



## Aggregated Data Analysis (The “Yellow Tables”) Overview

Each year, the Assessment Office aggregates the “0-4 scores” on programs’ signature assignment data around college, university, and national standards. These data are summarized and grouped in a series of aggregate analysis tables, known informally as the “yellow tables” due to their yellow shading. This document provides an overview of the purpose of this process, how it works, how the tables are used, and how programs might use the data.

### History, Evolution and Purpose

The university, CTC, and NCATE ask that the college aggregate student learning data *across* programs to assess unit success in supporting student learning. The Yellow Tables were developed by the Assessment Office in Fall 2008 to report this aggregate data, after the Assessment Committee decided that an overall 0-4 score for each signature assignment would provide a way for the college to collect comparable data while giving individual programs flexibility in how they assessed student learning.

In Fall 2013, based on CTC feedback as well as NCATE expectations, the yellow tables were modified to include “pathways” data for programs that have a variety of pathways to completion.

### How It Works

The Yellow Tables address 3 sets of standards: 1) the college’s Conceptual Framework; 2) CSULB learning outcomes; 3) NCATE standards (for NCATE programs only).

Each program’s data is linked to standards based on the program’s assessment plan. *Program faculty* have mapped learning outcomes to one or more elements in multiple sets of standards (e.g., SLO 5 maps to the conceptual framework standard of “innovation”) on the assessment plan. The Assessment Office then aggregates the 0-4 score for each program’s signature assignment mapped to a particular standard. In general, a single assignment that is mapped to multiple SLOs (e.g., fieldwork) is not included in average since this would create redundancy in the data. A simple average (non-weighted) of programs’ means is then reported for each standard.

At the program level, then, the Yellow Tables are a way to look at SLO data aggregated around standards.

### How the Tables are Used

The Yellow Tables are used in several ways:

- The tables are shared with the university assessment office in each annual report the college prepares.
- Both program-level and unit-level data in tables are reviewed each fall by the Assessment Committee. The committee has identified a score of less than 3.0 as the point at which it asks a department chair to contact the program coordinator regarding the score and report back to the committee.
- The tables are on the Assessment Office web site and used as part of each accreditation visit.

*Programs are not compared based on these results.* Given the college's focus on assessment at the program level (with signature assignments and rubrics), it is not possible to use the data to compare programs. Rather, the data provide a snapshot of how an *individual* program is doing on each standard as well as the college as a whole.

## How Programs Can Use the Yellow Tables

There are several questions program faculty might ask themselves about the data in the yellow tables:

- (Reviewing the assessment plan) Are our SLOs mapped correctly to the standards? Should we contact the Assessment Office to make revisions?
- On what standards are we doing especially well? What SLOs are associated with these standards? What lessons can we draw from this?
- Are there standards on which we are struggling? If so, why? (As with general SLO data, explanations may include student performance, a problem with the assignment or rubric, especially rigorous expectations, etc.) What changes can we make to improve student success?

## FAQs

### 1. Is all SLO data included in the Yellow Tables?

No. The Assessment Office generally does not include data for an assignment (e.g., fieldwork) that cuts across multiple SLOs, as this would create redundancy in the averages across standards.

### 2. Are programs with an average below 3.0 for a standard “in trouble”?

No. The Assessment Committee asks chairs to follow up with programs with any average below 3.0 only to understand the situation. Experience has shown programs are well-aware of any issues, are able to provide clear explanations, and are taking steps to address them even before contacted by the chair.

### 3. The “N” for a given standard looks far larger than the number of students in my program. Why is this?

In most cases, a large N appears because a program has mapped multiple SLOs (and, therefore, signature assignments) to a given standard. This has a sort of multiplier effect, as the Assessment Office aggregates the data across all relevant SLOs, resulting in a higher N. Consult your assessment plan first, to see whether multiple SLOs are mapped to the standard in question. If not, please contact the Assessment Office.

### 4. The “N” for a given standard looks smaller than I would expect. Why is this?

The most common reason for this is that data for a particular signature assignment were not reported for the given period. Perhaps a course was not offered, or perhaps the data were not turned in to the Assessment Office. However, it is also possible that the Assessment Office missed linking data that was reported and should have been aggregated. Therefore, if you notice this problem please contact the Assessment Office.

### 5. What should programs do with these data?

These tables are shared for informational purposes only. We ask that you review the data for your program, but no additional action is required. If, however, you have questions or notice areas of concern (e.g., there is an error in how an SLO has been mapped to a standard), please contact the Assessment Office.