# GAVILAN COLLEGE

# College Status Report on
# Student Learning Outcomes Implementation

## May 25, 2012

**Submitted by:**

Gavilan College
5055 Santa Teresa Boulevard
Gilroy, CA 95020
www.gavilan.edu

**To:**

The Accrediting Commission for
Community and Junior Colleges
of the Western Association of
Schools and Colleges

## ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

### COLLEGE STATUS REPORT ON STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES IMPLEMENTATION

**INSTRUCTIONS**

Colleges are asked to use this report form in completing their *College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation.* Colleges should submit a brief narrative analysis and quantitative and qualitative evidence demonstrating status of Student Learning Outcome (SLO) implementation. The report is divided into sections representing the bulleted characteristics of the Proficiency implementation level on the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, Part III (Rubric). Colleges are asked to interpret their implementation level through the lens of the Accreditation Standards cited for each characteristic. The final report section before the evidence list requests a brief narrative self-assessment of overall status in relationship to the proficiency level, indicating what plans are in place to mitigate any noted deficiencies or areas for improvement. **Narrative responses for each section of the template should not exceed 250 words.**

This report form offers examples of quantitative and qualitative evidence which might be included for each of the characteristics. The examples are illustrative in nature and are not intended to provide a complete listing of the kinds of evidence colleges may use to document SLO status. College evidence used for one Proficiency level characteristic may also serve as evidence for another characteristic.

This report is provided to colleges in hard copy and also electronically, by e-mail, as a fill-in Word document. The reports must be submitted to the Commission by either the October 15, 2012 date or the March 15, 2013 date, as defined on the enclosed list of colleges by assigned reporting date. When the report is completed, colleges should:

  a. Submit the report form by email to the ACCJC (accjc@accjc.org); **and**

  b. Submit the full report *with attached evidence* on CD/DVD to the ACCJC (ACCJC, 10 Commercial Blvd., Suite 204, Novato, CA 94949).

Although evidence cited in the text of the report may include links to college web resources, the Commission requires actual copies (electronic files) of the evidence for its records.

### COLLEGE INFORMATION: DATE OF REPORT; COLLEGE; SUBMITTED BY; CERTIFICATION BY CEO

Date of Report:  May 25, 2012

Institution's Name: Gavilan Community College District

Name and Title of Individual Completing Report:  Kathleen Rose, Executive Vice President and Chief Instruction Officer; Randy Brown, Director, Institutional Research.

Telephone Number and E-mail Address: (408) 848-4760 krose @gavilan.edu

Certification by Chief Executive Officer: *The information included in this report is certified as a complete and accurate representation of the reporting institution.*

Name of CEO: Kathleen Rose          Signature:  Kathleen Rose
                                               (e-signature permitted)

<table>
<tr><td>

**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND AUTHENTIC ASSESSMENTS ARE IN PLACE FOR COURSES, PROGRAMS, SUPPORT SERVICES, CERTIFICATES AND DEGREES.**

</td></tr>
</table>

Eligibility Requirement 10: Student Learning and Achievement

Standards: I.A.1; II.A.1.a; II.A.1.c; II.A.2.a,b,e,f,g,h,i; II.A.3[See II.A.3.a,b,c.]; II.A.6; II.B.4; II.C.2].

**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE:** Evidence demonstrating numbers/percentages of course, program (academic and student services), and institutional level outcomes are in place and assessed. Documentation on institutional planning processes demonstrating integrated planning and the way SLO assessment results impact program review. Descriptions could include discussions of high-impact courses, gateway courses, college frameworks, and so forth.

**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NUMERICAL RESPONSE**
**QUANTITATIVE EVIDENCE/DATA ON THE RATE/PERCENTAGE OF SLOS DEFINED AND ASSESSED**

1.  Courses
    a.  Total number of college courses (active courses in the college catalog, offered on the schedule in some rotation): <u>887</u>
    b.  Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: <u>887</u>
        Percentage of total: <u>100%</u>
    c.  Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: <u>612</u>
        Percentage of total: <u>69%</u>

2.  Programs
    a.  Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college): <u>93</u>
    b.  Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes: <u>93</u>;
        Percentage of total: <u>100%</u>
    c.  Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: <u>39</u>;
        Percentage of total: <u>42%</u>

3.  Student Learning and Support Activities
    a.  Total number of student learning and support activities (as college has identified or grouped them for SLO implementation): <u>35</u>
    b.  Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: <u>33</u>;
        Percentage of total: <u>94%</u>
    c.  Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: <u>33</u>; Percentage of total: <u>94%</u>

4.  Institutional Learning Outcomes
    a.  Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined: <u>22</u>
    b.  Number of institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment: <u>11</u>

**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NARRATIVE RESPONSE**

Individual courses and programs have developed Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and are reviewed on a regular cycle by the college's curriculum committee. The assessment of these SLOs is well under way at the course level, with nearly 70% of all courses having been assessed at least once (e.g. 1.1 & 1.2). This work has been used to inform modifications in curriculum, assessment, and pedagogy (see above examples). The course, program, and institutional-level assessments are reported through an online interface, which details the assessment instrument, the results and how the results were used (1.3). A reporting function on the site summarizes the proportion of courses assessed, when they were last assessed, and who reported the data.

In addition to course level assessment, 94% of non-instructional programs, e.g., Human Resources, Tutoring Center, are regularly assessing and reporting upon their outcomes (1.4). For instructional programs, 42% have assessed and reported upon this work (1.5), while 50% of the institutional SLOs have been assessed. SLO data has been used to modify services, curriculum, and inform budget requests (1.6).

Both instructional and non-instructional program-level SLO data is used in the annual program review process and is used to inform annual program plans. These plans are the basis for the college's annual allocation process (1.7).

**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 2: THERE IS A WIDESPREAD INSTITUTIONAL DIALOGUE ABOUT ASSESSMENT RESULTS AND IDENTIFICATION OF GAPS.**

Standards: I.B.1; I.B.2; I.B.3; I.B.5.

**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE:** Documentation on processes and outcomes of SLO assessment. Specific examples with the outcome data analysis and description of how the results were used. Descriptions could include examples of institutional changes made to respond to outcomes assessment results.

**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 2: NARRATIVE RESPONSE**
Outcome data is periodically shared in campus governance committees, specifically the Curriculum Committee, the Learning Council, the President's Council, the Academic Senate and the Department Chairs. Data is regularly presented from the Office of Institutional Research and time is provided for discussion regarding the impact of assessments on teaching and learning (2.1 & 2.2).

In an effort to track the effect of the curriculum modifications, Gavilan College developed the Gavilan Integrated Data System (GIDS) which provides a desktop aid for all faculty and staff to track persistence and retention changes among other data. This data tool has been utilized in discussions at the departmental level and used in annual program plan preparation. The most current enhancement of the system includes a cohort tracking functionality that has begun to be utilized (2.3 & 2.4).

As the results of college wide gap analysis, a cross-disciplinary group was established to conduct dialogue and planning around student learning. The Learning Council has repeatedly used data and

information to discuss and develop interventions (2.5). As a result of the Learning Council, the shift over the past two years has been evident: from a community of teaching to a community of learning. The Teaching and Learning Center, as well as the Student Success Center have been established on campus as a result of this shift. These developments have been influenced by the ubiquity of SLO and other data (2.6).

Individual departments and instructors have also used SLO and course success data to advance campus-wide developments. For example, as a result of the gaps identified by SLOs (2.7), the ESL, English and Math departments have completed the screening and placement preparation to implement Accuplacer in fall 2012.

Through the college's program planning and allocation process, individual programs are encouraged to use data to inform their objectives and corresponding budget requests. These objectives and requests are assigned a ranked score, which includes data support as one of the ranking criteria (2.8).

**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 3: DECISION MAKING INCLUDES DIALOGUE ON THE RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT AND IS PURPOSEFULLY DIRECTED TOWARD ALIGNING INSTITUTION-WIDE PRACTICES TO SUPPORT AND IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING.**

Standards: I.B; I.B.3; II.A.1.c; II.A.2.f; III.A.1.c; IV.A.2.b.

**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE:** Documentation of institutional planning processes and the integration of SLO assessment results with program review, college-wide planning and resource allocation, including evidence of college-wide dialogue.

**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 3: NARRATIVE RESPONSE**
SLO assessment and results are included in the program review which occurs every five years for all campus instructional and non-instructional programs. These results are used by programs to reflect on past and current progress, and to plan for the future (3.1). These five-year reviews are also the basis for the annual program plans, which map out specific activities to accomplish program objectives. These annual program plans are scored and ranked based on criteria (including SLOs, PLOs, and ILOs) that emphasize the use of planning data.

SLO and other data have been a part of the development of the strategic plan, educational master plan, and annual program plans. For example, the Student Services Council annually reflects on its data and uses it to propose additional staffing in multiple areas (3.2). The college has also developed a model for innovation and college dialogue, the Learning Council. This group takes information and input from all sectors of the campus, including students, to formulate and implement strategies to improve student learning and success. The group has successfully implemented an early alert system and several new services to support Veteran students. A board policy was developed through the work of the Learning Council to formalize the college's commitment to ongoing student success efforts (3.3). This group uses dialogue and assessment data to understand and address issues of student learning (See 2.2).

**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 4: APPROPRIATE RESOURCES CONTINUE TO BE ALLOCATED AND FINE-TUNED.**

Standards: I.B; I.B.4; I.B.6; III.C.2; III.D.2.a; III.D.3.

**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE:** Documentation on the integration of SLO assessment results with institutional planning and resource allocation.

**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 4: NARRATIVE RESPONSE**
Since Fall 2006, a series of formal trainings have been conducted to increase faculty, staff, and administration understanding of SLOs and how to assess and report upon results (4.1 & 4.2). More importantly, the current SLO coordinator has provided individual support sessions. These sessions include providing information and directly answering individual questions. In 10/11 the coordinator provided 4 formal trainings, and 41 support sessions.

The college has also developed an easy-to-use online reporting system that has been used to report and summarize college SLO work. The Management Information System department also supports and updates the site to keep it current with changes in curriculum and college organizational structure.

In addition to the support provided by the SLO coordinator, the college has been providing financial compensation for part-time instructors who are the only non-full-time instructor for a particular course. Part-time instructors are compensated for assessing and reflecting upon and reporting SLO work.

Looking forward, the college has approved the use of three 20% reassignments for full-time or part-time faculty members to become Instructional Liaisons to carry forward the work of the SLO coordinator (who is also the institutional researcher). The work will include: training on current practices and requirements for SLOs and PLOs; educating other faculty about how to develop, evaluate, assess, and document SLOs and PLOs; and directly assisting faculty with the assessment and reporting processes.

**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 5: COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT REPORTS EXIST AND ARE COMPLETED AND UPDATED ON A REGULAR BASIS.**

Standards: I.A.1; I.B; I.B.3; I.B.5; I.B.6; II.A.2.a; II.B.

**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE:** Documentation on the process and cycle of SLO assessment, including results of cycles of assessment. Copies of summative assessment reports, with actual learning outcomes.

**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 5: NARRATIVE RESPONSE**
Each course and program is required to report their assessment work using an online reporting system. The reporting system allows a user to select a course or program and the year that the assessment data was collected (5.1). The user reports the outcome, the assessment tool used to collect the data, the assessment results, and how the assessment results were used. At the course level, the SLO is also aligned with the appropriate program-level outcome(s). A similar form is also used for non-instructional programs (1.1 & 1.4). A reporting function on this same site allows the user to view when

and by whom the last assessment was reported for all of the courses and programs on record.  As a part of the curriculum update process, each course and program is required to regularly assess course and program-level SLOs (5.2).

In some cases, the results from the assessment reporting site are supplemented by additional reports that provide greater detail.  For example, the tutoring center survey or the English portfolio report is available online through the institutional research site and provides greater detail regarding the assessment and results (5.3 & 5.4).

**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 6: COURSE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ARE ALIGNED WITH DEGREE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES.**

Standards: II.A.2.e; II.A.2.f; II.A.2.i.

**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE:** Documentation on the alignment/integration of course level outcomes with program outcomes.  Description could include curriculum mapping or other alignment activities. Samples across the curriculum of institutional outcomes mapped to program outcomes.

**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 6: NARRATIVE RESPONSE**
Currently, each course-level SLO is mapped to an institutional outcome through the curriculum review process.  This process requires that each course regularly updates its SLOs and their respective alignment.  Each outcome is mapped to both the institutional outcomes and appropriate program-level outcomes.  This mapping information is provided for all to view on the course outline of record (6.1).

Course level outcomes are also aligned to program-level outcomes through the SLO assessment reporting website.  The site allows a user to select which program-level outcomes align with each course-level outcome (6.2).  This process insures that course-level outcomes map to program-level outcomes.

**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 7: STUDENTS DEMONSTRATE AWARENESS OF GOALS AND PURPOSES OF COURSES AND PROGRAMS IN WHICH THEY ARE ENROLLED.**

Standards: I.B.5; II.A.6; II.A.6.a; II.B.

**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE:** Documentation on means the college uses to inform students of course and program purposes and outcomes.  Samples across the curriculum of: course outlines of record and syllabi with course SLOs; program and institutional SLOs in catalog.

**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 7: NARRATIVE RESPONSE**
Each course, along with other information, is required to have the outcomes for the course on the course syllabus (7.1 & 7.2). Copies are reviewed by the area Deans at the beginning of the semester to insure compliance with format and information.  Curriculum committee course update and modification forms require the faculty to describe all of the SLOs for the specific course, along with mapping to the program and institutional-level outcomes.  The assessment information on the course outlines also must match the stated SLOs.

PLOs for each instructional program are also highlighted in the college catalogue (7.3 & 7.4). These materials are available in printed and electronic format and are reviewed with each catalog update cycle. The institutional outcomes are posted on the SLO reporting site.

| **SELF-ASSESSMENT ON LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION:** | **YOU PLANNED TO ADDRESS NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS? WHAT LEVEL OF SLO IMPLEMENTATION WOULD YOU ASSIGN YOUR COLLEGE? WHY? WHAT EFFORTS HAVE YOU PLANNED TO ADDRESS NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS?** |
|---|---|

**SELF-ASSESSMENT ON LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION: NARRATIVE RESPONSE**

The college continues to strive toward systematic integration of SLO throughout its entire planning and implementation efforts. The college has made tremendous strides since the last WASC visit. The college has developed and aligned appropriate outcomes for all of its courses and programs and is regularly assessing close to 70% of its courses and 100% of non-instructional programs. Current efforts are in place to continue to broaden the assessment of instructional program-level outcomes. The assessment work has been institutionalized and is widely documented and included into planning and allocation dialogue. As a result, the college meets the proficient level in accordance with the Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Student Learning Outcomes rubric.

Work remains to strengthen the links between SLO assessment and planning. The program plan process at the college is the annual formal mechanism for planning and providing support for new initiatives. This process needs to be further strengthened to include cross-program plans and to integrate non-general fund sources of funds. Further, these plans will need to utilize SLO assessment results. Lastly, the evaluative data used to understand the effectiveness of these plans needs to be more frequent and rigorous. With the help of the college's integrated planning committee, these changes will be made in collaboration with the college community.

**TABLE OF EVIDENCE: LIST THE EVIDENCE USED TO SUPPORT YOUR NARRATIVE REPORT, SECTION BY SECTION.**

**TABLE OF EVIDENCE (NO WORD COUNT LIMIT)**

1.1 Course-level SLO example - Anthropology
1.2 Course level SLO example - Health Education
1.3 SLO reporting site screen shot
1.4 Non-instructional SLO reporting example update
1.5 Instruction program results
1.6 Program plan sample
1.7 Integrated planning model

2.1 SLO roundtable
2.2 Data dialogue samples - Learning Council
2.3 Data dialogue samples - Cohort Tracking
2.4 Cohort tracking interface
2.5 Learning Council Meeting minutes
2.6 Student Success report
2.7 Math Progression study report
2.8 Budget ranking rubric

3.1 Program review sample
3.2 SLO dialogue
3.3 Board Student Success Policy

4.1 Training outline sample
4.2 SLO update sample

5.1 SLO reporting site (course selector screen shot)
5.2 English Assessment Schedule
5.3 Report sample (English portfolio)
5.4 Report sample (Tutoring Center)

6.1 Course outline example
6.2 Program-level SLO alignment

7.1 CTE Course Syllabi
7.2 LAS Course Syllabi
7.3 CTE Catalogue sample
7.4 LAS Catalogue sample

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC)

10 Commercial Blvd., Suite 204, Novato, CA 94949

Telephone: 415-506-0234 ◊FAX: 415-506-0238◊E-mail: accjc@accjc.org