

2010-11 Annual Program Review Update

PROGRAM NAME:

Assessment Center

Name of person or persons that filled out this form:

Stephen Fletcher

I. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

A. What is the primary mission/purpose of your program?:

The Assessment Center provides students with the opportunity to assess skills in mathematics and English so they will be able to make informed decisions about course selection.

B. What is your Program Level Outcome (PLO) statement?:

Students will better understand how to use their educational history and assessment recommendations to inform their course selection process. This will be evident by their enrolling in recommended courses and not retesting.

1. Describe the processes by which your PLO is assessed:

N/A Analysis of SLOAC results (refer to Part III)
y of students about enrollment Analysis of SSLOAC results (refer to Part III)

Other:

2. How does your PLO directly or indirectly support the: Mission, Institutional Core Competencies (ICC), and/or Strategic Initiatives

(Attach "PLO to Mission, ICC, and/ SI matching sheet(s)."

Comments:

The placement process is about helping students evaluate their knowledge and training so they can best utilize the programs provided by De Anza. This process involves students evaluating their knowledge and skills to decide what placement test to take. Placement test results provide information about the quality of students' evaluation. The Assessment Center also provides feedback to students about their evaluation of prior college coursework. Students evaluate prior college coursework to determine if those courses meet the prerequisites of possible courses at De Anza. Once students' make an evaluation, documents are submitted and feedback is provided. For these reasons, the Assessment Center supports the college mission of helping students develop information literacy.

C. Program Demographics

1. How many people does your program/department serve?

8884 # Students

Source: Hyperion for placement

5 Sets of faculty # Faculty

Source: We provide information to

2010-11 Annual Program Review Update

3	De Anza Program	# Staff	Source: We work with Rob Mieso in
	16 high schools	# Community	Source: By coordinating with

Comments: Describe the typical characteristics of the people your program serves - i.e. What are their goals, majors, reasons for coming to your program, etc.

we serve two types of groups. The first group focuses on incoming students who are going through the matriculation process. Our work with Outreach and

2. Number of employees associated with the program?

5	# FT staff	200	Total hrs per wk combined
0	# PT staff	0	Total hrs per wk combined
0	# FT Faculty	0	(FTEF)
0	# PT faculty	0	(FTEF)
0	# Students	0	Total hrs per wk combined

II. SIGNIFICANT CHANGES and TRENDS

A. **If your program offers instruction**, attach your Program Review Data Sheet (from IR). Briefly, address any significant changes and how they have effected your **curriculum / instruction** relative to:

1. Growth or decline in historically underrepresented populations (Latina/o, African Ancestry, Pacific Islander, Filipino)

N/A

2. Trends related to closing the student equity gap relative to the college's stated goals.

N/A

3. Overall enrollment growth or decline of all student populations

N/A

B. Briefly, address any significant changes and how they have effected your program's **services** relative to:

1. Growth or decline in historically underrepresented populations (Latina/o, African Ancestry, Pacific Islander, Filipino)

2010-11 Annual Program Review Update

To facilitate the increase in the number of underrepresented students at De Anza, the Assessment Center works with Outreach and Admissions and Records on the matriculation process for students in local high schools. Outreach helps students complete the online application and then the Assessment Center goes to the high schools to conduct placement testing. In spring 2011, the Assessment Center went to 16 schools, some in the Fremont Union High School District but many in the East Side Union High School District. We are working on how to track the students tested in the high schools to determine if and when they enroll in De Anza.

2. Trends related to closing the student equity gap relative to the college's stated goals.

N/A

3. Overall enrollment growth or decline of all student populations

The number of placement tests administered in 2009-10 was 31782, which is a decline from 36501 in 2008-9. The number of transcripts reviewed for placement in 2009-10 was 774, which is an increase from 473 in 2008-9. There was also a change in what placement recommendations students received. For English, in 2008-9 3% of the students placed into EWRT 1A and 35% placed into EWRT 211. In 2009-10, 44% of students placed into EWRT 1A and 28% placed into EWRT 211. This change was primarily associated with the change in placement of Asian and White students.

C. Make any modifications, deletions, additions, edits, etc. to your 2008-09 Comprehensive Program Review (CPR). Use the spaces below to explain what changes you are making to your CPR and the reasons for those changes (i.e. College/District policies, state or federal laws and regulations, external agencies regulations or requirements, budget cuts, personnel decisions, etc.).

In fall 2009, we started enforcing the Title 5 regulation that placement tests cannot be used by students to bypass a course they have failed or withdrawn from. Implementing this change led to a reduction in the number of tests administered. More importantly, the change led to students staying in classes the last few weeks of each quarter.

D. Use this space to explain anything else about your program that was not included in your 2008-09 Comprehensive Program Review (CPR) or under II.C. What should be known about your program that hasn't been asked?

The primary change not included in the 2008-9 CPR is the transcript review process to clear course prerequisites. In 2008-9, we reviewed 473 and in 2009-10 we reviewed 774. For winter 2011, we reviewed 522 transcripts. More than 80% of the winter 2011 clearances were for college level English or mathematics classes.

2010-11
Annual Program Review Update

III. OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

**If your program offers both instruction and services, complete all of Part III.
If your program does not offer instruction, skip to III. E.**

A. **If your program offers instruction**, describe the number of **SLOAC** that have been completed or will be completed in 2010-11.

N/A

B. **If your program offers instruction**, describe the level of engagement in the 2010-11 **SLOAC** process. (i.e. How many faculty, staff, and administrators participated in the SLOAC process?)

N/A

C. **If your program offers instruction**, what program enhancements are you implementing as a result of the 2010-11 **SLOAC** process? (Only describe planned enhancements that **do not require additional resources**. Enhancements that require new resources will be addressed in Part V.)

D. **If your program offers instruction**, what are your **SLOAC** plans for 2011-12?

N/A

E. Describe the number of **SSLOAC** that have been completed or will be completed in 2010-11.

When we started the SSLOAC process, we had four outcomes. Each was measured and the results were reviewed. We dropped on outcome dealing with students' post-assessment plans because there was little variation in the survey results. As the key variable in the initial outcomes seemed to be test preparation, we added additional survey items about what type of preparation would students be willing to participate in. While we have increased the number of links on our website to practice tests, any on-campus preparation program will need to involve subject area departments. Consequently, we have relayed our results to the DARE committee.

F. Describe the level of engagement in the 2010-11 **SSLOAC** process. (i.e. How many faculty, staff, and administrators participated in the SSLOAC process?)

2010-11 Annual Program Review Update

The five members of the Assessment Center staff participated in developing the four initial outcomes and reviewing the data. All staff were involved in dropping one of the initial outcomes (plan to take the recommended course at De Anza) and adding a new one dealing with students' interest in participating in a preparation program. The information from the new outcome has been shared with the DARE committee, which is looking at similar issues.

G. What program enhancements are you implementing as a result of the 2010-11 **SSLOAC** process? (Only describe planned enhancements that **do not require additional resources**. Enhancements that require new resources will be addressed in Part V.)

The major change was the implementation of April 4 of the new re-test practice. The change encourages students to enroll in the courses recommended by the placement test rather than becoming serial placement test takers. It also encourages students to prepare before taking a placement test. Another project we are working on is the development of a video with Outreach and Financial Aid, funded by the DARE committee. The video will be an orientation to De Anza. Our portion will focus on the importance of preparation for the placement test.

H. What are your **SSLOAC** plans for 2011-12?

An ongoing concern is how to deal with the high volume of students at certain periods of time and the low volume at other times. In an attempt to address these issues, we are working on an appointment scheduling process. Our assessments in 2011-12 will focus on the appointment scheduling process and what works and what needs improvement.

IV. PROGRAM BUDGET DATA

	2009-10 Actual	2010-11 Projected
'A' budget		\$429,885
'B' budget		\$37,920
'C' Budget		
TOTALS	\$0	\$467,805 (automatically calculated)

**If your program is NOT requesting any new resources -
your 2010-11 Annual Program Review Update is finished**

**If your program IS requesting any new resources -
Continue to Part V.**

2010-11
Annual Program Review Update

V. RESOURCE REQUESTS

Department/Program Summary

A. Human Resources: Please submit up to three faculty and/or staff choices below in department/program ranked order:

Program Position Priority #1:

Faculty

Staff

Full-Time

Part-Time

Position Name:

Brief description:

Rationale: How will this person enhance or maintain your program's plans to improve outcomes relative to the college Mission, Institutional Core Competencies, Strategic Initiatives, Program Goals, etc. (i.e. What specific SLOAC/SSLOAC results support the program's need for this position?)

If applicable, address the FTE, PT/FTE ratios, and WSCH goals that support your request for this position.

Program Position Priority #2:

Faculty

Staff

Full-Time

Part-Time

Position Name:

Brief description:

2010-11
Annual Program Review Update

Rationale: How will this person enhance or maintain your program's plans to improve outcomes relative to the college Mission, Institutional Core Competencies, Strategic Initiatives, Program Goals, etc. (i.e. What specific SLOAC/SSLOAC results support the program's need for this position?)

If applicable, address the FTE, PT/FTE ratios, and WSCH goals that support your request for this position.

Program Position Priority #3:

Faculty

Staff

Full-Time

Part-Time

Position Name:

Brief description:

Rationale: How will this person enhance or maintain your program's plans to improve outcomes relative to the college Mission, Institutional Core Competencies, Strategic Initiatives, Program Goals, etc. (i.e. What specific SLOAC/SSLOAC results support the program's need for this position?)

If applicable, address the FTE, PT/FTE ratios, and WSCH goals that support your request for this position.

NOTE: It is an expectation that all positions that are allocated 2 or more years prior to the next Comprehensive Program Review (2013-14) will be assessed relative to their contribution to the program, the program level outcomes and the program review criteria. In this light, briefly state some of the criteria you may use to assess the effect of each of the additional positions on your program.

Review Criteria:

B. Equipment/Materials/Facilities: Please submit up to three resource requests in department/program ranked order:

Program Resource Priority #1:

Equipment

Materials

Facilities

2010-11
Annual Program Review Update

Est. Cost

Item Name:

Brief description:

Rationale: How will this resource enhance or maintain your program's plans to improve outcomes relative to the college Mission, Institutional Core Competencies, Strategic Initiatives, Program Goals, etc. (i.e. What specific SLOAC/SSLOAC results support the program's need for this item?)

Program Resource Priority #2:

Equipment

Materials

Facilities

Est. Cost

Item Name:

Brief description:

Rationale: How will this resource enhance or maintain your program's plans to improve outcomes relative to the college Mission, Institutional Core Competencies, Strategic Initiatives, Program Goals, etc. (i.e. What specific SLOAC/SSLOAC results support the program's need for this item?)

Program Resource Priority #3:

Equipment

Materials

Facilities

Est. Cost

Item Name:

Brief description:

2010-11

Annual Program Review Update

Rationale: How will this resource enhance or maintain your program's plans to improve outcomes relative to the college Mission, Institutional Core Competencies, Strategic Initiatives, Program Goals, etc. (i.e. What specific SLOAC/SSLOAC results support the program's need for this item?)

NOTE: It is an expectation that all resources that are allocated 2 or more years prior to the next Comprehensive Program Review (2013-14) will be assessed relative to their contribution to the program, the program level outcomes and the program review criteria. In this light, briefly state some of the criteria you may use to assess the effect of the additional equipment/materials/facilities on your program.

Review Criteria:

Divisional Summary (If applicable)

C. Human Resources: Of all the position requests within your Division what is the divisional ranking of your department/program position request?

Program Position Priority #1:

Division Position Ranking:

Program Position Priority #2:

Division Position Ranking:

Program Position Priority #3:

Division Position Ranking:

D. Equipment/Materials/Facilities: Of all the resource requests within your Division what is the divisional ranking of your department/program resource request?

Program Resource Priority #1:

Division Resource Ranking:

Program Resource Priority #2:

Division Resource Ranking:

2010-11
Annual Program Review Update

Program Resource Priority #3:

Division Resource Ranking: