

# 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](mailto: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 10, 2012

Institution's Name: San José City College

Name and Title of Individual Completing Report: Tammeil Gilkerson, Interim VP of Academic Affairs

Telephone Number and E-mail Address: 408-298-2181 ext. 3142; [tammeil.gilkerson@sjcc.edu](mailto:tammeil.gilkerson@sjcc.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: Barbara Kavalier, PhD

Signature: *s/Barbara Kavalier, PhD*

(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): 615
- b. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 603  
Percentage of total: 99%
- c. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 519  
Percentage of total: 84% [519 of 539 offered = 98%]

2. Programs

- a. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college): 34
- b. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 34;  
Percentage of total: 100%
- c. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 34;  
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): 22
- b. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 22;  
Percentage of total: 100%
- c. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 22; Percentage of total: 100%

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**

San José City College (SJCC) has 100 percent of its instructional and non-instructional programs routinely assessing defined SLOs. Ninety six percent of all active courses have defined SLOs, and 98% of all courses offered in the last two semesters have ongoing assessment (1.1). The College has defined six Institutional SLOs, assessed three, and developed an assessment plan for the remainder. Meeting these benchmarks has been the result of coordinated efforts among several campus committees - Finance (FC), Instructional Policies and Curriculum (IPCC), Program Review (PRC), Strategic Planning (SPC), and Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment (SLOAC) – along with the governing bodies (1.2-3). There has been continual quality improvement in the procedures associated with all areas so that SLOs and assessment protocols are integrated into the Program Review and Resource Allocation processes. The College has drafted handbooks for SLO Assessment, Program Review, and Integrated Planning & Resource Allocation so that all faculty and staff have ready access to procedural information in each area and to a description of their integration (1.4-6).

Regarding the SLO assessment process specifically, the SLOAC had initially developed forms and procedures to guide the process but did not require complete uniformity given that each area had been in varying stages of the SLO and assessment cycle when the committee was formed in 2010 (1.7). The College recently purchased the relational database system, TracDat, which will allow for more consistency in the process as well as the creation of institutional memory for SLO assessment at all levels (1.8).

**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**

SJCC has seen continuous quality improvement in the area of institutional dialogue about assessment results (2.1). With the formation of the SLOAC in 2010 there have been increased opportunities for such institution wide discussions. The SLOAC facilitated campus wide workshops and presentations during the College’s Professional Development Days, as well as smaller, more focused workshops throughout each semester for instructional and non-instructional areas (2.2-3). Area Deans have also made discussion on SLO assessment and results a priority within department and division wide meetings. With the refinement and integration of the processes related to SLO assessment, program review, and resource allocation, the interdependency between each process and specific links have become clearer. Decisions impacting instructional or service delivery as well as funding requests are made with an eye toward SLO assessment results. While the procedures have continually been evaluated and refined, the respective committees (SLOAC, PRC, FC, and SPC) have updated forms and developed handbooks to reflect these more integrated processes (2.4-6). Moreover, the College has purchased TracDat to facilitate the archiving of SLO assessment results and to make the entire process

more manageable, accessible, and uniform.

**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 formation of a Strategic Planning Committee and the updated procedures implemented by the Program Review Committee, along with the continued efforts of the SLOAC, have all set a standard for continual improvement in decision-making processes (3.1). The SLOAC developed SLO Assessment reporting forms that are used at the course and program levels for instructional and non-instructional areas (3.2). The reporting forms are included in the annual and comprehensive Program Reviews (3.3-4). Funding requests made to the Finance Committee can only be made with accompanying Program Review information. There is evidence across the campus of improvements made based on SLO assessments. With the improved budget allocation procedures, and greater transparency in the budget “hearings”, the alignment of institution wide practices that support and improve student learning have become more observable.

An example of how one program used assessment results in decision making is the purchase of document readers for ESL classrooms. A survey of ESL instructors regarding their use of technology in their teaching (also aligned with an Institutional SLO) revealed that more Moodle training and document readers would enhance instruction. This information was included in their Annual Program Review and the Dean included it in the Division Resource Allocation Request submitted to the Finance Committee for deliberation in the Spring of 2012 (3.5-6). The process allowed for the purchase of six readers for ESL classrooms.

**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 successfully implemented the new Resource Allocation Model that links all SLO assessment and Program Review to resource allocation (4.1). Based on Comprehensive and Annual Program Review forms and SLO assessment reports (at the course and program levels), departments and programs submit budget requests to their Deans (4.2-5). The Deans review the requests and make modifications and/or recommendations to the departments if necessary. The Deans then forward the budget requests to the Vice President of the respective area for review prior to submission to the Finance Committee Budget Hearings (4.6).

The Administration has provided significant financial support for improving the SLO assessment process by allocating reassigned time to two faculty members to coordinate college wide SLO efforts, and one to chair the Program Review Committee, as well as by purchasing TracDat for the purposes of proper documentation and archiving of SLO assessments (4.7). The SLOAC, Program Review Committee, and the Professional Development Center, also coordinated by two faculty members receiving released time, continue to host workshops and training sessions to deal with the completion of the various tasks associated with these integrated processes (4.8).

**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 5: COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT REPORTS EXIST AND ARE COMPLETED AND UPDATED ON A REGULAR BASIS.**

Standards: I.A.1; I.B; I.B.3; I.B.5; I.B.6; II.A.2.a; II.B.

**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE:** Documentation on the process and cycle of SLO assessment, including results of cycles of assessment. Copies of summative assessment reports, with actual learning outcomes.

**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 5: NARRATIVE RESPONSE**

Since before the establishment of the SLOAC in 2010 there has been a variety of SLO data management procedures across campus (5.1). To standardize this, the College purchased the relational database system, TracDat, making it possible for an easy transition from established forms while creating an institutional memory that heretofore was encumbered by different archiving methods. Initial training in the use of TracDat began in July 2012 and there is a plan of incremental training throughout fall 2012 (5.2-3). That is, SLOAC members, VPs, Deans, and program “leads” will have priority training and then train others.

The procedures to date established by SLOAC reflect a six-step cycle: 1) Identify SLOs for program/course; 2) Identify assessment tool; 3) Perform assessment/gather data; 4) Review data and summarize strengths and weaknesses of program/course based on the assessment; 5) Create an action plan and timeline for program/course improvement including date of recommended next assessment; 6) Implement action plan, share reports/summaries, and decide on next SLO to assess. Review Step 1. Begin again at Step 2 (5.4).

Once the SLO Assessment Report is completed, including communication with colleagues, the form is submitted to the Dean by the end of the sixth week of the subsequent semester. The Dean reviews and archives the Assessment Report forms for the course and program levels. Each program or department should assess all SLOs within a three to four year period so as to coordinate with the Comprehensive

Program Review process and the updating of Course Outlines of Record.

**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**

SJCC has adopted the term Institutional SLOs to reflect the most comprehensive interaction between the College and any given student, including the degree/certificate-seeking student. Program SLOs can also reflect outcome achievement at the degree level.

Since 2010 the SLOAC has facilitated workshops focusing on mapping and aligning SLOs across the course, program, and institutional levels, however, it has only been in the last six months that maps have been posted (6.1). Likewise, since the 2011 Accreditation Follow-up Report, there have been intensified efforts in documenting the alignment of SLOs across the three levels. Prior to the purchase of TracDat, each program or department had used different methods of mapping (6.2-3). In the spring 2012 the SLOAC made available mapping templates for programs to use and held workshops to facilitate the completion of the maps (6.4). Those programs that had not completed alignment maps by the beginning of the fall 2012 will have the opportunity to easily document alignment with the use of TracDat (6.5). It is anticipated that all programs and departments will have documented alignment across the three levels by the end of the spring 2013.

**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**

All faculty members must include in their syllabi the course SLOs as per Board policy 4020.5 (7.1). The SLOAC webpage includes links to all of the program level SLOs as well as the ISLOs (7.2). Course outlines with SLOs are stored in the College's file sharing server and are available at students' request (7.3). Each Division maintains a copy of the syllabus for all active courses each semester. Some

programs and services across the campus have posted their SLOs so that students have the opportunity to become familiar with them at a basic level. The SLOAC has made presentations to the Associated Student Body and there have been several articles in the student newspaper dealing with the SLO and accreditation processes. The assessment of the PSLOs and ISLOs has also broadened students' knowledge of the SLO assessment process (7.4-5). Future assessments of the ISLOs will include assessments of students' general awareness of the SLO assessment process at all levels (7.6).

**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**

As evidenced in this report, SJCC has made significant progress in the area of SLO assessment at all levels and is at the proficiency level in SLO implementation. There has not only been increased dialogue about the process and procedures of SLO assessment, but more importantly, there is a growing awareness that these tasks directly impact the College's goal of student success. The recent purchase of a relational database system (TracDat) will allow for ease in creating institutional memory and a more uniform method of documenting the important processes and dialogue taking place around SLOs and their assessment. Training sessions will continue throughout the fall 2012 semester so that the full assessment cycle will be managed through TracDat by the spring 2013. The academic divisions along with the IPCC are working diligently to revise course outlines and to deactivate courses that have not been offered in many semesters. Over the last two semesters 98% of all courses offered reported ongoing assessment, which demonstrates that gaps in student learning are being identified and addressed consistently. The administration continues to support faculty release time to coordinate SLO assessment efforts. In short, the continual and coordinated efforts of SJCC staff, faculty, and administrators have ensured that SLO assessment is being sustained not only in terms of the exigencies of the ACCJC, but as an important observable of student success. The extraordinary commitment of our staff and faculty in this area over the past two years is inspiring and should be commended.

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

**TABLE OF EVIDENCE (NO WORD COUNT LIMIT)**

- 1.1 Ongoing Course SLO Assessments
- 1.2 *SJCC Fall 2012 Accreditation Follow-up Report* – College Recommendation 3 (2012 Follow-up Report), pages 40-49
- 1.3 Evidence Folder\_2012 Follow-up Report, College Recommendation 3 (Evidence Folder)
- 1.4 SLO & Assessment Handbook (Evidence Folder, Document C 3.127)
- 1.5 Integrated Planning & Resource Allocation Handbook
- 1.6 Program Review Handbook
- 1.7 Current SLO Assessment Reporting forms (Evidence Folder, Document 3.125-126)
- 1.8 SJCC TracDat Assessment Unit Reference Guide
  
- 2.1 2012 Follow-up Report, pages 49-52
- 2.2 SLOAC Bimonthly sessions (Evidence Folder, Document C 3.002)
- 2.3 Professional Development Day, 23 March 2012 (Evidence Folder, Document C 3.049)
- 2.4 SLO & Assessment Handbook (Evidence Folder, Document C 3.127)
- 2.5 Integrated Planning & Resource Allocation Handbook
- 2.6 Program Review Handbook
  
- 3.1 2012 Follow-up Report, pages 52-56
- 3.2 Current SLO Assessment Report forms (Evidence Folder, Document C 3.125-126)
- 3.3 Annual Program Review forms and instructions
- 3.4 Comprehensive Program Review Academic Programs Template
- 3.5 Resource Allocation Request, ESL (Evidence Folder, Document C 3.088)
- 3.6 Resource Allocation Request, LA (Evidence Folder, Document C 3.089)
  
- 4.1 2012 Follow-up Report, pages 56-58
- 4.2 Integrated Planning and Resource Allocation Handbook
- 4.3 Annual Program Review forms and instructions
- 4.4 Comprehensive Program Review Academic Programs Template
- 4.5 Current SLO Assessment Reporting forms (Evidence Folder, Document C 3.125-126)
- 4.6 Resource Allocation Request, LA (Evidence Folder, Document C 3.089)
- 4.7 SLO Coordinator Job description (Evidence Folder, Document C 3.116)
- 4.8 Revised List of Workshops and Training\_Professional Development Center, Oct 2012
  
- 5.1 2012 Follow-up Report, pages 59-60
- 5.2 TentativeTracDat Training Timeline
- 5.3 SJCC TracDat Assessment Unit Reference Guide
- 5.4 SLO & Assessment Handbook (Evidence Folder, Document C 3.127)
  
- 6.1 2012 Follow-up Report, pages 60-62
- 6.2 BUS 071 Curriculum Map (Evidence Folder, Document C 3.138)
- 6.3 COM 020 Curriculum Map (Evidence Folder, Document C 3.139)
- 6.4 Mapping Templates (Evidence Folder, Document C 3.136)



6.5 Accounting Mapping TracDat

7.1 2012 Follow-up Report, pages 63-64

7.2 SJCC Institutional and Program SLOs

7.3 Course Outline of Record Form

7.4 ISLO Assessment Results, Dec 2011 (Evidence Folder, Document C 3.128)

7.5 ISLO Assessment Results, May 2012 (Evidence Folder, Document C 3.129)

7.6 ISLO Assessment Timeline (Evidence Folder, Document C 3.001)

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](mailto:accjc@accjc.org)