

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 13, 2012

Institution's Name: El Camino College

Name and Title of Individual Completing Report: Francisco Arce

Telephone Number and E-mail Address: (310) 660-3119; fmarce@elcamino.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: Thomas M. Fallo

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): 1074
 - b. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 1074
Percentage of total: 100%
 - c. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 594
Percentage of total: 55%
2. Programs
 - a. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college): 60
 - b. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 60;
Percentage of total: 100%
 - c. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 59;
Percentage of total: 98%
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): 24
 - b. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 24;
Percentage of total: 100%
 - c. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 20; Percentage of total: 84%
4. Institutional Learning Outcomes
 - a. Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined: 6
 - b. Number of institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment: 3

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

As of spring 2012, the College and the Compton Center have jointly assessed three of the six core competencies: Communication and Comprehension (fall 2010), Critical, Creative, and Analytical Thinking (spring 2011), and Professional and Personal Growth (spring 2012) (Appendix 1.E., 1F.). The remaining core competencies, Community and Collaboration, Information and Technology Literacy, and Content Knowledge will be assessed fall 2012, spring 2013, and fall 2013, respectively. The assessments will repeat starting in fall 2014 in accordance with the established four-year cycle (Appendix 1.A.).

All academic programs at the College have SLOs in place. All courses have at least one SLO with course-level authentic assessments occurring regularly. As of June 2012, approximately 55% of all courses have been assessed, including courses with several outcomes which have been assessed multiple times. Program-level SLOs are assessed on a timeline that aligns with the program review cycle four year cycle (Appendix 1.G.). Program reviews include a section on SLOs and assessment results. Faculty summarize and analyze the recommended and implemented changes resulting from course and program level SLO assessment (Appendix 1.B.). As described in the ECC planning model (Appendix 1.D.), SLO assessment data is used for program review, which then drives recommendations for annual planning and budgeting, which is how resources are allocated.

There are a total of 24 unique Student Services programs identified between ECC and CEC (Appendix 1.C.). All programs have at least one SLO in place; included in this figure are programs with several outcomes which have been assessed multiple times.

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

SLOs are widely discussed across campus: in division and department meetings, the Assessment of Learning Committee (ALC), the Academic Senate, campus SLO summits, Flex day workshops and presentations, SLO facilitator meetings, deans meetings, department meetings, and SLO team meetings (Appendix 2.A-C., 2.H-J.). For example, within the Art and Math departments, there are frequent discussions of all aspects of student learning assessment in an attempt to increase effectiveness and participation by faculty (Appendix 2.D., 2.G.). At the Center, Flex days were devoted to SLO-related in spring 2011 and 2012 where faculty developed classroom strategies that would be implemented based on assessment results (Appendix 2.E.).

The college has six core competencies (institutional outcomes) that are assessed in a four year cycle (Appendix 1.A). The assessment results have been shared with the campus via summits, Flex day presentations, newsletters, and presentations to different campus committees, including Academic Senate and the Faculty Development Committee (Appendix 2.F.). In spring 2012 the ALC created a SLO video that discusses the importance of assessments and the link between SLOs, program review, planning and budgeting (Appendix 3.G.). The video is posted on the SLO webpage.

Regarding Student Services programs, institutional dialogue takes place regularly through department and division meetings (Appendix 2.K.), the joint Student and Community Advancement Student Learning Outcomes Committee (Appendix 2.L.), multiple workshops and trainings (Appendix 2.M.), and presentations to the CEC Board of Trustees. Student Services SLO assessment data and results are shared through Plan Builder and Program Review (Appendix 2.N.).

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

SLOs are a critical component of program reviews. SLO coordinators participate in the review process and provide guidance and feedback specifically on the SLO section of the report. Program reviews include thoughtful discussions about improving instructional methods, adjusting assessment tools, clarifying assignments or assessments to better reflect the desired outcome (Appendix 1.B.). Program reviews suggesting changes and improvements via additional resources have these recommendations added to annual plans in Plan Builder, the College's planning software (Appendix 3.E., 3.H.). The recommendations are discussed among faculty, prioritized, then forwarded on to the division level for potential funding and implementation. Starting spring 2012, all program reviews begin in the spring semester and end in the fall semester, to align with the college's planning and budgeting cycle (Appendix 3.B.). This allows programs to have their recommendations ready to input into their annual plan. This change has increased awareness of the correlation between SLOs, program review, planning and budgeting (Appendix 1.A.).

At Compton, SLO reports from several academic programs suggested more tutoring and writing workshops are necessary (Appendix 3.D.). As a result, an Instructional Specialist was hired in Spring 2012 to lead in the Center's tutoring and related academic support. (Appendix 3.F.)

All Student Services program SLOs strengthen institution-wide practices by addressing barriers to student persistence, retention and completion to support and improve student learning (Appendix 3.I., 3.C. and 3.A.).

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 organizational structure supports and facilitates authentic dialogue of SLOs and assessments. Assessment of student learning is coordinated by SLO coordinators, SLO division facilitators, and the ALC (Appendix 4.C., 4.D.). In spring 2012, the Academic Senate established a Vice President of Instructional Effectiveness position to facilitate communication between the Academic Senate, the ALC and serve as the co-chair of the Academic Program Review Committee.

For example, the Scientific Method SLO for Biology concluded that the students need a greater degree of practice using lab equipment, technology and supplies. The 2012-13 plan asked for budget increases to help with the identified needs (Appendix 4.A.).

The Proficiency with Instrumentation SLO for the pre-allied health courses noted students in some classes are having difficulty properly adjusting microscopes because equipment is in need of repair. The 2012-13 plan requests funding to purchase new microscopes (Appendix 4.B.).

In the Childhood Education program, faculty uses SLO data to refine assignments, promote and improve student learning and the overall quality of the program. Faculty collaborate on assignments to ensure consistency among instructors (Appendix 4.F.).

Based on their English 80 SLO assessment, faculty determined that a new exit exam was necessary (Appendix 4.G.). They applied for a Foundation iGrant and plan to develop an exam that accurately assesses students' skills (Appendix 4.E.).

Student Services programs annually identify, assess, evaluate and complete the SLO cycle to fine-tune program activities and services for students. These results are shared through the institutional planning process, ensuring appropriate resource allocation.

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

CurricUNET serves as the College's online SLO management and reporting system. The campus fully implemented CurricUNET in Spring 2012 to input course and program level SLOs and assessments. The SLO coordinators created a manual and conducted several campus-wide trainings in late fall 2011 and early spring 2012 for faculty and staff (Appendix 5.A.).

CurricUNET uses a standard reporting format that includes an SLO statement, the assessment tool and the rubric used to measure the outcomes (Appendix 5.B.). The results of each assessment are documented in a narrative form that discusses the findings of the assessment. The final part of the assessment involves faculty reflection where faculty can make recommendations on improvements for the next assessment cycle. CurricUNET provides a location for faculty to exchange thoughts about student learning results and improvement ideas. The implementation has helped improve campus-wide understanding and communication of the SLO assessment process. Faculty receive emails when changes are made or assessment reports are submitted. This communication encourages faculty discussions regarding outcomes and assessment results.

Another benefit of CurricUNET is that it is a relational database that integrates with program review reports. SLO data are automatically populated into the program review module for reference when faculty examine program success or areas to improve.

Currently, all Student Services programs are transitioning to CurricUNET. For the past several years a Word document template was used to create SLO statements, assessments and reports which were then posted online (Appendix 5.C., 5.D., 5.E., 5.F., 5.G. and 5.H.).

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 six core competencies (institutional outcomes): Communication and Comprehension; Critical, Creative, and Analytical Thinking; Professional and Personal Growth; Community and Collaboration; Information and Technology Literacy; and Content Knowledge. During Spring Flex Day 2010, the college faculty mapped their courses and programs to the College's core competencies. Using a scale of 1-4, (1=least important and 4=very important) faculty were asked to rate how strongly each core competency was related to the program and each course within the program (Appendix 6.A., 6.F., 6.G.). This alignment activity has allowed the college easy access to the hierarchical data when needed. For example, the College has been able to assess the first three core competencies by focusing

on courses that are “very important” to the core competency. In addition, faculty who teach courses that were rated a “4” were invited to participate in the design, assessment, and reflection of the fourth core competency.

All course level SLOs are also aligned with program level SLOs. Each division has documented their course to program alignments (Appendix 6.B., 6.C., 6.D.). These alignments are stored in CurricUNET and are included in assessment reports. Faculty are continuously fine-tuning their alignments to ensure they are accurate and appropriate. For example, the Art program-level SLO has been rephrased to better align with the institutional core competencies. As a result, most of course-level outcomes have also been rewritten to ensure clarity and alignment with the core competencies and the program-level outcome (Appendix 6.E.).

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 widely communicated to students via course syllabi, division and college web pages, and the college catalog (Appendix 7.A., 7.C., 7.D.). For example, the Center uses a syllabus template which directs faculty to include all course SLOs. In addition, the College defined and published and posted an SLO assessment timeline in fall 2009, and updates it regularly, as needed. SLO facilitators review this timeline periodically with program faculty and deans.

In fall 2010 the Institutional Research Office administered an online campus climate survey to a random sample of 2,000 students to gauge general opinions on several topics, including SLOs (Appendix 7.B.). A total of 250 students responded to the survey (13% response rate, not unusual for online surveys). Students were asked if professors have explained the SLOs, if class activities are in line with SLOs, if class assignments are in line with SLOs, and if syllabi clearly state the SLOs. Over 95% of students are aware of and value SLOs and related activities.

Regarding Student Services program SLOs, there are wide-spread examples of surveys, questionnaires and evaluation data demonstrating student awareness of the goals and scope of program services or areas where more education is needed (Appendix 7.E., 7.F., 7.G.).

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 is currently at the Proficiency level of SLO implementation. The college meets each of the rubric statements, some more strongly than others. Programs often identify their own areas of improvement. For example, the English program included a thoughtful analysis in their program review (Appendix 8.A.). The college has an organizational structure to continuously support ongoing SLO assessments and authentic dialogue.

Based on feedback from the first two core competency assessments, ALC discussed the need to revisit the statements and fine tune them. The goal is to consider the assessment tool(s) while rewriting the statements, leading to more authentic assessments.

In the next few years, the college will have more evidence of SLO assessments that have led to institutional changes and resource allocation. The program review template has been revised to emphasize the importance of analyzing assessment results and making recommendations for changes and improvements, which lead to resource allocation.

Student Services programs also meet the proficiency level of implementation. Two areas of improvement include: better widespread institutional dialogue on assessment results and better identification of the connection between SLO assessments and resource allocation. Resource allocation is often indirectly associated with the SLO. In the future, Student Services programs will be encouraged to include better connections between their SLO and program resources, in their SLO reports, when appropriate.

The College continues to refine and evaluate ways of assessing student learning at the course, program, and institutional levels, resulting in an increase in authentic dialogue and appropriate resource allocation.

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

TABLE OF EVIDENCE (NO WORD COUNT LIMIT)

Proficiency Rubric Statement 1 Evidence:

A: Core Competency Assessment Timeline

B: Program Review Template

C: SLO Programs List

D: ECC Planning Model

E: Communication and Comprehension Assessment Report

F: Core Competency and You Newsletter

G: 4-year timeline template

Proficiency Rubric Statement 2 Evidence:

- A: Fall 2011 Flex Day PowerPoint
- B: SLO Facilitator agendas
- C: Math Flex Day Agenda
- D: Foreign Language Department Meeting Agenda
- E: CEC Improvement Strategies
- F: Core Competency Newsletter
- G: Business division meeting minutes
- H: Academic Affairs Deans and Directors meeting agenda
- I: Behavioral and Social Sciences Flex Day presentation
- J: Humanities Spring Flex Day Presentation
- K: Financial Aid 2011/12 SLO Assessment Report
- L: SCA-SLO Committee Agenda
- M: ECC CurricUNET Training Slide
- N: Transfer Center 2010/11 SLO Assessment Report

Proficiency Rubric Statement 3 Evidence:

- A: SLO ECC Form 2010-11 EOPS CARE
- B: Program Review Cycle
- C: CEC Cal/WORKS SLO Assessment Report Section 1
- D: CEC History 101 course assessment
- E: Sociology Program Review
- F: CEC May Board of Trustees agenda
- G: SLO video transcript
- H: Math for Teachers Program Review
- I: CEC EOPS/CARE SLO Assessment Report

Proficiency Rubric Statement 4 Evidence:

- A: Biology Program Review
- B: Health Sciences Program Review
- C: SLO Coordinator tasks
- D: SLO facilitator tasks
- E: English 80 iGrant proposal
- F: Childhood Education Program Review
- G: English 80 course assessment

Proficiency Rubric Statement 5 Evidence:

- A: CurricUNET manual
- B: Childhood Education program assessment
- C: ECC EOPS Academic Goal Assessment Report
- D: ECC EOPS Book Voucher Assessment Report
- E: CEC Admissions and Records SLO History Report
- F: CEC-SLO AR 2010-11
- G: CEC-SLO AR 2011-12
- H: CEC-SLO SRC Section 1 Report Fall 2011

Proficiency Rubric Statement 6 Evidence:

- A: Natural Science Core Competency Map
- B: Childhood Education course to program alignment
- C: Psychology course to program alignment
- D: History course to program alignment
- E: Art Program Review
- F: Business Core Competency Map
- G: Industry and Technology Core Competency Map

Proficiency Rubric Statement 7 Evidence:

- A: SLO Catalog page
- B: Campus Climate Survey
- C: English 1A syllabus
- D: Radiologic Technology 111 syllabus
- E: ECC Testing SLO ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR 2011-2012 Section 1
- F: ECC-SLO pre_post_test 2011_2012 assessment tool – survey
- G: CEC Student Enhancement Program SLO ASSESSMENT REPORT
- F: CEC syllabus template

Self-Assessment:

- A: English Program Review

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