



Assessment Committee

Assessment and Continuous Improvement Consensus Feedback

October 19, 2021

Dear Karita Maltos:

Thank you for submitting your 2021 Assessment and Continuous Improvement (ACI) Report to the Assessment Committee.

As your colleagues, the Assessment Committee deeply appreciates the effort you and your team have made in preparing these materials so that we can fully understand the department goals, successes, and challenges. As you know, the assessment process is a peer-review support process to ensure collaborative engagement in continuous improvement with the intent to better meet our students' needs and thoroughly follow through on our commitment to the NWCCU accreditation process and requirements.

The Assessment Committee members each review the report, score each section based on a common rubric, and provide comments. Following the individual scoring process, the Committee convenes a meeting to review the scores, comments and discuss the strengths and any shortcomings in the report. The Committee also addresses any disparities that might occur between individual scores and works to build consensus to ensure a shared understanding of specific feedback the Committee will provide to the department.

In the attached document, the Committee provides a Consensus Summary Report with detailed criterion scores and narrative feedback. Your overall score was **3.63** (out of 4.0).

According to the protocol, the next ACIR is due **September 30, 2024**.

Please see the attached Assessment and Continuous Improvement Report Rubric, provided to assist with ongoing department development. If you have questions, need support, or need resources please contact accreditation@heritage.edu.

The members of the Assessment Commitment, appreciate your commitment to assessment and continuous improvement.

Assessment Committee (2021-2022)

Melissa Hill, Co-Chair

Kazu Sonoda, Co-Chair

Marisol Rodriguez-Price

Shawna Martin

SaraBecca Martin

Aaron Krantz

Renae Harris

Isaias Guerrero

Karita Maltos

Martin Valadez

Jim Dugan, guest

Gloria Jones-Dance, guest

Mary James, guest

| | |
|--|---|
| Rubric Level 4 (Highly Developed) Descriptor | Focused Summary of Feedback (A score of 3 or above indicates meeting the standard) |
| Goals Measureable goals to support and achieve the purpose and mission of HU | Score: 3.8 out of 4 |
| Goals – Highly Developed Descriptor Measureable goals explicitly support the purpose and are aligned to the HU mission and strategic goals | Comments: The goals listed are very much in alignment with HU and its service to its student population. It is admirable that the ASC opted to refine the department mission within the context of the HU mission and strategic plan. This section could be improved if some connection to student achievement as a result of attending tutoring could be evident. |
| Measures (Tools) & Data Sources tool used to measure outcomes | Score: 3.9 out of 4 |
| Measures (Tools) & Data Sources – Highly Developed Descriptor Measures and tools address all aspects of the goals, provide measurable results, and adequate data for analysis | Comments: Introduction and changing landscape provides context for discussion of measures and data sources. Measures address goals, are measurable, and provide adequate data for analysis. |
| Evidence (Target/ Benchmark) measureable results lead to goal achievement | Score: 3.5 out of 4 |
| Evidence (Target/ Benchmark) – Highly Developed Descriptor Measurable levels of achievement have been specified for all measures and represent success at achieving the goals | Comments: Levels of achievement have been specified for the measures. Challenges identified and plan to address gaps in meeting student learning needs. |
| Results & Analysis data collected, results analyzed | Score: 3.8 out of 4 |
| Results & Analysis – Highly Developed Descriptor Results are available for all goals, aggregated and analyzed by the department. Results are used to plan and address gaps/weaknesses identified as a result of analysis | Comments: Detailed analysis presented, both quantitative and qualitative. Gaps in the assessment measure itself were noted. Areas where benchmarks weren't met were clearly articulated, indicating transparent self-reflection by ASC staff. Results and Analysis have clear deadlines and have task well-coordinated. |
| Continuous Improvement document changes made or next steps | Score: 3.4 out of 4 |
| Continuous Improvement – Highly Developed Descriptor Analysis of data, disaggregated in categories relevant to equity, by department leads to documented change in process, policy, procedures, measures, or assessment. There is a detailed action plan with specific changes to be implemented, including responsible parties and plan to evaluate changes | Comments: Data has been used to identify student populations who would best benefit from the use of ASC but do not utilize the resource. Data were disaggregated to help determine areas of inequity. Departmental change strategies are explicitly detailed. Additional plans for continuous improvement are evident in reviewing goal language to ensure alignment with the HU strategic plan. Plans for improving outcomes in areas where benchmarks were unmet are clearly articulated. Suggestion to amend goal 3 seems like a wise choice, as this goal could be more concrete. |

| | |
|--|--|
| Information Sharing | Score: 3.4 out of 4 |
| Information Sharing – Highly Developed Descriptor Results, analysis, and continuous improvement plan are shared with stakeholders identified in Assessment Plan. Discussion and feedback from stakeholders is documented | Comments: Succinct description of successes and concerns. The table with the action summary is brilliant and helpful for follow up review of continuous improvement in the future. Resources needed for changes are articulated, and evident by the content of the report as a whole. The Committee suggests that sharing of data could also occur with student government, and proactively with the VPs to potentially garner more support for the ASC (in the area of marketing, for example). |

Overall Consensus Feedback

Receipt of CRLA certification is a testament to the strength of the ASC. This is a detailed, clear, thorough, and concise report of the ASC. Analysis of goals and strategies for continuous improvement are appropriate and achievable with support from the institution. The narrative of the report provides context for the revitalization and improvement of service design and tutor training. The Committee is excited to see how the ASC evolves with the return to campus and beyond.

The Committee would like permission from the department to use this report as a model to help other departments develop their reports in the future.