

Kapi'olani CC Proposed Course Level Assessment Plan
FS Ad Hoc SLO/Assessment Committee
10/24/10

Overview

The ACCJC requires course level assessment of course competencies. At the course level, assessment is a means to systematically examine the degree to which students attain the course competencies as evidenced through demonstrated student learning. Faculty collectively engage in a formal process of evaluating student performance on signature assignments, projects, embedded questions, and/or exams and then fine tuning some aspect of the course/curriculum, when applicable, with the ultimate purpose of improving overall educational quality and achieving improved student learning. Assessment results may suggest curriculum modifications, exploration of various pedagogical tasks, and/or adjustments to assessment practices; the end result is an iterative cycle of improvement.

Assessment and Grading

The ACCJC differentiates between grading and assessment. Grading is assessment of individual student learning. Faculty assign grades, and students and faculty work together to identify the student's own strengths and weaknesses. Final grades carry an aggregate assessment of a student's entire work for the course, and may include attendance and class participation. Consequently, looking at a distribution of grades provides little information to the College's stakeholders about the degree to which students are learning the knowledge, skills, and attitudes articulated in each course competency.

Assessment looks at student learning across students, sections, and courses. Faculty must work collectively to identify where learning is satisfactory, which approaches produce the most learning, and what needs to be improved. Assessment is not focused on individual students, but rather on the aggregate. Faculty score assessment instruments designed to measure how well students are achieving the course competencies. However, the assessment and /or scoring process never infringes on instructors' grading procedures.

Proposed Course Assessment Plan

1. *Systematic Assessment:* Courses should complete an assessment cycle every 5 years. The assessment information should be used to justify changes to an existing course, which must go through a course review every five years. Assessment is part of the 5-year review process, and assessment information should be included with the course information on curriculum central.
2. *Priority list for assessment:*
 1. Disciplines should begin to assess courses that have multiple sections and instructors.
 2. Disciplines should focus on courses with lower success rates
 3. Other courses
3. *Assessment management:* The process of course-level assessment of student learning must be meaningful and manageable for program/discipline faculty. Programs and disciplines can choose from the options below.

Option 1

1. Each instructor evaluates his/her students' work using agreed upon criteria (rubric). The assessments/assignments that are being scored are aligned with the specific course competencies that are being measured that year.
2. Instructors summarize data and forward data to the program/discipline assessment coordinator. The program/discipline assessment coordinator aggregates the data.
3. Instructors meet to discuss results and possible pedagogical, curricular, and programmatic revisions.
4. Program/discipline assessment coordinator completes and submits an assessment report that includes the action(s) that will be taken to improve student learning.

Option 2

1. Each instructor embeds a signature assignment or questions that are designed to measure specific competencies. Signature assignments or embedded questions are collected and scored by individual faculty using agreed upon criteria (rubric).
2. Instructors forward scores to program/discipline assessment coordinator. Program/discipline assessment coordinators aggregates the data.
3. Instructors meet to discuss the results and possible pedagogical, curricular and programmatic revisions.
5. Program/discipline assessment coordinator completes and submits assessment report that includes the action(s) that will be taken to improve student learning.

Option 3

1. Each instructor summarizes his/her students' results on the target competency(s) being assessed, using his or her own criteria.
2. Instructors meet to discuss the results and must determine commonalities and a reliable way to compare and contrast the information into a cohesive conclusion.
3. Discuss possible pedagogical, curricular, and programmatic revisions based in the results.
4. Program/discipline assessment coordinator completes and submits an assessment report that includes the action(s) that will be taken to improve student learning.

Option 4 (if used, must be used in combination with Option 1, 2, or 3)

1. Each instructor gives a student survey that has agreed upon questions (SALG or other survey can be used). Survey results should be aggregated.
2. Instructors meet to discuss results
3. Because surveys are indirect evidence of student learning, they can be used to validate the direct evidence collected in options 1, 2, and 3.
4. Program/discipline assessment coordinator includes information from student surveys on the assessment report.

4. *Apply assessment process:* Program/discipline assessment coordinators need to apply the following five step assessment process for each course competency. Each of these steps is aligned with the assessment report template.

1. Identify competency or competencies to be assessed
2. Determine a common assessment (pick from the above three options)
 - a. Option 1 requires that faculty agree upon a set of criteria that can be used to evaluate student work.
 - b. Option 2 requires faculty to create a signature assignment or design embedded questions and a specific set of criteria to evaluate work.
 - c. Option 4, if used, must be used combination with options 1, 2, or 3.

3. Establish benchmarks
4. Analyze results – collect and record the aggregated results from the assessment. Discipline faculty should analyze results to determine what is going well and what could be improved.
5. Recommendations for improvement – Use the results of the assessment to recommend improvements to curriculum, pedagogy, competencies, support etc. Submit an assessment report to the department chair, dean, and Vice Chancellor.

Organization:

1. Program and discipline assessment coordinators given 3 or more credits each semester of teaching equivalencies to lead assessment efforts.
2. The College needs to provide training sessions for faculty.
3. Assessment team includes assessment coordinator (6 credits), CTE faculty (3 credits), Liberal Arts faculty (3 credits), IT person to design website. This team will support assessment efforts at the course and program level for the College.
4. Program and disciplines can schedule summer institutes for faculty to work on assessment.
5. Each program/discipline should assess 3-5 courses by May 2012.

Assessment is an integral part of institutional effectiveness. A systematic, ongoing cycle of setting goals, measuring attainment of those goals, and using the results to make informed decisions is crucial to continuous improvement. Good assessment can promote quality at all levels of the institution by providing necessary evidence to guide effective decision making in several areas including institutional changes, programmatic changes, and course curricular modifications. Assessment is driven by faculty and staff, and it must be supported by the College through adequate resource allocation.

Assessment supports the KCC Strategic Plan Outcome A: Native Hawaiian Educational Attainment and Outcome B: Hawai'i's Educational Capital, performance measures A4 and B4 to increase the number Native Hawaiian and all other students completing certificates and degrees or transfer to a baccalaureate institution. It also meets Strategic Outcome E: to recognize and invest in faculty and staff resources and develop innovative and inspiring learning environment in which to work.

Assessment results are intended for changes in courses, curricula, programs, and institutional structure, not the evaluation of individual faculty members. Under no circumstances should the data from assessment be used in the contract renewal, lecturer self-assessment, tenure, or promotion process.