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| --- | --- |
| **Outcome Committee Meeting Minutes**  Rio Hondo College Fitness Center KDA 106 | 16 April 2019 | 2:30 to 3:30 PM | |
| Attendance: Scott Jaeggi, Aimee Ortiz, Caroline Durdella,, Julie Huang, Adam Westman, Vann Priest, Lupe Alvarado, Lisette Acevedo, Alyson Cartagena (chair), Mike Garabedian, Sarah Coté (ex officio)  Unable to attend: Robin Babou, Jose Arroyo, Wendy Carrera, Scott Dixon, John Frala, Rachel Garcia, Mike Salazar, Shaina Philips, Mark Littrell, Laura Ramirez, Yunior Hernandez, Cynthia Lewis, Shelly Spencer.  *NB: Motions and action items italicized in RED.* | |
| I. Welcome | a. The meeting was called to order at 2:33 PM. |
| II. Approval of March minutes | a. The March minutes were approved unanimously without changes. |
| III. Approval of November minutes | a. Training sessions: 34 total.  i. There were 14 sessions conducted in the first eight weeks of Fall 2018.  ii. There were 20 session conducted in the first eight weeks of Spring 2019.  iii. These numbers are exclusive of personal training sessions, and the training materials that faculty members accessed in the online Faculty Resource Center.  b. March 22 deadline results (through April 10) for target year of AY2017-18.  i. So far, there have been 2,028 course-level outcomes entered into TaskStream.  ii. This number comprises 409 different courses  iii. This number comprises 1,065 discrete CRNs.  iv. Cartagena noted that as a result of some faculty members having entered data outside the target year, some of the data is not entirely accurate; Markelle Stansell is working on cleaning up the data, and hopefully soon will have a more accurate report that will help the committee understand in which areas faculty members may need encouragement.  c. May 31 deadline for AY 2018-19.  i. Cartagena is continuing to send out “Hacks of the Week” through May 31 in order in part to keep outcomes work fresh in folks’ minds.  ii. Cartagena asked whether we need additional training sessions for faculty in the last few weeks, explaining that she felt that during finals week there might be more flexibility for faculty members to attend open training sessions held hourly. Ortiz said she thought training sessions would be a good idea, but admitted she didn’t think there would be much participation from her division given ancillary tasks (e.g., pinning ceremony) that week. Westman said he didn’t think some folks would sign up until such time as administration switched from carrot to stick mode. Based on these observations and other input from committee members, *Cartagena said she would will schedule some open training sessions during finals hours, though with limited hours.*  d. Governance report submitted.  i. Cartagena noted she submitted the Governance report, and that she based the report on what the committee talked about last time as well as discussion at recent meetings. She said that although she had to submit the report before the meeting, committee members with suggested changes can still get them to Cartagena, who can change the document.  e. Guided Pathways (due May 10).  i. Cartagena noted that outcomes really only fits into three of the 14 Guided Pathways elements, but that, as at the last meeting, she wants to make certain the Outcomes Committee goals line up. She noted that outcomes are components of the Four Pillars of Guided Pathways, and we need to stay connected with the Guided Pathways committee.  f. Annual Planning Retreat.  i. Cartagena gave a very quick report at the Annual Planning Retreat on April 12, and noted that she has the PowerPoint that committee members are welcome to share with their respective divisions. |
| IV. Status report: Caroline Durdella | a. “Suburban Community College: Statement on Standards of Assessment Practice for Instructional Programs.”  i. Durdella provided a document she prepared eight years ago in order to help her former institution line up outcomes with the requirements of the Accrediting Commission of for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). (This document is included as an addendum which follows my salutation, below. —MG).  ii. Durdella explained that at her former college, Outcomes was actually a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee. When she arrived there was no framework in place for colleagues to have any kind of *standards,* and no record keeping system to track compliance and non-compliance.  iii. Durdella’s guide created a standard of minimum compliance. She directed the Outcomes Committee to review the cycle of assessment on page 4. Essentially, she said, colleagues at her former institution sought to establish a sustainable review cycle for courses and faculty as well as the program level. A cycle was adopted, and tracked, though not in dedicated software. Cartagena suggested a desirable goal would be for next year’s committee to make sure that *course* learning outcomes are integrated with curriculum and program outcomes in RHC’s program review cycle.  b. Taskstream suitability.  i. In response to a question about the suitability of TaskStream from the last meeting, Durdella said that while it is true that there are components of TaskStream that RHC has neither purchased nor implemented, she would argue the committee needs to think about its process first before we see whether TaskStream can work or not, and/or what other non-implemented components might work best.  c. Accreditation.  i. Durdella said she is auditing where RHC is in respect to accreditation standards. She pulled all eligibility requirements and standards that relate to outcomes and outcomes assessment. She reminded the committee that RHC’s next accreditation visit is 2022 (i.e., not that far away), so we have a year to identify any gaps and address them. Next steps will include assembling an institutional self-evaluation team as, Durdella observed, it would be ideal to identify and address those gaps ahead of time. Later in the meeting, Priest asked and Durdella answered that we will wait for the appointment of a new president before this new team is formed.  ii. Dudella noted that she and Cartagena had met to record their initial reactions and impressions to ACCJC requirements and standards. She asked the committee to take a look and react to them: i.e., “Do we need to add anything, change anything?” Cartagena noted that Outcomes has an opportunity to line up outcomes goals with accreditation requirements. Durdella asked the committee to look at standard 1, and specifically 1.b.8., wherein she and Cartagena recorded data in order to identify where standard 1 requirements are being met, provide examples, find potential gaps, and develop action items related to the gaps. Durdella said It would be helpful if committee members could look at and react to this document, which is attached as an addendum to these minutes, below; *Cartagena asked and Durdella answered that yes, this should be homework. Committee members will examine the document to provide Durdella with feedback.*  iii. Cartagena asked and Durdella answered that yes, 2022 is the full review. Durdella said that the process has changed somewhat from years past, and that the new method has the full self-evaluation/assessment happening six months before the actual visit: this time, she said, the accreditors will let colleges know the areas they intend to focus during the site visit. Durdella suggested this is a better way to do things.  iv. Garabedian asked whether the rubric might be converted into a Google document in order to track committee members’ comments; Durdella suggested she would prefer a different platform. Adam said perhaps there is a tool in Canvas to facilitate review; Coté said the P-drive could be used, and that MS-Word could track comments depending on how the initial document was set up. Cartagena asked and Durdella answered that committee members should review this document before other faculty members to provide feedback. |
| V. Additional committee recommendations: dialogue and discussion | a. Next meeting (May 21) as open lab.   i. Because it is exam time, and we do need to sit with a few things, Cartagena asked committee members if it makes sense to make May 21 an open lab for anyone that is needing it, like the committee itself or the College at large? Westman said that there are already many open labs being offered, but that because of all the variables, it would be impossible to determine whether this meeting would be well-attended or not. The group agreed the May 21 could be an open lab.  b. Other recs: Making Outcomes mean something; TaskStream suitability; process development.  i. Westman said that outcomes work seems largely a chore for most. He argued if the committee could have a discussion by which we might make the process more meaningful, then more faculty buy in might obtain. He said he would recommend this being on the agenda for next year’s first meeting: If we could have a dialogue in the committee about what we are trying to achieve, what the value of outcomes is, and how we might make this process it valuable for/to everyone, it would be advantageous. Cartagena suggested that increasing buy in and telegraphing value might well improve the quality of the outcomes that are composed.  ii. Westman observed again that TaskStream is challenging, and thanked Durdella for bringing up the fact that there are pieces that are missing. If, he said, there are TaskStream alternatives, and if RHC will use this software for another decade, then he would welcome a candid discussion about its suitability. Durdella responded that TaskStream indeed does have these other pieces, but once again urged the committee to discuss practices and processes first before assessing TaskStream. She said the last thing we want is procrusteanism, where RHC buys something and then develop practices to fit the software. The Outcomes Committee, she said, should make some decisions about standard processes and guidelines, then talk about whether TaskStream could fit the bill.  iii. Alvarado said that he thought the committee’s next meeting should include an agenda item whereby we begin developing the kinds of processes Durdella developed at her previous institution. |
|
| VI. Adjournment | a. The meeting adjourned at 3:09 PM.  b. The next meeting, an open lab, will be May 21 at a location TBD. |

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Garabedian, 04/16/2019

Addendum 1. Suburban Community College: Statement on Standards of Assessment Practice for Instructional Programs

**Suburban Community College**

**Statement on Standards of Assessment Practice**

**for Instructional Programs**

In order to meet the mandate of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges ACCJC standard for proficiency in outcomes assessment by fall 2012 as well as to prepare for the acquisition and implementation of an assessment management system, the college has developed the following statement on standards of assessment practice as it relates to instructional programs.

Assessment of instruction at Suburban Community College meets each of the following criteria:

1) identification of at least two student learning outcomes for each course and one for each program on file with the Institutional Effectiveness Office,

2) use of direct and indirect assessment methods,

3) current and specific assessments of record for course and program level SLOs on file,

4) a regular, explicitly stated cycle of assessment for all courses and programs on file with the Institutional Effectiveness office,

5) reports of assessment results and action plans on file with the Institutional Effectiveness office.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness serves as the central repository for receiving assessment information. Assessments of record, cycles of assessment, and reports of assessment results for all courses and programs should be filed with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

The five criteria stated above represent the threshold for assessment practice for instruction. They enable the institution to describe a common core of learning to external stakeholders and agencies. The college invites and encourages faculty to engage in outcomes assessment practices that go beyond the threshold established by the criteria.

Each of the criteria is elaborated further below.

**Number of Course and Program Learning Outcomes**

As previously agreed upon by the Curriculum Committee, each course is to specify a minimum of two student learning outcomes. Each program must establish at least one program outcome. Faculty are strongly encouraged to work collaboratively to develop a set of student learning outcomes that best reflect the broad or overarching goals of their courses and programs. At SCC, student learning outcomes at the course level are stored in the Course Outline of Record in CurricUNET; as such, they are widely available to the public. It is important that faculty regularly review their student learning outcomes to ensure that they are in alignment with the stated course purposes and instructional content, activities, and assignments that are described on the Course Outline of Record.

**Use of Direct and Indirect Assessment**

The primary purpose of assessment at Suburban Community College is to understand and improve the teaching and learning process. To accomplish this, Suburban Community College strongly encourages direct assessment of student learning outcomes at the course level. Direct assessment of learning should be embedded in course activities and assignments. Direct assessment is aligned with the stated course purposes and objectives and connected to graded student assignments. Further, direct assessment uses summative measures to describe the achievement of learning outcomes rather than student self-assessments or student self-perceptions of learning in the course. Direct assessment methods are preferred at the course level because they provide evidence or confirmation that learning has occurred as a result of the course rather than an indication that learning has occurred. Some examples of direct assessments include evaluations of: exams, quizzes, papers, reports, presentations, performances, and projects.

Direct assessment is also strongly encouraged for highly structured programs, those that involve a common core of coursework or a prescribed sequence of courses. For highly structured programs, direct assessment is best accomplished through graded assignments developed for capstone courses that reflect the cumulative knowledge a student would acquire as a result of taking a common core of coursework or course sequence.

In contrast to direct assessment, which provides evidence of student learning, indirect assessment provides an indication or suggestion that learning has occurred. Because indirect assessment is not considered evidentiary, its use is reserved for programs which are more flexibly structured; programs lacking a common core of coursework or a prescribed sequence of courses. These loosely structured programs are often characterized by a menu style approach, which allows students to select particular courses from within specific content areas to meet the requirements of the program. For example, the Liberal Arts degrees in Arts, Humanities, and Communication, Math and Science, Multi-Cultural Studies, and Social and Behavioral Sciences are loosely structured programs as described above. As such, these programs are more individualized, and direct assessment of learning is not easily accomplished. Additionally, indirect assessment is reserved for assessment of institutional level student learning outcomes. An example of an indirect assessment method is a survey measuring student self-perceptions of learning in specific content areas.

Faculty are strongly encouraged to use direct assessment methods whenever possible to describe the achievement of stated learning outcomes as well as any other assessment methods they deem necessary to explain assessment results. Effective use of direct and indirect assessment methods ensures that the college will be prepared to provide consistent and uniform evidence to the ACCJC that reflects a more complete view of student learning and meets the proficiency requirements.

**Assessments of Record**

Assessments of record for courses and programs identify in very specific ways both the type of assessment to be used and the evaluation criteria that will be used to determine the degree to which the stated outcomes are achieved. Faculty are encouraged to work collaboratively within their disciplines and departments to develop common forms of assessment and uniform evaluation criteria which reflect the collective knowledge of the faculty in the discipline, foster department consensus over individual preferences, and ensure continuity and consistency in expectations for students and the evaluation of student work samples. In developing assessment instruments and evaluation criteria, faculty should strive to balance individual teaching styles with the need to develop consistent results that can be meaningfully interpreted across sections of the same course.

For example, a common type of assessment might consist of a final exam with a set of shared, embedded questions measuring a single student learning outcome or set of outcomes. Using this type of assessment, faculty could implement the assessment instrument across sections of a course. Uniform evaluation criteria using this type of assessment would include identifying the common test items for the exam, mapping test items to course or program SLOs, and specifying the number or percent correct that is needed to meet the stated learning outcome.

Similarly, faculty could implement a term paper on a specific topic as a common type of assessment. With a term paper, the parameters of the assignment could be specified with some degree of flexibility; however, the evaluation criteria would need to be uniform and correspond to domains of learning associated with the SLOs and the achievement levels associated with the stated learning outcomes for the course. This can be accomplished by developing and implementing a common or standardized rubric. Common or standardized rubrics should be normed by the faculty and specify domains of learning and the levels of achievement for each of the domains.

Common forms of assessment and uniform evaluation make learning expectations and standards of performance explicit for students and enable the institution to validly and reliably describe core achievements within and across specific areas of student learning.

**Cycle of Assessment**

The college expects faculty to assess achievement of student learning outcomes using a regular cycle of assessment that is connected to the program review schedule. This schedule specifies that all programs are reviewed once every three years. In keeping with this schedule, the college expects that the achievement of *all* course and program level student learning outcomes will be evaluated holistically, using longitudinal data when possible, at least once within a three-year cycle. For example, during the program review process, programs and disciplines should discuss the degree to which all course and program outcomes were achieved rather than specific outcomes for a particular course at one point in time.

Further, in an effort to ensure that each discipline and department continues to make progress in achieving the standard of sustainable, continuous quality improvement as well as engages in a robust dialogue related to the achievement of student learning outcomes, the college uses a standard calendar for course level outcomes assessment. This calendar specifies the assessment schedule as follows:

* course outcomes associated with courses offered in both fall and spring terms are assessed in the fall with results reported during the spring term;
* and course outcomes associated with courses offered once or less than once annually should be assessed during the term in which they are offered with results reported in the subsequent term.

Assessment and dialog about student learning should occur at least once annually for courses offered in fall or spring terms and as often as is possible for those courses offered less than annually. Disciplines and departments may choose to evaluate all course outcomes for a course within a given term or they can choose to evaluate specific outcomes for a course within a given term. For example, if a course has three outcomes, and is offered in fall and spring terms annually, the department might choose to assess all three outcomes at once or assess one outcome each fall for three successive years. However, if the department chooses to assess all course outcomes in one term, assessment for that course would need to be conducted each fall to meet the requirement that course outcomes be assessed and dialog about student learning occurred at least annually. Each course and program outcome should be evaluated at least once within the three-year cycle and each department or discipline should follow the standard assessment schedule when assessing and submitting their results.

Using the three-year cycle of holistic assessment in conjunction with the standard calendar for course level outcomes assessment creates a systematic cycle of assessment that is connected to larger college planning and resource allocation processes and helps to develop widespread dialog about student learning across course and program offerings. Frequent assessment and dialog about student learning are necessary to foster deep learning and demonstrate proficiency with the ACCJC standards for outcomes assessment. Appendix A contains a sample Assessment Cycle report.

**Results**

Assessment results are used by faculty to understand and improve the teaching and learning process. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness serves as the central repository for receiving assessment reports. Faculty should file reports of assessment results for all courses and programs with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. Reports should use the five-column format and identify the degree to which stated outcomes have been achieved as well as any plans for improvement or change (see Appendix B). Rather than submitting multiple reports for different sections of the same course, annual reports of course outcomes should be aggregated by course prior to submission.

**Appendix A**

**Assessment Cycle**

All SLOs should be assessed at least once within a three-year cycle. A complete assessment cycle includes: gathering assessment data, analyzing assessment data, sharing results within the department or discipline, and reporting results. In the matrix below, indicate the term in which each of your course SLOs will be assessed (inclusive of the entire assessment cycle).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SLO** | **Data Gathered** | **Data Analyzed** | **Data Shared**  **Improvement Dialogue** | **Results Reported**  **Nichols Model** | **Changes Implemented** |
| Sample: SLO 1 (analyze statistical data) | Fall 2011 – by November 1 | Late fall 2011 – before end of term | Flex – mid-January | Spring 2012 | Fall 2012 |
| **SLO 1** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **SLO 2** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **SLO 3** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **SLO 4** |  |  |  |  |  |

**Appendix B**

**COURSE SLO ASSESSMENT REPORT, SCC**

Department: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Course: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Year: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Semester:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*Faculty Member: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1) Outcome to be assessed | 2) Means of assessment and criteria of success | 3) Summary of data collected | 4) Analysis of data | 5) Plan of action/what to do next |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Addendum 2. ISER Audit Outcomes

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Eligibility Requirements** | | | | |
| **Requirement** | **How Met** | **Evidence** | **Potential Gaps** | **Action Items** |
| **Student Learning and Student Achievement** |  |  |  |  |
| 11. The institution defines standards for student achievement and assesses its performance against those standards. The institution publishes for each program the program's expected student learning and any program-specific achievement outcomes. Through regular and systematic assessment, it demonstrates that students who complete programs, no matter where or how they are offered, achieve the identified outcomes and that the standards for student achievement are met. (Standard I.B.2, 1.B.3, and II.A.1) | Outcomes statements published in catalogue and on web annually through ACCJC reporting 5 year goals/targets/standards set for Vision for Success and SEA | Website, catalogue, Faculty Resource Center Reports for ACCJC, SEA Plan, Vision Goals document | Publication of results of assessments and student achievement as well as institution set standards for achievement | Institutional Effectiveness report  Program websites to publish |
| **General Education** |  |  |  |  |
| 12. The institution defines and incorporates into all of its degree programs a substantial component of general education designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and promote intellectual inquiry. The general education component includes an introduction to some of the major areas of knowledge. General education courses are selected to ensure students achieve comprehensive learning outcomes in the degree program. Degree credit for the general education component must be consistent with levels of quality and rigor appropriate to higher education. (Standard II.A.12 and II.A.5) |  |  |  |  |
| **Institutional Planning and Evaluation** |  |  |  |  |
| 19. The institution systematically evaluates and makes public how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its purposes, including assessment of student learning outcomes.  The institution provides evidence of planning for improvement of institutional structures and processes, student achievement of educational goals, and student learning. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding improvement through an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. (Standard I.B.9 and I.C.3) | Program Review, Program Planning, Task Stream | Task Stream Reports for Program Review, Program Planning | Makes public/publishes | Website, program websites, Institutional Effectiveness Report |
| **Integrity in Communication with the Public** |  |  |  |  |
| 20.The institution provides a print or electronic catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning the following:  **General Information**  • Official Name, Address(es), Telephone Number(s), and Website Address of the Institution  • Educational Mission  • Representation of accredited status with ACCJC and with programmatic accreditors, if any  • Course, Program, and Degree Offerings  • Student Learning Outcomes for Programs and Degrees  • Academic Calendar and Program Length  • Academic Freedom Statement  • Available Student Financial Aid  • Available Learning Resources  • Names and Degrees of Administrators and Faculty  • Names of Governing Board Members | MET | MET | MET | MET |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard I: Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, and Integrity**  The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes student learning and student achievement. Using analysis of quantitative and qualitative data, the institution continuously and systematically evaluates, plans, implements, and improves the quality of its educational programs and services. The institution demonstrates integrity in all policies, actions, and communication. The administration, faculty, staff, and governing board members act honestly, ethically, and fairly in the performance of their duties. | | | | |
| **Standard** | **How Met** | **Evidence** | **Potential Gaps** | **Action Items** |
| **B. Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness** |  |  |  |  |
| ***Academic Quality*** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The institution demonstrates a sustained, substantive and collegial dialog about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement. | Program Review, Program Planning, annual faculty dialogue  Flex day  PFC, IEC, Outcomes Committee | Task Stream reports  Department/division meeting minutes/notes  Flex day proceedings | It is unclear the extent to which information in Task Stream reflects the expectation of the standard or whether dialogue that takes place within the department and the division reflects the standard | Conduct audit of the quality of the information submitted through Task Stream; request that division submit any meeting notes or minutes to evaluate the frequency and substance of division/department dialogue |
| 2. The institution defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services. (ER 11) | Curriculum Committee, Program Review, Program Planning, Outcomes Committee  Program Review meetings | Course outlines, Task Stream, | Information is in course outlines and Task Stream but is not reported on systematically | Regular and systematic reporting of outcomes assessment progress |
| 3. The institution establishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement, and publishes this information. (ER 11) | Outcomes statements published in catalogue and on web  Annually through ACCJC reporting  5 year goals/targets/standards set for Vision for Success and SEA | Website, catalogue, Faculty Resource Center    Reports for ACCJC, SEA Plan, Vision Goals document | Publishes results of assessments and student achievement | Develop an annual institutional effectiveness report; ensure dialogue regarding report; publish information via web |
| 4. The institution uses assessment data and organizes its institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement. | Program Review, Program Planning, Vision for Success, SEA | Information from program review and program plans are integrated with the annual planning cycle | Quality of the plans and the use of data and proficiency standards needs to be evaluated | Develop a plan to audit the quality of the submissions in Task Stream |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard I: Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, and Integrity**  The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes student learning and student achievement. Using analysis of quantitative and qualitative data, the institution continuously and systematically evaluates, plans, implements, and improves the quality of its educational programs and services. The institution demonstrates integrity in all policies, actions, and communication. The administration, faculty, staff, and governing board members act honestly, ethically, and fairly in the performance of their duties. | | | | |
| **Standard** | **How Met** | **Evidence** | **Potential Gaps** | **Action Items** |
| **B. Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness** |  |  |  |  |
| ***Institutional Effectiveness*** |  |  |  |  |
| 5. The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of goals and objectives, student learning outcomes, and student achievement. Quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery. | Program review, data in Task Stream | Program review and planning documents located in Task Stream | The quality of submissions in Task Stream may not rise to the level of meeting the standard | Audit Task Stream submissions, Institutional Effectiveness report |
| 6. The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human, fiscal and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies. | Achievement data is disaggregated by subpopulations in the program review data set; The examination of achievement data for specific purposes including SEA and Vision for Success | Program Review data set, Vision for Success, SEA Plan | Learning outcomes data are not disaggregated by subpopulations because they are gathered at the section level rather than the student level; it’s unclear the extent to which programs use disaggregated data available to them in the program review process | How to disaggregate learning outcomes for subpopulations?    Evaluate the extent to which disaggregated data are being used in the program planning and review processes |
| 8. The institution broadly communicates the results of all of its assessment and evaluation activities so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities. | Largely MET; See Item I.B.1 | Largely MET; See Item I.B.1 | Largely MET; See Item I.B.1 | Largely MET; See Item I.B.1 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard I: Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, and Integrity**  The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes student learning and student achievement. Using analysis of quantitative and qualitative data, the institution continuously and systematically evaluates, plans, implements, and improves the quality of its educational programs and services. The institution demonstrates integrity in all policies, actions, and communication. The administration, faculty, staff, and governing board members act honestly, ethically, and fairly in the performance of their duties. | | | | |
| **Standard** | **How Met** | **Evidence** | **Potential Gaps** | **Action Items** |
| **C. Institutional Integrity** |  |  |  |  |
| 3. The institution uses documented assessment of student learning and evaluation of student achievement to communicate matters of academic quality to appropriate constituencies, including current and prospective students and the public. (ER 19) | PARTIALLY MET | PARTIALLY MET | Current and prospective students and the public | Publish assessment and achievement outcomes and make accessible to current and prospective students and the public |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Support Services**  The institution offers instructional programs, library and learning support services, and student support services aligned with its mission. The institution’s programs are conducted at levels of quality and rigor appropriate for higher education. The institution assesses its educational quality through methods accepted in higher education, makes the results of its assessments available to the public, and uses the results to improve educational quality and institutional effectiveness. The institution defines and incorporates into all of its degree programs a substantial component of general education designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and to promote intellectual inquiry. The provisions of this standard are broadly applicable to all instructional programs and student and learning support services offered in the name of the institution. | | | | |
| **Standard** | **How Met** | **Evidence** | **Potential Gaps** | **Action Items** |
| **A. Instructional Programs** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. The institution identifies and regularly  assesses learning outcomes for courses,  programs, certificates and degrees using  established institutional procedures. The  institution has officially approved and  current course outlines that  include student learning outcomes. In  every class section students receive a  course syllabus that includes learning  outcomes from the institution’s officially  approved course outline. | Curriculum Committee requirements; Divisions check syllabi for compliance w/ requirements |  | Need an established and agreed upon systematic cycle of assessment; process divisions are using to ensure syllabi are in compliance needs to be documented | Develop cycle of assessment; document division level processes |
| 11. The institution includes in all of its programs, student learning outcomes, appropriate to the program level, in communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, the ability to engage diverse perspectives, and other program-specific learning outcomes. | ILOs in Task Stream and catalogue | ILOs in Task Stream and catalogue | Who is responsible for ILOs? How often are they reviewed and updated? How does the review process for ILOs connect with Program Review, Program Planning, and Curriculum Course review? | Develop or document the ILO cycle and relate it to other cycles on campus. |
| 12. The institution requires of all of its degree programs a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy for both associate and baccalaureate degrees that is clearly stated in its catalog. The institution, relying on faculty expertise, determines the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education curriculum, based upon student learning outcomes and competencies appropriate to the degree level. The learning outcomes include a student’s preparation for and acceptance of responsible participation in civil society, skills for lifelong learning and application of learning, and a broad comprehension of the development of knowledge, practice, and interpretive approaches in the arts and humanities, the sciences, mathematics, and social sciences. (ER 12) | Overlaps with II.A.11 | Overlaps with II.A.11 | Overlaps with II.A.11 | Overlaps with II.A.11 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Support Services**  The institution offers instructional programs, library and learning support services, and student support services aligned with its mission. The institution’s programs are conducted at levels of quality and rigor appropriate for higher education. The institution assesses its educational quality through methods accepted in higher education, makes the results of its assessments available to the public, and uses the results to improve educational quality and institutional effectiveness. The institution defines and incorporates into all of its degree programs a substantial component of general education designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and to promote intellectual inquiry. The provisions of this standard are broadly applicable to all instructional programs and student and learning support services offered in the name of the institution. | | | | |
| **Standard** | **How Met** | **Evidence** | **Potential Gaps** | **Action Items** |
| **C. Student Support Services** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. The institution identifies and assesses learning support outcomes for its student population and provides appropriate student support services and programs to achieve those outcomes. The institution uses assessment data to continuously improve student support programs and services. | Program Review and Program Planning    Student Services cycle and process |  | Need to review Student Services cycle/process; potential variation in the quality of the submissions via Task Stream | Evaluate cycle/process and quality of the submissions in Task Stream |