



College Report Card, 2015

Changes to the 2015 Edition

Last year, the College made a substantial change to the evaluation of its planning processes, and one result was a drastically redesigned College Planning Report Card. This year, in the spirit of continuous quality improvement, revisions and refinements continue to be made.

In particular, the annual assessment reports from the three institutional effectiveness areas of planning, student learning outcomes, and program review have been revised to include sections on continued progress and on goals. Last year, which was the inaugural year of the new format, the reports provided only descriptive summaries—snapshots in time. This year, it was decided by IEC that ongoingly the reports should have a descriptive summary followed by changes that were made during the current year ('Continued Progress') followed by possible action plans for the next year ('Goals').

In this respect, not only is it much easier for a reader to tell what was accomplished and what remains to be accomplished but also it mirrors the accreditation format.

One unlooked-for consequence of these changes was that the section of last year's college report card that performed the function of explaining what remained to be accomplished was deemed no longer necessary, even further simplifying and streamlining the report card. Hopefully, with these changes, the final form of the report card has been achieved.

Methodology of Ratings

All IEC members scored each of the narrative responses on a 5-point scale:

- 5 – exceeds norm of expected practice
- 4 – solidly meets expected practice
- 3 – meets expected practice
- 2 – does not minimally meet expected practice
- 1 – does not meet expected practice

Each member of the IEC scores responses separately for each SCQI statement and submits his or her ratings to the chair ahead of the year's last IEC meeting. The scores are aggregated and then distributed at the meeting for discussion. Since norming is not possible on this single target, the initial raw scores are used to promote dialogue not just about the College's performance level but also what constitutes "expected practice." Members are allowed to change scores if they feel they were off-base, missed something or had an expectation clarified. Norming is done every year, and the likelihood, if not the expectation, is that the norm varies slightly from year to year.

Results of Ratings

	2015	High	Low	2014	Change
Planning	4.13			3.97	
The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key process and improve student learning.	4.25	5	3	4.00	↑
There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust, and pervasive; data and analysis are widely distributed throughout the institution.	3.75	5	3	3.44	↑
There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes.	4.25	5	4	4.22	↑
There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes.	4.25	5	4	4.22	↑
Program Review	3.46			3.74	
Program Review process are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.	3.00	4	2	3.89	↓↓↓
The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.	4.00	5	3	4.00	-
The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.	3.38	4	3	3.33	↑
SLO's	3.50			3.72	
Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic, and used for continuous quality improvement	2.50	3	2	3.78	↓↓↓
Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive, and robust	3.50	4	3	3.67	↓
There is evaluation of student learning outcomes processes	3.38	4	3	3.78	↓
Evaluation and fine tuning of organizational structure to support student learning are ongoing	3.38	4	3	3.44	↓
Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college	4.00	4	4	3.44	↑↑
Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews	4.25	5	4	4.22	↑



Cerro Coso Community College

Annual Assessment Report 2015 Institutional Planning

Instructions

Submit a brief narrative analysis demonstrating the committee's assessment of the status of Planning implementation at Cerro Coso Community College. This report is divided into sections representing the bulleted characteristics of ACCJC's Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness. Part II of this Rubric comprises Planning. ACCJC expects all member colleges to be at the implementation level of 'Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement', the Rubric's highest level, for Planning.

The committee is asked to provide a descriptive summary of how well the college meets the characteristics. Responses should be a concise explanation of what the college is currently doing in each of the identified areas. Concrete details can be referenced for illustrative purposes or qualitative or quantitative data cited as space permits. Responses should be written as if for an outside reader **and not exceed 300 words**.

In completing the report, the committee is asked to interpret the college's implementation level through the lens of Accreditation Standards cited for each characteristic. Language from these Standards is included under each section as appropriate.

Finally, provide a list of evidence that may be cited to support and verify the statements made in the descriptive summary. The actual evidence does not need to be provided, but the list should be compiled as if it were—that is, carefully and specifically, not the kitchen-sink approach.

Rubric Statement 1: The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning

Relevant Standards Language

1. The mission guides institutional decision-making, planning, and resource allocation and informs institutional goals for student learning and achievement. (IA3)
2. The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of outcomes, goals, and objectives through analyses of quantitative and qualitative data disaggregated by program type and mode of delivery. (IB5)

3. The institution engages in broad based, systematic evaluation and planning. The institution integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Institutional planning addresses short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services and for human, physical, technology, and financial resources. (IB8)

Status

Since 2011-12, Cerro Coso Community College has had an annual integrated planning process that begins with the mission, college strategic goals, and operational performance as measured in outcomes assessment and program review. Each operational unit writes a unit plan that links its purpose to the mission and annual goals and resource requests to strategic goals and to outcomes assessment. Unit plans are reviewed and aggregated at section and division levels where more inclusive plans are written. A student success plan is compiled from success goals identified in the annual plans. These guide the development in February of resource requests analyses in physical resources, IT, marketing, professional development, and staffing that look for trends and commonalities. In March, all this information is used to build the college budget for the following year, one that very specifically ties allocation of resources to mission, strategic goals, and outcomes assessment.

The planning process incorporates a variety of quantitative and qualitative data. Every year instructional units are provided with student achievement data disaggregated by ethnicity, age, gender, and disability. Student support and administrative services units employ a mix of qualitative and quantitative data as identified in assessment plans—such as usage statistics or survey results. All operational entities at the unit level undergo a program review that calls for a comprehensive analysis of data results longitudinally as well as a snapshot in time.

Finally, goal-setting at the college is a mix of short- and long-term planning. Annual plans call for one-year goals to be set. Program reviews require two- and five-year goals. The college strategic goals and the mission statement are reviewed once every three years, as outlined in the Participatory Governance Manual, which is also reviewed once every three years. An Educational Master Plan is compiled once every five years.

Continued Progress

Three new improvements were made in this area in academic year 2014-15. The first is the **new 2015-18 college strategic goals**, which were written in a way that is not only more uniform, consistent, and measurable but also that is tied directly into common metrics that the college is already keeping. This means the institution is better able to assess—at any given moment—the progress it is making in accomplishing its mission.

A second improvement was identifying gaps in **student equity** for unit, section, and division plans. In the 14-15 templates, the units, sections, and divisions were asked to identify gaps based on the annual unit plan data provided from district IR. Starting in 15-16, the units, sections, and divisions will be asked to develop strategies and actions to address these gaps. The ability to analyze disaggregated data for access and success has been a missing piece of college planning and will help it accomplish its mission and improve institutional effectiveness and academic quality. By being embedded in the annual plans, it gives the college one more tool for determining short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services

Finally, two new external planning requirements were addressed. Institution-set standards, required by ACCJC, were reviewed and revised at the same time the college underwent its mission, vision, values, and strategic goal review. This now has a clear place in the college's integrated planning process. And the Chancellor's Office Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) required the college to adopt short-term goals in four institutional effectiveness areas by June 30, 2015. This was done by task force this year.

Goals

- Add specific language in the 15-16 template prompting units, sections, and divisions to not just identify gaps in student equity but design improvements.
- Work in annual setting of IEPI goals into the yearly planning process.

Evidence

Annual Integrated Planning Cycle Timeline and Graphic, 2013-14
Sample Annual Unit Plans (Instructional, Student Services, and Administrative Services)
Sample Annual Section Plans
Sample Annual Division Plans
Sample Resource Request Analyses
Sample Budget
Sample AUP Data Provided to Departments
Sample Program Review (Instructional and Non-Instructional)
Cerro Coso Community College Mission Statement
Cerro Coso Community College Strategic Plan, 2012-15
Participatory Governance Manual, 2012-15
Cerro Coso Community College Educational Master Plan, 2012-17

Rubric Statement 2: There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust, and pervasive; data and analysis are widely distributed throughout the institution

Relevant Standards Language

1. The institution demonstrates a substantive and collegial dialogue about student outcomes, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement. (IB1)
2. The institution publishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, and assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement. (IB3)

Status

The planning cycle prompts dialogue at every step about institutional performance results and improvement strategies for instructional programs, support services, and administrative services. Dialogue takes place continuously on a variety of cycles: as often as weekly in Student Services staff meetings; monthly or bimonthly in committees such as Student Success and Support Council, Institutional Effectiveness, Student Learning Outcomes, and Program Review; at least twice a semester in instructional departments as part of required department meetings; annually for the development of the equity plan, the student success plan, and the budget, as well as for department, section, and division unit plans; once every three years at the whole-college level during the review of mission, strategic goals, participatory governance model, and institution-set standards; and once every five years for SLO assessment, COR renewal, program review, and the setting of the Educational Master Plan.

Dialogue goes on between and among all constituent groups: faculty to faculty in department meetings, COR renewal, and SLO assessment; faculty and administrators in program review, unit plan development, and committee meetings; classified staff and faculty in department meetings and unit plan development; classified staff and faculty and administrators in Student Services meetings, participatory governance committees, and mission, strategic goal, and institution-set standards review.

As a result of recent conversation, dialogue for institution-set standards now has a place and a process. As a measure of how well the college is fulfilling its mission, they are to be reviewed on the same cycle as the mission and strategic goals, once every three years. The College has institution-set standards for success rate, number of degrees and certificates awarded, number of students transferring, persistence rate, and, in the CTE areas, licensure pass rate and employment rate.

Continued Progress

Two new improvements were made in this area in academic year 2014-15. The first was the work of an enrollment management task force that looked closely at the procedures and practices the college uses in this area and that made recommendations for improvement. The tenor of the report is the need for more robust dialogue about enrollment management across the college—particularly between student services and academic affairs and between

marketing and other segments of the college. Among the recommendations was the identification of a committee to focus on enrollment management issues. The college believes it has found one in the Student Success and Support Council.

A second improvement was the result of a College Council survey last spring (2014) that revealed College Council was not as effective as it thought it was. Constituents reported not feeling in the loop on institutional effectiveness and the discussions taking place at College Council. This led to a several-pronged initiative to improve the flow of information down and up the ladder of representation—for example, the relocating of constituent reports at the beginning of the agenda rather than the end

Goal

- Revise the mission, charge, and composition of the Student Success and Support Council to reflect a role as the college's primary steering committee for specific initiatives of student access and success.

Evidence

Sample Agenda and Minutes from SSSP, IEC, SLO, and Program Review Committees
Sample Agenda and Minutes from Department Meetings
Sample Annual Unit Plans (Instructional, Student Services, and Administrative Services)
Sample Annual Section Plans
Sample Annual Division Plans
Sample Resource Request Analysis
Sample Agenda and Minutes from College Council Showing Review of Mission, Strategic Plan, and Participatory Governance Model
Sample Agenda and Minutes from Department Meetings Showing SLO Assessment
Sample Agenda and Minutes from CIC
Sample Agenda and Minutes from IEC Showing Program Review Discussion

Rubric Statement 3: There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes

Relevant Standards Language

1. The institution regularly evaluates the efficacy and currency of its planning processes, plans for, and makes changes as needed. (IB9)

Status

Since 2011-12, the annual integrated planning cycle has undergone a number of adaptations and refinements as a result of evaluation and assessment:

- The completion of a new set of strategic goals that is far more focused and measurable than the prior set
- insertion of a student success plan into the cycle
- revision of the program review template to align resource categories directly with those in the annual unit plan
- revision of the program review template to more fully embed outcomes assessment
- revision of the unit plan template to require annual updates on program review goals
- revision of the unit plan template to prompt fuller reporting of 'closing the loop' actions on outcomes
- provision of more complete budgetary information to units at the beginning of the planning cycle and a prepopulated budget worksheet to simplify budget-building
- creation of mid-point progress checks on the achievement of annual unit plan goals
- adjustment of the deadlines of annual plans to enable fuller dialogue between levels of the planning cycle (units, sections, divisions)
- simplification and enhancement of the budget-building process whereby the budget development committee speaks to some but not all unit leaders
- headway on an institution-wide set of longitudinal measurements to form a bedrock for evaluating institutional effectiveness (Thoyote).
- development of a process for establishing and reviewing institution-set standards
- creation of an evaluation instrument to measure the effectiveness of the planning process

As an ongoing process, the planning cycle is evaluated annually by means of an assessment report completed by the committee (this document) and through a survey distributed to all internal stakeholders. Changes in the process are made between cycles, allowing thorough time for planning and implementation.

Continued Progress

Adaptations and refinements continue to be made on the college's planning and evaluation processes. One long-anticipated improvement in 2014-15 was the development of a web-input form for the planning documents. Not only are the plans more efficiently submitted through the web, but the various pieces go into a database, which allows for autofill for subsequent plans—for example, midterm reports where the goals are automatically filled in for proposers to respond to.

A second one was redesigning the planning templates to bring the resource request areas down to the unit plan level. Before, the resource areas of staffing, facilities, information technology, marketing, and professional development only emerged in the section plans and up. By making them explicit parts of the unit plans, there is a much more direct link with the analysis at the section and division levels as well as an easier road for those completing resource request analyses.

Goal

- Make revisions in the web-input system for better ease of use and more attractive report generation.

Evidence

Cerro Coso Community College Strategic Goals, 2012-15

Annual Integrated Planning Cycle, Timeline and Graphic, 2013-14

Program Review Template, 2013-14 (Instructional and Non-Instructional)

Annual Unit Plan Template, 2013-14

Sample Budget Worksheets Provided to Departments and Units, August 2013

Report of Mid-Point Progress Checks, March 2014

Sample Agenda and Minutes from Budget Development Committee Showing Dialogue with Unit Leaders

Thoyote *Draft*

Agenda and Minutes from IEC Showing Discussion of Evaluation Instrument for Institutional Planning

Annual Assessment Survey

Rubric Statement 4: There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes

Relevant Accreditation Standards Language

1. The institution communicates the results of all its assessments broadly so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities. (IB10)

Status

Commitment to student learning is embedded throughout the college's guiding statements. Improvement of student achievement underlies four of the college's strategic goals: fostering student success, enhancing engagement, connecting with the community, and achieving a level of sustainable continuous quality improvement. The college's vision, values, service philosophy, and general education philosophy all specifically identify student learning as a major goal and focus. And the mission directly states the institution's purpose of producing and supporting student learning.

Educational effectiveness is evidenced throughout the planning process. Program reviews and annual unit plans codify the analysis of outcomes assessment and the goals that result

from that analysis. Departments and units now provide mid-term progress checks during the year on the attainment of goals. The budget development process is designed so allocation of resources requires justification in planning documents. The student success plan, once it gets integrated into the cycle, will be a yearly statement of the specific goals planned by each department to improve educational effectiveness. Likewise, the equity plan, once it gets integrated, will identify where the college is falling short serving under-represented groups and set out plans for intervention.

Results of assessments are communicated to students, prospective students, and the community through the college website. The program review documents are posted on the main program review page. Outcomes assessments are linked from the SLO Assessment Results page (one click from the main page). To view SLO results, students click through to the CurricUNET site. PLO's for instructional programs are located on a separate page on the website, together with those for Student Services. ILO's are available at CurricUNET. GELO's are located at CurricUNET but show not having been assessed. A Comprehensive Annual Assessment Report is generated each year by the SLO committee and posted to the main SLO page.

Continued Progress

The big improvement in this area in 2014-15 was the restructuring of the planning pages. Beforehand, planning documents were listed on static pages year by year—2012-13, 2013-14, etc. This did not lend itself to sorting or to easy searching. This year, the planning documents were moved to a new server that allows a viewer to determine how he or she wants to see the documents—year by year or unit by unit. The second view permits a viewer to pull up any unit, section, or division, and see its planning documents going back as far as the college has them.

Goals

- Create and distribute a periodic newsletter to the internal community. The president currently sends out a "CC Chronicle" every Monday that is accessible and easy to read. A similar communication once or twice a semester would be a good idea for planning and accreditation.
- Create an "Outcomes" tab for every program that lists the results of the last active assessment of PLO's. This will become the college's primary method of communicating assessment results.

Evidence

Cerro Coso Community College Strategic Plan, 2012-15
Cerro Coso Community College Values Statement
Cerro Coso Community College Vision Statement
Cerro Coso Community College Service Philosophy

Cerro Coso Community College General Education Philosophy
Cerro Coso Community College Mission Statement
Annual Unit Plan Template, 2013-14
Report of Mid-Point Progress Checks, March 2014
Sample Annual Unit Plans (Instructional, Student Services, and Administrative Services)
Annual Integrated Planning Cycle Timeline and Graphic, 2013-14
Screen Capture, Program Review Main Page
Screen Capture, SLO Assessment Results Page
Sample SLO Assessment Reports from CurricUNET
Sample PLO Assessment Reports Linked from SLO Assessment Main Page (Instructional and Student Services)
ILO Assessment Report from CurricUNET
Screen Capture, SLO Main Page
Comprehensive Annual Assessment Report, December 2013



Cerro Coso Community College

Annual Assessment Report 2015 Program Review

Instructions

Submit a brief narrative analysis demonstrating the committee's assessment of the status of Program Review implementation at Cerro Coso Community College. This report is divided into sections representing the bulleted characteristics of ACCJC's Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness. Part I of this Rubric comprises Program Review. ACCJC expects all member colleges to be at the implementation level of 'Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement', the Rubric's highest level, for Program Review. The section items below are the bulleted characteristics of the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement level.

The committee is asked to provide a descriptive summary of how well the college meets the characteristics. Responses should be a concise explanation of what the college is currently doing in each of the identified areas. Concrete details can be referenced for illustrative purposes or qualitative or quantitative data cited as space permits. Responses should be written as if for an outside reader **and not exceed 300 words**.

In completing the report, the committee is asked to interpret the college's implementation level through the lens of Accreditation Standards cited for each characteristic. Language from these Standards is included under each section.

Finally, provide a list of evidence that may be cited to support and verify the statements made in the descriptive summary. The actual evidence does not need to be provided, but the list should be compiled as if it were—that is, carefully and specifically, not the kitchen-sink approach.

Rubric Statement 1: Program Review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement

Relevant Standards Language

1. The institution defines and assesses learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services (IB2)
2. The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of outcomes, goals, and objectives through analyses of quantitative and qualitative data disaggregated by program type and mode of delivery. (IB5)

3. The institution regularly evaluates its policies and practices in educational programs and student and learning and support services, resources management, and governance to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of mission. (IB7)
4. Faculty and others responsible for instructional courses, programs and directly related services act to continuously improve instructional programs and services through systematic evaluation to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and achieve stated learning outcomes. (IIA2)
5. The institution regularly evaluates the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education, support student learning, and enhance accomplishment of the mission of the institution. (IIB1)
6. The institution defines and assesses learning and other intended outcomes for library and learning support services and uses assessment data to continuously improve programs and services. (IIB11)

Status

Program review is a key component to Cerro Coso's integrated planning cycle. The most current program review informs the annual planning cycle, along with student learning outcome assessment and strategic goals. The college has historically had a 6-year program review cycle, but in 2014, we are adopting a 5-year cycle.

Program review evaluates program relevance, appropriateness, currency, and student achievement, and it provides an action plan that is based on the evaluation of those areas. The formats for instructional and non-instructional program reviews address the same broad areas, but instructional program reviews serve to evaluate and improve instructional programs and services, whereas non-instructional program reviews serve to evaluate and improve student and learning support services.

All program reviews include definitions of student learning outcomes or, if applicable, administrative unit outcomes and describe the results of assessment. Program learning outcomes and administrative unit outcomes are assessed during the year prior to the completion of program review in order to provide a fresh assessment of student learning. In the program review, a summary of both course and program learning outcome assessment is provided, including the attribution of specific gaps where targets were not met and remediation plans to improve the result. Through the closing of this loop, faculty continuously evaluate the currency of curriculum and the application of teaching strategies in the classroom. Institutional research provides aggregated and disaggregated data about student demand, patterns of course offerings, and student performance.

Analysis of job development support and learning support services is used to identify student needs. Analysis of staffing, professional development, physical resources,

technology, and marketing is used to assess whether the program has what is necessary to adequately promote and support the program.

Continued Progress

In the 2014-2015 academic year, the following Program Reviews were reviewed by the committee: Counseling, Liberal Arts Math and Science, Honors, and Human Resources. Additionally, Admissions & Records and Engineering had first reviews this year, with second reviews to follow in the Fall.

Programs that were due last year, but have not yet been submitted are ACCESS, Emergency Medical Technology, and Student Government/Activities. Student Government/Activities does not currently have a director, but I have been in contact with the other responsible parties several times during the year. We had a commitment to see ACCESS on 4/14/15, but it was not submitted.

Programs that were due this year, but have not yet been submitted are Marketing/Public Relations, Vocational Nursing, and Financial/Aid Scholarships. We had a commitment to see Vocational Nursing on May 7, but it was not submitted. The committee agreed to let both Financial/Aid Scholarships and the second review of Admissions & Records slip to the Fall of 2015 because fresh data would be available by then, and we preferred that the new data be incorporated into the review.

Goals

Next year is going to be a busy year with all of the Business, Management, and Office Technology programs, General Sciences, Mathematics, Basic Skills, Learning Assistance Center, Maintenance and Operations, and Athletics scheduled. The Program Review Committee Chair will provide training in the Fall for all responsible parties with review due that year. The Chair will also continue to reach out to those individuals throughout the year to offer support and obtain commitments for a review date.

Evidence

Annual Planning Cycle
Program Review Templates

Rubric Statement 2: The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness

Relevant Standards Language

4. The institution regularly evaluates the efficacy and currency of its planning processes, plans, and makes changes as needed. (IB9)

Status

Until Spring 2014, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee has been overseeing program review. Now, a Program Review Committee has been formed with broad representation of college constituents, including five to seven full time faculty members, two administrators, two classified staff members, and a student. The committee also is represented by multiple campus sites. The Program Review Committee Chair is also a member of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and the Student Learning Outcome Assessment Committee.

The charge of the Program Review Committee is to promote and support the systematic self-assessment of instructional programs, student support services, and administrative/operational areas throughout the college. The Program Review Committee reads and evaluates the self-studies, provides feedback to units completing the review, and ensures results are used to refine and improve program practices. As part of a continuous quality improvement process, the committee engages in ongoing review and revision of templates and processes associated with Program Review.

The evaluation of program reviews involves a technical review and a committee review. Technical review includes feedback from the Faculty Chair (if the proposer is not also the Faculty Chair), to the Dean, and to an advisory committee representative if from a career technical education area. After parties in the technical review phase have signed off on the document, the Program Review Chair forwards the document to committee members for evaluation. A rubric is used to score the document for completeness, strength of analysis, evidence of student achievement, and overall impression. Members also provide recommendations for improvement if areas score below outstanding. Recommendations must be resolved before the document obtains final approval.

The Program Review Committee itself will be evaluated annually by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee using the ACCJC's criteria for sustainable continuous quality improvement for program review.

Continued Progress

The committee's processes are working well. We lost 1 member this year, but that discipline already had representation by another member, so we did not replace the member who dropped. Our scoring rubric is working well, and quality feedback is being generated by members. The fact that rubrics and feedback are emailed to the Chair is convenient for everyone. The Chair sends all narrative feedback to the proposer prior to the meeting so the individual knows in advance what the concerns are, if any. The proposer is then prepared to discuss feedback at the meeting. After the first review, the final recommendations are emailed to the proposer for implementation for the second review. If at the second review,

the document is still not ready, it is sent back for more revision. This occurred once this year.

Goals

The committee does not have a specific goal attached to this topic other than to continue with the processes we are using and to reflect on effectiveness of the processes each year.

Evidence

Program Review Process

Program Review Committee Charge/Composition

Program Review Rubric

Rubric Statement 3: The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.

Relevant Standards Language

2. The institution demonstrates a substantive and collegial dialogue about student outcomes, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement. (IB1)
3. The institution disaggregates and analyzes outcomes for subpopulations of students important to its mission. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include human and fiscal resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies. (IB6)
4. The institution regularly evaluates and improves the quality and currency of all instructional programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, pre-collegiate, and continuing and community education courses and programs, regardless of delivery mode or location. The institution systematically strives to improve outcomes for students. (IIA17)

Status

Student achievement is evaluated from several sources of data. Student learning outcome assessment is completed during the year prior to program review. These data cannot be disaggregated for subpopulations because a premise of student learning outcome assessment is that we don't track individual students. Rather, student work comprises a sample, often randomly selected. However, assessment data is regularly disaggregated by delivery mode—especially important for the college's substantial online offerings. The District Research office provides a packaged set of student achievement data from the Banner MIS, and this data could potentially disaggregate for subpopulations, but this level of disaggregation has not been provided for Program Reviews thus far. Career Technical

Education programs can cite Perkins IV Core Indicators of Performance, which includes performance data for non-traditional genders in the discipline.

Identification of gaps is an important component of program review. In the Student Achievement section of the Program Review template, student performance data, employment data, and student learning outcome assessment data is cited and interpreted. Where gaps are identified, strategies are developed to address and correct those gaps. Needs for staffing, professional development, facilities and physical resources, technology, and marketing are also described in the Currency section. As a result of all program needs and gaps in student achievement that are identified, a summary analysis of Program Review is followed by three-year and six-year strategies, which are folded into the annual planning cycle. As Program Review informs the annual planning cycle, steady progress is made on the implementation of strategies and goals. Annual Unit Plans are also the vehicle for making specific budget requests for staffing, professional development, facilities and physical resources, technology, and marketing. The loop is closed when the next Program Review documents completion of the goals that were set.

Continued Progress

The committee identified a need to update the Program Review template to better capture student learning outcome assessment results and progress. To date, program reviews have been quite varied in the thoroughness and content in this section. We want to see a schedule of when each SLO and PLO was assessed, the result, reflective discussion about outcomes that were not met, the interventions that were applied, and when those were reassessed. The Student Learning Outcome Assessment Committee asked that a minimum number of SLO assessments be current prior to a program review being approved.

Goals

The Program Review template has been updated for implementation in Fall 2015.

Evidence

Program Review Template
Perkins IV Core Indicators
Annual Planning Cycle
Annual Unit Plans



Cerro Coso Community College

Annual Assessment Report 2015 Student Learning Outcomes

Instructions

Submit a brief narrative analysis demonstrating the committee's assessment of the status of Student Learning Outcomes implementation at Cerro Coso Community College. This report is divided into sections representing the bulleted characteristics of ACCJC's Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness. Part III of this Rubric comprises Student Learning Outcomes. ACCJC expects all member colleges to be at the implementation level of 'Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement', the Rubric's highest level, for Student Learning Outcomes.

The committee is asked to provide a descriptive summary of how well the college meets the characteristics. Responses should be a concise explanation of what the college is currently doing in each of the identified areas. Concrete details can be referenced for illustrative purposes or qualitative or quantitative data cited as space permits. Responses should be written as if for an outside reader **and not exceed 300 words**.

In completing the report, the committee is asked to interpret the college's implementation level through the lens of Accreditation Standards cited for each characteristic. Language from these Standards is included under each section.

Finally, provide a list of evidence that may be cited to support and verify the statements made in the descriptive summary. The actual evidence does not need to be provided, but the list should be compiled as if it were—that is, carefully and specifically, not the kitchen-sink approach.

Rubric Statement 1: Student Learning Outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic, and used for continuous quality improvement

Relevant Standards Language

5. The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of outcomes, goals, and objectives through analyses of quantitative and qualitative data disaggregated by program type and mode of delivery. (IB5)
6. The institution disaggregates and analyzes outcomes for subpopulations of students important to its mission. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it

implements strategies, which may include human and fiscal resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies. (IB6)

7. The institution identifies and regularly assesses learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates and degrees using established institutional procedures. The institution has officially approved course outlines that include student learning outcomes. (IIA4)

Status

Learning outcomes are assessed at the course, program, service and institution level. Outcomes are aggregated and analyzed to identify themes and inform instruction and services. Programs connect learning and resource requests direction to the college's mission and strategic goals. Departments and programs are continuing to fine-tune analysis of outcomes and more are beginning to consider course learning outcome data in a disaggregated manner, related to course offerings (days/time), online/on-ground, and full time/part time faculty. SLO and PLO data is used to identify resources needed to enhance or scaffold student learning, including remediation and intervention, and is reported in the AUP. The SLO Committee reviews each AUP and identifies common themes across courses, programs, services and the institution. This information is used to inform discussions and training at all levels.

The SLO Coordinator is a member of the Curriculum and Instruction, and the Institutional Effectiveness Committees. This ensures continuous monitoring of quality and consistency from identification of learning outcomes in the course outlines through the assessment cycle. The course outlines are entered into CurricUNET and the active course student learning outcomes are populated into the assessment module. This process ensures accuracy in the assessment process as learning outcomes are reviewed and revised. The SLO Committee has recommended each program assess SLOs in the first three years of the program review cycle, assess PLOs in the fourth year and complete the program review in the fifth year. If gaps are detected, appropriate remediation will be implemented and the learning outcome will be reassessed prior to the program review. Over the next year, the SLO Coordinator in collaboration with faculty chairs, will solidify this process and specific assessment schedules will be developed. This process will ensure learning outcomes are assessed in a regular cycle and consistency for units.

Continued Progress

Chairs have been asked to complete the 5 year cycle indicating when SLOs will be assessed (within the first 3 years, PLOs in the 4th year and writing the PR in the 5th. Chairs are also working on the SLO to PLO map. (Solidify process and specific assessment schedules will be developed). These documents will be posted on the SLO Moodle.

- To date, two Departments have submitted

The college is moving away from using the objectives provided in C-ID as SLOs. This method has been unwieldy at best and due to the sheer number of SLOs is bogging down meaningful discussion. To help clarify this, the SLO Terminology Glossary by the ASCCC has been provided to Department Chairs, SLO and CIC committee members.

The college is now counting all courses and programs in the catalog when factoring the percent assessed. This has resulted in lower percentages.

- Ongoing assessment of Courses: 62.53%
- Ongoing assessment of Programs: 71.43%

SLO Coordinator and administration have been working with CIC and faculty chairs to delete inactive courses.

The SLO Committee has recommended each program assess SLOs in the first three years of the program review cycle, assess PLOs in the fourth year and complete the program review in the fifth year. If gaps are detected, appropriate remediation will be implemented and the learning outcome will be reassessed prior to the program review when possible.

Programs with less than 85% of their courses assessed are not eligible to complete Program Review. This language will be added to the Program Review template and will be communicated to Department Chairs during the Fall 2015 Program Review training. The target will move, to somewhere in the 90's (to allow for new courses), over the next few years.

The SLO Committee recommends new courses be informally assessed the first time offered. This provides faculty with necessary information related to curriculum and SLO assessment methods. The faculty/department may choose to enter this assessment, or simply use it for their information. The second time a course is offered, the course needs to be assessed and the assessment entered in CurricUNET.

Goals

- Specific assessment schedules will be implemented, providing clear “due dates” for when each course is to be assessed. This process will ensure learning outcomes are assessed in a regular cycle and consistency in units.
- A spreadsheet to track SLO assessments is needed because the current tool has deficits and does not allow for accurate or meaningful tracking and reporting. To achieve this, it will require special compensation or load.
- Move SLO/PLO assessment towards the 95% mark.
- Specific strategies and support need to be developed for disaggregating outcomes for subpopulations of students important to its mission. Disaggregation occurs in Program Review, but not directly related to specific student learning outcomes. The

college needs to move to a management system (ie. SLO Cloud) that allows for disaggregation at the SLO level.

Evidence

Agenda and Minutes from College Council, IEC, and SLO Committee Meetings
SLO annual report
Annual Unit Plans

Rubric Statement 2: Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive, and robust

Relevant Standards Language

3. The institution demonstrates a substantive and collegial dialogue about student outcomes, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement. (IB1)

Status

The College maintains a planning section on the website, where SLO resources and data is housed. Formal and informal resources are available for faculty, staff, students and the public. These resources highlight best practice and effective strategies in learning outcome assessment and can provide guidance for faculty and staff, and a context through which to interpret the information for students and the public. The SLO Coordinator is available to meet with groups of faculty or staff and is an active member of the curriculum instruction, student learning outcome and institutional effectiveness committees, effectively connecting and ensuring consistency. The AUP and Program Review templates require programs and units to link SLO and PLO data to budget requests. SLO assessment information and results directly impact student behavior and achievement as faculty and staff identify best practices and collaboration opportunities both internally and externally with colleagues. The College's 2012 Institutional Self Evaluation Report identified the need to develop a schedule creating a cohesive plan connecting SLO and PLO assessment. In spring 2015, faculty chairs submitted a schedule for PLO assessment, illustrating how assessments connect within the program. This will help programs increase productivity in assessing outcomes in a consistent and systematic manner, providing necessary data for PLO assessment and Program Review. The information gathered in these reports help to improve programs and courses and in turn, student learning and success.

Continued Progress

Beginning in Fall 2015 the SLO moodle, which contains resources and assessment training videos, will contain a block for each department. Assessment tools, assessment plan (5 yr and PLO/SLO map), assessment data and department minutes related to learning outcome

assessment can be uploaded. Each Department can have a discussion forum where discussions related to assessment can take place (particularly for those unable to participate in meetings). This allows all faculty to easily access the most up to date Assessment tool for their course. This strategy will also help communication regarding assessments, across disciplines. Entering assessment data into CurricUNET will continue. The moodle is meant to provide a means of communication and be a central repository for assessment documents.

Goals

- Increase dialogue to become more pervasive and robust.
- Additional information will be asked for in the AUP, specifically requesting the identification of why gaps exist (drop down menu with themes).
- Departments will be asked to provide evidence of dialogue related to course and program SLOs.

Evidence

Annual Unit Plans
Program Review Template
SLO moodle
Agenda and Minutes from SLO and IEC Committees
Agenda and Minutes from Department Meetings
Agenda and Minutes from Academic Senate
PLO Assessment Plans

Rubric Statement 3: There is evaluation of student learning outcomes processes

Relevant Standards Language

2. The institution regularly evaluates the efficacy and currency of its planning processes, plans for, and makes changes as needed. (IB9)

Status

The SLO Coordinator, in consultation with the SLO Committee prepares a Comprehensive Annual Assessment Report, addressing ILO, PLO and SLO progress. Programs have historically addressed SLO and PLO data in their AUP, however, in fall 2013, more intentional language was added to encourage discussion of significant assessment findings, specifically requiring programs to address “progress made” on previous assessment goals, along with identification of gaps and planned improvements, towards outcome assessment. The Committee reviews each AUP, identifies gaps and overarching themes and the results are aggregated and reported out. Additionally, a course matrix is used to track SLO assessment

for both current and newly developed courses. In fall 2013, faculty chairs submitted a schedule for PLO assessment, illustrating how assessments connect within the program. This will help programs increase productivity in assessing outcomes in a consistent and systemic manner, providing necessary data for PLO assessment and Program Review. The information gathered in these reports help to improve programs and courses and in turn, student learning and success. Beginning Spring 2014, this annual assessment report will be completed and the information used to inform planning. Additionally, it would be beneficial to develop and implement a survey as another measure of awareness, engagement and identification of training and support needed.

Continued Progress

Working on survey questions for annual report

Goals

- Survey questions have been drafted and submitted to Michael Carley (to be included in the next IEC Annual Report survey, Spring 2016)

Evidence

Annual Unit Plans

SLO Annual Assessment Report

Comprehensive Annual Report

Annual Assessment Survey *drafted questions for spring 2016 survey*

Agenda and Minutes from Faculty Chairs Meetings

Rubric Statement 4: Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing

Relevant Standards Language

5. The institution uses assessment data, organizes its institutional processes and allocates resources to support student learning and student achievement. (IB4)

Status

Intentional dialogue related to SLO data and student success takes place across the college, including venues such as College Council; monthly Faculty Chairs meetings; the Institutional Effectiveness, Student Learning Outcome and Curriculum and Instruction Committees, Department and Advisory meetings. The various levels work to identify themes from reporting instruments such as the AUP and Program Review, which then directly inform institutional planning and resource allocation. Divisions, Units, Programs and Departments

must directly correlate SLO assessment and student success to requests for resources. The Student Learning Outcome Committee's 2012 and 2013 Comprehensive Annual Reports identified that the primary theme for SLO gaps between target and goal is attributed to "specific instructional techniques." This theme does not include course content, but rather connects with the need for professional development both within the Department and also for the faculty as a whole. The 2013-2014 Professional Development Resource Request identifies the goal of, "provide training to enhance student success with teaching techniques and technologies." This is only one example of how the institutional planning and effectiveness directly connects between SLO/PLO assessment and resource allocation.

Continued Progress

Survey questions have been drafted and submitted to Michael Carley (to be included in the next IEC Annual Report survey, Spring 2016)

Goals

- Increase mapping of courses and programs between CIC, Program Review and SLO Committee. When faculty present courses and programs in CIC, they will be asked: When was the course/program last assessed? How did the assessment results inform the SLO/PLO and ultimately the COR being presented?
- Implement SLO questions on IEC survey as another measure of awareness, engagement and identification of training and support needed.
- SLO Moodle training videos, resources and Department blocks

Evidence

Student Learning Outcome Comprehensive Annual Reports
Agenda and Minutes from College Council, Faculty Chairs, IEC, SLO and CIC Meetings
Agenda and Minutes from Department and Advisory Meetings
Professional development resource request

Rubric Statement 5: Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college

Relevant Standards Language

1. The institution communicates the results of all its assessments broadly so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities. (IB10)
2. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that specifies at minimum learning outcomes associated with those in the institution's officially approved course outline. (IIA4)

Status

The AUP and Program Review templates require programs and units to link SLO and PLO data to budget requests. SLOA information and results directly impact student behavior and achievement as faculty and staff identify best practices and collaboration opportunities both internally and externally with colleagues. The College's 2012 Institutional Self Evaluation Report, identified the need to develop a schedule creating a cohesive plan connecting SLO and PLO assessment. In fall 2013, faculty chairs submitted a schedule for PLO assessment, illustrating how assessments connect within the program. This will help programs increase productivity in assessing outcomes in a consistent and systemic manner, providing necessary data for PLO assessment and Program Review. The information gathered in these reports help to improve programs and courses and in turn, student learning and success. Future goals include a more intentional communication with faculty and staff regarding the current progress in assessment, identified gaps and themes, and specific goals for the academic year. This, in conjunction with a schedule that incorporates Program Review, PLO and SLO assessment, will help to ensure sustainable and continuous quality improvement, particularly in areas that have fluctuating leadership and staffing. In 2012-2013 the Academic Senate approved a syllabus template for all faculty to use, which includes highlighting Student Learning Outcomes associated with the course, as indicated in the Course Outline of Record.

Continued Progress

The SLO Committee identified the following strategy, to begin in Fall 2015:
Use the SLO moodle, create a block for each department. Assessment tools, assessment plan (5 year and PLO/SLO map), assessment data and department minutes related to learning outcome assessment can be uploaded. This allows all faculty to easily be able to access the most up to date Assessment tool for their course.

Goals

- Visibility. Development of Learning Assessment website.
- Address the question, how are assessment results communicated broadly?
- Annual Learning Outcome updates to faculty. Beginning in fall 2015, each fall, a list of scheduled outcomes due in CurricUNET and those scheduled to be assessed will be provided to faculty chairs. (This goal hinges on Dept. Chairs submitted the 5 year plan)

Evidence

Annual Unit Plans

Program Review

SLO annual report

Agenda and Minutes from SLO, Faculty chair, and Academic Senate Meetings

Rubric Statement 6: Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews

No Relevant Standards Language

Status

Learning outcomes directly influence curriculum and program review. The instructional and non-instructional program review template requires detailed and specific analysis of learning outcomes, including how well students are achieving the learning outcomes, along with identification and analysis of trends and gaps. The faculty and staff directly involved in the program are encouraged to actively participate in the analysis of data and writing of the program review. Program review serves as both a reflective tool and a catalyst for change. Course and program learning outcomes are analyzed to ensure they align with the goals of the program, including, desired knowledge and/or skills. The student learning outcomes and competency levels for degrees, certificates, programs, and courses must correlate and assessment data is examined to ensure pathways and learning outcomes are appropriate.

Continued Progress

The SLO Committee has recommended the following: Programs with less than 85% of their courses assessed are not eligible to complete Program Review. This language will be added to the Program Review template and will be communicated to Department Chairs during the Fall 2015 Program Review training. The target will move, to somewhere in the 90's (to allow for new courses), over the next few years.

Programs will be asked to submit their 5 year plan in the Program Review document.

Goals

- This standard was scored at 4.25 in Spring 2014. It was determined that no specific goals are necessary at this time.

Evidence

Program Reviews

Agenda and Minutes from Program Review Committee Meetings

Agenda and Minutes from SLO Committee Meetings

Agenda and Minutes from IEC Meetings