Annual Report for Assessment of Outcomes 2011-2012

Please address the questions below
send to *learningassessment@pcc.edu* by **June 22, 2011**; with Annual Report in the subject line

Note: Information provided in this report may be inserted into or summarized in Section 2C (LDC/DE)) or 6B (CTE) of the Program Review Outline.

1. Describe <u>changes that have been implemented</u> towards improving students' attainment of outcomes that resulted from outcome <u>assessments carried out in 2010-2011</u>.   These may include but are not limited to changes to content, materials, instruction, pedagogy etc.

*We added more content related to defining **research-based instruction** and **advocacy** in our courses so that our students would be better able to articulate these concepts. Additional information was offered in ED 251, ED 131, and ED 100. Both of these concepts are part of the Oregon Paraeducator certificate which guides our coursework and assessment process. We discussed this as a SAC and directed faculty to emphasize and define both concepts more clearly.*

For <u>each outcome assessed this year</u>:

2. Describe the assessment design (tool and processes) used. Include relevant information about:

- The nature of the assessment (e.g., written work, project, portfolio, exam, survey, performance etc.) and if it is direct (assesses evidence mastery of outcomes) or indirect (student's perception of mastery). Please give rationale for indirect assessments (direct assessments are preferable).

- The student sample assessed (including sample size relative to the targeted student population for the assessment activity) process and rationale for selection of the student sample. Why was this group of students and/or courses chosen?

- Any rubrics, checklists, surveys or other tools that were used to evaluate the student work. (Please include with your report). Where appropriate, identify benchmarks.

- How you analyzed results, including steps taken to ensure that results are reliable (consistent from one evaluator to another.

Students who wish to obtain an AAS or a one-year certificate in Paraeducation must complete a portfolio to demonstrate that they have successfully met all program outcomes. They take a culminating course (ED 263) to compile all their work, choose appropriate artifacts, write reflective statements describing the artifacts and how they demonstrate competence, and receive support in doing so. Portfolios are reviewed by a team of faculty according to a statewide rubric (since PCC offers the statewide certificate). Reliability is ensured by having the team review the portfolios together and coming to consensus on each rating on the rubric. This year the team paid special attention to how well the students demonstrated understanding of the term"research-based instruction" since students had needed extra support in last year. The education faculty reviewed a sample of five students who completed portfolios. It was a small sample, but it did represent 100% of students completing portfolios this year..

*At the suggestion of last year's assessment feedback, the SAC sought a larger sample to measure student comprehension of **advocacy**. The SAC looked at a broader sample of papers written for ED 100: Introduction to Education which is offered online to hundreds of students every year (many are students who are not completing our certificate or degree). The seven members of the Education SAC used a **trend analysis** in reviewing the 76 papers addressing advocacy during fall and winter terms. The prompt provided to students: "Write a one-page paper describing two different situations in which advocacy would be part of an educator's job". In the same module, students have had a chance to review a power point regarding*

advocacy and ethics in schools and respond to an ethical scenario in a discussion with fellow students. We wanted to see in these advocacy papers what students were talking about and whether they had a good understanding of this concept.

3. Provide information about the results (i.e., what did you learn about how well students are meeting the outcomes)?

   - If scored (e.g., if a rubric or other scaled tool is used), please report the data, and relate to any appropriate benchmarks.
   - Results should be broken down in a way that is meaningful and useful for making improvements to teaching/learning.   Please show those specific results.

   *The evidence in the **portfolio** clearly showed that all five students successfully demonstrated a solid understanding of **research-based instruction, and met all the outcomes of the program successfully.***

   *The evidence provided by the **ED 100 papers on the topic of advocacy** varied a great deal in terms of types of advocacy and included the following reasons for advocacy: mentoring, disability, English Language Learners, New teachers, students success, criticism of teachers, student government, bullying, abuse, program cuts, reading difficulties, sexual harassment, college advising, parents, school funding, low self-esteem, adjusting instruction, interpretation, discrimination, professional development, taking to principal or counselor, low-income, teaching about self-advocacy. The areas which were most prominent included fifty-seven percent discussing **disability** (43/76) and forty-one percent discussing **English Language Learners** (31/76). This makes sense as each remain a strong focus of this program. The SAC agreed that the quality of response varied a great deal and that the assignment could be improved in terms of soliciting more depth of understanding.*

4. Identify any changes that should, as a result of this assessment, be implemented to help improve students' attainment of outcomes. (These may include, but are not limited to, changes in curriculum, content, materials, instruction, pedagogy etc).

   *While the SAC felt that measures **taken to more explicitly instruct about research-based instruction were sufficient, the advocacy papers proved that this area could use some improvement.** While reviewing the portfolios, the committee discovered a powerful letter of advocacy written by a student in the program. The letter so well demonstrated a student's understanding of advocacy for educators that they recommend the assignment change from the advocacy paper to an advocacy letter in written for a realistic scenario such as the one by the student (see attached).*

5. Reflect on the effectiveness of this assessment tool and assessment process. Please describe any changes to assessment methodology that would lead to more meaningful results if this assessment were to be repeated (or adapted to another outcome). Is there a different kind of assessment tool or process that the SAC would like to use for this outcome in the future?   If the assessment tool and processes does not need to be revised, please indicate this.

The use of the more in-depth portfolio and the broader (larger in number) trend analysis of one assignment provided two different perspectives on different issues in the program, and each seemed to shed some light on student comprehension of the issues we were assessing. The SAC intends to continue using both for assessment purposes, looking at different issues each year as needed. Next year's assessment will again focus on advocacy with a trend-analysis using the new assignment to see if students demonstrate a better understanding of advocacy.

The Education department piloted the e-portfolio and students used it in the portfolio class to show each other their artifacts and reflections. While no one elected to use it for their final portfolio product, two out of the five students used the tool to organize all of their artifacts and reflections. In the next academic year, all education students will have access to the e-portfolio and be guided by their instructors to save artifacts in every course. All online courses will have modules with explicit e-portfolio instruction and Education instructors will be trained to guide students appropriately.

Tanya Mead
Education SAC Chair
June 21, 2012