

CTE Annual Assessment Report Template

The purpose of CTE program-level assessment at PCC is to look at student achievement of degree and certificate-level outcomes and to help faculty focus on how to improve student learning based on assessment.

Please choose one of the program outcomes that was part of this year's Summary Data Report, and provide a more in-depth explanation of your assessment process, results and how this might be used to enhance teaching and learning.

This form is to be used for assessments (first time the outcome is assessed) and for re-assessments (a follow-up for the initial assessment of the same outcome).

Upon completing the form, please e-mail it to learningassessment@pcc.edu.

The text boxes will expand to accommodate as much text as you wish to provide.

SAC Assessment Contact (s):

<i>Name</i>	<i>e-mail</i>
Linda Paulson	Linda.paulson@pcc.edu

1. What SAC do you represent?

Management & Supervisory Development

2. Before reporting on this year's assessment, please briefly reflect on last year's project. On the last page of the Learning Assessment Peer Review Feedback from summer 2019, the peer evaluators created a custom question or two for your SAC. Please cut and paste that question in the box below, and add your SAC's response to the question(s). In future years, the custom question will be embedded in the annual program review update.

Question: what are some possibilities to encourage students to complete the assignment(s) tied to the SAC's assessment projects in the future?

This question was posed at our Fall 2019 SAC meeting regarding ways we could encourage completion rates of those assignments to be assessed in 2019-2020. We agreed to use the CPN mid-term, reaching out to our students for assistance in completing assignments. As for incentives we discussed having students complete small assignments that lead to the assessed assignment. We agreed faculty will put these methods into practice for all courses 2019-2020.

SAC set a completion rate benchmark for designated assessed assignments at a minimum of 80%, factoring in the possibilities not all students will complete the course assignments for various personal reasons. For most classes, students are encouraged to complete assignments, with the option to submit late work within an acceptable timeframe. For this assessment year, our completion rate for designated assignments (9 classes were assessed this year) is 55%. See chart below:

Term/Class	# of Completed Assignments	Student Course Completion #	Difference	Completion rate
Fall Term MSD 105	15	18	3	83%
Winter Term MSD 105	12	18	6	66%
Winter Term MSD 206	13	13	0	100%
Fall Term MSD 101	11	13	2	84%
Winter Term MSD 101	14	19	5	73%
Fall Term MSD 279	13	15	2	87%
Winter Term MSD 279	16	16	0	100%
Fall Term MSD 117	13	24	11	54%
Fall Term MSD 121	10	17	7	58%
	117	153	36	
Completion rate meeting benchmark of 80%				56%

Our SAC will be discussing further recommendations to increase completion rates for several of our classes. We have noticed a decrease in completion rates for MSD 105 and MSD 101 during Winter term. However, the completion rate changed Spring term 2020. For example, MSD 105 had 16 students complete the designated assignment out of a total of 18 students. Monitoring these rates would also be a realistic next step for our SAC.

In addition, will the SAC report on the remaining outcomes next year? Yes.

3. Which outcome is reported here for 2019-20? (Please provide the text of the focal outcome, and the degrees/certificates to which it applies.)

2. Strengthen organizational effectiveness by facilitating effective work relationships and resolving conflicts in a diverse workplace with skillful application of a broad range of communication skills.

AAS-MSD: Management/Supervisory Development AAS Degree

ACERT1-MSD: Management/Supervisory Development One-Year Certificate

4. Please share how this outcome was assessed, to help us understand your process for assessment. Please include information about your benchmark (the score that indicates successful attainment of the outcome) and how it was determined. For example, if your benchmark is set at 2, what does that mean?

Prior to the assessment, course rubrics were created identifying a specific course outcome aligning to the corresponding Degree/Certificate outcome, assessed 2019-2020. Next, the CTE coach and faculty collaborated in selecting course assignments that incorporated specific language, methods, techniques and strategies addressed in the corresponding course outcome. Some of our faculty, chose to modify their assignment for greater consistency between assignment and course outcome.

SAC felt by incorporating the course outcomes within the context of the assignments would have a direct positive impact on the following:

1. Increase in higher student learning attainment rate for the course outcome.
2. Greater consistency in the assessment of artifacts. Evaluators would be less likely to have personal assumptions impacting their evaluation results.

In Spring of 2020, SAC collected artifacts for Fall term (2019) MSD 105, Winter term (2020) MSD 105, and Fall term MSD 206 assessing Degree/Certificates #2.

Step 1: Due to COVID-19 our evaluation process required only remote access, creating an interesting conundrum. We chose to create various files in Google Drive to include the corresponding rubric attached to a document containing assignment instructions along with all numbered student artifacts (names were removed to ensure anonymity). Each file was identified by the outcome and course numbers. All raters were sent this information a week in advance.

Step 2: A Zoom norming session between raters occurred reviewing the evaluation process and rubrics. Each artifact was assessed by a minimum of two raters. This session was held on June 2nd.

Step 3. A direct assessment was conducted using the course rubric directly reflecting the program outcome designated for assessment. Since this was accomplished remotely, we came across difficulties on how to come to consensus due to time constraints and scheduling, especially for PT faculty who had stipulations on when their work was to be completed to be paid for their services by June 5th.

Raters chose to assess artifacts independently. We agreed each rater was to make copies of rubrics to avoid any bias from other raters. Results were combined after all artifacts were assessed. If there were any inconsistencies in scores, a third rater read was designated to review and rate the artifact, becoming the tiebreaker.

A final Zoom meeting was scheduled a week after the initial meeting to go over results. If the third rater did not agree with either of the two raters, then this would be discussed at that time, collaborating to reach consensus.

Using this system, inter-rater reliability was at 100%. We recognized this inter-rater reliability process may not be up to standard. Under the circumstances, all raters agreed this was the best option due to various limitations.

Benchmark: SAC determined and voted on the level of competency that would be effective in achieving the Program outcome. Students are to achieve at least level Mastery level 3. Meeting all criteria defined under this measure. We decided mastery level 3 meets required student learning attainment of all program outcomes.

5. Please provide data collected in the assessment of this outcome (including score distribution and percentage meeting benchmark). We understand that some SACs will need to present work that is not redacted when reporting to TSA. For this report, please do not include student G#,s, but do assign an arbitrary identifier, especially if you wish to reference individual scores in your discussion. Include your principal data in the box below. Attach supplemental information or appendices when this form is turned in.

The chart below summarizes student rating results.

(Also, refer to F 2019 MSD 105 Student Artifacts and Rubrics, W 2020 MSD 105 Student Artifacts and Rubrics and W 2020 MSD 206 Student Artifacts and Rubrics attachments)

MSD 105: Workplace Communication Skills (Fall Term 2019)*(15 out of 18 students completed the assignment)*

CCOG Intended Outcome	Mastery Level 4	Emerging Level 3	Basic Level 2	Static Level 1
Identified and analyzed communication techniques in facilitating effective relationships focusing on resolving conflicts in a diverse workplace.	8 53%	6 40%	1 7%	0
Benchmark		93%		

MSD 105: Workplace Communication Skills (Winter Term 2020)*(12 out of 18 students completed the assignment)*

CCOG Intended Outcome	Mastery Level 4	Emerging Level 3	Basic Level 2	Static Level 1
Identified and analyzed communication techniques in facilitating effective relationships focusing on resolving conflicts in a diverse workplace.	10 83%	2 17%	0	0
Benchmark		100%		

- **Mastery Level 4:** Thoroughly identified and analyzed techniques in facilitating effective relationships focusing on resolving conflicts in a diverse workplace.
- **Emerging Level 3:** Substantially identified and analyzed techniques in facilitating effective relationships focusing on resolving conflicts in a diverse workplace.
- **Basic Level 2:** Marginally identified and analyzed techniques in facilitating effective relationships focusing on resolving conflicts in a diverse workplace.
- **Static Level 1:** Does not attempt to meet objective.

MSD 206: Workplace Communication Skills (Fall Term)*(13 out of 13 students completed the assignment)*

CCOG Intended Outcome	Mastery Level 4	Emerging Level 3	Basic Level 2	Static Level 1
Explained strategies to assess, advise, listen to, and document the troubled employee to help him/her change counterproductive behaviors, as well as achieve company objectives.	7	4	2	0

	54%	31%	15%	
Benchmark		85%		

- **Mastery Level 4:** Thoroughly explained strategies to assess, advise, listen, and document the troubled employee to help him/her change counterproductive behaviors, as well as achieve company objectives.
- **Emerging Level 3:** Substantially explained strategies to assess, advise, listen, and document the troubled employee to help him/her change counterproductive behaviors, as well as achieve company objectives.
- **Basic Level 2:** Marginally explained strategies to assess, advise, listen, and document the troubled employee to help him/her change counterproductive behaviors, as well as achieve company objectives.

6. Please discuss your overall findings regarding student learning. (Were there any surprises? Do data points make sense? How much confidence does the SAC have on these results? How does this information relate to student learning?)

We were pleasantly surprised to see the value of faculty collaboration in selecting and modifying assignments incorporating language used in the course outcome. (This would also benefit new MSD faculty or those faculty who are teaching the assessed class for the first time.)

As a result, students demonstrated a greater ability to apply various concepts, skills, and strategies in meeting course outcomes providing us with relevant data reflecting actual student learning attainment.

7. Please reflect on the entire project and share how your CTE SAC will use the results to improve student mastery of this outcome. Are there changes that need to be made? How will the SAC use the results to reassess this outcome in the future?

SAC plans to continue collaborating with faculty in selecting and modifying assignments to better reflect our course outcome language, concepts, and skills.

Regarding the MSD assessment process, SAC does not plan to make any changes for 2020-2021. We feel confident this process provided realistic data on student learning attainment on outcomes.

The data from this assessment will be used as a baseline to determine improvement of student learning attainment for future assessments.

If this is a Reassessment (that is, the outcome has been assessed before), please answer question 8; otherwise, write N/A and continue with question 9.

8. Were any modifications to instruction implemented between the prior assessment and this one? How did the assessment methods and results compare with the prior assessment?

Our goal from the 2018-2019 MSD SAC assessment focal report, was to consider a final project or paper to reflect student attainment of program outcome. For 2019-2020 Assessment, final assignments for MSD 105 and MSD 206 were assessed reflecting a more comprehensive representation of student learning attainment of course outcome.

MSD 105 was used as a test course to determine if there was a verifiable difference between the existing Fall 2019 assignment versus the modified version offered Winter 2020. Our goal was to determine if redesigning a designated assignment to include language, methods, strategies and techniques outlined in the course outcome would result in a higher level of student learning attainment. From the data we collected comparing the two there was a 30% increase in student artifacts reaching Mastery Level 4.

To help us understand your SAC's overall processes, please complete these additional questions.

9. Was the SAC able to include Part-Time (PT) and Full-Time (FT) faculty for this assessment? If PT faculty did not participate, please explain any barriers that might account for this fact.

Two PT and two FT faculty participated in assessing artifacts.

10. Has this information been shared with all members of your SAC?

We will be sharing the results of this assessment at our next SAC meeting Fall 2020.

11. Are there any areas that you might want help with from your CTE coach? Please let us know.

Not at this time.

12. If the project/assignment was assessed by more than one faculty member, how did the SAC ensure that all faculty or scorers were scoring in a consistent manner, also known as norming?

As detailed previously in #4, our norming session occurred remotely which was a new experience! In the past, all evaluators met on campus. After reviewing the inter-rater reliability process, raters independently rated each student artifact then compared results. Discussion took place over the disparity in those artifacts. Raters would come to an agreement with an understanding of different perspectives. This was all completed during one meeting that usually lasted around 4 hours.

This assessment year, we went through the inter-rater reliability process during an initial remote meeting. Raters reviewed the rubrics and discussed a scoring method focusing on specific wording in the CCOG and measures. A second meeting was scheduled a week later to discuss results. Raters reported missing direct interaction immediately after assessing rubrics.

If remote assessing of artifacts continue 2020-2021, improvements to the process will be implemented to include more opportunity for collaboration among raters.

13. Is there anything else you would like to share with us? Please let us know.

In general, there were various challenges planning the assessment of artifacts (9 courses total) in a remote environment. Much time was spent organizing artifacts and rubrics in a simplistic manner enabling easy access for raters. Our raters did a fabulous job under these conditions. One reason, they were experienced in the process, participating in past artifact assessments which was extremely beneficial. Though there is much room for improvement going remote, SAC still felt we were able accomplish this task collecting meaningful information and data on student learning attainment of our outcomes.

Thank you for completing this report!

We hope this has been a useful project to help your CTE SAC assist your students!