

*Subject Area Committee Name:* Dental Assisting

*Focal Outcome Being Assessed:* Cultural Awareness/Self-reflection

*Contact Person:*

<i>Name</i>	<i>e-mail</i>
Magda D'Angelis-Morris	magda.dangelismorris@pcc.edu  Jbeach@pcc.edu (Josette Beach)

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 [Wayne Hooke](#) 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\_2016 (Example: NRS\_ARF\_2016)
- SACs are encouraged to share this report with their LAC coach for feedback before submitting.
- Make all submissions to [learningassessment@pcc.edu](mailto:learningassessment@pcc.edu).

**Due Dates:**

- **Planning Sections of LAC Assessment or Reassessment Reports: November 28<sup>th</sup>, 2016**
- **Completed LAC Assessment or Reassessment Reports: June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2017**

Note: Page 2 was totally blank and was deleted from PDF.

*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?*

Cultural Competency will be interpreted as the ability to understand how to treat all patients in an ethical, compassionate and understanding manner. The clinician will need to be open to listening about how dentistry is perceived by a large diverse population. This ability to listen will in turn create a better understanding of how to treat the individual patient. Self-Reflection will be interpreted as the ability to incorporate other approaches to educating the patient about dental care, without including pre-conceived biases towards a particular culture.

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

- Degree/Certificate Outcome – if yes, include here: Address and respond appropriately to the issues that may arise from cultural and socioeconomic differences in both a dental and community environment/Cultural Awareness*
- PCC Core Outcome – if yes, which one: Cultural Awareness/Self-Reflection*
- Course Outcome – if yes, which one: Practice as a dental assistant applying ethical principles and standards as set forth in the Oregon Dental Practice Act. This encompasses treating a diverse population in an ethical manner .*
- 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.): **Students took a pre-assessment test; participated in the classroom in a Speed Culture Q&A with a panel of International Students. Students took a post-assessment test a few days after the Q&A session. International Students received information from DA instructor and ESOL instructors introduced information to their students prior to the Q&A session.**
- 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.):
- 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.):
- 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.):
- 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:

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

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

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: Aligned benchmark based on rubrics created by the SAC. See appendix Instructors (3 FT and 2 PT will score the assessments based on the rubrics created for the Cultural Competency/Self-Reflection Assessment outcomes)

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 students in the Dental Assisting Cohort.

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 5<sup>th</sup> 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.)*

DA cohort will be assigned numbers while taking the pre and post-assessment tests.

*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:*

38

**Sample size calculator**

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

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

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

What is the response distribution?  
Leave this as 50%

Your recommended sample size is

**10** %

**90** %

**105**

**50** %

**42**

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. Lower margin of error requires a larger sample size. **Use 10% and 90% in these boxes.**

The 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.**

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

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.**

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 conducting the “norming” or “calibrating” session:

Instructors will score a sample artifact (s). Then we will discuss it as a group with the intent to calibrate ourselves. After this session, we will score each artifact. We will look at the data after this assignment.

**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:

**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):

The goal was to have students score a 2 after the Q&A session or change her/his mind and want to volunteer internationally.

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.**

Numbers will be given to each student and instructors participating in this assessment.

*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):

*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:

***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:*

*Changed the project from qualitative to quantitative data. Unchecked the Non-PCC Faculty box as it no longer applies. Changed verbiage.*

*5. Narrative*

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

*Report submitted as attachments.*

## 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? 40 pre, 34 post  
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? 39 pre, 33 post

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:

We exceed the suggested sample size of 37 with an acceptable margin of error of 5%. We obtained 40 artifacts for the pre-assessment questions. We fell below the suggested sample size of 37 for the post-assessment questions. We had 34 artifacts. However, we surpassed 99% confidence for the pre-assessment questions and were close to 90% confidence for the post-assessment questions. (SAMPLE OF 35 = 90% CONFIDENCE; SAMPLE OF 37 = 95% CONFIDENCE; SAMPLE OF 38 = 99% CONFIDENCE).

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:

Agreement at the norming session: to have scores within 1 of one another. Outliers would be counted and her/his score would possibly change data.

**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.*

Click here to enter text. 17 students attained benchmark of 2 and 11 students obtained a 3 for question # 1; 13 students attained benchmark and 16 students exceed benchmark with a 3 for question # 2; 8 students attained a benchmark of 2 and 17 students attained a 3 for question # 3; 8 students attained benchmark of 2, 10 students exceed it at 3 for question # 4.

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.”*

SEE APPENDIX

**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.*

Our students should continue to be offered this opportunity every year. Many of our students did not have knowledge of other cultures outside the United States. Knowing different cultures and customs is extremely important to be able to interact well with the diverse patient population that they will be provide care to. The more opportunity they have to be exposed to different cultures and customs while at PCC, the better off they will be when they are in industry, educating and providing care to their patients. They will be able to understand why a patient might react a certain

way to the treatment or education they are providing. And if they don't understand, they will have ways to ask the patient why in a respectful manner.

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

We will make minor changes to this project. Changes will mainly address how questions are phrased to allow better understanding, particularly to benefit our ESOL Dental Assisting students.

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).*

Be more specific with one of the questions and changing question # 5 to prompt students to answer the question fully. These changes will allow instructor (s) to collect more meaningful data.

*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):*

We need to refine our norming session: grade more artifacts and discuss. This will hopefully decrease the # of outliers.

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.

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

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

Provide more artifacts to score at the norming session.

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

If 'other,' please describe briefly below.

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.

I think our SAC is onboard to continue this project in future years. In addition, we have been discussing how to embed more cultural competencies into our program. We are doing a good job with the self-reflection component. Almost all of our courses have

embedded self-reflection assessments.