



College Report Card, 2016

Methodology of Ratings

All IEC members scored each of the narrative responses on a 5-point scale:

- 5 – exceeds norm of expected practice
- 4 – solidly meets expected practice
- 3 – meets expected practice
- 2 – does not minimally meet expected practice
- 1 – does not meet expected practice

Each member of the IEC scores responses separately for each SCQI statement and submits his or her ratings to the chair ahead of the year's last IEC meeting. The scores are aggregated and then distributed at the meeting for discussion. Since norming is not possible on this single target, the initial raw scores are used to promote dialogue not just about the College's performance level but also what constitutes "expected practice." Members are allowed to change scores if they feel they were off-base, missed something or had an expectation clarified. Norming is done every year, and the likelihood, if not the expectation, is that the norm varies slightly from year to year.

Results of Ratings

	2015	High	Low	2016	Change
Planning	4.13			4.18	
The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key process and improve student learning.	4.25	5	4	4.43	↑
There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust, and pervasive; data and analysis are widely distributed throughout the institution.	3.75	4	3	3.86	↑
There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes.	4.25	5	4	4.57	↑
There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes.	4.25	4	3	3.86	↓↓
Program Review	3.46			3.95	
Program Review process are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.	3.00	5	4	4.17	↑↑
The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.	4.00	4	4	4.00	-
The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.	3.38	4	3	3.67	↑
SLO's	3.50			4.08	
Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic, and used for continuous quality improvement	2.50	4	3	3.50	↑↑
Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive, and robust	3.50	5	4	4.33	↑↑
There is evaluation of student learning outcomes processes	3.38	4	4	4.00	↑
Evaluation and fine tuning of organizational structure to support student learning are ongoing	3.38	4	4	4.00	↑
Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college	4.00	4	4	4.00	-
Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews	4.25	5	4	4.67	↑↑



Cerro Coso Community College

Annual Assessment Report 2016 Institutional Planning

Instructions

Submit a brief narrative analysis demonstrating the committee's assessment of the status of Planning implementation at Cerro Coso Community College. This report is divided into sections representing the bulleted characteristics of ACCJC's Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness. Part II of this Rubric comprises Planning. ACCJC expects all member colleges to be at the implementation level of 'Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement', the Rubric's highest level, for Planning.

The committee is asked to provide a descriptive summary of how well the college meets the characteristics. Responses should be a concise explanation of what the college is currently doing in each of the identified areas. Concrete details can be referenced for illustrative purposes or qualitative or quantitative data cited as space permits. Responses should be written as if for an outside reader **and not exceed 300 words**.

In completing the report, the committee is asked to interpret the college's implementation level through the lens of Accreditation Standards cited for each characteristic. Language from these Standards is included under each section as appropriate.

Finally, provide a list of evidence that may be cited to support and verify the statements made in the descriptive summary. The actual evidence does not need to be provided, but the list should be compiled as if it were—that is, carefully and specifically, not the kitchen-sink approach.

Rubric Statement 1: The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning

Relevant Standards Language

1. The mission guides institutional decision-making, planning, and resource allocation and informs institutional goals for student learning and achievement. (IA3)
2. The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of outcomes, goals, and objectives through analyses of quantitative and qualitative data disaggregated by program type and mode of delivery. (IB5)

3. The institution engages in broad based, systematic evaluation and planning. The institution integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Institutional planning addresses short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services and for human, physical, technology, and financial resources. (IB8)

Status

Cerro Coso Community College has an annual integrated planning process that begins with the mission, college strategic goals, and operational performance as measured in outcomes assessment and program review. Each operational unit writes a unit plan that links its purpose to the mission and annual goals and resource requests to strategic goals and to outcomes assessment. Unit plans are reviewed and aggregated at section and division levels where more inclusive plans are written. These guide the development in February of resource requests analyses in physical resources, IT, marketing, professional development, and staffing that look for trends and commonalities. In March, all this information is used to build the college budget for the following year, one that very specifically ties allocation of resources to mission, strategic goals, and outcomes assessment.

The planning process incorporates a variety of quantitative and qualitative data. Every year instructional units are provided with student achievement data disaggregated by ethnicity, age, gender, and disability. Student support and administrative services units employ a mix of qualitative and quantitative data as identified in assessment plans—such as usage statistics or survey results. All operational entities at the unit level undergo a program review that calls for a comprehensive analysis of data results longitudinally as well as a snapshot in time. In 14-15, student equity became a focus, and district IR generated a system to provide data for instructional departments annually.

Goal-setting at the college is a mix of short- and long-term planning. Annual plans call for one-year goals to be set. Program reviews require two- and five-year goals. The college strategic goals and the mission statement are reviewed once every three years, as outlined in the Participatory Governance Manual, which is also reviewed once every three years. An Educational Master Plan is compiled once every five years. In 14-15, the ability to analyze student equity data for access and success has been a missing piece of college planning and will help it accomplish its mission and improve institutional effectiveness and academic quality. By being embedded in the annual plans, it gives the college one more tool for determining short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services

In 14-15, two new external planning requirements were addressed. Institution-set standards, required by ACCJC, were reviewed and revised at the same time the college underwent its mission, vision, values, and strategic goal review. This now has a clear place in the college's integrated planning process. And the Chancellor's Office Institutional

Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) required the college to adopt short-term goals in four institutional effectiveness areas by June 30, 2015. This was done by task force this year.

Continued Progress

Two new improvements were made in this area in academic year 2015-16. Specific language was added to the annual unit plan templates prompting units, sections, and divisions to not just identify gaps in student equity but design improvements. The first roll out of this prompted a lot of questions and heightened the dialogue surrounding student equity gaps, how they are determined, what it means, and what should be done about it.

A second improvement this year was to establish a place for IEPI goals in the integrated planning process. It was determined that IEC itself would review the goals every spring semester, set draft targets for the upcoming year, and then communicate the targets to college council and academic senate for feedback before finalizing them prior to the June 30 deadline.

Goals

- One of the goals of the area is to not have any goals next year. Seriously, the process has been kneaded, prodded, and tweaked every year enough over the last four years and it is time to take a break and let the system run.

Evidence

Annual Integrated Planning Cycle Timeline and Graphic, 2013-14
Sample Annual Unit Plans (Instructional, Student Services, and Administrative Services)
Sample Annual Section Plans
Sample Annual Division Plans
Sample Resource Request Analyses
Sample Budget
Sample AUP Data Provided to Departments
Sample Program Review (Instructional and Non-Instructional)
Cerro Coso Community College Mission Statement
Cerro Coso Community College Strategic Plan, 2012-15
Participatory Governance Manual, 2012-15
Cerro Coso Community College Educational Master Plan, 2012-17

Rubric Statement 2: There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust, and pervasive; data and analysis are widely distributed throughout the institution

Relevant Standards Language

1. The institution demonstrates a substantive and collegial dialogue about student outcomes, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement. (IB1)
2. The institution publishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, and assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement. (IB3)

Status

The planning cycle prompts dialogue at every step about institutional performance results and improvement strategies for instructional programs, support services, and administrative services. Dialogue takes place continuously on a variety of cycles: as often as weekly in Student Services staff meetings; monthly or bimonthly in committees such as Student Success and Support Council, Institutional Effectiveness, Student Learning Outcomes, and Program Review; at least twice a semester in instructional departments as part of required department meetings; annually for the development of the equity plan, the student success plan, and the budget, as well as for department, section, and division unit plans; once every three years at the whole-college level during the review of mission, strategic goals, participatory governance model, and institution-set standards; and once every five years for SLO assessment, COR renewal, program review, and the setting of the Educational Master Plan. Institution-set standards are reviewed on the same cycle as the mission and strategic goals, once every three years.

Dialogue goes on between and among all constituent groups: faculty to faculty in department meetings, COR renewal, and SLO assessment; faculty and administrators in program review, unit plan development, and committee meetings; classified staff and faculty in department meetings and unit plan development; classified staff and faculty and administrators in Student Services meetings, participatory governance committees, and mission, strategic goal, and institution-set standards review.

One improvement in 14-15 took place as a result of College Council's satisfaction survey delivered in spring of 2014 which revealed College Council was not as effective as it thought it was. This led to changes in both College Council and Academic Senate to improve the flow of information up and down the ladder of representation—Academic Senate in scheduling specific committee reports each meeting and College Council in relocating constituent reports at the beginning of the agenda rather than the end.

Continued Progress

One major new improvement in academic year 2015-16 was to revise the mission, charge, and composition of the Student Success and Support Council to reflect its role as a participatory governance group that operates as the college's primary steering committee for specific initiatives of student access and success. Dialogue further ensued about the way

to make the SSSC more useful in a support role to units and departments (instructional and otherwise) across the college, as well as what role SSSC plays in providing data to the college.

Goal

- Further refine the role the Student Success and Support Council plays in beginning, deepening, and sustaining dialogue about institutional effectiveness in improving student achievement; developing processes and documentation

Evidence

Sample Agenda and Minutes from SSSP, IEC, SLO, and Program Review Committees
Sample Agenda and Minutes from Department Meetings
Sample Annual Unit Plans (Instructional, Student Services, and Administrative Services)
Sample Annual Section Plans
Sample Annual Division Plans
Sample Resource Request Analysis
Sample Agenda and Minutes from College Council Showing Review of Mission, Strategic Plan, and Participatory Governance Model
Sample Agenda and Minutes from Department Meetings Showing SLO Assessment
Sample Agenda and Minutes from CIC
Sample Agenda and Minutes from IEC Showing Program Review Discussion

Rubric Statement 3: There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes

Relevant Standards Language

1. The institution regularly evaluates the efficacy and currency of its planning processes, plans for, and makes changes as needed. (IB9)

Status

Since 2011-12, the annual integrated planning cycle has undergone a number of adaptations and refinements as a result of evaluation and assessment:

- The completion of a new set of strategic goals that is far more focused and measurable than the prior set
- insertion of a student success plan into the cycle
- revision of the program review template to align resource categories directly with those in the annual unit plan
- revision of the program review template to more fully embed outcomes assessment

- revision of the unit plan template to require annual updates on program review goals
- revision of the unit plan template to prompt fuller reporting of ‘closing the loop’ actions on outcomes
- provision of more complete budgetary information to units at the beginning of the planning cycle and a prepopulated budget worksheet to simplify budget-building
- creation of mid-point progress checks on the achievement of annual unit plan goals
- adjustment of the deadlines of annual plans to enable fuller dialogue between levels of the planning cycle (units, sections, divisions)
- simplification and enhancement of the budget-building process whereby the budget development committee speaks to some but not all unit leaders
- headway on an institution-wide set of longitudinal measurements to form a bedrock for evaluating institutional effectiveness (Thoyote).
- development of a process for establishing and reviewing institution-set standards
- creation of an evaluation instrument to measure the effectiveness of the planning process
- development of a web-input form for planning documents at all levels: unit, section, division, resource request, mid-year progress
- redesigning the planning templates to bring the resource request areas down to the unit plan level

As an ongoing process, the planning cycle is evaluated annually by means of an assessment report completed by the committee (this document) and through a survey distributed to all internal stakeholders. Changes in the process are made between cycles, allowing thorough time for planning and implementation.

Continued Progress

Adaptations and refinements continue to be made on the college’s planning and evaluation processes, mostly on the way the annual plans are submitted. Revisions were made in the web-input system for better ease of use and more attractive report generation; it is now much easier to see the different components of the plans. Also, the SLO section included drop-down themes to facilitate the work of the SLO committee to identify trends.

A second change this year was to eliminate the redundant budget information inside of the annual plan itself. Instead of listing resource needs in separate tables in the plan and then transferring those figures into the budget spreadsheet, the budget changes are just put directly on the spreadsheet. And then also directly on the spreadsheet are placed the justifications, with a drop-down menu to facilitate choices (vendor increase, program expansion, etc.).

Goal

- Establish 'one-time' codes in the budget to track program initiatives that are not ongoing expenses. This will help smooth out year-to-year budget analysis.

Evidence

Cerro Coso Community College Strategic Goals, 2012-15

Annual Integrated Planning Cycle, Timeline and Graphic, 2013-14

Program Review Template, 2013-14 (Instructional and Non-Instructional)

Annual Unit Plan Template, 2013-14

Sample Budget Worksheets Provided to Departments and Units, August 2013

Report of Mid-Point Progress Checks, March 2014

Sample Agenda and Minutes from Budget Development Committee Showing Dialogue with Unit Leaders

Thoyote *Draft*

Agenda and Minutes from IEC Showing Discussion of Evaluation Instrument for Institutional Planning

Annual Assessment Survey

Rubric Statement 4: There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes

Relevant Accreditation Standards Language

1. The institution communicates the results of all its assessments broadly so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities. (IB10)

Status

Commitment to student learning is embedded throughout the college's guiding statements. Improvement of student achievement underlies four of the college's strategic goals: fostering student success, enhancing engagement, connecting with the community, and achieving a level of sustainable continuous quality improvement. The college's vision, values, service philosophy, and general education philosophy all specifically identify student learning as a major goal and focus. And the mission directly states the institution's purpose of producing and supporting student learning.

Educational effectiveness is evidenced throughout the planning process. Program reviews and annual unit plans codify the analysis of outcomes assessment and the goals that result from that analysis. Departments and units now provide mid-term progress checks during the year on the attainment of goals. The budget development process is designed so allocation of resources requires justification in planning documents. The student success plan, once it

gets integrated into the cycle, will be a yearly statement of the specific goals planned by each department to improve educational effectiveness. Likewise, the equity plan, once *it* gets integrated, will identify where the college is falling short serving under-represented groups and set out plans for intervention.

Results of assessments are communicated to students, prospective students, and the community through the college website. The program review documents are posted on the main program review page. Outcomes assessments are linked from the SLO Assessment Results page (one click from the main page). To view SLO results, students click through to the CurricUNET site. PLO's for instructional programs are located on a separate page on the website, together with those for Student Services. ILO's are available at CurricUNET. GELO's are located at CurricUNET but show not having been assessed. A Comprehensive Annual Assessment Report is generated each year by the SLO committee and posted to the main SLO page.

In 2014-15 the planning pages were restructured. Beforehand, planning documents were listed on static pages year by year—2012-13, 2013-14, etc. This did not lend itself to sorting or to easy searching. Now viewers can pull up any unit, section, or division, and see its planning documents going back as far as the college has them.

Continued Progress

No improvements were made in this area in 2015-16. The 15-16 goals have been held over to 16-17.

Goals

- Create and distribute a periodic newsletter to the internal community. The president currently sends out a "CC Chronicle" every Monday that is accessible and easy to read. A similar communication once or twice a semester would be a good idea for planning and accreditation.
- Create an "Outcomes" tab for every program that lists the results of the last active assessment of PLO's. This will become the college's primary method of communicating assessment results.

Evidence

Cerro Coso Community College Strategic Plan, 2012-15
Cerro Coso Community College Values Statement
Cerro Coso Community College Vision Statement
Cerro Coso Community College Service Philosophy
Cerro Coso Community College General Education Philosophy
Cerro Coso Community College Mission Statement
Annual Unit Plan Template, 2013-14

Report of Mid-Point Progress Checks, March 2014
Sample Annual Unit Plans (Instructional, Student Services, and Administrative Services)
Annual Integrated Planning Cycle Timeline and Graphic, 2013-14
Screen Capture, Program Review Main Page
Screen Capture, SLO Assessment Results Page
Sample SLO Assessment Reports from CurricUNET
Sample PLO Assessment Reports Linked from SLO Assessment Main Page (Instructional and Student Services)
ILO Assessment Report from CurricUNET
Screen Capture, SLO Main Page
Comprehensive Annual Assessment Report, December 2013



Cerro Coso Community College

Annual Program Review Assessment Report

Instructions

Submit a brief narrative analysis demonstrating the committee’s assessment of the status of Program Review implementation at Cerro Coso Community College. This report is divided into sections representing the bulleted characteristics of ACCJC’s Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness. Part I of this Rubric comprises Program Review. ACCJC expects all member colleges to be at the implementation level of ‘Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement’, the Rubric’s highest level, for Program Review. The section items below are the bulleted characteristics of the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement level.

The committee is asked to provide a descriptive summary of how well the college meets the characteristics. Responses should be a concise explanation of what the college is currently doing in each of the identified areas. Concrete details can be referenced for illustrative purposes or qualitative or quantitative data cited as space permits. Responses should be written as if for an outside reader **and not exceed 300 words**.

In completing the report, the committee is asked to interpret the college’s implementation level through the lens of Accreditation Standards cited for each characteristic. Language from these Standards is included under each section.

Finally, provide a list of evidence that may be cited to support and verify the statements made in the descriptive summary. The actual evidence does not need to be provided, but the list should be compiled as if it were—that is, carefully and specifically, not the kitchen-sink approach.

Rubric Statement 1: Program Review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement

Relevant Standards Language

1. The institution defines and assesses learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services (IB2)
2. The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of outcomes, goals, and objectives through analyses of quantitative and qualitative data disaggregated by program type and mode of delivery. (IB5)

3. The institution regularly evaluates its policies and practices in educational programs and student and learning and support services, resources management, and governance to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of mission. (IB7)
4. Faculty and others responsible for instructional courses, programs and directly related services act to continuously improve instructional programs and services through systematic evaluation to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and achieve stated learning outcomes. (IIA2)
5. The institution regularly evaluates the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education, support student learning, and enhance accomplishment of the mission of the institution. (IIB1)
6. The institution defines and assesses learning and other intended outcomes for library and learning support services and uses assessment data to continuously improve programs and services. (IIB11)

Descriptive Summary

Program review is a key component to Cerro Coso's integrated planning cycle. The most current program review informs the annual planning cycle, along with student learning outcome assessment and strategic goals. The college has historically had a 6-year program review cycle, but in 2014, we are adopting a 5-year cycle.

Program review evaluates program relevance, appropriateness, currency, and student achievement, and it provides an action plan that is based on the evaluation of those areas. The formats for instructional and non-instructional program reviews address the same broad areas, but instructional program reviews serve to evaluate and improve instructional programs and services, whereas non-instructional program reviews serve to evaluate and improve student and learning support services.

All program reviews include definitions of student learning outcomes or, if applicable, administrative unit outcomes and describe the results of assessment. Program learning outcomes and administrative unit outcomes are assessed during the year prior to the completion of program review in order to provide a fresh assessment of student learning. In the program review, a summary of both course and program learning outcome assessment is provided, including the attribution of specific gaps where targets were not met and remediation plans to improve the result. Through the closing of this loop, faculty continuously evaluate the currency of curriculum and the application of teaching strategies in the classroom. Institutional research provides aggregated and disaggregated data about student demand, patterns of course offerings, and student performance.

Analysis of job development support and learning support services is used to identify student needs. Analysis of staffing, professional development, physical resources, technology, and marketing is used to assess whether the program has what is necessary to adequately promote and support the program.

Continued Progress

In the 2015-2016 academic year, the following Program Reviews were reviewed by the committee (in the order of review):

	PR 1 st Review	PR 2 nd Review
Engineering	✓	✓
Emergency Medical Technology	✓	✓
Marketing and Public Relations	✓	✓
Financial Aid/Scholarships	✓	✓
Vocational Nursing	✓	✓
Business	✓	✓
Learning Assistance Center	✓	✓
Mathematics	✓	✓
Business Office Technology	✓	
ACCESS	✓	
Student Government/Activities	✓	

The Program Reviews with second reviews completed are in various stages of approval from Academic Senate (if applicable) and College Council. Business Office Technology, ACCESS, and Student Government/Activities will finish the process in the Fall.

All past due program reviews are complete or have been approved for a first review. Program Reviews that are currently due that have not begun the process are Athletics, Basic Skills, and General Sciences. The position of Director of Athletics was only recently filled, and I know that he is currently working on the Athletics Program Review. There is currently no leadership position for Basic Skills. The General Sciences Program Review was actually submitted for a first review, but it was based on a program configuration that is not current. The Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) met with science faculty members with further input about the content. I expect this will be resubmitted for a first review early in the Fall.

Next year will not be quite as busy as this year has been, due to having largely caught up with past due Program Reviews and also due to the unequal distribution of scheduled Program Reviews. The committee will look at the long term schedule next year and make some adjustments to improve distribution.

Goals

- Make minor changes to Program Review schedule.

Evidence

Annual Planning Cycle

Rubric Statement 2: The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness

Relevant Standards Language

4. The institution regularly evaluates the efficacy and currency of its planning processes, plans, and makes changes as needed. (IB9)

Descriptive Summary

Until Spring 2014, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee has been overseeing program review. Now, a Program Review Committee has been formed with broad representation of college constituents, including five to seven full time faculty members, two administrators, two classified staff members, and a student. The committee also is represented by multiple campus sites. The Program Review Committee Chair is also a member of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and the Student Learning Outcome Assessment Committee.

The charge of the Program Review Committee is to promote and support the systematic self-assessment of instructional programs, student support services, and administrative/operational areas throughout the college. The Program Review Committee reads and evaluates the self-studies, provides feedback to units completing the review, and ensures results are used to refine and improve program practices. As part of a continuous quality improvement process, the committee engages in ongoing review and revision of templates and processes associated with Program Review.

The evaluation of program reviews involves a technical review and a committee review. Technical review includes feedback from the Faculty Chair (if the proposer is not also the Faculty Chair), to the Dean, and to an advisory committee representative if from a career technical education area. After parties in the technical review phase have signed off on the document, the Program Review Chair forwards the document to committee members for evaluation. A rubric is used to score the document for completeness, strength of analysis, evidence of student achievement, and overall impression. Members also provide recommendations for improvement if areas score below outstanding. Recommendations must be resolved before the document obtains final approval.

The Program Review Committee itself will be evaluated annually by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee using the ACCJC's criteria for sustainable continuous quality improvement for program review.

Continued Progress

The committee's processes are working relatively well. The committee feels that our scoring and evaluation process is producing quality Program Review documents that thoughtfully analyze a program's strengths, weaknesses, and plans for improvement. The authors of the documents have expressed appreciation that feedback that they receive helps them to engage

more deeply in analysis and consider aspects of the program's impact they had not considered. Despite the fact that sometimes the feedback and corresponding requests for changes are quite lengthy, presenters have told the committee that the process is positive.

Stakeholders have identified a few ways that improved college-wide dialog can occur. We have noted that often the writing of a Program Review is solitary activity, and other members of the department don't see the document until it enters the approval process, if at all. This can increase the risk there being gaps or errors in the content, and it can make other members of the department feel marginalized. Commencing with the upcoming Fall training, it will be conveyed to responsible parties that all members of the department should have the opportunity for input to the document throughout the process. Due to subject matter expertise being limited to one or only a few department members, this does not imply that the whole department co-author the document. It only requires that there is dialogue. The Program Review Chair will require that all members of the department be copied when the document is submitted for first review and will respond to the group, asking if all members had input in the process and whether there are any objections to it being scheduled for a first review.

Additionally, we have seen significant misunderstanding about what Administrative Unit Outcomes are and how they are assessed, and the SLOAC would like the opportunity to provide early feedback about this—before significant conclusions are drawn that inform the writing of the document. During Fall training, it will be conveyed that responsible parties must schedule this presentation with the SLOAC in the Fall.

The VPAA also requested that responsible parties contact him early in the writing of the document for input and guidance. This will be conveyed during annual Fall training. Finally, the VPAA requested that the CTE Dean become a permanent member of the committee. The committee approved these changes.

The committee also identified a need for information about the process—especially first steps in getting started with a Program Review—be more accessible. While the process is posted on the Program Review page of the institutional web site and is also provided to responsible parties during annual Program Review training in the Fall, a “Getting Started” section was recommended. And while all previous Program Reviews are posted on the Program Review page for numerous examples of successfully approved Program Reviews, the committee also feels that a specific exemplar Program Review be provided to responsible parties for guidance.

Goals

1. Require department-wide affirmation of opportunity for input.
2. Require SLOAC presentation of Part 4 in the Fall.
3. Request that responsible parties collaborate with VPAA during the writing of the document.
4. Add the CTE Dean as a member of the committee.
5. Update Program Review web page to provide “Getting Started” tips.

Evidence

Program Review Process

Program Review Committee Charge/Composition

Rubric Statement 3: The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.

Relevant Standards Language

2. The institution demonstrates a substantive and collegial dialogue about student outcomes, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement. (IB1)
3. The institution disaggregates and analyzes outcomes for subpopulations of students important to its mission. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include human and fiscal resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies. (IB6)
4. The institution regularly evaluates and improves the quality and currency of all instructional programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, pre-collegiate, and continuing and community education courses and programs, regardless of delivery mode or location. The institution systematically strives to improve outcomes for students. (IIA17)

Descriptive Summary

Student achievement is evaluated from several sources of data. Student learning outcome assessment is completed during the year prior to program review. These data cannot be disaggregated for subpopulations because a premise of student learning outcome assessment is that we don't track individual students. Rather, student work comprises a sample, often randomly selected. However, assessment data is regularly disaggregated by delivery mode—especially important for the college's substantial online offerings. The District Research office provides a packaged set of student achievement data from the Banner MIS, and this data could potentially disaggregate for subpopulations, but this level of disaggregation has not been provided for Program Reviews thus far. Career Technical Education programs can cite Perkins IV Core Indicators of Performance, which includes performance data for non-traditional genders in the discipline.

Identification of gaps is an important component of program review. In the Student Achievement section of the Program Review template, student performance data, employment data, and student learning outcome assessment data is cited and interpreted. Where gaps are identified, strategies are developed to address and correct those gaps. Needs for staffing, professional development, facilities and physical resources, technology, and marketing are also described in the Currency section. As a result of all program needs and gaps

in student achievement that are identified, a summary analysis of Program Review is followed by three-year and six-year strategies, which are folded into the annual planning cycle. As Program Review informs the annual planning cycle, steady progress is made on the implementation of strategies and goals. Annual Unit Plans are also the vehicle for making specific budget requests for staffing, professional development, facilities and physical resources, technology, and marketing. The loop is closed when the next Program Review documents completion of the goals that were set.

Continued Progress

This year, we implemented the inclusion of PLO/AUO/SLO assessment histories in the Program Review document, including whether outcomes were met and, if not, when they were reassessed. In some cases, outcomes were not met and not yet reassessed, and this has provided opportunity to emphasize the need for closing gaps and engaging in continuous improvements in the quality of the program.

The college does not currently have the capacity to disaggregate outcomes data by demographic groups, but this will be possible when eLumen is implemented.

Programs are evaluated regularly, and we have closed the gap on past due Program Reviews. As described in the first section, the only Program Reviews that are still currently due are those that have had a recent change in leadership or are making substantial progress toward a draft that can be submitted in the Fall. A question was raised this year about whether the Program Review Committee is responsible for the 2-year Occupational Supplements for CTE programs. Since CTE Dean pulls the necessary data, works with Chairs and/or faculty members with subject matter expertise to generate short narratives for the two data sets, and then submits them as a batch for Board approval, the evaluation by the Program Review Committee is not relevant.

Minor updates to the templates were made for the coming year, including adding page numbers, clarifying in the non-instructional template that department revenues should also be described in section 2.7, adding a table for the PLO/SLO assessment schedule in the next cycle, and clarifying that it is not necessary to reproduce all SLO data in the appendix—just identify where the information can be accessed. These changes have been made, and the revised templates have been submitted to update links on the Program Review web page.

Goals

1. Update Program Review templates. This has been completed.

Evidence

Program Review Templates



Cerro Coso Community College

Annual Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report

Instructions

Submit a brief narrative analysis demonstrating the committee's assessment of the status of Student Learning Outcomes implementation at Cerro Coso Community College. This report is divided into sections representing the bulleted characteristics of ACCJC's Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness. Part III of this Rubric comprises Student Learning Outcomes. ACCJC expects all member colleges to be at the implementation level of 'Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement', the Rubric's highest level, for Student Learning Outcomes.

The committee is asked to provide a descriptive summary of how well the college meets the characteristics. Responses should be a concise explanation of what the college is currently doing in each of the identified areas. Concrete details can be referenced for illustrative purposes or qualitative or quantitative data cited as space permits. Responses should be written as if for an outside reader **and not exceed 300 words**.

In completing the report, the committee is asked to interpret the college's implementation level through the lens of Accreditation Standards cited for each characteristic. Language from these Standards is included under each section.

Finally, provide a list of evidence that may be cited to support and verify the statements made in the descriptive summary. The actual evidence does not need to be provided, but the list should be compiled as if it were—that is, carefully and specifically, not the kitchen-sink approach.

Rubric Statement 1: Student Learning Outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic, and used for continuous quality improvement

Relevant Standards Language

5. The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of outcomes, goals, and objectives through analyses of quantitative and qualitative data disaggregated by program type and mode of delivery. (IB5)
6. The institution disaggregates and analyzes outcomes for subpopulations of students important to its mission. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it

implements strategies, which may include human and fiscal resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies. (IB6)

7. The institution identifies and regularly assesses learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates and degrees using established institutional procedures. The institution has officially approved course outlines that include student learning outcomes. (IIA4)

Status

Learning outcomes are assessed at the course, program, service and institution level. Outcomes are aggregated and analyzed to identify themes and inform instruction and services. Programs connect learning and resource requests direction to the college's mission and strategic goals. Departments and programs are continuing to fine-tune analysis of outcomes and more are beginning to consider course learning outcome data in a disaggregated manner, related to course offerings (days/time), online/on-ground, and full time/part time faculty. SLO and PLO data is used to identify resources needed to enhance or scaffold student learning, including remediation and intervention, and is reported in the AUP. The SLO Committee reviews each AUP and identifies common themes across courses, programs, services and the institution. This information is used to inform discussions and training at all levels.

The SLO Coordinator is a member of the Curriculum and Instruction, and the Institutional Effectiveness Committees. This ensures continuous monitoring of quality and consistency from identification of learning outcomes in the course outlines through the assessment cycle. The course outlines are entered into CurricUNET and the active course student learning outcomes are populated into the assessment module. The SLO Committee has recommended each program assess SLOs in the first three years of the program review cycle, assess PLOs in the fourth year and complete the program review in the fifth year. For all assessments, if gaps are detected, appropriate remediation will be implemented and the learning outcome will be reassessed prior to the program review.

The college is now counting all courses and programs in the catalog when factoring the percent assessed. This resulted in lower percentages in 2014/2015. Concerted effort has been made to delete courses and programs that are no longer viable, and to assess those without prior assessment.

- Ongoing assessment
Courses: (14/15) 62.53% (15/16) 80.88 %
Programs: (14/15) 71.43% (15/16) 91.67 %

Programs with less than 85% of their courses assessed are not eligible to complete Program Review. This language was added to the Program Review template and communicated to Department Chairs during the Fall 2015 Program Review training. The target will move, to somewhere in the 90's (to allow for new courses), over the next few years.

Continued Progress

Chairs have been asked to complete the 5 year cycle indicating when SLOs will be assessed (within the first 3 years, PLOs in the 4th year and writing the PR in the 5th. Chairs are also working on the SLO to PLO map. (Solidify process and specific assessment schedules will be developed). These documents will be posted on the SLO Moodle.

- To date, two Departments have submitted

The SLO Committee has recommended the following:

The SLO Committee recommends new courses be informally assessed the first time offered. This provides faculty with necessary information related to curriculum and slo assessment methods. The faculty/department may choose to enter this assessment, or simply use it for their information. The second time a course is offered, the course needs to be assessed and the assessment entered in CurricUNET.

Goals

- Implement eLumen Learning Outcome management system.
 - Specific assessment schedules will be implemented, providing clear “due dates” for when each course is to be assessed. This process will ensure learning outcomes are assessed in a regular cycle and consistency in units.
 - A spreadsheet to track SLO assessments is needed because the current tool has deficits and does not allow for accurate or meaningful tracking and reporting. eLumen will allow for this level of tracking and reporting.
- Move SLO/PLO assessment towards the 95% mark.
- Specific strategies and support need to be developed for disaggregating outcomes for subpopulations of students important to its mission. Disaggregation occurs in Program Review, but not directly related to specific student learning outcomes. The college will be moving to eLumen, a management system that allows for disaggregation at the SLO level.

Evidence

Agenda and Minutes from College Council, IEC, and SLO Committee Meetings
SLO annual report
Annual Unit Plans

Rubric Statement 2: Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive, and robust

Relevant Standards Language

3. The institution demonstrates a substantive and collegial dialogue about student outcomes, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement. (IB1)

Status

The College maintains a planning section on the website, where SLO resources and data is housed. Formal and informal resources are available for faculty, staff, students and the public. These resources highlight best practice and effective strategies in learning outcome assessment and can provide guidance for faculty and staff, and a context through which to interpret the information for students and the public. The SLO Coordinator is available to meet with groups of faculty or staff and is an active member of the curriculum instruction, student learning outcome and institutional effectiveness committees, effectively connecting and ensuring consistency. The AUP and Program Review templates require programs and units to link SLO and PLO data to budget requests. SLO assessment information and results directly impact student behavior and achievement as faculty and staff identify best practices and collaboration opportunities both internally and externally with colleagues. The College's 2012 Institutional Self Evaluation Report identified the need to develop a schedule creating a cohesive plan connecting SLO and PLO assessment. In spring 2015, faculty chairs submitted a schedule for PLO assessment, illustrating how assessments connect within the program. This will help programs increase productivity in assessing outcomes in a consistent and systematic manner, providing necessary data for PLO assessment and Program Review. The information gathered in these reports help to improve programs and courses and in turn, student learning and success.

Continued Progress

Fall 2015, additional information was asked for in the AUP, specifically requesting the identification of why gaps exist (drop down menu with themes). The themes were also revised to be reflective of both academic and student learning and support programs.

Proposers are asked to identify where the gaps are, what the gaps are, and what's being planned to address them. In 2014, we asked only for an analysis of gaps; in 2015 we are asking for plans for improvement.

The SLO section includes not just the chart where proposers reflect on outcomes that missed the target (with much clearer instructions this year) but also a box to describe improvements that were implemented in the prior year. In previous years, we had only asked what outcome changes were *planned* by the department, not what was actually implemented. This will make it a lot easier for the SLO committee to identify at a glance improvements actually made.

Originally, the plan was to use the SLO moodle, which contains resources and assessment training videos, to provide a block for each department. Assessment tools, assessment plan (5 yr and PLO/SLO map), assessment data and department minutes related to learning outcome assessment can be uploaded. Each Department could have a discussion forum where discussions related to assessment can take place (particularly for those unable to participate in meetings). This goal is to create a location where faculty will have access the most up to date Assessment tool for their course. *This did not occur because of the decision to move to Canvas, and moodle will no longer be supported long term.*

eLumen, or another sustainable online repository will be beneficial. The idea is to provide a means of communication and be a central repository for assessment documents. This strategy would also help communication regarding assessments, across disciplines.

The SLO Committee did recommend moving away from entering assessment data in CurricUNET due to continued challenges. A database in the SLO moodle was created and assessment data was entered, beginning in spring 2016. This database will continue to be used until eLumen is in place. SLO Committee reports are regularly provided to Academic Senate, and IEC. All SLO Committee agenda and minutes are posted to the Governance tab.

Goals

- Increase dialogue to become more pervasive and robust.
 - Added questions and discussion in CIC helps to increase dialog and create loop-back.
 - Plan a LO Newsletter, Lunch and Learns targeted at integrating the ILOs (once approved)
- Departments will be asked to provide evidence of dialogue related to course and program SLOs.

Evidence

Annual Unit Plans
Program Review Template
SLO moodle
Agenda and Minutes from SLO and IEC Committees
Agenda and Minutes from Department Meetings
Agenda and Minutes from Academic Senate
Agenda and Minutes from Program Review
PLO Assessment Plans

Rubric Statement 3: There is evaluation of student learning outcomes processes

Relevant Standards Language

2. The institution regularly evaluates the efficacy and currency of its planning processes, plans for, and makes changes as needed. (IB9)

Status

The SLO Coordinator, in consultation with the SLO Committee prepares a Comprehensive Annual Assessment Report, addressing ILO, PLO and SLO progress. Programs have historically addressed SLO and PLO data in their AUP, however, in fall 2013, more intentional language was added to encourage discussion of significant assessment findings, specifically requiring programs to address “progress made” on previous assessment goals, along with identification of gaps and planned improvements, towards outcome assessment. The Committee reviews each AUP, identifies gaps and overarching themes and the results are aggregated and reported out. Additionally, a course matrix is used to track SLO assessment for both current and newly developed courses. In fall 2013, faculty chairs submitted a schedule for PLO assessment, illustrating how assessments connect within the program. This will help programs increase productivity in assessing outcomes in a consistent and systemic manner, providing necessary data for PLO assessment and Program Review. The

information gathered in these reports help to improve programs and courses and in turn, student learning and success. Beginning Spring 2014, this annual assessment report will be completed and the information used to inform planning. Additionally, it would be beneficial to develop and implement a survey as another measure of awareness, engagement and identification of training and support needed.

Continued Progress

The following survey questions were included in the IEC Annual Report Survey, conducted March/April 2016:

- I am aware of the Student Learning Outcomes or Administrative Unit Outcomes in my department or area
- I have been involved in discussing assessment results (SLOs, PLOs, AUOs)
- I have been involved in discussing course-level SLO assessment results (teaching faculty only)
- I have been involved in discussing program-level PLO assessment results (teaching faculty only)
- I have a clear understanding of how my activities connect to the SLOs or AUOs in my area
- I know where to find the latest SLO or AUO assessment results for my area
- I have received training in SLOs, AUOs, and how to assess them
- Which of the following has your department or area done in reviewing assessment results (select all that apply)
 - Identified gaps in learning or service and attributed them to specific factors
 - Adjusted teaching/learning or operational strategies based on assessment results
 - Identified meaningful trends that informed teaching or service strategies

Goals

- Analyze the survey results from the survey, develop and implement interventions. Initial review of the survey results demonstrate that assessment results are being used to: identify gaps, adjust teaching/learning or operational strategies, and identify meaningful trends that inform teaching or service strategies.
- The portion of Program Review related to Learning Outcomes will be presented to the SLO Committee prior to being reviewed by the Program Review Committee.

Evidence

Annual Unit Plans
SLO Annual Assessment Report
Comprehensive Annual Report
Annual Assessment Survey with SLO questions
Agenda and Minutes from Faculty Chairs Meetings

Rubric Statement 4: Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing

Relevant Standards Language

5. The institution uses assessment data, organizes its institutional processes and allocates resources to support student learning and student achievement. (IB4)

Status

Intentional dialogue related to SLO data and student success takes place across the college, including venues such as College Council; monthly Faculty Chairs meetings; the Institutional Effectiveness, Student Learning Outcome and Curriculum and Instruction Committees, Department and Advisory meetings. The various levels work to identify themes from reporting instruments such as the AUP and Program Review, which then directly inform institutional planning and resource allocation. Divisions, Units, Programs and Departments must directly correlate SLO assessment and student success to requests for resources. The Student Learning Outcome Committee's 2012 and 2013 Comprehensive Annual Reports identified that the primary theme for SLO gaps between target and goal is attributed to "specific instructional techniques." This theme does not include course content, but rather connects with the need for professional development both within the Department and also for the faculty as a whole. The 2013-2014 Professional Development Resource Request identifies the goal of, "provide training to enhance student success with teaching techniques and technologies." This is only one example of how the institutional planning and effectiveness directly connects between SLO/PLO assessment and resource allocation.

Continued Progress

Survey questions were included in the spring 2016 IEC Annual Report Survey. This provides another measure of awareness, engagement, and identification of training and support needed.

There is now increased mapping of courses and programs between CIC, Program Review and SLO Committee. When faculty present courses and programs in CIC, they are asked: When was the course/program last assessed? How did the assessment results inform the SLO/PLO and ultimately the COR being presented?

Goals

- Chart for future assessments (5 year plan identifying when SLOs and PLOs will be assessed) will be included in Program Review
- Specific SLO training will be included in the Adjunct Faculty Handbook (being drafted by Dr. Marvin).
- SLO training videos, resources and Department repository
- SLO Coordinator will attend new faculty orientation to provide training related to learning outcomes and assessment.
- The SLO Committee will further review the survey results in Fall 2016 and use insights to address increased awareness and engagement.

Evidence

2016 IEC Annual Report Survey
Student Learning Outcome Comprehensive Annual Reports
Agenda and Minutes from College Council, Faculty Chairs, IEC, SLO and CIC Meetings
Agenda and Minutes from Department and Advisory Meetings
Professional development resource request

Rubric Statement 5: Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college

Relevant Standards Language

1. The institution communicates the results of all its assessments broadly so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities. (IB10)
2. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that specifies at minimum learning outcomes associated with those in the institution's officially approved course outline. (IIA4)

Status

The AUP and Program Review templates require programs and units to link SLO and PLO data to budget requests. SLOA information and results directly impact student behavior and achievement as faculty and staff identify best practices and collaboration opportunities both internally and externally with colleagues. The College's 2012 Institutional Self Evaluation Report, identified the need to develop a schedule creating a cohesive plan connecting SLO and PLO assessment. In fall 2013, faculty chairs submitted a schedule for PLO assessment, illustrating how assessments connect within the program. This will help programs increase productivity in assessing outcomes in a consistent and systemic manner, providing necessary data for PLO assessment and Program Review. The information gathered in these reports help to improve programs and courses and in turn, student learning and success. Future goals include a more intentional communication with faculty and staff regarding the current progress in assessment, identified gaps and themes, and specific goals for the academic year. This, in conjunction with a schedule that incorporates Program Review, PLO and SLO assessment, will help to ensure sustainable and continuous quality improvement, particularly in areas that have fluctuating leadership and staffing. In 2012-2013 the Academic Senate approved a syllabus template for all faculty to use, which includes highlighting Student Learning Outcomes associated with the course, as indicated in the Course Outline of Record.

Continued Progress

The SLO Committee identified the following strategy, to begin in Fall 2015:
Use the SLO moodle, create a block for each department. Assessment tools, assessment plan (5 year and PLO/SLO map), assessment data and department minutes related to learning outcome assessment can be uploaded. This allows all faculty to easily be able to access the most up to date

Assessment tool for their course. *This did not occur because of the decision to move to Canvas, and moodle will no longer be supported long term.*

eLumen, or another sustainable online repository will be beneficial. The idea is to provide a means of communication and be a central repository for assessment documents. This strategy would also help communication regarding assessments, across disciplines.

Goals

- Visibility. Development of Learning Assessment website.
 - A draft version will be ready in Fall 2016.
- Address the question, how are assessment results communicated broadly?
- Annual Learning Outcome updates to faculty. As soon as eLumen is implemented, each fall, a list of scheduled outcomes due, and those scheduled to be assessed will be provided to faculty chairs. (This goal hinges on Dept. Chairs submitted the 5 year plan)

Evidence

Annual Unit Plans

Program Review

SLO annual report

Agenda and Minutes from SLO, Faculty chair, and Academic Senate Meetings

Rubric Statement 6: Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews

Relevant Standards Language

Status

Learning outcomes directly influence curriculum and program review. The instructional and non-instructional program review template requires detailed and specific analysis of learning outcomes, including how well students are achieving the learning outcomes, along with identification and analysis of trends and gaps. The faculty and staff directly involved in the program are encouraged to actively participate in the analysis of data and writing of the program review. Program review serves as both a reflective tool and a catalyst for change. Course and program learning outcomes are analyzed to ensure they align with the goals of the program, including, desired knowledge and/or skills. The student learning outcomes and competency levels for degrees, certificates, programs, and courses must correlate and assessment data is examined to ensure pathways and learning outcomes are appropriate.

Continued Progress

The SLO Committee has recommended the following: Programs with less than 85% of their courses assessed are not eligible to complete Program Review. This language will be added to the Program Review template and will be communicated to Department Chairs during the Fall 2015 Program Review training. The target will move, to somewhere in the 90's (to allow for new courses), over the next few years.

Programs will be asked to submit their 5 year plan in the Program Review document.

Goals

This standard was scored at 4.25 in Spring 2015. It was determined that no specific goals are necessary at this time.

- The portion of Program Review related to Learning Outcomes will be presented to the SLO Committee prior to being reviewed by the Program Review Committee.
- Chart for future assessments (5 year plan identifying when SLOs and PLOs will be assessed) will be included in Program Review

Evidence

Program Reviews

Agenda and Minutes from Program Review Committee Meetings

Agenda and Minutes from SLO Committee Meetings

Agenda and Minutes from IEC Meetings

Cerro Coso Community College

Strategic Planning Survey

Spring 2016

Report on Survey Results

Introduction and Methodology

In the spring of 2014, Cerro Coso Community College determined a need for a strategic planning survey that would assess employee opinion regarding how well the college is doing on issues of planning, setting and tracking of goals, and budget and resource allocation. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC), working with the Kern Community College District Office of Institutional Research and Reporting, put together a survey instrument based on questions used at other colleges and modified them to the needs of Cerro Coso. The survey was conducted online and was open from April 1st, 2014 through Friday, April 18th, with a survey notice sent to all employees on the 1st along with two reminders during the survey time period. A total of 101 employees responded during that time.

The instrument asked Cerro Coso employees a total of 29 questions about the strategic planning process, addressing their knowledge of the process, their belief in its efficacy, and their perceptions of their place in the process. These questions were asked in a 4-point Likert scale format, with responses ranging from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’ and were divided into three categories: Mission & Institutional Goals, College Planning, and Budget & Resource Allocation. Additionally, we asked three questions about the employees: their employee type (classified, faculty or management), whether they work for the college full or part-time, and their length of service. Lastly, we asked one open-ended question, allowing employees to provide unstructured feedback to the committee.

In the spring of 2016, the College repeated the survey, with an added section for Outcomes and Assessment, using the same scale. For the 2016 survey, there were 73 responses. The 2016 survey instrument can be found as Appendix A, starting on page 6. Most of the data presented in this report compares the results of the two surveys.

Results

In this section, we provide an overview and summary of the results. A total of 101 employees responded to the survey in 2014 and 73 in 2016. The tables below show the percentages of respondents who answered ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’ to each question by survey year, along with the percentage point difference between the two survey years. Each set of result is divided among the four survey sections.

To provide as simple as possible view of the results, the next three charts show the results of each of the three sets of questions with the ‘strongly agree’ and ‘agree’ response options combined. Chart 2 shows the percentage of employees responding either “agree” or “strongly agree” to each question regarding Mission and Institutional Goals.

Responses to questions from the Mission and Strategic Goals section were mostly similar between the two survey years. More than ninety percent of employees report being familiar with the college mission and that they believe it is appropriate to students in the service area. A somewhat smaller percentage, though still more than three quarters, agreed with most of the other questions in the group. There were increases in agreement on several of the questions. As of 2016, more than 90% agreed that the Mission Statement provides guidance for planning and decision-making, an increase of 13 percentage points. Also showing substantial increases in agreement were questions on familiarity with current strategic goals and objectives, and knowledge about progress made toward those goals. The latter was the lowest rated question in this section in 2014.

Table 1: Mission and Strategic Goals

	2014	2016	Difference
a. I am familiar with the Cerro Coso Community College Mission Statement.	92%	91%	-1%
b. In my experience, the Mission Statement provides guidance for institutional planning and decision-making at the college.	78%	91%	13%
c. I believe Cerro Coso Community College's Mission Statement is appropriate for the students in our service area.	97%	89%	-7%
d. I have used or referred to the Cerro Coso Community College Mission Statement in some aspect of my work.	78%	76%	-2%
e. Cerro Coso Community College has clearly-defined, specific institutional goals and objectives.	79%	91%	12%
f. I am familiar with the current strategic goals and objectives.	84%	81%	-3%
g. My area or department works to achieve the college's strategic goals and objectives.	88%	91%	3%
h. I know what progress has been made toward achieving the college's strategic goals and objectives.	57%	67%	9%
i. My work is used as evidence to assess progress on achieving the strategic goals and objectives	74%	78%	4%

Table 2 provides the results for the College Planning section of questions. The strongest areas involved program review and unit planning with more than eighty percent of respondents believing that their program reviews and unit plans were integrated into the college planning process. About three quarters of respondents agreed that there is collaboration and dialogue in the planning in their areas and that research and data are incorporated into college planning and decision-making.

There were increases in agreement for a handful of questions. Sixty-nine percent of respondents stated that they had a substantive role in the planning process, up from 58% in the previous survey.

Similarly, there was a fifteen percentage point increase in respondents who say that they know where to participate and have input into planning. There were also smaller increases in agreement in other questions, such as incorporation of research and data, collaboration and dialogue, etc.

Table 2: College Planning

	2014	2016	Difference
a. My area's program review is integrated into the college's planning process.	86%	82%	-4%
b. I contributed to the development of the most recent program review in my area.	61%	61%	-1%
c. My area's annual unit plan is integrated into the college's planning process	81%	79%	-2%
d. I contributed to the development of the most recent annual unit plan in my area.	66%	71%	6%
e. I have a substantive role in the planning process that is appropriate to my areas of responsibility and expertise.	58%	69%	11%
f. Planning in my area is the result of collaboration and dialogue	73%	80%	7%
g. I know where to participate and provide input into the college planning process.	57%	72%	15%
h. I have had sufficient opportunity to provide input into the college-wide planning process.	56%	61%	6%
i. I have an understanding of the college's strengths and weaknesses as identified in planning.	57%	66%	8%
j. Research and data are incorporated into college planning and decision-making.	76%	81%	5%
k. I am familiar with the college's planning web pages.	58%	62%	4%

Responses to questions in the section on Budget and Resource Allocation are provided in Table 3. Between two thirds and three quarters of respondents agreed with most of these questions in both survey years. One question got less than a majority support, and that is familiarity with the college budget development process, and this is unchanged in 2016. There were increases in agreement three questions, these being that planning influences decisions in facilities, information technology, and marketing.

Table 3: Budget and Resource Allocation

	2014	2016	Difference
a. There are clear connections at Cerro Coso between planning, budgeting and the allocation of resources.	65%	71%	6%
b. I am familiar with the college budget development process.	48%	49%	2%
c. Staffing decisions at Cerro Coso are the result of institutional planning.	63%	70%	8%
d. Facilities decisions at Cerro Coso are the result of institutional planning	64%	75%	11%
e. Information technology decisions at Cerro Coso are the result of institutional planning.	77%	89%	12%
f. Professional development decisions at Cerro Coso are the result of institutional planning.	76%	75%	-2%
g. Marketing decisions at Cerro Coso are the result of institutional planning.	65%	77%	12%
h. In my role, I have had sufficient opportunity to provide input into my area's budget development and request for resources.	60%	64%	4%
i. The status of the budget in my area is available to me.	68%	71%	3%

Next we have the section on Outcomes and Assessment. Because this section is new, there are no comparison data from 2014. There is substantial agreement with questions on awareness, and somewhat lower (though still fairly high) agreement on questions regarding actual participation in outcomes assessment. Nearly two thirds of respondents state that they have been involved in discussing program-level assessment results and know where to find the assessment results in their area. Just under three in five say they have received training in assessment.

The last question in this section asked respondents which things they had done as they were reviewing their assessment results. Three choices were provided, with respondents asked to select all that apply. Responses were similar, with just over half of people selecting each of the three options.

Table 4: Outcomes and Assessment

	2016
a. I am aware of the Student Learning Outcomes or Administrative Unit Outcomes in my department or area	86%
b. I have been involved in discussing assessment results (SLOs, PLOs, AUOs)	78%
c. I have been involved in discussing course-level SLO assessment results (teaching faculty only)	85%
d. I have been involved in discussing program-level PLO assessment results (teaching faculty only)	64%
e. I have a clear understanding of how my activities connect to the SLOs or AUOs in my area	85%
f. I know where to find the latest SLO or AUO assessment results for my area	64%
g. I have received training in SLOs, AUOs and how to assess them	59%

Table 5: Which of the following has your department or area done in reviewing assessment results (select all that apply)

	#	Percentage
Identified gaps in learning or service and attributed them to specific factors	40	55%
Adjusted teaching/learning or operational strategies based on assessment results	39	53%
Identified meaningful trends that informed teaching or service strategies	37	51%

Lastly, we turn to the open-ended question. Question 6 asked respondents to “Please elaborate on any of your responses to the questions above or provide any other comments about the strategic planning process that you would like to share.” This question was included to allow for unstructured feedback that might provide planning committees to see issues that had not been considered before or that could not easily be included in a scaled question. The responses to this question are provided as Appendix B beginning on page 11. These responses are provided verbatim with grammatical and other errors included. Of the 73 respondents to the survey, 22 made a comment (excluding those stating something like “no comment”). Because of the limited number of responses, caution must be used when drawing definitive conclusions. The one area where a clear pattern is visible is in communication. Several of the respondents requested some manner of change in communication.

Appendix A: Survey Instrument



Cerro Coso Community College Strategic Planning Evaluation Survey

Hello Faculty and Staff,

The Cerro Coso Community College Institutional Effectiveness Committee is tasked with evaluating the current planning process. Please take a few minutes to respond to the brief survey below. Your answers are completely anonymous and will help us improve our strategic planning efforts in the future.

1. Mission and Strategic Goals.

Please tell us how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/Not applicable
a. I am familiar with the Cerro Coso Community College Mission Statement.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. In my experience, the Mission Statement provides guidance for institutional planning and decision-making at the college.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. I believe Cerro Coso Community College's Mission Statement is appropriate for the students in our service area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. I have used or referred to the Cerro Coso Community College Mission Statement in some aspect of my work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Cerro Coso Community College has clearly-defined, specific institutional goals and objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

f. I am familiar with the current strategic goals and objectives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. My area or department works to achieve the college's strategic goals and objectives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. I know what progress has been made toward achieving the college's strategic goals and objectives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. My work is used as evidence to assess progress on achieving the strategic goals and objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. College Planning.

Please tell us how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/Not applicable
a. My area's program review is integrated into the college's planning process.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. I contributed to the development of the most recent program review in my area.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. My area's annual unit plan is integrated into the college's planning process	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. I contributed to the development of the most recent annual unit plan in my area.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. I have a substantive role in the planning process that is appropriate to my areas of responsibility and expertise.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. Planning in my area is the result of collaboration and dialogue	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. I know where to participate and provide input into the college planning process.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. I have had sufficient opportunity to provide input into the college-wide planning process.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. I have an understanding of the college's strengths and weaknesses as identified in planning.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

j. Research and data are incorporated into college planning and decision-making.

k. I am familiar with the college's planning web pages.

3. Budget and Resource Allocation.

Please tell us how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/Not applicable
a. There are clear connections at Cerro Coso between planning, budgeting and the allocation of resources.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. I am familiar with the college budget development process.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Staffing decisions at Cerro Coso are the result of institutional planning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Facilities decisions at Cerro Coso are the result of institutional planning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Information technology decisions at Cerro Coso are the result of institutional planning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Professional development decisions at Cerro Coso are the result of institutional planning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Marketing decisions at Cerro Coso are the result of institutional planning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. In my role, I have had sufficient opportunity to provide input into my area's budget development and request for resources.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. The status of the budget in my area is available to me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Outcomes and Assessment

This section includes questions about outcomes and assessment. For those teaching classes, the term would be Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the course-level and Program Learning Outcomes for the program (degree and certificate) level. For others, we would refer to Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUOs). A couple of questions apply only to courses and programs (degrees and certificates). In these cases, if you are not

teaching, please choose not applicable.

4. Please tell us how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't know/Not applicable
a. I am aware of the Student Learning Outcomes or Administrative Unit Outcomes in my department or area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. I have been involved in discussing assessment results (SLOs, PLOs, AUOs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. I have been involved in discussing course-level SLO assessment results (teaching faculty only)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. I have been involved in discussing program-level PLO assessment results (teaching faculty only)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. I have a clear understanding of how my activities connect to the SLOs or AUOs in my area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. I know where to find the latest SLO or AUO assessment results for my area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. I have received training in SLOs, AUOs and how to assess them	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. Which of the following has your department or area done in reviewing assessment results (select all that apply)

- Identified gaps in learning or service and attributed them to specific factors
- Adjusted teaching/learning or operational strategies based on assessment results
- Identified meaningful trends that informed teaching or service strategies

6. Please elaborate on any of your responses to the questions above or provide any other comments about the strategic planning process that you would like to share. (Please be specific and constructive. Limit 1,024 characters (about 150 words or so).

An empty rectangular form field with a light gray border. On the right side, there are three vertically stacked buttons: a small square with a right-pointing arrow, a small square, and a small square with a left-pointing arrow. On the bottom left, there are two small square buttons: one with a left-pointing arrow and one with a right-pointing arrow.

7. What is your main employee type?

- Faculty
- Classified
- Management

8. Are you currently working full or part-time?

- Full-time
- Part-time

9. How long have you worked for Cerro Coso Community College?

- Less than 2 years
- More than 2, but less than 5 years
- More than 5, but less than 10 years
- More than 10 years

Appendix B: Responses to Open-Ended Question

Question 4: Please elaborate on any of your responses to the questions above or provide any other comments about the strategic planning process that you would like to share. (Please be brief, on topic, and constructive. Limit 1,000 characters--about 150 words or so).

ID Comment

- 7 As counselors we get together to see what SLO's are working and which SLO's we need to adjust to meet the outcome.
- 10 Our department assesses course annually. We use the results to revise SLO or develop methods to help students successfully meet specific SLOs.
- 15 There is no training for faculty chairs. Our campus is sink or swim no support.
"The status of the budget in my area is available to me"--I agree, but the budget committee needs to be more prompt of letting chairs know if their budget requests were approved or denied. In terms of the clear link between planning and allocation of resources, it seems that the college can quickly decide to spend \$100,000 on a new platform with no link to planning, yet require faculty and staff to justify and plan for paltry supplies.
- 17 I wonder why Cerro Coso does not provide certain foundational skills courses (i.e. ESL courses, ENGL 40, MATH 20, etc.) at regional sites where the data indicates that such courses are a community need.
- 19 My department may talk about the items in number five, but does not do any of these. I know where to find basic information on the website and through Inside CC, however, it is not always current. I am also not part of the decision making process in my
- 21 department so I had to disagree with many of the questions.
- 27 Collaboration and clarity not a strong suit at Cerro Coso. Administrative decision making less reliant on shared governance than other colleges. Administrative heavy staff has not made decisions about academic or student services more manageable for staff, students or faculty.
- 30 I am unsure if IT decisions at Cerro Coso are driven by our college needs or those of the district and the combination of all 3 colleges.
- 31 As adjunct faculty with some personal health and other issues, I have not been able to attend the last few meetings in Ridgecrest. I believe that this lack has resulted in my unfamiliarity with some of these issues.
- 32 It would help to understand what happens to equipment requests between submitting the AUP and the final budget. We don't hear if anything is approved or disapproved but eventually see that nothing is budgeted under Equipment so assume it was disapproved. It would help if someone were allowed to "make a case" for needed equipment if Administration does not feel that we are spending college funds responsibly and if we could get an explanation for disapproval. Or as we save money and have some left at the end of the year, it would be wonderful if we could transfer that to the following year to help make equipment purchases. It would be nice to feel trusted with purchasing items that Faculty knows will enhance student learning or prevent OSHA problems or whatever. Thank you for the survey opportunity.
- 34

Although I'm an adjunct faculty way out in East Kern, my department chair includes me in department discussion and planning. Additionally, I've had the opportunity to draft SLO assessments for a couple of classes for the department's review. I greatly
36 appreciate the opportunity to contribute and learn more about the teaching profession.

Seems like scheduling is an important part of our job that requires planning. Currently, schedules are submitted then changes are made by the VP without notifying the department chair. When schedules go live there are many changes as the departments realize changes were made. If department chairs were informed about changes and counseling was part of the decision process we could have a better schedule without all
38 the additional work of editing after the fact.

Based on past SLO assessments' results, I have made some changes to certain Spanish language assignments due to "unclear" instructions to students. It is clear that when students have been exposed to a foreign language acquisition at an early age, then they can easily make the transition to our college level foreign language courses. Besides, they improve their own language: English by making grammatical construction comparisons between both languages. Therefore, we need to put emphasis on the importance of learning a second language at the elementary, middle and high school level. Collaborate with the Latin instructor in exchanging data results and identifying problems and providing a solution. For example, we will have to revise one particular
40 SLO.

45 We have adjusted SLOs as needed.

50 Relatively new at Cerro Coso so I have not had the chance to be involved with the planning of several of the above questions.

While I have received training in writing SLOs, there is no training in how to design assessments that are appropriate. We just randomly try to figure out what is going to work and often the assessments do not seem to address what we are trying to get at. The numbers for success are arbitrary and the SLO assessments seem uninformative - although we have had great discussions about how to best support our students because of this process. It would be useful to have institutional support in what assessments look like and appropriate ways to assess different types of SLOs. Even information on how to identify and write multiple choice questions, what an assessment of higher order verbs looks like. Can we really assess an SLO that uses
53 analyze with a multiple choice test?

Lack of communication from chairs and other administrators. It seems we are told that something needs to be done without any discussion or evaluation of why we are doing things a certain way. For example, I have been told to do my SLO's once a year. No discussion regarding this. Is it necessary once a year? What about reassessment of
57 SLO's? My opinion is never asked. The attitude is "This is just how we do things"

I sincerely wish that construction and renovation projects were based upon planning and feedback. While I realize that there is a contract that is controlled by the State, there appears to be so many articles in the contract that protect the contractor and not the college. Furthermore, the last construction projects were performed by contractors (the lowest bid obviously) and the results were barely adequate, and the construction process left very much to be desired--the contractor failed to follow clear instructions. It's very frustrating when we have to submit plans and documents to justify spending \$15 and to see all the issues that arise with construction/renovation. Also, the budget process for purchasing supplies is being severely micromanaged. A line item for every discipline and every geographic site--is this necessary? There is no clear process (or no process at all) for the purchase of equipment. We are one breakdown away from not
58 being able to offer some classes because of this.

Because of all the planning I have a better understanding of the inter workings of the college. For years it didn't make since to me but now that I'm directly involved I can see
59 why we do what we do during these planning cycles. Thank you,

I have only been an Adjunct instructor now for 3 semesters; so some of my replies might seem disjointed. I am still learning what my Dept. heads want in the long-term,
62 and I am attempting to meet those goals. They are supportive of my goal- achievement.

My sense is that my very late start this semester has limited my ability to take advantage of the processes discusses. Therefore, my answers may be far from
63 representing the true average response.

67 No Comments

68 None.

69 I am a new employee, so I don't know about a lot of the planning process(es).
The latest decision to remodel did not appear to be the result of integrated planning or
72 collegial dialogue and did not factor in FTES decline.

To provide as simple as possible view of the results, the next three charts show the results of each of the three sets of questions with the ‘strongly agree’ and ‘agree’ response options combined. Chart 2 shows the percentage of employees responding either “agree” or “strongly agree” to each question regarding Mission and Institutional Goals.

Responses to questions from the Mission and Strategic Goals section were mostly similar between the two survey years. More than ninety percent of employees report being familiar with the college mission and that they believe it is appropriate to students in the service area. A somewhat smaller percentage, though still more than three quarters, agreed with most of the other questions in the group. There were increases in agreement on several of the questions. As of 2016, more than 90% agreed that the Mission Statement provides guidance for planning and decision-making, an increase of 13 percentage points. Also showing substantial increases in agreement were questions on familiarity with current strategic goals and objectives, and knowledge about progress made toward those goals. The latter was the lowest rated question in this section in 2014.

Table 1: Mission and Strategic Goals

	2014	2016	Difference
a. I am familiar with the Cerro Coso Community College Mission Statement.	92%	91%	-1%
b. In my experience, the Mission Statement provides guidance for institutional planning and decision-making at the college.	78%	91%	13%
c. I believe Cerro Coso Community College's Mission Statement is appropriate for the students in our service area.	97%	89%	-7%
d. I have used or referred to the Cerro Coso Community College Mission Statement in some aspect of my work.	78%	76%	-2%
e. Cerro Coso Community College has clearly-defined, specific institutional goals and objectives.	79%	91%	12%
f. I am familiar with the current strategic goals and objectives.	84%	81%	-3%
g. My area or department works to achieve the college's strategic goals and objectives.	88%	91%	3%
h. I know what progress has been made toward achieving the college's strategic goals and objectives.	57%	67%	9%
i. My work is used as evidence to assess progress on achieving the strategic goals and objectives	74%	78%	4%

Table 2 provides the results for the College Planning section of questions. The strongest areas involved program review and unit planning with more than eighty percent of respondents believing that their program reviews and unit plans were integrated into the college planning process. About three quarters of respondents agreed that there is collaboration and dialogue in the planning in their areas and that research and data are incorporated into college planning and decision-making.

There were increases in agreement for a handful of questions. Sixty-nine percent of respondents stated that they had a substantive role in the planning process, up from 58% in the previous survey.