Submission rate holding steady at approximately 89%
LAST YEAR’S ANNUAL REPORTING

- 2 Reports (2 deadlines): Annual Plan (AP) and End-of-Year (EOY)
- Multi-Year Plan
- Two options for report format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1 (new format)</th>
<th>Option 2 (old format)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Checkboxes, limited narrative</td>
<td>Narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 outcome per report</td>
<td>More than 1 outcome per report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More structure/guidance</td>
<td>Minimal structure/guidance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Rationale:
  - Long reports & critical info still missing
  - Overall Picture
- Mid-Year feedback (31 respondents; 30 used new format)
  - 77% like 10% unsure 13% did not like
SUMMER PEER REVIEW

Participants

- 12 CTE reviewers (1 floater)
- 10 LDC reviewers (3 floaters)
- 9 LAC coaches
SUMMER PEER REVIEW

Changes

• Reviewers used a checklist rather than a rubric
• Subsection and Global scores given to all reports
• Assessment data were quantitatively analyzed this year
• Awards now given in a single category: Exemplary Assessment
  • Eligibility determined by the global scores
2013-2014 FINDINGS

2013-2014 is the first year that LAC has conducted comprehensive quantitative analyses:

1. Meta-analysis of outcome attainment data
   - Statistical technique that integrates data from multiple studies
2. Analysis of peer review data

This year’s analyses were proof-of-concept/pilot studies.
The fundamental measure in educational assessment is the outcome attainment rate: how many of them ‘got it’ at the level we want them to?
39% of SAC reports include attainment rates for identified benchmark levels of performance.

LDC/DE Outcome Attainment Data: 32/80
CTE Outcome Attainment Data: 38/100

LDC/DE Outcome Attainment Data

32/80

CTE Outcome Attainment Data

38/100
OUTCOME ATTAINMENT DATA

Cautions about interpreting the attainment rate data:

• These rates cannot be definitively interpreted as ‘official’ attainment rates, because, e.g.:
  • Some SACs chose difficult-to-attain outcomes; others did not;
  • We cannot be sure how representative the report data are; etc.

View attainment rates as very rough, tentative estimates only.
OUTCOME ATTAINMENT DATA

Estimated overall outcome attainment rates:
• CTE – 82-90%
• LDC/DE – 70-80%

These rates are typical for similar institutions/programs.
OUTCOME ATTAINMENT DATA

Some moderator variables (variables that influence the strength/direction of effects) were significant in the LDC/DE, but not in the CTE data.
Assessments requiring associate’s degree level work had lower student attainment rates:

- Associate’s Degree Level: 66% (between 58-73%)
- Other levels: 79% (between 73-85%)

(using the Degree Qualifications Profile standards)
Opportunity: Increase student attainment rates for ‘more difficult’ outcomes.
CRITICAL THINKING ATTAINMENT (LDC/DE)

Attainment rates for Critical Thinking and Problem Solving were lower (71%) than those for the other core outcomes (79%).

Not an uncommon finding in higher education
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE META-ANALYSIS


2. LDC/DE: SACs consider/explore associate’s level outcomes and assessment activities.

3. LDC/DE: consider ways to improve students’ success with critical thinking.
PEER REVIEW DATA – OVER-ALL SCORES

CTE – 21 POSSIBLE
• 16-21 typical
• 21 higher
• 15 lower

LDC/DE – 18 POSSIBLE
• 14-17 typical
• 18 higher
• 13 lower

Interquartile Range
PEER REVIEW DATA – SUBSECTION SCORES

• About $\frac{1}{2}$ of all reports attained the highest marks on any particular subsection
• Two subsections were less strong institution-wide:
PEER REVIEW DATA – SUBSECTION SCORES

• About ½ of all reports attained the highest marks on any particular subsection

• Two subsections were less strong institution-wide:
  • SAC Participation/Coordination – these scores indicate the degree to which SAC coordination was demonstrated.
PEER REVIEW DATA – SUBSECTION SCORES

• About ½ of all reports attained the highest marks on any particular subsection

• Two subsections were less strong institution-wide:
  • Assessment Process – these scores indicate the degree to which assessments demonstrated technical competencies that help to ensure valid, reliable results.
IMPROVING ASSESSMENT PROJECTS - SACS

• Peer Review Feedback has been posted in each SAC’s Spaces page

• A cover letter has been sent to all identified SAC chairs and assessment project coordinators that provides more detailed information that will help you interpret and put your specific results in context

• Contact Michele to arrange coaching help for problem areas (michele.marden@pcc.edu; x4786)
IMPROVING ASSESSMENT PROJECTS AT PCC

SAC COORDINATION

• When assessing a course, have all instructors submit randomly selected artifacts (or, with 5 or more instructors, at least 80% participate)

• Involve FT and PT instructors in rating artifacts

ASSESSMENT PROCESSES

• When using a rubric, include a norming session and attend to inter-rater agreement
There is significant variation between faculty members in how core and course outcomes are intentionally included in their courses.
SAC COORDINATION - OUR MODEL

At PCC, SACs are charged with developing course outcomes and with determining the expectations for how the college core outcomes are addressed and assessed in their courses.

CORE OUTCOMES
COURSE OUTCOMES

SHARED VISION

SHARED ASSESSMENTS

COORDINATED ACTIONS

SUBJECT AREA COMMITTEES
Shared/coordinated components vary in weight and emphasis in different SACs, courses, programs, etc.
Shared/coordinated components vary in weight and emphasis in different SACs, courses, programs, etc.
SAC COORDINATION - OUR MODEL

Testimonials

• Levi Query & Delia McQueen – PE
• Kendra Cawley – Dark Side
IMPROVING ASSESSMENT PROJECTS AT PCC

Averaging-Away Meaning

Rubric (scale 1-4; 4 best; benchmark “3”)

Rubric AVG: 2.5
Row/Criteria #1 AVG: 2.52
Row/Criteria #2 AVG: 2.48

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50 samples of student work</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3 Benchmark</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion #1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion #2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LAC COACHES

SAC support

• Peer Review Feedback
• General (templates, sample size, norming)
• Review annual reports
• Advocate for Peer Review
• Available Resources
• Communication Channel (concerns/issues/successes)
• (Possible facilitation)

Improvements noticed by admin!

• Assessment Section of Program Review
LAC COACHING - CHANGES 2014-2015

• More coach training
• Coach-led TLC assessment sessions
• 5 returning, 3 new coaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jamee Kristen (SOC)</th>
<th>Sally Earll (Curriculum Coordinator)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laura Sanders (ENG/WR)</td>
<td>Shirlee Geiger (PHL, prior LAC Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hunter-Bernstein (ABE, ED)</td>
<td>Susan Wilson (Acad. Support Coordinator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora Stevens (BI, HIM)</td>
<td>Torie Scott (LIB)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Coach Assignments: Contact Michele Marden
  michele.marden@pcc.edu; x4786
FACULTY ASSESSMENT CLASS – ASSESSING CORE OUTCOMES (CEU CREDIT)

- For CTE & LDC/DE, PT/FT
- Fridays from 10-12
- Cascade Campus
- Cost covered as a PCC benefit
- Still some seats available
- Contact Wayne Hooke with questions whooke@pcc.edu
DOI ASSESSMENT SUPPORT

• 10 hours per year per SAC for assessment work done by PT faculty
• Contact your SAC Administrative Liaison to arrange this
PCC’S CENTER FOR CAREERS IN EDUCATION

• Winter term: Embedding and Assessing Cultural Awareness
• Spring term: Assessing Critical Thinking and Problem Solving
CALENDAR/DUE DATES

• 2 annual plans (first sections of report) due Nov 7, 2014
• Changes to multi-year plan due Nov 7, 2014 (no changes – no reporting)
• 2 end-of-year reports (completed form) due June 19, 2015
EXPECT MORE CHANGES

- We are still seeing dynamic changes in assessment nationally, regionally, and locally
- Assessment related areas are being reported-on this year to NWCCU
- Expect more changes....
CONTACT INFORMATION

Website: www.pcc.edu/assessment
LAC email: learningassessment@pcc.edu

Wayne Hooke, Chair (whooke@pcc.edu)
Michele Marden, Vice-Chair (michele.marden@pcc.edu)