

Annual Reassessment Report – Pilot Report Template

The purpose of SAC-level assessment at PCC is to identify the levels of student achievement of course- or program-level outcomes in the name of improving those levels of achievement. The second part of that process is the reassessment of an outcome that has been assessed in a previous year.

In an initial assessment of an outcome, a SAC should identify any areas of student achievement of an outcome that could be improved. The SAC should then target those areas with a teaching strategy appropriate to its discipline during the reassessment year. The reassessment of the outcome then determines if the strategy was effective by measuring any changes to student achievement.

This process, of assessing, analyzing, creating a teaching strategy, and reassessing, is called "closing the loop." It is how assessment can be useful for instructors and, by extension, for students. On completing the form, please e-mail it to learningassessment@pcc.edu.

Note that questions marked with an asterisk* indicate that the accompanying help document includes information relevant to that question.

SAC Assessment Contact:

<i>Name</i>	<i>e-mail</i>
Linda Paulson Daphne Wu	linda.paulson@pcc.edu daphne.wu@pcc.edu

1. What SAC do you represent?

Management & Supervisory Development

2. Were any changes made to the reassessment plan submitted in Fall Term? If so, please briefly describe them.

MSD SAC did not make any changes to the reassessment plan.

3. Did the SAC implement a teaching strategy and/or curricular change to improve student outcome achievement? If so, describe it here. If not, what were the barriers to such a strategy's development?*

Yes, In a collaborative effort, MSD instructors designed generic assignments focusing on MSD 101 & MSD 117 designated assessment rubrics.

4. Please provide a summary of your results; include only key data points and your overall findings regarding student learning.

MSD SAC learned our process in designing generic assignments did not provide consistent results in reaching our benchmarks for all designated core outcomes. As an example; MSD 117 superseded the benchmark in critical thinking reporting a 93% rate in comparison to the previous year's assessment report, 79%. Unfortunately, MSD 117 reported a 30% decline from the previous year's benchmark results in cultural awareness. The same was true for MSD 101. Cultural awareness reported an increase in the benchmark rate of 27%, while reporting the same low benchmark rate 16% ± 1% from the previous year's report.
(Refer to Appendix 2)

- 5a. What were the benchmark levels (minimum acceptable level of student achievement of the outcome) for the project?*

Benchmark: 75%, level 3 and above.

- 5b. What percentage or frequency of students achieved the benchmark levels?*

- MSD 117
 - Critical Thinking: Number of students:52, number of artifacts:46*, number of assignments: 1, 93% attained benchmark.
 - Cultural Awareness: Number of students : 52, number of artifacts: 45, number of assignments: 1, 33% attained benchmark.

- MSD 101:

- Critical Thinking: Number of students: 21, number of artifacts:17*, number of assignments:1, 15% attained benchmark.
- Cultural Awareness: Number of students: 21, number of artifacts: 13: number of assignments: 1, 62% attained benchmark.

* This number pertains to students who completed the assignment.
Refer to Appendix 2 & 4

6. Please accompany your report with the actual results of your project as an appendix (i.e. along with this report, send the project results themselves as a spreadsheet or document) if possible. If that is not possible, please explain.*

All data collected for this assessment report is attached as an Appendix.

7. How did changes to teaching or curriculum affect student outcome achievement?

The changes in curriculum, regarding generic assignment for MSD 117 (critical thinking) resulted in 93% benchmark rate, an increase of 14% from previous year. For MSD 101 (cultural awareness), there was an increase of 25% of students reaching the benchmark.

Unfortunately, student outcome achievement dropped by 30% in reaching the benchmark due to the generic assignment did not fully address the course outcome/PCC core outcomes. Similarly, MSD 101 student outcome achievement stay the same \pm 1%.

Refer to Appendix 5 & 6

8. How was student work redacted (i.e. made anonymous)?*

All identifying information was removed by instructors, prior to evaluation.

One SAC member assembles packets of artifacts for assessment and verifies elimination of names. A simple numbering system is used for tracking assessments.

9. In general terms, describe the level of SAC involvement in the project (e.g. were both PT and FT faculty involved in contributing and/or scoring artifacts? Did all instructors or a representative sample of instructors contribute student work to be evaluated?) Identify any barriers to participation within the SAC.

MSD SAC assessment rater team consisted of three PT faculty and one FT faculty. Those PT faculty who volunteered to score artifacts, had previous experience and comprehension of the MSD assessment rating process. One rater who contributed artifacts from their own class, was dismissed from rating these artifacts. All student artifacts received rating from a team of two instructors. MSD SAC did not experience any barriers to participation.
Refer to Appendix 1

10. Do the results justify reassessing the outcome again or that the SAC should now move on to another outcome?*

We plan to reassess the outcomes using modified versions of the generic assignments to help ensure that the generic assignments target designated course outcomes, program outcomes and PCC core outcomes. This will provide accurate data on student learning retention, allowing for realistic changes to curriculum.

11. Please explain how results have been shared, or will be shared, with members of your SAC.

MSD SAC will present assessment results at our next SAC meeting in Fall, 2018.

12. Please comment briefly on any changes to the reassessment process that would lead to more meaningful results.

We plan to revise the generic assignment process with following steps:

- In Fall 2018 we plan to recruit MSD faculty, forming a sub-committee of instructors to review and revise those generic assignments in cultural awareness and critical thinking that did not address the related course rubric.
- In Fall 2018/Winter 2019, we plan to pilot revised generic assignments using a small sample of student artifacts and make necessary modifications to assignments.

- In Spring 2019, we will collecting and assessing all students artifacts from MSD101 & MSD117. Reassessing program outcomes and critical thinking and cultural awareness core outcomes.

13. Based on your experience with reassessment this year, are there any areas that you might want help with from your LAC coach?

We plan to contact our LAC coach when issues arise.

14. Is there anything else you want to share with reviewers about your reassessment project that has not been captured in the form?

No, MSD SAC believes we have adequately covered all results, issues, and successes in our analysis of this year's assessment process. One consideration MSD SAC will revisit during Fall is to reevaluate the benchmark. Presently, the benchmark for MSD address level 3 and above, we want to discuss if this is a realist benchmark for our MSD certificate and degree students.