



College Report Card, 2017

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

	2016	High	Low	2017	Change
Planning	4.18			4.31	
The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key process and improve student learning.	4.43	5	4	4.50	↑
There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust, and pervasive; data and analysis are widely distributed throughout the institution.	3.86	5	3	3.75	↓
There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes.	4.57	5	4	4.75	↑
There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes.	3.86	5	4	4.25	↑
Program Review	3.95			4.00	
Program Review process are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.	4.17	4	3	3.25	↓↓
The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.	4.00	5	4	4.50	↑
The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.	3.67	5	4	4.25	↑↑
SLO's	4.08			4.28	
Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic, and used for continuous quality improvement	3.50	5	3	3.67	↑
Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive, and robust	4.33	4	4	4.00	↓
There is evaluation of student learning outcomes processes	4.00	5	4	4.67	↑↑
Evaluation and fine tuning of organizational structure to support student learning are ongoing	4.00	5	4	4.67	↑↑
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	4.67	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)

Annual Assessment Report 2016 Institutional Planning

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. In 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.

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. A comprehensive basic skills plan, a student equity plan, and student success and support plan are required periodically by the Chancellor's Office.

Annual Assessment Report 2016 Institutional Planning

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. They will be reviewed every three years along with these other documents. And the Chancellor's Office Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) requires the college to adopt short-term and long-term goals in a variety of institutional effectiveness annually. In 2015-16, it was determined that IEC, advised by a standing committee of the academic senate for those targets related to student performance, would review the goals every spring semester set draft targets, and then communicate the targets to college council and academic senate for feedback before finalizing them prior to the June 30 deadline.

Continued Progress

One of the goals of this area in 2016-17 was not to have any goals. The committee felt that the annual integrated planning process had been kneaded, prodded, and tweaked every year enough over the first four years that it was time to take a break and let the system run.

Nevertheless, 2017 was the year to produce a new Educational Master Plan. The College secured the services of Maas and Company to complete a thorough external scan, program inventory, growth projections, and facilities projections. This document was delivered too late in spring semester to submit it to broad based dialogue, which will be planned for the fall.

In addition, the Chancellor's Office continued to make refinements in their "Big 3" planning documents, including a major integration of student equity, student success and support program, and basic skills initiative plans. Staff members attended training on this integration in spring 2016.

Goals

- Complete the educational master plan process and document by scheduling forums, generating feedback, finalizing the document, distributing as appropriate and publicizing distribution, and posting to the website.
- Complete the first integrated planning document for the student equity, student success and support program, and basic skills. Since the timeline aligns well (document due in November), integrate the development of this document with unit and section planning.

Evidence

Annual Assessment Report 2016 Institutional Planning

Annual Integrated Planning Cycle Timeline and Graphic
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 Strategic Plan, 2015-18
Participatory Governance Manual, 2015-18
Cerro Coso Community College Educational Master Plan, 2017-2022

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 program, basic skills 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

Annual Assessment Report 2016 Institutional Planning

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, academic senate, curriculum renewal, and inquiry groups; 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 administrators in inquiry groups and all-staff meetings; and finally all constituent groups together 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. At the same time, a single one-stop governance tab was created on the college website with agendas, minutes, and meeting schedules for all participatory governance committees. An additional improvement in 2015-16 was turning the Student Success and Support Council into a participatory governance committee so that input and feedback could be gathered through all employee groups, reflecting the belief that student success is the business of the entire college.

Continued Progress

One goal planned for and achieved in 2016-17 was developing the Student Success and Support Council to play a more central college role in beginning, deepening, and sustaining dialogue about institutional effectiveness in improving student achievement. This resulted in the creation of a set of four inquiry groups in spring 2017 to research best practices around the Student Success Factors of "Directed," "Focused," and "Connected"—best practices designed to be adopted by faculty and by staff in unit and section plans to increase sensitivity and responsiveness in these areas.

In fall 2016, the college applied for and was awarded an IEPI technical assistance visit. The area of focus was developing an effective institutional research office, and the college was visited by an IEPI team in March 2017. The team met with a variety of committee and working groups, as well as all constituent groups. They delivered a menu of options to the college in late March that reflected the variety of perspectives and that provided suggestions for best practices in bringing on a college-level research office.

Annual Assessment Report 2016 Institutional Planning

In spring 2017, the college also administered additional surveys to generate institutional dialogue: CCSSE (as well as CCFSSSE), Institutional Capacity Assessment Framework (ICAT), and Ohio State's financial wellness survey. The second of these is available to us as part of our participation in Achieving the Dream. The results of the surveys will be compiled in summer 2017 and shared across the college in the fall.

Goals

- Create and run inquiry groups for two more of the Student Success Factors, develop best practices for staff and faculty, implement identified best practices at scale across the college.
- Use the suggestions from the IEPI menu of options to develop a work plan for creating and college-level IR office, implement the plan paying careful attention to effectively onboard the new positions, establish research priorities through college-wide dialogue, acculturate the employees to Cerro Coso, provide opportunities for professional development as needed, and develop a communication plan for sharing data.
- Share results of CCSSE, ICAT, and the financial wellness surveys across the college in fall 2017

Evidence

Governance page on the college website

Sample Agenda and Minutes from College Council and participatory governance committees such as IEC, SSSP, SLO, Program Review, and Budget Development Committees

Sample Agenda and Minutes from Academic Senate, Curriculum and Instruction Council, and Classified Senate.

Sample Agenda and Minutes from Department Meetings

Sample Agenda and Minutes from Inquiry Groups

Sample Agenda and Minutes from Department Meetings

IEPI Menu of Options

IEPI Work Plan

2017 CCSSE and CCFSSSE Results

2017 ICAT Results

2017 Financial Wellness Results

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

Annual Assessment Report 2016 Institutional Planning

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
- 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
- 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
- Revisions to the web-input system for better ease of use and more attractive report generation
- Inclusion of drop-down themes in the SLO sections of unit, section, and division plans to facilitate the work of the SLO committee in identifying trends.
- Elimination of redundant budget information inside of the annual plan itself in favor of direct input into the budget worksheet spreadsheet; creation of drop-down options for justification of budget augmentations (vendor increase, program expansion, etc).

Annual Assessment Report 2016 Institutional Planning

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. Results of these self-assessments and surveys are annually reported out in the College Report card. Changes in the process are not made between cycles, allowing thorough time for planning and implementation.

Continued Progress

In 2016-17, as indicated above, the process and documents mostly did not change this year. However, a 'one-time' code added into the budget worksheets this year to track program initiatives that are not ongoing expenses such as instructional supplies, non-instructional supplies, personnel, etc. This was designed to help smooth out year-to-year budget analysis.

Goal

- Carry out a thorough revision of the annual integrated planning documents—unit plans, section plans, and division plans—so that the documents are further streamlined and contain a clear system for prioritizing budget requests.

Evidence

Cerro Coso Community College Strategic Goals, 2015-2018
Annual Integrated Planning Cycle Timeline and Graphic
Program Review Templates, instructional and non-instructional
Midterm Progress Reports
Sample Budget Development Committee minutes showing dialogue with faculty chairs and unit leaders
Setting Institution-Set Standards Process in Participatory Governance Model, 2016-2019
Annual Unit Plan Web-Input Form (screen capture)
Annual Section Plan Web-Input Form (screen capture)
Annual Division Plan Web-Input Form (screen capture)
Drop-down SLO themes in web-input forms (screen capture)
Sample Annual Unit Plan budgets
Sample Annual Section Plan budgets
Sample Annual Division Plan budgets
College Report Cards

Annual Assessment Report 2016 Institutional Planning

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 all five of the college's strategic goals (maximizing student success, advancing student equity measures, ensuring student access, enhancing community connections, and strengthening organizational effectiveness). 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 contain an 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 integrated student success plan, student equity plan, and basic skills plans all 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. An Annual Assessment Report is generated each year by the SLO committee, reviewed and rated by the entire IEC team, and posted as one part of the College Report Card.

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

Annual Assessment Report 2016 Institutional Planning

In 2016-17, a periodic newsletter called “The Progress Report” was created by the IEC to report out matters of quality assurance regarding student learning and achievement. The newsletter goes out to all employees (through cc_all) and in 16-17 included topics about accreditation, integrated planning, outcomes assessment, student success and support program, and (forthcoming) student equity.

Also in 2016-17, Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) assessments were first published for each instructional program that had completed a program review since 2015. These results are linked under each program’s main information page. This publication reflects discussions on multiple committees about the best way to address ACCJC’s standard to make SLO outcomes available to prospective students and the community

Goals

- Major goals in this area have been planned for and accomplished the last several years. No goals are anticipated for 2017-18.

Evidence

Cerro Coso Community College Mission Statement
Cerro Coso Community College Strategic Goals, 2015-18
Cerro Coso Community College Vision, Values, Institutional Learning Objectives
Cerro Coso Community College General Education Philosophy
Sample Annual Unit Plans (Instructional, Student Services, and Administrative Services)
Sample Program Reviews (instructional and non-instructional)
Sample Midterm Progress Checks
Sample Budget Worksheets for annual unit plans
Integrated Student Equity, Student Success and Support Program, and Basic Skills Plan
Program Review Main Page (screen capture)
College Report Cards
Annual Planning Main Page (screen capture)
Progress Report Main Page (screen capture)
Sample Progress Reports
Sample PLO Assessment Result pages from programs



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)

Annual Program Review Assessment Report

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)

Status

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.

Annual Program Review Assessment Report

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 2016-2017 academic year, the following Program Reviews were reviewed and/or expected by the committee (in the order of review):

	PR 1 st Review	PR 2 nd Review	A. Senate	C. Council
Financial Aid/Scholarships	✓	✓	N/A	
Business Office Technology	✓	✓	✓	✓
ACCESS	✓	✓	N/A	✓
Student Government/Activities	✓	✓	N/A	
General Sciences	✓	✓	✓	✓
Computer Information Systems	✓	✓	✓	✓
Maintenance and Operations	✓			
Information Technology	✓			
Web Professional	✓			
Administration of Justice				
Basic Skills				
Athletics				

Financial Aid/Scholarships (due 2015) was actually approved last year, but it has not been submitted to College Council yet. Student Government/Activities (due 2014) was approved by the Program Review Committee this year, but also has not been approved by College Council yet. These parties have received reminders about this.

Maintenance and Operations, Information Technology, and Web Professional (all 2017 Program Reviews) will have had first review approvals by the end of this semester and finish in the Fall. Administration of Justice, also a 2017 Program Review is still being worked on and will submit for first review in the Fall. The Athletics and Basic Skills (due 2016) did not have program directors until this year. These are both still being worked on, and I have received confirmation that we will see them first thing in the Fall.

This year, multiple Program Reviews did not quite complete the process by May. However, we have a reasonable expectation that all will be complete early in the Fall.

Goals

Annual Program Review Assessment Report

- Send more reminders during the year to encourage earlier submission.

Evidence

Annual Planning Cycle
Program Review Tracker

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)

Status

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.

Annual Program Review Assessment Report

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 continue to work fairly 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. However, this year, we were presented with one particular Program Review that was very aggressive. After three reviews, the tone was much more collegial, although not ideal. The Vice President of Academic Affairs later shared that there were some errors of points of fact in the document, and the implication of lack of institutional dialog about complaints in the document may raise red flags with Accreditors. The vantage point necessary to identify these problems is an administrative perspective with sufficient knowledge of institutional history. The committee current has only one administrative member, and two are required. I would like to request that another administrator join the committee, ideally the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

During the Spring semester, participation of Program Review Committee members started to decline, both in review of documents and in meeting attendance. Meeting attendance declined, partly due to class scheduling at the prison for two members. These members, however, were diligent about reviewing documents ahead of time and submitting rubrics. But reduced attendance has affected the quality of dialog during the meeting. We are going to move our meetings to non-CIC Fridays next year to avoid this conflict.

The committee composition needs to be revisited. We have some redundancy and some areas are vacant. The committee charge requires 5-7 full-time faculty members (of which no more than 3 also serve on CIC), representing a minimum of 4 of the following areas:

- English, Languages and the Arts (including Media Arts);
(Christine Abbott ESCC, Suzie Ama)
- Social Sciences and Child Development
(Lisa Fuller)
- Mathematics and Science;
(Scott Cameron, Steve Rogers)
- Nursing and Medical Assisting, Health and Physical Education;
(Kim Kelly)
- Business, Computer Science;
- EMT, Industrial Arts (Public Safety);
(Peter Fulks)

Annual Program Review Assessment Report

If none of the above members have primary assignment at a non-IWV site,

- One faculty member from Counseling and one representative at large.
(Karee Hamilton)

Additionally,

- Two classified members
(Sylvia Sotomayor, Vacant)
- Two administrators
(Michael Kane, Vacant)
- One student
(Vacant)

The committee will be losing one member to retirement (Christine), who was also a non-IWV site representative. We don't need to replace this position, as the non-IWV representation requirement is fulfilled with Karee as a counselor and with either Scott or Steve serving as representative at large. It also brings the number of faculty down to the upper limit of 7. We do need one additional administrator, one additional classified, and one student.

With respect to committee rapport, authors of the documents have continued to express 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.

Technical review has been implemented this year. During Program Review Training in the Fall, responsible parties are informed that they need to consult with their manager or dean, department chair and department members, advisory committee (if applicable), and the Student Learning Outcome Committee. This year, the SLO committee and the Program Review committee have met on the same day of the month, and new Program Reviews are placed on the agenda for the morning SLO committee meeting. If substantial revisions are requested in the student learning outcome section (Part 4) of the document, the SLO Coordinator attends the afternoon Program Review meeting to present that input.

Last year, the committee also identified a need for clearer information about the process—especially first steps in getting started with a Program Review. 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. This has been implemented.

Goals

Annual Program Review Assessment Report

- Fill vacant positions

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)

Status

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.

Annual Program Review Assessment Report

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

The PLO/AUO/SLO assessment histories in the Program Review document continue to connect student achievement with other trends seen in Program Review data. The Program Review also captures summaries of gaps seen in learning outcomes. The loop of continued refinement and improvement projects forward to Annual Unit Plans, where progress on Program Review goals are discussed annually. And in the subsequent Program Review, the status of previous goals is evaluated and discussed.

We have noticed that reassessment following unmet learning outcomes often does not occur immediately. This is a college-wide trend. We expect that the adoption of eLumen will help remind faculty and staff to close gaps and reassess within a tighter timeframe. We don't know yet whether the Program Review module of eLumen will be more appropriate for Program Reviews or for Annual Unit Plans. Overall, we expect that the adoption of eLumen will improve assessment of student achievement and of programs.

As the Programs Reviews are completed with regularity, thoroughness, and professionalism, previous Program Reviews are important resources for new Program Reviews. For example, a recent Program Review referenced the Learning Assistance Center Program Review for evaluation of availability of tutoring services for online students.

The Program Review template effectively captures strengths and gaps in programs, and is not in need of revision at this time.

Goals

- Adopt eLumen

Annual Program Review Assessment Report

Evidence

Program Review Templates

Annual Unit Plan Template



Cerro Coso Community College

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)

Annual Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report

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. (IIA3)

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 %	(16-17) 88.66%
Programs:	(14/15) 71.43%	(15/16) 91.67 %	(16-17) 94.44%

Annual Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report

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.

Program Review now includes a chart for future assessments (5 year plan identifying when SLOs and PLOs will be assessed).

Continued Progress

ILOs have been developed and Programs have provided maps for each Program /Cert between CSLOs and ILOs.

Goals

- Implement eLumen Learning Outcome management system. (go live fall 2017)
 - 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.
 - The SLO Committee suggests choosing one program or department to pilot disaggregation once data is robust enough in eLumen, such as English.

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

Annual Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report

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.

Annual Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report

eLumen, or another sustainable online repository is needed to centralize: 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).

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.
- 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

Annual Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report

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.

Questions were included in the IEC Annual Report Survey, conducted March/April 2016, and will be included every other year going forward.

Continued Progress

The portion of Program Review related to Learning Outcomes will be presented to the SLO Committee prior to being reviewed by the PR Committee.

Goals

- This standard was scored at 4 in Spring 2016. It was determined that no specific goals are necessary at this time.

Evidence

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

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)

Annual Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report

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. 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. These questions will be included every other year with the survey.

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?

Specific SLO training is now included in the revised Adjunct Faculty Handbook.

Continued Progress

- Program Review now includes a chart for future assessments (5-year plan identifying when SLOs and PLOs will be assessed)
- SLO Coordinator will continue to attend new faculty orientation to provide training related to learning outcomes and assessment.

Goals

- SLO training resources and Department repository
- SLO Committee reviewed the survey results in Fall 2016 and is exploring ways to increase awareness and engagement.

Annual Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report

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. (IIA3)

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

Annual Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report

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.* The idea continues to be a goal.

eLumen, and Canvas Dept/Program pages 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.

Moving towards a more visible presentation of Learning Outcome to the public. Program Learning Outcomes are being linked in each Program's webpage. Links to the Program Review will also be included to provide for additional context should someone be interested.

Goals

- 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

SLO AUP Themes Review Report

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

Relevant Standards Language

[None]

Status

Annual Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report

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. Programs completing program review are including a 4-year schedule reflecting when each course (CSLO) and program learning outcome (PLO) will be assessed for the next cycle.

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.

Goals

- This standard was scored at 4.67 in Spring 2017. It was determined that no specific goals are necessary at this time.

Evidence

Program Reviews

Agenda and Minutes from Program Review Committee Meetings

Agenda and Minutes from SLO Committee Meetings

Agenda and Minutes from IEC Meetings