Chaffey Accreditation is Reaffirmed; however, ACCJC still has “Concern” about overall progress on Student Learning Outcomes

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting June 9-11, 2010, took action to reaffirm accreditation, with a requirement that the College complete a Follow-Up Report.

The Commission requires that the Follow-Up Report be submitted by March 15, 2011. The Follow-Up Report should demonstrate the institution's resolution of the recommendations as noted below:

- **Recommendation 3**: Program Elimination (Standard IIA.6.a)
- **Recommendation 4**: Code of Ethics (Standard IIIA. 1. d, IVB.1.h)
- **Recommendation 5**: Evaluation of Board Policies (Standard IVB.1.e)

In addition to the above recommendations, ACCJC expressed concern about the college’s progress on the implementation of SLOs to meet the fall 2012 “proficiency level” deadline. The ACCJC accreditation letter sent to Dr. Shannon in July stated:

**Commission Concern**: With regard to the Commission's requirement that institutions meet standards and achieve the proficiency level by fall 2012, the College is required to develop comprehensive reports to clearly demonstrate the ongoing and systematic review of student learning outcomes and the use of data on student achievement of expected learning outcomes to plan and implement improvements to courses, programs, and services. Evidence of this should be included in the upcoming Midterm Report. (Standards LB.1, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, ILB.4, and II.C.2)

According to ACCJC, a college is a the “proficiency level” for SLOs when outcomes and assessment are in place for all courses, programs and degrees, assessment results are in alignment with institution-wide practices, decision-making includes discussion of assessment results, comprehensive assessment reports are completed on a regular basis and students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and assessment results are being used for improving institutional effectiveness.
Outcomes and Assessment School Facilitators Appointed

To assist with the implantation of Student Learning Outcomes at Chaffey, the college has appointment six new Outcomes and Assessment School Facilitators. These six volunteer School Facilitators with work with the Student Learning Outcome Coordinators to help address school specific SLO matters and to help the college make the final push to the 2012 SLO Proficiency Level deadline. The new Outcome and Assessment School Facilitators are:

- Bruce Osborn, Business and Applied Technology
- William Araiza, Instructional Support
- Misty Burruel, Visual, Performing and Communication Arts
- Annette Henry, Athletics and Physical Education
- Dave Karp, Business and Applied Technology
- Daniel Kern, Social and Behavioral Sciences

These new school facilitators will assist school programs in the development of SLOs at program and course level, assist programs to complete the Curricunet Learning Outcomes page, serve as a liaison with school deans and coordinators to keep them informed of important outcomes and assessment-related issues, assist school programs with the preparation of the SLO portion of program review and other SLO monitoring reports, assist with training session including Flex SLO presentations and SLO training sessions at the Faculty Success Center and assist programs with maintaining a body of evidence regarding SLO activity within their department/program such as the SLO binders, material on Curricunet, material on PSR, and material on ePortfolio.

The solution: We as faculty must own the assessment process at the department level, collect only those data that matter to us as teachers, and use the data for our own purposes to improve student learning.

How to Get the Assessment Monkey Off Your Back: A Simple, Basic Plan for Outcomes Assessment in Your Department

John C. Bean, Consulting Professor of Writing and Assessment

The following article is an example of how one college addressed the issue of outcomes assessment. We have included it as an illustration not as a blueprint for outcomes assessment at Chaffey College.

This document is aimed at departments suffering from Assessment Hostility Disorder (AHD) often characterized by FOF (fear of filing) or FWT (fear of wasted time)—in this case, wasted time collecting pointless data that might bite us in the posterior if misused. The solution: We as faculty must own the assessment process at the department level, collect only those data that matter to us as teachers, and use the data for our own purposes to improve student learning. When assessment is owned by faculty, it can be a powerful strategy for improving the learning environment we create for students. In fact, it may be one of our best strategies for maintaining the centrality of teaching and learning at Seattle University. The purpose of assessment is threefold:
How to Get the Assessment Monkey Off Your Back cont. from page 2

- To help faculty make improvements in curriculum, assignments, or teaching methods to improve student learning or performance
- To help faculty assess the disciplinary and Core competencies of graduating seniors
- To provide diagnostic information about individual students for more effective advising, placement, or supplemental instruction

The rest of this document provides a template for a simple, basic approach to assessment that any undergraduate department can use to improve its major.

The Prerequisites Before initiating this basic plan, your department must do the following:
1. Develop learning outcomes for your major.
2. Agree to devote one meeting per year (two hours) to an evidence-based discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of your graduating seniors.
3. Appoint an assessment coordinator to run the meeting and write a one-page report.
4. Agree to experiment with changes in teaching methods, emphases, assignment design, or curriculum to address weaknesses identified in 2. above.

The Basic Plan This basic plan uses two assessment measures, one direct and one indirect:
- **Direct measure:** Teacher observation of the performance of seniors on course-embedded assignments.
- **Indirect measure:** Data on your majors’ responses to the Seattle University Survey of Student Engagement Questionnaire1 or to a departmentally designed questionnaire focused on learning in the major.

The Procedures for Implementing the Plan on a Two-Year Cycle

- **Year One:**
  1. Department selects one or two learning outcomes to be assessed.
  2. Teachers of upper division courses identify course-embedded assignments that assess the selected outcomes.
  3. Throughout the year teachers track the performance of seniors on these assignments and note characteristic patterns of strengths or weaknesses.
  4. At the department’s annual assessment meeting, teachers report on the patterns they have observed. At the same meeting, teachers analyze departmental data provided by your department’s chosen questionnaire.
  5. Teachers identify characteristic problem areas in senior performance and brainstorm possible changes that might be made in curriculum, assignment design, emphases, or teaching methods to address these problems.
  6. Assessment coordinator writes a one-page report for departmental records.

- **Year Two:**
  1. Faculty try to implement the changes identified in Step 5 above. Such changes could involve a variety of individual experiments (for example, developing methods to improve critical reading or placing more emphasis on library research) or a whole department experiment (piloting a new course to address a gap in the curriculum or developing a new unit in an existing course).
  2. At the department’s annual assessment meeting, faculty report on their experiments for boosting student performance. Individual instructors provide observational data—again based on course embedded assignments—about how well the experiments worked.
  3. Assessment coordinator writes a one-page report for departmental records.

- **Years Three and Four:**
  1. Repeat the process on new student learning outcomes.
  2. At time of program review the department’s one-page reports on each year’s assessment activities become evidence that (1) the department has an assessment plan; (2) that it monitors the disciplinary competence of graduating seniors; and (3) that it uses assessment results to improve instruction.

Basic Plan Upgrades If your department discovers that this process initiates valuable discussions of teaching and learning and identifies ways to improve curricula or instruction, the efficiency and power of the process can be increased through upgrades such as the following:
- Creating scoring rubrics for assignments. These allow for much more precise observation of student work and lead to improved analysis of students’ strengths and weaknesses.
SLOs Links of the Month

- Cleveland State University Office of Student Learning Assessment
  - http://www.csuohio.edu/offices/assessment/
- Cal State University Fresno Learning Assessment Methods

SLO Down Contact Information

Marie Boyd, SLO Co-Coordinator
Phone: 909.652.6968
E-mail: marie.boyd@chaffey.edu

Tom Vitzelio, SLO Co-Coordinator
Phone: 909.652.8152
E-mail: tom.vitzelio@chaffey.edu

Interested in assisting with the S.L.O. Down? Contact either Marie Boyd or Tom Vitzelio.
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