

Review Results (Reconciled)

Participating Area: Architecture

Reviewed by: Pasadena LACreconciler06

Date Reviewed: 04/02/2014 04:59:33 PM (PDT)

Workspace Template: Annual Assessment Report

Workspace: Annual Assessment Report

Review Method: Using Rubric

Review Summary for 2013: Course SLOs and Assessment Results (Course SLOs and Assessment Results, Analysis, and Recommendations for Improvement)

Final Score: 13.00 (out of 15)

Overall comments: Overall, this is a very thorough, reflective, and comprehensive report. Clearly, all the instructors put time and effort into this assessment and reporting process. Consider a few simple adjustments to choice of verbs and simplifying the SLOs and this report could be even more effective and perhaps even lead to future procurement!

The Learning Assessment Committee thanks you for your contribution to PCC's efforts to improve student success. If you have any questions or concerns about the feedback given or PCC's assessment process, you are encouraged to contact the Learning Assessment Committee:
LearningAssessment@pasadena.edu.

Detailed Results (Rubric used: Annual Assessment Report 2.0)

Outcome Focus & Measurability

(3) Exemplary 3

Outcome statements are clear, concise, measurable statements that include higher-level thinking verbs from Bloom's Taxonomy. Each SLO addresses a single component that is student-focused.

(2) Acceptable 2

Outcome statements are mostly clear but lack specificity. They are measurable. Each SLO addresses a single component and is student-focused. Verbs could employ higher-level thinking.

(1) Developing 1

Outcome statements are vague and lack clarity. Measurability may be compromised or questionable. Verbs do not relate to student ability/accomplishment. SLO may address more than one outcome.

(0) Does Not Meet Standard 0

Outcome statements are not clear, concise or measurable. SLOs address multiple components. Verbs do not conform to Bloom's Taxonomy or are vague or lack student focus.

Criterion Score: 2.00

Comments on this criterion (optional): Some SLO verbs use Bloom's Taxonomy (a really great one is "formulate", as in Arch 11). Some could be replaced with more appropriate verbs (perhaps "solve" rather than "communicate" or "apply" rather than "employ" or "assess" rather than "evaluate"? Many SLOs have a noun instead of a verb ("realization" is used in Arch 11, 10B, 13, & 20A. Arch 14 has "execution of..." perhaps "apply" or produce" would be more effective.) Arh 11 also seems to have a compound SLO: presentations and discussions--is one assessment sufficient to evaluate both? Consider pairing down some of the SLOs so they read more clearly. For example SLO #1, "Formulate original arguments regarding historical architecture using cultural concepts through reading, research and discussion," is exemplary for its clarity and concision (students probably easily understand this Objective).

Assessment/rubric

(3) Exemplary 3

(2) Acceptable 2

(1) Developing 1

(0) Does Not Meet Standard 0

Assessment measures the stated outcome; rubric aligns with assessment.	Assessment mostly measures the stated outcome; rubric mostly aligns with assessment.	Assessment partially measures the stated outcome; rubric is vague.	Assessment does not measure the stated outcome or rubric is not included.
Criterion Score: 3.00 Comments on this criterion (optional): Each assessment accurately reflects its SLO, and they appear to all be performed about the same time, which allows for consistency. Rubrics are all attached by file.			
Data & Results			
(3) Exemplary 3 All results are summarized; all data is included.	(2) Acceptable 2 Some results/data included.	(1) Developing 1 Data not included; results partially summarized.	(0) Does Not Meet Standard 0 No results/data included.
Criterion Score: 3.00 Comments on this criterion (optional): Data is included for all assessments. Consider presenting the data in a tabular form.			
Analysis			
(3) Exemplary 3 Includes reflective analysis of outcome results.	(2) Acceptable 2 Includes analysis, partially tied to results.	(1) Developing 1 Includes analysis but not tied to results.	(0) Does Not Meet Standard 0 No analysis is included.
Criterion Score: 3.00 Comments on this criterion (optional): Analysis by each instructor is thoughtful and reflective of outcome results. It is clear that the author(s) put time and effort in their analysis.			
Recommendations for Improvement			
(3) Exemplary 3 Includes thoughtful and feasible recommendations to improve student results for the majority of the assessments conducted; a well-developed plan to secure resources is included.	(2) Acceptable 2 Includes feasible recommendations to improve student results for some of the assessments conducted; some plan to secure resources is included.	(1) Developing 1 Recommendations for improving student results are in need of improvement and development; plan to secure resources is deficient.	(0) Does Not Meet Standard 0 No recommendations or plan to secure resources provided.
Criterion Score: 2.00 Comments on this criterion (optional): Most recommendations are thoughtful and provide valid steps to improve student success-or at least future attempts. Though some recommendations mention deficiencies in the facilities and the need for access to more computers and lab hours, no resource requests are made, and no plan is given to secure resources.			