

Administrative Response to Program Review - Testing

Prepared by Linda Reisser, Dean of Student Development

9/26/07

The Testing staff created a well-written program review, and conducted an excellent, thought-provoking presentation on July 10, 2007.

The program review deserves commendation for the following:

- summarizing the functions, staffing levels, space currently provided, and usage of testing services;
- describing accomplishments during the past three years;
- presenting the data in a clear and attractive format, with photos, charts, and colorful graphics;
- using National College Testing Association (NCTA) standards to assess operations;
- conducting a survey of student satisfaction, suggestions, etc.;
- including goals for 2007-09;
- emphasizing professional development;
- summarizing both strengths and areas for improvement;
- presenting a very helpful set of recommendations.

The Testing staff has made significant contributions to PCC by:

- assisting with the transition from ASSET to COMPASS;
- participating in the pilot of COMPASS-ESL, and integrating it into the testing system;
- creating an informative webpage;
- participating in the LEAN process;
- continuing to evolve and experiment in order to serve more students, with efficiency and good customer service.

Areas for Improvement

1. Clear standards

Standards used to assess program effectiveness could have been stated with more specificity. While giving a general list of goals under "Mission," and including a very detailed list of NCTA Standards in the Appendix, there was not a clear statement of service standards (e.g., what should an effective Testing Office be doing?).

2. Reports to assist decision-makers

We were pleased with the display of information in the review, and would like to encourage regular reporting in order to inform decisions.

Examples:

- placement results (how many students are placed into which levels)
- revenue generated by testing of non-students
- number of students tested and units used at each campus, each term and annually
- number of retests
- trends (e.g., over a three-year period)
- data that support changes in space, personnel, or other resources.

We understand that efforts were made to generate some of these reports, but they couldn't be completed before the program review presentation.

3. Evaluation/Recommendations re. Testing Guidelines

The Program Review stated that "There has not been a comprehensive study on the effectiveness and appropriateness of the ACT COMPASS product as the placement testing tool for PCC since its adoption in 2004." While this is true, the Institutional Effectiveness Office conducted a study of the success rate of students in Reading, Writing and Math, based on Compass vs. ASSET placement. The Deans and Associate Deans need to continue gathering and analyzing data, reviewing cut scores and retesting guidelines, and determine if more comprehensive evaluation or further comparison with the other computerized test (Accuplacer) is appropriate.

Program Review Recommendations

1. Clearer Direction

The recommendation that PCC Management provide direction, and the inclusion of three scenarios, will be helpful in planning and further discussion at administrative levels. Heather Lang and the Associate Deans of Student Development will provide leadership. Generally, the Deans support the medium view, with service to our current students as highest priority. We need to carefully review how many contracted services we can provide. If there is demand, and we have the resources, providing them is a service to the community.

2. Adequate Space, Personnel and Resources

More specific recommendations for space, personnel, and resources would be helpful. This information is actually needed immediately in order to propose changes in space for testing into the 2008 Bond proposal. We need to assure that we have the resources to provide proctored testing when instructors cannot provide make-up testing or distance learning testing.

3. Additional GED Testing Site(s)

The Deans of Student Development have indicated support for expanding GED testing in Washington County. Discussions are currently underway regarding options.

4. Accommodations for OSD Students/Universal Design

Steps are being taken to move in the direction of integrating proctored exams as OSD accommodations, with adequate space. Further proposals are needed if the campus testing centers are going to provide the budget for proctoring. Space and design proposals need to be clarified and promoted.

5. Consistent Procedures, Communication, and Reporting

This is an excellent recommendation, and we encourage the Associate Deans of Student Development to provide support and coordination.

Overall, we appreciate the efforts of all who produced this first Program Review for Testing, and the ongoing work done by the staff over the years. You have provided vital services for students entering PCC!