Assessment Committee Report 2/5/20

Training
- 17 SLO assessment drop-in sessions during weeks 13, 15, and 16 of fall semester
  - Equivalent to 47 hours of availability with 20 faculty attending
- Two SLO assessment drop-in sessions during spring flex week (1/13, 1/15)
- One workshop (1/13) during spring flex week on syncing assessments between Canvas and eLumen
- One briefing (1/23) for President Christian on assessment processes
- One workshop (1/27) during Communication department meeting on reviewing SLO data in eLumen

Accomplishments
- Assessment Committee voted and approved a sub-team on 1/31 to conduct ILO study work
- Feedback for Program Review Assessment Reports have been generated by AC Members
  - Overview report is attached
- SLO/PLO review in eLumen (as of 2/3):
  - 264 courses and 19 programs reviewed by AC Members

In Progress
- 2019-20 assessment plans are being updated and posted to AC website
  - Status: 47 / 78 = 60% updated and posted to website
- Development and planning of ILO study for Spring 2020
- Re-map learning outcomes (SLO-PLO, SLO-ILO, SLO-GELO) for courses/programs revised effective Summer 2019

Future Work
- Closing of the loop by providing feedback to programs who submitted Assessment Report in Program Review
- Implement SLO-ILO and AUO-ILO integration with Dean Waller

Assessment Committee Goals for 2019-2020

Goal 1: Provide the knowledge and training necessary to create, regularly assess, and report student learning outcomes (SLOs & PLOs).
  - Linked to ACCJC I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.5, I.B.8, II.A.1
  - Linked to BC Strategic Goals 1.8

Goal 2: Supports collecting and reviewing of assessment data and facilitates organizing processes to support student learning.
  - Linked to ACCJC I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.8, II.A.3
  - Linked to BC Strategic Goals 1.8
2019-2020 Program Review Assessment Report

(Based on data results from 2018-2019)

Item Analysis of Assessment Committee Feedback (N=54)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Assess</th>
<th>Reflect</th>
<th>Refine*</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Meets Expectations</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Question left out of Program Review; unable to evaluate

Insights

- Identified need for investigation of prerequisites and duplicate course content
- Identified areas where students lacked understanding of particular concepts within a course
- Identified the assessment tool may not have been a good measure of the learning outcome
- Identified that a majority of students are meeting or exceeding expectations in many programs

Challenges

- Insufficient data entered into eLumen to assess the program
- Lack of wider faculty participation in completion of assessment data and discussion for reporting
- Difficulty incorporating adjunct faculty into the assessment process
- Lack of a standardized assessment tool across multiple sections of a course
- Limited resources to improve outcomes in some programs

Best Practices:

- A variety of courses within a program are assessed on a regular basis
- Assessment tools are normed across sections of a course
- Conversations regarding assessment are ongoing and inclusive of all faculty, including adjuncts
- Programs included feedback from outside sources such as advisory board members

Assessment Committee Considerations for Change

- Include more detailed instructions within the Program Review Assessment Report prompt
- Discussion needed regarding individualized reporting for certificates and degrees
- Consider workshops/tutorials for department meetings to discuss Program Review assessment narratives
- Provision of feedback to faculty that did not submit Assessment Report