2018-2019 Program Review Assessment Report

(Based on data results from 2017-2018)

Item Analysis of Assessment Committee Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Reflection</th>
<th>Refinement</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Meets Expectations</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Insights:

- Faculty's biggest areas of strength is dialogue and refinement, which is the goal of the assessment process
- Identified need for cross-discipline dialogue
- Identified need for faculty to norm assessment tools and procedures across similar sections
- Identified need of more detailed scoring rubrics
- Identified need to norm faculty's interpretation of “exceeds”, “meets”, and “does not meet” standards
- Full-time faculty need to work closely with adjunct to help them with assessment

Challenges:

- 64/154 = 42% of instructional programs submitted assessment reports
- Insufficient data entered into eLumen to assess the program
- Go beyond the data – describe what the numbers mean for the students in the program
- Cut and paste to all programs within the department
- Need for wider faculty participation in completion of assessment reports

Best Practices:

- Increased participation of faculty desiring to assess all SLOs for all sections to provide better data for program analysis
- Assessment is a standing agenda item for all department meetings
- Norming of assessment tools across instructors/sections
- Department goal of providing eLumen training for adjunct faculty members
- Normed assessment tools and procedures with course leads to monitor process

Assessment Committee Considerations for Change:

- Check boxes to clearly identify type of program
- Norm definition of program (Title 5)
- Adding number of sections and/or students assessed column to the assessment chart