

# 2020-21 Assessment Report in Program Review

**Agricultural Business:**

**Date: 10-22-2020**

- 2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Agriculture Business

**Sorted by: Program**

**SI Section Templates:** Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21, Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

## Agricultural Business

### Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21

#### 2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Agriculture Business

| Courses | % Students Exceeds | % Students Meets | % Students Doesn't Meet | % Students N/A |
|---------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| AGBS B3 | 0%                 | 0%               | 0%                      | 0%             |
| AGBS B5 | 0%                 | 0%               | 0%                      | 0%             |
| AGBS B6 | 0%                 | 0%               | 0%                      | 0%             |
| AGBS B2 | 0%                 | 0%               | 0%                      | 0%             |
| Soil B1 | 0%                 | 0%               | 0%                      | 0%             |
| Econ B2 | 5.6%               | 46.67%           | 25%                     | 23.33%         |
|         |                    |                  |                         |                |

### Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

#### 2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Agriculture Business

**PLAN:**

**Describe the process, timing, and tools used to assess the courses for the program.  
(see examples)**

Only Econ B2 has been assessed this year. Econ B2 has a 77% ISLO success rate so therefore in no way influences our education goals in a negative manner. The Agriculture Business program appreciates the efforts and success of the Econ program at Bakersfield College, and wants to ensure the ECON program that the AGBS program has no desire to influence or alter the teaching or assessment of any course in the ECON program

**REFLECT:**

**Based on the SLO performance data listed in the table, describe both the strengths and weaknesses of the program.  
(see examples)**

No assessment data to reflect upon

**REFINE:**

**Summarize the changes that discipline faculty plan to implement based on the program's strengths and weaknesses listed above. (see examples)**

No assessment data to reflect upon

**DIALOGUE:**

**Explain the frequency and content of assessment planning for the program (e.g., department meetings, advisory boards, etc.). (see examples)**

The Agriculture Business team meet monthly. At that time we will devote time to include discussions on assessment and the methodology to accomplish same. Additional systems will be utilized as required to engage in ISLO assessment

# 2020-21 Assessment Report in Program Review

**Music:**

**Date: 10-22-2020**

- 2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Commercial Music

**Sorted by: Program**

**SI Section Templates:** Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21, Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

## Music

### Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21

#### 2020-2021 Instructional Program Review **Commercial Music**

| Courses  | % Students Exceeds | % Students Meets | % Students Doesn't Meet | % Students N/A |
|----------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| MUSC B30 | 24%                | 66%              | 10%                     |                |
| MUSC B31 |                    |                  |                         |                |
| MUSC B32 | 16.67%             | 75%              | 8.3%                    |                |
| MUSC B33 | 36.11%             | 38.89%           | 13.89%                  |                |
| MUSC B34 | 58.33%             | 41.67%           | 0%                      |                |
| MUSC B36 | 19.44%             | 72.22%           | 8.33%                   |                |
|          |                    |                  |                         |                |

### Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

#### 2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Commercial Music

**PLAN:**

**Describe the process, timing, and tools used to assess the courses for the program.  
(see examples)**

Assessment tools in the commercial music program include oral and written quizzes, student gear demonstrations, video tutorials, blogposts, and production of podcast. The tools are spread evenly across the semester to get students used to consistent, sustained engagement (necessary in the commercial music world).

**REFLECT:**

**Based on the SLO performance data listed in the table, describe both the strengths and weaknesses of the program.  
(see examples)**

The program has consistently hit its targets. weaknesses are found especially in B33 (Live Sound) and B30 (Intro to Music Tech). Both courses present significant challenges/learning curves that are just plain difficult. We could do better in identifying particular challenges, such as mixing a live show for the first time, by increasing the amount of personal exposure to the audio gear. The

challenge in this is, of course, teaching space.

**REFINE:**

**Summarize the changes that discipline faculty plan to implement based on the program's strengths and weaknesses listed above. (see examples)**

We need to refine our approach to the toughest elements of commercial music (DAW learning curve, live sound mixing) and assess slo results in a more focused way. We will do this by identifying particular slos that align with these challenges and assess regularly.

**DIALOGUE:**

**Explain the frequency and content of assessment planning for the program (e.g., department meetings, advisory boards, etc.). (see examples)**

I am the only full-time faculty in Commercial Music (with two other instructors teaching one class each). We are in consistent contact and we spend time thinking about and working on assessment strategies.

Additional meetings, email exchanges, texts etc. are used to follow up on progress and in creating, proctoring and gathering the test results as well as the analysis. The advisory board meets once a month and I am also in individual communication with board members to assess particular employer needs.

# 2020-21 Assessment Report in Program Review

**Forestry:**

**Date: 10-22-2020**

- 2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Agriculture: Forestry

**Sorted by: Program**

**SI Section Templates:** Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21, Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

## Forestry

### Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21

#### 2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Agriculture: Forestry

| Courses   | % Students Exceeds | % Students Meets | % Students Doesn't Meet | % Students N/A |
|-----------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| FORE B1   | 0%                 | 0%               | 0%                      | 0%             |
| FORE B2   | 0%                 | 0%               | 0%                      | 0%             |
| FORE B3   | 6.19%              | 80.48%           | 13.33%                  | 0%             |
| FORE B4   | 0%                 | 0%               | 0%                      | 0%             |
| FORE B5   | 0%                 | 0%               | 0%                      | 0%             |
| FORE B6   | 7.14%              | 78.57%           | 14.29%                  | 0%             |
| FORE B7   | 0%                 | 66.67%           | 0%                      | 33.33%         |
| FORE B48W | 0%                 | 0%               | 0%                      | 0%             |
|           |                    |                  |                         |                |

### Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

#### 2020-2021 Instructional Program Review Agriculture: Forestry

**PLAN:**

**Describe the process, timing, and tools used to assess the courses for the program.  
(see examples)**

Assessment tools used by the BC Forestry

Department include multiple-choice questions, short answers, fill in responses, and Pre/Post test comparisons. Faculty review their class data and compare their data with other faculty within their discipline. Tests are analyzed for validity, reliability, and credibility throughout the teaching cycle.

Typically, faculty will collaborate and discuss how the particular SLO could be presented more effectively. Previous strategies include, incorporating in class review/discussion questions in an attempt to reinforce the material with practical application.

**REFLECT:**

**Based on the SLO performance data listed in the table, describe both the strengths and weaknesses of the program.  
(see examples)**

Based on the single year of assessment data available, we see a strong amount of students meeting expectations. A clear minority of students are not meeting expectations, however only a small percentage of students are exceeding expectations. In order to fully understand and develop trends, we need to continue collecting data so we can begin to look at longitudinal change over time.

**REFINE:**

**Summarize the changes that discipline faculty plan to implement based on the program's strengths and weaknesses listed above.  
(see examples)**

Until additional SLO achievement data is available, the faculty are not able to implement an improvement plan. Until additional data is collected, faculty will focus on generating valid, reliable assessment tools and collection procedures.

**DIALOGUE:**

**Explain the frequency and content of assessment planning for the program (e.g., department meetings, advisory boards, etc.).  
(see examples)**

We meet as a department on a monthly basis and devote time to assessment at these meetings. Progress reports are presented by those involved in assessing. Additional meetings, email exchanges, texts etc. are used to follow up on progress and in creating, proctoring and gathering the test results as well as the analysis.

# 2020-21 Assessment Report in Program Review

**Manufacturing Technology:**

**Date: 10-22-2020**

- 2020-2021 3-Year Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Manufacturing Technology

**Sorted by: Program**

**SI Section Templates:** Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21, Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

## Manufacturing Technology

### Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21

#### 2020-2021 3-Year Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Manufacturing Technology

| Courses        | % Students Exceeds | % Students Meets | % Students Doesn't Meet | % Students N/A |
|----------------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| MFGTB1 AB - 01 | 54.68%             | 26.56%           | 17.18%                  | 1.58%          |
| MFGTB1 AB - 50 | 58%                | 40%              | 2%                      | 0%             |
| MFGTB2 - 50    | 50%                | 31.25%           | 18.75%                  | 0%             |
| MFGTB3 - 50    | 41.67%             | 50%              | 8.33%                   | 0%             |
| MFGTB55        | 0%                 | 100%             | 0%                      | 0%             |
|                |                    |                  |                         |                |

### Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

#### 2020-2021 3-Year Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Manufacturing Technology

**PLAN:**

**Describe the process, timing, and tools used to assess the courses for the program.  
(see examples)**

- MFGTB1 AB -01 - Assessment for this course is done through the completion of an in-lab project which requires the student to complete all of the SLO's as part of the completion of their project.
- MFGTB1 AB-50 - Assessment for this course is done through the completion of an in-lab project which requires the student to complete all of the SLO's as part of the completion of their project.
- MFGTB2 - 50 - This assessment represents a single project in support of students understanding of SLO #1 Upon successful completion of the course, the student will be able to describe the most important cutting operations performed on the CNC lathe. The project however is not the only assignment that can be used for this assessment, rather it was the first one document.
- MFGTB3 - 50 - This assessment represents a student's ability to correctly explain and utilize

the most commonly used preparatory codes (G codes) and miscellaneous codes (M codes) used in programming mill operations. The assignment used is not the only exercise that can be used to assess SLO completion, merely the first in a series of exercises used to build understanding in the course.

- MFGTB55 - 01 - Assessment reflects the student's ability to accomplish tasks expected as SLO's for the course. The SLO tested for in this instance was: Setup Lathe part in mill and machine a circular hole pattern using an indexing head and calculate hole position.

### **REFLECT:**

**Based on the SLO performance data listed in the table, describe both the strengths and weaknesses of the program.**

**(see examples)**

- MFGT-B1AB - Strengths - Teaches students with little to no prior experience or skill at planning and building to a specification a level of understanding which will allow them to plan and execute projects to specification, and use machine tools to perform basic metal removal techniques. Weaknesses - Not enough space or equipment to plan and execute more complex projects. Also, not enough time in term to expose all students to various other areas of metal cutting. The equipment used in this course is showing its age and is close to the end of the expected lifecycle.

- MFGTB2 - Strengths - The course does provide a strong platform for students to learn manual Lathe programming and editing techniques. and CAM programming software. Weaknesses - Lab only has two CNC lathes and does not have enough space for much more than 2 or three more machines.

- MFGT- B3 - Strengths - The course has a strong platform for teaching programming and editing functions of the subject. Weaknesses - course lacks the simulation software to link designed programs to shop floor machine operations. Also, lab space is limited, and there are only two CNC milling machines in a lab to instruct between 17-21 students each term.

### **REFINE:**

**Summarize the changes that discipline faculty plan to implement based on the program's strengths and weaknesses listed above.**

**(see examples)**

- MFGT-B1AB - Smaller projects have been developed to address in part the lack of available workspace in Lab. Conducting multiple machine type function projects simultaneously to promote overall student and equipment effectiveness.

- MFGTB2 - To address the limited amount of lab equipment usage the control simulators have been further integrated into the student learning experience earlier on in the program content allowing the students to practice with actual machine control even if it's not exactly the same as operating a real machine. Additionally, the integration of virtual cut simulation software and added demonstrations has aided in student understanding and skill-building within the limited landscape.

- MFGT- B3 - Course equipped with needed simulation software to link designed programs to shop floor machine operations. Added HAAS mini milling machine to support students learning of current and relevant machine controls. Modular setups on CNC milling machines will help demo facilitation and limited student direct interaction with two CNC milling machines to be used between 17-21 students each term.

**DIALOGUE:**

**Explain the frequency and content of assessment planning for the program (e.g., department meetings, advisory boards, etc.).  
(see examples)**

- The department meets each semester. The Advisory group was meeting twice per annum, but due to COVID, we have yet to meet this cycle. A zoom session is being planned to ensure continued communications.

# 2020-21 Assessment Report in Program Review

**Physics:****Date: 10-22-2020**

- 2020-2021 3-Year Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Physics

**Sorted by: Program**

**SI Section Templates:** Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21, Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

## Physics

### Assessment Report (Part 1 Assessment Table) 2020-21

#### 2020-2021 3-Year Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Physics

| Courses           | % Students Exceeds | % Students Meets | % Students Doesn't Meet | % Students N/A |
|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| Physics AS-T:     |                    |                  |                         |                |
| PHYS B4A          | 30.29%             | 43.91%           | 19.8%                   | 6%             |
| PHYS B4B          | 35.34%             | 41.56%           | 21.71%                  | 1.39%          |
| PHYS B4C          | 0%                 | 0%               | 0%                      | 0%             |
| MATH B6A          | 20.83%             | 41.67%           | 30.56%                  | 6.94%          |
| MATH B6B          | 23.53%             | 17.65%           | 17.65%                  | 41.18%         |
| MATH B6C          | 34.92%             | 34.92%           | 30.16%                  | 0%             |
|                   |                    |                  |                         |                |
| Physics UCTP:     |                    |                  |                         |                |
| CHEM B1A          | 26.84%             | 43.38%           | 29.41%                  | 0.37%          |
| CHEM B1B          | 70.59%             | 19.61%           | 3.92%                   | 5.88%          |
| MATH B6A          | 20.83%             | 41.67%           | 30.56%                  | 6.94%          |
| MATH B6B          | 23.53%             | 17.65%           | 17.65%                  | 41.18%         |
| MATH B6C          | 34.92%             | 34.92%           | 30.16%                  | 0%             |
| MATH B6D          | 1.47%              | 48.53%           | 48.53%                  | 1.47%          |
| MATH B6E          | 19.37%             | 40.6%            | 32.61%                  | 7.42%          |
| PHYS B4A          | 30.29%             | 43.91%           | 19.8%                   | 6%             |
| PHYS B4B          | 35.34%             | 41.56%           | 21.71%                  | 1.39%          |
| PHYS B4C          | 0%                 | 0%               | 0%                      | 0%             |
|                   |                    |                  |                         |                |
| Astronomy Courses |                    |                  |                         |                |
| ASTR B1           | 0%                 | 68.27%           | 31.73%                  | 0%             |
| ASTR B2           | 20.33%             | 52.03%           | 17.89%                  | 9.76%          |
| ASTR B3           | 3.86%              | 64.91%           | 29.37%                  | 1.85%          |

| Courses | % Students Exceeds | % Students Meets | % Students Doesn't Meet | % Students N/A |
|---------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
|         |                    |                  |                         |                |

## Assessment Report (Part 2 Responses) 2020-21

### 2020-2021 3-Year Comprehensive Instructional Program Review Physics

**PLAN:**

**Describe the process, timing, and tools used to assess the courses for the program.**

**(see examples)**

Physics faculty utilize the assessment plan to schedule their SLO assessments. Physics faculty use exams (unit and/or final) and/or quizzes as the assessment tool for lecture-based SLOs and lab reports are used for lab-based SLOs. SLOs are assessed by multiple assignments each semester and graded by rubrics to distinguish exceeds/meets/doesn't meet expectations. Astronomy faculty use the final exam for their assessment for the lecture-based SLOs.

**REFLECT:**

**Based on the SLO performance data listed in the table, describe both the strengths and weaknesses of the program.**

**(see examples)**

**Strengths:**

Over 75% of student assessments met or exceeded physics SLOs. Physics faculty have adjusted their presentation methods/pedagogies to improve student comprehension of the physics concepts and explicitly making connections between the mathematics B6 concepts to solve physics problems. COVID-19 may have had an impact on SLO performance due to transitioning online.

**Weaknesses:**

Approximately 60% of student assessments of mathematics student learning outcomes resulted in a satisfactory meeting of math SLOs needed for success in all physics courses. This can lead to below average student performance on calculus-based problems in our physics courses.

**REFINE:**

**Summarize the changes that discipline faculty plan to implement based on the program's strengths and weaknesses listed above.**

**(see examples)**

Physics faculty have adjusted the assessment cycle towards evaluating the majority of SLOs each semester so that data tracking of outcomes is more current and reliable. This has allowed us to more clearly observe trends over time. There is interest in looking into how well math aptitude fits into success for PHYS B2 and PHYS B4 series students. Physics faculty are exploring flipped vs. traditional lecture pedagogies.

**DIALOGUE:**

**Explain the frequency and content of assessment planning for the program (e.g., department meetings, advisory boards, etc.).  
(see examples)**

Discipline faculty informally discuss course assessment processes during office hours and between classes. Discipline faculty formally discuss course and program assessment processes during the physics faculty meeting for Program Review. When SLOs were refined for 2019-20, there was a formal meeting between physics faculty to discuss adaptations to the language of SLOs.