Annual Report for Assessment of Outcomes 2012-13

Subject Area Committee Name:Emergency TeleCommunicator
Contact person: _Carol Bruneau
For LDC/DE: Core outcome(s) assessed:
For CTE: Degree or certificate* assessed:
*please attach a table showing the alignment of the degree or certificate outcomes with the College Core Outcomes

Please address the questions below and send to <u>learningassessment@pcc.edu</u> by **June 21, 2013** with Annual Report in the subject line

Note: Information provided in this report may be inserted into or summarized in Section 2C Program Review Outline.

Describe <u>changes that have been implemented</u> towards improving students' attainment of outcomes that
 <u>resulted from recent outcome assessments</u>. These may include but are not limited to changes to content,
 materials, instruction, pedagogy etc. Please be sure to **describe the connection** between the assessment
 results and the changes made.

In 2012, the ETC/911 program updated outcome assessment tools and matrix to align with industry accepted standards set by the Association of Professional Communications Officials International (APCO). These assessment tools are designed to monitor and evaluate student performance using matrices that are common to a dispatch environment. Using a model based in APCO, students are introduced to the evaluations used in most dispatch environments, preparing them for the style of training and assessment they will face in the job market.

Students are assessed using both problem-based learning assignments and practical knowledge demonstrations. Results of practical performance testing can identify areas where additional education or clarification is required by the instructors. These updates continue to align the classroom experience with what students will find during the training program used in many communications centers.

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).
 - The student sample assessed (including sample size relative to the targeted student population for the assessment activity) process and rationale for selection of the student sample. Why was this group of students and/or courses chosen?
 - Any rubrics, checklists, surveys or other tools that were used to evaluate the student work. (Please include with your report OK to include in appendix). Where appropriate, identify benchmarks.
 - How you analyzed results, including steps taken to ensure that results are reliable (consistent from one evaluator to another.

Outcome: #1

Use a variety of questioning techniques and interpersonal communication skills to determine location and needs of callers who may be aggressive, distraught or difficult, then interpret and encapsulate that information into a limited space and format, without compromising the accuracy of the facts.

Outcome #2

Record, interpret and encapsulate information received primarily via verbal communication accurately using a computer keyboard.

Student knowledge and abilities for <u>Communication</u> and <u>Critical Thinking</u> are assessed during practical, labbased classes using The Law Enforcement Call Handling Form (see Appendix A) and the Medical Dispatch Case Evaluation Record (see Appendix B). These forms, similar to quality assurance tools commonly used by dispatch centers nationwide to critique law enforcement calls for service, uses Standardized Call Guides and Evaluation Guidelines to ensure police calls for service are processed according to established set protocols. Students are graded on a sliding scale, with a minimum score of at least 70% required to successfully pass the requirements of the exercises.

The Law Enforcement Evaluation Form is used in ETC110, Communications Center Operations Basic, ETC111 Communications Center Operations Intermediate and ETC112 Communications Center Operations Advanced. The Medical Dispatch Case Evaluation Record is used in ETC202 EMD Overview. In 2012 a total of 13 students completed ETC112 Communications Center Operations Advanced, the final lab class for the ETC program. Of

those, 15.4% received As, 15.4 received Bs and 38.5% received Cs. A final grade of C or above would be comparable to entry-level applicants in a communications environment.

In addition, students are tested at the beginning of the first term using <u>CritiCall</u>, a software program used by many communications centers for pre-employment testing, to determine a baseline of skills. Students are then tested at the end of the second term to quantify improvements or deficiencies. Critical comparison improvement from Fall 2012 to Spring 2013 was 74% (**Appendix C: Critical**)

Students and instructors ETC 911 staff met throughout the term to review the use of the form and evaluate what could be added or subtracted to make the process more effective and relevant to industry standards.

- 3. Provide information about the results_(i.e., what did you learn about how well students are meeting the outcomes)?
 - If scored (e.g., if a rubric or other scaled tool is used), please report the data, and relate to any
 appropriate benchmarks.
- Results should be broken down in a way that is meaningful and useful for making improvements to teaching/learning. Please show those specific results

The Law Enforcement Call Handling Form is used as a quantitative grading matrix, providing specific feedback showing the expected result vs. the achieved result (See Appendix D: Sample Completed Law Enforcement Call Handling Form). This form is based in the pre-determined standards following APCOs *Minimum Training Standards for Public Safety Telecommunicators* (See Appendix E) and the use of scripted scenarios for graded quizzes and tests (See Appendix F – Call Scripts). These standards of scoring are used in all lab classes, becoming progressively more demanding to demonstrate student knowledge based in industry standards.

Throughout the program students use the Law Enforcement Call Handling Sheet to evaluate their own calls, determining where they did well and where they need improvement. Collectively, students critique calls from the perspective of a dispatcher to ensure all required information is present. Instructors use the form for practical quizzes and final exams.

With these results of CRITICAL testing provided at the end of the second term, students can view their keyboarding and computer aided dispatching skills for self-reflection and self-study.

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).

Each category of the Law Enforcement Call Handling Evaluation Form was re-numbered with subheadings for easier review. (See Appendix G Updated Law Enforcement Call Handling Evaluation Form.) For example, the Required Information, Where section changed to heading Case Entry #1, Verified Address.

Subheadings were reviewed to ensure the points matched the rating scale. For example, Interrogation Category 16, Vehicle Description was changed to a value of 5 points, one point each for Color/Year/Make/Model/Style. This numerical rating provides students with increased opportunities to define their performance in meeting required standards. In addition, quantifying additional results provides students with a deeper understanding of the parameters of the field of dispatch. This allows the student to prioritize their self-study efforts.

Specific Call Types Scripts will continue to be developed to ensure continuity during mid-term and final exams by instructors playing "the caller."

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

The updated version of the Law Enforcement Call Handling Evaluation Form will be used for 2013, and reviewed again at the end of the program to determine if additional changes are necessary.

Appendix A Law Enforcement Call Handling Evaluation

Call #	: Date of Review:	Reviewe	er:	_	
Term:	Mid Term: Final:				
Call T	ype:				
Stude	nt Name:				
For ar	nswers to be correct the information	on in ALL (CAPS m	ust be included. Oth	er pieces information
listed	are optional. If the call taker inclu	uded infor	mation	that isn't required, bu	ut it is incorrect they do
not re	ceive the points. Tasks marked in	parenthe	sis are	optional and are not	worth any points.
Case	Entry – 41 points possible				
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	OBV/NA Points Rcvd	Points Possible
1. Ok	otained/verified address				5
2. Ol	otained/verified call back number				5
3. Er	ntered correctly `				5
4. De	etermined correct complaint in				
lin	e one of call				5
5. Er	ntered correctly				5
6. Cc	orrect call code				5
7. Ca	all Priority				5
8. De	etermined Weapons				1
9. Ti	me Information				1
10. De	etermined Drugs				1
11. De	etermined Alcohol				1
12. De	etails Field Completed				1
13. Ol	otained RP name				1
Calle	er Interrogation – 7 poi	nts pos	sible		
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	OBV/NA Points Rcvd	Points Possible
14. Ca	aller information				1
15. Su	spect Descriptions				1
16. Ve	ehicle Description				1
17. Ot	thers Involved?				1
18. Sa	ifety of Caller?				1
10 Hi	story of Parties?				1

20. Contact Caller?	Ш			1	
Call Taker Techniques 9 po	oints	s poss	ible		
	<u>Yes</u>	No	Points Rcvd	Points Possible	
21. Primary info received in 60 seconds?				1	
22. Call saved?				1	
23. Call routed correctly?				1	
24. All officer safety factors considered?				1	
25. In control of call?				1	
26. Confidence instilled?				1	
27. Questioning was not suggestive				1	
Points given for "no" answer indicating stud	dent d	did not cr	reate expectation	ons/use prohibited behaviors	
28. Assumptions clarified				1	
29. Kept caller updated				1	
Customer Service – 4 points p	ossi <u>Yes</u>	ble No	Points Rcvd	Points Possible	
00 B					
30. Proper greeting				1	
31. Avoided / explained gaps 22. Maintained professional attitude				1	
32. Maintained professional attitude				1	
33. Empathetic, compassionate, supportive		Ш		1	
Call Remarks – 4 points possib	ole				
	<u>Yes</u>	No_	Points Rcvd.	Points Possible	
34. Complete				1	
35. Concise				1	
36. Clear				1	
37. Ended correctly	Ш			1	

SCORING:

Case Entry	<u>41</u>	41
Caller Interrogation	+7	7
Call Taker Technique	+9	9
Customer Service	+ 4	4
Call Remarks	+ 4	4
Total Score:	= <u>65/65</u> =	100

Reviewer Comments:

APPENDIX C CRITICAL Sample

Spring 2013	Overall Score	Data Entry Typing Score	T score	Decision Making	Data Entry Emergency	Call Summarization Primary
Α	69%	2172	38	80%	90%	57%
В	77%	3168	42	90%		40%
С	87%	3000	53	80%	75%	80%
D	91%	4992	55	100%	100%	100%
E	76%	2340	36	100%	100%	60%
F	98%	3672	45	100%	90%	80%
G	90%		40	100%	90%	80%
Н	85%	3504	44	100%		80%
1	88%	5328	59	100%		80%
J	79%	2940	51	100%	90%	95%
K	85%	2016	35	100%	70%	86%
L	88%	5148	56	100%	90%	100%
Total	84%	3480	46	96%	88%	78%

Call Summarization Emergency	Cross Referencing Primary	Cross Referencing Emergency	Character Comparison	Memory
80%	100%	80%	90%	%
100%	00%	90%	100%	100%
100%	80%	10000%	100%	
100%	70%	100%	100%	90%
100%	60%	100%	90%	90%
100%	80%	100%	100%	90%
100%	70%	100%	90%	100%
100%	70%	100%	90%	90%
100%	60%	100%	100%	100%
	95%	100%	100%	
00%	60%	50%	100%	%
100%	60%	100%	100%	90%
89%	67%	91%	97%	94%

Prioritization		Reading Comprehension
100%	80%	73%
70%	47%	
100%	93%	93%
80%	93%	100%
80%	80%	67%
100%	100%	100%
100%	93%	
90%	87%	87%
90%	87%	93%
60%	87%	80%
100%	93%	87%
90%	93%	87%
88%	86%	87%

Appendix D Completed Law Enforcement Call Handling Evaluation

Call <u>#:</u>	Date of Review:	Reviewe	er:	_	
Term:	Mid Term: Final:				
Call Ty	pe: <u>Domestic Disturbance</u>				
Studer	nt Name:				
For an	swers to be correct the informatio	n in ALL (CAPS m	ust be included. Oth	er pieces information
listed a	are optional. If the call taker inclu	ded infor	mation	that isn't required, bu	ut it is incorrect they do
not red	ceive the points. Tasks marked in	parenthe	sis are	optional and are not	worth any points.
Case	Entry – 41 points possible				
1 Ob	toin ad (vanifical adduces	<u>Yes</u> ⊠	<u>No</u>	OBV/NA Points Rcvd	Points Possible
	tained/verified address Alder Ave		Ш		5
	tained/verified call back number	\boxtimes			5
222-33			Ш		3
	tered correctly `	\boxtimes		П	5
	termined correct complaint in				Ü
	ne of call	\boxtimes		П	5
	<i>IRBANCE</i>	_	<u>—</u>	_	
5. Er	ntered correctly				5
6. Co	rrect call code				5
DOM					
7. Ca	II Priority				5
In Pro	gress				
8. De	termined Weapons				1
NO W	EAPS SEEN				
9. Tin	ne Information				1
Occuri	ring Now				
10. De	termined Drugs				1
UNK D	DK .				
11. De	termined Alcohol				1
UNK D	DR .	_		_	
12. De	tails Field Completed	\boxtimes			1

PHYSICAL

13. Obtained RP name				1
Allison Franklin				
Caller Interrogation – 7 point	s pos	sible		
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	OBV/NA Points Rcvd	Points Possible
14 Collar information	\square			1
14. Caller information	\boxtimes			1
15. Suspect Descriptions MARK THOMAS 25				1
WM RED SHT/JEANS				
MARYANN THOMAS 25				
WF PINK SHR/JEANS	\square			1
16. Vehicle Description BLUE PU				1
17. Others Involved?	\bowtie			1
				1
18. Safety of Caller?				1
19. History of Parties?				1
20. Contact Caller?				1
Call Taker Techniques 9 p	oints	possi	ible	
у р	<u>Yes</u>	No	Points Rcvd Points P	ossible of the control of the contro
21. Primary info received in 60 seconds?	\boxtimes			1
22. Call saved?				1
23. Call routed correctly?				1
24. All officer safety factors considered?				1
25. In control of call?				1
26. Confidence instilled?				1
27. Questioning was not suggestive		\boxtimes		1
Points given for "no" answer indicating stu	ıdent di	d not cr	eate expectations/use	prohibited behaviors.
28. Assumptions clarified	\boxtimes			1
29. Kept caller updated	\boxtimes			1

Customer Service – 4 points possible

	<u>Yes</u>	No	Points Rcvd	Points Possible
30. Proper greeting				1
31. Avoided / explained gaps	\boxtimes			1
32. Maintained professional attitude	\boxtimes			1
33. Empathetic, compassionate, supportive	\boxtimes			1

Call Remarks - 4 points possible

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	Points Rcvd.	Points Possible
34. Complete	\boxtimes			1
35. Concise				1
36. Clear	\boxtimes			1
37. Ended correctly				1

SCORING:

Case Entry		<u>41</u>			41
Caller Interrogation	+_	7			7
Call Taker Technique	+_	9			9
Customer Service	+	4			4
Call Remarks	+	4			4
Total Score:	= <u>(</u>	65/65	=	=	100

Reviewer Comments:

Appendix E

Validity and Assessment

(The following is from the Approved Application for Locally Produced Technical Skill Assessment by the Oregon Department of Education)

Validity

Assessment is through both NAED testing and certification and the Law Enforcement Evaluation Form which evaluates the task based skills identified by APCO against a scoring guide. In addition, instructors and staff work closely with an advisory committee made up of representatives from local 911 and dispatch organization and with students to identify needs, challenges and accomplishments.

In Chapter Seven of the *APCO Minimum Training Standards for Public Safety Telecommunicators*Guide, APCO sets the following standards:

- 7.2.1 The Calltaker shall demonstrate the ability to apply procedures to answer calls within Agency parameters while projecting a professional demeanor.
- 7.2.2 The Calltaker shall demonstrate the ability to obtain, verify, and analyze incident information to include, location, reporting party contact information, nature, and severity of the incident while applying effective communication skills to control the call.
- 7.2.3 The Calltaker shall demonstrate the ability to synthesize all available information to identify conditions that may affect public and responder safety.
- 7.2.4 The Calltaker shall demonstrate the ability to ascertain whether the caller is in an unsafe location and then take appropriate protective actions in compliance with agency directives.
- 7.3 The Calltaker shall demonstrate the ability to accurately document incident information including, but not limited to incident urgency details, establish call priority, and appropriately label call types.
- 7.4 The Calltaker shall demonstrate the ability to manage challenging calls and callers including, but not limited to: missing, abducted and sexually exploited children, child callers, communications impaired callers, and callers with limited English language proficiency.
- 7.5 The Calltaker shall verify, document and relay initial dispatch information, and provide updates as necessary to process calls for service.

7.5.1 The Calltaker shall provide callers with any agency approved pre-arrival instructions₁₄ and inform callers of actions being taken to respond to the requests for service according to written directives.

PCC ETC911 students are evaluated on their ability to meet these standards using both written tests and the Call Taking Evaluation and Medical Evaluation Form used as a scoring guide during ETC110, ETC112, and/or ETC112 lab classes.

Appendix F - Call Guide Script

SIMULATION CALL SCENARIO: DOMESTIC DISTURBANCE

SCENARIO INFO:

The caller is moderately excited but cooperative and reporting a fight between neighbors. The caller has limited information about the subjects involved.

Student Tested On:

General Ability:

Ability to correctly process call for service

Specific Tasks

Ability to complete case entry correctly

Ability to obtain, verify, and analyze incident information to include, location, reporting party contact information, nature, and severity of the incident while applying effective communication skills to control the call.

Ability to synthesize all available information to identify conditions that may affect public and responder safety

Ability to ascertain whether the caller is in an safe location

Ability to accurately document incident information

Ability to provide callers with any approved pre-arrival instruction

Call Scenario	Caller Profile
Caller reporting a fight between a man and	Excited but cooperative
woman next door.	
Call Taker Questions	Caller Responses
911 where is your emergency	My neighbors across the street are fighting
What is the address?	1250 Alder Ave
How many people are fighting?	It's a man and his wife. He is yelling at her and
	pushing her
Do you know their names?	Yes, they are Mark and Maryanne Thomas
Can you describe them?	Mark is a white guy with brown hair, a red shirt

	and jeans
	Maryanne is a white gal, wearing a pink tank
	top and jeans
	They are both about 25 years old
Are there any weapons?	No
Has anyone been drinking or doing drugs?	Beats me
Do they have any vehicles?	Yea, they own a blue beater pickup in the
	driveway. I can't see the plate
Your name?	Allison Franklin
What is your phone number?	222 – 3344
Is anyone else involved?	No
Are there any children there?	Yes they have a five year old girl who was
	playing outside. She's inside now
Do you feel safe?	Yes I'm fine, I'm inside my house watching
	through my front window
Do you know if there is any history between	I have no idea
them?	
Do you want contact?	No thank you
Call Taker Instructions:	
Observer notes:	
	ı

Appendix G – Law Enforcement Call Handling Evaluation

Cal	l <u>#:</u>	Date of Review:	Reviewe	er:	_	
<u>Ter</u>	m:	Mid Term: Final:	_			
Cal	l Type: _					
Stu	dent Nam	ne:				
For	answers	to be correct following information	ation m	ust be c	completed in the CAD	screen. All entries
mu	st be type	ed in CAPITAL letters. Each CA	AD field	must b	e filled out completely	/ .
Ca	se Entry	/ – 46 points possible				
			<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	OBV/NA Points Rcvd	Points Possible
1.	Obtained	/verified address				5
	a. E	ntered correctly				5
2.	Obtai	ned/verified call back number				5
	a. E	ntered correctly				5
3.	Determin	ed correct complaint in				
line	one of ca	all				5
	a. E	ntered correctly				5
	b. T	ime Information				1
4.	Correct C	Call Code				5
5.	Correct C	Call Priority				5
6.	Determin	ed Weapons				1
7.	Determin	ned Drugs				1
8.	Determin	ied Alcohol				1
9.	Details Fi	ield Completed				1
10.	Obtained	RP name				1

Caller Interrogation – 18 points possible

23. Confidence instilled?

25. Assumptions clarified

24. Questioning was effective

3	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	OBV/NA Points Re	cvd Points Possible			
11. Caller information				1			
12. Suspect Description							
a. Name				1			
b. Race				1			
c. Sex				1			
d. Age/DOB				1			
e. Build/Height/Weight				1			
f. Hair/Hat				1			
g. Jacket/Shirt				1			
h. Pants/Shorts/Skirt				1			
13. Vehicle Description							
a. Color				1			
b. Year				1			
c. Make				1			
d. Model				1			
e. Style				1			
14. Others Involved?				1			
15. Safety of Caller?				1			
16. History of Parties?				1			
17. Contact Caller?				1			
Call Taker Techniques 9 points possible							
	<u>Yes</u>	No	Points Rcvd	Points Possible			
18. Primary info received in 60 seconds?				1			
19. Call saved?				1			
20. Call routed correctly?				1			
21. All officer safety factors considered?				1			
22. In control of call?				1			

1

1

1

26. Kept caller updated						1		
Customer Service – 4 points possible								
			<u>Yes</u>	No	Points Rcvd	Points Possible		
27. Proper greeting						1		
28. Avoided / explaine	ed ga	ıps				1		
29. Maintained profes	siona	al attitude				1		
30. Empathetic, comp	assic	onate, supportive				1		
Call Remarks -	Call Remarks – 4 points possible							
			<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	Points Rcvd.	Points Possible		
31. Complete						1		
32. Concise						1		
33. Clear						1		
34. Ended correctly						1		
SCORING:	Ро	ssible		Rece	eived			
Case Entry		46			46			
Caller Interrogation	+	18			18			
Call Taker Technique	+	9			9			
Customer Service	+	4			4			
Call Remarks	+	4			4			
Total Score:		81			81			

Reviewer Comments: