BASIC PROGRAM INFORMATION

Program Review is about documenting the discussions and plans you have for improving student success in your program and sharing that information with the college community. It is also about linking your plans to decisions about resource allocations. With that in mind, please answer the following questions.

Department Name: Testing & Assessment Center

Division Name: Counseling

Please list all team members who participated in this Program Review:

Name	Department	Position
Kennedy Bui	Testing & Assessment Center	Assessment Center Supervisor
Fountainetta Coleman	Testing & Assessment Center	Assessment Specialist
Raymond Gerardo	Testing & Assessment Center	Assessment Specialist

Number of Full Time Faculty: 0   **Number of Part Time Faculty:** 0

Please list all existing Classified positions: *Example: Administrative Assistant I*

(1) Assessment Supervisor
(2) Assessment Specialist
(2) TEA – Program Assistant II
(1) TEA – Program Assistant II (on call test proctor during finals week)

List all departments covered by this review and indicate the appropriate program type.

	Certificate	AA / AS	AD-T	Pathway
N/A	☐ Certificate	☐ AA / AS	☐ AD-T	☐ Pathway
	☐ Certificate	☐ AA / AS	☐ AD-T	☐ Pathway
	☐ Certificate	☐ AA / AS	☐ AD-T	☐ Pathway
	☐ Certificate	☐ AA / AS	☐ AD-T	☐ Pathway
	☐ Certificate	☐ AA / AS	☐ AD-T	☐ Pathway

SECTION 1.1: SERVICE AREA DATA

1.1A. Service Area Data:

	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	Data Source
Total Number of Test Administered	**12,286**	**12,714**	**11,012**	**Data Source**
Math/ENG/ESLL Placement Tests*	7887	8065	7407	Accuplacer
Chemistry Placement Tests	326	346	271	MIS/TAC Records
Accommodated Tests	3478	3785	2906	Clockwork
iTEP Tests	153	127	113	Register Blast
Foothill Online Learning	136	76	29	Register Blast
CLRP: MBTI & Strong Assessments	306	316	286	Register Blast

* Placement Test represents Foothill Main Campus & Sunnyvale Center

1.1B. Student Service Trend:

Students Served (Over Past 3 Years): ☐ Increase ☒ Steady/No Change ☐ Decrease

1.1C. Student Demographics: Please describe service trends for the following student groups, comparing the current program-level data with previous data (past 3 years).

	Increase	Steady/No Change	Decrease
African American	☐	☒	☐
Asian	☒	☐	☐
Filipino	☐	☒	☐
Latino/a	☐	☒	☐
Native American	☐	☒	☐
Pacific Islander	☐	☒	☐
White	☐	☒	☐
Decline to State	☐	☐	☒
Male	☐	☒	☐
Female	☐	☒	☐
<25 Years Old	☐	☒	☐
>25 Years Old	☐	☒	☐

Math Placements					
	All Accuplacer Placements			**Placements via Retests**	
Student Group	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**
By Ethnicity					
African American	225 (5%)	207 (5%)	161 (4%)	11 (4%)	14 (4%)
Asian	1091 (24%)	1051 (25%)	1118 (31%)	82 (31%)	135 (37%)
Filipinx	234 (5%)	218 (5%)	188 (5%)	13 (5%)	15 (4%)
Latinx	1375 (31%)	1266 (30%)	1137 (31%)	72 (28%)	102 (28%)
Native American	29 (1%)	16 (0%)	22 (1%)	1 (0%)	2 (1%)
Pacific Islander	75 (2%)	66 (2%)	53 (1%)	2 (1%)	2 (1%)
White	1090 (24%)	1029 (25%)	892 (25%)	59 (23%)	84 (23%)
Ethnicity Not Stated	364 (8%)	329 (8%)	47 (1%)	21 (8%)	10 (3%)
By Gender					
Female	2244 (50%)	2131 (51%)	1800 (50%)	136 (52%)	185 (51%)
Male	2204 (49%)	2016 (48%)	1792 (50%)	124 (48%)	176 (48%)
Gender Not Stated	35 (1%)	35 (1%)	26 (1%)	1 (0%)	3 (1%)
Total	4483 (100%)	4182 (100%)	3618 (100%)	261 (100%)	364 (100%)

Math Placements						
	All Accuplacer Placements			**Placements via Retests**		**Retest Rate**
Student Group	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**	**2016-17**
By Age						
25 or younger	3798 (85%)	3463 (83%)	3082 (85%)	208 (80%)	316 (87%)	10%
26 or older	685 (15%)	717 (17%)	536 (15%)	53 (20%)	48 (13%)	9%
Age not stated	0 (0%)	2 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	n/a
Total	4483 (100%)	4182 (100%)	3618 (100%)	261 (100%)	364 (100%)	10%

Note: Retest data for 2015-16 reflects only part of the year. Percents may not appear to sum due to rounding

English Placements					
	All Accuplacer Placements			**Placements via Retests**	
Student Group	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**
By Ethnicity					
African American	152 (6%)	168 (6%)	120 (4%)	6 (7%)	10 (6%)
Asian	513 (19%)	663 (22%)	684 (24%)	27 (31%)	49 (30%)
Filipinx	177 (7%)	165 (6%)	182 (6%)	4 (5%)	9 (5%)
Latinx	994 (37%)	1043 (35%)	1019 (36%)	30 (34%)	48 (29%)
Native American	24 (1%)	11 (0%)	17 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Pacific Islander	53 (2%)	61 (2%)	53 (2%)	4 (5%)	2 (1%)
White	705 (26%)	726 (25%)	733 (26%)	11 (13%)	42 (26%)
Ethnicity Not Stated	63 (2%)	123 (4%)	35 (1%)	5 (6%)	4 (2%)
By Gender					
Female	1396 (52%)	1520 (51%)	1463 (51%)	45 (52%)	91 (55%)
Male	1263 (47%)	1417 (48%)	1358 (48%)	42 (48%)	71 (43%)
Gender Not Stated	22 (1%)	23 (1%)	22 (1%)	0 (0%)	2 (1%)
Total	2681 (100%)	2960 (100%)	2843 (100%)	87 (100%)	164 (100%)

English Placements						
	All Accuplacer Placements			**Placements via Retests**		**Retest Rate**
Student Group	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**	**2016-17**
By Age						
25 or younger	2226 (83%)	2480 (84%)	2422 (85%)	78 (90%)	146 (89%)	6%
26 or older	454 (17%)	480 (16%)	421 (15%)	9 (10%)	18 (11%)	4%
Age not stated	1 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	n/a
Total	2681 (100%)	2960 (100%)	2843 (100%)	87 (100%)	164 (100%)	6%

Note: Retest data for 2015-16 reflects only part of the year. Percents may not appear to sum due to rounding

ESL Placements					
	All Accuplacer Placements			**Placements via Retests**	
Student Group	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**
By Ethnicity					
African American	9 (1%)	11 (1%)	22 (2%)	1 (3%)	5 (4%)
Asian	359 (37%)	465 (45%)	579 (60%)	21 (58%)	88 (77%)
Filipinx	11 (1%)	7 (1%)	3 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Latinx	108 (11%)	119 (12%)	142 (15%)	3 (8%)	7 (6%)
Native American	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Pacific Islander	5 (1%)	2 (0%)	3 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
White	201 (21%)	188 (18%)	208 (21%)	6 (17%)	13 (11%)
Ethnicity Not Stated	265 (28%)	235 (23%)	15 (2%)	5 (14%)	1 (1%)
By Gender					
Female	512 (53%)	580 (56%)	600 (62%)	20 (56%)	58 (51%)
Male	437 (46%)	441 (43%)	372 (38%)	16 (44%)	56 (49%)
Gender Not Stated	9 (1%)	6 (1%)	1 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total	958 (100%)	1027 (100%)	973 (100%)	36 (100%)	114 (100%)

ESL Placements						
	All Accuplacer Placements			**Placements via Retests**		**Retest Rate**
Student Group	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**	**2016-17**
By Age						
25 or younger	643 (67%)	666 (65%)	609 (63%)	23 (64%)	96 (84%)	16%
26 or older	314 (33%)	361 (35%)	364 (37%)	13 (36%)	18 (16%)	5%
Age not stated	1 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	n/a
Total	958 (100%)	1027 (100%)	973 (100%)	36 (100%)	114 (100%)	12%

Note: Retest data for 2015-16 reflects only part of the year. Percents may not appear to sum due to rounding

1.1D. Equity: One of the goals of the College's Student Equity plan is to close the performance gap for disproportionately impacted students, including African-American, Hispanic/Latino, and Filipino/Pacific Islanders. If your service trend for these students (or other groups not listed above, such as foster youth, veterans, and students with disabilities) is declining, what is your program doing to address this?

The Testing and Assessment Center piloted multiple measures for placement through the use of self-reported high school GPA and high school English/Math course grades (HST). The pilot required students to take the placement assessment and answer background questions to receive a multiple measure placement and students would be given the higher of both results. The pilot began June 14, 2017 and is currently ongoing. The pilot includes placement for the English sequence (ENGL 220, ENGL 110, ENGL 1A), Math 10 and Math 105. The decision rules were based off of the RP Group state validated rules. The Multiple Measure Pilot data reflects students tested from June 14-July21, 2016.

Overall, the data showed an increase in student placement with the use of HST data; with HST data students were able to place out of basic skills courses they would have had to take with the Accuplacer exam alone.

During Fall 2016 multiple measures pilot, 43% of multiple measures math placements were higher than the Accuplacer placement, and 60% of multiple measures English placements were higher than the Accuplacer placement. The student groups who showed the biggest gains with multiple measures were:
- African American students: 67% placed higher in math, and 75% placed higher in English.
- Latinx students: 64% placed higher in math, and 71% placed higher in English.
- Filipinx students: 68% placed higher in English.
- Pacific Islander students: 83% placed higher in English.
- Students age 26 or older: 64% placed higher in math, and 75% placed higher in English.

During the Fall 2016 multiple measures pilot, there was a large increase in the rate of placement into college-level courses:
- 63% of math placements were into college-level courses compared to 40-45% in previous years. The student groups who showed the biggest gains in rate of placement into college-level math were African American students and Filipinx students.
- 66% of English placements were into college-level courses compared to 32-40% in previous years. The student groups who showed the biggest gains in rate of placement into college-level English were African American students, Filipinx students, Latinx students, and Pacific Islander students.

Math:
There were 513 students who received an Accuplacer placement in math during the pilot, and 253 students who received a multiple measures placement. In total, 249 (49%) of the 513 students who received an Accuplacer placement also received a multiple measures placement. Almost half of these multiple measures placements – 108, or 43% – were higher than the corresponding Accuplacer placement. The largest gains were for African American students (67% placed higher), Latinx students (64% placed higher), and students age 26 or older (64% placed higher). It is important to note that the highest possible placement for math via multiple measures was Math 10 / Math 44; there were five higher placements possible via Accuplacer: Math 11, Math 48A, Math 48B / Math 12, Math 48C, and Math 1A.

English:

There were 448 students who received an Accuplacer placement in English during the pilot, and of these students, 261, or 58%, also received a multiple measures placement. (No students received a multiple measures placement in English without a corresponding Accuplacer placement.) More than half of these multiple measures placements – 156, or 60% – were higher than the corresponding Accuplacer placement. The largest gains were for African American students (75% placed higher), Filipinx students (68% placed higher), Latinx students (71% placed higher), Pacific Islander students (83% placed higher), and students age 26 or older (75% placed higher). It is important to note that the highest possible placement for English via multiple measures was English 1A; there was one higher Accuplacer placement possible, English 1A Honors (code 1700).

Placement Increased with HST by Ethnicity

Accuplacer vs. MM Placements Fall 2016 Pilot: June 14-July 21, 2016						
	Math			**English**		
Student Group	**Accuplacer placements**	**MM placements**	**% MM higher**	**Accuplacer placements**	**MM placements**	**% MM higher**
By Ethnicity						
African American	21	6	67%	18	12	75%
Asian	123	75	23%	91	45	49%
Filipinx	36	22	45%	39	22	68%
Latinx	175	61	64%	163	97	71%
Native American	3	1	100%	4	2	0%
Pacific Islander	10	4	25%	9	6	83%
White	140	83	43%	122	77	47%
Ethnicity Not Stated	5	1	0%	2	0	0%
By Gender						
Female	260	128	48%	226	138	62%
Male	249	122	37%	219	121	59%
Gender Not Stated	4	3	33%	3	2	0%
By Age						
25 or Younger	463	231	41%	414	245	59%
26 or Older	49	22	64%	34	16	75%
Age Not Stated	1	0	n/a	0	0	n/a
Total	513	253	43%	448	261	60%

In order to continue working towards the college's equity plan the TAC – in collaboration with faculty, ETS, Evaluations, Institutional Research, and Admissions and Records – will expand the use of multiple measures for placement. By Spring 2018 the TAC will expand the multiple measures pilot to include the following math courses: Math 220, Math 48A, and Math 1A. In addition, the TAC and Institutional Research is developing an ESL survey to capture student data for International, ESL, non-credit, and immigrant students. The goal of the survey is to develop a tool which can be used to assess and place students without educational history.

Other efforts from the TAC to create a more accessible and inclusive testing environment include

translating handouts used into various native languages and enabling web based language translation on our assessment webpage.

1.1E. Service Area: How has assessment and reflection of service-area Student Learning Outcomes (SA-SLOs) led to program changes and/or improvements?

SA-SLO 1: Assessment and reflection of service area outcomes has shown our efforts to provide access to online math study guides through the use of EdReady have increased from 2015-2017. The data depicts a growth in user logins, but also a decline in time logged in. From anecdotal data, students report the program is cumbersome and too time consuming. In an internal study conducted Winter 2017 the data suggest students who use EdReady prior to their assessment test do score higher on Accuplacer than students who do not. The TAC will continue to promote the use of study guides prior to testing.

Year	User Logins	Number of Users Logged on <10 mins.	Data Source
2014-15	795	47	EdReady Report
2015-16	1132	660	EdReady Report
2016-17	1651	1059	EdReady Report

SA-SLO 2: In 2014, the TAC adopted Clockwork to replace the paper accommodated testing process. With Clockwork students and faculty are able to make testing appointments, collect student data, and submit exams/exam rules. The adoption of Clockwork required the collaboration of TAC, DRC and faculty to revise current accommodated testing policies and procedures to support the transition to an online system. The TAC has created online training tutorials, videos, e-mails, and has regularly sent TAC staff to the DRC to assist students to make appointments. It is a privilege of the TAC to provide services for DRC students as we understand the stress associated with testing. Over the past three years, the numbers of student appointments have fluctuated from 2015-2017. Recognizing this variance, the TAC will work closely with the DRC to continue to support DRC students and faculty.

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Data Source
Accommodated Testing Appointments	3478	3785	2906	Clockwork Report

1.1E. SA-SLOs: If your program's SA-SLOs are not being met, please discuss your program objectives aimed at addressing this.

SECTION 1.2: INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM DATA & ENROLLMENT

If your program has an instructional component, please complete Section 1.2.

If your program does not have an instructional component, please skip to Section 2.

1.2A. Transcriptable Program Data: Data will be posted on Institutional Research's website for all measures except non-transcriptable completion. You must manually copy data in the boxes below for every degree or certificate of achievement covered by this program review.

Transcriptable Program	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
N/A			

1.2B. Non-Transcriptable Program Data: Please provide any non-transcriptable completion data you have available. Institutional Research does not track this data; you are responsible for tracking this data.

Non-Transcriptable Program	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
N/A			

Please provide the rationale for offering a non-transcriptable program and share the most recent program completion data.

1.2C. Department Level Data:

	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
Enrollment	N/A		
Productivity			
Course Success			
Full-Time Load (FTEF)			
Part-Time Load (FTEF)			

1.2D. Enrollment Trend:

Program Enrollment (Over Past 3 Years): ☐ Increase ☐ Steady/No Change ☐ Decrease

1.2E. Course Success Trends: Please describe course success trends for the following student groups and compare the program-level data with the college-level data.

	Program-Level Trend			College-Level Comparison		
	Increase	Steady/No Change	Decrease	Above	At Level	Below
African American	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Asian	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Filipino	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Latino/a	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Native American	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Pacific Islander	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
White	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Decline to State	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

1.2F. Course Success Demographics: Please compare the program-level course success rate data for the following student groups with the college-level data.

Male: ☐ Above Level ☐ At Level ☐ Below Level
Female: ☐ Above Level ☐ At Level ☐ Below Level
<25 Years Old: ☐ Above Level ☐ At Level ☐ Below Level
>25 Years Old: ☐ Above Level ☐ At Level ☐ Below Level

1.2G. Equity: One of the goals of the College's Student Equity plan is to close the performance gap for disproportionately impacted students, including African-American, Hispanic/Latino, and Filipinos/Pacific Islanders. If the course success rates for these students (or other groups not listed above, such as foster youth, veterans, and students with disabilities) is below that of the College, what is your program doing to address this?

1.1H Course Enrollment: If there are particular courses that are not getting sufficient enrollment, are regularly cancelled due to low enrollment, or are not scheduled, discuss how your program is addressing this issue.

1.1I. Productivity: Although the college productivity goal is **535**, there are many factors that affect productivity (i.e. seat count / facilities / accreditation restrictions).

Program Productivity Trend: ☐ Increase ☐ Steady/No Change ☐ Decrease
Program Productivity (Compared to College Goal): ☐ Above Goal ☐ At Goal ☐ Below Goal

Please discuss what factors may be affecting your program's productivity.

If your program's productivity is below that of the College, please discuss your program objectives aimed at addressing this.

1.1J. Institutional Standard: This represents the lowest course completion (success) rate deemed acceptable by the College's accrediting body (ACCJC). The institutional standard is **57%**.
Program Level Course Completion: ☐ Above Standard ☐ At Standard ☐ Below Standard
Targeted Student Course Completion: ☐ Above Standard ☐ At Standard ☐ Below Standard
Online Student Course Completion: ☐ Above Standard ☐ At Standard ☐ Below Standard
In-Person/Hybrid Course Completion: ☐ Above Standard ☐ At Standard ☐ Below Standard

1.1K. Institutional Effectiveness (IEPI) Goal: This represents an aspirational goal for course completion (success) rates; all programs should strive to reach/surpass this goal. The IEPI goal is **77%**.
Program Level Course Completion: ☐ Above Goal ☐ At Goal ☐ Below Goal
Targeted Student Course Completion: ☐ Above Goal ☐ At Goal ☐ Below Goal
Online Student Course Completion: ☐ Above Goal ☐ At Goal ☐ Below Goal
In-Person/Hybrid Course Completion: ☐ Above Goal ☐ At Goal ☐ Below Goal

Please comment on your program's efforts to continually improve course completion (success) rates, especially for students with basic skills needs.

If your program's course completion (success) rates are below the institutional standard (see above), please discuss your program objectives aimed at addressing this.

1.1L. Faculty Discussion: Does meaningful dialogue currently take place in shaping, evaluating, and assessing your program's Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, in what venues do these discussions take place? (Check all that apply)
☐ Department Meetings ☐ Opening Day ☐ Online Discussions ☐ Other:

If no, please discuss what is missing and/or the obstacles to ensuring dialogue takes place.

1.1M. Course-Level: How has assessment and reflection of CL-SLOs led to course-level changes?

If your program's CL-SLOs are not being met, please indicate your program objectives aimed at addressing this.

SECTION 2: SUMMARY OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES & RESOURCE REQUESTS

2A. Past Program Objectives/Outcomes: Please list program objectives (not resource requests) from past program reviews and provide an update by checking the appropriate status box.

#1 Customizing Clockwork test & exams functions and establishing policies and procedures	Year: 2017	☒ Completed	☐ Ongoing	☐ No Longer a Goal
#2 Improving Accommodated Testing logistics during finals	Year: 2016	☐ Completed	☒ Ongoing	☐ No Longer a Goal
#3 Multiple Measures for Assessment Placement Pilots: English, Math and ESLL	Year: 2016	☐ Completed	☒ Ongoing	☐ No Longer a Goal
#4 Adoption of Common Assessment	Year: 2016	☐ Completed	☐ Ongoing	☒ No Longer a Goal
#5 Large scale placement testing and Summer Placement: SOAR, SOAR on the Go, Math Summer Bridge, International Student Testing	Year: 2017	☒ Completed	☐ Ongoing	☐ No Longer a Goal
#6 Validation Studies: English, Math, ESLL, and Chemistry	Year: 2016	☐ Completed	☒ Ongoing	☐ No Longer a Goal
#7 Assisting testing service transition from Middlefield Campus to Sunnyvale Campus	Year: 2017	☒ Completed	☐ Ongoing	☐ No Longer a Goal
#8 Academic Integrity for Accommodated & Placement Testing	Year: 2015	☒ Completed	☐ Ongoing	☐ No Longer a Goal

Please comment on any challenges or obstacles with ongoing past objectives.

#2 The limited trained staff and space available to the TAC continues to make proctoring finals for DRC students a challenge. The TAC proctors approximately 300 students during the five days of finals each quarter. The TAC is responsible for confirming all appointments, confirming exam and exam rules (submitted by instructors), providing each student's individual accommodations, and returning all exams to instructors. Furthermore, a number of students require the accommodation of a private room. This continues to be a struggle for the TAC to find rooms and proctors with our limited resources.

Finals Accommodated Testing

	Fall '15	Winter '16	Spring '16	Fall '16	Winter '17	Spring '17
Test Proctored	301	275	299	278	244	241

#3 Multiple Measures Assessment Project Pilot (MMAP): The MMAP Pilot began during Fall quarter 2017 to include placements for the English course sequence, Math 105, and Math 10. Due to changes in staffing, vacancy of critical roles (college researcher), and lack of data; the pilot has not expanded to include the entire Math course sequence, ESL, and Chemistry. With the termination of Common Assessment Initiative and the passage of Assembly Bill 705, the TAC will focus its efforts to establish comprehensive multiple measures to include all necessary course placements. Math faculties have agreed to adopt the RP Group decision rules to expand multiple measure clearance for Math 220, Math 48A, and Math 1A. The TAC plans to fully implement multiple measures for the English and Math sequences by Spring 2018.

#6 Validation Studies for English, ESLL, Math and Chemistry Placement Test Planning: The last validation studies were completed in 2010 by a third party contractor. In Fall 2016, TAC facilitated the Chemistry validation study conducted by the 3SP Researcher and was granted temporary approval. Validation studies have long been an objective of the TAC, but the issuance of the Extended Suspension of Approval Process for Assessment Instrument issued by the CCCCO in May 2016 delayed our efforts to validate in preparation for the Common Assessment system adoption. Furthermore, with the exit of the 3SP Researcher (Spring 2016) and Acting Interim Assessment Supervisor (Spring 2017) validation studies were paused until the hire of the new 3SP Researcher and Assessment Supervisor (October 2017). With the termination of Accuplacer Classic (January 2019), Common Assessment and the signing of Assembly Bill 705, Foothill College has not decided on a new assessment tools, nevertheless will conduct validation studies when selected.

Please provide rationale behind any objectives that are no longer a priority for the program.

#4 Adoption of Common Assessment: During 2015-2016 the TAC and 3SP Research Analyst worked together to improve the integrity of placement testing data and processes to ensure data records would be correct upon the adoption of Common Assessment System. This work continued until Spring 2016 where progress paused due to the departure of the 3SP Research Analyst and acting Assessment Supervisor in Spring 2017. On October 24, 2017 the California Community Colleges Chancellors Office (CCCCO) issued a memo indicating the following:
  * Colleges are to cease further efforts on CCCAssess and CAI.
  * The CAI Advisory Committee and five CAI Work Groups will sunset by the end of 2017.
The Common Assessment Initiative is now expired and therefore no longer an objective for TAC.

2B. New Program Objectives: Please list all new program objectives discussed in Section 1; do <u>not</u> list resource requests in this section.

Program Objective	Implementation Timeline	Progress Measures
Example: Reduce Wait Time for Counselors	*Winter 2016 Term*	*Student Surveys*
#1 Multiple Measures Assessment Pilot expansion: Math Sequence, ESLL and Chemistry	Spring 2018	Project Completion
#2 Validation Studies for English, ESLL, Chemistry, and Math Placement test	Fall 2018	Project Completion
#3 Faculty In-service: Clockwork	Winter 2018	Faculty Survey
#4 Language Access for Non-native Speakers	Spring 2018	Number of non-English speaking student served
#5 Adoption of new Assessment Tool	Fall 2018	Project Completion
#6 Marketing/Informing staff and students regarding Multiple Measures Assessment	Spring 2018	Number of Multiple Measure placements
#7 Increase space availability to meet the accommodation testing needs of students with disability during final exam week	Winter 2018	Increase in room availability

2C. EMP Goals. Please refer to the Educational Master Planning (EMP) <u>website</u> for more information. Indicate which EMP goals are supported by your program objectives (Check all that apply).

☒ Create a culture of equity that promotes student success, particularly for underserved students.
☐ Strengthen a sense of community and commitment to the College's mission; expand participation from all constituencies in shared governance.
☒ Recognize and support a campus culture that values ongoing improvement and stewardship of resources.

2D. Resource Requests: Using the table below, summarize your program's <u>unfunded</u> resource requests. Refer to the Operations Planning Committee (OPC) <u>website</u> for current guiding principles, rubrics and resource allocation information. Be sure to mention the resource request in your narrative above when discussing your program so the request can be fully vetted.

Resource Request	$	Program Objective (Section 2B)	Type of Resource Request			
			Full-Time Faculty/Staff Position	One-Time B-Budget Augmentation	Ongoing B-Budget Augmentation	Facilities and Equipment
Hire one full time or long-term part-time assessment specialist	25,000 to 60,000	All of the objectives need additional personnel support	☒	☐	☐	☐

2E. Unbudgeted Reassigned Time: Please list and provide rationale for requested reassign time.

N/A

2F. Review: Review the resource requests that were granted over the last three years and provide evidence that the resource allocations supported your goals and led to student success.

The TAC has requested an additional full-time assessment specialist in previous Program Reviews in order to sustain necessary security measures and meet student needs. Currently, the TAC functions with a supervisor, two full-time assessment specialists, and three part time TEAs to fill one full-time position.

TAC has always operated with a full-time (40 hours per week) TEA positions and the Testing Team will continue to request the annual renewal of the TEA position. However, ACE has already informed HR that TEA positions will no longer be renewed effective July 1, 2018. The Team is in need of a third permanent, full-time assessment specialist (to replace the TEA positions). The limitations of a TEA position include: loss of programmatic knowledge with the 180 day position expiration; inconsistency of staff schedules; and lack of commitment by temporary staff. When the team is short staffed, the supervisor falls into the assessment specialist role. However, the assessment center supervisor is not a reliable staff back up because the position is responsible to coordinate large scale research projects; attend off campus trainings and conferences; and participate in shared governance meetings and Admin Council responsibilities. Until the Testing Team has full-time, permanent support, the department will continue to struggle to meet the demands of the college and the students.

TAC is requesting the following positions: 1) one full-time assessment specialist staff position or annual funding for the full-time TEA position; and is also requesting funding for 2) one TEA position to work during our times of high volume (June through September to assist with placement testing for incoming new students and during finals week each quarter).

SECTION 3: PROGRAM SUMMARY

3A. Prior Feedback: Address the concerns or recommendations made in prior program review cycles, including any feedback from the Dean/VP, Program Review Committee (PRC), etc.

Concern/Recommendation	Comments
Hire 3SP Researcher	Goal has been met.
Hire Assessment Specialist	Goal not met, ongoing request.
Validation Studies	Please see section 2A.

3B. Summary: What else would you like to highlight about your program (e.g. innovative initiatives, collaborations, community service/outreach projects, etc.)?

Multiple Measures Assessment Project Pilot: The TAC piloted the use of multiple measures in order to make Foothill's placement model more equitable to all student population. The multiple measures pilot was conducted within compliance of CCCCO assessment regulations and the data supports the use of multiple measures for placement. The TAC is currently in the process of expanding multiple measures pilot assessment for the Math sequence (Math 220, 48A, 1A) and implementing an ESL survey to gather data for possible placemen to use. Multiple measures satisfy the requirements of AB705 and allow more students into college level courses. Data reflected in section 1.1D

Large Scale Placement Testing: From 2015-2017 the TAC participated in several large scale testing events including SOAR, SOAR on the go, Math Summer Bridge, Welcome Wednesday and International Student Orientation. These events allow Foothill College to connect directly with the community it serves and prepares students to begin/continue their college career.

Placement Testing Event:	Dates:	Location:	# of Tests Proctored:	# Staff
High School Outreach Event #1	1/20/16	Morgan Hill Academy	16	2
High School Outreach Event #2	4/12/16	Woodside High	37	2
SOAR #1	6/4/16	TAC & 8401	214	8
SOAR #2	7/11/16	TAC	70	4
Non-Credit ESLL Course #1	7/19/16	Middlefield Campus	6	1
Non-Credit ESLL Course #2	7/21/16	Middlefield Campus	18	1
Math Summer Bridge #1	7/28/16	PSME Center & Labs	38	1
SOAR #3	8/1/16	TAC	58	4
Math Summer Bridge #2	8/11/16	PSME Center & Labs	67	1
Math Summer Bridge #3	8/25/16	PSME Center & Labs	67	1
Summer International Student Orientation Day 1	8/29/16	TAC	119	4
Summer International Student Orientation Day 2	8/30/16	TAC	70	4
SOAR #4	8/30/16	TAC	11	4
Welcome Wednesday	9/21/16	TAC, Drop In Program	106	4
High School Outreach Event	4/25/17	Woodside High School	30	3
High School Outreach Event	5/4/17	Palo Alto High School	12	1
High School Outreach Event	5/11/17	Mountain View High School	90	5
Sunnyvale SOAR	5/23/17	Sunnyvale Campus	94	7
SOAR #5	6/24/17	Foothill Campus	210	5
Math Summer Bridge	8/10/17	Foothill Campus	61	2
ESL Summer Intensive	8/17/17	Foothill Campus	8	2
Fall International Student Orientation	9/6/17 9/7/17	Foothill Campus	385	4
SOAR#6	9/11/17	Foothill Campus	44	4
Math Summer Bridge	9/15/17	Foothill Campus	80	2
Winter International Student Orientation	12/6/17 12/7/17	TAC	42	4

SECTION 4: LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

4A. Attach 2015-2016 Service-Area Outcomes: Four Column Report for SA-SLO Assessment from TracDat. Please contact the Office of Instruction to assist you with this step if needed.

4B. Attach 2015-2016 Course-Level Outcomes: Four Column Report for CL-SLO Assessment from TracDat. Please contact the Office of Instruction to assist you with this step if needed.

SECTION 5: FEEDBACK AND FOLLOW-UP

This section is for the Dean/Supervising Administrator to provide feedback.

5A. Strengths and successes of the program as evidenced by the data and analysis:

The Testing & Assessment Center is unique at Foothill in that the center is responsible for serving two distinct student populations with different purposes: 1) provide proctoring for students in the Disability Resource Services (DRC) needing accommodated testing; and 2) provide placement testing for English, English as Second Language, math and chemistry. In addition, the Center is an official testing site for International Test of English Proficiency (iTEP), a language assessment for non-native English speakers. Compared to the last comprehensive program review, it is evident that over the past three years, the Testing & Assessment Center has made tremendous improvement on the service delivery and has successfully implemented new initiatives for both accommodated testing and placement testing.

In regards to accommodated testing, the Center has worked hard to collaborate with DRC and the teaching faculty to establish mutually agreed upon process and procedures to achieve consistency. Guidelines for both instructors and DRC students are clear and accessible. The TAC staff has undergone extensive and consistent training on Clockworks and the rules of proctoring students with disabilities to ensure academic integrity. An Assessment Specialist is assigned to participate in the DRC weekly case management meetings. Working closely with the DRC counselors and Accommodations Coordinator have resulted in better case management of special needs students. The TAC team has worked hard to earn respect and collaboration from the instructional faculty. The team has been mobile in going on SOAR-on-the Go in local high schools and the Sunnyvale Center to provide placement testing to new college students.

In regards to placement testing, the Assessment Supervisor has played a key role in the successful implementation of the Multiple Measure Pilot on campus for English, ESLL and math. With the continued success, as evidenced by data, the faculty are now willing to expand the pilot to additional course placement. The hiring of the 3SP Institutional Researcher has been critical in validating the multiple measures and providing the much-needed data for faculty and the Assessment Taskgroup. It is a continuous collaboration that the Assessment Supervisor must sustain with the division deans in both Language Arts and Physical Science Math & Engineering, as well as the faculty, and the Admissions department. It is exciting to see the data of the multiple measure placements and how it plays an important role in bringing equity to our disproportionately impacted student groups.

The current team of the supervisor and two specialists is dynamic, efficient and culturally competent. The success of the Testing & Assessment Center is the testament of the staff's commitment to provide a professional and student-centered environment and service to our students. They are doing a fantastic job with such a small team and with so many different functions and objectives.

5B. Areas of concern, if any:

A continued concern is the lack of space, especially private rooms, for DRC students who need accommodated testing during final exams week. With an average of 300 students needing accommodated testing in a span of four days, it is extremely challenging to find the physical space to meet student demand. At Foothill, instructors require synchronized time for accommodated testers and in-class testers. As a result, there isn't enough space in TAC to serve all the students. Even with the addition of a classroom reserved for final exams, students are crammed together in a small space, which

create distractions for students who are supposed to be testing in a distraction free environment. The Assessment Supervisor and I are working hard to find more classrooms for final exam time.

During final exam week, TAC is overwhelmed with the demand of accommodated testing. Since TAC staff can only proctor, they cannot make any decision regarding accommodation needs. It is critical that we have the support of the DRC Supervisor and staff. We will be working with DRC to have the Accommodations Coordinator housed in TAC during final exams to directly resolve student and instructor issues and concerns relating to accommodations. This will alleviate the high level of anxiety from students and the volume of concerns expressed by faculty.

A second continued concern is the lack of staffing to meet all the program objectives outlined. For many years, the Center has depended on a minimum of two full-time Temporary Employment Assignments (TEAs) since two full-time Assessment Specialists simply cannot meet the daily operations of both accommodated testing and placement testing. With the bargaining unit, ACE, objecting to continued use of TEAs, TAC must be able to hire either a full-time Assessment Specialist or a permanent part-time specialist in order to keep the current level of operations.

5C. Recommendations for improvement:

Continue to work closely with the 3SP Institutional Researcher and the College Assessment Taskgroup to continue the important work of multiple measures and the implementation of AB705. There are many uncertainties at this time regarding the state requirements and with Accuplacer phasing out. It is recommended that De Anza and Foothill can agree to the same multiple measures in order to better serve our students within the FHDA District.

5D. Recommended Next Steps:
       ☒ Proceed as Planned on Program Review Schedule
       ☐ Further Review / Out-of-Cycle In-Depth Review

Lan Truong
Dean of Counseling Division

This section is for the <u>Vice President/President</u> to provide feedback.

5E. Strengths and successes of the program as evidenced by the data and analysis:

The team at the TAC has made great efforts to manage requirements effecting student testing and their adjustment to adding multiple measures to the process of placing students. I appreciate the team's willingness to work with the DRC faculty and staff to serve students receiving accommodations for testing, which I know creates many challenges.

5F. Areas of concern, if any:

With the college budget issues, it is unknown if we will be able to fill another testing assistant position.

5G. Recommendations for improvement:

None

5H. Recommended Next Steps:
- ☐ Proceed as Planned on Program Review Schedule
- ☐ Further Review / Out-of-Cycle In-Depth Review

Denise Swett, VPSS   2/11/18

Upon completion of <u>Section 5</u>, the Program Review document should be returned to department faculty/staff for review, then submitted to the Office of Instruction and Institutional Research for public posting. Please refer to the Program Review timeline.