



**SEATTLE CENTRAL  
COLLEGE**

*One of the Seattle Colleges*

**MID-CYCLE EVALUATION REPORT**

Presented to  
The Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

**March 6, 2015**

Seattle Central College  
1701 Broadway  
Seattle, WA 98122-2413  
<http://seattlecentral.edu>

# Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	1
.....	
<b>Part I</b>	
Structure and Assignments .....	3
Overall Institutional Assessment Planning and Analysis of Achievements .....	3
Annual Institutional Planning Cycle .....	4
College-Wide Strategic Planning .....	4
Operational Planning .....	5
Innovative Initiatives and Special Projects .....	5
Core Theme Planning .....	6
Planning for Core Themes One and Two .....	6
Planning for Core Theme Three and Four .....	8
Core Theme Assessment and Improvement .....	8
Core Theme Systematic Improvement Strategies .....	9
Communicating Results to Stakeholders – for Evaluation and Continuous Planning .....	11
<b>Part II</b>	
Examples of Operationalizing Mission and Core Theme Objectives .....	12
Example A – Achievement Levels of Core Themes and Mission in 2013-2014 .....	12
Example B1 – Alignment of Course Learning Outcomes to College-Wide Student Learning Outcomes .....	14
Example B2 – Alignment of Course Learning Outcomes to Program Learning Outcomes .....	16
Example B3 – Student Achievements: Completion (Awards) .....	17
<b>Part III</b>	
Moving Forward: Action Plans for Year Seven Evaluation .....	18
Ongoing Institutional Planning and Assessment .....	18
Continuous Improvement of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment .....	19
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	19
<b>Appendices</b> .....	20

## List of Acronyms

Acronym	Definition
AA	Associate of Arts
AAS	Associate of Applied Science
AAS-T	Associate of Applied Science-Transfer
ABE	Adult Basic Education
ABS	Applied Behavioral Science (bachelor degree program)
AEE	Associate in Elementary Education
AH	Allied Health (Division)
AS	Associate of Science
BITCA	Business Information Technology and Creative Arts (Division)
BTS	Basic and Transitional Studies (Division)
CAC	Course Approval Committee
CCC	Curriculum Coordinating Council
CSP	Coordinated Studies Program
CTC	Community and Technical Colleges (Washington state)
CWSLO	College-Wide Student Learning Outcomes
ESL	English as a Second Language
FTES	Full-time equivalent, Student
GED	General Education Development
I-BEST	Integrated Basic Education and Skills Training
IAC	Instructional Assessment Committee
IEP	International Educational Programs
IT	Information Technology
LCC	Learning Communities Committee
PRC	Program Review Committee
RCW	Revised Code of Washington
SAM	Science and Mathematics (Division)
SBCTC	State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
SCD	Seattle Colleges District VI
SMA	Seattle Maritime Academy
SVI	Seattle Vocational Institute

Acronym	Definition
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
WABERS+	Washington Adult Basic Education Reporting System
WAC	Washington Administrative Code
WACTC	Washington State Community and Technical Colleges, Presidents' Group
WTC	Wood Technology Center (Location)

# Mid-Cycle Evaluation Report

## Introduction

Seattle Central College has gone through an intensive period of accreditation activities during the last five years. Reporting for these activities includes the following:

- *2010 Regular Interim Report* and visit of the 10-year cycle based on the 2003 accreditation standards.
- *2011 Year One Self-Evaluation Report* based on the revised accreditation standards.
- *2012 Comprehensive Self-Evaluation Report* and visit for the first Bachelor Degree in Applied Science (BAS), and changing the college's status to a bachelor degree granting institution.
- *2013 Year One Self-Evaluation Report*, starting the second seven-year accreditation evaluation cycle.
- *2015 Mid-Cycle Evaluation Report (MCE)* and visit – Preparations for the Year Three Self-Evaluation Report were discontinued in summer 2014 because of changes in NWCCU requirements; began preparing the MCE report in summer 2014.

## Summary of Major Steps and Actions to Improve the Achievement of Core Theme Objectives

Since fall 2012, the college has taken the following actions to improve the achievement of core theme objectives:

- Reaffirmed core themes and objectives and revised outcomes and indicators of achievements (IAs) in winter 2013.
- Further revised IAs in 2014 after reviewing available data and survey results (students, employees, and faculty).
- Determined a meaningful approach to evaluate the achievement of core theme objectives and outcomes, and extent of mission fulfillment.
- Began addressing recommendations from the 2012 visit and *2013 Year One Self-Evaluation Report*.
- With participation from all three colleges in the district, revised the AA degree learning outcomes which were adopted by all three colleges in fall 2014.
- Implemented a monitoring and review process for annual “Core Theme Progress Report.”
- Searched for a technical solution to facilitate and enhance multi-level analysis of learning outcomes assessment data at the course, program/degree, and college-wide outcome levels. In the process, the college has taken the following actions:
  - ✓ In 2012-13, as a pilot project, faculty reviewed and revised program level learning outcomes and entered course level learning outcomes in Canvas, a course management system. Unfortunately, technical limitations made it impossible to extract data from the system for analysis. Nevertheless, through this effort, 13 programs updated or revised their program

level learning outcomes (PLOs) with approval from the Instructional Assessment Committee, and 29 faculty revised learning outcomes for 221 courses.

- ✓ Initiated a process to collect and analyze learning outcomes assessment data for seven programs. Tested the assessment data collection process and evaluated the analysis results. See examples in Part II of this report.
- Implemented a requirement to link updated or revised program learning outcomes to course-level learning outcomes in the course approval process, and established formal learning outcome assessment reviews one year prior to scheduled program reviews.
- Revised Standard One (See Appendix 1)

# Part I

The college has established the structure of the following groups to work together, contribute to, and monitor the processes of achieving the college's core themes and fulfilling its mission.

## Structure and Assignments

In 2010 the college established an accreditation team with representation from different areas of the college. This team used extensive input from the college community to develop the core themes, objectives, outcomes, and indicators of achievement (IAs). The Board of Trustees for the Seattle College District, which includes North Seattle, Seattle Central, and South Seattle, approved the college's mission and the four core themes in early 2011 and reaffirmed them in 2013. In 2012, the college established a team for each core theme. The accreditation structure and responsibilities are briefly described as follows:

**Core Theme Teams:** With members representing different areas of the college, each team is responsible for reviewing and revising the core theme objectives, outcomes, and IAs based on the annual Core Theme Progress Report.

**Program Teams:** Programs in Instruction, departments in Student Services and Administrative Services provide data and reports for relevant sections in Standard Two.

**Curriculum Coordinating Council (CCC):** The four CCC standing committees—Course Approval, Instructional Assessment, Program Review, and Learning Communities—work closely together to ensure that student learning outcomes are created and assessed at multiple levels, and that instructional programs are evaluated in a four-year cycle. For specific templates, instructions, reports, and memberships of each standing committee, see the webpage for each committee at <https://sites.google.com/a/seattlecentral.edu/cc/home>.

**Accreditation Steering Committee:** The committee monitors the college's accreditation process, progress toward achievement of the core themes, and status of mission fulfillment. The committee also provides support and input for the self-evaluation and preparation for the MCE reports and visits.

**President's Cabinet:** The cabinet is comprised of the college President, Vice-Presidents, and the Executive Director for Strategic Initiatives and Institutional Research. This group reviews and assesses the overall achievement of core theme objectives and mission fulfillment annually, provides support and directions to the Accreditation Steering Committee, and submits reports to the District Chancellor and Board of Trustees.

**Office of Strategic Initiatives and Institutional Research (SIIR):** SIIR staff support and assist all programs, committees, and teams in data collection, surveys, and data analyses.

## Overall Institutional Assessment Planning and Analysis of Achievements

In winter 2013, the college started to implement an integrative approach to the processes of annual strategic planning and budget planning, in order to align resource allocation to strategic action plans and assessment of achievements.

## Annual Institutional Planning Cycle

Table 1 outlines the college’s planning cycle, which integrates strategic planning and budgeting processes.

**Table 1 – Integrated Strategic Planning and Budgeting Processes and Cycle**

Year	Summer	Fall	Winter	Spring
2013-14	1) Final budget allocation 2) Retreats to review: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>achievements of previous year</li> <li>implementation plans for current year</li> </ol>	<u>Implementation</u> of current strategic action plans for current year	1) Current year implementation cont. 2) <u>Planning</u> for next year (2014-15) 3) Strategic action plans for next year (2014-15)	1) Current year implementation cont. 2) <u>Budget requests</u> for next year (2014-15) supported by strategic action plans 3) Achievement reports for 2013-14 by June
2014-15	Repeat the same cycle of planning and budgeting processes			

## College-Wide Strategic Planning

The annual planning process begins in summer with management retreats for the President’s Cabinet, separate administrative units (Instruction, Administrative Services, and Student Services), and the college-wide Management Team. During each retreat, the participants review achievements for the previous year and the latest relevant institutional data. Guided by the strategic priorities for the current year, each unit/team identifies its strategic approaches for the year to support the objectives of the core themes and the *2011-2016 Strategic Plan* (Appendix 2).

### Integration of Strategic Planning and Budgeting Planning at Division, Program, and Department Levels

Divisions, programs, and departments follow the same planning cycle. A college-wide Strategic Planning Day, usually in February, kicks off the planning process for the following year. Each division, program, or department develops its Strategic Action Plans, which must align with the college’s core theme objectives, the *2011-2016 Strategic Plan*, and the strategic priorities for the coming year. As part of this process, each division, program, and department uses planning templates to review and record its achievements, action plans, and funding needs from various resources (Appendix 3— Strategic Action Plan Templates for 2015-2016).

### Input from Appropriate Constituencies

Through the year, faculty, staff, and administrators provide input and suggestions at regular meetings and during collaborative work for special projects and initiatives. In addition, faculty and staff are encouraged to contribute to planning and evaluation efforts for their respective areas by attending three designated events: President’ Day in fall (September), Strategic Planning Day in winter (February), and Seattle Central Day in spring (May), when the college shares and celebrates achievements.

## Operational Planning

The college's 2011-2016 *Strategic Plan* provides operational directions for achieving the core theme objectives and college mission. Each year, using the core themes and the strategic plan objectives as a framework, the college identifies strategic priorities based on the previous year's achievements and projected needs. Divisions, programs, and departments use these strategic priorities to guide their own planning.

In addition to the annual Strategic Planning and Budgeting Planning cycle, during the year, administrative units, college-wide committees, and individual divisions, programs and departments meet weekly, biweekly, monthly, or quarterly to continue planning, address operational issues, and select or implement action plans that support the college's core theme objectives.

### Budget Planning and Resource Allocation

The strategic planning process for the whole institution starts in winter each year. The state Legislature begins its session in early January, and the college holds a forum early in spring to share projected state revenue and budget directions. The College Council reads the strategic action plans, distills themes, and recommends budget allocation guidelines to the President's Cabinet, which are shared with the college community. In April, the college Business Office provides specific budget planning forms and related information for budget requests at the division, program, and department levels. All budget requests must be supported by specific strategic action plans; this requirement is especially important for one-time requests for special projects.

Each administrative unit presents its consolidated budget requests to the College Council in May. In June, the College Council submits recommendations to the President's Cabinet. The final recommended resource allocation is presented at a college-wide open forum in June. The college submits a preliminary budget for the next year to the district Financial Services as part of the district budget to be approved by the Board of Trustees in the summer. As a state-funded institution, the college's annual budget is not finalized until the state Legislature completes the state budget, typically in late June.

### Innovative Initiatives and Special Projects

The college adopts various innovative initiatives and projects to help improve student learning, success, and retention in support of the achievements of core theme objectives and mission sustainability. At present, these initiatives and projects include the following, many of which are funded by external grants:

- Pathway to Completion (Grant) – Including Productive Persistence strategies
- Integrated Assignments (Ongoing)
- Project Finish Line (Grant) – Planning in process for implementation in summer 2015
- First Quarter Experience – Planning in process for implementation in fall 2015
- Grants for Specific Instructional Divisions, such as:
  - ✓ Allied Health:
    - Gates Foundation grant for curriculum development of bachelor degrees in Allied Health and Nursing
  - ✓ Science and Mathematics (Listing only 3 out of 10 here):

- MESA (Math, Engineering, Science Achievement)
- Onsite Scholarships Project
- RST (Ready! Set! Transfer!) Project
- ✓ Basic and Transitional Studies:
  - Integrated Digital English Acceleration (IDEA) grant
- ✓ Instructional Resource Services:
  - Digital Literacy Grant

## Core Theme Planning

The college developed core themes and objectives in 2010 prior to the *Year One Self-Evaluation Report* in 2011. The college reviewed its core themes and objectives three times: First, in 2011 prior to the Comprehensive Evaluation visit, next in 2012 to prepare the *2013 Year One Self-Evaluation Report*, and finally in 2013-2014 after receiving the Evaluation Committee Report. During these reviews, the college reaffirmed the four core themes with very minor wording changes to one objective, and revised several of the outcomes and many of the indicators of achievement (IAs). The total number of IAs has been reduced from 80 to 68. The latest changes are reflected in Appendix 1 – Revised Standard One in this report.

Table 2 below demonstrates the changes of objectives, outcomes, and indicators of achievement to support the achievement of core themes as they have been refined since 2011:

**Table 2 – Changes of Core Theme Objectives, Outcomes, and Indicators of Achievement**

Year	Core Theme	Objective	Outcome	Indicators
2012 Comprehensive Self-Evaluation Report	4	10	20	80
2013 Year One Self-Evaluation Report	4	10	20	77
2015 Mid-Cycle Evaluation Report	4	10	19	68

## Planning for Core Themes One and Two

Core themes one and two are closely tied to student learning and success. The integrative work of the Curriculum Coordinating Council (CCC) and its four standing committees contributes to the continuous curriculum improvement through assessment of student learning and achievements.

Prior to 2007, a single Curriculum Advisory Committee was responsible for all program review and course approval processes. In 2007, an Assessment Committee was created to support faculty assessment of student learning outcomes. All instructional programs have published their program or degree level learning outcomes on their respective webpages since 2005. Annual reports on

assessment of student learning outcomes by program were collected from 2006- 2008 through 2010-2011. With the goal of better coordination of assessment efforts, in early 2009, the college established the Curriculum Coordinating Council (CCC) with four standing committees: Program Review, Course Approval, Instructional Assessment, and Learning Communities. Since 2010, some key achievements related to assessment efforts include:

- Completed the revision of the College-Wide Student Learning Outcomes (CWSLOs) in 2009, <http://www.seattlecentral.edu/about/outcomes.php>
- Completed the review of all 39 instructional programs in the first four-year cycle in 2010-2011
- Began requiring instructional programs to revise and update their program or degree level learning outcomes in 2012
- Revised the learning outcomes for the AA degree at the *district* level in spring 2014. The college presidents and the Board of Trustees approved the revised learning outcomes in July 2014.

In order to support and improve the achievement of Core Theme One (Responsive Teaching and Learning) and Core Theme Two (Catalyst for Opportunities and Success), the college implemented the following plans and actions relating to the interconnected assessment efforts of reviewing program and curriculum, course approval, learning communities, and assessment of student learning outcomes:

#### **Program Review (PRC) Process**

- Added a Mid-Cycle Report to address recommendations from Program Review Committee and the Vice President for Instruction as of fall 2012, <https://sites.google.com/a/seattlecentral.edu/ccc/resources-prc-1/multiple-year-schedule>
- Established a process to review progress of learning outcomes assessment one year prior to the scheduled program review for each program, <https://sites.google.com/a/seattlecentral.edu/ccc/instructions-iac>

#### **Course Approval (CAC) Process**

- Implemented a requirement to align each course proposal to CWSLOs, program learning outcomes (PLOs), and course level learning outcomes (CLOs) with assessment methods
- Established a requirement for updated PLOs approved by the Instructional Assessment Committee (IAC) prior to course approval
- Began using an Automated Course Approval (ACA) system in 2013 to streamline the approval process and provide access to approved course outlines in the district's document center, <https://inside.seattlecolleges.com/default.aspx?svc=courseapproval&page=documents>. (See Appendix 4 ~ Examples of Approved Courses)

#### **Instructional Assessment (IAC) Process**

- Established a process for approving revised program level learning outcomes
- Started conducting assessment reviews to evaluate program and course level learning outcomes and assessment results one year prior to scheduled program review in a four-year cycle
- Continued to provide training and support to faculty for updating program and course level learning outcomes and developing an assessment plan

### **Learning Communities (LCC) Process**

- Required LCC reviews and approval for learning communities (CSPs, linked and integrated assignments) two years ahead of scheduled offerings.
- Working to coordinate the offering of I-Best classes linking college level courses with upper level ESL courses.
- Continued to provide regular workshops to support faculty participation and sharing of their experiences with learning communities.
- Directed and coordinated the themes for integrated assignments. The current theme is “food,” which has generated much interest and excitement among faculty and students in 2014-2015. Previous themes were “water” and “cotton.” (Appendix 5 ~ Courses Participating in Integrated Assignments, Winter 2015)

### **Planning for Core Themes Three and Four**

The planning for core themes three and four involved instructional divisions and departments within the administrative units. Examples of these ongoing efforts include:

- Integrating diversity and globalism in curricula
- Facilitating cross-cultural interactions and learning in student activities and student organizations.
- Creating a learning environment on campus that is inclusive and respectful of students’ backgrounds as well as the hiring of employees that reflects the student populations
- Promoting integrative learning and collaboration among faculty and students across disciplines and programs, such as coordinated studies, I-BEST courses, and integrated assignments
- Encouraging and providing opportunities for students to participate in internships, community volunteer work, and service learning
- Building community relationships to increase contributions toward scholarships that assist students in need and support student achievement
- Engaging experts in business and industry through service on technical advisory committees (TAC) to ensure that curriculum maintains relevance and currency and to expand potential opportunities for student internships and employment after completion

### **Core Theme Assessment and Improvement**

As explained in Revised Standard One, for each indicator of achievement (IA), the college sets a benchmark based on the rolling average of the previous three years when data is available. For some IAs, data of fewer than three years are used. When a five-point scale is used as a measure, the benchmark is set at 3.5.

For measuring the achievement of each indicator of achievement (IA), the college uses the following criteria to rate the progress of each IA:

Progress Rating	Evaluation Criteria
0	No previous data available to set the benchmark. Rating is not assigned, and the IA is excluded from the evaluation of core theme objective achievement.
1	Annual achievement is below 95% of the benchmark
2	Annual achievement is meeting at least 95% of the benchmark
3	Annual achievement is at least 10% higher than the benchmark

For determining the achievements of outcomes, core theme objectives, core themes, and college mission, the college has developed the following criteria:

- An outcome is considered achieved when 70% of the indicators of achievement (IAs) under the outcomes are rated 2 or 3, excluding IAs rated as “0.” IAs with “0” rating occur only when an IA is introduced in a new annual cycle and previous data is unavailable.
- A core theme objective is considered achieved when 70% of the IAs under the objective are rated 2 or 3 excluding IAs rated as “0.”
- A core theme is considered achieved when 70% of all the IAs under the core theme are rated 2 or 3, excluding IAs with “0” rating.
- The college mission is considered achieved when 70% of the core theme objectives are achieved. The extent of mission fulfillment will also be measured based on the total number of IAs receiving the rating of 2 or 3.

**Core Theme Systematic Improvement Strategies**

Since 2013-2014, the college has assessed annual results of the IAs under each core theme objective based on the benchmark for each IA, assigning each IA a progress rating of 1, 2 or 3. The *2013-2014 Core Theme Progress Report* (Appendix 6), Part II, Example A describes the strategies used to evaluate the level of achievement of the core themes in 2013-2014. Core Theme Teams and the Accreditation Steering Committee are responsible for evaluating the achievement of each IA, with particular focus on IAs receiving a rating of “1.” Guiding evaluation questions include:

- For an IA receiving a “3” – What are the success factors and sustainability potentials?
- For an IA receiving a “2” rating – What are the achievement factors and likelihood for continuous success, especially for IAs receiving a marginal “2” rating?
- For an IA receiving a “1” rating – What are the causes behind the weak areas, and what improvement action plans are needed? Which divisions/departments should be involved?

The systematic annual assessment of the achievement levels of IAs will support the overall achievement of the core theme objectives and mission over the seven-year accreditation cycle, during which the college will demonstrate continuous improvement efforts.

**Ongoing Assessment Efforts that Support the Achievement of Core Themes**

Regular evaluation of instructional programs and assessment of student learning outcomes are an integral part of achieving the core themes and continuous improvement. After several years of ongoing efforts, the college has improved in the following areas:

- Instructional Program Review: All instruction programs are reviewed in a four-year cycle with required mid-cycle progress reports and check-ins
- Learning Outcomes Assessment: Course learning outcomes (CLOs) are aligned to college-wide student learning outcomes (CWSLOs) (See Example B1 in Part II) and CLOs are aligned to program learning outcomes (PLOs) or degree level learning outcomes. (See Example B2 in Part II)
- Follow-up actions from analyses of student achievements (See Example B3 in Part II)
- Strategic Action Plans: Divisions, programs, and departments document achievements in annual reports (See Appendix 7 ~ Examples of Achievement Reports of Division/Department Strategic Action Plans).

### **Annual Review of Achievements -- Reports and Analyses**

Annually, the college reviews its achievements through the following reports and analysis results for assessment and planning:

- Student achievement: Based on annual reports and data from State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC):
  - ✓ Student completion awards: GED/HS diplomas, transfer degrees (AA, AS, and AAS-T), certificates (short-term and >45 credits), AAS, and BAS in workforce programs
  - ✓ Transfers to public and private four-year institutions in Washington State
  - ✓ Student achievement points
- Enrollment: Monitoring enrollment trends and changes quarterly, annually, and longer-term
- Retention: Analyzing retention trends by program category (academic transfer, professional-technical, basic skills, and bachelor's degrees)
- Instructional Programs Sustainability: Reviewing program data, including enrollment and cost per FTES by program, college-wide, and program category
- Student/faculty ratios: Analysis by program
- College-wide surveys: Graduates, students, employees, TAC, Student Leadership
- Program level data: Surveys of current students and graduates, e.g., Coop Ed, Graphic Design, Apparel Design & Development, and the Library

College-wide reports and information are frequently shared at regular administrative unit meetings, such as the President's Cabinet, the President's Executive Council, the Instructional Deans (iDeans) Group, the Student Services Managers Council, the Administrative Services Leadership Council, and the college's Management Team meetings. Divisions and departments also share pertinent reports and data information with their respective faculty and staff.

### **Review of Assessment Processes, Achievement, and Improvement**

Since winter 2013 when the college implemented integrated strategic planning and budgeting processes, the College Council, President's Cabinet, and the SIIR Office have reviewed and refined the processes twice with input from divisions and departments for the 2014-2015 and

2015-2016 academic years. Improvements included annual cycles; timelines; templates for strategic action plans; and guidelines for aligning strategic planning and budget requests to core theme objectives, strategic plan objectives, and strategic directions for the next year.

### **Using Results for Improvement**

Assessment results, updated data, and special analysis reports are a regular and integral part of the annual strategic planning process at the institutional level. Further, the college now uses this information to guide directions and priorities at all organizational levels. Examples are shown in the following areas:

#### **Annual Core Theme Progress Report**

The college uses the results of the annual Core Theme Progress Report to evaluate the achievement of each indicator of achievement (IA) and to determine the achievement levels of the core themes and mission. The college analyzes IAs with “1” ratings to identify explanations and improvement strategies. See Example A in Part II (Appendix 6).

#### **Instructional Programs**

- Since 2010, annual “Instructional Program Sustainability Data” and other relevant information, such as market demand, have been used to revise existing program curricula, create high demand degree programs, sunset programs, and make other program changes.
- Quarterly and annual enrollment reports (campus and district) are used for enrollment planning and quarterly course offerings.
- Annual student/faculty ratios by program are used to measure program efficiency and course planning.

### **Communicating Results to Stakeholders - for Evaluation and Continuous Planning**

All the reports and analyses mentioned in the section of Annual Review of Achievements above are shared regularly and made available to the college community through various channels to facilitate continuous planning and improvement. Examples are shown in Table 3 below:

**Table 3 – Availability and Accessibility of Documentation/Data**

Item	Title of Document/Data	Located or Provided to:
1	Annual Core Theme Progress Report, e.g., 2013-2014	Accreditation Steering Committee., Core Theme Teams, management groups, and President’s Cabinet
2	Annual data analyses of enrollment (retention/persistence, changes), student success (progress, completion, grants/initiatives/projects)	Administrative unit retreats, management team retreat
3	Annual Instructional Programs Sustainability Data: ENR, FTE cost, degree/certificates	President’s Cabinet, iDeans, and posted in the Document Center of the district Intranet
4	Program or departmental level achievements in respective areas of instruction, student support services, and administrative services	Shared at regular meetings of programs, divisions, or departments
5	Annual Student Achievement reports (from SBCTC) – reviews and analyses	Regular iDeans bi-weekly meetings, SEM meetings, retreats, and President’s Cabinet
6	Instructional program reviews reports and mid-cycle reports	Openly accessible on PRC webpage
7	Updated program learning outcomes (PLOs); College-Wide Student Learning Outcomes	Openly accessible on IAC webpage and individual program webpages
8	Approved new and revised courses	Openly accessible at the district Intranet under “Course Inventory” of Instruction
9	Employee and student surveys	SIIR, VPI Office, iDeans, and President’s Cabinet
10	Learning outcomes assessment data analysis results by program	SIIR, VPI Office, and respective division deans and program faculty
11	Program/department budget allocation and expenditures	Online Financial Management System (FMS) accessible to program/department managers, administrators, and Business Office

## Part II

### Examples of Operationalizing Mission and Core Theme Objectives

Presented in this section are four examples of how the college used assessment results to determine the achievement levels of its core theme objectives and college mission. These examples also demonstrate the operational implications of the assessment results.

#### **Example A -- Achievement levels of Core Themes and Mission in 2013-2014**

The *2013-2014 Core Theme Progress Report* demonstrates the annual assessment process for the core themes and college mission. The specific progress results of indicators of achievement, outcomes, and core theme objectives are described in Appendix 6 – *2013-2014 Core Theme Progress Report*.

In Revised Standard One and on pages 8-9 of this report, it explains that each indicator of achievement (IA) receives a progress rating of 0, 1, 2, or 3. The college has established criteria to determine the achievement level of each core theme objective and the college mission. Tables 4 and 5 below show the achievement levels of the core themes and college mission in 2013-2014.

**Table 4 – Extent of Mission Fulfillment in 2013-2014 Based on Outcomes**

Core Theme	No. of Outcomes	No. of Outcomes Achieved	Extent of Mission Achieved Based on Outcomes	Extent of Core Themes Achieved Based on IAs	Extent of Mission Achieved Based on IAs	
1	(5-1)= 4	4	100%	91%	11	10
2	5	5	100%	89%	19	17
3	(6-2) = 4	3	75%	81%	16	13
4	3	2	67%	90%	10	9
	16	14	88%	Avg. = 88%	56	49
					88%	

**Table 5 – Extent of Mission Fulfillment in 2013-2014 Based on Objectives**

Core Theme	No. of Core Theme Objectives	No. of Core Theme Objectives Achieved	Extent of Mission Achieved Based on Objectives	Extent of Core Theme Achieved Based on IAs	Extent of Mission Achieved Based on IAs	
1	3	3	100%	91%	11	10
2	2	2	100%	89%	19	17
3	(3-1) = 2	1	50%	81%	16	13
4	2	1	50%	90%	10	9
	9	7	78%	Avg. = 88%	56	49
					88%	

In summary, the college achieved 14 of the 16 outcomes, seven of the nine core theme objectives, and all four core themes. For further detail, see analysis (page 9-14) in Appendix 6 - 2013-2014 Core Theme Progress Report. The extent of mission fulfillment achieved in 2013-2014 is as follows:

- 88 percent based on achievement of outcomes
- 78 percent based on achievement of core theme objectives
- 88 percent based on achievement of core theme
- 88 percent based on achievement of all indicators of achievement

This progress report inspired high levels of discussion and engagement when it was shared with the Accreditation Steering Committee, Core Theme Teams, Presidents' Cabinet, the instructional deans, and other groups. Participants suggested further analysis and additional data, as well as ideas for potential action plans and strategies for improvement, especially for IAs with ratings of "1." There was common agreement that the progress report should be shared at the program level and with faculty and staff, and that the report should be considered a key document for annual strategic planning, a process that has implications for resource allocation.

The reviews and discussions covered the following areas:

- The meaning, usefulness, and significance of each indicator of achievement
- The criteria used to determine achievement levels of core theme objectives, core themes, and mission
- The need for more data and further analysis for some IAs
- Data interpretation, implication, and reliability
- The need for systematic and consistent data collection
- Sustainability of IAs with high ratings or achievement levels
- The implication and identification of needed improvement actions

The college expects that the annual process of core theme progress reporting and reviewing will provide insights and directions for identifying changes in progress and achievement trends of the IAs, outcomes, and core theme objectives. The assessment of the achievement levels has significant operational implications concerning program changes and offerings, service support, and resource allocation.

### **Example B1 - Alignment of Course Learning Outcomes to College-Wide Student Learning Outcomes**

Since discovering that the Canvas learning management system was not capable of gathering assessment data for student learning outcomes in fall 2013, the college has continued to seek a technical solution to facilitate the collection and analysis of learning outcomes assessment data. Such a tool must be easy for faculty to adopt while providing useful analysis results at course level (cross-sections of the same course), program level, and institutional level.

To evaluate the extent of achievement for college-wide student learning outcomes (CWSLOs) (Appendix 8 - College-Wide Student Learning Outcomes) at the institutional level, the Instructional Assessment Committee developed an online form to document alignments between course learning outcomes (CLOs) and the CWLSOs. Data to test the online form was provided by faculty in five disciplines with courses contributing to the Associate of Arts (AA) degree (Business, Chemistry, Math, Philosophy, and Sociology), and two professional-technical programs (Culinary Arts and Apparel Design & Development). The form enables faculty to document that CLOs link to one or more CWSLOs, and to record assessment methods used to determine whether a student met or exceeded the specific learning outcome. The form also allows programs to aggregate related assessment data across several sections of a course.

The analysis of the collected data covered a total of 18 courses, some with multiple sections, and assessment of 1,159 individual students. The results show high percentages of students meeting or exceeding expectations for one or more CWSLOs for each course, ranging from 62 percent to 100 percent, except for Math 085 which has a 45 percent achievement. As shown in the table below, in terms of the five CWSLOs, the CLOs in these programs demonstrated strong links to “Think” and “Connect,” but fewer outcomes aligning to “Collaborate.” Some courses linked only to one of the five CWSLOs, but most linked to three or four of the CWSLO. The results also show the assessment of learning outcomes for courses with multiple sections, such as Chemistry, Math, and Sociology. For additional assessment data analysis results, see Appendix 9 – Alignment of Course Learning Outcomes to College-Wide Student Learning Outcomes.

Area	Course	Collaborate Think	Communicate Connect	Continue Learning
<b>AA Transfer</b>				
Business	ACCT 201	✓	✓	✓
	BUS 210 Business Statistics	✓	✓	✓
	ECO 100	✓	✓	✓
	ECO 201 Microeconomics	✓	✓	✓
	ECO 202 Macroeconomics	✓	✓	✓
Chemistry	CHEM& 161			✓
Math	MAT 085			✓
Philosophy	PHIL 101	✓		
	PHIL 120			✓
	PHIL 160		✓	
Sociology	SOC 101	✓	✓	✓
<b>Workforce</b>				
Culinary Arts	CUL 103	✓	✓	✓
	CUL 112		✓	✓
	HOS 101		✓	✓
	HOS 111		✓	✓
	HOS 122		✓	✓
	HOS 124	✓	✓	✓
Apparel Design	APPRL 201	✓	✓	✓

✓ Indicates the course is aligned with one or more of this type of college-wide learning outcome.

After reviewing the results of the CLO-CWSLO analysis, most faculty indicated plans to make changes in their courses. In general, the faculty who participated in this new approach in providing CLO assessment data found the online form easy to use. The analysis of the collected data was not as time consuming. The college plans to expand the data collection process to more courses and

programs until all instructional programs are included. Broadening the collection of assessment data to include all programs will provide more in-depth views of learning outcomes achievement at multiple levels.

**Example B2 -- Alignment of Course Learning Outcomes to Program Learning Outcomes**

A similar process was used to analyze program level learning outcomes. Student achievement data of CLOs for the same 18 courses are shown in the Table 6 below. Business (Accounting), Chemistry, Math, and Sociology provided assessment data for multiple sections. (Appendix 10 – Alignment of Course Learning Outcomes to Program/Degree Learning Outcomes)

**Table 6 – Students Achieving Course Learning Outcomes by Program**

Discipline / Programs	No. of Courses	Total Students Assessed	Exceeding Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Not Meeting Expectations	% Meeting or Exceeding Expectations
Business	5	375	115	155	105	72%
Chemistry	1	111	0	78	33	70%
Math	1	120	24	30	66	45%
Philosophy	3	90	31	44	15	83%
Sociology	1	316	164	107	45	86%
Apparel Design	1	28	5	16	7	75%
Culinary Arts	6	119	63	46	10	92%
<b>Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1,159</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>476</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>76%</b>

Analysis of the same assessment data also demonstrates the levels of alignment in different courses of course level learning outcomes to the program level learning outcomes; in the case of transfer programs, program level learning outcomes are those of the AA degree. The AA degree learning outcomes were completely revised in summer 2014. Program faculty were asked to align the previous PLOs with the new ones; as a result only eight of the 12 AA degree outcomes are represented in the example below. Table 6 shows the alignment between five AA degree disciplines and the AA degree PLOs.

The difference in number of program learning outcomes assessed by discipline varies significantly. Courses in Business and Sociology assessed four program learning outcomes, Philosophy three, Math two, and Chemistry one. The learning outcomes most assessed are “Critical Thinking, Inquiry and Analysis, and Problem Solving” and “Quantitative Literacy.” After reviewing the analysis results, faculty indicated their likelihood of making changes to improve their CLO assessment ranging from 0 percent, 17 percent, 25 percent, 50 percent, 67 percent and 100 percent.

Most courses used multiple methods of assessment. In two courses, only one method was used, while up to four methods were used for other courses. The most common assessment method was exam. Other methods included discussion, observation, performance, essay, homework, lab, and presentation.

**Table 7 – Alignment Between PLOs and Courses**

AA Transfer					
Program Learning Outcome	Business	Chemistry	Math	Philosophy	Sociology
1. Communication (Reading, Oral or Signed, Written, Other Forms of Expression)				✓	✓
2. Critical Thinking, Inquiry and Analysis, and Problem Solving	✓		✓	✓	✓
3. Global Learning and Intercultural Knowledge and Competence	✓				
4. Quantitative Literacy	✓	✓		✓	
5. Creative Thinking					
6. Information Literacy			✓		✓
7. Technology Literacy	✓				
8. Integrative Learning					✓
9. Collaboration					
10. Ethical Reasoning					
11. Civic Engagement					
12. Foundations and Skills for Life-long Learning					

**Examples B3 -- Student Achievements: Completion (Awards)**

After reviewing the analysis of student completion (awards) by program category for the last four years (2010-2011 to 2013-2014), the instructional deans discovered the following trends in student completion:

- More than 80 percent of the completion (awards) was consistently in degree programs (AA, AS, AAS, and AAS-T, and BAS), a proportion significantly higher than most other colleges in the state system. The success of this achievement also has an impact on retention as students need greater commitment to complete a degree than a certificate.
- A significantly low percentage of completion (awards) was in short-term certificates.
- The completion in GED and high school diplomas has increased during the last two years (2012-2013 and 2013-2014).

The assessment of the multi-year completion (awards) data in 2014 prompted the college to ask whether it is meeting the need for short-term certificate training. The discussion resulted in a major effort to:

- Increase viable and stackable short-term certificates to meet market demand and student needs. Since fall 2014, a total of 13 short-term certificates under consideration. Several new certificates will be offered in fall 2015.
- Promote integration and collaboration of academic transfer, workforce programs, and basic skills programs to provide students with marketable skills. These activities include:
  - ✓ Offering new I-BEST courses in spring 2015 linking an upper level ESL with a course in allied health (AHE 149).
  - ✓ Revising and merging the curricula of different programs to create new certificates and degree offerings. At least two programs have been working on this creative effort since fall 2014.
- Provide basic skills students opportunities to transition to college level programs, for example:
  - ✓ Offering courses in “ESL for Math” and “ESL for College Prep,” and other support services to help students transition to college programs.
  - ✓ Establishing academic I-BEST options which include ENG 092/096/101 and HUM 105 in spring 2015.

The instructional deans have gained momentum to actively seek solutions to increase short-term and stackable certificate offerings by collaborating across divisions; learning from other institutions; and creating partnerships with external agencies, businesses, and industry.

## Part III

### **Moving Forward: Action Plans for Year Seven Evaluation**

After the MCE visit in April 2015, the college plans to act on the Evaluation Committee’s feedback for the MCE report and make necessary changes as suggested by the evaluators. From 2015 to 2018, in preparation for the Year Seven Self-Evaluation report and visit, the college will make continuous improvements in the following areas:

#### **Ongoing Institutional Planning and Assessment**

The college routinely reviews and evaluates its various planning processes with input from constituencies and participants. The feedback is reviewed and analyzed for improvement purposes. Going forward, the college plans to:

- Annually review and monitor progress and achievement of each IA and core theme objective:
  - ✓ Address learning outcomes and IAs that require changes or improvements
  - ✓ Communicate achievements and challenges and share progress data with all levels of the college community
  - ✓ Identify areas for improvement and address issues related to reaching the target for each core theme and the mission fulfillment threshold

- ✓ Continue and expand successful initiatives to improve student learning and completion, such as the highly successful Productive Persistence and Project Finish Line
- Evaluate the effectiveness of integrating planning and resource allocation processes and achievements:
  - ✓ Revisit the extent of integration annually, evaluate processes and results, and use the results for further improvement
  - ✓ Improve the reporting of achievements by all programs, divisions, departments, and administrative units
- Find and implement a technical solution to provide the college community with access to the annual plans and achievement reports

### **Continuous Improvement of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment**

Continuous improvement efforts for assessing student learning outcomes will include the following:

- Expand the assessment data analysis of student learning outcomes to all instructional programs
- Provide support for faculty to use the results of the assessment data analysis to further improve student learning
- Resolve technical issues and enter all assessment data into the Strategic Planning Online (SPOL) system to allow course-, program-, and institutional-level analysis and evaluation of student achievement of learning outcomes
- Train faculty to use the full capability of the SPOL system to evaluate assessment results and post additional reports, and establish an efficient and accessible process for tracking multiple years of assessment data
- Continue to provide training for faculty in developing, revising, and assessing learning outcomes at multiple levels—course, program, and college-wide
- Maintain requirements in the course approval process to include learning outcomes, assessment methods, and alignment to program and college-wide learning outcomes.

## **Conclusion**

After completing the Mid-Cycle Evaluation (MCE) Report, the college has concluded that the MCE review process helps clarify connections within the accreditation standards. The process allows the institutions to examine how continuous review and assessment contribute to meaningful adjustment and revision throughout the process of evaluating mission fulfillment over the seven-year period. In particular, careful review of core theme objectives and indicators of achievement help the college take essential steps to achieve continuous improvement and fulfill the mission. The college looks forward to the MCE visit and to the committee's suggestions that will provide direction as the self-evaluation process and improvement efforts continue.

# Appendices

[See a Separate File]

Appendix	Title
1	Revised Standard One
2	2011-2016 Strategic Plan
3	Strategic Action Plan Templates for 2015-2016
4	Examples of Approved Courses
5	Courses Participating in Integrated Assignments, Winter 2015
6	2013-2014 Core Theme Progress Report
7	Examples of Achievement Reports of Division/Department Strategic Action Plans
8	College-Wide Student Learning Outcomes (CWSLOs)
9	Alignment of Course Learning Outcomes to College-Wide Student Learning Outcomes
10	Alignment of Course Learning Outcomes to Program Learning Outcomes