

Program Review – Assessment Report

Name of Program:

Electronics Technology

Plan – Describe the process used to assess the courses for this program.

We follow the process developed by the college, by assessing a portion of the course CSLO's each year. In courses with a single faculty member teaching them, that faculty member has created an assessment plan/rubric that is used for each CSLO. For multiple faculty members teaching a course, the rubric is shared among them, and it is the responsibility of each faculty member to assess his/her sections of that course. Generally, the tests/exams that are normally conducted for the purpose of student grading are used to assess the CSLO that applies. There are other assessment methods used, such as lab work completion/grading and observation of students performing a hands-on skill covered in the CSLO.

Since this is the first year of gathering and comparing all the CSLO performance percentages on a single table, you will notice as we did, that the results are all over the board. If the grade distribution of these courses was also displayed in table form, we expect a more uniform result.

With all due respect, we can see several weaknesses in the current SLO assessment and reporting processes that limit the usefulness of the data that is currently available to us. Since we are self-assessing, we felt it was important to include these concerns in this document.

1) There appears to be a high variation between standards used among the various courses. What one faculty member would classify as "exceeds performance" or "meets performance" varies widely among the courses. However, many of the same students are reflected in other courses in the table, and their course grades probably vary by only one or possibly two letter grades between the courses.

2) Previous assessment data was reported by hand (before using eLumen, we used spreadsheets) and that data appears to not be reflected. Also, when CSLO's change, the course starts over with assessment data (hence in the upcoming years, there will be several summary data tables for each course, with different assessment methods/standards used between the two).

3) The college timing of assessment requires only one or a few CSLO's to be assessed each year, so many of the courses have a total percentage that could be based on only one or a few CSLO's and not the entire CSLO list. Therefore, the overall performance of the class for ALL CSLO's will not be available for several more years. Making decisions on the effectiveness of a course based on only one or two CSLO's out of the total does not seem reasonable at this point.

Assess – Fill in the table using the data from the report SLO Performance - By Department, Course, CSLO

Courses	% Students Exceed	% Students Meets	% Students Doesn't Meet	% Students N/A	Total
ELET B1	12.5%	54.69%	26.56%	6.25%	100%
ELET B4	47.2%	38.9%	13.9%	0%	100%
ELET B5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

ELET B6	27.5%	50%	10%	12.5%	100%
ELET B55a	37.24%	39.32%	18.62%	4.83%	100%
ELET B55a	15.38%	52.56%	32.05%	0%	100%
ELET B56	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELET B58	20.9%	62%	17.1%	0%	100%
ELET B61	23.8%	76.2%	0%	0%	100%
ELET B62	42.8%	57.2%	0%	0%	100%
ELET B70	21.4%	53.3%	19.2%	6.1%	100%
INDT B10	1.1%	63.6%	25.4%	10.1%	100%
MFGT B1ab	5.4%	80.8%	13.8%	0%	100%
WELD B1b	40.8%	39.7%	15.5%	4%	100%

Reflect – Based on the SLO performance data listed in the table, describe both the strengths and weaknesses of the program.

Again, a significant number of the courses have data totals based on the assessment of only one or two of the CSLO's, and the performance standards (as explained above) appear to vary wildly among the courses in the program. Compare both versions of ELET B55a as an example. They both appear because the CSLO's were revised when the course was updated. The percentages varied greatly, even though the average student population between those two time periods did not deviate in an appreciable way.

With that qualifier, we feel that the number of students that meet or exceed the standards in the courses we teach in our program (the ELET ones) are a very significant and commendable result **in this highly technical and demanding program**. We expected the class having the highest percentage of “doesn't meet” standards students would be our ELET B1 class, which is often the first technical class they take when they enter the program without previous college experience, or as an older adult that has years, if not decades of time since they last took an academic course.

The glaring weakness we see is the significant variation among the standards applied to their classes when individual faculty members developed their own. The table form of our assessment efforts as shown above does not reflect the individual reflection and planning that occurred when we reported the CSLO data and reflected on it each year. In our program faculty meetings (which unfortunately did not have consistent minutes taken as evidence), we did discuss changes that should be made to multiple-faculty-taught courses.

Refine – Summarize the changes that discipline faculty plan to implement based on the program's strengths and weaknesses listed above.

In all honesty, the data table above does not provide us with any appreciable insight in specific changes that could be made. However, as mentioned above, we have made changes to course content, course materials/textbooks/lab curriculum, course coverage of specific topics (e.g. moving topics to a different course where it would be more appropriate and timely), and we have even **raised** standards (such as the uniform requirement that students have a “C” test/exam average to be eligible for a “C” or better grade in the course) program-wide.

Our biggest take-away about the data in the table in this report is that we need to discuss as a program if we can come to a more uniform consensus about what it means to “exceed”, “meet”, and “does not meet” standards. If we can come to a consensus, it would be more helpful and could inspire more ideas and potential improvements. Without the consistency, the data totals are not effective when compared to our reflection on individual CSLO’s, particularly between daytime and evening sections and/or between face-to-face and hybrid course formats.

It may not have been the process that was expected, but we think this was actually a valuable outcome. Assessment needs to be valid, and the discussion program-wide about what our standards should be – in a program with multiple faculty members having diverse views - this ongoing conversation is necessary and beneficial. Over time, as more CSLO’s are assessed and our approaches more uniform, the process can be more effective.

Dialogue – Explain when, or how often, discipline faculty meet to discuss the assessment process (e.g., planning, data collection, and results) for this program (e.g., department meeting).

Our program meets periodically each semester (more on an as-needed basis) to discuss overall strategies/changes that are necessary to address deficiencies in the CSLO’s that appear problematic. However, since many of our courses are usually taught by a single faculty member (along with an adjunct potentially -which are not required to attend these meetings), each faculty member takes more of an individual approach to addressing any CSLO issues for those courses. We do share changes and strategies for not only this particular assessment, but also for other issues and problems that we are experiencing in our classes. Our full E&S and Ind. Tech department meets at least several times per semester, and assessment is regularly on the agenda. Additionally, there is quite a bit of e-mail conversation on assessment throughout the year.