

Kapi'olani Community College Course Level Assessment Plan

Spring 2015

Assessment is a rich conversation about student learning informed by data¹

Overview

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 an evaluation 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 evaluation of a student's entire work for the course.

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 utilize various measures to determine the level of student achievement of course competencies. While assessment of student learning does not infringe on instructors' grading procedures, instructors may well find that grading according to course competencies may contribute valuable information to the process of assessing course competencies.

Course Level Assessment Plan

Systematic Assessment

Courses should complete an assessment cycle every five years. The assessment information should be used to justify changes to an existing course, which must go through a course review every five years. Course assessment is part of the five-year course review process, and assessment information should be updated with the course information during this process.

Assessment Plans and Reports

All active courses should have a five-year Course Assessment Plan (CAP) on file in their respective Laulima departmental website (or other departmental archive, as appropriate). All active courses should also archive their Course Learning Reports (CLRs) within this web site. The CLRs on file for each course should be in accordance with the plan laid out in that course's CAP. CAP and CLR information should be reflected in each department's Learning and Assessment Schedule and Report (LASR).

Completion and submission of these reports should conform to the following schedule:

Document	Due Date	Submission	Archive Location
CAP*	Every 5 years or when course is updated (whichever comes first)	Faculty submit to Program / Discipline Coordinator or Department Chair	Department Laulima web site
CLR*	Last day of faculty duty in spring of the academic year in which the competency(s) is assessed	Faculty submit to Program / Discipline Coordinator or Department Chair**	Department Laulima web site
LASR	Update fall semester progress by December 31, spring semester progress by May 31	Live, online document (no submission)	Google Drive (UH System accessible)

* File naming conventions:

CAP = cap_coursealphanumeric-year-month

Example: cap_eng100-2014-08

CLR = clr_coursealphanumeric-year-month

Example: clr_eng100-2015-05

LASR (when backed up) = lasr_department-AYcompleted

Example: lasr_nursing-AY14-15

** Department Chair submits CLR to Office for Institutional Effectiveness (OFIE) by date designated by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

The College is currently (April 2015) transitioning to a software-based assessment management system, Taskstream. It is expected that the CAP, CLR, and LASR equivalents in Taskstream will be completed in accordance with the above schedule.

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

This option is applicable to courses in which faculty use different assignments and a common assessment rubric / set of criteria.

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 lead faculty member or program/discipline coordinator. The lead faculty member or program/discipline coordinator aggregates the data.
3. Instructors meet to discuss results and possible pedagogical, curricular, and programmatic revisions.
4. The lead faculty member or program/discipline coordinator completes and submits a Course Learning Report (CLR) that includes the action(s) that will be taken to improve student learning.

Option 2

This option is applicable to courses in which faculty use common assignments and a common assessment rubric / set of criteria.

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 lead faculty member or program/discipline coordinator. The lead faculty member or program/discipline coordinator aggregates the data.

3. Instructors meet to discuss the results and possible pedagogical, curricular and programmatic revisions.
4. The lead faculty member or program/discipline coordinator completes and submits a Course Learning Report (CLR) that includes the action(s) that will be taken to improve student learning.

Option 3

This option is applicable to courses in which faculty use different assignments and a different assessment rubric / set of criteria.

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. Instructors meet to discuss possible pedagogical, curricular, and programmatic revisions based in the results.
4. The lead faculty member or program/discipline coordinator completes and submits a Course Learning Report (CLR) that includes the action(s) that will be taken to improve student learning.

Option 4

This option is an add-on option; if used, it must be used in combination with Option 1, 2, or 3.

1. Each instructor gives a student survey that has agreed upon questions (e.g., Student Assessment of their Learning Gains [SALG] or other survey). 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. The lead faculty member or program /discipline coordinator includes information from student surveys on the Course Learning Report (CLR).

Assessment Processes

Department chairs and/or program/discipline coordinators need to ensure that faculty members responsible for assessing competencies in their courses have a Course Assessment Plan (CAP) on file and follow the plan outlined in it. In addition, faculty should be provided support when completing Course Learning Reports (CLRs) so that all necessary information is provided.

Faculty apply the following six-step assessment process for each course competency.

1. Identify a 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 3 requires faculty to summarize his/her students' results on the target competency(s) being assessed, using his or her own criteria, and to collaborate with other faculty teaching the course in order to find reliable ways to compare and contrast the information into a cohesive conclusion.
 - d. Option 4, if used, must be used in 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. Make recommendations for improvement: use the results of the assessment to recommend improvements to curriculum, pedagogy, competencies, support, etc.
6. Implement recommendations and re-assess (i.e., close the loop).

Organization

The College needs to provide ongoing training sessions for faculty. The assessment team includes a full-time institutional assessment coordinator, a Career & Technical Education assessment coach (TE = 6 credits), and an Arts & Sciences assessment coach (TE = 6 credits). This team will support assessment efforts at the course and program level for the College. The assessment team may schedule professional development to support faculty assessment efforts.

Each program/department will need to determine how many courses they will assess in a given year, keeping in mind that all courses must be assessed following a five-year reporting cycle.

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.

Use of Assessment in Faculty Evaluation

For guidance on the use of assessment results in faculty evaluation, see Faculty Senate Resolution 05052014-9, Guidelines for the Use of Learning Outcomes Assessment in Faculty Evaluation (dated May 6, 2014) and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs response to (dated August 23, 2014) / Chancellor's concurrence and approval of (on October 29, 2014) said resolution.

Support for the KCC Strategic Plan

Assessment supports KCC's 2008 – 2015 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 Outcome E: to recognize and invest in faculty and staff resources and develop innovative and inspiring learning environments in which to work.

Note: Original plan approved by Faculty Senate November 1, 2010; current plan approved February 1, 2016.

1 Marchese, T. Cited in Banta, T. W. (2005) *Developing assessment methods at classroom, unit, and university-wide levels*. Paper presented at the Assessment Institute, Indianapolis. Retrieved January 31, 2015 from <http://www.bmcc.cuny.edu/iresearch/upload/Banta.pdf>