

Subject Area Committee Name: Aviation Maintenance Technology

Contact Person

<i>Name</i>	<i>e-mail</i>
Steve Phillips	shphilli@pcc.edu

Document your plan for each of the two Focal Analysis assessment projects your SAC will be doing this year in the first sections of this report. Focal analysis typically involves a thorough investigation of a degree/certificate outcome (or elements of a chosen outcome). This deeper analysis should be driven by an attempt to improve student learning (e.g., assessment motivated by faculty curiosity, anecdotal experience, or summary data evidence that is somehow troubling) – rather than to provide evidence that students are attaining the degree and certificate outcomes.

If your SAC is using an assessment design that captures two outcomes, use a separate planning form for each outcome, **even if you are assessing both in a single project**. Complete each section of each 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.

- Use separate report forms for each outcome your SAC is assessing.
- Refer to the help document for guidance in filling-out this report. If this document does not address your question/concern, contact [Michele Marden](#) to arrange for coaching assistance.
- Please attach all rubrics/assignments/etc. to your report submissions.
- **Subject Line of Email:** Assessment Report Form (or ARF) for <your SAC name> (Example: ARF for NRS)
- **File name:** SACInitials_ARF_2015 (Example: NRS_ARF_2015)
- 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 7th, 2014**
- **Changes to Multi-Year Plan submitted last year: November 7th, 2014**
- **Completed LAC Assessment or Reassessment Reports: June 19th, 2015**

Please Verify These Before Beginning this Report:

This project is in the first stage of the assess/re-assess process (if this is a follow-up, re-assessment project, use the LAC Re-assessment Report Form CTE. Available at: <http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/learning-assessment/LDC-2013-2014-Info-Templates.html>

This project is aligned with the SAC's Multi-Year Plan. Available for review at: <http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/degree-outcome/AssessmentPlansFall2010.html>. If there are changes, Multi-Year Plans can be altered and resubmitted to meet the current needs of the SAC.

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.

Troubleshooting. To show that the students are achieving the level of competency expected.

1B. If the assessment project relates to any of the following, check all that apply:

- Degree/Certificate Outcome – if yes, include here: A.A.S., 2-year Airframe and Powerplant*
- PCC Core Outcome – if yes, which one: CT&PS, PC*
- Course Outcome – if yes, which one: none*

2. Project Description

2A. Assessment Context

Check all the applicable items: **Course based assessment.**

Course names and number(s): AMT219 - Turbine Engine Overhaul

Expected number of sections offered in the term when the assessment project will be conducted: 2

Number of these sections taught by full-time instructors: 2/year

Number of these sections taught by part-time instructors: 0

Number of distance learning/hybrid sections: 0

Type of assessment (e.g., essay, exam, speech, project, etc.): Project evaluation of engine trimming by means of multiple choice quiz. The first assessment was modified to multiple choice to improve analysis.

Are there course outcomes that align with this aspect of the outcome being investigated? Yes No

If yes, include the course outcome(s) from the relevant CCOG(s): We think now after looking at it that we could add an Outcome statement regarding Troubleshooting

Common/embedded assignment in all relevant course sections. An embedded assignment is one that is already included as an element in the course as usually taught. Please attach the activity in an appendix. If the activity cannot be shared, indicate the type of assignment (e.g., essay, exam, speech, project, etc.):

Common – but not embedded - assignment used in all relevant course sections. Please attach the activity in an appendix. If the activity cannot be shared, indicate the type of assignment (e.g., essay, exam, speech, project, etc.):

Practicum/Clinical work. Please attach the activity/checklist/etc. in an appendix. If this cannot be shared, indicate the type of assessment (e.g., supervisor checklist, interview, essay, exam, speech, project, etc.):

External certification exam. Please attach sample questions for the relevant portions of the exam in an appendix (provided that publically revealing this information will not compromise test security). Also, briefly describe how the results of this exam are broken down in a way that leads to nuanced information about the aspect of the core outcome that is being investigated.

SAC-created, non-course assessment. Please attach the assessment in an appendix. If the assessment cannot be shared, indicate the type of assignment (e.g., essay, exam, speech, project, etc.):

Portfolio. Please attach sample instructions/activities/etc. for the relevant portions of the portfolio submission in an appendix. Briefly describe how the results of this assessment are broken down in a way that leads to nuanced information about the aspect of the core outcome that is being investigated:

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.):

- Survey**
- Interview**
- Other.** Please attach the activity/assessment in an appendix. If the activity cannot be shared, please briefly describe it:

In the event publically sharing your assessment documents will compromise future assessments or uses of the assignment, do not attach the actual assignment/document. Instead, please give as much detail about the activity as possible in an appendix.

2B. How will you score/measure/quantify student performance?

- Rubric** (used when student performance is on a continuum - if available, attach as an appendix – if in development - attach to the completed report that is submitted in June)
- Checklist** (used when presence/absence rather than quality is being evaluated - if available, attach as an appendix – if in development - attach to the completed report that is submitted in June)
- Trend Analysis** (often used to understand the ways in which students are, and are not, meeting expectations; trend analysis can complement rubrics and checklist)
- Objective Scoring** (e.g., Scantron scored examinations)
- Other** – briefly describe:

2C. Type of assessment (select one per column)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantitative | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Direct Assessment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Qualitative | <input type="checkbox"/> Indirect Assessment |

If you selected 'Indirect Assessment', please share your rationale:

Qualitative Measures: projects that analyze in-depth, non-numerical data via observer impression rather than via quantitative analysis. Generally, qualitative measures are used in exploratory, pilot projects rather than in true assessments of student attainment. Indirect assessments (e.g., surveys, focus groups, etc.) do not use measures of direct student work output. These types of assessments are also not able to truly document student attainment.

2D. Check any of the following that were used by your SAC to create or select the assessment/scoring criteria/instruments used in this project:

- Committee or subcommittee of the SAC collaborated in its creation
- Standardized assessment
- Collaboration with external stakeholders (e.g., advisory board, transfer institution/program)
- Theoretical Model (e.g., Bloom's Taxonomy)
- Aligned the assessment with standards from a professional body (for example, The American Psychological Association Undergraduate Guidelines, etc.)
- Aligned the benchmark with the Associate's Degree level expectations of the Degree Qualifications Profile
- Aligned the benchmark to within-discipline post-requisite course(s)
- Aligned the benchmark to out-of-discipline post-requisite course(s)
- Other (briefly explain: _____)

2E. In which quarter will student artifacts (examples of student work) be collected? If student artifacts will be collected in more than one term, check all that apply.

- Fall Winter Spring Other (e.g., if work is collected between terms)

2F. When during the term will it be collected? If student artifacts will be collected more than once in a term, check all that apply.

- Early Mid-term Late n/a

2G. What student group do you want to generalize the results of your assessment to? For example, if you are assessing performance in a course, the student group you want to generalize to is 'all students taking this course.'

All students taking this course.

2H. There is no single, recommended assessment strategy. Each SAC is tasked with choosing appropriate methods for their purposes. Which best describes the purpose of this project?

- To measure established outcomes and/or drive programmatic change (proceed to section H below)**
- To participate in the Multi-State Collaborative for Learning Outcomes Assessment**
- Preliminary/Exploratory investigation (consult with an LAC coach prior to making this selection since most assessment projects should not qualify as preliminary/exploratory)**

If you selected 'Preliminary/Exploratory' (most often a 'pilot study'), briefly describe why you opted to do a pilot study, along with 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. It is not currently taught in most sections of this course. 2 full-time faculty and 1 part-time faculty member will field-test 3 different activities/assessments intended to measure student attainment of this proposed course outcome. The 3 will be compared to see which work best."

2I. Which will you measure?

- the population** (all relevant students – e.g., all students enrolled in all currently offered sections of the course)
 a sample (a subset of students)

If you are using a sample, select all of the following that describe your sample/sampling strategy (refer to the Help Guide for assistance):

- Random Sample** (student work selected completely randomly from all relevant students)
 Systematic Sample (student work selected through an arbitrary pattern, e.g., 'start at student 7 on the roster and then select every 5th student following'; repeating this in all relevant course sections)
 Stratified Sample (more complex, consult with an LAC coach if you need assistance)
 Cluster Sample (students are selected randomly from meaningful, naturally occurring groupings (e.g., SES, placement exam scores, etc.)
 Voluntary Response Sample (students submit their work/responses through voluntary submission, e.g., via a survey)
 Opportunity/Convenience Sample (only a few instructors are participating in a project taught via multiple sections, so, only those instructors' students are included)

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 AMT sample will be all of the students of each section/class in which the Troubleshooting project will be conducted.

*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.):***

Approximately 30 students from both sample classes.

Sample size calculator

What margin of error can you accept?
5% is a common choice

10 %

What confidence level do you need?
Typical choices are 90%, 95%, or 99%

90 %

What is the population size?
If you don't know, use 20000

105

What is the response distribution?
Leave this as 50%

50 %

Your recommended sample size is

42

Handwritten annotations:
 - Red arrows point from the 10% margin of error, 90% confidence level, and 42 recommended sample size fields to explanatory text.
 - Text: "The margin of error is the amount of error that you can tolerate. If 90% of respondents answer yes, while 10% answer no, you may be able to tolerate a larger amount of error than if the respondents are split 50-50 or 45-55. Lower margin of error requires a larger sample size. Use 10% and 90% in these boxes."
 - Text: "Confidence level is the amount of uncertainty you can tolerate. Suppose that you have 20 yes-no questions in your survey. With a confidence level of 95%, you would expect that for one of the questions (1 in 20), the percentage of people who answer yes would be more than the margin of error away from the true answer. The true answer is the percentage you would get if you exhaustively interviewed everyone. Higher confidence level requires a larger sample size. Enter the total number of students currently enrolled in all sections of the courses you are assessing here."
 - Text: "For each question, what do you expect the results will be? If the sample is skewed highly one way or the other, the population probably is, too. If you don't know, use 50%, which gives the largest sample size. See below under More information if this is confusing. Measure this many students."
 - Text: "This is the minimum recommended size of your survey. If you create a sample of this many people and get responses from everyone, you're more likely to get a correct answer than you would from a large sample where only a small percentage of the sample responds to your survey."

3. Project Mechanics

3A. Does your project utilize a rubric for scoring? Yes No

If 'No', proceed to section B. If 'Yes', complete the following.

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, see the contact [Michele Marden](#) to arrange for coaching help for your SAC's norming session.

Which method of ensuring consistent scoring (inter-rater reliability) will your SAC use for this project?

Agreement – the percentage of raters giving each artifact the same/similar score in a norming session

If you are using agreement, describe your plan for plan for conducting the “norming” or “calibrating” session:

Consensus - all raters score all artifacts and reach agreement on each score

Though rarely used at PCC, some SACs might occasionally use the consistency measure for determining the similarity of their ratings. Consistency is generally only recommended when measuring student improvement – not for showing outcome attainment (which explains its rarity). See the Help Guide for more information. Check here if you will be using consistency calculations in this assessment.

Consistency* – raters’ scores are correlated: this captures relative standing of the performance ratings - but not precise agreement – and then briefly describe your plan:

3B. Have performance benchmarks been specified?

The fundamental measure in educational assessment is the number of students who complete the work at the expected/required level. We are calling this SAC-determined performance expectation the ‘benchmark.’

Yes (determined by faculty consensus – all instructors who currently teach the course)

Yes (determined by only some of the instructors who currently teach the course)

Yes (determined by alignment with an external standard: e.g., standards published by the discipline’s professional organization)

Yes (determined by post-requisite course expectations within PCC)

Yes (determined by post-requisite course expectations for transfer institution)

Yes (other). Describe briefly:

No

If yes, briefly describe your performance benchmarks, being as specific as possible (if needed, attach as an appendix):

FAA 14CFR Part 147, Appendix D, Goal F., Fuel Metering Systems, Task 23 - Inspect, check,service, troubleshoot and repair reciprocating and turbince engine fuel metering systems.

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.

Data will be transferred to a spreadsheet without any identifying information.

3D. Will you be coding your data/artifacts in order to compare student sub-groups? Yes No

If yes, select one of the boxes below:

- student's total earned hours previous coursework completed ethnicity other

Briefly describe your coding plan and rationale (and if you selected 'other', identify the sub-groups you will be coding for:

3E. Ideally, student work is **evaluated** by both full-time and adjunct faculty, even if students being assessed are taught by only full-time and/or adjunct faculty. Further, more than one rater is needed to ensure inter-rater reliability. If you feel only one rater is feasible for your SAC, please consult with an LAC coach prior to submitting your plan/conducting your assessment.

Other groups may be appropriate depending on the assessment. Check all that apply.

- PCC Adjunct Faculty within the program/discipline
- PCC FT Faculty within the program/discipline
- PCC Faculty outside the program/discipline
- Program Advisory Board Members
- Non-PCC Faculty
- External Supervisors
- Other:

End of Planning Section – Complete the remainder of this report after your assessment project is complete.

Beginning of End of Year Reporting Section – complete the following sections after your assessment project is complete.

4. Changes to the Assessment Plan

Have there been changes to your project since you submitted the planning section of this report? Yes No

If so, note the changes in the planning section above.

5. Results of the Analysis of Assessment Project Data

5A. Quantitative Summary of Sample/Population

How many students were enrolled in all sections of the course(s) you assessed this year? 28
 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? All 28 students
 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?

- Agreement** – the percentage of raters giving each artifact the same/similar score in a norming session
- Consensus** - all raters score all artifacts and reach agreement on each score
- Consistency** – raters' scores are correlated: this captures relative standing of the performance ratings - but not precise agreement

Inter-rater reliability was not assured.

If you utilized agreement or consistency measures of inter-rater reliability, report the level here:

5C. Brief Summary of Your Results

*In most cases, report the numbers of students who attain your benchmark level and the numbers who do not. **Do not average these numbers or combine dissimilar categories (e.g., do not combine ratings for communication and critical thinking together).** If your project measures how many students attain the overall benchmark level of performance, report the summary numbers below (choose one):*

- 1. If you used frequencies (the actual number who attained the desired level(s) and the actual number who did not), report those here for each of your criteria for this learning outcome. For example, "46 students attained the benchmark level over-all in written communication and 15 did not. Our SAC used 5 criteria within this rubric: 46 student achieved the benchmark level in idea expression (15 did not); 54 achieved the benchmark level for use of standard English (10 did not); etc."*
- 2. 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, "75% of 61 students attained the benchmark level over-all in written communication. Our SAC used 5 criteria within this rubric: 75% of students achieved the benchmark level in idea expression; 89% achieved the benchmark level for use of standard English; etc."*

100% of the first student population evaluated reached the benchmark of 70% or higher. In the second population of 14 students, 3 of them fell below the benchmark. Upon oral review with them, they were found to exceed the minimum benchmark of 70%.

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 assessment? For example, "We are pleased that most of our students are using standard English in their writing, but want to improve our students' ability to express ideas clearly..."

This was informative to us about assessment of important learning outcomes of our students. We found that we could evaluate these outcomes by way of a strategically designed multiple choice quiz. We also learned that the explanation of the quiz process is important to achieve accurate results. Future quiz revisions will have more detailed explanation.

5F. Do the results of this project suggest that academic changes might be beneficial to your students (changes in curriculum, content, materials, instruction, pedagogy etc.)? Yes No

If you answered 'Yes,' briefly describe the changes to improve student learning below. If you answered 'No', detail why no changes are called for.

No changes in instruction are necessary. The students were told what they needed to learn and this assessment reinforced that.

If you are planning changes, when will these changes be fully implemented?

5G. Has all identifying information been removed from your documents? (Information includes student/instructor/supervisor names/identification numbers, names of external placement sites, etc.) Yes No

6. SAC Response to the Assessment Project Results

6A. Assessment Tools & Processes: Indicate how well each of the following worked for your assessment:

Tools (rubrics, test items, questionnaires, etc.):

very well some small problems/limitations to fix notable problems/limitations to fix tools completely inadequate/failure

Please comment briefly on any changes to assessment tools that would lead to more meaningful results if this assessment were to be repeated (or adapted to another outcome).

The first assessment was modified to multiple choice to improve analysis. The second assessment will be modified to improve the details of the quiz.

Processes (faculty involvement, sampling, norming, inter-rater reliability, etc.):

very well some small problems/limitations to fix notable problems/limitations to fix tools completely inadequate/failure

Please comment briefly on any changes to assessment process that would lead to more meaningful results if this assessment were to be repeated (or adapted to another outcome).

The process of developing the assessment engaged all of the faculty. (4)

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)*

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> email | <input type="checkbox"/> phone call | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> workshop |
| <input type="checkbox"/> campus mail | <input type="checkbox"/> face-to-face meeting | <input type="checkbox"/> other |
| <input type="checkbox"/> no changes to share | | |

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. Re-assessment is a critical part of the overall assessment process. This is especially important if academic changes have been implemented. How will you assess the effectiveness of the changes you plan to make?

- follow-up project in next year's annual report
- in a future assessment project

- on-going informal assessment
- 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.

We have had good discussion about quantitative assessment of outcomes. We will be working individually and collectively to integrate improvements.