepage]: 72%
- Porthole Student Newspaper: 16%
- Hours of Operation: 2%
- Popular Databases: 1%
- Databases by Subject: 2%
- Meet the Staff: 3%
- Databases A to Z List: 1%
- Archives: 1%
- [All other pages]: 1%
“Events”

Total: 9569 (64% of all views)

Catalog - Middle of homepage: 57%
Ebsco search box: 9%
Catalog - Page header: 9%
Journal title search: 4%
Ebsco (dropdown): 3%
Proquest (dropdown): 2%
Campus homepage: 2%
Gale (dropdown): 2%
JSTOR (dropdown): 2%
All other events: 2%

(64% of all views)
“Events” per page

- 95.0%: Library homepage
- 2.2%: Databases by Subject
- 0.7%: Popular Databases
- 0.5%: eBooks
- 0.4%: Databases A to Z List
- 0.1%: [All other pages]
Sessions per device type

- Desktop (includes laptops): 95%
- Mobile: 3%
- Tablet: 2%
In-person Study

- Five participants
  - 1 graduate student, 3 undergraduates, 1 staff member
  - Number of participants recommended by usability expert Jakob Nielsen
- Nine tasks made up of standard library tasks
- Recorded the session using Camtasia screen capture software and a digital voice recorder
In-person Results

- Four out of nine tasks were successfully completed by all five participants
  - Catalog, hours, policies, course guides
- However, some tasks were completed with much difficulty, even if the answer was ultimately found
- The remaining five tasks were completed by 80% of participants
Participant Suggestions

- Clarifying language
  - Some language was off-putting or confusing
- Design tweaks
  - Reordering or adding links
- Simplifying pages
  - Paring down language and lists
- Adding an actual FAQ
  - Right now, the page says “coming soon!”
What did we learn?

- By far our most popular feature is the catalog search box in the middle of the homepage
  - Patrons turn to the search box when they don’t know where else to find information, even if the search box is just for the catalog
- Overall our page design is liked by patrons, but we can do more to improve usability
Future Changes

- Dynamic PHP-based pages
  - Enable us to customize and display a live calendar and new acquisitions
- Creation of short video tutorials
- Integration of our new discovery layer (name TBD)
Questions/Comments?
Professional, Training, and Education Department

Faculty Assessment Day
Spring 2014

Lesson Plans Course Material
PS 414 and PS 120
PS 120
Primer of Towing

PREREQUISITE(S) – None

LEARNING OUTCOME(S)

● Have the ability to operate a simple powerboat in familiar waters in light to moderate wind and sea conditions.
● Enhance knowledge of seamanship, terminology, weather, water conditions (i.e. wind, tides, currents), safety equipment and responding to boating related medical emergencies
● Earn USCG 4-hour Assistance Towing course completion certificate for an Endorsement to any license up to Master Not More Than 200 Gross Tons

MEASUREMENT(S)

1. Exams
2. Practicum
3. Captain’s Evaluation MTDO 524
PS 414
Bridge Resource Management

PREREQUISITE(S) – MTDO 524, MT 520, or MT 521

LEARNING OUTCOME(S)
- Be able to demonstrate knowledge of Bridge Resource Management
- Be able to demonstrate knowledge of Ship Maneuvering and Handling

MEASUREMENT(S)
1. Exams
2. Practicum
3. Captain’s Evaluation MTDO 525
## Regulatory Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PS 414</th>
<th>PS 120</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NVIC 12-14</td>
<td>SUNYDP-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table A-II/1 – OICNW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER B-II + B-VIII – STCW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 CFR 11.309(a)(4)(vii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMO Model Course 1.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table A-II/1 – OICNW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section B-I/12 – STCW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 CFR 11.301 (e) + 11.309(a)(4)(xvi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMO Model Course 1.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On-Line Resources

- **Lecture**
  - Useful Links
  - Case Studies
  - Voyage Plan Guidelines
    - Station Bill
    - Watch Bill
    - Standing Orders
    - Night Orders

- **Lab Exercise**
  - Available on line with date listed on Calendar
  - Goals and Objectives