Subject Area Committee Name: EMS

Contact Person:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name | e-mail |
| Jackilyn Williams | jackilyn.cypher@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 focal assessment or reassessment report is required this year. Document your plan for this year’s reassessment report 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 to arrange for coaching assistance.
* Please attach all rubrics/assignments/etc. to your report submissions.
* **Subject Line of Email:** Ressessment Report Form (or RRF) for <your SAC name> (Example: RRF for NRS)
* **File name:** SACInitials\_RRF\_2016 (Example: NRS\_RRF\_2016)
* SACs are encouraged to share this report with their LAC coach for feedback before submitting.
* Make all submissions to 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:

[x]  This project is in the second stage of the assess/re-assess process (if this is an initial assessment, use the LAC Assessment Report Form LDC. Available at: <http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/learning-assessment/CTEAssessment_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 initial assessment included the entire 2014 program population (n24). At that time, the population meeting benchmarks = 24 (100%); population not meeting benchmarks = 0. It needs to be noted that the initial assessment was an in-progress assessment, not complete. One reassessment has already been reported, the 2014-2015 program population (n24), again, it needs to be noted that the reassessment reported on was also an in-progress assessment, meaning no data was available to report. The program is including the 2015-2016 report also as a reassessment, because there was no results to report in the first reassessment. We can report data captured on the first reassessment to get a clear picture of outcomes.  |
| Briefly summarize the changes to instruction, assignments, texts, lectures, etc. that you have made to address your initial findings:There were no changes between the initial reporting (2013-2014) and the first reassessment reporting (2014-2015). The initial reporting was an in-progress assessment, and final results were not available until Feb. 2015. The first reassessment reporting also will have no data to report until approximately April 2016. The paramedic program runs on a calendar year, not an academic year, so we are not able to report complete summary data in a June report. Both times we were seeing indications of positive progression & attainment of outcomes, hence did not want or need to make changes until all data was available.  |
| If you initially assessed students in courses, which courses did you assess:Our initial report (2013-2014) included Spring Term 2014 (EMS 242 & EMS 244). EMS 242 is a Didactic/Skills Lab Course; EMS 244 is Clinical (Hospital) Rotations with a weekly Skills Lab component. At the time of the initial report was submitted (June 2014), we were looking at incomplete data, as we were looking for summary data from the entire program, not just a few courses. This was the case with the 2014-2015 reassessment. |
| If you made changes to your assessment tools or processes for this reassessment, briefly describe those changes here:As noted above, no changes were made. |

**1. Outcome Chosen for Focal Analysis**

|  |
| --- |
| 1A. Briefly describe what and why this focal outcome is being investigate: (e.g., “First term students do not seem to be able to transfer the knowledge from their math class to our program class. We wish to investigate student understanding of the needed math concepts upon entry into our course. If students do have the theoretical understanding, we will investigate ways we can help students apply their knowledge in a concrete application.” A second example is: “Anecdotally, it seems that our first year students are not retaining critical information between Winter and Spring Quarters.” We will measure student benchmark attainment in Winter Quarter.There is an expectation by clinical & field preceptors that paramedic student interns begin their rotations ready to perform, communicate and accept feedback on their performance. Many EMTs enter the paramedic program lacking the ability to professionally accept & use verbal and/or written feelback to improve performance. We want to determine if simulation feedback gives them the communication skills to respond positively & productively to verbal feedback from preceptors, without becoming defensive. Competence in communication skills is critical for the professional paramedic, and we need to explore methods to ensure that the students are progressing through the program from simple to complex therapeutic communication, while also addressing cultural awareness. We are exploring & developing these results for evaluation of student attainment of paramedic level competency. We would like to do a second reassessment as to capture all of the data from one program cohort for PCC outcomes reporting.  |
| 1B. If the assessment project relates to any of the following, check all that apply:[x]  Degree/Certificate Outcome – if yes, include here: Demonstrate communication skills of the medical environment in order to develop & maintain professional client relationships at the Paramedic level.[x]  PCC Core Outcome – if yes, which one: Communication; Cultural Awareness[x]  Course Outcome – if yes, which one: Professional Interpersonal Communication; The ability to understand & respond to unique cultural needs of patients. |

**2. Project Description**

|  |
| --- |
| 2A. Assessment Context |
| ***Check all the applicable items:*** |
| [x]  **Course based assessment.** Course names and number(s): Didactic II, EMS 242; Clinical I/Clinical II, EMS 244/246; Field I/Field II, EMS 248/250; Didactic III EMS 252 (Capstone Sourse)Expected number of sections offered in the term when the assessment project will be conducted: 1 (Only 1 section of each course is offered in any given year)Number of these sections taught by full-time instructors: 100%Number of these sections taught by part-time instructors: 0 %Number of distance learning/hybrid sections included: 0Type of assessment (e.g., essay, exam, speech, project, etc.): Simulation ScenariosAre there course outcomes that align with this aspect of the core outcome being investigated? [x]  Yes [ ]  NoIf yes, include the course outcome(s) from the relevant CCOG(s): EMS 242: The student will be able to: 5. Synthesize facts and principles from the psychosocial sciences in describing the unique challenges in dealing with themselves, adults, children, and other special populations when faced with a death and dying situation.EMS 244/246: The student will: 3.Effectively communicate in a self-directed manner with persons of diverse cultural backgrounds and roles in a variety of settings. 4.Demonstrate ethical and legal responsibilities in regard to health care 7.Develop a plan of care based on the patients history and physical exam, develop a problem list, and identify the appropriate intervention for each problem. 8.Solicit and utilize the preceptors feedback to improve performance 9.Meet potential employer expectations by developing an appropriate resume and demonstrating well- developed interview skills. EMS 248/250: The student will: 2.Gain a working knowledge of the EMS system he/she is assigned to, and or Oregon's EMS system in general. 8.Solicit and utilize the preceptor's feedback to improve performance. EMS 252: The student will: 1.Demonstrate synthesizing facts and principles from the biophysical-psychosocial science throughout human development in the assessment and communication process for patients of all ages. 3.Identify the paramedic role within the health care system and serve as a healthy role model for public, peers and other health care professionals. 7.Demonstrate effective communication with peers and direction of a medical team during emergency medical care procedures. 9.Demonstrate accurate and succinct written and/or oral reporting with regards to patient care. [x]  **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.): **Clinical & Field Simulation Formative & Summative Evaluations (Appendix J); Simulation Performance Standards (Appendix I); Global Affective Professional Behavior Evaluation (Appendix A)** [ ]  **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.):[x]  **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.): **Daily Clinical Experience Log/Evaluation (Appendix B); Clinical Performance Standards (Appendix C); Field Internship Daily Performance Record (Appendix D); Field Internship Performance Standards (Appendix E); Patient Care Reports (Appendix F); Field Preceptor's Statement of Entry-Level Competency (Appendix G); Medical Director's Statement of Program Competency (Appendix H)** [x]  **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.National Registry of Emergency Medical Technician-Paramedic (NREMT-P) Cognitive & Psychomotor Examinations. Not authorized to provide sample questions. All aspects of the examination must be completed as a "pass" (competent entry-level). If any aspect is failed, then graduates are not entry-level competent. This is the licensing exam for the State of Oregon (as well as all the other states). The exams are broken down into subject areas, and each area must be passed and/or completed as compent, as well as an over-all passing score/evaluation. We can trend repeated missed subject areas only for nuanced information. [ ]  **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:      [x]  **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.):**Test with Industry Recognized Certificate or License (TESTIRCL\*\*)** [ ]   **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? [x]  **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)[x]  **Quantitative**  [x]  **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:[x]  Committee or subcommittee of the SAC collaborated in its creation[x]  Standardized assessment[x]  Collaboration with external stakeholders (e.g., advisory board, transfer institution/program)[ ]  Theoretical Model (e.g., Bloom’s Taxonomy)[x]  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[x]  Aligned the benchmark to within-discipline post-requisite course(s)[ ]  Aligned the benchmark to out-of-discipline post-requisite course(s)[x]  Other (briefly explain: Aligned the benchmarks to comply with national accreditation standards for paramedic programs & program benchmarks) |
| 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.[x]  **Fall** [ ]  **Winter** [x]  **Spring** [x]  **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.[x]  **Early** [x]  **Mid-term** [x]  **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.’ The entire cohort of current paramedic degree program |
| 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? [x]  **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 related 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?[x]  **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.”The entire cohort is being used |
| 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.):**      |



**3. Project Mechanics**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3A. Does your project utilize a rubric for scoring?  |  [x]  **Yes**  [ ]  **No** |
| If ‘No’, proceed to section B. If ‘Yes’, complete the following.Whenever possible, 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 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?[x]  **Agreement** – the percentage of raters giving each artifact the same/similar score in a norming sessionIf you are using agreement, describe your plan for plan for conducting the “norming” or “calibrating” session:The use of performance standards to enhance individual artifact scoring has lead to improved norming process outcomes, and has allowed raters to achieve 100% (or very close to 100%) consistency during norming sessions. Raters must achieve a minimum of 95% accuracy or receive additional guidance on use of the standards rubric. This has also allowed the raters to stay consistent over time. The performance standards rubric gives raters appropriate language for feedback & guidance. 100% of raters gave all aspects of the evaluation tool the same or very similar scores at the conclusion of the same/similar norming sessions (100% Agreement) [ ]  **Consensus** - all raters score all artifacts and reach agreement on each scoreThough 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.’ [x]  **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)[x]  **Yes** (determined by alignment with an external standard: e.g., standards published by the discipline’s professional organization)[x]  **Yes** (determined by post-requisite course expectations within PCC)[ ]  **Yes** (determined by post-requisite course expectations for transfer institution)[x]  **Yes** (other). Describe briefly: National performance benchmarks for entry-level paramedic performance; program benchmarks[ ]  **No**If yes, briefly describe your performance benchmarks, being as specific as possible (if needed, attach as an appendix):NREMT-P Exam = Pass within 1 yr. of program completion Global Affective Evaluation = Competent in all categories at the conclusion of each course & at program completion Daily Clinical Experience Evaluation = "3" rating using a 1-3 Likert Scale (Appendix C) Field Internship Daily Performance Record = "3" rating using a 1-3 Likert Scale (Appendix E) Simulation Summative Evals = Competent score within 3 attempts (Appendix l) Patient Care Reports = Required ALS Calls (40/40) & Team Leads (50/50) have been met Field Preceptor & Medical Director Statement of Entry-Level Competency = Competent as Entry-Level by both at program completion (Appendix G & H) 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.**       |
| 3D. Will you be coding your data/artifacts in order to compare student sub-groups?  | [ ]  **Yes**  [x]  **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 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.[x]  PCC Adjunct Faculty within the program/discipline[x]  PCC FT Faculty within the program/discipline[ ]  PCC Faculty outside the program/discipline[ ]  Program Advisory Board Members[ ]  Non-PCC Faculty[x]  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/PopulationHow 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 ResultsIn 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: 58 student achieved the benchmark level in idea expression (4 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: 94% 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 [ ]  NoIf 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/failurePlease 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/failurePlease 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.      |