

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: 2-19-2013

Institution's Name: Coastline Community College

Name and Title of Individual Completing Report: Gayle Berggren, Ph.D., Professor, SLO Coordinator

Telephone Number and E-mail Address: 714-241-6251 gberggren@coastline.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: Loretta P. Adrian, Ph.D. Signature: Loretta P. Adrian
(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): 921 (fall 2012)
- b. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 921
Percentage of total: 100%
- c. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 849 (fall 2012)
Percentage of total: 92% (This number removes 27 courses that need updated curriculum/SLOs. The baseline was re-calculated to 99 non-assessed courses minus 27=72; 921-72=849 completed SLOs. 849/921/=92%.)

2. Programs

- a. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college):
117
- b. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 117 ;
Percentage of total: 100%
- c. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 116 ;
Percentage of total: 99% (One program did not get their PSLOs distributed in Seaport)

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): 15
- b. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 8 ;
Percentage of total: 62%
- c. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 8 ; Percentage of total: 62%

4. Institutional Learning Outcomes

- a. Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined: 8
- b. Number of institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment: 8

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

- In fall 2011 nearly all courses had SLOs. During the December 2011 Curriculum Committee meeting, courses without SLOs were discussed; at the February 2012 meeting every course that did not have SLOs in the course outline of record were suspended (Doc. 1). In fall 2011, nearly all instructional programs, including majors and certificates, identified PSLOs and ISLOs that were mapped to their course curriculum (Doc. 2).
- Beginning 2005 student services and departmental area outcomes were identified as their program reviews were completed. Annual program reviews began fall 2012 (Doc. 3).
- In spring 2012, when the new version of Coastline's LMS, Seaport³ debuted, *all* faculty were required to develop Seaport home pages on which they set up assignments that linked to their identified SLOs so that Seaport could be used to electronically collect SLOs. At the end of the course, a quantitative report is automatically generated in Seaport which indicates how many students fully achieve, partially achieve, or fail to achieve the stated learning outcomes, based upon a pre-set 80% achievement rate (Doc. 4).
- Course, program, and institutional-level SLOs and outcomes are automatically visible to students and faculty in their Seaport course home pages (Doc. 5). Institutional degree outcomes can be compared by semester (Doc. 6).
- Outcomes are collected each semester; the faculty dialog about these outcomes once a year in the spring to coincide with the college planning/budgeting process; the results of the dialog are communicated to the Planning Committee (PIEAC) via ISLO/degree outcomes (Doc. 6), Closing the Loop Surveys, annual program reviews, and via six-year program reviews. The VP Instruction and the SLO Coordinator also provide key summaries to decision-making groups (Doc. 7; Doc. 8).

Documents:

- Doc. 1.1 [Courses without SLOs Dropped by Curriculum Committee](#)
- Doc. 1.2 [Programs missing PSLOs 2-15-2013.docx](#)
- Doc. 1.3 Annual Student Services and Departmental Review Reports:
 - [Annual Report Admission and Records SAO 4-02-2012.pdf](#)
 - [Annual Report Assessment SAO 10-30-12.pdf](#)
 - [Annual Report CalWorks SAO 4-02-2012.pdf](#)
 - [Annual Report Counseling SAO 4-3-2012.docx](#)
 - [Annual Report Distance Learning SAO Jan 2013.docx](#)
 - [Annual Report EOPS SAO 4-2-2012.pdf](#)
 - [Annual Report Financial Aid SAO 4-2-2012.pdf](#)
 - [Annual Report Military SAO 11-16-2012.pdf](#)
- Doc. 1.4 [Fall 2012 Instructional SLO Reports](#)
- Doc. 1.5 [Seaport3 Screen Shot Example Showing SLO Screens that Students See.docx](#)
- Doc. 1.6 [ISLO/degree outcomes for non-contract and contract ed. \(6 pages\)](#)
- Doc. 1.7 [ClosingTheLoopSurveyprintable2-5-12.pdf](#)
- Doc. 1.8 [CLoopResults-Report to PIEAC-3-2013.docx](#)

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 outcome data is provided for dialog at the spring faculty meeting (Doc. 1). The college has set the college-wide student level of achievement for CSLOs, PSLOs, and ISLOs to 80%; faculty discuss ways to help students achieve this level. The live SLO achievement data is available online via the Seaport³ reporting tool at all times (Doc. 2; Doc. 3; Doc. 4).
- As a result of college-wide dialog regarding student outcomes, the college hired a full-time faculty member in fall 2011 to staff a Student Success Center; he is increasing the number and types of tutoring and skills workshops available to students.
- A Closing the Loop Survey (Doc. 5) gathers summative data and feedback immediately after the faculty meeting dialog from faculty within each major, program, and/or certificate. The survey requests that the faculty summarize: 1) why SLOs may not have been met and what strategies the faculty might use to improve SLO implementation; 2) why students may not have achieved SLOs and what solutions or implementation strategies the faculty might undertake to improve SLO achievement in their departments. In addition, the survey asks the faculty to identify instructional or other needs as related to key Education Master Plan Goals. In this way the dialog is summarized and feedback is linked to the Education Master Plan and the planning process.
- Institution-wide dialog on a variety of college topics related to general student outcomes and success occurs at the beginning of each semester at all-college meetings, involving all faculty and staff.

SLO Data Collection, Dialog, and Integration of Dialog with Planning:

SLO Data Collection Date	Date of Faculty Dialog	Report to Planning Committee
End of Fall 2011	Start of Spring 2012 Faculty Meeting (Doc 5) ClosingTheLoopSurveyprintable2-5-12.pdf (Doc. 6) CTLSurveySummaryforfall2011dataSpring2012Dialog.pdf Summary results fall 2011 data/spring dialog	(Doc. 7) CloopResults-Report to PIEAC-4-2012.docx
End of Spring 2012	Start of Fall 2012 Faculty Meeting (Doc. 8) Closing the Loop Survey Printable Fall 2012.pdf (Doc. 9) Closing the Loop Survey Summary Charts Spring 2012.docx	(Report to Planning Committee only made in spring to coincide with budgeting)
End of Fall 2012	Start of Spring 2013 Faculty Meeting (Doc. 10) CTLSpring2013DialogPrintable.pdf (Doc. 11) CTLSpr2013 DialogCharts.docx (Doc. 12) CTLSurvSummfall12dataDialogspr2013.pdf	(Doc. 13) CLoopResults-Report to PIEAC-3-2013.docx

Documents:

- Doc. 2.1 [Fall 2012 Instructional SLO Reports](#)
- Doc. 2.2 [SLO Look-Up Page Screenshot.docx](#)
- Doc. 2.3 [SLO Lookup Business3.pdf](#)
- Doc. 2.4 [Building Codes Technology Web Page SLOs.pdf](#)
- Doc. 2.5 [ClosingTheLoopSurveyprintable2-5-12.pdf](#)
- Doc. 2.6 [CTLSurveySummaryforfall2011dataSpring2012Dialog.pdf](#)
- Doc. 2.7 [CloopResults-Report to PIEAC-4-2012.docx](#)
- Doc. 2.8 [Closing the Loop Survey Printable Fall 2012.pdf](#)
- Doc. 2.9 [Closing the Loop Survey Summary Charts Spring 2012.docx](#)
- Doc. 2.10 [CTLSpring2013DialogPrintable.pdf](#)
- Doc. 2.11 [CTLSpr2013 DialogCharts.docx](#)
- Doc. 2.12 [CTLSurvSummfall12dataDialogspr2013.pdf](#)
- Doc. 2.13 [Closing Loop Survey Summary-Report to PIEAC-3-2013.docx](#)

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

SLO results and analyses are included in the program reviews, which occur every five years for all instructional and non-instructional programs. These results are used by programs to identify progress and problem areas, and to make changes to ensure student success. In addition, annual reviews provide updates of specific activities taking place to accomplish program objectives. These annual program plans also use CSLO, PLO, and ISLO data in their planning (Doc. 1).

Individual programs needing funding to further their program or student goals request funds using the Resource Allocation Proposal which is submitted to the PIEAC during the regular funding cycle (Doc. 2). The PIEAC uses a Prioritization Allocation Rubric to determine which proposals to fund, based on documentation of need from each department's annual review (Doc. 3). The process is documented in the Planning Guide (Doc. 4). Other data comes to the PIEAC from the annual spring dialog at the faculty meeting (Doc. 5). Results from this dialog assist the PIEAC in understanding and addressing the needs and issues of student learning; spring dialog coincides with the spring budget process in the PIEAC (Doc. 6; Doc. 7).

SAO reporting occurs at the end of fall during annual program review in preparation for spring budget planning.

Institution-wide dialog on a variety of college topics related to student outcomes and success occurs at the beginning of each semester at all-college meetings.

Documents:

- Doc. 3.1 [Program Review Handbook Draft February 2013.docx](#) See Page 9
- Doc. 3.2 [2012-13 CCC Resource Allocation Proposal](#)
- Doc. 3.3 [Prioritization Allocation Rubric](#)
- Doc. 3.4 [Planning Guide 7-12](#)
- Doc. 3.5 [Closing the Loop Survey Printable Fall 2012.pdf](#)
- Doc. 3.6 [CloopResults-Report to PIEAC-4-2012.docx](#)
- Doc. 3.7 [Closing Loop Survey Summary-Report to PIEAC-3-2013.docx](#)

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

Since fall 2006, the SLO coordinator provided formal training to increase faculty, staff, and administrator understanding of SLOs and how to write, implement, assess, and report results. In fall 2011 the SLO coordinator provided large group training and individual support to implement PSLOs and ISLOs and automated reporting in Seaport³ (in-office, phone, and email). Beginning spring 2012 additional part-time faculty were hired to assist the SLO coordinator in working with individual faculty who have difficulty setting up their SLOs in Seaport³ (Doc. 4.1; Doc. 4.2).

The Seaport trainers provide ongoing training courses in how to set up the Seaport SLOs, and they developed a training site. The college has also provided the ongoing support of several Seaport programmers who have been developing the Seaport reporting tools and improving the SLO features for faculty, and the SLO coordinator.

Individual programs needing funding to further their program or student goals request funds using the Resource Allocation Proposal which is submitted to the PIEAC during the regular funding cycle (Doc. 4.3). The PIEAC uses a Prioritization Allocation Rubric (Doc. 4.4) to determine which proposals to fund, based on documentation of need from each department's annual review and documentation, in part, of student learning outcomes (2012-2013 prioritizations are summarized in this document: Doc. 4.5). The process is documented in the Planning Guide (Doc. 4.6). Other data comes to the PIEAC from the annual spring faculty meeting dialog (Doc. 4.7).

Documents:

- Doc. 4.1 [SLO Implementation Timeline Table.docx](#)
- Doc. 4.2 [Psychology Training Example PSLO & ISLO](#)
- Doc. 4.3 [2012-13 CCC Resource Allocation Proposal](#)
- Doc. 4.4 [Prioritization PAR Survey](#)
- Doc. 4.5 [PIEAC Prioritization Allocation Ranking 12-13.pdf](#)

Doc. 4.6 [Planning Guide 7-12](#)
Doc. 4.7 [Closing the Loop Survey Printable Fall 2012.pdf](#)

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

Student progress toward achieving CSLOs, PSLOs, and ISLOs is automatically collected in the Seaport LMS. It is available throughout the semester and is visible to both faculty and students within their Seaport course home pages, so progress may be checked (Doc. 5.1). At the end of each semester or summer term this data is tabulated at the course, instructor, program, and institutional level in Seaport³ (data is available at any time during the semester, but only end of term data reflects actual achievement) (Doc. 5.2). The reporting system allows a user to select by term, program, course, SLO level, and course ticket number. In the fall, instructors are asked to make a “qualitative comment” about their data. All the qualitative and quantitative data is printed and provided to faculty at the beginning of the spring semester at the spring faculty meeting where it is discussed. The results of the dialog, including suggestions for improvement and requests for funding that is tied to college goals is collected by a survey called “Closing the Loop” which is graphically summarized in Survey Monkey. The SLO Coordinator provides a summary report about the Closing the Loop to the PIEAC in the spring which coincides with budget planning (Doc. 5.3; Doc. 5.4).

The Cycle for SLO Assessment:

- Instructional SLO assessment is ongoing.
- Dialog for SLO assessment takes place in the spring; feedback and tie-in the budgeting occurs in the spring.
- SAO reporting occurs at the end of fall during annual program review in preparation for spring budget planning (Doc. 5.5).

Documents:

- Doc. 5.1 [Seaport3 Screen Shot Example Showing SLO Screens that Students See.docx](#)
Doc. 5.2 [Fall 2012 Instructional SLO Reports](#)
Doc. 5.3 [CloopResults-Report to PIEAC-4-2012.docx](#)
Doc. 5.4 [CLoopResults-Report to PIEAC-3-2013.docx](#)
Doc. 5.5 Annual Student Services and Departmental Review Reports:
[Annual Report Admission and Records SAO 4-02-2012.pdf](#)
[Annual Report Assessment SAO 10-30-12.pdf](#)
[Annual Report CalWorks SAO 4-02-2012.pdf](#)
[Annual Report Counseling SAO 4-3-2012.docx](#)
[Annual Report Distance Learning SAO Jan 2013.docx](#)
[Annual Report EOPS SAO 4-2-2012.pdf](#)
[Annual Report Financial Aid SAO 4-2-2012.pdf](#)
[Annual Report Military SAO 11-16-2012.pdf](#)

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

When PSLOs and ISLOs were developed, they were identified for each department on a mapping grid containing CLOS, and the user was required to link the CSLOs, PSLOs and ISLOs. (Not all courses measure all PSLOs and ISLOs.) (Doc 6.1; Doc 6.2; Doc. 6.3; Doc. 6.4)

The college has a link on the Web page at which all SLOs can be viewed by program and certificate (Doc. 6.5). Students, faculty, and community members may peruse how each course maps to PSLOs and institutional ISLOs (Doc. 6.6). Students can also see the same SLOs when they are perusing the programs from the College Web Page (Doc 6.7).

SLO achievement printouts across the curriculum demonstrate how institutional outcomes map to program and degree outcomes (Doc. 6.8).

Documents:

Doc. 6.1 [Mapping Training Example](#)

Doc. 6.2 [Psychology Training Example PSLO & ISLO](#)

Doc. 6.3 [Core Degree Outcomes with Assessments](#)

Doc. 6.4 [Sample Alignment Maps](#)

Astronomy; Biology; Adv Account Cert Spec; Building Codes AA; Bus Admin Mjr; Bus Plan Cert Spec; Chemistry; Cisco; Computer Networking AA; Education Studies AA; Emerg Mgt Homeland Security; English Program Goals Pt1; English Program Goals Pt2; English Program Goals Pt3; Gerontology; Geographic Information Systems Cert of Spec; History; Health & Fitness; Home Business Cert Spec; Intermediate Accounting Cert Spec; Leadership Cert Accomp; Mgt & Superv AA; M&S S&M Cert of Achiev; Microsoft; Process Technician; Project Mgmt Cert Accomp; Physics; Process Tech Fund Cert Accomp; Real Estate Broker Cert Achiev; Cognitive and Caregivers Boot Camp

Doc. 6.5 [SLO Look-Up Page Screenshot.docx](#)

Doc. 6.6 [SLO Lookup Business3.pdf](#)

Doc. 6.7 [Building Codes Technology Web Page SLOs.pdf](#)

Doc. 6.8 [Fall 2012 Instructional SLO Reports](#)

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

Since all instructors measure their SLOs in Seaport LMS (including distance learning and on-site instructors), Seaport automatically populates CSLOs, PSLOs, and ISLOs to be measured into each course shell just prior to each semester. This ensures the correct SLOs are used by each instructor and all SLOs can be viewed by students (Doc. 7.1). Since SLOs are visible in the Seaport course shell, not all instructors replicate SLOs in their syllabi. Every instructor is encouraged to post their complete syllabus on Seaport LMS (Doc. 7.2).

Seaport also contains a specific link where students can view their personal progress in meeting the various CSLOs, PSLOs, and ISLOs associated with their course. When students click the link “Student Learning Outcomes” they get their own achievement information (Doc. 7.3).

The college has a link on the Web page at which all SLOs can be viewed by course, program, and certificate (Doc. 7.4). Students, faculty, and community members may peruse how each course maps to PSLOs and institutional ISLOs (Doc. 7.5). Students can also see the same SLOs when they are perusing the programs from the College Web Page (Doc. 7.6).

Course outlines list CSLOs (Doc. 7.7); PSLOs and ISLOs reside in Seaport.

In response to the fall student Accreditation Self-Study Survey question, “Instructors inform students of skills or learning outcomes we are expected to achieve,” 91% of students *strongly agreed* or *agreed*; 2% of students *strongly disagreed* or *disagreed* and 6% were *neutral* (Question 2, Student Survey Version 1) (Doc. 7.8).

Documents:

Doc. 7.1 [Seaport3 Screen Shot Example Showing SLO Screens that Students See.docx](#)

Doc. 7.2 Sample Syllabi
[Syllabus Principles of Human Sexuality 1.docx](#);
[Syllabus-History 170 Online.docx](#)
[Syllabus English 099.docx](#)
[Syllabus Business Computing BC 147](#)

Doc. 7.3 [SLO Screen Student View \(Within Course\)](#)

Doc. 7.4 [SLO Look-Up Page Screenshot.docx](#)

Doc. 7.5 [SLO Lookup Business3.pdf](#)

Doc. 7.6 [Building Codes Technology Web Page SLOs.pdf](#)

Doc. 7.7 Sample Course Outlines:
[ACCT_C100_Outline_Accounting.doc](#)
[CHEM_C110_Outline_Intro_to_Chemistry.doc](#)
[ENGL_C100_Outline_Fresh_Comp.doc](#)
[MATH_C160_Outline_Statistics.doc](#)
[PHIL_C100_Outline_Intro_to_Philosophy.doc](#)
[PSCI_C180_Outline_Political_Science.doc](#)
[SPAN_C180A_Outline_Elem_Spanish.doc](#)

Doc. 7.8 [Accreditation Survey Results Student V1](#)

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

We have achieved Proficiency and are working to maintain Sustainability.

The college has the following Actionable Improvement Plan: **In Spring 2013 evaluate the efficacy of Seaport³ SLO technical applications and related procedures to collect useful student achievement data and to effect improvements in student outcomes.**

The following steps have been taken or are ongoing:

- On January 31, 2013 the SLO coordinator gathered input from department chairs regarding the Seaport LMS procedures and the Closing the Loop Survey that gathers data and feedback from the faculty SLO dialog and ties into the college planning process.
- On February 19, 2013 the SLO coordinator gathered input from the Academic Standards subcommittee of the Academic Senate regarding the same topics and additional questions about the faculty dialog process. Updates and suggested changes will be presented to the March 5 Senate meeting and the March 6 Planning (PIEAC) meeting.
- The Planning committee (PIEAC) has also been actively collaborating with the Program and Department Review Committee (PDRC) to institutionalize how outcomes from program review are reported to the PIEAC and integrated in the planning and budgeting process. A new automated data report from the District enables instructional programs to report on a yearly basis; an annual program review report was implemented fall 2012, to coincide with spring 2013 budgeting (Doc. 8.1). A new dean was assigned to co-chair PDRC which should facilitate and improve coordination of SOA collection and reporting.
- The SLO Coordinator and the Seaport designers continue to collaborate on the development of additional Seaport SLO reports so that SLO outcome data can be more easily summarized for tracking and reporting to governance committees and PIEAC, and for use by faculty.

Documents:

Doc. 8. 1 [Annual Institutional Plan Psych 2011-12-Example.docx](#)

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

TABLE OF EVIDENCE (NO WORD COUNT LIMIT)

Proficiency Rubric/Document Number Cross-References	Document
Doc. 1.1	Courses without SLOs Dropped by Curriculum Committee

Doc. 1.2	Programs missing PSLOs 2-15-2013.docx
Doc. 1.3; Doc. 5.5	Annual Student Services and Departmental Review Reports: Annual Report Admission and Records SAO 4-02-2012.pdf Annual Report Assessment SAO 10-30-12.pdf Annual Report CalWorks SAO 4-02-2012.pdf Annual Report Counseling SAO 4-3-2012.docx Annual Report Distance Learning SAO Jan 2013.docx Annual Report EOPS SAO 4-2-2012.pdf Annual Report Financial Aid SAO 4-2-2012.pdf Annual Report Military SAO 11-16-2012.pdf
Doc. 1.4; Doc. 2.1; Doc. 5.2; Doc. 6.8	Fall 2012 Instructional SLO Reports
Doc. 1.5; Doc. 5.1; Doc. 7.1	Seaport3 Screen Shot Example Showing SLO Screens that Students See.docx
Doc. 1.6	ISLO/degree outcomes for non-contract and contract ed. (6 pages)
Doc. 1.7; Doc. 2.5	ClosingTheLoopSurveyprintable2-5-12.pdf
Doc. 1.8; Doc. 2.13; Doc. 3.7; Doc. 5.4	CLoopResults-Report to PIEAC-3-2013.docx
Doc. 2.2; Doc. 6.5; Doc. 7.4	SLO Look-Up Page Screenshot.docx
Doc. 2.3; Doc. 6.6; Doc. 7.5	SLO Lookup Business3.pdf
Doc. 2.4; Doc. 6.7; Doc. 7.6	Building Codes Technology Web Page SLOs.pdf
Doc. 2.6	CTLSurveySummaryforfall2011dataSpring2012Dialog.pdf
Doc. 2.7; Doc. 3.6; Doc. 5.3	CloopResults-Report to PIEAC-4-2012.docx
Doc. 2.8; Doc. 3.5; Doc. 4.7	Closing the Loop Survey Printable Fall 2012.pdf
Doc. 2.9	Closing the Loop Survey Summary Charts Spring 2012.docx
Doc. 2.10	CTLSpring2013DialogPrintable.pdf
Doc. 2.11	CTLSpr2013 DialogCharts.docx
Doc. 2.12	CTLSurvSummfall12dataDialogspr2013.pdf
Doc. 3.1	Program Review Handbook Draft February 2013.docx See Page 9

Doc. 3.2; 4.3	2012-13 CCC Resource Allocation Proposal
Doc. 3.3; Doc. 4.4	Prioritization PAR Survey
Doc. 3.4; Doc. 4.6	Planning Guide 7-12
Doc. 4.1	SLO Implementation Timeline Table.docx
Doc. 4.2; 6.2	Psychology Training Example PSLO & ISLO
Doc. 4.5	PIEAC Prioritization Allocation Ranking 12-13.pdf
Doc. 6.1	Mapping Training Example
Doc. 6.3	Core Degree Outcomes with Assessments
Doc. 6.4	Sample Alignment Maps
Doc. 7.2	Sample Syllabi Syllabus Principles of Human Sexuality 1.docx ; Syllabus-History 170 Online.docx Syllabus English 099.docx Syllabus Business Computing BC 147
Doc. 7.3	SLO Screen Student View (Within Course)
Doc. 7.7	Sample Course Outlines: ACCT_C100_Outline_Accounting.doc CHEM_C110_Outline_Intro_to_Chemistry.doc ENGL_C100_Outline_Fresh_Comp.doc MATH_C160_Outline_Statistics.doc PHIL_C100_Outline_Intro_to_Philosophy.doc PSCI_C180_Outline_Political_Science.doc SPAN_C180A_Outline_Elem_Spanish.doc
Doc. 7.8	Accreditation Survey Results Student V1
Doc. 8.1	Annual Institutional Plan Psych 2011-12-Example.docx

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