

Annual Report for Assessment of Outcomes 2011-2012

Please address the questions below and
send to learningassessment@pcc.edu by **June 22, 2012** with Annual Report in the subject line.

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

The DE Core Outcomes assessment committee set out to design a comprehensive, district-wide assessment of an entire level of our courses. As such, we have taken the year to propose an assessment and acquire SAC approval, to design the actual assessment, and to implement and analyze the tool. Furthermore, we have been fortunate to receive grant support through the Learning Assessment Council for assistance from an assessment expert during the spring term to help us analyze and interpret the data, as well as analyze our process and assessment tool for our future work.

As you will see in our report and in the included documents, our process has been time-and-labor intensive. Though we have made periodic updates to our SAC chairs and our SAC as a whole, there hasn't been time to share the findings of our assessment, let alone discuss and plan changes to be implemented across all the campuses within the district; the current PCC assessment cycle, as it stands, has not facilitated the implementation of any SAC wide changes with the requested timeframe.

The DE SAC fully understands that effective program-wide assessment can be useful in a variety of ways – there is no question there – and even if we did not believe in such kinds of assessment, only fools are ignorant to the fact that assessment-based, data-driven curriculum design is a tsunami-like national movement in education. However, there is an enormous learning-curve for *real, meaningful, effective* program-wide assessment: to first get our SAC to comprehend program-wide assessment at an enormous college with various campuses around a large metropolitan area; then to accomplish buy-in and participation from a diverse body of faculty across the district, most of who are part-time; then to figure out how to design an effective assessment; then to administer the assessment while continuing to foster ongoing buy-in and participation; then to collect and analyze the data; then to discuss the results as a SAC community; then to collectively decide on what to change across the district and then to do it; and then, to do follow-up work to see if the change was effective, sometimes designing a whole new assessment tool all of its own.

Individual SACs are charged with doing all of this work for two entire core outcomes during only one academic year while accomplishing other critical tasks. In addition, it is often a small group of people who take on this enormous task for the entire SAC while others try to tackle other pressing demands.

Though we would really *love* to be able to reap the rewards of our grueling efforts by being able to implement positive change that helps student outcome attainment, the reality is that this takes a lot of time. We are both proud of our efforts and growth yet discouraged to answer this question with the simple statement:

No changes were made.

For each outcome assessed this year:

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).**

During fall quarter, a new Core Outcomes committee was created, comprised of three full-time faculty from CA, SY, and RC. This committee reviewed the assessments of the past and set goals for this year's assessment. Two years ago, a committed, part-time instructor took on the SAC's assessment project by creating an assessment tool. No SAC-wide changes were made to the curriculum as a result of this project; this assessment was driven by a single individual, at a single campus, taking the "burden" of SAC-wide work onto her shoulders.

The following year, we put together a small committee made up of people from Cascade and Sylvania and implemented an assessment of five sections of RD 115 (114 students total). We scored a project with the common, shared rubric created collaboratively by the committee. There were some successes such as instructors working together across campuses to discuss curriculum and assessment. However, we ran into many problems, including lack of SAC participation. Unfortunately, despite all the hours put in by the committee, no SAC-wide curricular changes were implemented as a result of this project. The benefit of this work was significant, however: the SAC became much more informed about effective, program-wide assessment.

Because of the lessons of the previous two-years, this year's committee sought more participation from the SAC and wanted to look at outcomes program-wide, rather than in a specific project from a specific course. In the spring, we created a proposal of with three different options (included below); we presented the proposal to the SAC at our fall in-service and received unanimous approval for one of our options. We decided against a direct assessment because, as of yet, we do not have shared, common assignments to assess together. We chose indirect assessment of student perceptions of these outcomes because we hoped this would facilitate participation. We wanted to break our trend of limited participation, where only a few people would assess work from only a few courses.

During winter quarter of 2012, we developed a SAC-wide assessment of *all* RD and WR 90 courses, in which instructors district-wide administered a 20-question online Survey Monkey pre- and post-survey of the two selected core outcomes: self-reflection and professional competency. The general survey was administered once at the beginning of the term and once at the end. In addition to the general online survey, a group of courses were randomly selected from each campus for an intervention strategy, a brief, easy to implement three-question form asking how students about their preparation for class and whether they thought about connections between the course materials and other contexts. The intent of the tool was to provide students a regular reminder of self-reflection and professional competency skills they should be practicing to improve their success in class.

- **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?**

As discussed above, we wanted to include all RD and WR 90 students across the district for the general pre- and post-assessment; both Reading and Writing 90 were determined to be the core courses with the greatest number of sections across the district with the highest enrollment of DE students. There were 60 courses across the district that were asked to participate. For the intervention, we managed a randomized selection of course sections. The number of courses for the intervention was determined by proportional division by number of campus sections of each subject and by 2:1 proportion of FT and PT faculty participation in most instances. The exception was Reading 90 at SE Center; no sections are taught by FT instructors. (Note: Hillsboro HEC and Forest Grove were considered Rock Creek; Forest Grove was considered Sylvania; and Distance Learning was eliminated from the pool.)

Unfortunately, the response rate on the assessment instrument was very low, both among individual students and whole classes, especially among classes in the control group, and especially at the end of the quarter. While there was no systematic difference in the response rate according to reading and writing classes, classes taught by part-time faculty had significantly fewer student responses than classes taught by full-time faculty at both the beginning and end of the quarter. In addition, estimated response rates varied by campus, with classes housed at Sylvania generating significantly higher responses at the start of the quarter than classes housed at Cascade. Without any information about individual students, there is no way to estimate whether there were important differences between the students who responded to the survey and those who did not. Low response, in general, or non-representative responses could lead to biased results.

	Possible Responses			Actual Responses			Average Class Response Rate	
	Classes	Start	End	Classes	Start	End	Start	End
Cascade	16	400	320	13	115	64	35%	25%
Hillsboro	2	50	40	0	0	0	0%	0%
Newberg	2	50	40	1	7	0	28%	0%
Rock Creek	14	350	280	13	173	102	53%	39%
Southeast	11	275	220	8	118	37	59%	23%
Sylvania	15	375	300	12	210	72	70%	30%
Full-Time	21	525	420	21	330	208	63%	49%
Part-Time	39	975	780	26	293	67	45%	13%
Reading	28	700	560	21	279	127	53%	30%
Writing	32	800	640	26	343	147	53%	28%
Control	38	950	760	23	287	102	50%	22%
Intervention	22	550	440	24	336	173	56%	36%
Total	60	1500	1200	47	623	275	53%	29%

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

Please see included pre- and post-survey and intervention form.

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

Thanks to the generosity of the Learning Assessment Council, DE received grant funding for an assessment expert to help us grow in our own knowledge of assessment and to analyze the complicated, large amount of data we collected. We contacted Ms. Alisha Lund-Chaix (<http://www.lund-chaix.com/>) who consults independently and also works through OPEN, Oregon Program Evaluator's Network (www.oregoneval.org). After various conversations to clarify our goals, she analyzed the data we sent her (Survey Monkey data and Excel spreadsheet of intervention data). In general, we wanted our findings to be teacher-friendly and directly usable in the classroom. We also wanted to continue our development of our culture of assessment. Her report is integrated here in this document.

Results of the assessment survey were analyzed in a three-step process, using the average class response for each question. First, for the results at the start of the quarter, average responses to each survey question were compared between classes that were selected to participate in the intervention to classes that were not selected for the intervention. This establishes a baseline measure of average self-reflection and professional competency practices and attitudes before any students were exposed to the intervention tool, and also helps determine whether the classes assigned to each group were roughly equivalent at that time.

Second, using a similar process, results at the end of the quarter were compared on each question between the classes assigned to receive the intervention tool and those that were not. This end-of-quarter measurement establishes whether self-reflection and professional competency practices were different at the end of the quarter compared to the baseline measurement, and whether the two groups differed on their self-reflection and professional competency practices and attitudes after a portion of the students had participated in the intervention.

Finally, the assessment results at the end of the quarter were compared for the classes assigned to each group, this time, taking into account their responses at the beginning of the quarter. This establishes whether any change in average class responses that may have occurred between the beginning and end of the quarter was different for the classes that participated in the intervention compared to the other classes.

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.**

**Also see included table of survey results.*

Average Scores at the Start of the Quarter

Overall, at the start of the quarter average self-reflection scores ranged from 2.2 to 1.7 (with more students answering "often true" than other answers on all questions). Average professional competency scores ranged from 2.1 to 1.2 (with more students answering "often true" than other answers on six of 10 questions). Most students rated their self-reflection and professional competency practices as "often true" or "always true" on each question.

Groups Equivalence at the Start of the Quarter

The intervention and control groups were statistically equivalent on all 20 items at the beginning of the quarter.

Average Scores at the End of the Quarter

Overall, at the end of the quarter, average self-reflection scores ranged from 2.1 to 1.6 (with more students answering “often true” more frequently than other answers on six of 10 questions). Average professional competency scores ranged from 2.0 to 1.2 (with more students answering “often true” than other answers on six of 10 questions). Most students rated their self-reflection and professional competency practices and attitudes as “often true” or “always true.”

For the control group this represents a statistically significant improvement for self-reflection items number 2, 3, and 7, and professional competency item number 4. For the intervention group this represents a statistically significant improvement for self-reflection items number 2 and 3, and professional competency item number 8. However, at the end of the quarter the response rate was very low, especially among the control group, thus increasing the risk of error due to the small sample size and the likelihood the findings are due to chance.

Groups Equivalence at the End of the Quarter

At the end of the quarter the groups were statistically unequal on self-reflection item number 2, and professional competency item number 9. As above, at the end of the quarter the response rate was very low, thus increasing the risk of error due to the small sample size and the likelihood the findings are due to chance.

Relative Change in Groups between the Start and End of the Quarter

On professional competency item number 9, the intervention group achieved significantly different change compared to the control group, relative to the responses provided at the beginning of the quarter. In other words, at the end of the quarter average scores for classes in the intervention group were nearly a third of a point higher than for classes in the control group, relative to where they stood at the beginning of the quarter. However an increase in point value indicates a decrease on the scale of frequency of the practice. As above, though, with such a small sample size the risk of error increases the likelihood that the findings are due to chance.

Interpretation

In general, students rated the frequency of engaging in specific self-reflection and professional competency practices and beliefs very highly, and even higher at the end of the quarter than at the beginning of the quarter. It is unclear what, if any, effect the bi-weekly intervention tool had on students enrolled in developmental education classes.

- 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).**

In the future, we imagine the findings of our work will have some pedagogical implications, though perhaps minor. We were, of course, assessing the two core outcomes in our courses, in general, but in addition, we added an intervention element as a pedagogical strategy to see if students were more likely to meet the outcomes with some “help.” When we designed the assessment, we had optimistically hoped to find that a quick intervention form, taking between 2-5 minutes of beginning-of-class time and repeated multiple times through the term, would be enough to inspire self-reflection around specific skills of professional competency.

Unfortunately, though students made some minor gains, the fact that our students made no significant progress reveals that just asking questions has no effect on student attainment of such outcomes; concepts must be covered through explicit, direct instruction. This implication, when presented to the SAC, can reinforce what many of us already know about instruction for DE students: Instruction must be intentional, thorough, scaffolded by careful instruction and practice, and assessed effectively.

The very nature of DE is interdisciplinary, and although our courses have titles like Reading 90 and Writing 90, the content of our courses spans much more than reading and writing to include student behaviors, values, attitudes, and perceptions around learning and studentship in general, and therefore, since we have so much to cover in our classes, it would've been encouraging to find that repeating a "reminder" (the intervention form) would've been an effective way to help students move forward. That would've offered us a time-saving teaching strategy to easily implement across the district.

As previously mentioned, the timetable for this level of assessment makes it difficult to enact any changes. Furthermore, we are a small committee of three and are unable to mandate changes we see fit. We have had interesting discussions among ourselves, within the committee, and informally among our peers. We have discussed the fact that students often act out of emotion, rather than reality. They often respond with answers they wish were true or answers that they think they are "supposed" to have. Our students are also typically overwhelmed and exhausted at the end of the term, so we question the reliability of responses at the end, if they are as thoughtful and intentional at the end as they might have been at the beginning of the term. In terms of a pre- and post- assessment, we have noticed that the first few weeks are like a honeymoon, the middle weeks are like the hard work of marriage, and the last third of the course is like a divorce. As such, in an ideal world, we would be able to devise an assessment that could track students in their subsequent classes by asking questions like, "Looking back at WR 90 from last term, what have you planned on changing this term as a result of that experience?"

One of the questions on the intervention asked students if they made any connections between their classes and their lives. Many students responded with statements like, "I'm too busy to do this!" In terms of in-the-classroom practices for reflection, we have discussed starting a kind of mid-term "boot-camp" that asks students to reflect and connect in more intentional, instructed, and intense ways. There are many great things that could be done on an individual level in response to our findings, but those are irrelevant here. Assessment and assessment-driven change, in this context, needs to be SAC-wide.

Our assessment process and tools have been something we are quite proud of. However, right now, it is a shame that after all of this often-burdensome work, we are discovering what we already know. Again, the assessment timeline seems unrealistic for deep, sustained inquiry, and we are a small committee without the power to make or implement large, SAC-wide changes.

- 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.**

I. REFLECTION ON THE ASSESSMENT TOOL

Response Rate

The overall response rate can be improved by using paper survey forms distributed and collected in class instead of web-based surveys, unless the class is delivered in an online only format. Web-based survey responses are notoriously low in general. It is to be expected, then that, in DE classes where students have significant technology challenges (both access and skills), the response rate would be even lower than the norm. We had hoped to do this assessment via Scantron forms, and even received financial support from our deans. However, we did not have enough time to select the correct Scantron forms and order them, and it was difficult to strategize who would be responsible for running the forms and doing the data collection. We understand that in-class surveys would increase the accuracy of course identifying information and would create a better opportunity for comparing individual student growth rather than class averages.

Furthermore, using paper survey forms may increase the “test” perception by students. Faculty administering the instrument would need to emphasize that the only “correct” answers are those the students judge to be accurate reflections of themselves.

Identifying Information

If a web-based survey is maintained, several course-identifying questions need to be added, in addition to the CRN, or that could generate the CRN. This could include whether the class is reading or writing, the instructor’s name, campus, and the day the class meets. Skip patterns could be utilized with forced-choice responses from a list to minimize the likelihood that students make errors. If both paper forms and a web-based instrument are used, it will be important to ensure the coding for the Scantron scoring is the same as the coding for the web instrument.

FT-PT Participation

There may be a number of causes that influenced the differential response rate between full-time and part-time faculty, and across campuses. Causes might include challenges such as ineffective communication, lack of buy-in, issues which themselves may be the result of other obstacles. PT faculty were required to send emails, check in, do the intervention, save the forms and submit them to a campus representative, and more. When PT faculty do not have office space, must run from campus to campus for classes, this kind of intervention can be seen as yet another obstacle in their delivery of effective instruction. The requirement for already-stretched PT faculty to add another element into their job further stretches their capacity. We know, however, that every effort should be made to ensure that classes that participate in the assessment are representative of classes in the developmental education department in general.

Individual versus Class Comparisons

Collecting identifying information about individual students would enable a comparison of change in the frequency of self-reflection and professional competency practices between the beginning and end of the quarter at the student level, as opposed to the class level. Tools and techniques are available to take into account the influence of the classroom group environment in making such comparisons. While this approach would more accurately reflect the actual events, comparing changes at the class-level may be a sufficient level of depth to generate the information necessary to gauge self-reflection and professional competency practices among students.

Assessment Process

If there is reason to be concerned about response shift as students become more aware of self-reflection concepts and proficiencies between the beginning and end of the quarter the preliminary assessment should be administered during the second or third week of the quarter, after a lesson with definitions and expectations has been presented to the students.

Revise the Assessment Instrument

Some of the questions on the survey instrument may be confusing to students, which, consequently, would make it impossible to interpret the results. For instance, there are several concepts included in the question, "I use my education to gain an understanding about myself and others in order to expend my abilities." Does it matter whether students gain a better understanding of themselves, but do not care about others? What if a student is confident in self-understanding, but earnestly wishes to understand others better? On different note, what if a student is focused on learning to read and write better through education, and relies on different venues entirely for self-understanding, such as family, church, or support groups? If the three concepts (understanding self, understanding others, expand abilities) are all essential in responding to the question accurately is the committee confident that this is clear to the students who responded?

The assessment committee may review the phrasing of each survey question to clarify interpretation. When the committee is confident that each question is clearly worded a pilot test should be administered with several students for the purpose of garnering feedback on the assessment instrument itself.

There may be reason to be concerned that the question phrasing encourages agreeable responses. In this case an alternative question format and/or negatively worded questions should be included on the assessment instrument. For instance, instead of asking how often students review sample or model work before beginning, consider asking how often students begin their work straight away, without reviewing examples first. It may be possible to test the validity of the assessment instrument by developing two different surveys and administering them to two different groups of students and comparing responses. Often, researchers design surveys that ask the same questions in multiple ways to determine the most neutral and valid phrasing, and to refine the survey for future use.

Individual self-reflection or professional competency practices may not be measured well by the questions on the assessment instruments. For instance, a student may be well aware how important it is to arrive on time or feel perfectly comfortable asking questions, but she or he may rarely manage to get to class on time, or think that questions are important enough to interrupt class for them. Each item should be reviewed to ensure it is measuring what the committee intends. Supplemental evidence to validate the assessment responses should also be gathered and examined. For instance, faculty could report the number of students absent or tardy at each class meeting throughout the quarter, which would be a better indicator of whether students arrived on time or at all. Similarly, faculty could report the number of late assignments, an estimate of the number of questions by students during and outside of class, or other observable behaviors.

Including questions about student characteristics may provide insight that helps understand who is likely to take the time to complete the assessment instrument, or changes that might be considered for the intervention. The committee might consider asking students their age, gender, race, employment status, marital status, whether they have children, whether they attend full or part-time, whether they are seeking a degree or short-term certification, commute time, or other characteristics that might be related to their ability to complete the assessment or answers they might provide on it.

Revise the Intervention

Our consultant was hesitant to make many recommendations to the intervention based solely on the information at hand. Evaluation practice, however, encourages program developers (in this case the assessment committee) to develop a map that links intended causes and effects to consider whether adequate and appropriate resources have been invested in a new tool or process, and to help determine, reflectively, whether a program has been implemented as it was intended. She has provided a more comprehensive program map in the table below. The example is not intended as a critique of the current intervention tool,

but rather to present a sample of how to visualize and measure the presence and effect of new resources and activities intended to improve students' self-reflection and professional competencies. (See table below.)

Resources	Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Impact
Institutional leadership and support				Students become more SR and better skilled in PC
Assessment Committee	Bi-monthly reminder tool	Students think about their class-prep activities regularly	Students remember certain SR/PC practices	
Professional development	Faculty training	Faculty knowledgeable about SR/PC pedagogy	Faculty adapt teaching to encourage SR/PC	
	Faculty reflection activities	Faculty actively practicing SR regularly		
Curriculum development	In-class SR/PC definition exercise	Students understand core concepts of SR/PC	Students can identify their own SR/PC practices and habits	
	Assignments about self-reflection	Students reading or writing about SR	Students think frequently and in different ways about SR/PC	
	Assignments about professional competency	Students reading or writing about PC		
		Once/week reflection time in class	Students actively engaging in SR regularly	

As the committee reviews the assessment results with departmental faculty it may be useful to brainstorm additional activities that faculty would be interested in pursuing. After a comprehensive list of new ideas is generated, establishing causal linkages between specific resources and activities and specific outcomes may facilitate the process of narrowing new activities to those that can be endowed with appropriate resources and those that are most likely to influence the intended outcome.

II. REFLECTION ON ASSESSMENT PROCESS

We truly appreciate all the support we've gotten from the LAC – both in person, in email, via phone, and in general, institutionally. The LAC has led PCC through some rough times, and we are very thankful that PCC has an assessment process that is faculty-driven, with room for a growth process. We are still learning about program-wide assessment.

Like many other SACs, the DE-SAC is a diverse, multi-campus program under different administration structures with different resources and resource-sources. Just last year, the DE Math was removed from the RD and WR SAC and into the Math SAC. This has given us a great opportunity to work together on our specific tasks. The timeline of our assessment process, in the midst of rethinking our identity and our curriculum in general, has been difficult.

The two-outcome-per-one-year cycle is a killer. Unfortunately, the rapid turn-around for all of this assessment data almost makes it feel like “busy work” because we’re so stressed to create, administer, analyze, report in such a short time. We haven’t been able to find something replicable for the following year because there is no time to reflect, which is ironic, since this is a core outcome for PCC. We ask reflection for our students, and perhaps should build it in to our work in a more intentional, structured, realistic way.

This report, in essence, is a reflective practice, but there is no time to implement our learning in any thoughtful way. In the end, there is no time to discuss real, meaningful change to our program because once we have some data, we have to turn around and design a new assessment. We are moving forward, and we are learning, but not in the most efficient, helpful way. The timetable is a burn-out cycle, and those on the assessment committees seem likely to “opt out,” not continuing their work, because they need a break. This threatens to disrupt the continuity of learning for SACs because there will be little to no real “tenure” on these assessment committees.

In thinking about this problem, we have discussed some possible solutions. One is a longer assessment cycle that would give more time for sustained thought and real change. Perhaps there could be a three-year assessment cycle. For example:

Year One

- First quarter: SAC, as a whole, undergo self-assessment to discover where to focus, where to put energy.
- Second quarter: SAC designs first drafts of the assessment with broader participation.
- Third quarter: SAC completes final version of assessment and administration policies

Year Two

- First quarter: Administer assessment
- Second quarter: Analyze data/discussion
- Third quarter: Decide on change(s)

Year Three

- Implement changes and reassess to see if change was effective

We would love to see the fruits of our labor and feel that the cards are stacked a little bit against us simply due to the structure and timeline. Despite all of this, with the generous help of the LAC, we are truly making progress *as a SAC*. Unfortunately, this isn’t yet making a difference in our program, curriculum, pedagogy, etc. We can’t yet see where our students are really benefitting.

III. CONCLUSION

We’re gradually learning how to assess at a program level by NOT quite doing it right the first or second time. It’s taking a while: slowly, more and more DE SAC members are understanding, through trial and error, what is being asked of us. We’d also like to add that our time-intensive learning process over the past years is not unique to the DE-SAC.

The process of thinking through these projects – discussing language and designing an assessment, thinking about what we want our students to get from our courses, how to be more inclusive, encountering snags along the way, and discovering what “program-wide” assessment looks like – helped illuminate many areas of confusion about how to make PCC Core Outcomes assessment relevant to our teaching and to our program. Overall, as the narrative details, these projects have been valuable learning experiences about assessment for the SAC as a whole.

In the future, we will work with the SAC to take more ownership over the assessment process. With the help of the LAC, we’d like to figure out ways to motivate participation since we are all extremely busy with diverse administrative work, committees, grants, other projects. We’d also like to find a way to legitimate our anecdotal evidence so that our assessments don’t simply produce what we already know from our experience.

Enc: 1) Core Outcomes assessment proposal, 2) letter to all RD and WR 90 instructors, 3) survey questions, 4) letter to faculty selected for the intervention, 5) intervention form, 6) stock letter for student instructions sent via email

Self-Reflection: Average Class Responses

		Start	End	Difference
(1) I use my education to gain an understanding about myself and others in order to expand my own abilities.	Control	1.70	1.52	0.18
	Intervention	1.72	1.63	0.10
	Difference	-0.02	-0.11	
(2) I have a variety of effective strategies for self-motivation that usually work for me when I'm feeling "tired, lazy, or down."	Control	2.20	1.78	0.42
	Intervention	2.31	2.06	0.25
	Difference	-0.11	-0.28	
(3) I set both short- and long-term goals and periodically review them.	Control	2.19	1.88	0.31
	Intervention	2.16	1.92	0.24
	Difference	0.03	-0.04	
(4) I assign priorities to what I choose to do each day.	Control	2.00	1.77	0.24
	Intervention	1.95	1.87	0.08
	Difference	0.05	-0.10	
(5) I plan review time so I don't have to cram right before tests.	Control	2.25	2.02	0.24
	Intervention	2.09	2.20	-0.11
	Difference	0.16	-0.19	
(6) I am manage my distractions (TV, Internet, social, etc.) to get my school work done.	Control	2.06	1.94	0.12
	Intervention	2.15	2.19	-0.03
	Difference	-0.09	-0.25	
(7) I typically follow through on all of my commitments and finish them to completion.	Control	1.87	1.62	0.25
	Intervention	1.83	1.73	0.11
	Difference	0.04	-0.11	
(8) I am aware of various methods for studying and taking notes and choose those that work best for me.	Control	1.91	1.71	0.21
	Intervention	1.91	1.74	0.17
	Difference	-0.00	-0.03	
(9) I make strong connections between my lessons, assignments, classes, and life.	Control	1.99	1.85	0.14
	Intervention	2.01	1.96	0.04
	Difference	-0.01	-0.11	
(10) I examine and challenge my own strongly held personal beliefs.	Control	1.78	1.69	0.08
	Intervention	1.98	1.97	0.00
	Difference	-0.20	-0.28	

Professional Competency: Average Class Responses

		Start	End	Difference
(1) I collaborate and work well in groups of different people.	Control	2.02	1.84	0.18
	Intervention	1.90	1.96	-0.06
	Difference	0.12	-0.12	
(2) I turn in my work on time and meet deadlines and due dates.	Control	1.60	1.54	0.06
	Intervention	1.66	1.63	0.03
	Difference	-0.05	-0.08	
(3) I recognize the importance of arriving to class on time.	Control	1.19	1.16	0.03
	Intervention	1.21	1.25	-0.04
	Difference	-0.02	-0.09	
(4) I am comfortable asking questions when I am unsure.	Control	2.03	1.75	0.28
	Intervention	1.98	1.94	0.03
	Difference	0.05	-0.19	
(5) I take the time to produce high quality work of which I feel proud.	Control	1.74	1.57	0.17
	Intervention	1.79	1.76	0.03
	Difference	-0.05	-0.19	
(6) I read and follow instructions carefully before starting a task.	Control	1.64	1.65	-0.02
	Intervention	1.72	1.73	-0.01
	Difference	-0.09	-0.08	
(7) I review sample/model work before beginning my own.	Control	2.07	2.00	0.07
	Intervention	2.03	1.94	0.10
	Difference	0.03	0.06	
(8) I am able to clearly communicate my ideas to others verbally (writing and speaking).	Control	2.15	1.82	0.33
	Intervention	2.12	1.95	0.17
	Difference	0.04	-0.12	
(9) I actively seek out available resources to find information when I need it.	Control	1.90	1.66	0.24
	Intervention	1.93	1.94	-0.02
	Difference	-0.03	-0.28	
(10) When I am not successful in a completed task, I take steps to improve in the future.	Control	1.57	1.55	0.02
	Intervention	1.68	1.68	-0.00
	Difference	-0.10	-0.12	

Key	
Figures represent average class scores for each question, based on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 equal to “always true” and 5 equal to “never or almost never true.”	
Start	Responses to the assessment at the beginning of the quarter, between January X and January y.
End	Responses to the assessment at the end of the quarter, between April X and April Y.
Intervention	Classes that were assigned to pilot test the bi-monthly self-reflection and professional competency tool.
Control	Classes that were not assigned to participate in the intervention.
Difference	The difference between average class responses at the beginning and end of the quarter, and between the intervention and control groups.

DE Subject Area Committee
Core Outcomes Assessment Proposal 2011-2012
Self-Reflection & Professional Competency

Option 1: Existing Data	
Goals:	
We would gather existing data to mine for evidence about student achievement in our two outcome areas. For example, a few years ago, the SAC instituted an attendance policy. We could ask instructors to go through old grades and records and see if there is a change between the “no policy” performance and “yes policy” performance. Or, we might also use past essays like "This I Believe" that many of us use to score with a self-reflection rubric.	
PROS	CONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No new implementation • • • • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low buy in • Only a few instructors would directly benefit • Difficulty in gathering old data • •

Option 2: Pre & Post Survey	
Goals:	
We would give students a simple survey regarding academic habits and attitudes at the beginning and end of the term to see if and where students improve throughout the course of our term. This would show us the areas we would need to target in the future for further investigation. For example, we might find that there is no change in students’ attitudes and values about education, but that their time management skills improved through the term. We would then need to figure out we what to do with data in the future for program and curriculum improvement.	
PROS	CONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We could target all classes in our entire program and have data for each level and course, or we could target one course (90-level is recommended). • Already mostly completed survey • • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data collection and analysis might be harder than anticipated. • Self-reporting, not direct assessment (i.e. We would not know why students improved or not, if they did.) • •

Option 3: Direct Assessment	
Goals:	
We would implement a new direct assessment where, in class at the end of the term, we ask students to write a response to a particular question (time limit or paragraph quantity). Sample question: What specific skills, knowledge, or habits did you learn in this class that will help you in the workplace? (This question asks students to self-reflect on professional competency.) Then, we would need to gather the writing and count and classify student responses, creating a taxonomy with some quantitative data.	
PROS	CONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • •

CORE OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PROJECT

Self-Reflection & Professional Competency

2011-2012

Dear DE Instructor,

Thank you for your important participation in this year's Core Outcomes assessment project for RD and WR 90. The two core outcomes chosen for this year are self-reflection and professional competency (information on back). Our hope is that the data generated will be useful in helping us deepen our discussion about what we are doing, how we are doing it, and how we might do it better.

We understand that this survey requires your extra effort and takes valuable time away from instruction, and therefore, we have tried to design this instrument to be as easy as possible. However, we would appreciate any feedback so we can improve our efforts for next year.

Instructions:

1. **In the first week of the term**, please administer the pre-survey.
2. Briefly explain the survey to students (The total process, including explanation, distributing materials, completing and collecting the survey, should take no more than 20 minutes and will probably be shorter.).
3. When the assessment is complete, please return the completed surveys to the Core Outcomes Committee campus representative or department chair.
4. **In the last week of the term**, please have students complete the same survey. Then, again return the materials the campus representative or department chair.

Again, we appreciate your participation.

Thanks,

The DE Core Outcomes Committee

Campus Representatives

- Cecelia Guinee at Sylvania (cguinee@pcc.edu)
- Beth Kaufka at Cascade (beth.kaufka@pcc.edu)
- Leslie Boyd at Rock Creek (lboyd@pcc.edu)
- Jocelin Higgins at SE (jocelin.higgins@pcc.edu)

CORE OUTCOMES INFORMATION SHEET

The following information was taken from: <http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/core-outcomes/>

Outcome I. Self-Reflection: Assess, examine and reflect on one's own academic skill, professional competence and personal beliefs and how these impact others.

Reflect on Self

- Appraise own skills and abilities.
- Set well-defined goals, monitor progress, and motivate self.
- Examine personal beliefs and measure them against the beliefs of others.
- Understand self as part of larger community.
- Be accountable for actions and their impact on others.
- Respect individual rights and the dignity of others.
- Appreciate and reflect on new ideas in a spirit of open interaction.
- Seek and acquire information and knowledge to achieve academic, career, and personal success as a lifelong learner.

Respond to Others

- Respect the beliefs of others.
- Be protective of the safety of others.
- Transfer personal skills and imagination to varying settings, including individual and group.
- Apply appropriate techniques for exploring and/or resolving conflicts and dealing with differences in a variety of settings.
- Understand the role of humor and empathy in human interactions.
- Respond to community issues and contribute to the community.

Outcome II. Professional Competency: Demonstrate and apply the knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary to enter and succeed in a defined profession or advanced academic program

Use Disciplinary Knowledge

- Use available resources to find information.
- Use the methods of inquiry or expression of a discipline or profession, such as observation, experimentation, experience, analysis, diagnosis or creative processes.
- Identify and/or recreate concepts, terms, and facts.
- Perform tasks, procedures, and processes with competence.
- Use basic terms, concepts, and facts to gain additional or more complex knowledge as a lifelong learner.

Apply Concepts, Skills, and Processes

- Produce a product, project, or presentation in an academic, professional, or technical setting.
- Use knowledge and skills to increase their understanding of themselves and others, and to expand their abilities.
- Transfer concepts and skills to other fields or new situations creatively.
- Explain concepts and skills to others.
- Apply appropriate technologies to analyze, solve, and present solutions to problems.
- Identify and use appropriate technology (e.g. computers, etc.) to research, solve, and present solutions to problems.
- Collaborate, take risks, demonstrate multi-disciplinary awareness, and use the imagination to achieve creative responses to problems.
- Make a decision and take actions based on analysis of information.
- Interpret and express quantitative ideas effectively in written, visual, aural, and oral form.
- Interpret and use written, quantitative, and visual text effectively in presentation of solutions to problems.
- Use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.

2011-2012 CORE OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT STUDENT SURVEY

Self-Reflection & Professional Competency

Instructions:

We had initially planned to collect data via Scantron forms. However, due to resource constraints, we administered the following questions via Survey Monkey.

Please include your name, the date, and the course in which you are taking the survey (e.g. RD 90 or WR 90).

Scale

5 = always true
4 = often true
3 = true about half of the time
2 = rarely true
1 = never or almost never true

Part I. Self-Reflection

- 1) I use my education to gain an understanding about myself and others in order to expand my own abilities.

5 = always true 4 = often true 3 = true about half of the time 2 = rarely true 1 = never or almost never true

- 2) I have a variety of effective strategies for self-motivation that usually work for me when I'm feeling "tired, lazy, or down."

5 = always true 4 = often true 3 = true about half of the time 2 = rarely true 1 = never or almost never true

- 3) I set both short- and long-term goals and periodically review them.

5 = always true 4 = often true 3 = true about half of the time 2 = rarely true 1 = never or almost never true

- 4) I assign priorities to what I choose to do each day.

5 = always true 4 = often true 3 = true about half of the time 2 = rarely true 1 = never or almost never true

- 5) I plan review time so I don't have to cram right before tests.

5 = always true 4 = often true 3 = true about half of the time 2 = rarely true 1 = never or almost never true

- 6) I am manage my distractions (TV, Internet, social, etc.) to get my school work done.

5 = always true 4 = often true 3 = true about half of the time 2 = rarely true 1 = never or almost never true

- 7) I typically follow through on all of my commitments and finish them to completion.

5 = always true 4 = often true 3 = true about half of the time 2 = rarely true 1 = never or almost never true

- 8) I am aware of various methods for studying and taking notes and choose those that work best for me.

5 = always true 4 = often true 3 = true about half of the time 2 = rarely true 1 = never or almost never true

- 9) I make strong connections between my lessons, assignments, classes, and life.

5 = always true 4 = often true 3 = true about half of the time 2 = rarely true 1 = never or almost never true

- 10)I examine and challenge my own strongly held personal beliefs.

5 = always true 4 = often true 3 = true about half of the time 2 = rarely true 1 = never or almost never true

Please continue on other side.

Part II. Professional Competency

1) I collaborate and work well in groups of different people.

5 = always true 4 = often true 3 = true about half of the time 2 = rarely true 1 = never or almost never true

2) I turn in my work on time and meet deadlines and due dates.

5 = always true 4 = often true 3 = true about half of the time 2 = rarely true 1 = never or almost never true

3) I recognize the importance of arriving to class on time.

5 = always true 4 = often true 3 = true about half of the time 2 = rarely true 1 = never or almost never true

4) I am comfortable asking questions when I am unsure.

5 = always true 4 = often true 3 = true about half of the time 2 = rarely true 1 = never or almost never true

5) I take the time to produce high quality work of which I feel proud.

5 = always true 4 = often true 3 = true about half of the time 2 = rarely true 1 = never or almost never true

6) I read and follow instructions carefully before starting a task.

5 = always true 4 = often true 3 = true about half of the time 2 = rarely true 1 = never or almost never true

7) I review sample/model work before beginning my own.

5 = always true 4 = often true 3 = true about half of the time 2 = rarely true 1 = never or almost never true

8) I am able to clearly communicate my ideas to others verbally (writing and speaking).

5 = always true 4 = often true 3 = true about half of the time 2 = rarely true 1 = never or almost never true

9) I actively seek out available resources to find information when I need it.

5 = always true 4 = often true 3 = true about half of the time 2 = rarely true 1 = never or almost never true

10) When I am not successful in a completed task, I take steps to improve in the future.

5 = always true 4 = often true 3 = true about half of the time 2 = rarely true 1 = never or almost never true

**When you have completed all 20 questions,
please return the survey to your instructor.
Thank you for your participation!**

RE: Core Outcomes Intervention Assessment

12/12/11

Dear DE colleague,

Congratulations! One of your 90-level courses has been selected for a special “intervention” component of the SAC Core Outcomes project. As you know, *all* RD and WR 90 courses district-wide will implement a 20-question pre and post survey on the two selected core outcomes: self-reflection and professional competency. The general survey will be administered once at the beginning of the term and once at the end.

In addition to the general survey, a group of courses were randomly selected from each campus for a brief intervention strategy, a brief, easy to implement three-question form that should only take up to five minutes of class time. This is where your extra help comes in!

Our hope is to assess whether weekly prompting, structured into the course itself, makes any difference in students’ perceptions around strategies for success and professional competency. Although we hope to see an increase in students’ perceptions of their habits in all participating DE courses, in the courses with the intervention, we expect to see a higher increase.

Implementation details:

- As in all other RD and WR 90 courses, **please administer the general pre and post survey** in your courses.
- **Starting week two, please administer the intervention form at the beginning of each class in **only** the selected course for the entire term.** For example, if your course runs on a Tues/Thurs rotation, administer the intervention at the beginning of class on Tuesday. We hope this will help set the tone for the week and prompt stronger self-reflection and professional competency skills for the next class.
- Please **bundle each week’s intervention forms and keep them**, so the Core Outcomes Committee has access to them during the data analysis stages. At the top of the form, you can circle the week of implementation. At the end of the term, please submit these to the committee representative.

More than anything, we want you and your students to benefit from participating in this intervention. As you will notice, we have left the 3rd question an optional instructor question, so you can also use this as a formative assessment for whatever you’d like. We have worked diligently to create an intervention that is helpful and easy to implement, and we hope we have succeeded.

We’re excited about this work and anticipate the findings! Thanks for your help. We understand that this is extra work for you, and we truly appreciate your participation. Again, if you are interested in joining the committee, we would love to have you!

Best,

The DE Core Outcomes Subcommittee

Appendix 1. Methodology for selection

The courses selected for the intervention were initially designated by level; both Reading and Writing 90 were determined to be the core courses with the greatest number of sections across the district with the highest enrollment of DE students.

The number of courses was determined by proportional division by number of campus sections of each subject and by 2:1 proportion of FT and PT faculty participation in most instances. The exception was Reading 90 at SE Center; no sections are taught by FT instructors. (Note: Hillsboro HEC and Forest Grove were considered Rock Creek; Forest Grove was considered Sylvania; and Distance Learning was eliminated from the pool.)

CA: 8 (3), RC: 10
(3), SY: 9 (3), SE
5 (1)

CA: 8 (3), RC:
10 (3), SY: 9
(3), SE 6 (2)

FT: 6, PT: 4

FT: 7, PT: 4

Appendix 2: Selected CRNs

Reading 90				Writing 90			
CRN	Instructor	Campus	FT/PT	CRN	Instructor	Campus	FT/PT
14014	Koya	SE	PT	11368	delVal	SE	FT
10452	Messersmith -Gavin	SY	FT	12670	Barber	SE	PT
10461	Messersmith -Gavin	SY	FT	10448	Arnett	SY	FT
14569	Evans	SY- Newburg	PT	10449	Guinee	SY	FT
10970	Selander	CA	FT	10447	Westerman	SY	PT
10637	Kaufka	CA	FT	10953	Burns	CA	FT
13606	Kamrar	CA	PT	10638	Selander	CA	FT
11001	Wright	RC	FT	14190	Buckley	CA	PT
14382	Fierman	RC	FT	11256	Boyd	RC	FT
10445	Bull	RC	PT	14664	Fierman	RC	FT
				16036	Kurczewski	RC- Hillsboro	PT

Please circle week of implementation: 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

DE CORE OUTCOMES INTERVENTION ASSESSMENT

** This is an anonymous assessment. Please do not include your name.*

1. What did you do to prepare for today's class?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> spent at least 10 minutes reviewing last week's work | <input type="checkbox"/> worked hard so I can take pride in my work |
| <input type="checkbox"/> made a prediction on what we'll do in class today | <input type="checkbox"/> used PCC support and peer resources (other students, Learning Center, tutors, etc.) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> have my homework ready to turn in | <input type="checkbox"/> mentally prepared to learn |
| <input type="checkbox"/> brought questions I have about course concepts | <input type="checkbox"/> managed distractions before coming to class (phone, child care, transportation, health) |

2. I have thought about how last week's coursework connects to other topics from the course, my other courses, and/or my life. ☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

Please explain your answer and give a specific example.

3. Optional question:

Please circle week of implementation: 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

DE CORE OUTCOMES INTERVENTION ASSESSMENT

** This is an anonymous assessment. Please do not include your name.*

1. What did you do to prepare for today's class?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> spent at least 10 minutes reviewing last week's work | <input type="checkbox"/> worked hard so I can take pride in my work |
| <input type="checkbox"/> made a prediction on what we'll do in class today | <input type="checkbox"/> used PCC support and peer resources (other students, Learning Center, tutors, etc.) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> have my homework ready to turn in | <input type="checkbox"/> mentally prepared to learn |
| <input type="checkbox"/> brought questions I have about course concepts | <input type="checkbox"/> managed distractions before coming to class (phone, child care, transportation, health) |

2. I have thought about how last week's coursework connects to other topics from the course, my other courses, and/or my life. ☐ strongly agree ☐ agree ☐ disagree ☐ strongly disagree

Please explain your answer and give a specific example.

3. Optional question:

Intervention

Dear Students,

The Developmental Education program is doing an online survey/assessment of PCC's two core outcomes: self-reflection and professional competency. We are asking you to complete a 20-question online survey. This should take about 5 minutes. This survey must be completed by Friday 1/20 (end of week two).

When the survey asks, please input your CRN (**14190**) and then proceed to answer the questions.

Here is the link:

Thank you for your participation.

Best,
Developmental Education, PCC

Intervention

Dear Students,

The Developmental Education program is doing an online survey/assessment of PCC's two core outcomes: self-reflection and professional competency. We are asking you to complete a 20-question online survey. This should take about 5 minutes. This survey must be completed by Friday 1/20 (end of week two).

When the survey asks, please input your CRN (**14190**) and then proceed to answer the questions.

Here is the link:

Thank you for your participation.

Best,
Developmental Education, PCC