

2018-2019 Program Review Assessment Report

(Based on data results from 2017-2018)

Item Analysis of Assessment Committee Feedback

	Planning	Assessment	Reflection	Refinement	Dialogue
Meets Expectations	24	17	22	29	36
Percentage Meets Expectations	52.2%	37.0%	47.8%	63.0%	78.3%

Insights:

- ✓ Faculty's biggest areas of strength is dialogue and refinement, which is the goal of the assessment process
- ✓ Identified need for cross-discipline dialogue
- ✓ Identified need for faculty to norm assessment tools and procedures across similar sections
- ✓ Identified need of more detailed scoring rubrics
- ✓ Identified need to norm faculty's interpretation of "exceeds", "meets", and "does not meet" standards
- ✓ Full-time faculty need to work closely with adjunct to help them with assessment

Challenges:

- ✓ 64/154 = 42% of instructional programs submitted assessment reports
- ✓ Insufficient data entered into eLumen to assess the program
- ✓ Go beyond the data – describe what the numbers mean for the students in the program
- ✓ Cut and paste to all programs within the department
- ✓ Need for wider faculty participation in completion of assessment reports

Best Practices:

- ✓ Increased participation of faculty desiring to assess all SLOs for all sections to provide better data for program analysis
- ✓ Assessment is a standing agenda item for all department meetings
- ✓ Norming of assessment tools across instructors/sections
- ✓ Department goal of providing eLumen training for adjunct faculty members
- ✓ Normed assessment tools and procedures with course leads to monitor process

Assessment Committee Considerations for Change:

- ✓ Check boxes to clearly identify type of program
- ✓ Norm definition of program (Title 5)
- ✓ Adding number of sections and/or students assessed column to the assessment chart