

Evaluating Outcomes Assessment Plan and Progress					
Respondents:	56 displayed, 56 total	Status:	Open		
Launched Date:	02/06/2018	Closed Date:	03/08/2018		
1. Assessment Planning					
		Response Total	Response Percent	Points	Avg
Initial: No formal plan (1 Points)		2	5%	2	2
Emerging: Relies on short-term planning (2 Points)		24	59%	48	48
Developed: Clear multi-year plan (3 Points)		11	27%	33	33
Highly Developed: Clear multi-year plan with several years of implementation (4 Points)		4	10%	16	16
Total Respondents		41	100%		
		Total Responses	41		
		Total Points Earned	99		
		Point Average	2.41		
		Point Weighted Average	2.41		
		(skipped this question)	15		
2. Assessable Outcomes					
		Response Total	Response Percent	Points	Avg
Initial: Non-specific outcomes. Do not state student learning outcomes (1 Points)		2	5%	2	2
Emerging: Most outcomes indicate how students demonstrate learning (2 Points)		14	34%	28	28
Developed: Each outcome describes student demonstration of learning (3 Points)		18	44%	54	54
Highly Developed: Outcomes describe demonstration of student learning. Outcomes used for improvement. (4 Points)		7	17%	28	28
Total Respondents		41	100%		
		Total Responses	41		
		Total Points Earned	112		
		Point Average	2.73		
		Point Weighted Average	2.73		
		(skipped this question)	15		
3. Assessment Implementation					
		Response Total	Response Percent	Points	Avg
Initial: Not clear that assessment data is collected (1 Points)		5	12%	5	5

Emerging: Evidence collected. Faculty have discussed <u>relevant</u> criteria for reviewing (2 Points)	20	49%	40	40
Developed: Evidence is collected and faculty use relevant criteria (3 Points)	12	29%	36	36
Highly Developed: Evidence collected, criteria determined and faculty discuss multiple sets of data. <u>Data</u> is used. (4 Points)	4	10%	16	16
Total Respondents		41	100%	
Total Responses		41		
Total Points Earned		97		
Point Average		2.37		
Point Weighted Average		2.37		
(skipped this question)		15		

## 4. Alignment

	Response Total	Response Percent	Points	Avg
Initial: No clear relationship between outcomes and curriculum (1 Points)	6	15%	6	6
Emerging: Some alignment between curriculum and outcomes (2 Points)	16	39%	32	32
Developed: Clear alignment between curriculum and outcomes (3 Points)	14	34%	42	42
Highly Developed: Curriculum, grading and support services are aligned with outcomes (4 Points)	5	12%	20	20
Total Respondents		41	100%	
Total Responses		41		
Total Points Earned		100		
Point Average		2.44		
Point Weighted Average		2.44		
(skipped this question)		15		

## 5. Valid Results

	Response Total	Response Percent	Points	Avg
Initial: Little to no evidence that measures are valid (1 Points)	14	34%	14	14
Emerging: Majority of measures are valid (2 Points)	15	37%	30	30
Developed: Valid measures in regular use (3 Points)	8	20%	24	24
Highly Developed: Multi-year use of valid measures (4 Points)	4	10%	16	16
Total Respondents		41	100%	
Total Responses		41		

Total Points Earned 84

Point Average 2.05

Point Weighted Average 2.05

(skipped this question) 15

6. Reliable Results

	Response Total	Response Percent	Points	Avg
Initial: No process to check for inter-rater reliability (1 Points)	18	44%	18	18
Emerging: Faculty preparing inter-rater reliability (2 Points)	14	34%	28	28
Developed: Faculty check for inter-rater reliability (3 Points)	6	15%	18	18
Highly Developed: Multi-year use of process and evidence of good inter-rater reliability (4 Points)	3	7%	12	12
Total Respondents		41	100%	
Total Responses		41		
Total Points Earned		76		
Point Average		1.85		
Point Weighted Average		1.85		
(skipped this question)		15		

7. Annual Feedback on Assessment Efforts

	Response Total	Response Percent	Points	Avg
Initial: No person or committee provides feedback to departments on quality of their assessment plan (1 Points)	12	29%	12	12
Emerging: Occasional feedback by person or committee (2 Points)	21	51%	42	42
Developed: Annual feedback by person or committee. Departments use feedback. (3 Points)	6	15%	18	18
Highly Developed: Annual feedback, departmental use and clear insitutional support (4 Points)	2	5%	8	8
Total Respondents		41	100%	
Total Responses		41		
Total Points Earned		80		
Point Average		1.95		
Point Weighted Average		1.95		
(skipped this question)		15		

8. Results are Used

	Response Total	Response Percent	Points	Avg
Initial: Results for outcomes are collected but not discussed. (1 Points)	8	20%	8	8
Emerging: Results	16	39%	32	32

collected, discussed but not used. (2 Points)				
Developed: Results collected, discussed and used. (3 Points)	14	34%	42	42
Highly Developed: Results collected, discussed and used and evidence to confirm that changes lead to improved learning (4 Points)	3	7%	12	12
Total Respondents		41	100%	
Total Responses		41		
Total Points Earned		94		
Point Average		2.29		
Point Weighted Average		2.29		
(skipped this question)		15		

9. Planning and Budgeting

	Response Total	Response Percent	Points	Avg
Initial: Outcomes not integrated into planning and budget (1 Points)	15	37%	15	15
Emerging: Attempts at aligning outcomes and planning and budget (2 Points)	23	56%	46	46
Developed: Alignment of outcomes and planning and budget occurs informally (3 Points)	2	5%	6	6
Highly Developed: Alignment of outcomes and planning is systematic and intentional (4 Points)	1	2%	4	4
Total Respondents		41	100%	
Total Responses		41		
Total Points Earned		71		
Point Average		1.73		
Point Weighted Average		1.73		
(skipped this question)		15		

10. How would you rate your satisfaction with using LiveText software to record outcomes assessment?

	Highly Satisfied (5 Points)	Satisfied (4 Points)	Neutral (3 Points)	Unsatisfied (2 Points)	Highly Unsatisfied (1 Points)	Response Total	Points	Avg
Ease of use	5% (2)(10pts)	20% (8)(32pts)	22.5% (9)(27pts)	30% (12)(24pts)	22.5% (9)(9pts)	40	102	2.55
Time required to enter assessment scores	5% (2)(10pts)	12.5% (5)(20pts)	32.5% (13)(39pts)	25% (10)(20pts)	25% (10)(10pts)	40	99	2.48
Rubric format	10% (4)(20pts)	15% (6)(24pts)	35% (14)(42pts)	20% (8)(16pts)	20% (8)(8pts)	40	110	2.75
Validity and reliability of data generated	2.5% (1)(5pts)	15% (6)(24pts)	32.5% (13)(39pts)	22.5% (9)(18pts)	27.5% (11)(11pts)	40	97	2.42
Total Respondents						40		
Total Responses						160		
Total Points Earned						408		

Survey Results

Point Average 2.55

Point Weighted Average 2.55

(skipped this question) 16

11. Would you like additional training on LiveText?

	Response Total	Response Percent	Points	Avg
Yes	13	34%	n/a	n/a
No	25	66%	n/a	n/a
Total Respondents		38		
(skipped this question)		18		

12. You indicated you would like additional training on LiveText, what format would you prefer?

	Response Total	Response Percent	Points	Avg
One-on-one training	7	18%	n/a	n/a
Small group workshop	9	22%	n/a	n/a
Large group workshop	0	0%	n/a	n/a
Total Respondents		40		
(skipped this question)		16		

13. Would you like additional training on generating valid and reliable assessment rubrics?

	Response Total	Response Percent	Points	Avg
Yes	24	60%	n/a	n/a
No	16	40%	n/a	n/a
Total Respondents		40		
(skipped this question)		16		

14. You indicated you would like additional training on generating valid and reliable assessment rubrics, what format would you prefer?

	Response Total	Response Percent	Points	Avg
One-on-one training	7	18%	n/a	n/a
Small group workshop	17	42%	n/a	n/a
Large group workshop	0	0%	n/a	n/a
Total Respondents		40		
(skipped this question)		16		

15. What are your primary concerns regarding the process of assessing learning outcomes (please describe)?

Total Respondents	28
(skipped this question)	28

16. What suggestions do you have to improve the Outcomes Assessment process (please describe)?

Total Respondents	22
(skipped this question)	34



**Results Text**

PRINT || RESULTS OVERVIEW

**Results Text**

This page shows the results text of the question item that you selected.



Manage Survey Folders

Create New Survey

**Evaluating Outcomes Assessment Plan and Progress**

**Respondents:** 39      **Status:** Open  
**Launched Date:** 02/06/2018      **Closed Date:** 03/08/2018

15. What are your primary concerns regarding the process of assessing learning outcomes (please describe)?	Full Response
1. It is being done in a disjointed method that is confusing faculty. This prevents us from going further down the path we need to be on.	<a href="#">view</a>
2. I am not convinced our process using LiveText generates reliable or valid results (I do appreciate the multi-stakes collaborative method, as that moves us closer towards reliability and validity in our assessment of student learning). Also, I don't think our process adequately reflects the unique processes of assessment that occur in the different disciplines. Finally, LiveText is far too time consuming and does not map on well to the more valuable assessment/reflection I am already doing.	<a href="#">view</a>
3. We need to establish a reliable process and continue/follow through longer. We are laying a good foundation but need some continuity and time with the process.	<a href="#">view</a>
4. How are these being used? I am in a department of one, so there is no comparison to work with. Would appreciate an hour just to meet with someone to get the assessment completed.	<a href="#">view</a>
5. No clear goal. No clear process. Process keeps changing. No great value to the instructor. Daily and quarterly course adjustments will be done regardless of a formal assessment process. Realize that accreditation is a fact of life.	<a href="#">view</a>
6. My program has designated testing for assessing student learning outcomes. I feel I am creating assignments and rubrics purely to satisfy the Live Text requirement, not to truly assess the learning of my students.	<a href="#">view</a>
7. alignment of outcomes of all sections, formats of the same course -- similar assessment instruments. Then we can try inter-rater reliability discussions.	<a href="#">view</a>
8. I would like to be able to evaluate different assessment software. Live text is not a user friendly format	<a href="#">view</a>
9. Re-doing work that has already been done in an already overtaxed department. It seems if reliable data is available and collected in a department we would not be required to repeat that data again. It wouldn't be bad if we could copy and paste our data into the live text system, but currently that is not a capability of our software.	<a href="#">view</a>
10. 1) Only degree seeking students are subject to assessment in LiveText. How accurate and useful are our results? It seems to imply that we have double standards and different achievement benchmarks for different groups. 2) My last assessment had 4 different rubrics. The final report generated by LiveText showed the results from the first one only. How do I capture the remaining ones? Where does this info go? How can I see the big picture?	<a href="#">view</a>
11. We use the rubrics to avoid subjective and impressionistic evaluations of whether we are meeting our outcomes. We want evidence! But the truth is that in non-STEM courses the use of the rubrics is still subjective-- we just spend hours creating the illusion of objectivity by assigning numbers to our subjective judgements.	<a href="#">view</a>
12. Ability to collect data at the student level. Important to understand the student population and provide enhancements using an equity lens.	<a href="#">view</a>
13. Most of my concerns is that the target keeps changing. Initially we were doing one rubric for each student in 2 of our classes. Now we are doing up to 7 rubrics (assignment outcomes, course outcomes, program outcomes, and 4 GSLO outcomes) for each student for 2 or more classes. It takes forever, and has no indication that what is collected is meaningful and can be used to fully assess a course and/or particular assignment.	<a href="#">view</a>
14. The ability of the college system to mirror required accreditation assessments. Want to do the work once rather than twice - don't mind feeding into two systems...	<a href="#">view</a>
15. The college seems to think that rubrics are the only means of conducting assessment. However, there are a number of different, appropriate assessment tools outside of a rubric. I wish we would be informed on what assessment means are acceptable and/or recommended, and given the opportunity to develop a comprehensive plan on how we intend on completing assessment.	<a href="#">view</a>
16. Being forced to use LiveText for assessing all learning outcomes is like being forced to build a house using only a hammer. A hammer is one tool, but there are others that are equally as useful. I am very happy that we're now acknowledging that outcomes can be assessed in ways that make sense for each teacher, and that might not involve LiveText.	<a href="#">view</a>
17. I feel LiveText adds an unnecessary layer of complexity to the process. It would be better to integrate assessment into myLakerLink.	<a href="#">view</a>
18. I was assessing the course outcomes from a Fall term class. Yet the report I needed to complete addressed program assessment. I should have considered the relevant program outcomes in Fall. I feel I am always a step behind in this process.	<a href="#">view</a>
19. It takes too long	<a href="#">view</a>
20. Current assessment process looks okay. However, there can be a paradigm shift in assessing the courses and programs where faculties, administrators, and NWCCU representative sit together for 30 minutes, skim the materials used by faculties in their classes including student test results, faculty evaluation, syllabus, course outlines, and ask questions and provide feedback so that their will be some sharing and learning to improve the quality of education. In this case, faculties will have to maintain the record though. I believe vast majority of faculties already do that. Current system is cumbersome to the faculties who already struggle for work-life balance, have no or limited time to keep up with emerging issues in their disciplines, revise the course materials, professional development, and list goes on.	<a href="#">view</a>
21. Assessment can be a very useful activity. Unfortunately the dean who initially lead the project had a "just do something" approach which wasted everyone's time. LiveText was the focus of many faculty member's frustration. I think that is due to a general frustration with learning any new system and trying to avoid pointing out the incompetence of those leading us. LiveText appears to be a robust and reliable tool that can be used in many different ways. I'm not sure it is the most cost effective solution for our needs but I don't find any significant faults with it.	<a href="#">view</a>
22. The process is cumbersome and confusing. The method we are using seems to be more focused on the success of the teacher and less on the student, and I believe that both need to be measured. The one should not be the byproduct of the other; they should inform one another.	<a href="#">view</a>
23. That we have a process in place to collect meaningful information.	<a href="#">view</a>
24. This is a difficult piece for us in Nursing as Outcomes have driven our data for years. We have a highly developed process for assessment of our outcomes and it is difficult to add something new into a mix that has years of experience behind it.	<a href="#">view</a>
25. The process is not intuitive and it feels like we must provide a lot of redundant information. It is so clear in my mind what makes a successful student in my class, but that seems to get lost in translation when using LiveText.	<a href="#">view</a>

- 26. The State of Oregon / Accreditation Teams should communicate to SWOCC exactly what they want from us. [view](#)  
There is no clear empirical objectives that has been chosen to be measured and no valid instrument designed to measure said objectives. Self assessment and reflection are valuable tools, but if quantitative data is to become part of the evaluation process, then proper steps need to be implemented to design, collect, and evaluate these objective measures.
- 27. [view](#)
- 28. There are some people who are fighting the process every step of the way and can't seem to understand that different disciplines may need different types of assessment. There is no way to argue for "validity" when there is no nationwide standard of assessment. And some people are not willing to try proposed methods before deeming them "not as good" or "useless." [view](#)





## Results Text

[PRINT](#) | [RESULTS OVERVIEW](#)

### Results Text

This page shows the results text of the question item that you selected.



#### Manage Survey Folders

[Create New Survey](#)

### Evaluating Outcomes Assessment Plan and Progress

**Respondents:** 39      **Status:** Open  
**Launched Date:** 02/06/2018      **Closed Date:** 03/08/2018

#### 16. What suggestions do you have to improve the Outcomes Assessment process (please describe)?

Full Response

1. Dump livetext and institute an easier system for capturing the data. Provide more training during in-service or if possible pay for those interested to show up on a Saturday on how to develop, use then evaluate rubrics. Have faculty assess every class every term with a simpler process than LiveText. [view](#)
2. Moving more towards the simple form recommended by Linn Benton; utilizing a committee of faculty members to direct the assessment process; reviewing the academic literature (including critiques) of assessment to help inform best practices on our own campuses. [view](#)
3. Having a list of what needs to be done so that I don't miss a deadline and having someone to do it with helps greatly. [view](#)
4. Simplify and CLARIFY the process expectations. Then stick to those expectations for at least a couple of years. Let faculty make this decision and then help promote it and assist in it. [view](#)
5. Live Text is just silly and a distraction. [view](#)
6. It would be great if we could adopt a format similar to what Linn-Benton CC is using and just report on our assessments. It seems that we are forcing all programs to use a format that is not necessarily applicable to all. I feel like I am trying to force my square peg into a round hole. [view](#)
7. Keep it simple- and decrease time consumption [view](#)
8. 1)To improve our practices and statistical significance of collected results, all registered students should be included in the assessment process. It will make our reports more meaningful.  
2) More training is needed to help faculty members with understanding alignment and the big picture. [view](#)
9. Ask instructors to propose a way to assess their outcomes and outline only the basic ingredients that must be included in the assessment. Have every student completing a degree write a short paper that would allow us to evaluate general student learning outcomes. Evaluate that paper according to a rubric. Have the those evaluating the paper go through a norming session. Pay faculty to do this. [view](#)
10. Committee structure for process and feedback opportunities for process development. [view](#)
11. #1: Have an actual laid out and documented plan. This has been a mess from the start as some staff have an idea of what they want, but it hasn't been documented fully and keeps changing every term. [view](#)
12. #2: Have actual full-cycle training. Up until now it has been hit and miss workshops without giving clear direction on how each piece fits together. [view](#)
13. #3: Feedback. There has been no feedback on whether what we have been doing is meeting expectations or completely misses the mark. This feedback needs to be either on an individual basis or by department. We need guidance if we are going to understand or improve. [view](#)
14. #4: Alignment work should be done outside of the chosen tool (aka livetext). Instead of doing multiple rubrics to show alignment. [view](#)
15. Identify a lead with more leadership skills... [view](#)
16. We need clear expectations. So many of our group think we only need to assess two classes per term. We should be assessing 100% of our course outcomes, program outcomes, and GSLOs every term. Why isn't this the norm? Why isn't this the expectation? [view](#)
17. I like the idea of the "short form" (is that what it's called? easy form?) wherein faculty report to their deans that the outcomes for their classes were or were not met. [view](#)
18. I encourage the administration to provide more assessment support to the Curry campus. Make sure that relevant training resources are available at both campuses. [view](#)
19. Live text is not assessment, live text is just one tool. We had a faculty member from LBCC, who is experienced in this assessment process, speak to us. She informed us that there were many routes to assessment and that LBCC had listened to its faculty members and come up with several strategies for assessment. Yet we do not seem to have listened to her at all. Instead we have a not very good piece of software that is not user friendly and blocks any meaningful work. [view](#)
20. Concrete plans and instructions so that faculties are not lost. [view](#)
21. Empower faculty to use the most valid indicators of learning available for the assessment. Then have the institution help them make the process easy and meaningful with appropriate reflection AND support for innovations in courses even if there is some cost. [view](#)
22. It needs to be streamlined and clear. It also needs to be manageable. Scoring six or seven rubrics per student per assignment is overwhelming and prohibitive. With this model, it would be near impossible to scale this up to all of my classes and all of my students, and I am not sure the data gained from it would help me as much or more than what I have done in the past. It has to be simplified. [view](#)
23. Think more about what data are generated, how they are generated, and what they mean. [view](#)
24. I'm am not sure, this is a difficult process for persons who have never had to look at outcomes and assess those outcomes. I know that the program that we obtained (live text) was what the team thought would work, possible in the future to ask the department that has always relied on outcomes may have valuable input into choosing programs that address what we do all the time in nursing. [view](#)
25. I think the process could be simplified. Three simple outcomes would determine whether or not a student is adept in my field. [view](#)
26. The repeated changes are problematic. We can't determine how effective a method is before we actually try it, and yet many people want to pass judgment before trying it. Perhaps instead of trying to force everyone to use the same rubrics, we could attempt the method which seems best to us and see how it works. [view](#)

