

2007-08 Annual RCCD Assessment Update

Introduction¹

RCCD began systematic efforts to assess student learning in 2000, partly in response to the new ACCJC accreditation standards. We also recognized the intrinsic value of using the emerging assessment methodologies to study, document, and (wherever possible) ameliorate student learning. Working closely with the Program Review Committee, RCCD continued to further implement a comprehensive assessment process for the institution. This report summarizes the district's chief activities and accomplishments for 2007-08 in outcomes assessment. It also discusses specific activities occurring at each of the three district campuses. It has been prepared by Sheryl Tschetter, district assessment coordinator and faculty co-chair of the district assessment committee (DAC), but multiple campus leaders have contributed to its content. Questions about the report and about outcomes assessment at RCCD in general, may be directed to Sheryl Tschetter at Sheryl.Tschetter@rcc.edu or 951 372 7039.

The 2007-08 district assessment plan, developed by the district assessment committee (DAC) in consultation with a number of college stakeholders, resulted in seven major goals for the academic year. This report will examine results in each of these areas.

Goal #1: Continue to monitor and support the work of disciplines in their efforts to develop and implement comprehensive assessment plans and report on results in Program Review documents.

This goal continues to be a primary function of the District Assessment Committee (DAC). To reinforce and help simplify independent and collaborative assessments of learning, DAC has completed the following:

1. Developed new forms to help faculty track assessment activities. The new forms can be accessed at <http://www.rcc.edu/administration/academicaffairs/effectiveness/assess/index.cfm>
2. Provided four ways for assessing learning that have been posted on the assessment website. These methods help full-time and part-time faculty who are the only discipline representatives on their campus assess learning in their courses.
3. Worked with the Program Review Committee to review all templates for program review reports.
4. Using scoring rubric (see attachment A), evaluated and scored assessment sections embedded in quadrennial and annual program review reports as well as annual ACCJC report (see attachments B and C for details by campus).

¹ Source for some information: The RCCD Outcomes Assessment Report 2006-7 by Arend Flick.

5. Practitioner Inquiry Workshops

Throughout the spring 2008 semester, representatives from the District Assessment Committee (DAC) have facilitated discussions and workshops on using assessment to further practitioner knowledge and expertise, especially related to reflective practice. Norco campus held three practitioner inquiry workshops and Riverside City held campus-wide discussions with stakeholders on implementing these workshops in fall 2008.

Outcomes of DAC Activities

As a result of our activities to support student learning in disciplines, committee members have decided to

1. Discuss how to improve the scoring of assessment activities reported in the annual program review reports
 - new rubric
 - revised rubric
 - norming session
 - collective or individual
2. Increase faculty development workshops on completing the assessment portion of the annual program review reports
3. Consider model practices to inform current documents and resources at RCCD for outcomes assessment
4. Work with campus leadership to continue to increase student learning outcomes assessment activities at course, program, degree, and certificate levels and to increase dialogue.

Goal #2: Support the work of Student Services and Administrative Units as they further develop and implement assessment plans.

District Assessment Committee (DAC) continues to work collaboratively with Program Review Committee (PRC) to assist development of service area outcomes (SAOs) in administrative and student support areas. In 2007-08, the second round of annual assessment plans for all Administrative Units (e.g., Institutional Effectiveness, Facilities, and Public Affairs) was submitted. These plans are the result of the RCCD Program Review committee, with the assistance of DAC, developing an Administrative Unit Program Review process that will require these units to identify and assess outcomes annually. Workshops have been held to help administrative units identify and assess the types of outcomes relative to increasing student learning, productivity, or efficiency.

Next Steps

To meet the requirements of this goal, DAC needs to:

- Learn more about these types of assessment activities;
- Discuss role of DAC in scoring assessments of administrative units and student support services;

- Continue to research model practices and adopt practices to simplify the assessment of these units
- Continue to work with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness in facilitating workshops in this area.

Goal #3: Identify and assess student learning outcomes at the program level throughout the district.

To assist programs in identifying and assessing SLOs, the District Assessment Committee (DAC) facilitated two workshops in fall 2007 for Career and Technical Education programs. In addition, to comply with Title V requirements, DAC worked with each of the seven sub-committees assigned to develop the outcomes in new areas of emphasis patterns for majors.

Next Steps

- Continue to investigate research on program outcomes assessment and development of program level outcomes and assessment of these
- Develop instructional sheet outline how to develop outcomes and how to assess them

Goal #4: Continue to assess General Education and map GE courses to GE outcomes.

Significant progress has been made in the area of general education assessment. In 2007-2008, multiple projects have been undertaken and completed to bring RCCD into alignment with ACCJC standards. These projects include:

1. Dr. Arend Flick was granted a sabbatical in 2007-08 to research literature and model practices in this area. His report, "Assessing General Education Outcomes at RCCD" can be accessed at _____.
2. A second project led by Dr. Arend Flick focused on scoring artifacts from identified general education courses in various disciplines related to the general education outcome on critical thinking. Working with Greg Aycock, Title V Outcomes Specialist and Sheryl Tschetter, assessment coordinator, the DAC team decided to employ a method developed at Johnson County Community College in Kansas involving reading student artifacts against a rubric by trained faculty assessors². Results from this study are forthcoming.
3. Dr. Sharon Crasnow, Academic Senate President, Norco, agreed to complete a special project wherein she aligned course-based SLOs to specific general education SLOs. This was an extremely time consuming project that has resulted in significant issues for further dialogue and discovery. Her report can be accessed at _____.
4. RCCD established seven areas of emphasis to bring the district into compliance with Title V standards. The District Assessment Committee worked with these sub-committees to develop program level SLOs.

² Source: "Assessing Critical Thinking at RCCD, by Arend Flick. The full report can be accessed at

Next Steps

1. The district academic senate needs to consider establishing a standing committee focused on all aspects of general education outcomes. The District Assessment Committee (DAC) continues to support these efforts.
2. Disciplines need to review the results of the alignment project and engage in dialogue relevant to ensuring course-based SLOs meet the requirements of general education SLOs

Goal #5: Assist the work of the strategic planning committees as they take assessment results into account in making budget allocation decision.

Throughout 2007-08, the District Assessment Committee (DAC) has been available to assist strategic planning committees on each of the three campuses to implement outcomes assessment as a component of its resource allocation process. The specific mechanisms for linking assessment and strategic planning are still evolving with campuses having established a rubric that connects assessment activities to resource allocations.

Goal #6: Develop better techniques for using existing Institutional Research data for assessment purposes.

Learning how to use data is a continuing challenge for community college practitioners, and those at RCCD are no different than their colleagues. Unlike their four-year colleagues, they are not focused solely on discipline specific tasks or research. Consequently, community college practitioners need continuing faculty development in this area to help them increase their expertise and knowledge.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness coordinated multiple workshops in spring 2008 focused on using IR data in program review and outcomes assessment projects. Projects included the quadrennial comprehensive program review as well as the annual program review. Workshops were conducted for administrative units and student support services as well.

Goal #7: Continue to publicize assessment data and educate the RCCD community about methodologies through the use of the DAC website, newsletter, workshops, etc.

Members of the District Assessment Committee (DAC) attended multiple conferences to continue increasing expertise and knowledge in the area of outcomes assessment. The newsletter was published just once during the 2007-2008 academic year. DAC representatives continue to be available at the discipline, department, campus, and district levels to facilitate workshops on outcomes assessment and methodologies.

Attachment A

Riverside Community College District

Rubric for Evaluating Discipline Assessment Activities

Stages	Sample discipline behaviors
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assessment plan is in place for more than one course or program.• Data has been collected to assess learning in one or more courses or programs.• Results of data collection have been used to improve student learning in at least one course or program.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assessment plan is in place for at least one course or program.• Data has been collected to assess learning in at least one course or program.• Results of data collection have been used to improve student learning.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assessment plan is in place for at least one course or program.• Data has been collected to assess learning in at least one course or program.• Results of data collection have not been used to improve student learning.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assessment plan is in place for at least one course or program.• No data has been generated to assess learning.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discussion of student learning outcomes and assessment of student learning has taken place.• No plan in place to assess learning for any course or program.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No information received regarding assessment activities.• No discussion has occurred at the discipline level.