

Annual Assessment 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>
Ben Cushing	Loren.cushing@pcc.edu

1. What SAC do you represent?

Sociology

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

Cultural Literacy

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

Faculty submitted artifacts from any course that had an assignment that had been aligned to the CL Rubric 2.0.

4a. How will you sample student work?*

From their roster, listed in alphabetical order by last name, faculty selected every 6th student: students 6, 12, 18, 24 & 30. They then downloaded the artifacts submitted by those students, redacted identifying information, and uploaded them into a shared google folder.

4b. Will the student work be part of the regular graded assignments for the course(s)?*

Yes

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

Faculty members will remove student names from artifacts prior to submitting artifacts to Ben Cushing. Ben will then double check to ensure that names have been redacted.

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

Direct assessment of authentic graded assignments using PCC's Cultural Literacy Rubric 2.0.

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

We will collect artifacts during winter term (2019). Artifacts will be scored in spring 2019.

8. Briefly describe the purpose or goal of this project. In other words, what are you hoping to learn?

In the previous year, our assessment project yielded important lessons about our assessment methods. In short, our data offered very little understanding of student learning, but it helped us to identify problems in aligning our assignments with our rubric. This year, we're focusing a great deal on assignment design (with assignment design Charettes in Fall and Winter terms) in the hope that we will be able to gather more conclusive data.

9. In general terms, describe the assessment project for the year. What steps will you take in carrying out the project?*

Fall term:

All sac members revise their assignment based on feedback from the Office of Academic Affairs (part of last year's assessment work.)

Jamee Kristen leads an Assignment Charette in our October SAC meeting. Faculty work in groups of 4 to provide/receive feedback on the assignments they plan to use to assess Cultural Literacy (aligned with new rubric) in their winter term courses. Faculty plan to revise assignments based on peer feedback and will give assignments to winter term courses for SAC/LAC assessment project

Winter term:

Ben Cushing will lead a second Assignment Charette early in winter term, so that faculty will have time to implement their revised assignment that term. PT faculty will be compensated from the 10 hour pool of SAC funding for assessment.

Faculty will assign their assignment, collect a random sample of artifacts, redact identifying information and forward artifacts to Ben Cushing.

Spring term:

During our spring SAC meeting, we will norm to the rubric and score student artifacts.

10a. What are the benchmarks (minimum acceptable level of student outcome achievement)?*

We would like to see our students meet level 2 on the Cultural Literacy Rubric Version 2.0.

10b. What percentage or frequency of students do you hope to see achieve the benchmarks?*

We don't yet have the baseline data to allow us to develop clear expectations for achievement. We hope that this year's assessment project will help us clarify our expectations.

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

We will be using PCC's Cultural Literacy Rubric Version 2.0. to assess authentic graded assignments.

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

Our Spring SAC meeting will be dedicated to norming to the rubric and then assessing student work. Each artifact will be assessed by two faculty members. Our data entry will track each individual artifact with an artifact number, which will allow us to identify any inconsistency in scoring.

13. If the results of the project indicate a need for additional instruction on the outcome in the future (i.e. during the reassessment year), what are possible steps the SAC might take to help students improve outcome achievement?*

Up until now, assessment has helped SAC members improve their teaching primarily through improved assignment design. If this year's assessment project yields more robust data (and we hope it will) we may be able to discuss strategies for refining our instruction. If this is the case, that discussion will take place in our Fall SAC Meeting in 2019.

14. 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?

I (Ben) could certainly use support in methods for sampling student artifacts and efficiently gathering sampled artifacts from various faculty.

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

Annual Assessment 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 first part of that process is the initial assessment of an outcome.

If this is a reassessment of an outcome that your SAC assessed previously, please use the Annual Reassessment Report instead.

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.

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

No changes were made.

16. Please provide an executive summary of your results; include only key data points and your overall findings regarding student learning.

The SAC scored 40 individual artifacts.

Four were scored within our Spring SAC meeting, as part of our norming process. These four artifacts (numbers 1, 2, 3 and 12) were scored by 8 faculty each.

The remaining artifacts were scored outside the meeting. Each remaining artifact was scored by two faculty members.

Mean scores for each criterion:

Definition: 1.27

Application: 2.28

Systems of Power: 2.0

Self-Reflection: 1.62

I believe that the relatively low scores for Definition (and to some extent Self-Reflection) reflect a continued need to clarify instructions within some assignments. Seven (out of 40) artifacts were scored at a 0 for Definition by both scorers.

17a. What were the benchmarks levels (minimum acceptable level of student achievement of the outcome) for the project?*

This is the first year in which we collected data that we consider reliable - due to our learning curve in terms of assignment design and rubric alignment. We generally hoped that our students would achieve at level 2.

17b. What percentage or frequency of students achieved the benchmark levels?*

If our benchmark is level 2, this is the percent of students who met the benchmark for each criterion:
Definition: 40%
Application: 87%
Systems of Power: 68%
Self-Reflection: 44%

18. 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.*

Attached

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

Redaction was completed by faculty prior to submitting artifacts to our shared google folder. This was easy when students submitted word documents, but difficult when students submitted PDFs. As a result, some PDF artifacts submitted to the folder still included identifying information. I (Ben) then printed all artifacts and used a sharpie to black out all remaining identifying information. This process was imperfect and labor intensive. We would be interested to know if members of the LAC or other SACs have found more effective and efficient methods for redaction.

20. 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 student work? Did all instructors or a representative sample of instructors contribute student work to be evaluated?) Identify any barriers to participation within the SAC.

In general, we had a high level of SAC involvement. Our faculty generally understand assessment and are working together to share the workload. In addition to our FT faculty, 6 PT faculty participated in our Fall SAC meeting norming and scoring process. PT faculty we paid for their work scoring artifacts outside of our SAC meeting. Still, several faculty members do not attend SAC meetings and have been generally disconnected from the assessment process. Outreach to these faculty will be important as we move forward in our assessment work.

21. Were potential benefits to student learning identified as a result of the assessment project? How will the SAC use the information during the reassessment of the outcome in the future (i.e. "closing the loop.")*

The primary benefit of assessment work so far has been improvement in assignment design. Assignment instructions have become clearer and more closely aligned with course content.

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

This report, and the accompanying data set, will be sent to SAC members. Additionally, a portion of our September or October SAC meeting will be dedicated to discussing the implications of this data and planning our 2019-2020 assessment work.

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

The successes we've had with assignment design have underscored the importance of aligning assignments to the rubric. Without a solid assignment, data is of very little value. We will continue to emphasize this within our SAC.

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

We are transitioning to a new SAC Chair this year: Kim Smith. Just as I needed a good deal of support in navigating the assessment process, Kim will probably need the same. Other SAC members will also be deeply engaged in assessment work and supporting our chair.

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

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