

ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

COLLEGE STATUS REPORT ON STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES IMPLEMENTATION

INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

- a. Submit the report form by email to the ACCJC (accjc@accjc.org); **and**
- b. Submit the full report *with attached evidence* on CD/DVD to the ACCJC (ACCJC, 10 Commercial Blvd., Suite 204, Novato, CA 94949).

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

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

Date of Report: September 17, 2012

Institution's Name: Ventura College

Name and Title of Individual Completing Report: Kathy Scott, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, English, and Learning Resources

Telephone Number and E-mail Address: 805/654-6400 ext. 3195; kscott@vccd.edu

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

Name of CEO: Robin Calote

Signature: _____
(e-signature permitted)

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

Eligibility Requirement 10: Student Learning and Achievement

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

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

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NUMERICAL RESPONSE

QUANTITATIVE EVIDENCE/DATA ON THE RATE/PERCENTAGE OF SLOS DEFINED AND ASSESSED

1. Courses

- a. Total number of college courses (active courses in the college catalog, offered on the schedule in some rotation): 562
- b. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 553
Percentage of total: 98%
- c. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 480
Percentage of total: 85%

2. Programs

- a. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college): 29
- b. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 27 ;
Percentage of total: 93
- c. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 27 ;
Percentage of total: 93

3. Student Learning and Support Activities

- a. Total number of student learning and support activities (as college has identified or grouped them for SLO implementation): 25
- b. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 25 ; Percentage of total: 100
- c. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 25 ; Percentage of total: 100

4. Institutional Learning Outcomes

- a. Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined: 5
- b. Number of institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment: 2

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Course, program, and institutional level SLOs are in place and being assessed as noted in the numerical response¹. Course-level SLOs and Service-unit outcomes (SUOs) have been assessed for several consecutive semesters^{2&3}. Our SLO and SUO forms and completed examples of both provide evidence of authentic and ongoing assessment^{4&5}. Program and institutional SLO/SUO assessments were piloted in Spring 2012 after which faculty who did the pilots conducted training for the department chairs and coordinators^{6&7}. Programs will be assessing program and two institutional SLOs this semester^{8,9,10, & 11}.

SLOs are integrated into the college's planning process, which begins with the Educational Master Plan and its five college goals¹². From the Educational Master Plan, the college's strategic plan and its priorities for each year are initiated^{13, 14, & 15}. Strategic Plan Objectives and its action plans address continuous assessment of SLOs for all courses and programs and the revision of program review to integrate SLOs and more meaningful analysis of data¹⁶.

Units completing program review are required to provide their analyses, findings, and initiatives for PSLOs, student success outcomes, and program operating outcomes¹⁷. Flowing from these three areas, initiatives, which may or may not require resources, are developed. For all areas, data are analyzed and discussed within each program, with the overall goal of continuous improvement of programs and services.

For both the SLO and program review processes, effectiveness is assessed through surveys, committee input, and self evaluations^{18, 19, & 20}. Improvements are made for the next cycle and assessment of the process occurs again. Reports documenting activities, input, and improvements in SLO and program review processes are written annually^{21 & 22}. The SLO Toolkit is online²³.

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

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

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

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 2: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

SLO/SUO forms created by the original SLO Oversight Group (SLOOG) were developed with dialogue and collaboration as a priority^{24 & 25}. Individual faculty assessment results are discussed by instructors teaching that course prior to the creation of findings and initiatives for changes/improvement in such areas as curriculum, teaching strategies, communication with students, services, and other support for students^{26 & 27}. For program review, the same process is utilized at the department and division level where dialogue takes place in regards to the prioritization of initiatives at the division level.

GE/Institutional ISLOs were revised in March 2012 after extensive discussions in the SLO and SUO

Committees, divisions, and the Academic Senate²⁸. Our GE/ISLOs are now easier to assess and aligned with skills faculty believe students should have at the completion of a degree or prior to transfer. ISUOs are currently being addressed by the SLO/SUO Oversight Committee²⁹. The college's rotational plan for SLO/SUOs provides timelines for institutional dialogue on developing (where needed) and revising GE/ISLO rubrics and for the development of institutional initiatives based on assessments^{30, 31, & 32}.

In spring 2012, extensive college dialogue occurred at campus forums and committees regarding a potential new Department of Education Title V grant in the areas of transfer velocity and institutional effectiveness. Using institutional data, a list of high-risk barrier courses was developed for which new strategies in the area of instruction and student services would be designed and implemented to improve transfer rates, particularly for our Hispanic students³³. In July 2012, the institution was awarded this new five-year \$2.9M Department of Ed HSI Grant.

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

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

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

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 3: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Decision-making dialogue regarding assessment takes place at the course, program/department and institutional levels^{34 & 35}. Faculty and staff use discussions of SLO/SUO assessment results to plan for improvement in subsequent semesters. In the program review process initiatives that require or do not require resources are discussed and documented. The College Planning Council (CPC) serves as the body that receives program review reports and initiative spreadsheets, hears and discusses program review presentations, forwards requests for initiatives to the appropriate committees such as Faculty Staffing Priorities or Budget Resources Committee for further discussion and prioritization, and receives final rankings back from the Executive Committee^{35, 36, 37, 38, 39, & 46}. The CPC also oversees strategic planning^{15 & 16}.

Each year during the program review process, programs and departments are required to "close the loop," meaning that they must report on the prior year's initiatives for accountability purposes⁴⁰.

Each year, a program review process committee (subcommittee of the CPC) meets to evaluate the process and make improvements for the following year⁴¹.

For the past two years, college-wide planning has also been discussed at campus forums, which are scheduled monthly during the academic year⁴².

In June 2012, the college purchased TracDat to help us manage the SLO, program review, and strategic

planning effort. Reports that document assessments, initiatives, and reassessment results will now make data easier to present for discussion and decision making purposes^{1 & 43}.

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

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

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

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 4: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

The college's integrated planning process is a functional system with well-defined procedures, all of which are dedicated to the improvement of institutional effectiveness and increased student learning.

As can be seen in our Integrated Planning chart⁴⁴, planning begins with the district and college mission, followed by the educational, facilities, and technology master plans, and the strategic plan. Every fall semester, the Ventura College Planning Parameters are published and presented by the College President at the College Planning Council (CPC)⁴⁵. Program Review and planning take place within these parameters. Using institutional and/or program generated data and analysis, programs and departments identify and prioritize initiatives. Initiatives must be supported by outcomes or other institutional data. Those initiatives requiring resources are first prioritized at the department/program and then division levels in collaborative meetings. These initiatives are then presented to the CPC^{39,46, & 50} during the program review presentations and then forwarded to the appropriate committee (Faculty Staffing Priorities, Technology, or Budget Resource Council) for additional discussion and prioritization^{47, 48, & 49}. These committees forward their recommendations to the Executive Team (President, EVP, and VP of Business Services) for college prioritization. Final funded initiatives are presented and discussed at the CPC and college staff notified.

In 2011/2012, \$1,436,658 was awarded in four categories—technology, facilities, staffing, or other--to programs and departments through the program review process. Programs and departments with unfunded initiatives may put forward the same initiatives the next year, and they will be prioritized along with any new initiatives³⁸.

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

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

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

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 5: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

SLOs and SUOs have been assessed each semester for the past several consecutive semesters¹. Assessment forms have been evaluated, revised, and fine-tuned after each semester/assessment cycle^{4 & 5}. These forms served as the basis for the data entry fields during TracDat implementation in the summer of 2012. The annual SLO Reports and samples of SUO completed forms clearly demonstrate the progress we have made in the area of assessment. Closing the loop on prior assessments is required, tracked, and documented^{2&3}.

During the 2011/2012 and 2012/2013 academic years, extensive discussions took place at the SLO Oversight Committee regarding the rotational plan, and several drafts were developed for consideration^{29&30}. SLO Oversight Committee discussions included the need to assess on a regular basis and also the need to provide sufficient time for implementation of initiatives and reassessment to determine whether or not improvement occurred. Beginning in fall 2012, discussions began that led to the proposal in fall 2012 of a five-year rotational plan for course, program, and ISLOs/ISUOs³¹. This proposal, which was created by SLO facilitators, was discussed at the Department Chairs and Coordinators Council and at the SLO Committee. The SLO Oversight Committee has approved the five year plan and it was forwarded to the Academic Senate. As the college continues in its commitment to Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement, the rotational plan will continue to be evaluated, revised, and fine-tuned, as needed.

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

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

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

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 6: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Student learning outcomes at the course level have been aligned with program level SLOs and institutional-level SLOs for several semesters. These mapping documents are on the college website, in SharePoint, and are currently being transitioned over to TracDat, which the college purchased last semester^{51, 52, & 53}. Mapping was also included in last year's program review documents, which similarly are on the college's website⁵⁴.

As the college continues to improve in its assessment efforts and gains a broader understanding of how SLOs align at the various levels, embedding at the course, program, and institutional level has become clearer. In spring 2012, several programs conducted PSLO assessment pilots that embedded program and institutional assessments into course level assessments^{6, 55, & 56}. Each program pilot used one assessment method but utilized two or three rubrics depending on the focus of the assessment. The Department Chairs and Coordinators were trained on embedded assessments in spring 2012 in preparation for PSLO assessments in fall 2012⁷. Also in preparation for the work to take place in fall,

programs and departments met with SLO facilitators in spring 2012 to review and revise, if necessary, PSLOs and mapping documents. Mapping also needed to be reviewed and revised to align with the new GE/ISLOs that were created that same semester.

PSLO and ISLO assessments are underway this semester and, in most cases, are embedded into course assessments^{8&9}. Assessment plans for PSLOs and ISLOs are in place, and SLO facilitators are working closely with faculty to complete them and to ensure that they are entered properly into TracDat.

In several programs, discussions about PSLOs and mapping have led faculty to create initiatives in which capstone courses or experiences are created or to consider prerequisites so that courses are taken in the order that is most appropriate for the building of knowledge and skills in that discipline.

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

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

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

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 7: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

The college uses a variety of methods to make students aware of SLOs and their importance in each course and program. PSLOs and GE/ISLOs are clearly stated in the catalog (PSLOs next to degree requirements, ISLOs in the introductory information)⁵⁷. PSLOs and mapping which have been on the college website⁵³. Course SLOs have been included on course syllabi for several years⁵⁸. Course syllabi are submitted to division offices, and the deans review them to ensure that course SLOs have been included. Emails by deans and updates by the college president include reminders to faculty about providing SLOs on course syllabi and discussing them with students⁵⁹. At mandatory flex day events and at subsequent department and division meetings, faculty member are advised of the importance of discussing SLOs and associated rubrics with students so that students are aware of expectations for the course⁶⁰. At the mandatory flex day meeting in August, 2012, rubrics were discussed with faculty at a professional development training regarding basic skills and included in a Basic Skills Toolkit provided to each faculty member in attendance. This Toolkit is also available online⁶¹.

SELF-ASSESSMENT ON LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION:

YOU PLANNED TO ADDRESS NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS? WHAT LEVEL OF SLO IMPLEMENTATION WOULD YOU ASSIGN YOUR COLLEGE? WHY? WHAT EFFORTS HAVE YOU PLANNED TO ADDRESS NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS?

SELF-ASSESSMENT ON LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

The college demonstrates full commitment to its ongoing assessments of SLOs at the course, program,

and institutional levels. The faculty and staff, supported by the work of the SLO Oversight Committee, the Academic Senate, the SLO facilitators, the TracDat facilitator, and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, have demonstrated their understanding of the importance of authentic SLOs/SUOs assessments at both the formative and summative stages in our continual and combined efforts to improve student learning and student success⁶². Widespread dialogue about assessment, surveys, and institutional data continues to increase at the department, program, and institutional level as SLOs and SUOs have been incorporated into the program review process, with initiatives and funding connected directly to initiatives that result from assessments and findings. Committee input and surveys of faculty and staff are conducted each year prior to revisions being made in the SLO/SUO processes for the next cycle¹⁸. Committees, including the SLO Oversight Committee, Budget Resource Council, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Curriculum Committee, and College Planning Council, among others, conduct annual self evaluations to determine effectiveness of the committee⁶³. Comprehensive SLO and Program Review Reports are written, with committee input, and made available online annually. Course, program, and institutional SLOs are aligned, and assessments are embedded through the use of instructional mapping^{53 & 54}. Students are made aware of the importance of SLOs for both courses and programs in a variety of ways⁵⁸. College faculty, staff, and administrators have put forth tremendous effort to improve the institution's SLO/SUO assessments, program review, and planning processes for the purposes of improving student success and institutional effectiveness.

For all of the reasons stated, the institution meets proficiency status for effectiveness in student learning outcomes.

A commitment to continuous quality improvement remains at the forefront, with process refinements in the works for tracking and assessing the effectiveness of newly-created initiatives. When the implementation and training of TracDat is complete, this task will be easier. We need to continue to conduct and improve our assessments of PSLOs and GE/ISLOs and to revise mapping as greater understanding of the alignment between courses and programs becomes clearer. We need to continue to educate our students about student learning outcomes and the importance of achieving them before they leave to enter the workforce or to transfer to a four-year institution.

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

TABLE OF EVIDENCE (NO WORD COUNT LIMIT)

Proficiency Statements # 1-7

1. TracDat Reports of SLOs, SUOs, & PLSOs
2. SLO Checklists 2011-2012
3. SUO Checklists 2011-2012
4. SLO Forms (completed examples)
5. SUO Forms (completed examples)
6. PSLO,SUO, & ISLO Assessment Pilots, Spring 2012

7. Department Chair and Coordinators Council Minutes
8. PSLO Assessment Plans, Fall 2012
9. ISLO Assessment Plans, Fall 2012
10. SLO/ SUO Key Terms & Tasks, Fall 2012
11. SLO/SUO Flex Day Worksheet
12. Educational Master Plan, 2009-2019
13. Strategic Plan ,2010-2011
14. Strategic Plan, 2011-2012
15. Strategic Plan, 2012-2013
16. Annual Planning Report, 2011 & 2012
17. Program Review (completed samples)
18. SLO Survey, 2011 & 2012
19. SLO Committee Self Evaluation
20. Program Review Survey
21. SLO Report, 2011& 2012
22. Program Review Report, 2011
23. SLO Toolkit
24. SLO Forms (Individual SLOs, Summary SLOs, Program SLOs, Program SUOs)
25. SLOOG Minutes
26. Individual SLO Form to Summary Form Course Examples
27. Rubrics Samples (for instructional use)
28. Revised GE/ISLO
29. SLOOC Minutes
30. SLO/SUO Rotational Plans Drafts
31. Five Year Rotational Plan
32. ISLO Rubrics
33. Title V- 20 courses
34. Program Review Timelines, 2011-2012 & 2012-2013
35. Program Review (completed samples)
36. Program Review Presentation Schedule
37. Rubrics for Faculty Staffing Priorities, Classified Staffing Priorities, Technology, Facilities,& Equipment
38. Program Review Initiative Spreadsheets
39. College Planning Council Minutes
40. Program Review Form 2012-2013
41. Program Review Process Committee Agenda
42. Forum/Agenda Notes
43. TracDat- Faculty Instructions
44. Integrated Planning Manual
45. VC Planning Perimeters 2012-2013

46. Sample Program Review Division Presentation to CPC
47. Faculty Staffing Priorities Agendas
48. Technology Committee Agendas & Minutes
49. Budget Resource Council Agendas & Minutes
50. Program Review Templates
51. Mapping Documents, 2010-2011
52. Mapping Documents, 2011-2012
53. TracDat Mapping
54. Program Review Mapping
55. Mapping Sample from Pilot, Spring 2012
56. Art Program Review Pilot
57. College Catalog (PSLO)
58. Sample Syllabi with SLOs
59. Email from College President regarding SLOs
60. Agendas for Flex day & Division Meetings
61. Basic Skills Toolkit
62. Email Pertaining to Formative & Summative Stages
63. Effectiveness of Committees Self Assessments

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC)

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

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