

De Anza College  
SLO Retreat, March 23, 2010, Admin 109  
Admin 109

Attended: Gregory Anderson, Byron Lilly, Coleen Lee-Wheat, Anu Khanna, Jim Haynes, Jackie Reza

### Agenda

9:30-11am

- Recap conference
- Break down rubrics
  - create timelines
  - who recruit to help
- To do list for Spring and Opening Days

11-1:30pm

- What does the ACCJC expect?
  - Share models of program assessment
  - Mapping? Spheres? What model might best fit De Anza?
  - Nuts and Bolts of model that we choose?
- 1:30 lunch off campus?
- depending on the conversation, ECMS (more bugs have been found)

### Minutes

**9:30am to 11am** Jim, Coleen and Anu

ACCJC Program Review Rubric was discussed. Coleen made several observations based from the Accreditation conference—the excerpts from a handout given to us at the conference are included here with her comments:

#### *PERHAPS*

***We should start with a look at De Anza's current program review structure.***

*The program review document is a place for faculty to both describe and document what they do and why they do it. (Administrators historically have a turn over of 4 years or less, so the Senate needs to manage program review. It was suggested that senior faculty assist in the accreditation self-study.)*

***What are the Important functions of program review  
(derived from reading "Program Review: Setting a Standard" p8-19)***

*Demonstrate a systematic planning process*

*Meet extrinsic accountability mandates (recommended secondary goal)*

In this light, Coleen suggested that we should work within the existing Program review structures that currently exist as the SLOAC results should exist to support "programs". De Anza's IPBT has already defined "programs" as departments and division within the current program review and budget allocation processes; it seems most logical to define "program assessment groups" to align with the current budget groups such that SLOAC results will easily blend into the process.

### ***Annual Update forms:***

Here are some questions that might be included in our Program Review or Annual Update form that would encourage discussion of SLOAC results?

- *Do instructional, student service and administrative activities sustain a vital, effective, and relevant role consistent with the program goals and the college mission?*
- *Do instructional, student service and administrative services adequately align to produce the appropriate student learning outcomes expected by transfer institutions, employers and other external entities depending on this training and education?*
- *Do quantitative and qualitative evidence support the college's assumptions about the effectiveness of its teaching and service?*
- *Are the human, physical and technological resources adequate to sustain the program?*
- *What does the program do to contribute to teaching and learning?*
- *How will changes to the program affect students?*

Perhaps we can utilize some of these questions in the Annual Update form.

--We decided to work on the details of a "PILOT" Annual Update form during the first week of the Spring Quarter. We need to get approval from the IBPT, SSPBT and FRBPT groups and Senate during the second week of the quarter. Questions such as who will create the reports, how it will be collected and who will review the data to make an overall summary need to be discussed. If we consider this a pilot, we should follow up with a survey – perhaps a survey monkey to determine how the users felt about the report, what could be improved etc.

We utilized a table given to us by the Accreditation conference to breakdown the ACCJC SLO Proficiency. We determined that our Action Plan to meet Proficiency in SLO's is well on its way.

An interpretation by Julie Slark "Rubric for Assessment of Progress Towards Implementing a SLO Framework at a community College will be attached to this document.

We also discussed an Action Plan check list Element of Proficiency in SLOs

The elements of Proficiency were derived from the ACCJC Rubric are listed below. A cross-section of the chart is also included:

SLOAC process in place for courses, programs, degrees

SLOAC results are being used for improvement and further alignment of institution wide processes

There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results

Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed towards improving student learning

Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned

Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed on a regular basis

Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes

By cpl 3\_23\_10

Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled

Elements of Proficiency	SLOAC process in place for courses, programs, degrees	SLOAC results are being used for improvement and further alignment of institution wide processes	There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results
Met?			
Action Plan?			
Outcome (how will you know you met the element?)			
Timeline (When done?)			
Decision making includes dialogue re: SLOAC results and is purposefully directed towards improving student learning			
Appropriate Resources are being discussed and allocated			
Comprehensive Reports exist and are complete on a regular basis			
Course level SLOs align with program level SLOs			
Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs			

In reviewing the chart, we felt that we are indeed on the right path. We have action plans for all elements of proficiency. Today's discussion will yield a frame for program assessment. Documenting via the ECMS is proving to be an overwhelming project. In addition, we are lacking the expertise to work with Bradley Creamer, the programmer for the ECMS and we are definitely lacking the support of the expertise of an Institutional Researcher relative to creating reports, what data to actually choose to collect and where to house the information.

Informing students of course and program SLOs is another task we need to tackle. (Later in the day, a discussion about where to place State mandated course and program descriptions and SLOs serves as a good start to this element of proficiency.

We shall have to revisit this exercise.

11:00am – 2pm Byron Lilly, Jackie Reza, Gregory Anderson joined us. Between 11:30 and 1:00 we engaged in a teleconference with Andrew La Manque.

Coleen started the conversation by bringing forth the following information:

*ACCJC--Purpose of Program level Assessment is to provide a mechanism for self-assessment. The outcomes need to make sense in relation to the campus organization and the curriculum with in the “program”*

**List of Potential concepts for defining “Program level assessment groups” p-12**

- Title V—an “educational program”—an organized sequence of courses leading to a defined objective, a degree, a certificate, a diploma, a license or transfer to another institution of higher ed.
- Disciplines—such as sciences
- Departments—such as counseling, early childhood ed
- Academic majors
- Student pathways—CTE, basic skills, transfer EOPS, ESPS
- College planning units related to divisions such as CTE
- Student Service pathways
- Admin Services
- Governance structures

**College Examples:**

Bakersfield College -- used an “outcomes perspective”

Started with a single academic program by discipline; studied the program and determined there were three significant pathways and three different outcomes. In this way, the outcomes for a biology transfer student, compared to an allied health student, compared to a “G.E.” requirement can be singled out.

Consumnes River and Skyline: --- a program is a cohesive group of course or activities that support a common set of outcomes (no example of how they will assess this yet)

Cabrillo—broadly defined as GE, Basic Skills and CTE

De Anza proposal – spheres ICCs = outcomes and mapping

NAPA college was discussed in detail as Anu noted that Napa has a very similar curriculum process. NAPA’s strengths: a clearly stated certificate and degree description in their catalogue

After lengthy discussion the assessment of core courses related to certificates and degrees would provide SLOAC results.

By cpl 3\_23\_10

Thus, this Fall using examples such as Napa and other colleges, and programs on campus Nursing, Speech, CIS, Outreach, Bookstore, Health Services, Financial Aid and EOPS might serve as examples for the Opening Day Kick-off. Using

*We should start with a look at De Anza's current program review structure.*

*How does it compare to any of the Assessment models listed above or discussed?*

*Perhaps we do not have to make the decision just provide a platform for discussion next Fall?*

*Perhaps we could just use the current structure and allow for evolution overtime by guiding the discussions in the future. If we used carefully chosen questions, faculty may realize through assessment as Bakersfield did that their "program" actually needed three separate outcomes.*