

The background of the cover features a photograph of a modern, curved building with a light-colored facade and blue awnings. In the foreground, there are lush green palm trees on the left and several agave plants with large, pointed leaves. A dense bed of bright pink flowers is at the bottom of the image. A large, faint watermark of the Ventura College seal is visible in the upper left corner of the sky.

VENTURA COLLEGE

SET YOUR COURSE

**ANNUAL
PLANNING REPORT**
Office of Institutional Effectiveness
August 2011

Contents

The ten-year Educational Master Plan charts the college’s long-term course. The Strategic Plan is comprised of a limited number of three-year institutional strategic goals derived from the Educational Master Plan. These three-year goals are further divided into strategic objectives, each operationalized through action steps. The Annual Planning Report, prepared by the College Planning Council, the Student Learning Outcomes Oversight Committee and the College President, documents the progress made on the Strategic Plan’s action steps from the prior year and the conclusions drawn from the student learning outcomes assessment process.

Section 1: Ventura College Strategic Plan.....	2
VC Objective 1: Continuously assess Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for all courses and programs. 2	
VC Objective 2: Revise program review process to integrate SLOs and a more meaningful analysis of data	6
VC Objective 3: Implement the Student Services Redesign Plan.....	9
VC Objective 4: Increase opportunities for staff to grow and have training opportunities to enhance service to students.....	11
VC Objective 5: Assess and, if necessary, modify the college’s organizational structure.	14
VC Objective 6: Explore opportunities for reconfiguring existing or acquiring new space to accommodate growth; reconfigure the East Campus curriculum.....	16
Section 2: SLO Status Report, Spring 2011	18

Section 1: Ventura College Strategic Plan

Annual Implementation Plan 2010-2011

1) SLOs/SUOs; 2) Program Review; 3) Student Services Redesign; 4) Professional Development; 5) Reorganization; 6) East Campus

VC Strategic Goal 1: Continuously improve educational programs and services to meet student, community, and workforce development needs.

VC Objective 1: Continuously assess Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for all courses and programs.

VCCCD Board Goal: Access and Student Success

VC Accreditation Recommendation: As noted in 2004, in order to fully meet this Standard the team recommends that the college accelerate its efforts to identify measurable student learning outcomes for every course, instructional program, and student support programs. In conjunction with this effort the college should assess all learning outcomes and incorporate analysis of student learning assessments into course and program improvements. (Accreditation Standard II.B.1-7, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a-b, II.A.2.e-f, II.B.4, II.C.2)

#	Action Steps	Responsible Party	Timeline	Progress
1.1	Form task force (Student Learning Outcome Oversight Group) to review variety of SLO/SUO assessment and documentation models and to recommend one to the Senate	President; Academic Senate President	October 2010	Completed
1.2	Develop a model to document the development and assessment of SLOS that includes the application of the assessment to program improvement and an aggressive cycle for assessing course level SLOs/SUOs	SLO Oversight Group	November 2010	Completed
1.3	Adopt SLO/SUO assessment model	Academic Senate	November 2010	Completed
1.4	Adopt definition of a "program"	Academic Senate	November 2010	Completed
1.5	Train Deans in the development of program level SLOs/SUOs	President and Deans serving on Student Learning Outcome Oversight Group	November 2010	Completed for Spring 2011 and ongoing
1.6	Recruit and select Learning Outcomes Assessment Facilitator	President, EVP	December 2010	Completed
1.7	Train Deans and Department Chairs in the assessment of course and	Learning Outcomes Assessment Facilitator;	November 2010	Completed for Spring 2011

	program SLOs/SUOs	SLO Oversight Group; Academic Senate		and ongoing
1.8	Develop SLO/SUO training manual	SLO Oversight Group; Academic Senate	December 2010	Completed
1.9	Adopt list of college programs	Academic Senate	December 2010	Completed
1.10	Inventory status of course- and program-level SLOs/SUOs	Learning Resources Supervisor	December 2010	Completed and ongoing
1.11	Establish format for database for course- and program-level SLOs/SUOs	Vice President and SLO Oversight Group	December 2010	Completed and ongoing
1.12	Enter course-level SLOs/SUOs and existing program-level SLOs/SUOs into defined databases	Learning Resources Supervisor	January 2011	Completed and ongoing
1.13	Complete development of program level SLOs/SUOs	Department Chairs/Faculty	January 2011	Completed
1.14	Assist faculty in the development of assessment strategies to be implemented in Spring 2011	Learning Outcomes Assessment Facilitators, Department Chairs, Deans	January - March 2011	Completed
1.15	Offer workshops in the improvement of instruction based on the assessments of SLO/SUO assessments	SLO Oversight Group	January 2011	Completed and ongoing
1.16	Establish and maintain a web page to document the SLO/SUO development and assessment process	Learning Resources Supervisor	January 2011	Completed and ongoing
1.17	Establish the list of SLO/SUO assessment documentation to be posted to the web page and review web page progress.	SLO Oversight Group	January 2011	Completed; Maintenance ongoing
1.18	Assess SLOs at course level and SUOs at program level and document assessment process and results	Faculty	February – March 2011	Completed and ongoing
1.19	Map college SLOs/SUOs and program SLOs/SUOs across all courses in each program	Deans and Department Chairs, assisted by Learning Outcomes Assessment Facilitators	May 2011	Completed
1.20	File SLO/SUO assessment results with the SLO Oversight Committee	Department Chairs	May 2011	Completed
1.21	Survey faculty and staff about SLO/SUO process	SLO Oversight Group	May 2011	Completed
1.22	Create SLO/SUO assessment calendar for Fall 2011	SLO Oversight Group	May 2011	Completed

1.23	Review results of SLO/SUO assessments	SLO Oversight Group	July 2011	In process
1.24	File Bi-Annual SLO/SUO Report	SLO Oversight Group	July 2011	In process
1.25	Establish institutional SLO/SUO Oversight Committee (with representation of faculty, staff, and managers) to replace interim SLO/SUO Oversight Group	Academic Senate	August 2011	
1.26	Apply SLO assessment results to improve programs and document those improvements	Department Chairs, Supervisors, Faculty	August – November 2011	
1.27	Provide ongoing training for SLO/SUO assessment process	SLO/SUO Oversight Committee	August 2011	
1.28	Submit SLO/SUO assessment results through the revised Program Review process, documenting any need for resources associated with plans for improvements.	Deans, Department Chairs, Coordinators, Supervisors	August – November 2011	
1.29	Assess SLOs/SUOs at course and program levels and document assessment process and results	Faculty, Staff, Managers, and Supervisors	August – November 2011	
1.30	Plan and strategize for assessment of college-level SLOs	SLO/SUO Oversight Committee	September 2011	
1.31	Review results of SLO/SUO assessments	SLO Oversight Committee	December 2011	
1.32	Review SLO/SUO development and assessment process; modify as necessary	SLO Oversight Committee, Academic Senate	January - February 2012	
1.33	Establish cycle chart that paces the review of courses over a multiple semester period	SLO Oversight Committee	January - February 2012	
1.34	Continue Faculty Professional Develop on SLOs/SUOs each semester	Learning Outcomes Assessment Facilitators	January – December 2012	
1.35	File Bi-Annual SLO Report	SLO Oversight Committee	June 2012	

Supporting Evidence

1. SLO Individual Faculty Form
2. SLO Course Summary Form
3. SLO/SUO Program Summary Form
4. Program Description and Mapping Form (also contains college-level SLOs for program)
5. SLOOG Minutes (on SLO webpage)
6. Timeline/Calendar for Spring 2011

7. Toolkit (on SLO webpage)
8. Program-level SLOs (on SLO webpage)
9. SLO Checklist (per program and overall college)
10. SharePoint (document depository)
 - Course-level SLOs/SUOs
 - Program-level SLOs/SUOs
 - Fillable forms
 - Completed SLO/SUO forms
 - Course-level SLO rubrics
11. Training sessions
 - Emails from Scott/Ty
 - Flex day programs
12. Accreditation Status Report
13. SLO Annual Report

Annual Implementation Plan 2010-2011

- 1) SLOs/SUOs; **2) Program Review**; 3) Student Services Redesign; 4) Professional Development;
5) Reorganization; 6) East Campus

VC Strategic Goal 1: Continuously improve educational programs and services to meet student, community, and workforce development needs.

VC Objective 2: Revise program review process to integrate SLOs and a more meaningful analysis of data

VCCCD Board Goal: Access and Student Success

VC Accreditation Recommendation: In order to fully meet this standard the team recommends that the college must increase its research capacity to serve the programs and fully integrate its research efforts into the program review process. Further Student Learning Outcomes need to become an integral part of the Program Review process, including incorporating the research function, detailed discussions, and appropriate analysis from SLO data research (Accreditation Standard I.B.1, I.B.2., II.B.1, II.B.3.a, II.B.3.c, II.B.4, ER 10 and 19). In order to fully meet this standard the team recommends that the college strengthen the content of its program review process to include a comprehensive and meaningful analysis of data with particular emphasis on student demographics, enrollment, program completion, retention, success, and achievement of student learning outcomes. Improvements to its programs should then be based on these results. (Accreditation Standard I.B.3, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a-b, II.A.2.e, II.C.2.i, II.B.2., II.B.3-4, II.C.2)

#	Action Steps	Responsible Party	Timeline	Progress
2.1	Establish Program Review Task Force	President, Academic Senate President	January 2011	Completed
2.2	Review existing program review process, forms, timelines, and available databases	Program Review Task Force	February 2011	Completed
2.3	Modify program review forms to include the additional required data fields: student demographics, enrollment trends, program completion, retention, success (grade distribution; pass rate), and achievement of student learning outcomes.	Program Review Task Force	February 2011	Completed
2.4	Develop relational database to automatically populate data form fields on program review documents.	Vice President; Institutional Researcher	February – March 2011	Schema completed; Database in development
2.5	Review timelines, flowchart and committee processes for program review.	Program Review Task Force	February 2011	Completed
2.6	Review and approve modified	Academic Senate	March 2011	Completed at

	program review forms, committee processes and timelines.			the April 5 th Meeting
2.7	Develop sample completed program review forms	Program Review Task Force	April 2011	Completed
2.8	Develop training materials for program review	Program Review Task Force	April 2011	Completed
2.9	Train Deans and Department Chairs	Program Review Task Force	August 2011	In progress
2.10	Pilot revised program review process	Program Review Committee, Deans and Department Chairs	August – December 2011	In progress
2.11	Survey the campus to identify strengths and weaknesses of revised model	Co-Chairs, Program Review Committee	January 2012	
2.12	Revise program review model based on feedback	Program Review Committee	February – March 2012	
2.13	Conduct second pilot of the revised program review process.	Program Review Committee, Deans and Department Chairs	August – December 2012	
2.14	Survey the campus to identify strengths and weaknesses of revised model	Co-Chairs, Program Review Committee	January 2013	
2.15	Revise program review model based on feedback	Program Review Committee	February – March 2013	

Supporting Evidence

1. Program Review Handbook
2. Planning Parameters for 2011-2012
3. College Planning Council Charter
4. Integrated Planning Map
5. Program Review Forum PowerPoint
6. Program Review Database Reports
7. Prototype Program Review Document
8. Executive Summary for Program Review
9. Program Review Task Force Meetings
 - a. Meeting – 11-16-10 Possible Model for Revision of Program Review Forms
 - b. Meeting – 02-10-11 Mini-task Force – Revised Program Review Document
 - c. Meeting – 02-24-11 Program Review Task Force
 - d. Meeting – 03-03-11 Academic Senate Program Review Model
 - e. Meeting – 03-14-11 Program Review SLO Interface
 - f. Meeting – 03-22-11 President’s Review of Recommendation 4 – Program Review
 - g. Meeting – 03-24-11 Academic Senate Program Review
 - h. Meeting – 03-25-11 President’s Review of Recommendation 8 – Institutional Effectiveness
 - i. Meeting – 04-21-11 Planning Parameters for Program Review Logistics
 - j. Meeting – 05-19-11 Data for Program Review

10. College Planning Council / Academic Senate

- a. Meeting – 04-07-11 Committee Charter; Establish Planning Parameters for FY12
- b. Meeting – 04-21-11 Planning Parameters
- c. Meeting – 05-05-11 Integrated Planning; Program Review Handbook

Annual Implementation Plan 2010-2011

- 1) SLOs/SUOs; 2) Program Review; **3) Student Services Redesign**; 4) Professional Development;
5) Reorganization; 6) East Campus

VC Strategic Goal 2: Provide students with information and access to diverse and comprehensive support services that lead to their success.

VC Objective 3: Implement the Student Services Redesign Plan.

VCCCD Board Goal: Access and Student Success

#	Action Steps	Responsible Party	Timeline	Progress
3.1	Student Services Retreat to launch project	President, Guest Facilitator	October 2010	Completed
3.2	Title V Implementation Team formed and begins meeting twice-monthly	Project Director, Activity Director, Student Services Liaison groups	October 2010	Teams formed; Meetings continue throughout academic year
3.3	Identify and prioritize new online academic support and student services at Ventura College and Oxnard College	Student Services Team, Project Director, Activity Director	November 2010 - June 2011	In progress
3.4	Fill Student Outreach Specialist position	President, Project Director, Dean of Student Services	December 2010	Completed via employee transfer
3.5	Hire consulting expertise to design, develop and implement online services at Ventura College and Oxnard College	Student Services Teams, Project Director, Web and Distant Education Task Force	December 2010 – September 2011	In progress*
3.6	Establish baseline data for all project objectives and quantifiable outcomes	Project Director, Institutional Researcher, Activities Directors	January – June 2011	In progress
3.7	Begin outreach to high school students and adults in the community	Activity Director, Outreach Specialist	January 2011	Ongoing*
3.8	Establish Welcome Center	Project Director, Activity Director, Dean of Student Services, Student Outreach Specialist	January 2011	In progress; Due for opening Fall 2011*
3.9	Form Title V Oversight Committee	Project Director	January 2011 –	Committee

	and start meeting quarterly		September 2015	formed, meetings are ongoing*
3.10	Fill Student Services Specialist position	President, Project Director, Dean of Student Services	February 2011	Completed
3.11	Analyze and map flow of information, services, decision points and outcomes for diverse populations of stakeholders on web portal	Consultant	Fall 2011	
3.12	Continue comprehensive data collection for all project objectives and quantify outcomes	Institutional Research, Project Director, Activity Director	July 2011 – June 2012	
3.13	Continue outreach to high school students and adults in the community	Activity Director, Student Outreach Specialist	July 2011 – June 2012	
3.14	Continue to enhance Welcome Center	Activity Director, Student Outreach Specialist, Student Services Specialist	July 2011 – June 2012	
3.15	Continue to identify and prioritize new online academic support and student services at Ventura College and Oxnard College	Student Services Teams, Activity Director, Project Director	July 2011 – June 2012	
3.16	Design, develop, pilot, evaluate and revise, soft roll-out, evaluate and revise, “go live” with prioritized online services at Ventura College and Oxnard College	Student Services Teams, Project Director, Activity Director, Consultant services, District Wide Web and Distant Ed Task Force	July 2011 – June 2012	
3.17	Revise Web portal hierarchy, information and services to align with identified flows as needed	Consultant	July 2012 – June 2013	

Supporting Evidence

1. Student Services Reengineering Plan
2. Title V Implementation Team Minutes
3. Welcome Center Design Plans
4. Portal Meeting Minutes
5. Sample High School Outreach Report, February 2011

Annual Implementation Plan 2010-2011

1) SLOs/SUOs; 2) Program Review; 3) Student Services Redesign; **4) Professional Development;**
5) Reorganization; 6) East Campus

VC Strategic Goal 4: Continuously enhance institutional operations and effectiveness

VC Objective 4: Increase opportunities for staff to grow and have training opportunities to enhance service to students.

VCCCD Board Goal: Professional Development for Faculty and Staff

#	Action Steps	Responsible Party	Timeline	Progress
4.1	Advertise for Ventura College Professional Development Activity Director	Title V Project Director	November 2010	Completed
4.2	Interview and select Activity Director	Project Director	December 2010	Completed
4.3	Meet with all stakeholders at both Ventura College and Oxnard College to establish Summer Institute draft proposal and develop a Task Force from both campuses	Project Director	November – December 2010	Completed
4.4	Advertise for participants to attend training	Project Director, Activity Director	January – April 2011	Completed
4.5	Select Instructional Design Specialist	Project Director	February 2011	Completed, May 2011
4.6	Survey Ventura College and Oxnard College full-time and part-time faculty for knowledge, skills and interest for professional development training and participation	Activity Director	January – February 2011	Completed
4.7	Develop appropriate curriculum for faculty summer institute	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialists VC and OC	April 2011	Completed
4.8	Recruit and select summer institute cohorts at VC and OC	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist	April – May 2011	Completed
4.9	Coordinate workshops from instructional experts, open to all summer institute participants	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialists	May – June 2011	Completed
4.10	Organize professional development trainings for 2011-2012 academic year	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist, Task Force, Faculty Professional Development	Fall 2011	Fall flex week activities planned; remainder in progress

		Committee Chair		
4.11	Implement and deliver summer institute	Project Director, Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist	June 2011	Completed
4.12	Identify faculty from summer institute and other trainings to pilot new ideas	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist	June 2011	Completed
4.13	Identify and capture baseline data for research specific to pilot groups	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist, Faculty involved in pilot testing	June – September 2011	Completed
4.14	Debrief summer institute faculty development training	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist, Task Force	June 2011	Completed
4.15	Create and implement new faculty survey regarding training for professional development needs	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist, Task Force	September – October 2011	
4.16	Continue ongoing year-round individual and small-group distance education training	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist	August 2011 – May 2012	
4.17	Update curriculum for summer institute	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist	October 2011 – March 2012	
4.18	Gather and compile results on reports of all pilot testing projects conducted in fall 2011	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist	January 2012	
4.19	Recruit and select summer institute cohorts for VC and OC	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist	January – April 2012	
4.20	Report to greater community of faculty at both VC and OC the results of pilot testing of ideas, and successes and failures of individual and small group distance education support	Project Director, Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist, Task Force	Spring 2012 and at summer institute	
4.21	Organize professional development trainings for 2012-2013 academic year	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist, Task Force	May – June 2012	
4.22	Implement and deliver summer institute	Project Director, Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist	June 2012	
4.23	Identify faculty from summer institute and other trainings to pilot new ideas, identify and capture baseline data for research specific	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist, plus faculty involved in pilot testing	June – September 2012	

	to pilot groups			
4.24	Debrief on all faculty development training in Spring 2012	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist, Task Force	August 2012	
4.25	Create and implement new faculty survey regarding training for professional development needs	Activity Director, Instructional Design Specialist Task Force	September – October 2012	

Supporting Evidence

1. Faculty Development Survey
2. Advertisement recruiting for Summer Institute
3. Summer Institute brochure with participant list
4. Minutes from Summer Institute debriefing
5. Flex day, draft of activities
6. Summer institute evaluation report
7. Summer institute participants' action plans

Annual Implementation Plan 2010-2011

- 1) SLOs/SUOs; 2) Program Review; 3) Student Services Redesign; 4) Professional Development;
5) Reorganization; 6) East Campus

VC Strategic Goal 4: Continuously enhance institutional operations and effectiveness.

VC Objective 5: Assess and, if necessary, modify the college’s organizational structure.

VCCCD Board Goal: Prudent Fiscal Stewardship

VC Accreditation Recommendations: In order to fully meet this standard the team recommends that the college must examine and provide evidence that appropriate leadership is addressing the various initiatives and programs on campus that support student learning. Efforts in online learning technology, basic skills initiatives, and SLOs lack an oversight committee or person responsible to oversee each of these projects and to ensure that they are implemented college wide in a manner that best serves the interests of student learning (Accreditation Standard II.A, II.B); As noted in 2004, in order to fully meet this standard the team recommends that the college president must develop an ongoing systematic and comprehensive system to assess the effectiveness of the college’s organizational structure, campus planning processes, and institutional effectiveness and to convey the results of such assessments to the college community in a timely manner. (Accreditation Standard IV.B.2.a-b, IV.B.2.c)

#	Action Steps	Responsible Party	Timeline	Progress
5.1	Conduct focus group discussion with Deans, Department Chairs and Senate Executive Committees	President	December 2010	Completed
5.2	Conduct online survey of campus community regarding strengths and weaknesses of current structure	President	January 2011	Completed
5.3	Report results of focus group discussion and campus survey to college faculty and staff	President	February 2011	Completed
5.4	Utilize large group decision-making process to develop several proposed organizational models	President	February 2011	Completed
5.5	Examine models and create initial organizational model.	President, Executive Vice President, Vice President	March 2011	Completed
5.6	Share initial model with Deans, Directors, Department Chairs and Classified Supervisors; consider and incorporate feedback	President	March 2011	Completed
5.7	Share revised model with Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and Associated Students; consider and incorporate feedback	President	March 2011	Completed
5.8	Review model with Chancellor’s	President	March 2011	Completed

	Cabinet; incorporate feedback			
5.9	Present request for Management Intern to Board of Trustees	President	April 2011	Completed; Proposal rejected
5.10	Redistribute departments assigned to the Dean of Communication & Learning Resources to other Divisions	President, Executive Vice President, Deans	May 2011	Completed
5.11	Modify assigned administrative responsibilities in accordance with the revised organizational structure	President, Executive Vice President, Vice President, Deans	May 2011	Completed
5.12	Present revised organizational model to Board of Trustees	President	July 2011	
5.13	Conduct online survey of campus community regarding strengths and weaknesses of revised structure	President	March 2012	

Supporting Evidence

1. Summary of Focus Group Discussion, December 3, 2010
2. Notes, Organizational Forum, February 11, 2011
3. Online Survey Results
4. Revised Organizational Chart
5. Division Responsibilities, Fall 2011

Annual Implementation Plan 2010-2011

- 1) SLOs/SUOs; 2) Program Review; 3) Student Services Redesign; 4) Professional Development;
5) Reorganization; **6) East Campus**

VC Strategic Goal 5: Implement the Ventura College East Campus educational plan.

VC Objective 6: Explore opportunities for reconfiguring existing or acquiring new space to accommodate growth; reconfigure the East Campus curriculum.

VCCCD Board Goal: Access and Student Success

#	Action Steps	Responsible Party	Timeline	Progress
6.1	Identify square footage and classroom configurations needed to provide instruction at East Campus	Executive Vice President; Dean, Off-Campus Programs	August – September, 2010	Completed
6.2	Research alternative locations to house the East Campus; obtain proposals and price quotes	Vice President, Business Services; Dean, Off-Campus Programs; District Director of General Services	October – December 2010	Completed
6.3	Narrow proposals and present best options to Chancellor’s Cabinet for review	Vice Chancellor, Business Services; President	January 2011	Completed
6.4	Identify core list of general education courses to offer in rotation in a fast-track format	Executive Vice President; Dean, Off-Campus Programs; Deans, Math & Science, Social Science & Humanities, Communication & Learning Resources	January – March 2011	Completed, June 2011
6.5	Present lease contract for Board approval	Vice Chancellor, Business Services; President	February 2011	Completed, March 2011
6.6	Develop new curriculum to prepare students for entry-level occupations using multi-functional machine “trainers”	Vice President, Business Services; Assistant Dean, Career & Technical Education; Consultant	February – May 2011	On hold until August 2011
6.7	Build out newly leased space in accordance with desired classroom configurations	Property owner under the supervision of the VP, Business Services and the Director of Facilities, Maintenance & Operations	March – May 2011	In progress, anticipate completion July 2011
6.8	Move out of existing facilities;	Dean, Off-Campus	June – July	In progress

	move in to and set up new facility	Programs; Director of Facilities, Maintenance & Operations; Technology Support Services Supervisor; East Campus faculty and staff	2011	
6.9	Publicize the new rotation of fast-track general education courses	Dean, Off-Campus Programs	June – August 2011	In progress
6.10	Pilot newly-revised English as a Second Language curriculum	Dean, Communication & Learning Resources; ESL faculty	August – December 2011	
6.11	Submit CTE curriculum for approval	Assistant Dean, Career & Technical Education	August – September 2011	
6.12	Pilot initial set of fast-track general education courses; modify the schedule if necessary to improve enrollment and productivity	Dean, Off-Campus Programs; Deans, Math & Science, Social Science & Humanities, Communication & Learning Resources	August – December 2011	
6.13	Identify one-time dollars (general fund, categorical, or grant) to support the acquisition of needed machine “trainers” and packaged software.	Vice President, Business Services; Assistant Dean, Career & Technical Education	September 2011 – March 2012	
6.14	Pilot new model of CTE training	Dean, Off-Campus; Assistant Dean, Career & Technical Education	August – December 2012	

Supporting Evidence

1. Santa Paula / Fillmore Design Team Report
2. Architectural Plans, Santa Paula Site

Section 2: SLO Status Report, Spring 2011

An interim SLO Oversight Group consisting of faculty, deans, the Academic Senate President, and the Learning Resources Supervisor was created in November 2010 in response to the preliminary recommendations from the accrediting team.

One of the SLO Group's initial tasks was to work with the Academic Senate on creating the definition of an instructional program and an official list of such programs. The list was subsequently approved by the Academic Senate on November 18, 2010. The SLO Group also helped to create program lists for Student and Instructional Services, Business Services Programs, and Institutional Offices. Prior to the end of the fall semester, faculty and/or staff of each program created program-level SLOs, which they then later mapped to their program's college-level SLOs.

Over the winter break, members of the SLO Oversight Group researched SLO data collection and analysis procedures at several colleges and drafted a process for the college to use in the spring semester.

Prior to the end of the fall 2010 semester, two faculty SLO facilitators were selected and reassigned a portion of their teaching load to join the SLO Oversight Group, or SLOOG, and to work with faculty and staff on the implementation of data collection and assessments for course and service-unit SLOs. The Group made the recommendation that one SLO for each course being taught would be assessed during the middle of the spring 2011 semester. Similarly, all service areas were expected to assess one Service Unit Outcome (SUO).

Throughout the end of the fall 2010 and during the first two months of the spring 2011 semesters, SLOOG developed and then later refined new SLO processes and forms, all of which were approved by the Academic Senate on February 17, 2011. The approved forms were presented to the department chairs and coordinators at a Department Chair and Coordinator's Council meeting. A separate meeting with student services personnel and academic support services was also held where dialogue about the process occurred.

In February 2011, departments and services met to determine which SLO (per course taught) or which SUO (one per program) would be assessed during the semester and what the performance goal should be; SLO rubrics were written or revised. In some cases, SLOs were also revised if, for example, they were found not to be easily measurable.

During March and April 2011, individual faculty members conducted formative assessments at the course level after which they met to complete Course SLO Summary forms, which involved discussing their results, comparing various teaching strategies, and making suggestions for

improvements to student learning. At both the Academic Senate and at Department Chair's and Coordinators Council, some faculty expressed concern over feeling pressured to assess summative SLOs at a formative stage. Discussions at Senate and SLOOG validated that beginning in fall 2011, faculty should indicate on their individual Course SLO forms if they would be assessing SLOs at either a formative, summative stage or (as the English Department decided for Spring 2011) at both stages.

Subsequent meetings in April were held in which programs reviewed the findings, developed initiatives/requests for resources needed for improvement based on those findings, and prioritized any initiatives/requests for resources as a program. These results were compiled onto a Program Level SLO Summary form. Faculty also completed a document in which they: 1) mapped individual courses to program level SLOs; and, 2) mapped program level SLOs to college level SLOs.

During the same period of time, service units collected and assessed data pertaining mostly to student satisfaction or, in some cases, student performance (e.g., successful completion of the FAFSA online application). As groups, they met to discuss and prioritize their findings and suggested initiatives/requests for resources. These results were compiled onto Service Unit Outcomes Summary forms.

Several members of the SLO Oversight Group were also serving on the program review task force and efforts to connect the two processes were present from the outset of the SLO/SUO process. The SLO/SUO forms, including specific wording, were written with program review in mind. Further, SLO and SUO forms were created to include database elements so that initiatives and requests for resources could be transferred easily into program review documents in the fall 2011 semester. SLO/SUO performance expectations, operating outcomes, primary and secondary assessment methods, performance assessment, findings, prioritized initiatives, and prioritized requests for resources are all part of the new program review process.

Several times throughout the spring 2011 semester, the college President as well as the Vice-President of Business Services made presentations at the Academic Senate about revising the program review process. At a Campus Forum hosted by the President the same information was shared with the campus community at large. The program review form and process will be further reviewed by the Academic Senate prior to final approval.

To serve programs and services as well as to support the new program review process, the institutional researcher is in the initial stages of creating an institutional effectiveness report that will examine disaggregated data for student goal attainment: student progress and achievement, graduation rates, transfer rates, licensure certification pass rates, and success

rates for distance education students. Research will also be collected and analyzed on student and employer satisfaction. This information will be put on the college's website in an easily accessible format and location for use by faculty, administration, and staff in their efforts to improve services and instruction and to make data-driven decisions. It will also be visible to the community, including our students.

The institutional researcher has also created a cohort of more than 1,000 students to allow the college to study the same data analyzed by CSU Sacramento in their report entitled *Divided We Fail*. The CSU report's key findings indicated that many students do not reach certain significant milestones (i.e., second semester retention, 30+ college units, etc.) or engage in successful enrollment patterns (i.e., completion of college-level math and/or English within the first two years). Cohort members for Ventura College's study all have a self-identified educational goal of completing an AA/AS degree, a certificate, or transfer. Similar information acquired from research associated with a Title V basic skills grant is already being used to increase persistence rates, and a new Title V co-op grant to improve student services and professional development will provide additional data for use in college efforts to improve institutional effectiveness.

In the beginning of the fall 2011 semester, the interim Student Learning Outcomes Oversight Group will be replaced by a permanent Academic Senate SLO Oversight Committee with two subgroups: a Senate subcommittee to oversee the instructional side and a committee comprised of classified supervisors, classified employees, and some faculty to oversee the services side. The Dean of Institutional Effectiveness will also serve on both committees.

Supplement to SLO Status Report, June 2011

The following supplement to the SLO Report was written at the conclusion of the spring 2011 semester after the college went through a semester of assessing SLOs. This report identifies areas of success, areas for improvement, and issues for the future. It also reports faculty/staff survey results, and issues for the future.

Successes of the process

- Department chairs and coordinators were instrumental in the success of this project during the spring semester 2011. They attended Department Chair Council meetings in large numbers, listened to numerous presentations, asked questions, provided input, and were engaged in the process. In most cases, they returned to their departments and led the effort to ensure that meetings were called; individual, course, and program level forms were completed; and dialogue about student learning occurred.
- The two faculty facilitators were involved at all levels. They participated in the SLO Oversight Group meetings, bringing the faculty voice into the process. They worked with divisions, departments, and individual faculty via whatever method worked well for the faculty, including email, meetings, and phone calls. With one program, they set up CCC Confer as a way for dialogue to occur. They brought back concerns of the faculty and staff to the SLO Oversight Group.
- The Academic Senate President was an active member of the SLO Oversight Group from the onset. His leadership helped to ensure that faculty was supportive of the process. He, too, brought back faculty concerns to the SLO Oversight Group.
- The Academic Senate, as a whole, was supportive of the process and the need for our college to do more in the area of student learning assessments.
- We had significant faculty and staff buy in across campus for this project. The vast majority understood the accreditation recommendations and was prepared to do the work and to be involved in the process. Even though there were complaints, the work got done.
- We had an exceptional response to the SLO project: 93% percent of academic programs conducted SLO course assessments, 100% of services conducted program assessments, 79% of instructional programs completed program summary forms, and 86% of academic programs mapped courses to program SLOs and program SLOs to college-level SLOs.

- Some programs did an exceptional job with the process. They looked beyond the need just to complete forms and took the process of faculty and/or staff dialogue about student learning or student satisfaction seriously.
- Most faculty and staff were flexible about conducting formative assessments the first time in order to get us through the process.
- The SLO Oversight Group was responsive to faculty and staff concerns, at times revising forms or allowing flexible dates when faculty insisted on conducting summative assessments. They altered their own timeline to accommodate these requests. Members of the SLO Oversight Group attended every Department Chair Council meeting during the Spring 2011 semester to sit with the faculty leaders and respond to questions or concerns.
- Some programs did an excellent job of connecting the findings from the course-level SLOs with specific program requests for resources.
- One program (English) did both formative and summative assessments.
- Some faculty/staff recognized and noted that their performance goal had been set too low and suggested in the findings or the initiatives section a way to increase the complexity of the assignment. They learned that their students could do more and readjusted their expectations accordingly.
- Some faculty/staff noted the need for students to have better writing or study skills. These are important observations and should lead to college dialogue about these essential academic skills as we look toward assessing our institutional (college-level) SLOs.

Areas to Improve

- We need to ensure that all faculty members, both full time and part time, are participating with their departments and programs by assessing SLOs and engaging in dialogue about student learning.
- A few programs did not submit their paperwork. It is not clear if the work was never done or whether the forms were not completed.
- There was concern about the number of forms involved in the process.
- The quality of the work done by the programs was inconsistent. In reviewing the forms, it was very clear that while most faculty, staff, and department chairs took the process seriously, some did only an average job, and a few put forth very little effort. In the

latter case, divisions and programs need to consider (where possible) assigning the task to another faculty or staff member.

- The idea that the SLO process is designed to promote dialogue about student learning must be reinforced because, in some cases, the forms did not reflect that it occurred extensively enough. It is possible, though, that the dialogue simply was not summarized on the form.
- Some instructional programs had not developed rubrics for the student learning outcome they assessed. While the SLO Oversight Group tried to be clear, this need may not have been sufficiently reinforced.
- In terms of the forms specifically, important information was sometimes missing. In some cases,
 - the specific SLO that was being assessed was not listed.
 - participating faculty members were not listed individually.
 - evidence of discussion was extremely minimal or missing.
 - the findings section was not completed.
- The SLO Oversight Group needs to be clear that not all initiatives require resources. For example, revising an assignment, reviewing alternative textbooks, etc. do not. Many forms contained no initiatives.
- Some faculty did not understand that the request for the assessment tool pertained only to the SLO being assessed (and was not a list of every assessment used in that course).
- The forms will need to be revised to encourage faculty to discuss student learning even if the SLO goal was achieved. Further, if the goal was easily achieved, then the goal may have been too low. They need to consider how the assignment could be revised to increase student learning (to be more difficult or to allow for higher-level thinking skills).
- We need to provide additional samples of forms that were completed properly, aligned findings from courses to program summary forms, and summarized discussions.
- As we continue our efforts to improve student learning, higher level thinking skills requiring critical thinking need to be encouraged as much as possible. When necessary, faculty should revisit Bloom's Taxonomy. Having students "name," "recall," or "list" elements or types of something is not at the same level as having students "synthesize," "formulate," or "estimate" for example. In some cases, a mix of lower level skills (in order for students to gain needed knowledge) is required before higher level skills can be expected.

- SLOs should be revised, modified, or rewritten, in some cases, as faculty and staff go through the assessment process and make discoveries about a) what is measurable/what is not and b) what should be measured/what is not as significant.
- The entire issue of formative vs. summative assessments was confusing and/or troublesome for many faculty members. Many felt that their SLOs had been written specifically to be assessed at semester end and asking/requiring them to do so earlier, limited their ability to assess appropriately or correctly. As the debate continued during the semester, it became clear that the formative vs. summative question needed further attention. If assessments are conducted at the end of the semester only, then changes cannot be made to assist students who did not satisfactorily meet the SLO during the semester. Faculty could make improvements for the next semester (which has value), but the students who moved on may not have learned as much as they should have. Some faculty members conduct formative assessments regularly as part of how they teach (and are not part of the SLOs), but in some cases, this process may not be happening and is an area in which we could improve.

Note: The Curriculum/SLO section of the WASC Postsecondary Accreditation Manual, 2011 Edition, asks the following discussion question: “To what extent do faculty members use formative and summative assessment results to modify learning and teaching opportunities?” (p. 35). Further, in a published article entitled “The role of student learning outcomes in accreditation quality review,” WASC Executive Director, Barbara Beno (2004), explains that both summative and formative assessments should occur. Dr. Beno also confirmed this information in a phone conversation with our college during the spring 11 semester.

- We need to make clear, also, that faculty/staff can assess a portion of an SLO if that would be appropriate. Assessment of student learning is the goal.
- In some cases, no connections existed between course-level findings and requests for resources. While these two areas will not always relate, they should do so a significant portion of the time. It is more difficult for these connections to be made this first time. As more and more SLOs are assessed over the semesters (giving us more data), making the connections will be easier to do.
- On the mapping document, faculty needs a clear understanding of “I” (introduce), “P” (practice), and “M” (master). Some programs put “M” across the entire document. Some had no “M”s, which means that nothing at the program level will be assessed. Both should be revised to ensure an appropriate mix and to demonstrate increasing skill levels. Further, we should consider changing the “M” to an “A” (assess) to avoid confusion and disagreement about the word “mastery.” Many faculty members feel that students at the community college level are not at a point where they would “master” certain concepts.

- The college needs to provide additional training to faculty and staff on assessment procedures and SLO processes.
- We need to set clear timelines so that faculty can work SLO assessments into their planning and syllabi.
- Skepticism exists among some faculty and staff about whether or not assessing and evaluating SLOs will lead to increases in student learning. We need faculty dialogue about the process to continue to occur at all levels. Faculty who are achieving successes in this area should be asked to discuss their strategy and process with other faculty.
- SharePoint proved to be a confusing place for many faculty and staff to use as a depository for completed forms. In the longer term, we need a software program that could help us manage the SLO effort more efficiently and effectively.
- See survey results below for additional suggestions for improvement.

Results of surveys

On April 29, 2011, 100 faculty and staff members attended a campus forum. One of the primary topics of the forum was the SLO work that had been done. At the conclusion of the large-group meeting, faculty and staff for each program met separately to discuss timelines and plans for the SLO work to be done in the fall semester. They were also asked to complete a short five-question survey.

Survey questions and summarized responses follow:

- 1) What positive aspects did you find to the process?
 - Faculty discussions/collaboration
 - Improved faculty discussions
 - Feedback about student performance as to what works/doesn't work
 - Careful analysis of student performance
 - Focus on course objectives as they relate to the entire program
 - Analysis about the way/process we teach
 - Goal setting for learning and teaching strategies
 - Too early to tell
 - Review and re-evaluation of existing SLOs
 - Consistency of process across college
 - Clearly defined forms and a clear process

- Templates with examples
- SLO team's training and support
- Nothing

2) What were some of the difficulties?

- Lack of time
- Mid-semester timelines
- Dropped on us in the middle of the semester
- Evaluating SLOs mid semester that were designed to be summative
- Scheduling time to meet with other instructors
- Too much work for instructors with small departments or multiple preps
- Lack of part-time faculty involvement
- Acquiring student data in a short period of time
- Great deal of effort with little positive outcome
- Amount of work and stress for department chairs
- Process not always clear
- Process for future semesters not clear
- Expectations not completely clear
- Learning a new system
- The term "mastery" is unclear
- Compatibility issues with Macs
- None

3) How could the overall SLO process be improved?

- Need seminars about how to approach the process
- More interaction with SLO faculty coordinators
- Knowing at the beginning of the semester what is expected
- Being able to coordinate it with our syllabi
- More time for implementation and evaluation
- Make SharePoint easier to use
- SLO team did a great job – nothing
- Not sure until we go through the process again
- Evaluate SLOs at the end of the semester
- Less paperwork, fewer questions on forms
- Sample forms filled out and posted online for reference and ideas
- Review collective effort to ascertain trends
- Do not change the process at this stage
- More time to complete process

4) What could your program do to improve the process for your discipline?

- Adjunct faculty must be involved more extensively (contractual problem)
- Have a lead person
- Need student and outside perspective
- Continuous improvement
- Keep in touch with the trend
- Acknowledge the usefulness of the effort (beyond the need to meet accreditation requirements)
- Link to program processes
- Need faculty buy-in to the process earlier
- Weave the SLO process into our normal operating processes
- Incorporate into department schedule now that we know it has to be done
- Program did an amazing job
- Nothing

5) What else would you like us to know?

- Variation in abilities of students from some who have trouble reading and writing to students who are creative and academically equipped
- Not happy about needing to take time out of the normal flow of work to assess SLOs but appreciate the efforts of those involved in the process
- Thank you for the guidance
- Outstanding job given the time frame and job
- Forms and models/examples were very helpful
- It was a waste of time
- Will stay abreast of this subject
- Great job

Faculty and staff were also surveyed via Survey Monkey at the end of the semester. Fifty-two responses were received, 43 of them from faculty. This survey consisted of 12 questions, many of which also had written responses. The written comments, for the most part, reflected the comments made on the survey at the campus forum and can be found on the Institutional Effectiveness webpage under SLOs.

The questions and percentages are as follows:

1) Please check one that applies to you:

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------|
| • Part-time faculty | 26.9% |
| • Full-time faculty | 44.2% |
| • Department chair | 11.5% |
| • Classified Employee | 9.6% |
| • Classified Supervisor | 1.9% |

- Manager 5.8%

2) Were you involved in the process?

- Yes 94.1%
- No 5.9%

3) In what way did the faculty facilitator process help your department the most? (check all that apply)

- Explaining the process 87.8%
- Completing the forms 56.1%
- Explaining SharePoint 14.6%
- Keeping on track 39.0%

4) What positive aspects did you find to the SLO/SUO process?

Fill-in responses – see report under Institutional Effectiveness/SLOs

5) What were some of the difficulties you encountered?

Fill-in responses– see report

6) What suggestions to you have for improving the process?

Fill-in responses – see report

7) What could your program do to improve the process for your discipline?

Fill-in responses – see report

8) What additional training could we provide you about the process?

Fill-in responses – see report

9) Tell us what you know about the SLO/SUO process (check all that apply):

- I know that MS SharePoint is our current document storage system 54.2%
- I am aware of my course and/or department's SLOs/SUOs 90.5%

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am aware that the college has a student learning outcomes webpage under College Information 	77.8%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am aware that there is going to be both an SLO and an SUO Committee in the fall semester and that my department has a representative on that committee 	68.4%
10) What resulted from your discipline/department's assessment? (check all those that apply)	
The department discussed student learning	82.2%
The department made changes that affect student learning	33.3%
The service program process was changed as a result of the assessment	17.8%
The SLO/SUO was revised	51.1%
We determined no changes were needed at this time	11.1%

Directions for the future

- Provide a smooth transition from the SLO Oversight Group to a faculty-led SLO committee in the fall.
- Have faculty facilitators work review, in detail, all work completed at the end of the spring 2011 semester so that they are in a position to provide greater assistance to the programs in fall. This will help to ensure that the quality of the work continues to improve.
- Work with the Department Chair/Coordinator's Council and the Academic Senate to ensure that departments/programs schedule regular department meetings at the beginning of each semester.
- Continue the discussion about formative vs. summative assessments. The SLO Oversight Group, which believes that both should be done, recommended that faculty/staff

conduct summative in the fall semester (which gives them time to do program review in the earlier part of the semester) and formative in the spring semester.

- As faculty/staff go through the new program review process in Fall 2011, ensure that connections exist between SLOs at the course level and program summaries/requests for resources.
- In Spring 2011, continue with the training of program-level SLOs assessments. Some will occur with the implementation of the new program review process in Fall 2011.
- In Spring 2011, begin a formal discussion of including and assessing college-level SLOs across the curriculum so that our students have additional opportunities to practice and acquire skills in communication, critical thinking, and information competency, among others.
- Research software programs to help us manage SLO assessment documentation (including rotation of assessments) and due dates/completion of initiatives.
- Continue to survey faculty and staff –and make improvements wherever possible -- as we continue with this process in the coming semesters.