

O

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: March 2013

Institution's Name: Barstow Community College

Name and Title of Individual Completing Report: Nance Nunes-Gill – SLO Coordinator

Telephone Number and E-mail Address: 760-252-2411 x 7234 / nnunes-gill@barstow.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: Interim President Bill Studt

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): 336
- b. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 333
Percentage of total: 99.1%
- c. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 333
Percentage of total: 99.1%

2. Programs

- a. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college): 41
- b. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 41;
Percentage of total: 100%
- c. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 41;
Percentage of total: 100%

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): 28
- b. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 25; Percentage of total: 89.2%
- c. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 25; Percentage of total: 89.2%

4. Institutional Learning Outcomes

- a. Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined: 4
- b. Number of institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment: 4

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

College has quantitative and qualitative systems in place for evaluating student learning outcomes (SLOs) for its courses, support services, and programs (II.A.1.a). To determine what students understand and have learned as a result of a given learning experience. SLOs are developed by programs; assessment of the outcomes allows programs to discover if students are learning what they need to learn. The assessment findings stimulate discussion and direct activities that improve instructional delivery, curricula, programs, and/or services (I.A.I, II.A.I.a, II.A.I,c). Faculty communicate program learning outcomes and course learning outcomes to students by identifying SLOs in the course syllabus and in some cases the SLOs/PLOs are posted in the classroom(I.A.2.a,b,e,f,g,h,i).

We have identified active courses in the college catalog offered in the schedule in some rotation as courses taught in the last 3 years that are still active.

Academic and Vocational Education programs report annually on outcomes assessment activities through the College's program review (planning for Institutional Effectiveness). This report includes student success/retention, FTES, changes being made to courses, pedagogy, services, and programs to improve student learning. Significant dialog regarding outcomes assessment and implications take place during program level, departments, and institutional levels.

Counseling and OSS embed intellectual and personal development. This semester the focus will be placed on completion of 3 Student Service Area Program Reviews, and the .9% course level SLOs will be completed. (II.A.b, II.A.3.c).

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

Robust dialog on outcomes assessment results have occurred on many levels including In-Service Day, Best Practice, All Division, All College, and program meetings. (i.e., Instruction, Student Services) designed to facilitate the self-reflective process (I.B.I). During program review, departments discuss findings, evaluate student achievement, and measure progress towards goals as part of the improvement process.

Training has been provided to deepen dialog about outcomes assessment and to address gaps in the process so we can improve quality of assessment. Student Services and Instruction Teams both provide opportunity for regular dialog among their managers about the assessment to strengthen support and increase institutional awareness of the results.

In addition to the increased dialog, additional monthly trainings for CTE adjuncts and faculty and Mentor Trainings for new adjuncts and faculty have occurred providing a guided approach to authentic assessment, greater engagement of faculty and other employees in the process, and increased value for and commitment to ongoing outcomes and assessment (I.B.3, I.B.5).

TO 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

The College has established a full program review and an annual program review update cycle for all programs and service areas of the college. The program reviews reports on results of outcomes and assessment as well as an evaluation of those results. Fall 2012 – 100% of active programs were submitted for Academic/Vocational and 89.2% for Service Areas. The results of assessment are a top priority across the College as demonstrated in its prominence in program review and recommendations for resource allocation. (I.B, I.B.3 II.A.2.f). Degree, Certificate, and Program (DCPs) Coordinators were established to facilitate and guide program Benchmarks I, II, III, and IV. (III.A.I.c). The College's SLO Coordinator is a faculty member with 40% reassigned time.

Decision making at the department/program level occurs as the result of dialog on the results of assessment during Best Practice, All Division, and program meetings (II.A.1.c). Decisions are made by faculty to alter course delivery strategies and pedagogy; faculty also makes decisions about the program and course structure changes to improve student learning, and these curricular changes are reviewed through the curriculum committee (IV.A.2.b). Faculty have asked for additional support for inclusion of adjunct faculty in meetings specifically designed to support broad dialog about implementation of outcomes assessment in regard to the whole range of courses in the department. Each of the Student Services has assessed outcomes to determine effectiveness and need for services; the results of assessment are used to make decisions about continuations or modification of those services.

Additionally, the Academic Senate (AS) has approved the SLOAC Handbook and Assessment Handbook embedding the requirement that outcomes assessment is required on a regular basis for all active courses and programs. This faculty-driven institutional support enables the college to purposefully align its practices to support and improve student learning.

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

A Faculty SLO Coordinator (40% release time) provides leadership for the outcomes assessment efforts on the campus and works with the Interim Dean of Research, Planning and Development, the SLO Committee, DCP Coordinators and the Deans of Instruction and Workforce and Economic Development Department (WEDD).

Additionally, administrators support academic departments and support services in responding to outcomes assessment finding (I.B). Resources connected with outcomes assessment are reported through the annual program review process, identified on the Budget Allocation Proposal form, and used for prioritizing requests resulting in low participation equates to low prioritization. The respective Deans of Instruction and WEDD forward the requests to the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate who review, prioritize and submits to the IEC Committee. The IEC Committee reviews, prioritizes and submits to the Finance Budget Committee. (III.D.2.a).

The Information Technology staff provides support for faculty classroom technology through collaborative discussions about IT resources. Distance Education committee in conjunction with the Webmaster monitors the success of online instruction.

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

A website was developed to store outcomes assessments reports for program reviews, course level outcomes, DCP benchmarks, Core Competencies, Dialog and Training. Currently the information gathered is stored on the Outcomes and Assessment website. By fall 2013, the program TracDat will be implemented. The results are used to enhance programs and service areas during meetings. This past fall is the first year that 89.2% non-instructional areas completed a program review along with instructional programs as per the assessment cycle. The IEC reviews these evaluations and any supporting BAPs as we move to closing the loop. The IEC examines the process and recommends changes to the process cycle for sustainability on continuous quality improvement.

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 uses CurriCUNET The course level SLOs are mapped to the institutional outcomes through the curriculum review process. This process requires that each course regularly updates its SLOs and their respective alignment. Each outcome is mapped to both the institutional outcomes and appropriate program level outcomes. This mapping information is provided for all to view on the course outline of record (II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.i).

Course level outcomes are also aligned to program level outcomes through the SLO assessment reporting website. The site allows a user to select which program level outcomes align with each course level outcomes. The DCP Benchmark identifies the course level outcomes mapping to program level outcomes.

In some of the Career and Technical Education (CTE) certificates/degrees awarded at the college, students must pass an industry-standardized exam to receive the certificate or license. In those programs, SLOs are created with these standardized requirements (II.A.2.i).

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

Each course, along with other information, is required to have the outcomes for the courses on the course syllabus (I.B.5; II.A.6; II.A.6.a; II.B). Syllabi's are reviewed by the Dean of Instruction at the beginning of the semester to insure compliance with format information. Curriculum committee course update and modification forms require the faculty to describe all of the SLOs for the specific course, along with mapping to the program and institutional level outcomes. The assessment information on the course outlines are required to match the stated SLOs. This information will soon be stored in

TracDat.

PLOs for each instructional program and certificate are identified in the college catalogue (I.B.5; II.A.6; II.A.6.a; II.B). The PLOs are available on the Outcomes and Assessment website and an electronic format which is reviewed with each catalog update cycle. In addition the institutional outcomes are posted on the Outcomes and Assessment website.

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 continues to strive towards systematic integration of SLOs throughout its entire planning and implementation efforts. The college has made tremendous strides having 100 % submission of SLOs for courses taught in fall 2012. An improvement of 48% from spring 2012. In addition, 89.2% of the non-instructional areas submitted program reviews in fall 2012. Current efforts are in place to continue demonstration of sustainable continuous quality improvement for both instructional and non-instructional program level outcomes. Due to the efforts of the DCP Coordinators and the benchmark documentation indicating the closing of the loop and IEC it is evident the assessment work has been institutionalized and is widely documented and included into planning and allocation dialogue. There is a systematic process in place. Thus, the college meets the proficient level in compliance with the Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Student Learning Outcomes rubric.

As with any effective institution there is an ongoing improvement cycle to strengthen the links between SLO assessment and planning. The program plan process at the college identifies planning and supportive resources for improvement. The IEC will assist with moving forward Program Review BAPs that are aligned with and support the college's goals. The college continues robust efforts to improve the efforts of student completion and success.

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

TABLE OF EVIDENCE (NO WORD COUNT LIMIT)

1. Adjunct Mentor Training Sessions
 - 1.1 Mentor – December 1, 2012
 - 1.2 Mentor – February 3, 2013
 - 1.3 Mentor – March 2, 2013 – Plagiarism
 - 1.4 Mentor – November 3, 2012
 - 1.5 Mentor – October 6, 2012
 - 1.6 Mentor – September 15, 2012
2. College Inservice – All College – BOT Meetings

- 2.1 All College.Fall 12.Sp13
- 2.2 Inservice – 2012 SLO’s (1)
- 2.3 Spring.Orientation.Invite
3. Core Competencies – Course Level Outcomes – Syllabi’s
 - 3.1 Core Competencies – Assessment Course – Global Awareness
 - 3.2 Core Competencies – Fall 2012 – NNG – Himmelrick
 - 3.3 Core Competencies – Fall 2012 – Sage Essay Grading Rubric
 - 3.4 Core Competencies – Fall 2012 – Sage Evidence001 (1)
 - 3.5 Core Competencies
 - 3.6 SLO Assessment – Sample – Born-Wood – BADM 51
 - 3.7 SLO Assessment – Sample – Love – RLGS 10 – PHIL 5
 - 3.8 SLO Assessment – Sample – Beshears, Michelle – ADJU 2
 - 3.9 SLO Course Level Feedback Form
 - 3.10 SLO.Email.4.26.12
 - 3.11 TracDat.Contract
4. CTE Training Sessions
 - 4.1 CTE Training – February 2, 2013
 - 4.2 CTE Training – February 25, 2012
 - 4.3 CTE Training – March 3, 2013
 - 4.4 CTE Training – November 4, 2012
 - 4.5 CTE Training – October 6, 2012
 - 4.6 CTE Training – September 15, 2012
5. Faculty - All-Division & Best Practice Meetings
 - 5.1 2008_2013 – English Dept Agenda and Minutes 2013 03 08
 - 5.2 2013 03 05 Best Practice Meeting Notes
 - 5.3 All Division – Basic Skills – Retention – Success – 10-25-2012
 - 5.4 All Div_BP_schedule_Fall12
 - 5.5 All-Div_BP_schedule_Spring13_2013 1 23
 - 5.6 Basic Skills Meetings
 - 5.7 Best Practice – SLO Training – 4-10-2012
 - 5.8 Best Practice Meeting – Agenda – 10-09-2012
 - 5.9 BestPractice.AllDiv.Mtgs.Fall12.Sp13
6. Institutional Effectiveness Committee
 - 6.1 IEC.Minutes.2012.09.25
 - 6.2 IEC.Minutes.2012.10.16
 - 6.3 IEC.Task.Timetable
7. Program Review – Benchmarks – BAP
 - 7.1 BAP.Scoring.Rubric
 - 7.2 BAPs.2012-13
 - 7.3 BCC.AssessmentPlan.F11
 - 7.4 Budget.Allocation.Proposal.4.12

- 7.5 DCP – Nat-Sci-Math – Benchmark II – Fall 2012
- 7.6 DCP – Nat-Sci-Math – Benchmark III – Fall 2012
- 7.7 DCP – Nat-Sci-Math – Benchmark IV – Fall 2012
- 7.8 Instructional.PR.Template
- 7.9 NonInstructional.PR.Template
- 7.10 NonInstructional.PRs.2012
- 7.11 Planning.PR.Cycle.Rev.1.13
- 7.12 PR.Process.Survey
- 7.13 PRC.Charge
- 7.14 Program Review – Instructional – Fall 2012 – Basic Skills Annual Update
- 7.15 Program Review – Instructional – Fall 2012 – Nat-Sci-Math – 2012 - 2013
- 7.16 Program Review – Non-Instructional – Fall – Fall 2012 – WEDD – CTE
- 8. SLOAC – DCP Meetings
 - 8.1 DCP Meetings consolidated
 - 8.2 SLOAC Meetings consolidated
 - 8.3 SLOAC.Handbook
- 9. Student Learning and Support Activities
 - 9.1 ASB Pictures
 - 9.2 Club Flyers
 - 9.3 EOPS Meeting 1
 - 9.4 EOPS Meeting 2
 - 9.5 EOPS Meeting
 - 9.6 EOPS Orientation Spring 2012
 - 9.7 Events
 - 9.8 NCSL Student Leadership_com-
 - 9.9 Student Service Department Training
 - 9.10 Tutorial.Handouts.SLOs
- 10. Syllabi's
 - 10.1 CHLD4_Sp13_Nunes
 - 10.2 CORs.Syllabi
 - 10.3 ENGL1C_Sp13_Firtha
 - 10.4 Faculty.Handbook.2011-13
 - 10.5 MATH50_Sp13_Naim
 - 10.6 SPAN1B_Sp13_Caldon
 - 10.7 SYLLABI Checklist – Blank
 - 10.8 Syllabus.Review.Process

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