EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes the findings from the evaluation of the assessment processes and outcomes conducted in the month of June 2014. One hundred and two participants provided the data for this evaluation through an on line survey comprised of 26 questions. The survey had three sections: the first one, “Commitment and Accountability,” contained ten questions; the second, “The Assessment Process” also contained 10 questions; the third, “Assessment Evidence Use,” was comprised of five questions. Of the 26 questions, 2 were qualitative in nature and provided an opportunity for participants to add comments to their responses to 2 quantitative questions.

The Evaluation of the assessment process and outcomes represents a substantial step forward to satisfying Accreditation Standard IB7 (Institutional Effectiveness). This is the first time since Harbor College instituted an assessment process that it has been evaluated. In general, the results show that those who responded to the survey have a positive view of the evaluations process. That is, the assessment of student learning outcomes is an accepted aspect of Harbor College culture (90% of respondents). This represents an important cultural change at Harbor that started with the adoption of the Achieving the Dream (AtD) initiative in 2011. AtD strongly supports and encourages data and evidence usage in all aspects of students’ success. Consequently, faculty and staff members at Harbor College have become adept to the use of evaluations and assessment as evidence.

More than 90% of respondents agreed that ISLOs reflect appropriate higher education goals and college level rigor, and they are consistent with the college mission. Although more than 70% of respondents considered the assessment process a fair process, the open-ended responses revealed an interesting variety of opinions on this matter.

A closer look at the results reveals that there are areas in the assessment process that need improvement:

1. About 36% of respondents don’t think that program and service area learning outcomes can be easily located.

   Recommendation: Change/improve the assessment website, making it accessible and easy to use to anyone looking for assessment information.

2. 32% of respondents didn’t think that the assessment process includes a schedule of frequency for ISLO assessment.
No recommendation: This aspect of the assessment process is bound to change this fall as a SLO alignment and schedule have been vetted and approved through the Academic Senate and CPC.

3. Almost 40% of respondents felt that the assessment process is not aligned with the institution's budget process.

   Recommendation: Include assessment data at all level of the planning process: program review, unit plans, and master plan.

4. More respondents agreed that collaborative discussions about data and evidence and making recommendations take place at the course level than at the program or institutional levels. These results reflect the work by faculty members who have embraced assessment and dialogue as methods to improve students’ success, and implement curricular and pedagogical changes. However, for program level discussions to occur, the participation and leadership of division chairs are necessary in addition to faculty participation. Likewise, collaborative discussions about ISLO results require the leadership and participation of chairs, corresponding area deans, and faculty.

   Recommendation: Make collaborative discussions about program assessment a prominent part of the division meetings. Minutes from division meetings where program assessment have been discussed and recommendations made need to be prominently showcased and posted. With regards to ISLO collaborative discussions and recommendations we need to explore other venues to present and discuss results. Offering ISLO flex activities once or twice a semester do not seem to be enough.