

Review of DAC 2008-09 Annual RCCD Assessment Update

Introduction

In a continuing effort to maintain the high expectations and standards at Riverside Community College District (RCCD) in the area of learning assessment, the District Assessment Committee (DAC) continued to research and implement emerging assessment methodologies to study, document, and (wherever possible) ameliorate student learning. Continuing to work closely with the District Academic Senate, local senates, and the other standing district committees, especially Program Review Committee, DAC continues to build on completed assessments with the 2012 standards from ACCJC in mind. DAC also continues to work on transitioning to a three college model.

The end of this academic year saw DAC implement an annual “retreat” to be held in the summer where faculty can brainstorm new and emerging methods in assessment, new promising practices for assessment, and review our current processes. We hope this will be an ongoing annual event.

This report summarizes DAC’s chief activities and accomplishments for 2008-09 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 2008-09 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. Revised the forms used to help faculty track assessment activities. The new forms can be accessed at <http://www.rcc.edu/administration/academicaffairs/effectiveness/assess/index.cfm>
2. Held multiple workshops on all three campuses to facilitate assessment design, especially in ways of assessing learning in a single course; these are available on the assessment website. The individual course assessment designs can help full-time and part-time faculty who are the only discipline representative on their campus assess learning in their courses. In fact, DAC has already received campus-based assessments for scoring from Norco campus. These single course assessment methods can be used by all faculty interested in improving pedagogy, and it can result in dialogue when faculty in multiple sections of a course or on different campuses collaborate to establish the elements of the assessment designs.

3. Revised the assessment portions of the program review templates for all levels of program review.
4. Using scoring rubric (see attachment A), evaluated and scored 13 assessment sections embedded in the quadrennial comprehensive program review documents submitted. In addition, DAC reviewed all annual program review reports and worked with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to complete the annual ACCJC reports for Moreno Valley and Riverside campuses; Norco completed its own.

As a result of our activities to support student learning in disciplines, the committee undertook the following:

1. Revise the rubric that identifies assessment behaviors to make those behaviors more specific and identifiable; this continues to be an ongoing process.
2. Continue to coordinate workshops to increase faculty development, especially related to identifying outcomes and developing the report on assessment results;
3. Consider model practices to inform current documents and resources at RCCD for outcomes assessment; and
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 2008-09, the third round of annual assessment plans for all campus-based Administrative Units was submitted, and the first round of district level Administrative Units program reviews began. 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.

As a result of ongoing discussions, DAC does not score administrative assessment submissions. However, during the 2008-09 academic year, DAC reviewed 19 administrative and 17 student support assessment plans. DAC offered suggestions for developing assessment plans and reporting results. Research of model practices to inform this area of outcomes assessment is ongoing.

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

This area continues to need development. Some strides forward were made in the development of the outcomes for the newly implemented seven majors (areas of emphasis) available to students at RCCD. Also, some new programs, such as Honors, have begun the process of identifying program level outcomes for assessment, and we are looking forward to their first

program based assessment. However, we need to make more effort to design assessments at the program level.

The most striking success in this area is in the Law Enforcement and Fire Technology programs where significant improvements in identifying outcomes and assessing these have been made. The hard work in these two programs has resulted in national recognition.

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

Dr. Sharon Crasnow completed a project wherein she aligned course-based SLOs to specific general education SLOs in summer/fall 2008. This was an extremely time consuming project that has resulted in significant issues for further dialogue and discovery.

Next Steps

1. The institution needs to determine how to move forward with general education outcomes; these need to be examined for currency, but to date, no action has been taken.
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 2008-09, 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. As Moreno Valley and Norco have visiting accreditation teams in October 2009, DAC did support ongoing efforts for the construction of the self studies on these campuses. The specific mechanisms for linking assessment and strategic planning are still evolving with some 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.

This goal is ongoing as learning how to use data is a continuing challenge for community college faculty, 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 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. However, these are specific to the program review process, and faculty might be served better by more general training.

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

Members of the District Assessment Committee (DAC) attended multiple conferences to continue increasing expertise and knowledge in the area of outcomes assessment. 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.

