

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: February 15, 2013


Institution's Name: College of the Siskiyous

Name and Title of Individual Completing Report: Robert A. Frost, Ph.D.
Vice President, Student Learning

Telephone Number and E-mail Address: 530-938-5201 / rfrost@siskiyous.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: **Randall C. Lawrence**

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): 522
- b. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 483
Percentage of total: 91%
- c. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 341
Percentage of total: 65%

2. Programs

- a. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college): 38
- b. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 37;
Percentage of total: 97%
- c. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 22;
Percentage of total: 58%

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): 6
- b. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 6; Percentage of total: 100%
- c. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 6; Percentage of total: 100%

4. Institutional Learning Outcomes

- a. Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined: 0
- b. Number of institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment: N/A

Note about the Data: As a part of implementing the new modules of CurricUNET, data collection for

SLO Reporting shifted from the Faculty PR Chair to the Director of Instructional Services. As a result, Siskiyous has reassessed its approach and applied a more thorough methodology to accounting for programs for the data in Section 1, which now includes new programs since 2010 (1.1).

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

College of the Siskiyous has SLOs and assessments in place for all levels: courses, programs, degrees, and institution. The Curriculum (CC) and Program Review (PR) Committees work side-by-side to coordinate maintenance, documentation and improvement, which are regularly reported out to the Board. (1.2–1.3) All courses and programs in the Siskiyous Catalog of 2012 have regularly scheduled SLO assessments. Courses are assessed on an annual basis; programs are assessed at three and six year cycles.

Institutional outcomes are met through the college's general education SLOs (1.4) which connect to each program. Siskiyous purchased the CurricUNET Assessment and Program Review modules after poor experience with TracDat, to ensure effective documentation of trend data across cycles. The Curriculum Committee's revised recommendation process (1.5) functions effectively over two years. Faculty track and improve course offerings based on a better understanding of the curriculum and SLO assessment process. As a result, campus dialogues review and critique our own learning through formalized assessment and evaluation. (1.6-1.7)

The college makes decisions differently as a result of increased emphasis on SLO assessment and program review. The financial investment in added CurricUNET modules, for this small rural college, and faculty support to integrating both systems and processes (1.8) illustrates the collaborative commitment within the college.

Specific changes as a result of the above include:

1. Academic Departments made changes to courses and programs. For example, 2012 Math Dept proposed to eliminate modular courses in favor of a reduced basic course sequence, specifically due to assessment analysis of prior years (1.9).
2. After first year of new integrated planning system, all of the Student Learning implementation plans are in progress except +/- 4, of which several have been tabled as no longer viable within the Educational Master Plan.
3. Basic Skills funding now tied directly to a revised funding process as a result of faculty recommendations for changes (after 3 years committee data reviews) (1.10).

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

Instructors analyze outcome data from Program Review annually at both the program level and with access to college-wide results (2.1). The results form rationale for budget requests and program innovations, as shown in the college's integrated planning system, Educational Master Plan, and CurricUNET reporting (2.2 – 2.4). Evidence of an ongoing and continuous improvement in this area includes:

2003: Siskiyou one of 3 colleges to pilot accreditation report to support development of new ACCJC SLO guidelines & manuals. College widely discussed/debated application through Ad hoc committee.

2004: Faculty craft and finalize GE SLOs. Senate approves GE SLOs & philosophy.
- Su 2004 3 Instructors attend the first ever Assessment institute sponsored by the RP group.

2005: Began annual FLEX workshop on SLO Assessment & analysis (2.5)
- Aug-Oct Faculty read & discuss *The Outcomes Primer* after an all-day workshop with author.

2006: January: FLEX Faculty begin work of developing and mapping program SLOs. This began two ongoing discussions: how many outcomes; and what is a program?
- Kathleen Gabriel presents an SLO workshop.
- Fall: faculty convened an assessment book club continued from 2005

2007: Title III grant supports Assessment Coordinator over two years.

2007: Faculty develop Annual Program Review process and template.

2009: SLO Committee disbands as work occurs within areas and departments.

2009: ISLOs integrated under college's General Education Outcomes.

2010: TracDat abandoned after one year; CurricUNET purchased and brought online by 2011.

2011: President reassigns an instructor to one-year assessment improvement project.

2011: All course SLOs are successfully integrated into CurricUNET.

2012: Spring semester evaluations include faculty evaluation of program review processes (2.6).
- Fall Orientation Day workshop on transition to new CurricUNET modules (2.7-2.8)
- Faculty complete SLO Proficiency forms as mechanism to report out & discuss most current activity (2.9).

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

Assessment results drive decision-making through an iterative process that (1) begins at the discipline level with discussion and review of results through program review process; (2)

includes analysis at the Program Review and Planning Committee levels (3.1-3.4); (3) is added into the Educational Master Plan after college-wide dialogue; and (4) is included at recommendation and decision-making levels through the college's management and governance processes (3.5 – 3.7).

Siskiyou has an established Educational Master Planning process that integrates Assessment, Planning, Budgeting, and continuous improvement (3.8). This system has been improved and revised continuously from a strategic planning model (3.9) to the current EMP and Planning by Design. The improved attention to SLOs and instruction is evident when the two are compared. Above all, the Curriculum and Program Review Committees drive the Assessment and improvement processes through CurricUNET process in place (3.10). Evidence supplied indicates:

- Continuous assessment of SLOs;
- Connecting SLOs to college vision and mission and board priorities;
- Establishing appropriate measures of success;
- Identified funding challenges connect to associated recommendations; and
- Applied learning connects to curriculum and Master Plan recommendations.

Attendance by both full-time (nearly 100% over past three years) and part-time instructors at workshops shows engagement. The current Educational Master Plan supports both current learning and the requisite decision-making aligned with this plan. EMP work includes continuous review of assessment/program review results by the Planning Committee (3.11-3.12).

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

Siskiyou continues to allocate resources based on a continuous review, proposal and recommendation process that has been in place for at least one decade. The process has improved in recent years through the new integrated planning process (4.1) but continues the well-known processes of requests and proposals that are routed through the academic and service areas to the Instructional Technology, Student Learning, and College Councils. In 2011-12, the entire Instructional Equipment budget was allocated in a collaborative process, with no administrative changes, in less than three months (4.2). Furthermore, as a result of multiple faculty requests for more reliable and timely computer equipment updates, the process and timeline for replacement was shifted to the VPSL office.

One example of how decision-making has improved from assessment results is in the computer replacement cycle. Since 2011, as a result of input from numerous faculty, all faculty computers are upgraded (Mac or PC) on-time on a four-year replacement cycle. Additionally, the planning process supports recommendations for additional or revised funding, be it technology or other learning support, based on results of assessments and data (4.3). In the area of services, program review input supported resource allocations to:

- Investments in Enrollment Services and Advising improvements through DegreeWorks
- ongoing Banner consulting to Matriculation and Enrollment Services 2010-12

In 2012-13, faculty submitted 13 resource requests to the dean's office for positions, equipment, and even facilities improvements (4.4)

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 a well-established assessment cycle (5.1), annual timeline and review and analysis through the program review process. Through establishment of the integrated planning system, these processes better connect all employees to assessment and planning.

Student Learning Outcomes are documented in CurricUNET and reviewed by the Curriculum Committee both on a regular update cycle and every time a course is reviewed for any reason by the committee. As a result, the up-to-date CurricUNET schedule shows that faculty recognize the top priority given to updated and relevant SLOs. The CurricUNET Assessment and Program Review modules fully integrate data with course and program SLOs and assessment criteria established by the faculty. Additionally, in Fall 2012, as a follow-on exercise from the August SLO Orientation Day workshop, the faculty completed SLO Proficiency Forms as a bridge to the new CurricUNET module as a mechanism to review/document how assessment results have been analyzed and used for results through the 11-12 cycle (5.2).

Comprehensive reports of both academic and institutional program reviews are

- reviewed annually by the Program Review Committee;
- analyzed by the Planning Committee alongside EMP Implementation Plans (5.3);
- updated on a regular schedule established by the Planning by Design system; and
- All reports are on file (5.4-5.7) and on the website.

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

Program level outcomes are embedded within each course so student success and program milestones can be tracked throughout the certificate or degree track. This is reviewed at each stage of the Curriculum review and approval processes and mapped and logged through CurricUNET (6.1-6.2). Program outcomes are derived directly from course level outcomes; the latter grows out of the former. These outcomes are further integrated through program review, where recommendations for changes or funding grow out of aligning course or program-level changes with the goals of the Educational Master Plan. (6.3). As a result of completing prescribed, required courses within a program, a student demonstrates competence, and thus achieves eligibility, for a certificate or degree from the college. As constructed, a student could not successfully complete a degree without meeting the program learning outcomes at the required level.

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

Siskiyous students are made aware of the goals and purposes of courses and programs through multiple means of communication. All CORs include SLOs, and students are made aware of course SLOs in syllabi and first day handouts, which are stored on the LMS course site or given as hardcopy (7.1). The Dean’s Office reviews first-day handouts and syllabi for this information, as it is included in all adjunct orientations. Furthermore, program webpages display program goals and purposes.

But as a rural district with some internet limitations, Siskiyous also offers print brochures for a variety of CTE and college programs (7.2). Above all, faculty are charged with informing students of both course and program goals, as they serve as the primary purveyors of such information (7.3). The college also has an active information network through Upward Bound which informs students beginning in their freshman year of high school of programs, their purposes, and types of learning activities in college (7.4).

Students indicate satisfaction in this area through regular use of nationally-normed assessments like SENSE and CCSSE. The most recent years indicate a high level of satisfaction with the program and course information they receive (7.5-7.7)

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

Siskiyou is operating at the proficient level.

1. All courses and programs have SLOs, which are assessed on a timeline that integrates with all other college planning and budgeting processes. Students are assessed on these SLOs and both certificate and degrees are awarded through demonstrating these defined competencies.
2. Program level outcomes are defined and publicized through the catalog as well as through a variety of electronic and print media.
3. Siskiyou faculty have, for many years, both scheduled ongoing dialogue and training in SLO assessment as well as completed informal unit/discipline level meetings where SLOs and achievement are of primary interest.
4. Institutional level decisions are made through attention to the Educational Master Plan, which is the focal point for aligning assessment, planning, budgeting, and achieving college mission.
5. Despite a one-fifth overall loss of revenue in the annual budget, Siskiyou continues to increase its investment in Assessment and Program Review support and applications.
6. Siskiyou has an established track record of regular, timely assessment that includes review and evaluation of the process and results.
7. The CurricUNET Assessment module was purchased and brought online with key goals for improvement including; analysis in reporting; monitoring of timelines and completion; and increasing inter-disciplinary dialogue.
8. Students indicate a high level of satisfaction with the learning outcome and program information they receive throughout their Siskiyou college experience.

Primarily, as described in #7 above, the college will continue to improve in interdisciplinary dialogue, analysis, and decision-making at the course and program level. Annual evaluation of timely submissions needs to continue so assessments are completed while data and discussions are fresh. Such efforts are driven by both Curriculum and Program Review Committees, with increasing collaboration with the VPSL Office. Monitoring and continuing to improve the participation of part-time instructors we see as our key challenge to support continued improvement in both SLO and Program Assessment.

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

TABLE OF EVIDENCE (NO WORD COUNT LIMIT)

- 1.1 [SLO Proficiency Report Data Tracking Methodology](#)
- 1.2 [Academic Program Review 2012 Instructions](#)
- 1.3 [Academic Program Review Report to the Board 10-19-2012](#)
- 1.4 [General Education SLOs](#)
- 1.5 [Curriculum Approval Process Flow Chart](#)
- 1.6 [Evaluation of 2011 Program Review Process 03-08-2012](#)

- 1.7 [Planning Day Clicker Activity 04-24-2012](#)
- 1.8 [Planning by Design Document](#)
- 1.9 [Examples Impact of Program Review and Assessment Results](#)
- 1.10 [Basic Skills Memo 2012-13](#)
- 2.1 [SLO Electronic Survey Results for 2011-12](#)
- 2.2 [Educational Master Plan 2010-2014](#)
- 2.3 [Planning by Design Document](#)
- 2.4 [Sample – Course Outlines \(Folder\)](#)
- 2.5 [Flex Activities](#)
- 2.6 [Evaluation of 2011 Program Review Process 03-08-2012](#)
- 2.7 [Orientation Day Presentation – SLO Proficiency](#)
- 2.8 [SLO Proficiency Report Form](#)
- 2.9 [Completed SLO Proficiency Forms Fall 2012 \(Folder\)](#)
- 3.1 [Planning Committee Agendas](#)
- 3.2 [Educational Master Plan 2010-14](#)
- 3.3 [EMP Year 1 Implementation Plans \(Folder\)](#)
- 3.4 [EMP Year 2 Implementation Plans \(Folder\)](#)
- 3.5 [Participatory Governance Model Document](#)
- 3.6 [Student Learning Council Instructional Equipment List](#)
- 3.7 [Instruction Council 2011-12 \(Folder\)](#)
- 3.8 [Planning by Design Document](#)
- 3.9 [2005-2010 Strategic Plan Final](#)
- 3.10 [Sample – Course Outlines \(Folder\)](#)
- 3.11 [Program Review Implications for Planning December 2012](#)
- 3.12 [Budget Development & Revision Process](#)
- 4.1 [Planning by Design Document](#)
- 4.2 [Student Learning Council Instructional Equipment List](#)
- 4.3 [EMP 2010-2014 Revised Implementation Plan Form](#)
- 4.4 [Resource Request Summary for Program Review](#)
- 5.1 [Schedule of Evaluation of Major Institutional Processes](#)
- 5.2 [Completed SLO Proficiency Forms Fall 2012 \(Folder\)](#)
- 5.3 [Program Review Implications for Planning](#)
- 5.4 [Academic Program Reviews for AY 2010-11 \(Folder\)](#)

- 5.5 [Institutional Program Review Completed Reports 2011-12 \(Folder\)](#)
- 5.6 [EMP Year 1 Implementation Plans \(Folder\)](#)
- 5.7 [EMP Year 2 Implementation Plans \(Folder\)](#)
- 6.1 [Curriculum Approval Process Flow Chart](#)
- 6.2 [Sample – Course Outlines \(Folder\)](#)
- 6.3 [Educational Master Plan 2010-14 \(Page 7 Highlighted Area\)](#)
- 7.1 [Sample – Course Syllabi with Student Learning Outcomes \(Folder\)](#)
- 7.2 [Program Brochures \(Folder\)](#)
- 7.3 [Faculty Handbook Section on Course Handouts](#)
- 7.4 [Upward Bound Program Information](#)
- 7.5 [ACT Student Survey Graphics Report 2012](#)
- 7.6 [CCSSE Benchmark Report 2011](#)
- 7.7 [SENSE Benchmark Report 2008 \(New Results will be Available Spring 2013\)](#)

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