

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: October 16, 2012

Institution's Name: **Cuyamaca College**

Name and Title of Individual Completing Report: Robin Steinback, Vice President Instruction and Anthony Zambelli, Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator.

Telephone Number and E-mail Address: 619 660-4226 – robin.steinback@gcccd.edu and anthony.zambelli@gcccd.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: Mark J. Zacovic Ph.D. 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): 686
 - b. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 595
Percentage of total: 87%
 - c. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 496
Percentage of total: 72%
2. Programs
 - a. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college): 100
 - b. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 100; Percentage of total: 100%
 - c. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 97;
Percentage of total: 97%
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): Student Services: 16; Administrative Services: 10.
 - b. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: Student Services: 16; Administrative Services: 10. Percentage of total: Student Services: 100%. Administrative Services: 100%
 - c. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: Student Services: 16; Administrative Services: 10 Percentage of total: Student Services: 100%; Administrative Services: 100%
4. Institutional Learning Outcomes
 - a. Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined: 6
 - b. Number of institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment: 6

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

A majority of courses and all instructional programs have Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) that are reviewed on a regular cycle by the Curriculum Committee (1.1). Course-level outcomes are mapped to Program-level (1.2) and Institutional Learning Outcomes. The results of SLO assessments are used to modify curriculum, assessment, and pedagogy (1.3). Progress is underway to ensure that all courses in schedule rotation have defined learning outcomes and assessment completed by the conclusion of the spring 2013 semester.

All non-instructional programs have adopted learning outcomes and use assessment data in their annual program review process and are used to inform annual program plans. These plans are used in the college's annual budget allocation process. Both Student Services and Administrative Services conducted their first assessment during 2011-12 academic year and used the results to create their 2012-13 goals. An online repository has been implemented in which course, program, and institutional-level assessment instruments, assessment results and how the results were used are uploaded.

SLO assessment is reviewed on an annual basis through the program review process in all instructional and non-instructional areas of the college. Program review forms are designed to identify the cycle by which each department plans to assess outcomes and use this information for improvement (1.4, 1.5, 1.6). Some departments have focused more on the linkages between course and program SLOs than others. The college recognized that tracking instructional program outcomes is an area for improvement and this issue has been addressed in the current revision of the program review process.

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

Student achievement and outcome data are shared with participatory governance councils and committees including Institutional Effectiveness & Resource Council, Academic Senate, Curriculum Committee, Instructional Council, Student Services Council, Instructional/Student Services/Administrative Services Program Review & Planning Committee, Student Learning Outcomes & Assessment Committee, and the Workforce Development Committee (complete list 2.1). Data are provided by Institutional Research, available online, and time in meetings is provided for discussion regarding the impact of assessments on teaching and learning (2.2, 2.3a-i)

Through the college's program planning and allocation process, individual programs are encouraged to use data to inform goals, strategies, and corresponding budget requests. These objectives and requests are assigned a ranked score, which includes data support as one of the ranking criteria (2.4, 2.5).

Individual departments and instructors have also used SLO and course success data to advance campus-wide developments (2.6). For example:

American Sign Language: The department assessed expressive and receptive fingerspelling skills during tutoring sessions. Based on their findings the department changed how it assesses fingerspelling to improve student performance in this area.

Biology: Biology faculty changed how students were assessed after getting poor results on one question in a lab exercise about enzymes while having acceptable results on other questions in the same exercise.

Tutoring and Supplemental Instruction: As a result of analyses of SLO assessment and student achievement, services in the STEM Center, Writing Center, and General Tutoring Center were made a college-wide priority using Basic Skills (2.7a-b), Perkins (2.8), and general funds (2.9a-b).

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

Annual program review and planning is an inclusive process that begins in departments. SLO assessment results are included in the annual program review for all instructional and non-instructional programs. Programs reflect on prior accomplishments and goals through this process, as well as discuss improvement plans or strategies they develop to increase student success rates (3.1a, 3.1b, 3.2, 3.3). These annual program plans are scored and ranked based on criteria (including SLOs, PLOs, and ILOs) that emphasize the use of planning data. All disciplines, programs, or units are asked to support their planning activities with quantifiable data from which an analysis on how well students are achieving stated learning outcomes at the course and program level takes place. Analysis of performance indicator data is used to design activities that increase and strengthen student learning and success (3.4, 3.5). For example:

Student Services: As a result of program review and planning, enrollment priorities were revised, the First Year Experience Program refined, and veterans' services improved (3.6, 3.7).

Business Services: As a result of program review, the department has taken steps to move the college into paperless processing, implemented ergonomically sound workstations, and developed training for grant managers (3.8, 3.9).

Annual plans are integrated into college-wide strategic goals and educational master plan priorities (3.10, 3.11, 3.12). In the recent Institutional Effectiveness Survey, 92% full-time faculty, 75% part-time faculty, 74% staff, and 82% administrators, agreed or strongly agreed that they have the "opportunity to dialogue with colleagues about how to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness" (3.13, 3.14).

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

Each semester, the Professional Development Committee as well as the three program review committees hosts workshops and forums covering topics such as Student Learning Outcomes, student success, teaching excellence, and authentic assessment. These workshops provide a venue for collegial, self-reflective dialogue about continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes (4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5).

The college has established an intranet site for departments to store reports and summaries of college SLO work (4.6). A more comprehensive, fully-online system to facilitate the integration of SLO assessment into the college-wide planning processes is currently under review by the Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District (4.7).

A faculty member serves as the SLO and Assessment Coordinator, faculty authors of program review are compensated as part of their assigned load, part-time faculty participate in assessment and program review via credit for professional development in department meetings, and all others do so as a regular part of their positions.

In recognition that continuous improvement is a college-wide responsibility, the composition of the Student Learning Outcomes & Assessment Committee was expanded to include membership from student services and administrative services. The charge was also changed from a compliance-orientation to a focus on mentorship for those conducting SLO assessment (4.8).

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

Prior to 2010, instructional program review was conducted once every five years and student services conducted program review on a similar cycle. SLO assessment was independent and decisions about budget allocation were connected to annual academic/student services master plans. In 2011, a more tightly integrated, participative, and transparent annual SLO, program review, and resource allocation planning model was implemented. The three program review committees review the reports and make recommendations to IERC based upon a comprehensive and self-reflective dialogue about the results of the assessment of student learning at the course, program, and institutional levels as well as other relevant data. After reviewing summaries of the self-reflective conversations and providing opportunities for further dialogue, IERC merges the rankings from Instructional Program Review, Student Services Program Review, and Administrative Services Program Review, makes recommendations to the President's Cabinet and reports back to the college constituencies. The ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue is documented within the Program Review processes and throughout the institutional effectiveness cycle (5.1, 5.2).

Each course and program is required to report their progress in assessing student achievement of learning outcomes within their annual program review report. The program review forms are designed to capture the forms of assessment used, the results of the assessment, plans to improve student achievement and follow up plans. There is also a place on the form for an assessment schedule so that all courses or programs will be assessed within a five-year cycle. This system is in place for all areas.

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

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

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

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 6: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Currently, each course- or service-level SLO is mapped to program-level and institutional learning outcomes within the appropriate program review report (6.1, 6.2). Learning outcomes and the process for certification of general education courses is regularly reviewed and recently revised by the Curriculum Committee (6.3, 6.4). Outcomes for general education, certificates, and degrees are published in the college catalog (6.5). Student learning outcomes have also been identified for basic skills, general education, and career and technical programs (6.6, 6.7, 6.8)

In the Institutional Effectiveness Survey, 83% of students, 88% of classified staff, 89% each of the full-time and part-time faculty, and 100% of administrators agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that “Cuyamaca College is committed to continuous improvement of student learning.” In response to the statement, “My department/program/discipline has used the results of SLO assessment to make improvements in instruction, student services or administrative services,” 65% of part-time faculty, 70% of full-time faculty, 79% of classified staff, and 82% of administrators agreed or strongly agreed (6.9).

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

Student learning outcomes are included in each course outline of record and faculty publish these outcomes on course syllabi (7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4). Department Chairs, program coordinators and division deans review course syllabi at the beginning of each semester to ensure compliance. General Education, degree and certificate outcomes are published in the college catalogue which is available in print and on the college website and reviewed annually. The institutional outcomes are posted on the SLO reporting site.

According to the results from the Institutional Effectiveness Survey (2012), 83% of student respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their instructors inform them about the types of skills or learning outcomes they are expected to master through classroom activities and assignments. A similar percent of students agreed or strongly agreed that the college is committed to continuous improvement of student learning (7.5).

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 has made great strides in systematic integration of assessment of SLOs throughout its entire planning and implementation efforts. The college has adopted institutional learning outcomes, aligned appropriate outcomes for all of its programs and services, and connected these to strategic and educational master plan goals. Assessment has been institutionalized and central to dialogue and decisions about planning and resource allocation.

All non-instructional programs are at proficiency and will reach the status of continuous process improvement by fall 2013. There are a number of instructional departments and academic support services that have also accomplished proficiency. For those departments not yet at proficiency, the SLO and Assessment Committee and the Instructional Program Review Committee have fostered a collaborative and mentor-based approach to provide assistance. By the end of the spring 2013 semester, all courses in schedule rotation will have SLOs and all of them will be on a regular assessment schedule. In addition, the 2013 program review focuses on the interdependency of course/service, program, and institutional outcomes.

Our central focus this year is on deepening understanding throughout the college community about the inextricable connections between assessment and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement. Our continued work in improving the program review and planning has strengthened the visibility and salience of this connection. The Institutional Effectiveness and Resource Council, composed of leadership from all college constituencies, will champion these collective efforts.

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

TABLE OF EVIDENCE (NO WORD COUNT LIMIT)

- 1.1 CuyamacaCollege-Copy of Course Master List 12-13 (081012).pdf
- 1.2 CuyamacaCollege-DegreesCertificates-Catalog-2012.pdf
- 1.3 CuyamacaCollege-CurriculumCommitteeMinutes
- 1.4 CuyamacaCollege-Conceptualizing-Your-Program-Review-and-Planning-Report.pdf
- 1.5 CuyamacaCollege-StudentServices-Program-Review-Planning-Template.pdf
- 1.6 CuyamacaCollege-IPRPC-Writers-Guidebook-2013-14.pdf

- 2.1 CuyamacaCollege-Committees and Councils receiving outcome data.pdf
- 2.2 CuyamacaCollege-ProgramReviewWarehouseSnapshot.pdf
- 2.3a CuyamacaCollege-ASPRPC-Minutes
- 2.3b CuyamacaCollege-CurriculumCommitteeMinutes
- 2.3c CuyamacaCollege-InstitutionalEffectiveness&ResourceCouncilMinutes
- 2.3d CuyamacaCollege-InstructionalCouncilMinutes
- 2.3e CuyamacaCollege-InstructionalProgramReview&PlanningMinutes
- 2.3f CuyamacaCollege-StudentLearningOutcomesAssessmentCommitteeMtgMinutes
- 2.3g CuyamacaCollege-StudentServicesCouncilMinutes
- 2.3h CuyamacaCollege-SSPRPC-Minutes
- 2.3i CuyamacaCollege-WorkforceDevelopmentCommitteeMinutes
- 2.4 CuyamacaCollege-IPRPC-Report-Assessment-Rubric.pdf
- 2.5 CuyamacaCollege-IPRPC-Outcomes-Worksheet-Assessment-Rubric.pdf
- 2.6 Cuyamaca College-Instruction-ProgramReviewReports-2012
- 2.7a CuyamacaCollege-BasicSkillsMinutes
- 2.7b CuyamcaCollege-BasicSkillsActivitiesFunded2012.pdf
- 2.8 CuyamacaCollege-PerkinsPlan2012.pdf
- 2.9a CuyamacaCollege-InstructionSummaryReport2012.pdf
- 2.9b CuyamacaCollege-AIP-withEMP-Priorities-2012-13-IERC.pdf

- 3.1a CuyamacaCollege-InstructionalProgramReview&PlanningWritersGuide2012
- 3.1b -- See 2.6
- 3.2 CuyamcaCollege-StudentServices-ProgramReviewReports-2012
- 3.3 CuyamacaCollege-AdministrativeServicesProgramReviewReports-2012.pdf
- 3.4 CuyamacaCollege-KPI_Spring2012_v5.pdf
- 3.5 -- See 2.2
- 3.6 CuyamacaCollege-StudentServices-Program Review-Summary-2012.pdf
- 3.7 CuyamacaCollege-GCCCDEnrollmentPriorityReport.pdf
- 3.8 CuyamacaCollege-AUO Assessment Doc-2012.docx
- 3.9 CuyamacaCollege-Admin-Services-SummaryReport-2012.pdf
- 3.10 CuyamacaCollege-IERC-Summative-Report-2012.pdf
- 3.11 CuyamacaCollege-EMPChapter6.pdf
- 3.12 -- See 2.9b
- 3.13 CuyamacaCollege-Institutional-Effectiveness-Survey 2012.pdf
- 3.14 CuyamacaCollege-ICDialogue-What can we learn from surveys-08-13-2012.pptx

- 4.1 CuyamacaCollege-ProfessionalDevelopment-Spring2011.pdf
- 4.2 CuyamacaCollege-Professional-Development-Fall2012.htm
- 4.3 CuyamacaCollege-SLOTrainingStudent-Services-Fall-2012.pdf
- 4.4 CuyamacaCollege-InstructionProgramReviewWorkshop-2012.pdf
- 4.5 CuyamacaCollege-IPRPC-Workshop-SenseMaking-Data-in-Program-Review.pdf
- 4.6 CuyamacaCollege-OutcomesWebpageSnapshots.pdf
- 4.7 CuyamacaCollege-DCEC-Notes-8-27-12.pdf
- 4.8 CuyamacaCollege-StudentLearningOutcomesAssessmentCommitteeCharge.pdf

- 5.1 --See 3.10, pages 1 – 7
- 5.2 CuyamacaCollege-IntegratedPlanningModel.pdf

- 6.1 CuyamacaCollege-IPRPC-Template-2013-14.pdf (See pages 13-18)
- 6.2 CuyamacaCollege-SSRPC-Template-2013.pdf (See page 7-10)
- 6.3 CuyamacaCollege-Curriculum-minutes-2012-05-01.pdf
- 6.4 CuyamacaCollege-CourseOutlineTemplate.pdf
- 6.5 CuyamacaCollege-Catalog-DegreesCertificates2012-13.pdf
- 6.6 CuyamacaCollege-BasicSkills-Outcomes-Fall 10.pdf
- 6.7 CuyamacaCollege-GE-Outcomes
- 6.8 CuyamacaCollege-CTE-Outcomes-2011.pdf
- 6.9 -- See 3.14, pages 12 & 17

- 7.1 CuyamacaCollege-CourseOutlineCIS190withSLO.pdf
- 7.2 CuyamacaCollege-CoureOutlineSPAN120withSLO.pdf
- 7.3 CuyamacaCollege-Syllabus-Math180-Fall-2012.pdf
- 7.4 CuyamacaCollege-Syllabus-CIS290Fall2012.pdf
- 7.5 See 3.14, page 5

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