Statement 1:

Student Learning Outcomes are in place for all courses, programs, degrees, and certificates. Course outcomes are posted on the College website and program outcomes posted on the website and in the College catalog.

Nearly all courses and programs (including academic degrees and certificates and support services) conduct ongoing assessments, with 43% of courses and 37% of programs completing at least one assessment cycle to date. An estimated 40% more are completing their assessment cycle by the end of fall 2012. While 66% of course assessments state that their results are positive, other responses such as “conduct further assessment” (22%), “use new or revised teaching methods” (21%) “develop new ways of evaluating student work” (18%), and “revise course syllabus or outline” (13%) illustrate how these assessments are influencing teaching and learning at the College. Action plans for support services show “results are positive” (57%), “conduct further assessment” (21%), “use new or revised resources or services” (21%), “develop new methods of evaluating student learning” (21%), “plan purchase of new equipment or supplies” (7%), “make changes in staffing plans” (0%), and/or “engage in professional development about best practices” (7%).

Assessment types for courses include any variety of item analysis of exams (70%), assignments based on rubrics (44%), assessments based on checklists (3%), direct observation of performances (44%), student self-assessments (13%), CATs (1%), and/or capstone projects (10%). Instructional programs show similar assessment types. For student support programs, assessments types include direct observation of performances (7%), student self-assessments (43%), and/or external/internal data (36%).

Statement 2:

Outcome data is routinely shared with the College during Duty Day, at various flex workshops, and within constituency group meetings. Early in the process, faculty and staff were encouraged to share their assessment and data-gathering techniques over a series of informational email postings.

The yearly Reedley College Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary provides the current data on completion of course, academic programs (including degree and certificate), and student support programs and highlights assessment activities, results, and action plans of a variety of courses, academic programs, and support services.

Among this information are the Institutional outcomes (GELOs) assessments which are systematically summarized each semester and their results shared with the College.

One example of the dialogue and identified gaps occurred during the creation of the blended degree outcomes. Faculty teaching within these degrees determined that several of their degrees were being under-awarded. This dialogue reached college-wide (during Duty Day and within Curriculum, Academic Senate, and College Council meetings) as the need to decide on degree offerings for students. It was also determined within many program meetings that many certificates and courses were not being sought by students, spurring a clean-up of courses, certificates and the breadth and purpose of the particular programs.

Another example of the dialogue and identified gaps also began within program meetings as it was determined that collection of assessment data among adjunct faculty was troublesome, especially in those cases where adjunct faculty were sole instructors for a course, and in a few cases sole instructors for a program. Again, the college-wide discussion of commitment to programs, student opportunities, and the direction of the College occurred within a variety of constituency groups, namely Program Review and Academic Senate.

Perhaps the main gap identified is the use of assessment results and subsequent action plans to influence college-wide planning, allocation of resources, and “improvement and further alignment of institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning”. In response to this gap, the Program Review Chair, working with the Program Review Committee and Student Learning Outcome Assessment Advisory Committee (a sub-committee of Program Review) is in the process of revising the Cycle Three Handbook to incorporate SLO assessment planning, mapping, and reporting of results and action plans exclusively within the program review report. This streamlining will address this gap as programs determine their goals for their programs and those goals are made known to the College.

Statement 3:

The current Cycle Three Program Review Handbook asks how SLO assessments are used for program improvement. Assessment results and action plans, along with other quantitative and qualitative data, influence the program’s goals. These goals (termed “recommendations” in the Cycle Two Handbook) are responded to in the Annual Program Review Report. Summaries of the Program Review reports are presented to College Council (comprised of representatives of the College-wide constituency groups). These summaries include the program’s SLO assessment information. In addition, oral presentations of each program are open to the College and recorded, then posted on Blackboard along with their reports. Programs are encouraged to share their SLO assessment findings as a part of their oral presentations.

In addition, SLO assessment progress is one criterion addressed in the Annual Program Review progress report.

The Program Review Chair/SLO Coordinator, working with the Program Committee and SLO Assessment Advisory Committee, two groups which have representation by all college constituency groups (faculty, classified, administration, student body), is revising the Program Review Handbook as a place for course, program, degree, and certificate SLO results to be exclusively analyzed and action plans established.   SLO mapping and assessment analysis was first placed into the Cycle Two handbook in its 2007 revision.  The SLO section of the handbook was revised to more direct questions regarding results and action plans in the Cycle Three handbook (approved spring 2009) further reflecting the programs’ assessment processes; however, a separate SLO process worked alongside program review and not exclusively within the program review process.  This mirrored, yet separate SLO reporting process was necessary as the College worked its way toward the proficiency level.  Now, with nearly every course, program, degree, and certificate assessed at least once, these before mentioned committees believe full inclusion of SLO assessment is best placed within the program review cycle.  This streamlining will assure our movement through the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement stage for both SLOs and Program Review.

The Program Review committee is also discussing a change in committee membership to include a representative from the Budget Committee and a representative from College Council.  The purpose for this proposed change is to solidify our integrated planning based on program review and SLO needs.  This will also aid in communications among these committees.

Statement 4:

Since fall 2006 a series of formal and informal trainings have taken place College-wide. These have included Norena Badway presentation (fall 2006), CCCAOE workshop (fall 2008), Janet Fulks (Bakersfield College, ASCCC) and Bob Pacheco (Barstow College, RP Group) presentation (fall 2009), Division Assessment Summits (fall 2010) where disciplines and support areas across four campuses gathered to address assessment practices, mapping, course outline content, and student learning, and semesterly workshops on process and assessment strategies by the SLO coordinator and well as countless individual consultations.

The College has agreed to support adjunct faculty who are sole instructors in their program or course within a program by compensating for their development and reporting of student learning outcomes.

As a part of the funding allocation process, those programs seeking additional funding are required to use student learning outcome assessment data, results, and action plans within their Resource Action Plan Proposal (RAPP).

Statement 5:

All course and program (academic and support services) student learning outcome assessment reports are posted on Blackboard within a program’s folder and linked to on the College website. Evidence of assessments also located with each program’s folder is a three-year assessment timeline, mapping of course to program to institution (GE) outcomes, proof of dialogue, and assessment tools. These are updated on a continuous basis by each program. While budget has prohibited the purchase of reporting software, the current system is organized, accessible, and functional.

Faculty and staff have taken advantage of these folders to store and share data, a variety of assessment tools, and assessment information with their adjunct faculty. Updated regularly, this system of posting and reporting allows faculty and staff to be fully invested in the outcomes assessment process.

The SLO Coordinator relies on these reports for yearly assessment summaries, collecting data on assessment types, results and action plans, and highlighting programs and courses which have been positively influenced by their assessments.

Statement 6:

A key component of the fall 2010 Assessment Summits was the implementation of mapping course and/or programs to the College’s General Education Learning Outcomes. Prior to this, within the Cycle Two Program Review reports, courses were linked to degrees and certificates. As courses revise their outcomes statements, mainly due to their assessment results and action plans, these outcomes are presented to the Curriculum Committee. Programs then update their mapping, along with timelines and assessment tools accordingly. As academic programs and support services programs revise their program outcomes based on assessment results and action plans, the updated outcomes are provided to the SLO coordinator and Chief Curriculum Officer for inclusion on the website and College Catalog.

Mapping also exists for blended degrees and is re-examined as needed.

Statement7:

Most faculty include their course’s student learning outcomes in their course syllabus. While outcomes are not required, course objectives are. Copies of the syllabi are reviewed by the Division Dean at the beginning of the semester. Faculty evaluations ask “Instructor clearly states instructional objective for the class session or week” as a part of the observation.

In addition, students are also made aware of the GE learning outcomes through the website and informational posters. Graduates are provided a survey with their graduation packet which self-assesses their acquirement of the College’s institutional (GE) outcomes.

All program outcomes are posted on the web page and in the College catalog.

Self-Assessment:

.