KEY INDICATORS ANALYSIS IN ASSESSMENT

2015-16

Summary of Assessment Process at Norco College

Office of Institutional Effectiveness 8/9/2016

KEY INDICATORS ANALYSIS IN ASSESSMENT

2015-16

As part of the evaluation of the assessment process, the Norco Assessment Committee (NAC) reviews all assessment sections of the Annual Program Reviews (APRs) and assigns a score between 0-3 based on a rubric (see Appendix A). Each area of the rubric captures a vital area of assessment, or key indicator, for each discipline that submitted an APR. The result of this process is a set of key indicators that quantitatively summarize the state of assessment at Norco College during 2014-15 (the time frame specified on the APR). The key indicators are: Initial Assessment, Loop-Closing, Improvement of Learning, TracDat Input, Dialogue on Results, and Participation in Program Assessment. Below is a table of the 26 disciplines that were scheduled to submit APRs and scores in each of the key indicators.

Disciplines	Initial	Loop- closing	Improve Learning	TracDat Input	Dialogue	PLO	Discipline Average
Accounting	3	3	3	3	2	1	3.0
Administration of Justice	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Anatomy and Physiology	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Anthropology	3	2.5	3	2	1	0	2.3
Biology/HS/Micro	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Commercial Music	3	3	3	3	2	0	2.8
Communication Studies							
Early Childhood Education	3	3	3	3	2	1	2.9
Economics							
Engineering (includes Architecture)	3	3	3	3	0	0	2.4
Geography							
Guidance	2	2	0.5	3	2	0	1.9

Honors	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Humanities	3	3	3	3	3	1	3.2
Journalism							
Kinesiology	2	1	3	1	1	0	1.6
Library	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.1
Mathematics							
Music	3	3	3	3	2.25	0	2.9
Philosophy	2.5	2.5	2	2	0.5	1	2.1
Political Science	2.5	2	3	2	2	0	2.3
Psychology	3	3	3	3	2	1	3.0
Real Estate	2.5	1	1	0.5	1	0	1.2
Retail management							
Sociology							
World Languages	3	3	3	3	3	1	3.2
Average	2.0	1.8	1.9	1.8	1.3	31.6%	1.8
Average (without 0's)	2.6	2.3	2.4	2.3	1.6	n/a	2.3

Out of the 26 disciplines who were in the cycle for annual program review, 19 submitted documents in time to be scored by NAC. In addition, four disciplines handing in program review documents left the entire assessment portion blank. The result was that 15 disciplines provided evidence that assessment was completed which is a participation rate of 58%. This is markedly lower than the previous year which had a participation rate of 72%. Reasons for this may be varied, but one possibility is that the program review process for 2015-16 included a significant increase in the amount of discipline data that needed to be summarized. This probably doesn't account for all of the decrease in participation, but it may be a factor.

Although the rubric only allows a maximum score of 3 to be assigned for each area, there are some disciplines that received an average score higher than 3. This was due to the "bonus point" that was added to the total score if disciplines were involved in the program assessment area. As can be seen upon review of scores, the range was 0-3.2.

In general, for each key the following scores represented a certain level of evidence that activity had occurred:

0-indicates no evidence of assessment activity completed.

- 1-indicates limited evidence of assessment activity completed.
- 2-indicates clear evidence of assessment activity completed.
- 3-indicates robust evidence of assessment activity completed.

The average scores for the first five key indicators were 2.0, 1.8, 1.9, 1.8, and 1.3 for Initial Assessment, Loop-Closing, Improvement of Learning, TracDat Input, and Dialogue on Results, respectively. The overall average was 1.8. These scores indicated that as an institution, Norco College was producing mostly clear to limited evidence of engagement in the assessment process with some instances of limited evidence. To some degree these scores are not an accurate depiction of the quality of assessment activity since four disciplines didn't produce anything in assessment and received scores of 0. If we extract the disciplines that received 0's to determine the quality of actual of assessment work conducted, the key indicators scores increased to 2.6, 2.3, 2.4, 2.3, and 1.6, respectively. The overall average without zeros was 2.3. These scores indicate that for those disciplines that engaged in assessment, there were clear to robust levels of evidence that the assessment process was ongoing and resulting in improved learning. The final key indicator was participation in program assessment. Six out of 19 disciplines (31.6%) indicated they were actively involved in program (PLO) assessment during the academic year. Given the 3-4 year cycle of program assessment, this is adequate participation to maintain these cycles.

In summary, though there is room for improvement, the key indicators analysis produced evidence that the quality of assessment occurring is quite good. However, there was a clear decrease in participation for the program review cycle during 2015-16 which created the perception that assessment activity was also decreased. It is hopeful that participation in program review and assessment will increase in the future due the addition of TracDat, and the hiring of additional faculty in disciplines that did not have a full-time faculty member.

Appendix 1-Scoring Rubric for Annual Program Review of Assessment

Assessment Unit Name:

Average score

	0	1	2	3	Comments
Initial SLO	No evidence	Limited evidence of	Clear evidence of on-	Clear and robust	
assessments	provided	on-going SLO	going SLO	evidence of on-going	
	•	assessment	assessment	SLO assessment	
		(1 incomplete	(1 complete	(2 or more complete	
		assessment - Plan	assessment)	assessments)	
		but no results)	·	,	
	0	1	2	3	
Loop Closing	No evidence	Limited evidence of	Clear evidence of	Clear and robust	
Assessments	provided	Loop-closing	loop-closing	evidence of loop-	
		assessment	(At least 1	closing	
		(Course identified as	Improvement plan in	(Multiple	
		"loop-closed", but	place, or clear	Improvement Plans	
		no Improvement	reasoning of "loop	in place, or very clear	
		Plan, or reasoning	closed" for at least 1	justification for "loop	
		provided)	initial assessment)	closed" for multiple	
				initial assessments)	
	0	1	2	3	
Assessment	No assessments in	Assessment	Assessments	All identified assessments have a	
input into TracDAT	TracDat format or	completed are in word/pdf in	identified have Assessment Plan, but	complete report (Plan	
1 racDA 1	Repository	Document	not all have Results		
	0	Repository	not an have Results	and Results) in TracDat data field)	
	U	1 Repository	2	2	
Attempts to	No indication of	No Improvement	Evidence of an	Multiple attempts	
improve student	any changes made	plans, changes made	attempt to implement	made to implement	
learning	to any courses, and	to any courses,	a change in a course	changes to courses or	
icai iiiig	no clarification	teaching approaches,	or teaching approach	teaching approaches,	
	provided	and no clarification	provided, or simple	or clear and	
	provided	or reasoning as to	clarifying statement	supported	
		why no	regarding why no	clarification why no	
		Improvement plans	specific improvement	improvement is	
	0		is needed	needed	
		1	2	3	
Dialogue across	No dialogue or	Limited	Clear demonstration	Robust and	
the discipline	attempt to	demonstration of	of dialogue and	systematic dialogue	
	communicate	dialogue or	sharing of assessment	and communication	
	results	communication	within discipline,	demonstrated within	
		within the discipline,	department, or	discipline,	
		department, college	college	department, or	
	0			college	
D. 41.1. 41. 1		I Engagement in at	2	3	
Participation in		Engagement in at least 1 initial PLO			
PLO assessment					
(bonus points		assessment and/or Engagement in at			
averaged into total score)		least 1 PLO closing-			
total score)		the-loop assessment			
		fall '14-spr '15			
		1011 11 Sp1 13			
		1			
Total for Each					
Column					
Column					