College of the Redwoods

7351 Tompkins Hill Road
Eureka, CA 95501

College Status Report on
Student Learning Outcomes Implementation

Submitted to
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

October 15, 2012

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 15, 2012

Institution's Name: College of the Redwoods

Name and Title of Individual Completing Report: Utpal K. Goswami, VPI and ALO

Telephone Number and E-mail Address: 707-476-4109 Utpal-Goswami@Redwoods.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: Kathryn G. Lehner

Signature: *Kathryn G. Lehner* (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): ___680_____
   b. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: ____680_____ Percentage of total: ___100%_____
   c. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: ____448_____ Percentage of total: ____65.8%_____

2. Programs
   a. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college): ____84_____
   b. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes: ____84_____; Percentage of total: ___100%_____
   c. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: ___56_____; Percentage of total: ____66.6%_____

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): ____10_____
   b. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: ____10_____; Percentage of total: ____100%_____
   c. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: ____10_____; Percentage of total: ___100%_____

4. Institutional Learning Outcomes
   a. Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined: _____3_____
   b. Number of institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment: ___100%_____

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

All individual courses and programs have developed Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). They are reviewed on a five-year cycle by the Curriculum Committee (#1.1). The College has adopted a two-year cycle for assessing all SLOs (#1.2). The assessment of these SLOs is progressing according to the plan. For instructional programs, at least one SLO was assessed in 90 percent of all the courses offered in Spring 2012 and in 95 percent of the courses offered in Summer 2012. At least one SLO has been assessed in 100 percent of the student support programs. The College has also assessed at least one program learning outcome (PLO) in 66 percent of the instructional programs. This number is expected to reach 100 percent by Fall 2013 due to the implementation of the two-year cycle.

Both instructional and non-instructional SLO data is used in the annual program review process (#1.3) and is used as a basis for annual program plans. The program review process is the basis for the College's budget allocation process (#1.4).

Assessment of student learning is part of faculty duties and is also a component of faculty evaluation (#1.5).

The College has developed an online system for tracking and reporting assessments (#1.6). The College has used assessment results to inform institutional plans, modify curriculum and pedagogy, and guide resource allocation and institutional dialogue (#1.7).

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

All course SLOs are assessed on a two-year cycle. The College has also mapped the course level SLOs to program learning outcomes (PLOs) (#2.1). Structured dialogue sessions are held to discuss assessment results at the discipline, program and institutional level (#2.2). Faculty and staff are provided regular training on assessment. Assessment results are also shared with the Curriculum Committee, Program Review Committee, Academic Senate, and the Board of Trustees. (#2.3)

The College uses assessment results to drive improvement at various levels. At the course level, post-test scores in CT-57C increased by 11 percent when the photos used in the instruction of identifying furniture and cabinet styles used throughout history were improved following a need identified through assessment (#2.4). Assessment results in MATH-5 led to pedagogical adjustments in teaching the use of graphing calculators which resulted in documented improvement in student success (#2.5).

At the institutional level, representatives from several departments discussed data on low percentages of Basic Skills English and Mathematics cohorts progressing through the sequence of basic skills courses. This prompted discussion of innovative ways in which Student Services could support students to persist. Advisors are now being embedded into some basic skills and student success courses. A first-year experience framework is being developed to support basic skills students (#2.6).

The program review process requires programs to develop annual plans based on institutional plans and assessment results along with corresponding budget requests. The Budget Planning Committee then ranks those requests for funding (#2.7).

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

Widespread dialogue about assessment is facilitated through the College's planning, budgeting, and program review processes. These processes are described in the College's Planning, Budgeting, and Program Review Manual (#3.1) and are referenced in the charge of the Assessment Committee and the College's program review templates.

Reporting on SLO assessment and results are part of the annual program review. The program review process also prompts authors to reflect on: (a) how the assessment of course level SLOs led to improvement of student learning; (b) how assessment of PLOs led to degree/certificate improvement; and (c) unusual assessment findings/observations that may require further research or institutional support (#3.2).

Planning and resource allocation decisions are integrated with the assessment and program review processes. Assessment themes that were developed during the May 2012 Assessment Summit have been linked to the objectives in Goal 1 of the 2012-17 Strategic Plan and Goal 1 of the 2012-17 Education Master Plan and were incorporated in the 2012-13 Annual Institutional Plan (#3.3).

In order to receive funding, the needs expressed through program review must be linked to the assessment of student learning or to institutional plans. The Assessment Committee is charged with developing broad assessment themes to inform further updates to institutional plans. The College held a two-day Assessment Summit (#3.4) to discuss Spring 2012 assessment data and foster institutional dialogue Based on the discussion and dialogue the College was able to develop several assessment themes to assist institutional plans over the next few years.

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 has supported assessment by providing released time for the Assessment Coordinator for the last three years. In addition, the College supports professional development activities for faculty and staff. Over the last three years a series of formal trainings have been conducted to increase faculty, staff, and administration understanding of SLOs and how to assess and report on results. The Assessment Committee has developed an assessment handbook (#4.1)

Program review is fundamental to College-wide planning. Program review reports contain an evaluation of changes in student achievement data and/or other significant indicators, a summary and analysis of assessment results, an update on progress related to program goals, a description of quality improvement plans, and resource requests. These components of program review are forwarded from the Program Review Committee to institutional planning groups, including the Assessment Committee, functional planning committees and administrators. The planning groups then use program review data to inform planning, make recommendations regarding resource allocation, and ultimately monitor the effectiveness of the planning processes themselves to ensure continuous quality improvement (#4.2).

The allocation of College resources is based on a clear description of the relationship between the resource requested and its impact on student learning via outcomes assessment, program effectiveness, and the vision, mission, and strategic goals of the College. The Budget Planning Committee (BPC) evaluates the planning-related resource requests ranked by the various integrated planning committees as well as the operating expense requests identified by the College's administrative team (#4.3).

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

The College has formalized the role of the Assessment Committee and provides 40 percent release time to the Assessment Coordinator. The Assessment Committee works closely with the Office of Institutional Research. By a collaborative process, the College has developed an online assessment reporting and tracking system (#5.1). The user reports on outcomes that have been assessed, the

assessment instrument, the assessment rubric, the assessment results and proposed actions based on assessment results (#5.2). The assessment tool also allows users to view previously submitted reports and to utilize the discussion forum. Users also report on completed actions using the "close the loop" process (#5.3).

All SLOs in Instructional and Student Services courses and programs are assessed on a two-year cycle. Service areas (Business Office, Maintenance etc.) report on service area outcomes on a yearly basis as part of the program review process. More than 65 percent of the courses and programs have ongoing assessments. With the adoption of the two-year cycle in 2012, the number is expected to reach 100 percent by end of Fall 2013.

Results of assessment work are sent to the Assessment Committee for review and identification of assessment themes that require interdepartmental and institutional-level dialogue (#5.4). This comprehensive assessment dialogue is then forwarded to administration for incorporation into institutional plans. The Program Review Committee conducts an analysis of trends in student achievement, including differences across student equity groups, and significant challenges and accomplishments for each program will be forwarded to deans and vice presidents for discussion and action.

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

The College has established a mapping process by which course level SLOs are mapped into program PLOs. The College gained efficiency in collecting assessment data since one set of data can be used for both course level and program level assessment. As a result the institution was able to pay more attention to discipline and institutional dialogue. The initial mapping activity mapped all existing SLOs. Henceforth, faculty proposing new courses or modifications to course proposals will be required to submit the assessment planning cycle and description of the course SLO mapping.

The information about mapping is available for public viewing (#6.1). The Assessment Committee conducts structured dialogue sessions to analyze, interpret and evaluate PLOs once the required number of course level assessment are completed.

The College uses general education outcomes as institutional outcomes (#6.2). The College ensures that programs meet institutional outcomes by requiring appropriate general education courses for degrees. The Curriculum Committee ensures all general education courses have course outcomes mapped to general education outcomes.

In order to reach the sustainable continuous quality improvement level, the College intends to extend the analysis of program outcomes to attainment of beginning, intermediate and mastery level of outcomes.

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 the catalog.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 7: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Every syllabus is required to describe the student learning outcomes (SLOs). Faculty are required to submit syllabus reporting templates before the beginning of the semester (#7.1). The submitted templates are reviewed by deans at the beginning of the semester to ensure compliance with format and information. The Curriculum Committee course update and modification forms require faculty to describe all of the SLOs for the specific course and the Curriculum Committee members review all forms to guarantee that course SLOs map to program SLOs. The assessment information on the course outlines also must match the stated SLOs in the course outline of record. PLOs are published for each instructional program in the College catalog (#7.2).

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 defined SLOs for 100 percent of the courses and has mapped the course level SLOs to program level SLOs. Assessment is now part of faculty duties and is a component of faculty evaluation. The College has also adopted a two-year assessment cycle. The College can document conducting over 90 percent of the planned assessments for two terms.

Systems are in place for submitting, tracking and recording assessment activities. Assessment of SLOs is a part of program review. Annual planning and resource allocation is based partly on linkages to assessment. Course SLOs are included in every syllabus and PLOs are published in the catalog. There is documented evidence of rich assessment related dialogue among faculty. The College has systematically used assessment results to improve curriculum, programs and services. As a result, the College meets the proficient level in accordance with the Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Student Learning Outcomes rubric.

The College intends to strengthen the link between SLO assessment and institutional effectiveness by

developing cross-program analysis and dialogue. The College intends to expand SLO mapping to include beginning, intermediate and mastery levels of linkage with program outcomes. In addition, the College intends to 'close the loop' on annual programs based on assessment results. Finally, the College intends to move towards comparative analysis of assessment results based on evaluation of institutional data along with peer group, regional and national data.

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

TABLE OF EVIDENCE (NO WORD COUNT LIMIT)

1.1	Curriculum Committee Stoplight
1.2	Two-year Assessment Plan
1.3	Use of SLOs in Program Review
1.4	Excerpt of Budget Process
1.5	MOU with CRFO
1.6	Assessment Website
1.7	Excerpts of Dialog
2.1	Mapping Example
2.2	Assessment Related Dialogue
2.3	Report to Senate
2.4	CT-57C Report
2.5	Math-5 Report
2.6	Annual Institutional Plan (FYE)
2.7	BPC Protocol
3.1	Planning Manual (Excerpt)
3.2	Program Review Prompt on Assessment
3.3	Annual Institutional Plan
3.4	Assessment Summit
4.1	Assessment Handbook
4.2	Planning Manual (Complete)
4.3	IPM Chart
5.1	Assessment Website
5.2	Assessment Reporting Form
5.3	Closing the Loop Process
5.4	Assessment Committee Charge
6.1	Mapping Website
6.2	General Education Outcomes
7.1	Syllabus Reporting Template
7.2	Catalog excerpt on PLO

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