Global Skills Evaluation Activity for Accreditation

Administered to LCC Faculty September 2016

The following prompts will be used to help develop our report re: accreditation standards 4A and 4B. In terms of the **Global Skills Assessment (Summer Institute) process**, please answer the following questions for each accreditation standard:

1. What aspects of the process are working well?

- I think the process, in general, is working well. It seems the voluntary submission process allows the Assessment Committee to collect valid artifacts.
- I have not had an opportunity to be involved in the Summer Institute process yet, but information about the process has been shared. I feel well informed, and the way students' work is assessed for Global Skills seems very thorough and effective.
- The process itself is reliably and consistently administered. Artifacts are randomized and de-identified. Artifacts are submitted from a range of disciplines and a cross-section of faculty. The Summer Institute is multi-disciplinary. There is a norming process and each artifact that is assessed, undergoes at least two reads (by 2 different faculty participants). The process is faculty driven including authorship and maintenance of the global skills rubrics; assessment of artifacts.
- Anonymous artifacts allow for unbiased assess. Faculty meet together to discuss and evaluate artifacts. Faculty come from different disciplines. Artifacts come from different disciplines. Outcomes are refined as a result of faculty interaction. Faculty interpretations of outcomes is normalized prior to evaluation.
- We have a clear schedule and process. The formation and activities performed in the Summer Institute are strong. The G.S. are clearly defined and accessed. The Assessment Committee meets regularly to review and support and improve the process, while representing the faculty at large and increasing communication campus wide. Quantitative and qualitative data are collected along the way. Faculty are well informed at the start of each quarter and play a primary role in facilitating assessment.
- The overall process seems to work well in assessing out student work. Having been part of the institute I know that it provides a good snapshot of student work. Bringing faculty from diverse disciplines.
- Working with a mixture of participants from all fields. Participants from other fields interpret how to grade artifacts in a different way than I or may have noticed something about an artifact that I missed.
- Getting a collection of faculty together to complete the Institute. Protocols established for the Institute. Global Skills integrated into Canvas.
- We collect a lot of good artifacts from a lot of disciplines.

- The Assessment team meets every summer.
- The process doesn't intrude on class time. A wide variety of artifacts are collected from different programs.
- Global Skills clear. Committee regularly meets to discuss ideas. Yearly Summer Institute. Assessment days with activities. Changes in Canvas happening.
- Summer Assessment Institute: selection, composite, structure, norming. Fall in-service report back.
- Collaboration of committee (consists of faculty members) to assess student work – using inter-rater reliability.
- I don't know that I am familiar enough with this process to answer these questions thoughtfully.
- Faculty are chosen from a large pool with representation from multiple disciplines and includes adjuncts. There are a larger number of artifacts coming in.
- Diversity of faculty assessing artifacts, well written rubrics for each outcome that are continually reviewed and revised.
- Having folks from multiple disciplines participate in the Summer Institute assessment, especially when those participants' areas don't correspond to the outcome being assessed.
- The Summer Institute fosters engaging and productive opportunities to clarify and elaborate upon what we really want our students to learn through their LCC experience. Additionally, the Institute offers time and space for faculty to norm expectations and consider their roles in the general education program.
- The Summer Institute, itself, seems to be working well and processes the data it receives.
- The mechanics of the process are working well once information has been submitted.
- The random selection of artifacts collected and evaluated is a great way to assess and generate a valid data set.
- Norming what works.
- Summer Institute brings faculty into the process from different disciplines. Interested faculty can apply to participate.
- Evaluation/ Summer Institute process. Reporting of data in open group at Fall Assessment day. Faculty are getting more time to be involved/ do the work on assessment days.
- The process has been developed and maintained by a broad base of faculty from across the college. This is truly a faculty led and maintained effort from artifact submission through rubric development. The rubric clearly defines indicators of achievement and has been vetted/implemented by faulty collaborating across disciplines. The norming process during the summer institutes increases collaboration and consensus and leads to more authentic and reliable scores.
- Between standard definition and the rubric, faculty is given a clear idea of what is expected.
- The norming of artifact assessment works really great. The sharing of data is excellent. The interdisciplinarity of the assessment institute is great. The ability to discuss and revise outcomes is excellent – makes the outcomes measurable, verifiable, and faculty-approved. The student outcomes achievements are clearly authentic and not doctored for the assessment. The institute provides regular and comprehensive assessment in a balanced and manageable way. Results are definitely shared in a timely manner, and suggestions for improvements are conveyed.
- Systematic approach to focusing on each Global Skill. Wide range of artifacts collected. Focus on norming and discussion.

- We are making progress. Most areas/programs are beginning to submit data. We talk about the process each year and adjust.
- Do not know...limited information received.
- Able to get a good variety of artifacts to analyze. Representation from most disciplines. Collaboration and communication with faculty in different subject areas to analyze the process and make it better. Continuing to modify and improve.
- Using various faculty from multiple disciplines to evaluate artifacts. Reporting back to faculty their averages for each Global Skills to open improvement in assessment.
- Leadership engages faculty in the process. Leadership is very skilled in this complicated process.
- The summer Institute that assesses student artifacts. The frequent discussion in faculty gatherings of the Global Skills.
- Frequent e-mail reminders of which Global Skills we will assess this year. Student artifacts submitted by faculty across campus. Evaluators at Summer Assessment Institute represent a cross-section of disciplines. Feedback presented at fall in-service. Global Skills rubrics developed by faculty. Global Skills outcome rubrics now available in Canvas – new. Hopefully this will simplify data collection reporting.
- Regular and Canvas-based collection of artifacts – very nice. Brad, Wendy and other assessment leaders at LCC do excellent work. They share the larger picture clearly with faculty in the trenches and provide good direction and resources at our regular assessment meetings. Dividing the work up into small bites across several years is a great way to ensure quality, as opposed to tackling the whole thing in one go.
- Multiple disciplines are represented. Support from the research department. Keep faculty updated on the Summer Institute. They constantly give reminders via email.
- Summer Institute. The representation across disciplines. Support from Research department to interpret data and assist in determining what tools are needed to seek data wanted by department. Bringing results to faculty as a group for discussion.
- Well organized. Respectable; consistently executed. Realistic workload; cycling through 1-2 Global Skills each year.
- Regarding the Summer Institute, there seems to be good faculty participation. Faculty from all disciplines are invited to take part. In short, the Summer Institute is inclusive. The Institute has evolved into a well-oiled machine.
- The effort to collect variety of samples and have faculty from different disciplines serve at the Summer Institute.
- I think it is a systematic comprehensive system. The assessment committee is dedicated and represents all departments. I think our outcomes and rubrics were thoughtfully developed with all faculty input.
- Coming together to evaluate college standards. Multiple disciplines active in assessment. Gathering faculty input.
- A diverse group of faculty involved in Institute. Ongoing, a yearly assessment. Comprehensive.
- When students leave our program for employment.
- The Summer Institute does a nice job of collecting data from student work and works collaboratively to assess this work in the content of the relevant Global Skills, from this analysis the outcomes can be tweaked and so are constantly evolving.

- Frequent retreats with the L&L (*Lang & Lit*) department. At these meetings we build rubrics and adjust alignment of courses. I don't know of what institution does this, but the institution as a whole does hold periodic assessment sessions.
- Not sure.
- The whole campus is involved in our campus-wide assessment processes. Global Skills posters are displayed prominently in classrooms. Summer Assessment Institutes are valuable to the faculty who participate – they enhance our teaching, ultimately. Our assessment process is faculty-driven.
- I think it is an excellent idea to break the large task into smaller doable chunks each year to help faculty keep on track and to have a very common goal. The Summer Institute composed of interdisciplinary members working together is good and from what I can tell they are doing good work toward compiling and analyzing goals. I also like the idea of an outside person looking at what we are doing rather than assessing my own assessment.

2. What aspects of the process are working less well?
- From my perspective, an area that's working less well may be that not all programs/degrees etc. are represented.
- It's hard for faculty to find time to participate during the summer – although that's probably the best time. Recruiting a variety of faculty and perhaps a larger number of participants might be helpful.
- The aggregated data for each outcome (and overall) does not indicate the level of graduating students. Many artifacts come from first year (or introductory courses) or students may be taking higher level courses early in their progression. Overall, it is difficult to capture "culminating" data. Also, not all disciplines represented as some outcomes are difficult to capture.
- Some departments' faculty not represented. Some artifacts from 1st year (or early ?) students. Some departments' student artifacts not represented, or not well.
- There is much more data to collect regularly than what we are currently gathering and processing each summer. Is annual actually "regular"? Use Canvas outcomes tool on a quarterly basis. 4B2 needs to be improved. Findings are announced to faculty in the fall. Are they published? What about others in the campus community? How can we better use data/results to inform planning and allocation of resources? Feed the C&P document into the AMP (Academic Master Plan) and follow through with prioritization (add this to the schedule to do regularly as well).
- We don't have a good way of evaluating based on the level of student (new, graduating, etc). Dispersing Institute results are difficult because they are complex and some faculty don't have the patience to critically assess results.
- There are certain outcomes that are difficult to assess (interpersonal) because paper artifacts are not enough to display the outcome.
- The number of documents collected. Knowledge of the students' academic progress/pathway related to the artifacts. Clarity of terms in the outcome descriptions and rubrics. Ex: Critical Thinking "Valid Methods of Inquiry" – Needs defined. There are many valid methods of Inquiry. Ex: Reflective but not really tied into rubric explanations. Assessing Interpersonal Skills (secondhand).

- Not sure.
- Not sure.
- Difficult to capture meaningful lab activities.
- Need more accountability. More programs need to be using results to inform program and outcome changes. More departments represented. More use of Canvas outcomes.
- Artifacts from all faculty. Closing the loop.
- Selection of sample student work.
- I don't know that I am familiar enough with this process to answer these questions thoughtfully.
- Artifacts should come from all departments. What can we do to improve scores below a 3?
- Emphasis on 200-level work excludes programs that require 100-level or less for certain areas. (Students can earn a DTA without ever taking a 200-level course?)
- Translating what is learned in the Institute back to the larger body of faculty. Participants get a lot out of it but the general faculty body, especially those who don't choose to participate in the institute, are missing out on the overall understanding.
- Artifacts are often not representative of the entire college experience. Some programs don't submit any artifacts. Some submit artifacts from students in their first year.
- I think that one of the biggest issues is gathering the data to be analyzed. Sometimes it is difficult to have time to gather the data on the part of faculty.*
- Although not technically part of the assessment process: we do not have a system in place to share pedagogy/andragogy that will help us improve our Global Skills. The process of assisting faculty in the submission of evidence.
- Results of the Summer Institute are vaguely shared, but no discussion on what to do to improve.
- When you said you didn't look at the lower courses – you aren't really comparing the change from beginning to end – the final outcome possibly – but not the growth.
- Getting artifacts from all disciplines. May have artifacts from same students. Probably have the best artifacts submitted at times. The same faculty take part in this – not all are able to attend in the summer.
- Artifacts collection still challenging. Sharing a report of results with supporting details. As set up, we have a barometer but no way to use it to identify places to focus/ work on improving.
- Certain elements, what used to be general education outcomes, citizenship, multiculturalism, aesthetic appreciation, have been dropped/ demoted to "global values" because of their difficulty to assess. Because of this, these key facets of a liberal arts education have been removed from the conversations.
- From math perspective, process is textually oriented. Assessing fundamental math, ie Algebra, is not as straight forward.
- You should not collect data on a voluntary basis. The information you gather might not represent the population. Large proportions of our students have virtually no chance of being assessed, even some areas are missed.
- Emails requesting artifacts should state clearly that we are looking for "end of program" artifacts.
- Data may not reflect student capabilities as they graduate.
- I believe it is okay that we get assessment from beginning and graduating students, but we are not using that to look at change from entry to exit. Statistics are mixed and we are not looking at the mix, so each year could have variation bias.

- Data gathering and communicating what is needed and why. Voluntary application of the system.
- Communication with new faculty on what this is about and how to asses using Global Skills. Collaboration with faculty that are in independent or individual disciplines. What about adjuncts?
- Not having artifacts from all disciplines that are represented in each Global Skills.
- Determining what the implications are for improvement from the results of the Summer Institute assessment.
- Not all disciplines submit student artifacts. Some difficulty deciding what student artifacts to submit. Feedback is very general, so you don't know if your particular artifact was easy to assess or not.
- The push for numbers data (quantitative) continues to imply a disadvantage to qualitative assessment, like interpersonal skills, the arts, etc. Perhaps there can be a place for subjective or word-based assessments alongside the purely numerical.
- Time can be an issue.
- There just never seems to be enough time set aside – tough to change with all else happening.
- Earmarked time for faculty to complete data/artifact collection – compilation and analysis. One Assessment Day is insufficient. (Sorry, this comment is more general to overall assessment process)
- There seems to be some difficulty collecting artifacts for a few of the Global Skills.
- Educating all faculty (including adjuncts) on what this institute entails and how to be a part of it. Collecting artifacts and representation from all departments.
- It seems we hear more about the process than the actual results. We were under our cut score in one area this summer, but we didn't seem to spend much time discussing it. (Maybe that will be in another meeting) If all disciplines aren't represented, that would be a weakness.
- I feel that it needs to be looked at more than once a year; fall/summer. Amount of faculty that submit artifacts.
- Not getting artifacts from each discipline.
- Getting students to understand that a work ethic will be required for success.
- Some people tend to dominate the Committee and I think some valuable information that other committee members might provide is lost.
- Our former capstone requirement was effective in meeting institutional learning outcomes. The current process is more cumbersome.
- Need to replace CAPSTONE with some measurement.
- We don't have mechanisms to ensure that we're assessing student work from students at the end of their degree path. We value the Global Values (citizenship, multiculturalism) but do not assess them. The data we produce may be meaningless because we cannot determine their statistical significances, it any. (Standard Four, 4.A.1, i.e.). No pre-/post-comparison of student achievement to see if we're actually adding value.
- As a newer faculty member I am finding it difficult to always understand the process that LCC uses to assess. The explanation given this morning and the overview of the process would have been helpful in my first year (it may have been said; so many new things coming at me that I may have missed a clear overview) while senior faculty do not and they need orientation. My situation is also unique in that I am a one person are, so even getting advice from people in the greater department does not help when it comes down to doing concrete tasks. I also wonder if

we might include some qualitative assessment. The Humanities are often better represented through this manner. Quantitative assessment is great, but when looking at arts/humanities where many of our Global Skills are actively being developed our "documents" do not look the same and collecting student data is difficult.

3. What recommendations do you have for improvement?

- Something that may improve the process is an opportunity for faculty to work together with members of the Assessment Committee and each other to develop assignments from which Global Skills may be assessed.
- It's hard for faculty to find time to participate during the summer – although that's probably the best time. Recruiting a variety of faculty and perhaps a larger number of participants might be helpful.
- De-aggregation of data to make it more reflective of actual level of each skill at point of leaving.
- Improve "carrot" or outreach to increase diverse faculty involvement. Improve artifact representation of % of students in terminal year and of disciplines.
- Improve "published" results and communication beyond faculty.
- Small group discussions of results/recommendations led by Institute participants.
- Clarification of terminology in outcomes/rubrics rather than assumptions. See example in #2. Assess interpersonal skills during selected courses by external evaluators using research (other Faculty at LCC) based protocol. If possible, improve collection of artifacts and differentiation as related to student credit intervals, progress towards degree, etc.
- None at this time.
- Helping prof tech come up with assessable work.
- Come up with a method to capture and use lab exercises that don't address just one outcome but multiple outcomes in the same exercise.
- More use of Canvas outcomes. Pick assessable materials from all departments. Reach beyond Committee, which is mostly sole representation.
- Hit the Global Skills throughout the next year to help close loop. Inform faculty better about what artifacts would work (especially prof tech for inclusion).
- Figure out which courses best represent students at the (towards the) end of their degree. Follow certain students? Overall picture.
- It seems as though this is voluntary response, which statistically can produce biased results. Is there a way to incorporate a process that is less voluntary? Separate out those who are graduating/not graduating? (I only ask this since this seemed to be of interest per the group discussion)
- Make sure artifacts come from students close to completing their degree. I'm not sure how that can happen since a PSYCH or SOC class, or even ENGL 102 could have new students mixed with those close to completion. Include scoring rubric for new faculty.
- Student portfolios.
- Trying to bring in more faculty for participation in the Summer Institute – it seems like the same people do it year after year. Strongly encouraging new faculty to participate. Making the results more clearly relatable to non-participating faculty.
- Provide incentives for faculty to submit artifacts. Provide opportunities for the collection of qualitative data. Integrate students learning from student programs: Forensics, Student

Government, music and theatre programs, etc. Co-curricular programs contribute to student learning.

- We could have systematic buy-in and eventually improvement if every faculty member had to rotate through the Institute. I realize this is problematic as it occurs during the summer.
- Not involved in the process enough to have valid recommendations. Only participate by doing my own class and programs work.
- Require all programs to submit work.
- Share more specifics about the artifacts and how they are evaluated.
- Provide a more detailed report than 5 numbers – it is very hard to see how/where it relates back to my work areas. Define/discuss a pathway from using Canvas outcomes inclusion in gen ed results. It's been a long time since we have demonstrated our evaluation processes to newer faculty.
- Find a way to bring global values, with all of their difficulty in assessing objectively, back into the conversation. Again, these are the cornerstones of a liberal arts education. Ongoing efforts to close the loop to "use these results to effect improvement." Give faculty more autonomy in planning in-service activities that tie directly to student achievement (i.e. SCALE) with corresponding notice and budget.
- From #2, I think that a standard form of a test, with each problem associated with a given outcome, would supply a meaningful statistical base.
- We need some form of random selection process to decide which artifacts will be assessed: Identify which end courses cover the skill to be assessed; determine which artifacts will be assessed from those courses. From class counts determine how many students are in those end courses. Randomly select which specific artifacts from the pool will be assessed.
- Maybe certain courses could be identified and then artifacts could be chosen from random sections of those courses.
- Continue to work on embedding assessment and figuring out ways to make it easy to collect data where possible. Discuss and purposefully look at entry vs graduation assessment.
- Standardization of definitions of Critical Thinking, numeracy, communication and interpersonal relations. Those may be available, but I do not have access to them, so that would flow with communication.
- Delineate between 100 and 200 level work. Require at least final/major projects, papers, etc. from each discipline as artifacts to assess that pertain to the Global Skills within each discipline.
- Check with other Washington State community colleges to see whether or not we are aligned.
- What do we do with data to inform future assessment, instruction, resources, etc.? Examples of student artifacts, best practices for assessing a particular skill.
- This is the first time I've understood that Global Skills assessment is most valuable for students close to graduation. It may not have changed the kinds of artifacts I submitted for review, but I think it could be clearer that "terminal" artifacts are preferable when the request is made. I don't feel that "allocation of resources" is tied clearly/transparent to the achievement of core theme objectives, as outlined in the first part of standard 4, and 4.B.1.
- During prep week, schedule fewer meetings and allocate more time to actual prep. That will free up time to focus on assessment.
- Provide more details about Summer Institute results. Perhaps the definition of "artifact" could be broadened.
- Reaching adjuncts about this process.

- More explanation on results of Institute. What are we going to do with our 2.9 score on criteria D?
- More information needs to be given to faculty. We had no context for the activities on assessment day.
- Better explanations of process. Still confusing.
- More campus wide focus on mathematics.
- Other than the Type A bossy individuals, I think the Summer Institute works well and exceeds in meeting its goals and objectives.
- Student input does not appear to be documented except in terms of end of course evaluation of instructor, but they are not asked how well we are educating Global Skills.
- Need to align subjects with work we do. Student voice in process. What do students need?
- More resources dedicated to gathering artifacts, getting them from the right point(s) in the students' time here (e.g. near the end of their degree path), and assessing them: could fund more faculty for the Summer Institute, for example, and for more time, perhaps more than one group/Institute.
- Recommendations: for new faculty I believe a session on the first assessment day that presents an overview and how one fits into it would be helpful to orient new faculty. A mentoring system which is probably happening in larger departments such as English and Math would be helpful. I also realize that it is my responsibility to seek out help and I have done so, but a more formalized mentoring would be helpful.

4. What evidence exists that shows that we are meeting this standard?
- The regularity of the Summer Institute and how the results are presented on Assessment Day are evidence that an Institution is meeting the standard for assessing student outcomes.
- Our assessment days, our assessment activities, the Curriculum Program Review, the Summer Assessment Institute. I feel very confident that we, as an institution, are doing a good job.
- Holistic, interdisciplinary, faculty driven process.
- The results of Institute.
- The G.S. page on the website. Our C&P documents. Notes/artifacts from the Summer Assessment Institute team. Meeting minutes from Assessment Committee. Canvas Changes (G.S. outcomes)
- There have been beneficial discussions of outcomes at many levels. Lang and Lit and Nursing seem to be implementing changes. Broad campus participation.
- Success in subsequent classes for sequential classes like English and Precollege Math.
- Collection of student artifacts. Protocols in place for systematic review. Data analysis, reported out, and discussed by campus (faculty) as well.
- We seem to achieve accreditation fairly easily due to great staff (Wendy, Brad, etc.).
- Not sure.
- Data
- Student work. Data collected shows that we are meeting minimum requirement or above. Changes in Canvas and outcomes being made in various departments. (English and Math)
- Summer Institute Report summary. Activity in fall in-service foster better classroom curriculum which should come through next time we assess the skills.
- Data from the institute. This! Sharing out with faculty at this meeting.

- Results provided as a results of Summer Institute.
- Evaluations show the scores are in the appropriate range.
- Everything that comes out of the Summer Institute demonstrates this.
- Our process is transparent and systematic.
- Would this not be the conclusion reached by the Summer Institute? Their call?
- Statistical evidence seems to be shared most often. However, there is a lack of anecdotal evidence.
- You ask for volunteers and choose a wide variety of disciplines. Having served on one committee I appreciate the work done.
- Faculty meetings (monthly) gather data and align the content to the SEP to continue data collection that meet the standards of accreditation.
- Students are meeting the outcomes that include the Global Skills.
- Working system is in place and moving along nicely. Clearly listed/defined outcomes and rubrics. Diverse team of faculty involved in many levels of the process.
- Well, participation and data from the institutes. The sheer number of artifacts submitted, whether or not they are used. Course plans map to these outcomes. Participation in institutes – faculty from across departments – demonstrate meaningfulness.
- We are documenting some specific outcomes now.
- If self-selected instructors are picking which artifacts will be assessed, we have no real evidence we are meeting any standard.
- Assessment Day. Assessment Institute summaries.
- Data from Summer Institute. This form.
- We made big improvements or progress in the number of artifacts we collected in this area (standard). The Summer Institute does norming and selected randomly a sample of the collected assessment. We are making changes to our process, but there is consistency to our method.
- Do not know.
- Faculty are submitting and analyzing artifacts from many disciplines. Continued work to involve all instructors.
- We are meeting this standard, although not fully, since not all programs/disciplines are submitting artifacts.
- The Summer Institute results.
- Data from Summer Institute.
- These regular meetings on assessment, the summer institute, Canvas applications (objective-related rubrics, etc.) and other activities seem to be very successful.
- They bring forward "areas of improvement" and encourage faculty to focus on those areas.
- Summer Institute – follow through bringing results to faculty and making the nexus to the academic planning component and curriculum design.
- Years of documentation from SAI's. (Program Reviews)
- Quarterly and annual curriculum reviews demonstrate that faculty are involved in the assessment process. Reports from the Summer Institute, as well as raw data and rubrics also provide evidence of meeting the standard.
- There is a systematic collection and analysis, but I think we are lacking in narrowing down areas of improvement.

- Overall, I think we're doing great. I think our assessment day and Summer Institute demonstrate this.
- Reports.
- Employer satisfaction: consistent hiring of LCC students.
- Student work is assessed, evaluated and scored. Data is presented to faculty driving fall assessment day.
- Evidence is in documents produced by the department.
- Student employment, four year college success of our students, student satisfaction survey.
- Summer Institute reports; In-service assessment activities involving all faculty.