

Appendix A: Historical Overview

An Historical Overview of Assessment of Student Learning at PCC

Academic Year	Assessment Events/Changes/Progress
1999-2000	PCC adopted formal Assessment of Student Learning (ASL) system; entire process was managed by faculty committee through bi-monthly meetings
2001-08	Assessment oversight was assigned to Assessment Coordinator, a faculty member with .5 release time. Series of coordinators chaired the ASL committee. Coordinator gradually inherited more and more responsibility for collecting, reviewing, and reporting all assessment data. Committee met, but gradually became less actively involved in review process of plans and reports.
2008-10	Direction of ASL shifted from course level to program level assessment. Administration directed Dept. Chairs to implement overall program review. Faculty were confused by mixed messages and grappled with differences between course, program, and institutional SLOs. With many changes in top administrators, consistent leadership in assessment processes and research practices was needed.
2010-12	<p>The 2010-11 academic year was a year of transition as the committee struggled with how to improve ASL participation and also to best manage the process. While most departments participated in the planning process, submission of final reports was inconsistent; thus, the college-wide report was also delayed.</p> <p>Three co-leaders (Assessment Faculty Leads), one from each academic division of the college, lead the assessment process. Job descriptions were developed, new Operating Procedures were drafted, and three Assessment Faculty Leads were identified to lead the assessment process the following year. New assessment forms were developed that focused more on significant and useful data and less on anecdotal evidence.</p>
2012-13	Significantly increased participation under the Faculty Lead system occurred. In 2012-13, the number of disciplines participating in ASL increased by 66%. The Arts & Sciences Division faculty under the guidance of their Lead, modified the assessment cycle so that data collection occurred primarily in the fall with analysis and reporting in the spring. The new approach helped address the need for timely reporting of results.
2013-15	In 2013-14, several other departments from the other divisions adopted the practice of assessing in the fall and reporting in the spring. Faculty Leads were also much more proactive during the fall semester, scheduling individual meetings and follow-up meetings with department chairs to assist with development of assessment plans. They also set spring deadlines within their own divisions with support from each of the academic deans. Those who needed help with the reporting were provided with additional support.
2015	<p>Course-level and program-level assessment processes remained fundamentally the same. During Spring 2015, in order to streamline the assessment reporting process, the Arts and Sciences and Business & Advanced Technology Divisions elected to change their assessment cycle from academic year to a calendar year. During Fall of 2015, the Health & Public Safety Division also adopted the calendar year cycle.</p> <p>The Assessment of Student Learning Committee began the process of reviewing commercial assessment programs to elevate the ASL process and expedite the ability to collect, compare, and analyze longitudinal data. Also during Fall 2015, the three academic divisions of the college participated in a formalized attempt to collect raw data on Critical Thinking at the institutional level.</p>