

Subject Area Committee Name: AB Auto Collision Repair Technology

Focal Outcome Being Assessed: Critical Thinking and Problem Solving

Contact Person:

<i>Name</i>	<i>e-mail</i>
George Warneke	george.warneke@pcc.edu

This form is for the initial assessment of a focal outcome.

- Refer to the help document for guidance in filling out this report. If this document does not address your question/concern, contact [Nora Stevens](#) to arrange for coaching assistance.
- Please attach all rubrics/assignments/etc. to your report submissions.
- **Subject Line of Email:** Assessment Report Form (or ARF) for <your SAC name> (Example: ARF for NRS)
- **File name:** SACInitials_ARF_2018 (Example: NRS_ARF_2018)
- SACs are encouraged to share this report with their LAC coach for feedback before submitting.
- Make all submissions to learningassessment@pcc.edu.

Due Dates:

- **Planning Sections of LAC Assessment or Reassessment Reports: November 27th, 2017**
- **Completed LAC Assessment or Reassessment Reports: June 16th, 2018**

Please Verify This Before Beginning this Report:

This project is not the second stage of the assess/reassess process (if this is a follow-up, re-assessment project, use the LAC Re-assessment Report Form CTE. Available [here](#)).

1. Outcome Chosen for Focal Analysis

1A. How does your field interpret the outcome you are assessing?

We evaluate three areas for Critical Thinking and Problem Solving; identify and implement strategies and processes to solve workplace and vehicle repair problems, apply necessary computation skills effectively as they pertain to auto collision repair, access and utilize repair information in a rapidly changing technology.

1B. If the assessment project relates to any of the following, check all that apply:

- Degree/Certificate Outcome – if yes, include here:* identify and implement strategies and processes to solve workplace and vehicle repair problems, apply necessary computation skills effectively as they pertain to auto collision repair, access and utilize repair information in a rapidly changing technology.
- PCC Core Outcome – if yes, which one: Critical Thinking and Problem Solving*
- Course Outcome – if yes, which one:*
- Exploratory Outcome – if yes, briefly describe:*

2. Project Description

2A. Assessment Context

Check all the applicable items:

Course-based assessment.

Course names and number(s):

Type of assessment (e.g., essay, exam, speech, project, etc.):

Are there course outcomes that align with this aspect of the outcome being investigated? Yes No

If yes, include the course outcome(s) from the relevant CCOG(s):

- Common/embedded assignment in all relevant course sections.** An embedded assignment is one that is already included as an element in the course as usually taught. Please attach the activity in an appendix. If the activity cannot be shared, indicate the type of assignment (e.g., essay, exam, speech, project, etc.):
- Common – but not embedded - assignment used in all relevant course sections.** Please attach the activity in an appendix. If the activity cannot be shared, indicate the type of assignment (e.g., essay, exam, speech, project, etc.):
- Practicum/Clinical work.** Please attach the activity/checklist/etc. in an appendix. If this cannot be shared, indicate the type of assessment (e.g., supervisor checklist, interview, essay, exam, speech, project, etc.): **AB Cooperative Education Employer Evaluation Form, AB Self-Reflection Cooperative Education Learning Assessment, AB Learning/Technical Skills Assessment Spreadsheet**
- External certification exam.** Please attach sample questions for the relevant portions of the exam in an appendix (provided that publically revealing this information will not compromise test security). Also, briefly describe how the results of this exam are broken down in a way that leads to nuanced information about the aspect of the core outcome that is being investigated.
- SAC-created, non-course assessment.** Please attach the assessment in an appendix. If the assessment cannot be shared, indicate the type of assignment (e.g., essay, exam, speech, project, etc.): **AB Cooperative Education Employer Evaluation Form, AB Self-Reflection Cooperative Education Learning Assessment, AB Learning/Technical Skills Assessment Spreadsheet**
- Portfolio.** Please attach sample instructions/activities/etc. for the relevant portions of the portfolio submission in an appendix. Briefly describe how the results of this assessment are broken down in a way that leads to nuanced information about the aspect of the core outcome that is being investigated:
- TSA.** Please attach the relevant portions of the assessment in an appendix. If the assessment cannot be shared, indicate the type of assignment (e.g., essay, exam, speech, project, etc.): **AB Cooperative Education Employer Evaluation Form, AB Learning/Technical Skills Assessment Spreadsheet**
- Survey**
- Interview**
- Other.** Please attach the activity/assessment in an appendix. If the activity cannot be shared, please briefly describe it:

In the event publicly sharing your assessment documents will compromise future assessments or uses of the assignment, do not attach the actual assignment/document. Instead, please give as much detail about the activity as possible in an appendix.

2B. How will you score/measure/quantify student performance?

- Rubric** (used when student performance is on a continuum - if available, attach as an appendix – if in development, attach to the completed report that is submitted in June)
- Checklist** (used when presence/absence rather than quality is being evaluated - if available, attach as an appendix – if in development, attach to the completed report that is submitted in June)
- Trend Analysis** (often used to understand the ways in which students are, and are not, meeting expectations; trend analysis can complement rubrics and checklist)
- Objective Scoring** (e.g., Scantron-scored examinations)
- Other** – briefly describe: **AB Cooperative Education Employer Evaluation Form, AB Self-Reflection Cooperative Education Learning Assessment, AB Learning/Technical Skills Assessment Spreadsheet**

2C. Type of assessment (select one per column)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Direct Assessment |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Qualitative | <input type="checkbox"/> Indirect Assessment |

If you selected 'Indirect Assessment', please share your rationale:

Qualitative Measures: projects that analyze in-depth, non-numerical data via observer impression rather than via quantitative analysis. Generally, qualitative measures are used in exploratory, pilot projects rather than in true assessments of student attainment. Note that the **use of a numerical rubric is considered quantitative analysis**, even if the artifacts under consideration are not based on quantitative calculations (e.g. an essay scored by a rubric counts as quantitative in the context of assessment).

Indirect assessments (e.g., surveys, focus groups, etc.) do not use measures of direct student work output. These types of assessments are also not able to truly document student attainment.

2D. Check any of the following that were used by your SAC to create or select the assessment/scoring criteria/instruments used in this project:

- Committee or subcommittee of the SAC collaborated in its creation
- Standardized assessment
- Collaboration with external stakeholders (e.g., advisory board, transfer institution/program)
- Theoretical Model (e.g., Bloom's Taxonomy)

- Aligned the assessment with standards from a professional body (for example, The American Psychological Association Undergraduate Guidelines, etc.)
- Aligned the benchmark with the Associate's Degree level expectations of the Degree Qualifications Profile
- Aligned the benchmark to within-discipline post-requisite course(s)
- Aligned the benchmark to out-of-discipline post-requisite course(s)
- Other (briefly explain: _____)

2E. In which quarter will student artifacts (samples of student work) be collected? If student artifacts will be collected in more than one term, check all that apply.

- Fall** **Winter** **Spring** **Other** (e.g., if work is collected between terms)

2F. What student group do you want to generalize the results of your assessment to? For example, if you are assessing performance in a course, the student group you want to generalize to is 'all students taking this course.'

All relevant students that complete end of program Cooperative Education course AB 280 A & B

2G. There is no single, recommended assessment strategy. Each SAC is tasked with choosing appropriate methods for their purposes. Which best describes the purpose of this project?

- To measure established outcomes and/or drive programmatic change**
- To participate in the Multi-State Collaborative for Learning Outcomes Assessment**
- Preliminary/Exploratory investigation**

If you selected 'Preliminary/Exploratory' (most often a 'pilot study'), briefly describe why you opted to do a pilot study, along with your rationale for selecting your sampling method:

2H. Which will you measure?

- the population** (all relevant students – e.g., all students enrolled in all currently-offered sections of the course)
- a sample** (a subset of students)

If you are using a sample, select all of the following that describe your sample/sampling strategy (refer to the Help Guide for assistance):

- Random Sample** (student work selected completely randomly from all relevant students)
- Systematic Sample** (student work selected through an arbitrary pattern, e.g., 'start at student 7 on the roster and then select every 5th student following'; repeating this in all relevant course sections)
- Stratified Sample** (more complex, consult with an LAC coach if you need assistance)
- Cluster Sample** (students are selected randomly from meaningful, naturally-occurring groupings (e.g., SES, placement exam scores, etc.))
- Voluntary Response Sample** (students submit their work/responses through voluntary submission – e.g., via a survey)
- Opportunity/Convenience Sample** (only a few instructors are participating in a project taught via multiple sections, so, only those instructors' students are included)

The last three options in bolded red have a high risk of introducing bias. If your SAC is using one or more of these sample/sampling strategies, please share your rationale:

2I. Briefly describe the procedure you will use to select your sample (including a description of the procedures used to ensure student and instructor anonymity.)

All relevant students that complete end of program Cooperative Education course AB 280 A & B . All personal information will be removed from data collected.

2J. Follow this link to determine how many artifacts (samples of student work) you should include in your assessment: <http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html> (see screen shot below).

Start with the number of students you estimate will be enrolled in the course(s) from which you will draw the sample – that is your “population.” Enter the other numbers as indicated in the screenshot. The sample size calculator will tell you how many artifacts you need to collect. Enter that number below:

15 – 20 students per year

Sample size calculator

What margin of error can you accept?
5% is a common choice

10 %

The margin of error is the amount of error that you can tolerate. If 90% of respondents answer *yes*, while 10% answer *no*, you may be able to tolerate a larger amount of error than if the respondents are split 50-50 or 45-55. **Use 10% and 90% in these boxes.**
Lower margin of error requires a larger sample size.

What confidence level do you need?
Typical choices are 90%, 95%, or 99%

90 %

Confidence level is the amount of uncertainty you can tolerate. Suppose that you have 20 yes-no questions in your survey. With a confidence level of 95%, you would expect that for one of the questions (1 in 20), the percentage of people who answer *yes* would be more than the margin of error away from the true answer. The true answer is the percentage you would get if you exhaustively interviewed everyone. Higher confidence level requires a larger sample size. **Enter the total number of students currently enrolled in all sections of the courses you are assessing here.**

What is the population size?
If you don't know, use 20000

105

How many people are there to choose your random sample from? The sample size doesn't matter for populations larger than 20,000.

What is the response distribution?
Leave this as 50%

50 %

For each question, what do you expect the results will be? If the sample is skewed highly one way or the other, the population probably is, too. If you don't know, use 50%, which gives the largest sample size. See below under **More information** if this is confusing. **Measure this many students.**

Your recommended sample size is

42

This is the minimum recommended size of your survey. If you create a sample of this many people and get responses from everyone, you're more likely to get a correct answer than you would from a large sample where only a small percentage of the sample responds to your survey.

3. Project Mechanics

3A. Does your project utilize a rubric for scoring? Yes No

If 'No', proceed to section B. If 'Yes', complete the following:

Which method of ensuring consistent scoring (inter-rater reliability) will your SAC use for this project?

Agreement – the percentage of raters giving each artifact the same/similar score in a norming session; ideally, that will be 75% agreement or greater.

If you are using agreement, describe your plan for plan for conducting the “norming” or “calibrating” session:

Consensus - all raters score all artifacts and reach agreement on each score

Consistency* – raters' scores are correlated: this captures relative standing of the performance ratings - but not precise agreement. Briefly describe your plan: For norming purposes, the AB Rubric Scoring Guide and AB Cooperative Education Employer Evaluation form are read by the employer/supervisor. The instructor, who is incharge of the Cooperative Education course, discusses these forms with the employer/supervisor and answers any questions to insure that the 3 level rubric is fully understood. During this norming session, which may last 15 minutes, the AB Learning Outcomes/Technical Skills Assessment Rubric document is discussed at length explaining the meaning of the 3 levels and how they relate to each of the 40 assessable areas. Workplace senarios are used to clarify some of the categories and examples are shared. The evaluator is made aware that our benchmark is the level 2. The employer/supervisor is asked to assess our student as they would assess any entry-level employee. The same norming process is used with every employer/supervisor evaluator every time even if that evaluator has done an evaluation for a previous student. For consistancy and confirmation that they fully understand, the rubric form is signed by the evaluator. The Employer Evaluation form is also signed by the employer/supervisor after the evaluation is completed. This is all done during the work site visit at the end of the 300 hours of Cooperative work site experience. There is only one instructor incharge of the Cooperative Education course for our program. The scoring method has been approved by our SAC. The SAC believes that this method is very consistent because of the way the instructor works with each employer/supervisor. Because of our size of relevant students for assessing and our small scale rubric, we feel that this method works well. We have attained valuable information from this process in the past eight years since it's creation. There is no way that the employer/supervisors from all of these collision repair facilities can get together for a norming session, but we feel that the instructor's consistency in working with the employer/supervisors to prep them for the evaluation produces reliable results. The 4 instructors in our program use Consensus for the Self-Reflection category only. This is based on evaluating sample journal entries from the required 8 weeks of journals from each student.

Notes: the agreement method is the most frequently used for assessment, but the **calculation of inter-rater reliability is also among the more challenging issues** within assessment as a whole. If your SAC is unfamiliar with norming procedures, contact your assessment coach, or if you don't know who your coach is, contact LAC Vice Chair [Chris Brooks](#) to arrange for coaching help for your SAC's norming session.

The consistency method is not generally recommended; see the help guide for details.

3B. Have performance benchmarks been specified?

The fundamental measure in educational assessment is the number of students who complete the work at the expected/required level. We are calling this SAC-determined performance expectation the 'benchmark.'

Yes

No

If yes, briefly describe your performance benchmarks, being as specific as possible (if needed, attach as an appendix):

Our rubric benchmark is a 2 in all areas of assessment, because our goal for our students is for them to leave with basic entry level knowledge and skills. (see attached Rubric)

Rubric score of 1 = Limited demonstration and application of knowledge and skills. Entry level employee exhibits limited skill and speed, applies few learned skills and knowledge and struggles to perform task (is not developing skills), does not complete task or requires excessive guidance.

Rubric score of 2 = Basic demonstration and application of knowledge and skills. Entry level employee exhibits basic skill and speed, applies knowledge and uses developing skills to perform task, completes with some guidance.

Rubric score of 3 = Demonstrates advanced comprehension and is able to apply essential knowledge and skill. Entry level employee exhibits advanced skill and speed, applies knowledge and uses proficient skills to perform task, completes with little guidance.

If no, what is the purpose of this assessment? (For example, this assessment will provide information that will lead to developing benchmarks in the future; or, this assessment will lead to areas for more detailed study; etc.)

3C. The purpose of this assessment is to have SAC-wide evaluation of student work, not to evaluate a particular instructor or student. Before evaluation, remove student-identifying information (and, when possible remove instructor-identifying information).

Please share your process for ensuring that all identifying information has been removed.

All Cooperative Education Employer Evaluation Form information is entered into our spreadsheet tool with no student or instructor identification included.

3D. Will you be coding your data/artifacts in order to compare student sub-groups? Yes No

If yes, select one of the boxes below:

student's total earned hours previous coursework completed ethnicity other

Briefly describe your coding plan and rationale (and if you selected 'other', identify the sub-groups you will be coding for):

We do have a numbering system tied back to the individual student's evaluation. This allows us to look at students for whom english is their second language to see if scores differ from other students. This is a comparison that we look at every year. We also look at students that took the AB280 Co-op course while they wait for a needed course. This option streamlines their flow through our program depending on what term they started. We compare these students to the ones that took the courses in the preferred order. We use discretion when deciding to allow a student to take the AB280 Co-op course before completing all of the other courses that make up our 2 year certificate and associate degree.

*3E. Ideally, student work is **evaluated** by both full-time and adjunct faculty, even if students being assessed are taught by only full-time and/or adjunct faculty. Further, more than one rater is needed to ensure inter-rater reliability. If you feel only one rater is feasible for your SAC, please explain why:*

Who will be assessing student work for this project? Check all that apply.

- PCC Adjunct Faculty within the program/discipline
- PCC FT Faculty within the program/discipline
- PCC Faculty outside the program/discipline
- Program Advisory Board Members
- Non-PCC Faculty
- External Supervisors
- Other: We do not have any adjunct faculty at this time.

End of Planning Section – Complete the remainder of this report after your assessment project is complete.

Beginning of End-of-Year Reporting Section – complete the following sections after your assessment project is complete.

4. Changes to the Assessment Plan

Have there been changes to your project since you submitted the planning section of this report? **Yes**
No

If so, summarize those changes below:

We are using lines we added to our AB Learning/Technical Skills Assessment Spreadsheet to track students that took the AB280 Co-op course while they wait for a needed course. This option streamlines their flow through our program depending on what term they started. We compare these students to the ones that took the courses in the preferred order. We use discretion when deciding to allow a student to take the AB280 Co-op course before completing all of the other courses that make up our 2 year certificate and associate degree.

We also added a line to track students that do the Co-op part-time. We will have a few of those students this coming year. It is not the preferred option for our students and advise them against that option, but we allow it to be more inclusive.

5. Narrative

Broadly, what did your SAC learn from the assessment of the focal outcome under consideration this year?

Our SAC learned that we are doing a good job at producing technicians for our industry that possess Critical Thinking and Problem Solving skills. Overall, our students are meeting or exceeding our benchmarks in all areas that are assessed. The results are great, proving that our program is producing valuable technicians. The minor times that there were #1s (limited knowledge or skills), matched certain students that we all agreed might be the students that would score a little lower in some areas.

6. Results of the Analysis of Assessment Project Data

6A. Quantitative Summary of Sample/Population

How many students were enrolled in all sections of the course(s) you assessed this year? 20

If you did not assess in a course, report the number of students that are in the group you intend to generalize your results to.

How many students did you actually assess in this project? 18

Did you use a recommended sample size (see the Sample Size Calculator linked to in section 2J)? **Yes**

No

If you did not use a recommended sample size in your assessment, briefly explain why:

All relevant students that completed the end of program Cooperative Education course AB 280 were evaluated. Two students did not complete the 300 hours in time to be evaluated before this assessment was completed. They will be included in next year's assessment.

6B. Did your project utilize a rubric for scoring? Yes No

If 'No', proceed to section C. If 'Yes', complete the following:

How was inter-rater reliability assured? (Contact your LAC Coach if you would like help calculating this.)

- Agreement** – the percentage of raters giving each artifact the same/similar score in a norming session
- Consensus** - all raters score all artifacts and reach agreement on each score
- Consistency** – raters' scores are correlated: this captures relative standing of the performance ratings - but not precise agreement
- Inter-rater reliability was not assured.**

If you utilized agreement or consistency measures of inter-rater reliability, report the level here:

We feel that we have 100% Consistency with our raters. For norming purposes, the AB Rubric Scoring Guide and AB Cooperative Education Employer Evaluation form are read by the employer/supervisor. The instructor, who is in charge of the Cooperative Education course, discusses these forms with the employer/supervisor and answers any questions to insure that the 3 level rubric is fully understood. During this norming session, which may last 15 minutes, the AB Learning Outcomes/Technical Skills Assessment Rubric document is discussed at length explaining the meaning of the 3 levels and how they relate to each of the 40 assessable areas. Workplace scenarios are used to clarify some of the categories and examples are shared. The evaluator is made aware that our benchmark is the level 2. The employer/supervisor is asked to assess our student as they would assess any entry-level employee. The same norming process is used with every employer/supervisor evaluator every time even if that evaluator has done an evaluation for a previous student. For consistency and confirmation that they fully understand, the rubric form is signed by the evaluator. The Employer Evaluation form is also signed by the employer/supervisor after the evaluation is completed. This is all done during the work site visit at the end of the 300 hours of Cooperative work site experience. There is only one instructor in charge of the Cooperative Education course for our program. The scoring method has been approved by our SAC. The SAC believes that this method is very consistent because of the way the instructor works with each employer/supervisor. Because of our size of relevant students for assessing and our small scale rubric, we feel that this method works well. We have attained valuable information from this process in the past eight years since it's creation. There is no way that the employer/supervisors from all of these collision repair facilities can get together for a norming session, but we feel that the instructor's consistency in working with the employer/supervisors to prep them for the evaluation produces reliable results. The 4 instructors in our program use Consensus for the Self-Reflection category only. This is based on evaluating sample journal entries from the required 8 weeks of journals from each student. **AB Learning Outcomes/Technical Skills Assessment Rubric Scoring Guide**

6C. Brief Summary of Your Results

1. *If you used frequencies of benchmark achievement, report those here. For example, “46 students attained or exceeded the benchmark level in written communication and 15 did not.” If necessary, provide detailed results in an appendix.*

We evaluate three areas for Critical Thinking and Problem Solving; identify and implement strategies and processes to solve workplace and vehicle repair problems, apply necessary computation skills effectively as they pertain to auto collision repair, access and utilize repair information in a rapidly changing technology. Out of 18 students evaluated, there was only one student (#3) that did not meet the benchmark of Level 2 (Basic) on our rubric scale in only one area for this focal outcome. That area was, identify and implement strategies and processes to solve workplace and vehicle repair problems, where that student scored a Level 1 (Limited). Student #3 is also identified through our coding as a student for whom English is that student’s second language. That student also was evaluated as a Level 1 (limited) for Reading. (**Refer to AB Learning/Technical Skills Assessment Spreadsheet**) We feel that the Level 1 (limited) for; identify and implement strategies and processes to solve workplace and vehicle repair problems, can be attributed to that same issue with this student. The English as a second language issue is something we identified as a problem and addressed and improved upon in the first few years of our assessments. We assess all outcomes every year and monitor the results throughout the year. Over the last couple of years, we have been working on improving this focal outcome by encouraging our students to use available industry data, info on processes and other manufacturer info in our training setting. We have done this by providing them with the knowledge of how to access and use this info rather than just providing it for them in our classroom and shop settings. It appears that our efforts have been successful!

2. *If you used percentages of the total to identify the degree of benchmark attainment in this project, report those here. For example, “75% of 61 students attained or exceeded the benchmark level.”*

Overall, for the Learning Assessment Skills average, 100% of the 18 students evaluated attained or exceeded the benchmark level! For the Technical Skills average, 94% of the 18 students evaluated attained or exceeded the benchmark level! The overall average for Learning Skills and Technical Skills Assessment was 100% of the evaluated students attained or exceeded the benchmark level!

We have also included a Trending Report using percentages for the 8 years that we have been assessing.

See AB Trending Report

6D. Attach a more detailed description or analysis of your results (e.g., rubric scores, trend analyses, etc.) as an appendix to this document. Appendix attached? **Yes** **No**

6E. Do the results of this project suggest that academic changes might be beneficial to your students (changes in curriculum, content, materials, instruction, pedagogy etc.)? Yes No

If you answered 'Yes,' briefly describe the changes to improve student learning below. If you answered 'No', detail why no changes are called for.

We assess all outcomes every year and monitor the results throughout the year. We have been doing this for 8 years now. We have been making continual changes as necessary. Three years ago in our Technical Skills portion of the assessment, we noticed that some of the students that we allowed to take the Cooperative Education course before the AB 205 Technical Skills & Collision Repair course, did not score as well in advanced areas as the other students that took the courses in the proper order. We allow some students an override to do this because the AB 205 course is only offered in the Winter term and the fact that last year we streamlined our program course flow. By doing this, it helps those students complete the program in a timely manner. This last year we were more selective in who we let do this. Students 1-3 needed our Technical Skills AB 205 course after the Co-op and students 4-9 needed Panel Replacement AB 201 after the Co-op. The students that we allow to do this need to be good students and have good job skills and work ethic as revealed in the courses so far. Students 1-9 have done as well or better than the other 9 students that took the courses in the preferred order! **Please refer to the AB Learning/Technical Skills Assessment Spreadsheet**

If you are planning changes, when will these changes be fully implemented?

We make changes as needed throughout the year.

6F. Has all identifying information been removed from your documents? (Information includes student/instructor/supervisor names/identification numbers, names of external placement sites, etc.) **Yes** **No**

7. SAC Response to the Assessment Project Results

7A. Assessment Tools & Processes: Indicate how well each of the following worked for your assessment:

Tools (rubrics, test items, questionnaires, etc.):

very well some small problems/limitations to fix notable problems/limitations to fix completely inadequate/failure

Please comment briefly on any changes to assessment tools that would lead to more meaningful results if this assessment were to be repeated (or adapted to another outcome).

Last year we streamlined our course flow to assist our students in completing our program in the timeliest manner. We are using lines we added to our AB Cooperative Education Employer Evaluation form to track students that took the AB280 Co-op course while they wait for a needed course. This option streamlines their flow through our program depending on what term they started. We compare these students to the ones that took the courses in the preferred order. We use discretion when deciding to allow a student to take the AB280 Co-op course before completing all of the other courses that make up our 2 year certificate and associate degree.

We also added a line to track students that do the Co-op part-time. We will have a few of those students this coming year. It is not the preferred option for our students, but we allow it to be more inclusive.

Processes (faculty involvement, sampling, norming, inter-rater reliability, etc.):

very well some small problems/limitations to fix notable problems/limitations to fix tools completely inadequate/failure

Please comment briefly on any changes to assessment process that would lead to more meaningful results if this assessment were to be repeated (or adapted to another outcome):

No changes are needed

8. Follow-Up Plan

8A. How will the changes detailed in this report be shared with all FT/PT faculty in your SAC? (select all that apply)

- | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> email | <input type="checkbox"/> phone call | <input type="checkbox"/> workshop |
| <input type="checkbox"/> campus mail | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> face-to-face meeting | <input type="checkbox"/> other |
| <input type="checkbox"/> no changes to share | | |

If 'other,' please describe briefly below.

We do not have any adjunct faculty at this time.

8B. Is further collaboration/training required to properly implement the identified changes? Yes No

If 'Yes,' briefly detail your plan/schedule below.

8C. Re-assessment is a critical part of the overall assessment process. This is especially important if academic changes have been implemented. How will you assess the effectiveness of the changes you plan to make?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> follow-up project in next year's annual report | <input type="checkbox"/> on-going informal assessment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> in a future assessment project | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> other |

If 'other,' please describe briefly below.

We assess all outcomes every year and monitor the results throughout the year. We make continual changes as necessary.

8D. SACs are learning how to create and manage meaningful assessments in their courses. This development may require SAC discussion to support the assessment process (e.g., awareness, buy-in, communication, etc.). Please briefly describe any successful developments within your SAC that support the quality assessment of student learning. If challenges remain, these can also be shared.

This is the eighth year that our program has been assessing all of the outcomes and our entire SAC is committed to it and supportive of it. It is very helpful and rewarding to document how well our program is doing and where there might be weaknesses or not, rather than just guessing.