Subject Area Committee Name: Anthropology

Core Outcome Being Assessed: Cultural Awareness

Contact Person:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name | e-mail |
| Michele Wilson | michele.wilson2@pcc.edu |

Use this form if your assessment project is a follow-up reassessment of a previously completed initial assessment. The basic model we use for core outcome assessment at PCC is an “assess – address – reassess” model.

The primary purpose for yearly assessment is to improve student learning. We do this by seeking out areas of concern, making changes, reassessing to see if the changes helped.

Only one assessment or reassessment report is required this year. Document your plan for this year’s assessment report(s) in the first sections of this form. This plan can be consistent with the Multi-Year Plan you have submitted to the LAC, though, this year, because PCC is engaging in a year-long exploration of our core outcomes and general education program, SACs are encouraged to explore/assess other potential outcomes. If reassessing, complete each section of this form. In some cases, all of the information needed to complete the section may not be available at the time the report is being written. In those cases, include the missing information when submitting the completed report at the end of the year.

* Refer to the help document for guidance in filling-out this report. If this document does not address your question/concern, contact [Chris Brooks](mailto:christopher.brooks3@pcc.edu) 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 MTH)
* **File name:** SACInitials\_ARF\_2016 (Example: MTH\_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 16th, 2015**
* **Completed LAC Assessment or Reassessment Reports: June 17th, 2016**

Please Verify This Before Beginning this Report:

This project is the second stage of the assess/re-assess process (if this is not a follow-up, re-assessment project, use the LAC Assessment Report Form LDC. Available at: <http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/learning-assessment/LDC_Assessment_Templates.html>

**Initial Assessment Project Summary (previously completed assessment project)**

|  |
| --- |
| Briefly summarize the main findings of your initial assessment. Include either 1) the frequencies (counts) of students who attained your benchmarks and those who did not, or 2) the percentage of students who attained your benchmark(s) and the size of the sample you measured:  The following summarizes the reassessment of Cultural Awareness in 2014-2015 (initial assessment was completed in 2013-2014, and those data can be found in that year's EOY Report). For 2014-2015 the sample measured: 231 students in the Presurvey (beginning of the term), and 58 students in the Postsurvey (end of the term). All students enrolled in 100-level ATH classes during Winter Term 2015 were our target, but not all of them participated in assessment for various (typical) reasons.  Percentage of Students who attained benchmark: 89.89% of 231 students attained the benchmark level over-all in response to the ten (10) questions administered at the beginning of the term ("Presurvey"). 93.62% of 58 students attained the benchmark level over-all in response to the ten (10) questions adminstered at the end of the term ("Postsurvey"). |
| Briefly summarize the changes to instruction, assignments, texts, lectures, etc. that you have made to address your initial findings:  After the Presurvey was administered during the first week of Winter 2015 term, the SAC Assessment Coordinator performed a cursory examination of the students' responses to determine which questions were most frequently missed. Those results were relayed to all SAC instructors participating in assessment so that they could address those errors in their instruction. NOTE: Faculty did not "teach" to any of the missed questions, but instead addressed the acumenical and discipline-specific challenges they believed the students faced that prevented them from answering the questions correctly. |
| If you initially assessed students in courses, which courses did you assess:  All 100-level ATH courses at all campuses and centers. |
| If you made changes to your assessment tools or processes for this reassessment, briefly describe those changes here:  Last year was the first year that assessment was delivered wholly via cloud. The previous year's assessment also utilized a survey instrument but was delivered hard-copy to live classes and as a "fill in the blank" document to on-line classes. The SAC determined that moving to a cloud-based format may increase the number of students who participated in assessment. We learned that participation in the cloud-based Presurvey was nearly equal to that in the previous year's assessment hard-copy format. Disconcerting, participation in the cloud-based Postsurvey was nearly half of the previous year's assessment hard-copy format. After discussion, the SAC agreed that students may in fact be more persuaded to participate if we return to the hard-copy format (that it will be harder for students to ignore the survey if it is handed to them in person).  On-line classes will continue to be assessed by utilizing a cloud-based instrument because of the nature of the classes. Last year, on-line participation in assessment was simultaneously excellent and poor. One faculty member saw participation among their students in both surveys at nearly 90%, while another faculty member saw no participation among their students (in either survey). We are working on understanding why the latter occurred so that it will not be repeated in this year's assessment. |

**1. Core Outcome**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1A. PCC Core Outcome: | Cultural Awareness |
| 1B. The Core Outcomes can look different in different disciplines and courses. For example, professional competence in math might emphasize the procedural skills needed for the next course; professional competence in psychology might emphasize the ability to interpret the meaning of some basic statistics. Briefly describe how your SAC will be identifying and measuring your students’ attainment of this core outcome below. | |
| A presurvey and postsurvey will be administered to all students enrolled in 100-level ATH classes in Winter term 2016. The survey will consist of twenty (20) true/false questions about the mechanics, expressions, and beliefs common in culture. | |
| 1C. Ideally, assessment projects are driven by faculty curiosity about student learning (e.g., are they really getting what is expected in this course?). Briefly share how/why the faculty expectation assessed in this report is useful to your students. Continuing with the above examples, if math students do not have the expected procedural skills for the next course, they may not be successful; psychology students are required to read and understand peer-reviewed research in the next course – so the ability to interpret basic statistics is essential for success in the next course. | |
| The "how" is defined above in Question 1B. The "why" is useful to students because having the ability to recognize the value of diverse human behaviors measures their ability to move their thinking about the nature of being human and working cooperatively with different people to more advanced levels. Thus, they will not only be prepared for higher-level coursework they will also be better positioned for thinking more holistically about the complexity of human behavior and interactions and the role they play as individuals in the process.  The SAC also agrees that continuing to assess Cultural Awareness is crucial because it is an Institutional Outcome that directly speaks to the nature of the Anthropology discipline and subsequently the work that we do in every class. Because this year's assessment is being defined as a "Year of Inquiry" we are troubled by the potential for the outcome to be eliminated. Our hope is that the results of our assessment may be used to discourage any potential elimination of the outcome at the Institutional level. | |

**2. Project Description**

|  |
| --- |
| 2A. Assessment Context |
| ***Check all the applicable items:*** |
| **Course based assessment.**  Course names and number(s): ATH 101 (Introduction to Physical Anthropology), ATH 102 (Introduction to Archaeology and Prehistory), and ATH 103 (Introduction to Cultural Anthropology).  Expected number of sections offered in the term when the assessment project will be conducted:  Number of these sections taught by full-time instructors: 5  Number of these sections taught by part-time instructors: 8  Number of distance learning/hybrid sections: 5  Type of assessment (e.g., essay, exam, speech, project, etc.): Presurvey and Postsurvey  Are there course outcomes that align with this aspect of the core outcome being investigated?  Yes  No  If yes, include the course outcome(s) from the relevant CCOG(s): For ATH 101: Use an understanding of biology, genetics and fossil evidence to examine the process of human physical and cultural evolution over time. For ATH 102: Evaluate the impact of human beings on the environment over time and in different ecological settings. For ATH 103: Reflect on how personal and social values are shaped by culture, and examine the role ethnocentrism plays in promoting cultural misunderstanding and intolerance at the local and global level.  **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.):  **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:  **Survey**  **Interview**  **Other.** Please attach the activity/assessment in an appendix. If the activity cannot be shared, please briefly describe:  In the event publically 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: Objective Scoring (hard-copy/scantron, and a cloud-based survey) |
| 2C. Type of assessment (select one per column)  **Quantitative**   **Direct Assessment**  **Qualitative**   **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. 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: In addition to a committee (that includes one full-time and one adjunct faculty), all ATH faculty commented individually and then together as a group about the efficacy of the instrument in measuring the outcome, and which components to include in the instrument) |
| 2E. In which quarter will student artifacts (examples 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. When during the term will it be collected? If student artifacts will be collected more than once in a term, check all that apply.  **Early**  **Mid-term**  **Late**  **n/a** |
| 2G. 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 enrolled in ATH 100-level courses at the beginning of the term; all students remaining in the same courses at the end of the term (at all campuses and centers). |
| 2H. 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 (proceed to section H below)**  **To participate in the Multi-State Collaborative for Learning Outcomes Assessment**  **Preliminary/Exploratory investigation**  If you selected ‘Preliminary/Exploratory’, briefly describe your rationale for selecting your sample of interest (skip section H below). For example: “The SAC intends to add a Cultural Awareness outcome to this course in the upcoming year. 2 full-time faculty and 1 part-time faculty member will field-test 3 different activities/assessments intended to measure student attainment of this proposed course outcome. The 3 will be compared to see which work best.” |
| 2I. 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 some of the relevant instructors are participating)  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:  **2J. Briefly describe the procedure you will use to select your sample (including a description of the procedures used to ensure student and instructor anonymity**. For example:  “We chose to use a random sample. We asked our administrative assistant to assist us in this process and she was willing. All instructors teaching course XXX will turn-in all student work to her by the 9th week of Winter Quarter. She will check that instructor and student identifying information has been removed. Our SAC decided we wanted to see our students’ over-all performance with the rubric criteria. Our administrative assistant will code the work for each section so that the scored work can be returned to the instructors (but only she will know which sections belong to which instructor). Once all this is done, I will number the submitted work (e.g., 1-300) and use a random number generator to select 56 samples (which is the sample size given by the Raosoft sample size calculator for 300 pieces of student work). After the work is scored, the administrative assistant will return the student work to individual faculty members. After this, we will set up a face-to-face meeting for all of the SAC to discuss the aggregated results.”  We chose the population (all students enrolled in 100-level ATH courses during Winter 2016 term). Faculty will adminster the survey the first day of class and the last week of class (preferably the last day). On both dates, live-class faculty will instruct students to only mark course information on the Scantron sheet; on-line faculty will embed a Qualtrics survey (or survey link) in their course which will be formatted to ensure anonymity. If they inadvertantly mark their names or any other identifiable metrics, those will be redacted.  Students will then complete the survey, and give their completed Scantrons back to the faculty member who will then forward them to the Assessment Coordinator; on-line results will be also be collected by the SAC Assessment Coordinator via Qualtrics. The Assessment Coordinator will use a rubric (Scantron "key" and preformatted Qualtrics' answer key) to calculate each student's right and wrong responses to survey questions. This will occur twice (again, after the presurvey and postsurvey).  Results from the Presurvey will be shared via email with all faculty participating in assessment to inform their instruction throughout the rest of the term (and ultimately leading up to the Postsurvey, and as was done after 2014-2015's Presurvey).  The end of the year's aggregated results will be shared during Spring 2016 in-service at the ATH SAC meeting. |
| 2K. 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). **Estimate the size of the group you will be measuring (either your sample or your population size [when you are measuring all relevant students]). Often, this can be based on recent enrollment information (last year, this term, etc.):**  In Winter 2015, there were nearly 400 students enrolled in 100-level ATH classes at PCC (including all campuses and centers). Depending on enrollment for Winter 2016, the size of the group will be the same as, more, or less than this number at the beginning of the term (for the presurvey). By the end of the term (for the postsurvey), this number will likely be less because of attrition, student absense, or other reasons that prevent students from being present when the survey is adminstered. |



**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.  Multiple raters should always be used in SAC assessment projects that utilize rubrics or checklists. SACs have several options for ensuring that ratings are similar across each rater. The most time consuming option is for all raters to collectively rate and discuss each artifact until they reach 100% agreement on each score (this is called **consensus**). In most cases, SACs should consider a more efficient strategy that divides the work (a norming or calibrating session). During a norming session, all raters participate in a training where the raters individually score pre-selected student work and then discuss their reasons for giving the scores they chose. Disagreements are resolved and the process is repeated. When the participants feel they are all rating student work consistently, they then independently score additional examples of student work in the norming session (often 4-6 artifacts). The ratings for these additional artifacts are checked to see what percentage of the scores are in agreement (the standard is 70% agreement or higher). When this standard is reached in the norming session, the raters can then divide-up the student work and rate it independently. If your SAC is unfamiliar with norming procedures, contact [Chris Brooks](mailto:christopher.brooks3@pcc.edu) to arrange for coaching help for your SAC’s norming session.  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  If you are using agreement, describe your plan for plan for conducting the “norming” or “calibrating” session:  SAC memebers collectively agreed to reuse the Pre/Postsurvey instrument from 2014-2015 Assessment. Each member rereviewed each question, and made suggestions about questions (commenting to keep the question in situ, change it, or delete it). In addition, each SAC member offered 2 new questions to add to the surveys. Michele Wilson, the SAC Assessment Coordinator, is in the process of collecting all of these data, and will communicate with SAC members about the results. Ultimately, the SAC will include questions in both surveys based on majority agreement.  **Consensus** - all raters score all artifacts and reach agreement on each score  Though rarely used at PCC, some SACs might occasionally use the consistency measure for determining the similarity of their ratings. Consistency is generally only recommended when measuring student improvement – not for showing outcome attainment (which explains its rarity). See the Help Guide for more information. Check here if you will be using consistency calculations in this assessment.  **Consistency\*** – raters’ scores are correlated: this captures relative standing of the performance ratings - but not precise agreement – and then briefly describe your plan: | | |
| 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** (determined by faculty consensus – all instructors who currently teach the course)  Yes (determined by only some of the instructors who currently teach the course)  **Yes** (determined by alignment with an external standard: e.g., standards published by the discipline’s professional organization)  **Yes** (determined by post-requisite course expectations within PCC)  **Yes** (determined by post-requisite course expectations for transfer institution)  **Yes** (other). Describe briefly:  **No**  If yes, briefly describe your performance benchmarks, being as specific as possible (if needed, attach as an appendix):  At the SAC's Fall 2015 Inservice meeting, most faculty were present (both full-time and four of six part-time). Considerable time was spent discussing how to measure the outcome, and based upon consensus, we agreed to continue to use quantitative direct assessment (instead of a rubric) in the form of true/false questions. After the meeting, the Assessment Coordinator forwarded a questionnaire to every ATH faculty member asking them to comment about the instrument (as previously described in 3a "Agreement"). At this time, the SAC continues to evaluate the instrument. It will be finalized by the end of Fall 2015 term.  The SAC agreed to continue to use our 2014-2015 benchmarks: 25% of the students would likely attain the benchmark over-all in the Presurvey (answering 70%, or 7 questions, correctly); 75% of the students would likely attain the benchmark over-all in the Postsurvey. NOTE: As faculty are currently examining each question proposed for the instrument, we agreed to more closely consider the wording in previously used and newly proposed questions. We want to ensure that students are asked to critically think about their ability to be culturally aware in a variety of contexts.  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 identifying student information (and, when possible remove instructor identifying information). If the SAC wishes to return instructor-specific results, see the Help Guide for suggestions on how to code and collate. Please share your process for ensuring that all identifying information has been removed.**  As noted in the response to Question 2J, faculty who are teaching a 100-level ATH class during Winter 2015 term will instruct students to only mark the course information on the Scantron sheet. If they inadvertantly mark their names or any other identifiable metrics, those will be redacted by the Assessment Coordinator. Once results are determined (from running students' individual answers marked on Scantron sheets through the Scantron machine), students' original answer sheets will be securely filed (and saved for one year for reference). | | |
| 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:  "Yes" in that coding will identify which ATH 100-level class the results represent and for which instructor students are completing the survey. | | |
| 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 consult with an LAC coach prior to submitting your plan/conducting your assessment.  Other groups may be appropriate depending on the assessment. 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.***

1. 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, note the changes in the planning section above. |

5. Results of the Analysis of Assessment Project Data

|  |
| --- |
| 5A. Quantitative Summary of Sample/Population  How many students were enrolled in all sections of the course(s) you assessed this year?  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 assessed in this project?  Did you use a recommended sample size (see the Sample Size Calculator linked to above)?  **Yes**   **No**  If you did not use a recommended sample size in your assessment, briefly explain why: |
| *5B. 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 SAC’s LAC Coach if you would like help with 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: |
| 5C. Brief Summary of Your Results  In most cases, report the numbers of students who attain your benchmark level and the numbers who do not. **Do not average these numbers or combine dissimilar categories (e.g., do not combine ratings for communication and critical thinking together).** If your project measures how many students attain the overall benchmark level of performance, report the summary numbers below (choose one):   1. If you used frequencies (the actual number who attained the desired level(s) and the actual number who did not), report those here for each of your criteria for this learning outcome. For example, “54 students attained the benchmark level over-all in written communication and 7 did not. Our SAC used 5 criteria within this rubric: 54 student achieved the benchmark level in idea expression (7 did not); 54 achieved the benchmark level for use of standard English (10 did not); etc.”      1. If your project used percentages of the total to identify the degree of benchmark attainment in this project, report those here for each of your criteria for this learning outcome. For example, “89% of 61 students attained the benchmark level over-all in written communication. Our SAC used 5 criteria within this rubric: 89% of students achieved the benchmark level in idea expression; 89% achieved the benchmark level for use of standard English; etc.”      1. Compare your students’ attainment of your expectations/benchmarks in this reassessment with their attainment in the initial assessment. Briefly summarize your conclusions. |
| 5D. 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** |
| 5E. What did the SAC learn about your students’ attainment of your important benchmarks from this reassessment? For example, “We are pleased that most of our students are using standard English in their writing, and want to improve our students’ ability to express ideas clearly. We found significant improvements in the reassessment as a result of the changes in instruction and assignments that we made this year….” |
| 5F. Do the results of this project suggest that additional 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.    If you are planning changes, when will these changes be fully implemented? |
| 5G. 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** |

6. SAC Response to the Assessment Project Results

|  |
| --- |
| 6A. 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  tools 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).    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). |

7. Follow-Up Plan

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7A. How will the changes detailed in this report be shared with all FT/PT faculty in your SAC? (select all that apply) | | | |
| email  campus mail  *no changes to share* | phone call  face-to-face meeting | | workshop  other |
| If ‘other,’ please describe briefly below. | | | |
|  | | | |
| 7B. Is further collaboration/training required to properly implement the identified changes?  Yes  No | | | |
| If ‘Yes,’ briefly detail your plan/schedule below. | | | |
|  | | | |
| 7C. Sometimes reassessment projects call for additional reassessments. These can be formal or informal. How will you assess the effectiveness of the changes you plan to make? | | | |
| follow-up project in next year’s annual report | | on-going informal assessment | |
| in a future assessment project | | other | |
| If ‘other,’ please describe briefly below. | | | |
|  | | | |
| 7D. 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. | | | |