

ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

COLLEGE STATUS REPORT ON STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES IMPLEMENTATION

INSTRUCTIONS

Colleges are asked to use this report form in completing their *College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation*. Colleges should submit a brief narrative analysis and quantitative and qualitative evidence demonstrating status of Student Learning Outcome (SLO) implementation. The report is divided into sections representing the bulleted characteristics of the Proficiency implementation level on the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, Part III (Rubric). Colleges are asked to interpret their implementation level through the lens of the Accreditation Standards cited for each characteristic. The final report section before the evidence list requests a brief narrative self-assessment of overall status in relationship to the proficiency level, indicating what plans are in place to mitigate any noted deficiencies or areas for improvement. **Narrative responses for each section of the template should not exceed 250 words.**

This report form offers examples of quantitative and qualitative evidence which might be included for each of the characteristics. The examples are illustrative in nature and are not intended to provide a complete listing of the kinds of evidence colleges may use to document SLO status. College evidence used for one Proficiency level characteristic may also serve as evidence for another characteristic.

This report is provided to colleges in hard copy and also electronically, by e-mail, as a fill-in Word document. The reports must be submitted to the Commission by either the October 15, 2012 date or the March 15, 2013 date, as defined on the enclosed list of colleges by assigned reporting date. When the report is completed, colleges should:

- a. Submit the report form by email to the ACCJC (accjc@accjc.org); **and**
- b. Submit the full report *with attached evidence* on CD/DVD to the ACCJC (ACCJC, 10 Commercial Blvd., Suite 204, Novato, CA 94949).

Although evidence cited in the text of the report may include links to college web resources, the Commission requires actual copies (electronic files) of the evidence for its records.

COLLEGE INFORMATION: DATE OF REPORT; COLLEGE; SUBMITTED BY; CERTIFICATION BY CEO

Date of Report: Oct. 15, 2012

Institution's Name: De Anza College

Name and Title of Individual Completing Report: Marisa Spatafore, Accreditation Liaison Officer

Telephone Number and E-mail Address: 408.864.8672; spataforemarisa@deanza.edu

Certification by Chief Executive Officer: *The information included in this report is certified as a complete and accurate representation of the reporting institution.*

Name of CEO: Brian Murphy



Signature

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND AUTHENTIC ASSESSMENTS ARE IN PLACE FOR COURSES, PROGRAMS, SUPPORT SERVICES, CERTIFICATES AND DEGREES.

Eligibility Requirement 10: Student Learning and Achievement

Standards: I.A.1; II.A.1.a; II.A.1.c; II.A.2.a,b,e,f,g,h,i; II.A.3 [See II.A.3.a,b,c.]; II.A.6; II.B.4; II.C.2].

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Evidence demonstrating numbers/percentages of course, program (academic and student services), and institutional level outcomes are in place and assessed. Documentation on institutional planning processes demonstrating integrated planning and the way SLO assessment results impact program review. Descriptions could include discussions of high-impact courses, gateway courses, college frameworks, and so forth.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NUMERICAL RESPONSE

QUANTITATIVE EVIDENCE/DATA ON THE RATE/PERCENTAGE OF SLOs DEFINED AND ASSESSED

1. Courses
 - a. Total number of college courses (active courses in the college catalog, offered on the schedule in some rotation): 1098 (1.1)
 - b. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 1098;
Percentage of total: 100% (1.1)
 - c. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 401 TracDat with methods of assessment + 413 archived completed SLOACs from previous Electronic Course Management System (ECMS) = 814; Percentage of total: 74% (1.2, 1.3)
2. Programs
 - a. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college): 57
 - b. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 57
Percentage of total: 100%
 - c. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 71 of 288 Program Level Outcome Statements have assessment methods; Percentage of total: 25% (1.4)
3. Student Learning and Support Activities
 - a. Total number of student learning and support activities (as college has identified or grouped them for SLO implementation): 29
 - b. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 29
Percentage of total: 100%
 - c. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 29; Percentage of total: 100%
4. Institutional Learning Outcomes
 - a. Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined: 5 Institutional Core Competencies (ICCs) with 32 assessable statements
 - b. Number of institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment: 32 (1.5)

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

The new outcomes data system, TracDat, which collects data at the course, program, service, administrative and institutional levels, became fully functional in spring 2012. All assessments completed on the previous system have been uploaded to TracDat in PDF format. Virtually all instructional support coordinators have been trained to use the new system.

Faculty members are now fully aware of the cyclic nature of the SLO process. When developing new curriculum, the starting point is creating SLO statements, which are required to be part of the course outline submitted to the Curriculum Committee for five-year review. All courses have ongoing assessments, with high-enrollment gateway courses being assessed most frequently. The Annual Program Review requires that assessment data be collected as part of the SLOAC process as supporting evidence (1.6).

Spring 2012 was the first opportunity for faculty to enter data for assessments of Program Level Outcomes (PLOs). During the quarter, 21% of the program level outcomes were assessed, and the college is well on track to achieve the goal of 100% complete by the Comprehensive Review in Spring 2014. All Institutional Core Competencies (ICCs; the college's equivalent of ILOs) are being assessed through the mapping of PLOs to the ICCs.

All Instructional Support Programs – Student Services (16 areas), Instructional Services (six areas) and Academic Services (seven areas) – have outcome statements and are involved in ongoing outcomes assessment.

In addition, Finance (eight areas) and Educational Resources (eight areas) have Administrative Unit Outcome (AUO) statements and are involved in ongoing outcomes assessment.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 2: THERE IS A WIDESPREAD INSTITUTIONAL DIALOGUE ABOUT ASSESSMENT RESULTS AND IDENTIFICATION OF GAPS.

Standards: I.B.1; I.B.2; I.B.3; I.B.5.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation on processes and outcomes of SLO assessment. Specific examples with the outcome data analysis and description of how the results were used. Descriptions could include examples of institutional changes made to respond to outcomes assessment results.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 2: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

De Anza College has witnessed an increasingly robust discourse emerge in the last five years regarding the ongoing utility of assessment work in identifying and addressing gaps in institutional efficacy and achievement.

The annual all-faculty assessment convocation, first held in 2011, features vigorous dialogue both across and within departments (2.1-2.4). The 2012 convocation resulted in the development of a rubric for assessing critical thinking at course, program and institutional levels (2.5-2.8). The cross-disciplinary model through which this rubric was developed will inform future campuswide assessment methods for other Institutional Core Competencies.

Discussions of outcomes work also extend beyond instruction and have yielded significant changes to institutional decision-making. Concurrent with the development of outcomes assessment at the course and program levels, discussions at college committees over the last five years (2.9-2.22) have resulted in significant revisions to both the Comprehensive and Annual Program Review processes. The Comprehensive Program Review process has moved from a three-year to a six-year cycle as a direct result of outcomes assessment and analysis. Annual Program Review work now includes the specific analysis of outcomes-based data to inform planning and budgeting decisions (2.23).

SLO-related dialogue continues to affect specific changes within the classroom as well, as evident in the dialogue recorded in the SLO newsletter (2.24), discussions documented in TracDat and annual workshops on SLOs at De Anza's Partners in Learning conference (2.25). Outcomes assessment is now an integrated component of the culture of the institution (2.26).

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 3: DECISION MAKING INCLUDES DIALOGUE ON THE RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT AND IS PURPOSEFULLY DIRECTED TOWARD ALIGNING INSTITUTION-WIDE PRACTICES TO SUPPORT AND IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING.

Standards: I.B; I.B.3; II.A.1.c; II.A.2.f; III.A.1.c; IV.A.2.b.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation of institutional planning processes and the integration of SLO assessment results with program review, college-wide planning and resource allocation, including evidence of college-wide dialogue.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 3: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

De Anza College has a long history of planning and Program Review that persists as the primary source of program information guiding the three planning and budgeting teams (PBTs) and College Council. Quantitative and qualitative data have long been the cornerstone of decision-making at De Anza. Through ongoing evaluation of the planning process, the 2005-2010 Education Master Plan (EMP) recognized the need to formally integrate outcomes assessment information into the Program Review process (3.1, 3.2).

Following further evaluation, review and discussions in 2011 in the SLO Steering Committee, Academic and Classified Senates, the PBTs and College Council, College Council converted the previous three-year Comprehensive Program Review cycle into the current six-year Outcomes Based Program Review process supported by Annual Program Review Updates in each of the five years between CPRs (3.3). With this model, Program Review and the Six-Year Planning Cycle is synchronized with the ACCJC's six-year accreditation cycle (3.4).

Each year the individual college programs submit their APRUs that include the most current updates of their outcomes assessment activities since the last APRU. Each program also requests any resource allocations based on their outcomes results and program improvement plans. Each of the three PBTs maintains a website to which they post each program's 2008-09 Comprehensive Program Review and APRUs from 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12 (3.5-3.8).

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 4: APPROPRIATE RESOURCES CONTINUE TO BE ALLOCATED AND FINE-TUNED.

Standards: I.B; I.B.4; I.B.6; III.C.2; III.D.2.a; III.D.3.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation on the integration of SLO assessment results with institutional planning and resource allocation.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 4: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Since 2009, the three Planning and Budget Teams – Instruction, Student Services, and Finance and Educational Resources – have posted their program CPRs and APRUs on their respective websites, making the program and SLO information available to all PBT members, other governance groups and College Council (4.1-4.10).

The IPBT has established a process in which its members are assigned the responsibility of thoroughly reading APRUs and developing questions related to such tasks as determining program viability or discontinuance, budget reduction scenarios, bond measure allocations, and other resource allocations including new faculty positions. In spring 2012, the IPBT made the first use of TracDat for the APRU; results are being reviewed by the SLO Core and Steering committees, College Planning Committee (CPC) and IPBT (4.11-4.21).

SSPBT members reviewed program CPRs and APRUs when deliberating on the service viability/discontinuance process, bond measure and other resource allocations, and developing budget reduction scenarios. After review and analysis of the Program Review process, in June 2012, the SSPBT approved the Service Viability and Discontinuance Process, making two substantial changes: a process in which each program's APRU is assigned readers from the SSPBT membership and the due date of APRUs moved from May to December. This change will make the outcomes assessment information more current and readily available for decision-making later in the academic year (4.22-4.27).

FERPBT members review Program Reviews and AUOs when determining bond measure allocations and other resource allocations, and in developing budget reduction scenarios (4.28, 4.29).

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 5: COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT REPORTS EXIST AND ARE COMPLETED AND UPDATED ON A REGULAR BASIS.

Standards: I.A.1; I.B; I.B.3; I.B.5; I.B.6; II.A.2.a; II.B.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation on the process and cycle of SLO assessment, including results of cycles of assessment. Copies of summative assessment reports, with actual learning outcomes.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 5: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

De Anza College made a long-term commitment to the sustainability of the Student Learning Outcome process with the implementation of the TracDat data collection system. Three SLO coordinators and a

team of liaisons who represent their respective departments support the creation of meaningful assessment methods and their documentation and enhancements (5.1). Reports on progress can be generated at the institutional, division and department levels (5.1).

Each faculty member within a department can readily run a report to ascertain what enhancements have been entered for a given course and how those enhancements have affected student learning. The faculty member can then choose whether or not to implement the enhancement into his/her course. Faculty teaching the same course have used data from multiple assessment cycles to improve student learning (5.2).

Department chairpersons have real-time access to reports listing all completed SLO process work at the program level and at the course level. This data includes the course name, SLO statement, data summaries, reflection and analysis of the data and proposed enhancements (5.3, 5.4).

Deans of divisions have the capability to generate reports showing this same data across their entire division (5.5, 5.6).

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 6: COURSE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ARE ALIGNED WITH DEGREE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES.

Standards: II.A.2.e; II.A.2.f; II.A.2.i.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation on the alignment/integration of course level outcomes with program outcomes. Description could include curriculum mapping or other alignment activities. Samples across the curriculum of institutional outcomes mapped to program outcomes.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 6: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Two tiers of mapping have been established in the TracDat system. Each program level outcome statement is first mapped to one or more of the Institutional Core Competencies (6.1). To make this mapping meaningful for each of the many curriculum areas, each ICC was broken down into smaller phrases matching the description of the five Institutional Core Competencies (6.2). In turn, each of these programs is mapped to the course or courses at which the student is first introduced and/or practices and/or achieves the skill stated in the Program Level Outcome (6.3).

These mapping decisions are the product of department dialogue. While such dialogue is encouraged at departmental meetings throughout the year, dedicated times are set aside on Opening Day and convocation days (6.4). At the Opening Day department meeting, participants are asked to commit to an assignment calendar stating which SLOs, at both the course and program levels, are to be assessed that year. An Opening Day SLO survey was designed and implemented to act as a self-assessment of instructional area SLO progress and to direct planning for which courses to assess (6.5). The follow-up to this exercise will be more easily facilitated as all begin to use the “assign” feature of the TracDat software.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 7: STUDENTS DEMONSTRATE AWARENESS OF GOALS AND PURPOSES OF COURSES AND PROGRAMS IN WHICH THEY ARE ENROLLED.

Standards: I.B.5; II.A.6; II.A.6.a; II.B.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation on means the college uses to inform students of course and program purposes and outcomes. Samples across the curriculum of: course outlines of record and syllabi with course SLOs; program and institutional SLOs in catalog.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 7: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

De Anza College provides clear and current information about courses and programs for students and strives to ensure accuracy of this information. Since fall 2010, the Curriculum Committee has approved all SLOs on the course outline of record. Per faculty “best practices” regarding syllabi determined by the Academic Senate, faculty are encouraged to participate in this practice by including their outcomes on their course syllabus (7.1) or via their course content in Catalyst, the online course management system. Students are thereby made aware of course-level outcomes from the very first day of class, when syllabi are distributed (7.2, 7.3).

Beginning with the 2012-13 college catalog, Program Level Outcomes are listed for every certificate and degree offered at the college. Students have access to this catalog both online (in three formats: searchable database, PDF and flipbook) and in hard copy. (7.4) The institutional outcomes are also included in the college catalog as well as listed on the De Anza College website. There are also posters—displayed in almost every classroom and meeting room—of the mission statement, which includes the Institutional Core Competencies/Institutional Learning Outcomes (7.5). Therefore, students have both access and exposure to Program Level and Institutional Core Competencies.

SELF-ASSESSMENT ON LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION:

YOU PLANNED TO ADDRESS NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS? WHAT LEVEL OF SLO IMPLEMENTATION WOULD YOU ASSIGN YOUR COLLEGE? WHY? WHAT EFFORTS HAVE YOU PLANNED TO ADDRESS NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS?

SELF-ASSESSMENT ON LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

De Anza College is at the proficiency level of all rubric statements. Learning outcomes have been established and are actively being assessed in instruction, student and academic services, and college services. The college is well on target to achieve its original goal of completing at least one assessment cycle for every course and service by the end of 2012-13. PLOAC, SLOAC, SSLOAC and AUOAC information is being documented in the new TracDat data management system. The college is moving toward creating a sustainable process through the training of faculty and student services coordinators in the use of TracDat (SA.1-SA.3).

A recent survey indicates that students are increasingly aware of the learning outcomes through multiple means including syllabi, department and faculty websites, in-class activities, and the Catalyst online course management system (SA.4).

Outcome assessment results and improvement plans have been successfully incorporated into the six-

year Program Review process supported by APRUs. APRUs and CPRUs are posted on each of the respective PBT websites and are used for making all programmatic decisions across the college.

Program Level Outcomes have been aligned with the appropriate degree and certificate outcomes and are published annually in the college catalog. In turn, courses are mapped to the appropriate PLOs.

Each PLO is linked to one or more of the college's Institutional Core Competencies (ICCs). The college is assessing each ICC during the five years between accreditation visits. Critical Thinking is the first ICC to be assessed, beginning in spring 2012 and concluding in 2012-13 (SA.5).

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

Table of Evidence (no word count limit)

Rubric Statement 1

- 1.1 Active Courses with SLO Statements
- 1.2 SLO statements with Ongoing Assessments
- 1.3 SLOACs Completed before TracDat Implementation
- 1.4 PLO statements with Ongoing Assessments
- 1.5 Summary of Mapping to ICCs
- 1.6 2012 Annual Program Review Document

Rubric Statement 2

- 2.1 2011 Convocation Day PowerPoint Slides
- 2.2 2011 SLO Convocation Manual
- 2.3 SLO Convocation 2012 - photos
- 2.4 SLO Convocation Flyer 2012
- 2.5 2012 Convocation Responses
- 2.6 Dickson ICC Rubric Template
- 2.7 Pape ICC Rubric Template
- 2.8 Ramirez ICC Rubric Template
- 2.9 Academic Senate SLO Resolution 6-11.pdf
- 2.10 Academic Senate Approved Notes January 31st, 2011
- 2.11 Classified Senate Agenda April16-09
- 2.12 Classified Senate Agenda Dec 3-09
- 2.13 Academic Senate Meeting Notes - May 24th, 2010
- 2.14 Academic Senate Meeting Notes - November 2010
- 2.15 College Council Meeting Notes - May 27, 2010
- 2.16 Notes of April 16th
- 2.17 Notes of January 30th
- 2.18 Notes of June 18th
- 2.19 Notes of April 25th
- 2.20 Notes of June 6th
- 2.21 Notes of May 16th
- 2.22 Notes of November 29th

- 2.23 2010 Changes to Master Planning
- 2.24 Sample SLO Newsletters
- 2.25 Partners In Learning Conference
- 2.26 Sample TracDat Reports Showing Department-Level Dialogue

Rubric Statement 3

- 3.1 Educational Master Plan 2010-15 approved Spring 2010, pgs. 19–26
- 3.2 Educational Master Plan 2010-15 Update approved Spring 2011, pgs. 15 - 17
- 3.3 Annual Program Review Update SSPBT 2011
- 3.4 College Council Meeting Notes - May 12, 2011
- 3.5 2011 De Anza College Institutional Self-Study, pgs. 26-31
- 3.6 Instruction Planning & Budget Team Program Reviews
- 3.7 Student Services Planning & Budget Team Resources & Files
- 3.8 FERPBT Program Reviews

Rubric Statement 4

- 4.1 IPBT APRU Revised 4-24-12
- 4.2 SSPBT APRU 2012 Form
- 4.3 Instruction Planning & Budget Team Resources & Files
- 4.4 FERPBT Program Reviews
- 4.5 FERPBT Meeting Notes - March 18, 2011
- 4.6 Campus Budget Measure C FF&E Phase II Requests
- 4.7 College Council February 23, 2012 - Meeting Notes
- 4.8 College Council Meeting Notes - February 9, 2012
- 4.9 College Council Meeting Notes - March 22, 2012
- 4.10 Joint PBT Meeting Notes - June 14, 2011
- 4.11 IPBT Meeting Notes - April 24, 2012
- 4.12 Request for Assessment Cycle Grant 2012
- 4.13 IPBT Meeting Notes - December 6, 2011
- 4.14 IPBT Meeting Notes - February 7, 2012
- 4.15 IPBT Meeting Notes - February 14, 2012
- 4.16 IPBT Meeting Notes - June 26, 2012
- 4.17 IPBT Meeting Notes - November 1, 2011
- 4.18 IPBT Meeting Notes - November 8, 2011
- 4.19 IPBT Meeting Notes - November 15, 2011
- 4.20 IPBT Meeting Notes - October 11, 2011
- 4.21 IPBT Meeting Notes - October 18, 2011
- 4.22 SSPBT Meeting Notes - April 25, 2012
- 4.23 SSPBT Meeting Notes - February 1, 2012
- 4.24 SSPBT Meeting Notes - February 29, 2012
- 4.25 SSPBT Meeting Notes - June 20, 2012
- 4.26 SSPBT Meeting Notes - May 9, 2012
- 4.27 SSPBT Meeting Notes - May 16, 2012
- 4.28 FERPBT Meeting Notes - April 27, 2011
- 4.29 Measure C FFE Request Narrative 2011-14

Rubric Statement 5

- 5.1 Liaisons 2011-12
- 5.2 Sample Enhancement Implementation
- 5.3 Sample Department Chair Report on SLOAC Work
- 5.4 Screen Shots for Obtaining Department Chair & Liaison Reports
- 5.5 Division Deans Reports showing SLOAC Progress
- 5.6 Screen Shots for Obtaining Deans Reports

Rubric Statement 6

- 6.1 Summary of Mapping of PLOs to ICCs
- 6.2 Descriptions of Institutional Core Competencies
- 6.3 Mapping of PLOs to courses
- 6.4 2012 Convocation
- 6.5 Opening Days 2012-13 Survey

Rubric Statement 7

- 7.1 Course outline with SLO statements
- 7.2 Assignment evidencing students being informed of SLOs
- 7.3 Results Faculty SLO Survey Opening Days 2012-13
- 7.4 De Anza College Catalog
- 7.5 Mission Statement and ILO poster

Self-Assessment

- SA.1 TracDat Instructional Users Manual
- SA.2 TracDat Deans Manuals
- SA.3 TracDat Department Coordinators Manual
- SA.4 Opening Days 2012-13 Survey
- SA.5 Critical Thinking Task Force Minutes – June 27, 2012

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC)
10 Commercial Blvd., Suite 204, Novato, CA 94949
Telephone: 415-506-0234 ♦ FAX: 415-506-0238 ♦ E-mail: accjc@accjc.org