

Annual Reassessment 2018-2019

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.

The planning section that follows is to be completed and submitted Fall Term. If your SAC is unable to complete it in fall, please fill out the planning section when completing the final report in spring.*

Planning Section: To be completed and submitted in Fall Term

SAC Assessment Contact:

<i>Name</i>	<i>e-mail</i>
Sara Robertson, Meredith Farkas	sara.robertson@pcc.edu , meredith.farkas@pcc.edu

1. What SAC do you represent?

Library SAC

2. What outcome(s) do you plan to reassess?

Self-Reflection / Integrated Learning

3a. What were the results of the outcome's initial assessment (in a past year)?

The LIB SAC set the following benchmarks for student achievement for the initial assessment of Self Reflection in Library 101, as reported in June 2018:

Benchmark 1:

75% or more artifacts will be scored proficient or advanced in ALL rubric criteria under Mechanics.

Achievement:

80% or more artifacts scored proficient or advanced in All three rubric criteria under Mechanics.

- Criteria 1: Choose three statements
 - 131 artifacts out of 148 in total achieved proficient or advanced for 88%
 - week 3: 64 selected 3 or more (advanced); 2 selected 2 statements (proficient) 2 selected 1 statement (developing) and 9 scored none or can't tell (emerging)
 - week 5: 65 selected 3 or more (advanced); 0 selected 2 statements (proficient); 2 selected 1 statement (developing) and 4 scored none or can't tell (emerging)
- Criteria 2: Provides examples of relevant search experiences
 - 128 artifacts out of 154 in total achieved proficient or advanced for 83%
 - 106 provided 3 or more examples (advanced); 22 provided 2 examples (proficient); 16 provided 1 example (developing) and 10 scored none or can't tell (emerging)
- Criteria 3: Include their thoughts on why they can relate to each of the statements
 - 128 artifacts out of 154 in total achieved proficient or advanced for 83%
 - 100 included 3 or more discrete thoughts (advanced); 28 included 2 discrete thoughts (proficient); 16 provided 1 discrete thought, and 10 scored none or can't tell (emerging)

Benchmark 2:

80% or more artifacts will be scored at least developing or proficient on at least TWO of the three rubric criteria under Quality or Depth.

Achievement:

Artifacts scored developing, proficient or advanced at a rate of 76%, 66% and 57% for the three rubric criteria under Quality and Depth.

- Criteria 1: Recognition of the value of what they learned
 - 110 artifacts out of 145 in total achieved developing, proficient or advanced for 76%
 - Scores: 21 advanced; 59 proficient; 30 developing; 35 emerging
- Criteria 2: Connections from learning to practice
 - 97 artifacts out of 125 in total achieved developing, proficient or advanced for 66%
 - Scores: 26 advanced; 50 proficient; 21 developing; 49 emerging
- Criteria 3: Reflective thinking on learning process
 - 83 artifacts out of 146 in total achieved developing, proficient or advanced for 57%
 - Scores: 10 advanced; 32 proficient; 41 developing; 63 emerging

3b. What area(s) of outcome achievement did the initial assessment identify that might benefit from additional focus by the SAC?

Benchmark achievement data showed that students could follow directions in the prompt, and instructions were fairly clear and understood. We focused on mechanics in order to distinguish between scoring the assignment (did they follow instructions) and quality of reflections (are the question prompts soliciting adequate responses). Result from the initial assessment helped us establish that the assignment approach is understood by students because they were consistently able to complete the task.

We also noted the frequency of statements selected by students in order to inform how we refine the list of statements in the assignment.

Based on the results of the assessment and a discussion of the summary report, the following areas of focus were identified by the Library SAC:

1. Backwards redesign / revise the assignment to solicit detailed responses from each of the following areas of the rubric:
 - a. Reflective thinking on the research process (Practices & Standards dimension 1; Self-Assessment dimension 2)
 - b. Connections from learning to practice (Connections to Experience dimension 3)
 - c. Recognition of the value of what they learned (Contextual awareness dimension 4)
2. Edit the existing list of statements to reflect those most selected by students.
 - a. Revise statements for clarity and redundancy. Add statements to cover gaps.
 - b. Revise affective statements to instead ask for reflections on ability or aptitude (e.g. "I feel" becomes "I can").

4. What changes to teaching might the SAC explore this year to address the areas in need of additional focus?

From the initial assessment:

The majority of students (76%) were found to be developing, proficient, or advanced in their recognition of the value of what they learned in the initial assessment. This meant they were able to move beyond a mere description of what they learned and recognized the value of the content knowledge. Sixty-six percent of students were found to be developing, proficient, or advanced in their connections from learning to practice meaning they were able to connect what they learned in the course to change what they might do going forward. Fifty-seven percent of students were found to be developing, proficient or advanced on demonstrating their thinking on the learning process.

Overall, the results indicate that student reflections of their learning is of adequate quality and depth, but both instruction and assignments need further development in order to meet desired benchmarks for student achievement. Specifically, the results indicate the reflection questions in each prompt need to better align with the rubric criteria. With these adjustments we expect students will better be able to demonstrate their learning.

Over the 2017-2018 academic year, the Library SAC collaboratively redesigned the Library 101 curriculum. One major shift in the new curriculum moved emphasis from searching and finding information to **critically evaluating information** in a variety of sources. The initial results from the Spring 2018 assessment on Self-Reflection were incorporated to LIB101 curriculum, and after two faculty taught the updated course using the new shared shell in Summer 2018, additional adjustments were made, including:

- Redesigning the final assignment to solely focus on assessing the outcomes of the Integrated Learning Rubric.
 - Instead of a cover letter with an annotated bibliography, the assignment is a series of prompts for students to reflect on their learning in the course.
 - Final Assignment was redesigned with additional changes based on the A&L DSAC “charrette” with faculty feedback

5. What course(s) will your assessment focus on?

Library 101

6. How will you sample student work?*

We will develop a representative sample pool using student artifacts submitted in LIB101 during Winter 2019 and Spring 2019, for a total of approximately 4-6 courses and 75-100 artifacts. We will seek recommendations from the Learning Assessment Council and Institutional Effectiveness in developing a representative sample in order to include demographic data in our analysis. Our estimation is that we will need to include a majority of the artifacts submitted in the sample pool in order for it to be representative. The sampling process will be developed after seeking guidance on best practices when including demographic and completion data in the data analysis.

7. Will the student work be part of the regular graded assignments for the course(s)?*

Yes, we will use a final course assignment as the artifact being assessed. All courses will use the same final assignment as a graded assignment, worth 15 points and 15% of the final grade.

The Final Reflection Assignment for LIB101 is included as an attachment to this report.

8. How will you redact student work (i.e. make it anonymous)?*

Individual instructors will provide one assessment team member access to their online Brightspace courses (both on-campus and fully online classes) from Winter 2019 and Spring 2019, and student work will be harvested directly from the course shells. Student artifacts consist of Word Documents uploaded to the Assignment area of the course. All student artifacts will be downloaded and each will be assigned a unique code. Each artifact will be reviewed and no instructor information will be retained (all instructor references will be redacted). Student demographics will be collected, including: age, race, and number of credits completed. Student names and personally identifying information will be redacted once the artifact is assigned a unique code. We will ensure there is a large enough pool of artifacts to guarantee anonymity. Artifacts will be scored without any identifying information. Demographic data will be used for data analysis after scoring.

9. Will your project be a direct or indirect assessment of student work? (Include an explanation if relevant.)*

Direct assessment. A shared assignment will be assessed across all courses as part of regular course activities. Student written artifacts are graded coursework.

10. In what term(s) will you collect student work?*

Winter and Spring 2019. Collecting work both terms will give us a bigger pool of artifacts. Because LIB101 is a five-week course, artifacts will be collected by end of week 7 of spring term.

11. In general terms, describe the reassessment project for the year. What steps will you take in carrying out the project?

We have developed a shared assignment for use in the courses and adjusted our teaching to best support the desired outcomes for student learning.

We will begin analyzing data at the end of spring term, specifically, a content analysis/coding of student responses to self-assessment reflection prompts. We will complete scoring artifacts using the Integrated Learning rubric in Fall 2019 in order to fully engage our PT Librarians (who teach LIB101) in the assessment work.

12a. What are the benchmarks (minimum acceptable level of student outcome achievement)?*

We are using the Integrated Learning Rubric developed by the Arts & Letters Discipline Area SAC, linked from the LAC area of Spaces: <https://spaces.pcc.edu/display/AALAR/Templates+and+Process>

We are using a benchmark of 2 for all rubric dimensions in order to align with the DSAC approach to assessment. Demonstrating a benchmark of 2 is the established expectation for all students at the completion of their General Education courses at PCC.

12b. What percentage or frequency of students do you hope to see achieve the benchmarks?*

We expect 100% of students to achieve a level 2 or above for each of the three rubric dimensions.

Integrated Learning Rubric dimensions for criteria 2 (PCC's benchmark) are as follows, with notes on LIB101 learning in italics:

1-Practices and standards dimension level 2: Describes practices or standards of the course, discipline or field. *Research process is the practice and standard in LIB101*

2-Self-assessment dimension level 2: Describes one's own competencies in relation to practices or standards as appropriate to the course, discipline or field. *Description of the significance of learning and changes to practices of finding and evaluating information.*

3-Connections to experience dimension level 2: Describes the impact of academic knowledge on one's own lived experience (personal points of view, values, choices, behavior, or possible future endeavors). *Describes the importance of the topic researched and how what student learned impacted understanding or point of view of the topic.*

4-Contextual awareness dimension level 2: Describes the relationship between one's own work and the larger context (e.g., audience, medium, communities, history or culture). *Describes their considerations when evaluating information from a variety of sources in terms of the dominant narrative on a topic.*

12c. Have your benchmark levels changed based on the results of the initial assessment? If so, why?*

Yes, we have increased the percentage of student achievement from 80% to 100% in order to align with college expectations. While not all of our students are nearing completion of their General Education, the expectation is that all students demonstrate at least a level 2 by the time they complete their GenEd coursework.

We understand this most likely is an impossible benchmark, and we hope to learn a lot from failing to meet this level of frequency in student achievement. We will look at additional data points and dig into the disaggregated data in order to better understand what is or isn't working in support of students demonstrating their learning. We will include: number of credits achieved; course format (f2f or online); intended major (specifically A&D Counseling program because LIB101 is a prerequisite), race, age, and concurrent high school enrollment status.

13. Describe the tools (e.g. rubrics, checklists, standardized exams) you will use in the project to evaluate student work.

We will use a rubric to assess final student reflection responses. The rubric used in the initial assessment maps directly to the Integrated Learning rubric developed by the Arts & Letters Discipline SAC, so we're opting to score artifacts with that rubric. As described above, we used the Integrated Learning rubric as the basis for the assignment redesign and changes to the curriculum in LIB101.

14. Describe how the SAC will ensure that the evaluation of student work is consistent (e.g. norming rubrics, verifying inter-rater reliability).*

We will develop a coding schema and have 2-3 independent raters for each discrete student response for the content analysis. For the holistic assessment using Integrated Learning rubric, we will complete a norming session with the raters prior to independently scoring the artifacts, and will report the percentage of inter-rater reliability.

15. Different SACs and individuals have different training in assessment. Your LAC coach is available to help with any step. What might you need help with moving forward?

We will need help with collecting demographic data for our students. One key question is whether we can easily collect student's intent to apply for the Alcohol and Drug Counseling Program, for which LIB101 is a prerequisite. We also plan to include demographic and completion data in the analysis.

We would like to work with our coach and get recommendations from Learning Assessment Council and Institutional Effectiveness to develop a representative sample in order to include demographic data in our analysis.

Please submit the completed planning section (leaving the following end-of-year report section blank) to learningassessment@pcc.edu by the November deadline.

Annual Reassessment Report 2018-2019

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.

If your SAC was unable to complete the planning section, above, during Fall Term, please fill that section out before completing the following end-of-year report.

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

Yes, while we were able to get demographic data for the Winter and Spring LIB101 student population, the sample size was too small (n = 59) to discern any correlations. The other adjustment is that we did not carry out a content analysis of student responses. We did analyze student work using the Integrated Learning Rubric and report out on that learning assessment here.

17. 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, the Library SAC designed a new shared curriculum for Library 101 and used the initial Self-Reflection assessment to build an assignment focused on Integrated Learning in order to align with the current rubric in use by the Arts & Letters DSAC. The 5-week, one credit course includes a discussion post in week three that introduces the importance of metacognition and self-reflection in the research process and asks them to share out about their learning. We also included a final assignment that walks them through reflecting on their learning, and how what they've learned has impacted their current practice and understandings of what research means to them in terms of their learning. We also designed several activities that focused on critical thinking and source evaluation, as well as reflecting on their search strategies and the process of research, as well as how what they are learning in the course can apply to future college work. The course was designed collaboratively, with additions from Part-Time and Full-Time faculty, and began teaching LIB101 with the new shared online shell beginning summer of 2018.

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

Student achievement was significantly lower than our benchmark of 100% of 2 or higher for all criteria, with the highest level of 76.3% for the Self-Assessment criteria, and the lowest level of 62.7% for the Contextual Awareness criteria. The results indicate that the reflection prompts need clarifying and better alignment to the Integrated Learning rubric if the SAC values those criteria and using that rubric in future assessments. The assessment shows students lack understanding of the concept of "Dominant Narrative" and we will need to better introduce and reinforce that concept and practice when evaluating and selecting an information source.

19a. What were the benchmark levels (minimum acceptable level of student achievement of the outcome) for the project?*

The Integrated Rubric has four dimensions and the expected level of achievement set by the DSAC faculty is 2 (out of a possible 4). For the LIB101 Integrated Learning assessment we set out the following benchmark:

We expect 100% of students to achieve a level 2 or above for each of the four rubric dimensions.

19b. What percentage or frequency of students achieved the benchmark levels?*

Frequency is included in the attached analysis. Percentages of achievement are bolded below.

Percentages of achievement by rubric criteria:

Criteria Score	Practices / Standards	Self-Assessment	Connect to Experience	Contextual Awareness
0-1	35.6%	23.7%	30.5%	37.3%
2-4	64.4%	76.3%	69.5%	62.7%

20. 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.*

The analysis is attached.

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

The revised LIB101 curriculum was a significant shift in the teaching and approach towards emphasizing critical thinking and information literacy. With such a significant change in curriculum, and the introduction of the concept of a dominant narrative when evaluating the perspective of a particular source, the goals for student learning have become more complex. In the initial assessment we had close to 85% achievement across all rubric dimensions. The reassessment shows a need to reinforce throughout the course: metacognition, self-reflection, and the four dimensions of the rubric.

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

One person collected student work from each of the Winter and Spring LIB101 courses and removed all student and instructor identifying information. The artifacts were then distributed to each of the reviewers so that no individual instructor would assess their own student's work. Each artifact was assigned a unique identifier for the purposes of recording scores on a shared spreadsheet.

23. 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.

All of the Part-Time Faculty Librarians teaching LIB 101 in Winter and Spring terms participated in contributing the artifacts. Three faculty participated in the scoring of artifacts: two PT Faculty who taught the course this year and one FT Faculty who has lead the development of the LIB101 curriculum and taught the course in previous terms.

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

Yes, the results justify reassessing after further development of the course. We will assess critical thinking and source evaluation in next year's learning assessment and expect to revise the curriculum based on those results as well. It could be useful to revisit assessing self-reflection and integrated learning in the next iteration of LIB101. While students are able to articulate detailed descriptions of their learning and experiences as researchers, there is a need to better build and reinforce each of the rubric dimensions, and contextual awareness in particular.

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

We have completed preliminary analysis but have not fully analyzed the assessment results. The preliminary analysis will be shared with the Library SAC over email prior to the pre-fall meeting in September during in-service week. We will discuss the results at the Sept. SAC meeting and determine whether a fuller analysis is needed at that time.

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

We used this reassessment as an opportunity to align our existing Self-Assessment rubric with the Integrated Learning rubric, and so the results are not fully comparable to the original assessment. In other words, while the rubric used in the initial assessment aligns with the Integrated Learning rubric, the benchmarks are not perfectly comparable because the rubrics differ. The results will be more meaningful in future assessments if the rubrics are consistent.

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

We were aspirational in our attempt to build data literacy and begin to consider demographic data in our approach to learning assessment. The sample pool was too small to be meaningful, but it would be helpful for the learning assessment council to work with college partners (DEI, Institutional Effectiveness, the YESS data team, etc) to begin building our capacity in this area.

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

Thank you for your feedback!

Please submit your report to learningassessment@pcc.edu by the June deadline.

