

# 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 15, 2012

Institution's Name: Merced College

Name and Title of Individual Completing Report: Anne Newins, ALO/VP, Student Personnel

Telephone Number and E-mail Address: (209) 384-6185, [newins.a@mccd.edu](mailto:newins.a@mccd.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: Dr. Ronald C. Taylor, Ph.D

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): 718
  - b. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 718  
Percentage of total: 100%
  - c. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 477  
Percentage of total: 66%
2. Programs
  - a. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college): 174
  - b. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 174;  
Percentage of total: 100%
  - c. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 86;  
Percentage of total: 49%
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): 25
  - b. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 20;  
Percentage of total: 80%
  - c. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 20; Percentage of total: 80%
4. Institutional Learning Outcomes
  - a. Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined: 5
  - b. Number of institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment: 0

**PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NARRATIVE RESPONSE**

All course SLO assessments are completed within a four-phase cycle (1.1). Currently, 24% of active courses have completed all four phases, 31% are in the process of completing phases I and II, and 11% are under investigation by the SLO coordinator as to when they will begin the second cycle of assessment. All program review SLOs, including support services SAO/SLOs, follow a five-year cycle that includes one comprehensive review and four yearly updates. All assessments include peer review to help ensure an authentic and sustainable process (1.2, 1.3). Oversight of the assessment process is conducted at several levels including faculty, deans, directors, supervisors, and various shared governance committees. Tracking of SLO assessment is done through a central support technician who oversees a campuswide matrix, which is housed on MC4Me (1.4). All courses have identifiable SLOs. As of November 2011, all faculty have been requested to use at least one direct measurement when assessing course SLOs. As of November 2011, faculty may no longer use unmapped grade distribution as a means of measuring course SLOs. Instead, faculty are encouraged to use student satisfaction surveys based upon course SLOs as an indirect measurement tool (1.5). Instruction and all support services have identified SLOs or SAOs for all active programs offered by the College. Each program will assess its SLO/SAOs in the same year as the comprehensive review using at least one direct measurement. In years two, three, four, and five programs will assess the SLO/SAOs using an indirect method, such as student satisfaction surveys. Institutional SLOs fall under the purview of the Assessment Review Committee (ARC). An ISLO assessment plan has been developed and approved. This plan will bring the College to 100% of ISLOs identified, with ongoing assessment by March 2013 (1.6).

Both instructional and non-instructional program-level SLO data is used in the annual program review process and is then used to inform annual program plans. These plans are the basis for the college's annual allocation process (1.7).

**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**

SLO/SAO results are fully integrated into the program review process for Student Services, Technology and Institutional Research (TIR), and Administrative Services and have comprehensive reports that are tied to the program review process in Instruction. The ties to program review allow each area to discuss their results with master planning committees and others throughout the resource allocation processes and annual goal planning sessions. Assessment results are also periodically discussed during shared governance meetings, specifically the Curriculum Committee, the College Council, and Academic Senate. In addition, multiple college areas, including Instruction and Student Services, distribute

quarterly newsletters to the campus community to inform personnel of their progress on SLO/SAOs (2.1, 2.2).

There has been a distinct culture shift from a campus community that does their SLO/SAOs and then believes it has completed a task to a campus that is engaged in dialogue about SLO/SAOs, their results, the changes that stemmed from them, and their ties to resource requests, in common talk throughout the campus on a daily basis.

Examples of this shift can be found in all areas of the campus; in Instruction the example comes from the Art department who found they needed to move an advisory of ENGL 01A to a pre-requisite for their ART 06 course due to their SLO results (2.3). In Student Services SLO/SAO results are discussed bi-monthly at Student Personnel Executive Committee (SPEC) meetings and feedback from other student services managers and the instructional representative are documented and used to improve programs (2.4). TIR discusses their results at regularly held all staff meetings and their master planning committee meetings and uses the feedback to improve the process and their programs (2.5). Administrative Services is fully implementing their SAO process this Fall, has fully integrated SAO assessment into their program review documents, and will have regularly scheduled manager meetings to discuss their results and how they can be used to improve their programs (2.6).

**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's integrated planning processes and procedures include program review and their related SLOs at multiple levels, including course, program, and institutional. Non-instructional divisions also utilize Service Area Outcomes when appropriate. Requests for resource allocations must be based on the assessment conducted for SLOs in combination with the overall program review. These, in turn, are discussed in relation to divisional goals, the District as a whole, and the Strategic Plan. Discussions about program reviews occur at many levels, including operational committees, shared governance committees and the College Council (3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4).

New resource requests that cannot be identified from the review processes are not funded. Program reviews, SLO's, planning, and resource allocation are discussed in many different venues, including cohort meetings, master planning committees, the College Council, Academic Senate, and operational committees. There are identified staff members who provide training and assistance to all departments on campus, either one on one, or in group meetings. A compiled list of the entire, prioritized resource allocation list is presented to the Educational Master Planning Committee and President (3.5).

The Integrated Planning, Program Review, and Governance Handbook, which is posted online, describes in detail the College's planning processes, including the role of student learning outcomes (1.7).

One example of the process working effectively was the recent funding of a POST certified officer for the Los Banos Campus which was identified as a critical need even during a period of extremely limited funding (3.6). Similarly, the Chemistry Department effectively advocated for their departmental needs which resulted in acquisition of new equipment (3.7).

**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**

All four areas of the college conduct regular trainings for their staff on the SLO/SAO processes, how they are tied to the program review processes and resource allocations, as well as how to use them to improve programs. The four college areas have provided formalized training to a cohort of area leaders to enlist them to assist other members of these areas, they are Cohort Assessment Trainers (CATs) in Instruction, and Student Learning Outcomes Program Review Specialists (SLO PROs) in Student Services, Administrative Services and TIR (4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4). To date over 60 faculty, staff, and managers have been trained in these roles.

The college has moved forward with using a common electronic database for the storage of program reviews in CurricUNET. After redesigning their module Instruction will re-launch the program in Fall 2012 and both Student Services and TIR are going to begin using the system this Fall, while Administrative Services will start in the Fall of 2013.

In order to provide the necessary support to staff and faculty the college has reassigned one FTEF faculty position to assist faculty, hired a full-time classified employee as a SLO/SAO Assistant to all college areas (4.5), and assigned a student services manager as the SLO/SAO Coordinator. The Instructional and Student Services SLO Coordinators have also leveraged staff resources by training additional faculty and staff to assist each other (the CATS and SLO PROs).

Another large shift on the campus has been the full integration of the tie between resource allocation and the program review/student learning outcomes processes. Resource requests that come from any area on campus must show a link to their program review or a student learning outcome or the request will not be funded.

**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**

Currently, faculty report the findings of student learning outcomes assessment using an online reporting system included in Merced College's CurricUNET course outline system. The SLO assessment reports populate SLOs from the active course outlines of record for each course.

Prior to fall 2012, faculty completed a standard form that was sent to the SLO Coordinator; completed assessment reports were then posted on the MC4Me Portal site (5.1). Standard reporting measures include SLOs assessed, methods of assessment for each SLO, findings of the assessment, and, most importantly, an action plan. Course SLO assessment has been broken into four phases; a course that is taught every semester will move through the four phases in a two year period (5.2). Courses offered on a rotational basis will move through the phases according to when they are offered (5.2).

Course SLOs are aligned with program SLOs and institutional SLOs in the SLO Grid that is included in instructional program reviews (5.3). The SLO grid is required as part of a comprehensive program review and is updated on an annual basis as needed. Non-instructional areas of the college have also fully integrated SLO/SAOs into their program review process (3.1, 3.3, 3.4).

A comprehensive matrix has been created to show where each course is with regards to phases of SLO assessment and is posted on the Assessment Review Committee (ARC) website within the MC4Me portal (1.4). The matrix also shows when every program from each area of the College is scheduled for a 5-year comprehensive review.

**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**

Currently all courses provide a statement that describes the alignment of its SLOs with both Program and Institutional Outcomes during the assessment process, which is updated on a two-year cycle of

assessment (6.1). This information can be viewed in CurricUNET beginning fall 2012 (and in folders on the IPRSLOAC webpage in MC4Me for prior years). Programs also provide a description of SLO alignment at the course and Institutional level during assessment (6.2). This mapping can be viewed in each Program Review assessment, which is updated yearly with a comprehensive assessment done on a five-year cycle.

**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 course on the course syllabus (7.1). Copies are reviewed by the instructional deans at the beginning of the semester to insure compliance with format and information. The Curriculum Committee course update and modification processes require the faculty to list all of the SLOs for the specific course as well as possible classroom activities for use as possible assessment tools. The assessment information on the course outlines also must align with the stated SLOs. Program SLOs for each instructional program are also noted in the College catalogue (7.2). These materials are available in printed and electronic format and are reviewed with each catalog update cycle. The Institutional outcomes are posted on the SLO reporting site as well as in the College catalogue (7.3). Many course assessments include student satisfaction surveys that measure a student’s awareness of the course and program SLOs (1.5). All course and program SLOs are viewable by students (as well as the public) through CurricUNET, which is found on the College home page (7.4).

**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**

Merced College has made substantial progress over the past year. It can best be described as moving from “product to process.” This includes the allocation of funding for a permanent classified employee to assist with Program Review and SLOs district wide. Discussions are underway about the current structure of dividing faculty coordination duties among several people will be re-designed during the 2012-13 Academic year in order to create a more sustainable job description (4.5).

The Administrative Services Division now is fully implemented in terms of incorporating revised, comprehensive report templates that synchronize with the formats used by other divisions. This area

also will be utilizing Service Area Outcomes throughout their departments as opposed to a limited number (3.1).

All courses and program assessments are on a time table for completion. There is extensive individual and group training on an ongoing basis to assist staff with the development and assessment mechanisms for SLOs and SAOs. A new handbook has been completed that includes the details for program review and SLOs for all divisions. Two divisions, and possibly three, will be migrating to the Governet software program for the maintenance of their document, which has already been adopted by the Instructional Programs (SA.1).

Merced College has created a structure that puts the college at the proficiency level. However, there are still instructional programs or courses that need to complete their SLO assessment cycles as of October 15. It is anticipated that substantially more will be completed by the end of the Spring 2013 semester (1.4).

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

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

- 1.1 Merced College Assessment Cycle for Instructional Courses
- 1.2 Instructional Course Peer Review Rubric
- 1.3 Instructional Program Peer Review Rubric
- 1.4 ARC cycle matrix
- 1.5 Example student satisfaction survey
- 1.6 Institutional Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan
- 1.7 Integrated Planning, Program Review and Governance Handbook
  
- 2.1 SLO Down Newsletter, February 15, 2012
- 2.2 Outcomes Newsletter, May 2012
- 2.3 Art 06 Course SLO Assessment Report, May 29, 2009
- 2.4 SPEC Meeting Notes, August 30, 2012
- 2.5 Technology and Research Master Planning Committee Notes, September 12, 2012
- 2.6 Administrative Services Program Review/SAOs Training Meeting Notes, September 6, 2012
  
- 3.1 Administrative Services Comprehensive Program Review Template
- 3.2 Instructional Comprehensive Program Review Template
- 3.3 Student Services Comprehensive Program Review Template
- 3.4 TIR Comprehensive Program Review Template
- 3.5 Resource Allocation Rankings
- 3.6 Campus Police Program Review
- 3.7 Chemistry Department Program Review
  
- 4.1 CATs Training Sessions, Spring 2012
- 4.2 Student Services SLO PROs Training Session, Spring 2012
- 4.3 Administrative Services SLO PROs Training Session, Fall 2012

- 4.4 TIR Program Review/SLO Training, August 4, 2011
- 4.5 Merced College SLO/SAO Program Review Assistant Job Description, Fall 2012
  
- 5.1 Instructional SLO Assessment Form
- 5.2 SLO Assessment Cycle Model
- 5.3 SLO Grid
  
- 6.1 Example of alignment of course SLOs with PR SLOs
- 6.2 Example of Mapping PR to ISLOs
  
- 7.1 Example of SLOs on course syllabus
- 7.2 Example of program SLOs in the College catalog
- 7.3 Example of ISLOs in the College catalog
- 7.4 Example of course SLOs in CurricUNET
  
- SA.1 CORR 1 Course Outline

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)