SUMMARY of Spring 2014 Outcomes Assessment Activities Reporting

For the 4th semester in a row, at the end of Spring 2014, standardized end-of-semester online reporting was required for all active courses, programs, and services with a deadline of June 2nd, 2014. These reports were intended to be progress reports of assessment activities that could reasonably occur in spring 2014 and also tentative plans for the upcoming fall 2014 semester. What follows is a summary of reporting activity, progress made toward achieving the ACCJC’s definition of Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI), and the course, program, student service, and administrative unit improvements implemented in spring 2014.

Summary of successes

- Assessment reporting rebounded in the spring. Reporting percentages for counseling and instructional courses were outstanding (100% and 91%) respectively.
- Assessment reporting appears to be becoming a “habit of mind” and a universally acknowledged and schedule part of semester work and work flow.
- Assessment reporting submissions are coming in throughout the semester, with many more early reports. We are grateful for this shift away from most reports coming in the night before the deadline, and we surmise the change is because people are finding ways to make this reporting process more sustainable and schedule the work at times when workloads can more reasonably handle it (not usually the last minute at the end of the semester).
- The reports are filled with details for concrete improvements in course, programs, and counseling.
- Responses on our new question asking about assessment/analysis frequency demonstrates that the campus is better informed about and overwhelmingly tackling and improving on our 3-year benchmark for assessment of every outcome.

Summary of needed improvements

- Instructional, Student Services, Counseling, and Administrative Services Program assessment reporting has a less robust submission quality than it could. Overall we need to better tie program improvements to assessment data.
- We need increased participation in ILO-mapped Instructional Program SLO assessment.
- The CCSF-defined assessment stage (number from 1-5) is still challenging some coordinators. We still see some folks lowering assessment stages from semester to semester, when they should be only going higher.
- The master list of Administrative Services, Student Services, and Counseling programs that need to report changes from semester to semester. We need with the help of the deans and vice chancellors in these areas to get a better grasp of which units should be reporting, and identify individuals who can assist us with improving the consistency of the reporting.

Reporting Activity and Percentages.

INSTRUCTIONAL:

Courses (91% reporting) In spring 2014, 1,597 courses (credit and non-credit combined) were required to submit assessment reports summarizing assessment activities or detailing future assessment plans. 1,457 reports were submitted.
**Programs (80% reporting)** In spring 2014, the College recognized 325 programs (certificates, degrees, discipline). Each was required to submit a report detailing assessment progress and/or future assessment plans. 260 programs submitted reports.

**COUNSELING (100% reporting)**

The College recognizes 7 counseling programs. 12 reports were submitted assessment reports were submitted across the various counseling departments and programs.

**STUDENT SERVICES (83% reporting)**

The College recognizes 15 student service programs. Over 15 reports were submitted but some services submitted multiple reports. 4 student service programs did not submit reports.

**ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES (52% reporting)**

The College anticipated 23 assessment reports documenting progress in assessment or detailing future plans. These administrative units are located in the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Finance, and the Chancellor’s Office. Centers are included in administrative service reports. In spring 2014, 12 reports were submitted.

**Progression toward Continuous Quality Improvement**

In fall 2012, all courses and programs were required to reach Proficiency, using the ACCJC rubric for Proficiency. At regional training workshops held during the 2013-2014 academic year, ACCJC staff members reported a deadline for reaching CQI will NOT be announced; however, if the processes used to meet proficiency were sustained, CQI would be naturally met. Semester assessment progress reports demonstrate that we are on a steady trajectory towards CQI (and gaining ground each semester).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported spring 2014 data</th>
<th># Reports</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses reaching Stage 5 (CQI)</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs reaching Stage 5 (CQI)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Service reaching Stage 5 (CQI)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Programs reaching Stage 5 (CQI)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 1. Percentage of Progression to CQI Fall 2012-Spring 2014**

The graph below charts the steady climb toward CQI on three areas for the three areas of the college in which we have the most consistent data: instructional programs, instructional courses, and counseling programs. Student service reorganization made data tracking difficult for some programs.
The escalation is not surprising given the frequency of assessment reported (chart 1 & 2) by coordinators and pace (chart 3) at which data is collected and analyzed for improvements.

**Chart 2. College-wide, outcomes assessment (measurements) happen with what frequency?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every semester</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every year</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every 2 years</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every 3 years (recommended maximum)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 3. College-wide, assessment data are reviewed and analyzed with an eye for course/program/service improvements with what frequency?

Every semester 738 47%
Every year 532 34%
Every 2 years 148 9%
Every 3 years (recommended maximum) 107 7%

Chart 4. Improvements implemented in spring 2014?

Yes 773 58%
No 564 42%

Analysis of Instructional Courses Improvements

As previously mentioned, 75 percent of courses are at CQI. Looking at courses staged at 4 (data analyzed and improvement implemented) and 5 (improvement is reassessed/loop closed), over 85% of courses have reached the higher stage of assessment. Course improvements are documented in progress reports and we have analyzed these results for common themes and frequency. For spring 2014, the most common assessment activity was refinement of curriculum/course outline based on assessment. The second most common improvement was refining the assessment instrumentation and processes. For courses, the most commonly reported instructional improvements (in order of frequency) were: an increase in instruction of particular material or a reallocation of instructional time for a particular topic; an upgrade of equipment or infusion of technology aiding course instruction; reevaluation of exams; an increase in critical thinking activities; new instructional materials; a sequencing of course content to improve outcome attainment; refinement of an existing assignment; better scaffolding of assignments; increasing the currency of curriculum; updating case studies and exemplars; better aligning SLOs with PSLOs, professional development training for faculty, and adding extra tutoring.

Analysis of Instructional Program Assessment Improvements

85% of programs reporting in spring 2014 document indicated they were at assessment stage 4 or 5. Assessment at the instructional program level has been slower than for courses, but the College is
seeing rapid gains. Most program assessment is done through a coordinated assessment of courses within a program (48%). Exit surveys are used by 32% of programs and capstone projects are evaluated in 10% of programs. 11% of instructional programs are still refining or developing a program level assessment technique.

Programs documented many improvements. Commonly reported improvements included establishing a transfer degree or new certificate, working with an Advisory Board to add/delete/update program curriculum, faculty coordination on improving a capstone project, updating technology or materials used across courses in a program, collaborating to create common exercises to measure PSLOs, strengthening instruction in a course central to a particular PSLO, scaffolding assignments across courses, holding alumni focus groups, changing the sequencing of courses, dialogue to discuss retention, addition of internships, refining program level assessment, and professional development workshops.

**Analysis of Counseling and Student Service Improvements**

Reported student service and counseling improvements were numerous. Several student service units are working to better collect data and refine assessment instrumentation. Most improvements reported included increasing contact time with students or increasing services targeted to students; creating community partnerships, in particular with SFUSD; increasing benefits to students, and increasing contact time with students. The LAC computer lab and MESA program increased or upgraded the use of technology, and student service units strived to create clearer communication pathways with students through brochures, updated websites, presentational materials, and email contact.

**Analysis of Administrative Unit Improvements**

Administrative Units significantly increased reporting of unit improvements in spring 2014. Improvements in administrative units detail increasing coordination of staff, improving safety for students, increasing language services, and providing unique learning opportunities by sponsoring retreats, conferences, and guest speakers. Other administrative units focused on improvement guided by increased training, processes, and better documenting procedures. Finally, AUOs are targeting cost savings, time saving, sustainability, and accuracy improvements in to services such as online requisitions and Banner data access through ARGOS.

**Evaluation of Assessment Processes**

June 2, 2014 was the deadline for the fifth cycle of standardized online progress reporting required for all courses and programs and the fourth cycle for all counseling and services.

**Improvements made to reporting form:**

- To provide continuity to users and minimize training needs (and to increase the habit of mind and attention to content), we made few changes to the reporting form for Spring 2014

**Improvements made to reporting process:**

- The SLO Committee sponsored a “Get It Done Day” at the Ocean campus and John Adams, Evans, Mission, and Downtown Center. Reporting data shows a spike in reporting on these days.
Even those that did not attend the day in person used the day as a soft deadline for completion of the report.

- In response to feedback, a link to the Assessment Reporting Form was added to MyCCSF page.
- The IT services unit of CCSF provided increased password reset support.

**Challenges with reporting form:**

- We are still dealing with forgotten passwords from folks who use the system only twice a year or who are new to the system and don’t already have a username and password. Some found the Word Transcript document hard to navigate and reported that its useful was limited. We suspect that’s because of the embedded ILO reporting. We plan to move the ILO reporting to a separate form in the future.
- Many people were getting “need permission” error message as their computers were recognizing an email address other than the CCSF Google mail account. Many still thought they could log into form with any gmail account.
- The GE Area A & E results were moved to another form so that file size issues would not be encountered as they were in fall 2013. It was easy to not see link or forget about it. We need to improve our outreach to course coordinators in the GE courses under coordinated assessment.
- For a while, submitted forms (past and present) could not be viewed off site, making it hard for chairs and deans to monitor completion and for coordinators to see past reports for continuity. That was due to efforts to stabilize the server on which the report viewer is housed. Eventually we got the server back up and solved that problem.

**Next Steps**

- Sept 19th is the final call for GE Area A & E results from spring 2014. We will contact specifically the individuals who indicated they completed assessments in GE Area A and E classes.
- Jan 5th is the deadline for fall 2014 reporting. We have already built the form, removing questions no longer needed, combining assessment methods and data analysis sections, and removing all pages related to ILOs (separating them into another form to be used only by Instructional Program Coordinators who are part of our college-wide coordinated assessment).
- We continue to work on CurricUNET implementation by focusing on the Curriculum Module implementation for fall. This implementation will allow us to have more consistent and modifiable ILO and GE Area mapping. We are working with instructional program coordinators to ensure they schedule program assessment around ILO#2 Communication ILO.