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: October 15, 2012

Institution's Name: Los Medanos College

Name and Title of Individual Completing Report: Kiran Kamath, Interim Senior Dean of Instruction and Accreditation Liaison Officer

Telephone Number and E-mail Address: (925) 439-2181 x 3285; kkamath@losmedanos.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: Signature: Signature Page Separate
Bob Kratochvil   (e-signature permitted)

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 catalogue, offered on the schedule in some rotation): 543
   b. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 543
      Percentage of total: 100%
   c. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 365. Percentage of total: 67%

2. Programs
   a. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college): 33
   b. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 33
      Percentage of total: 100%
   c. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 33
      Percentage of total: 100%

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): 13
   b. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 12
      Percentage of total: 92%
   c. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 12; Percentage of total: 92%

4. Institutional Learning Outcomes
   a. Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined: 5
   b. Number of institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment: 4

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Student learning outcomes are in place for all "active" courses (1.1a-c) and programs (1.2, 1.3), including certificates and degrees. Institutional level outcomes, represented by General Education outcomes (1.4), are in place. Almost every student support service has established student learning outcomes (1.5a-d). Course-level outcomes are aligned with program and/or institutional (GE) student learning outcomes (1.2-1.4). Student services outcomes are aligned with the mission of the institution and the student population served.

"Active" courses (1.1a) are those that are updated within five years and are currently scheduled. "Programs" in the context of assessment are defined and documented in the position paper (1.6).

Authentic assessments developed by either faculty, staff or managers to measure knowledge, skills, abilities or behaviors, are in place in instruction - institutional, program (1.7), and course levels (1.1a) - and in student services (1.5a-d). Assessment results (1.8a, 1.8b) are documented on the college's Public drive (5.2) and are reported in the annual program review (1.9). The assessment model (1.6) was revised during the 2011-12 academic year after college wide dialogue (1.10) to systematize assessment at all levels and to document the close integration of assessment, program review, planning, and resource allocation (1.11a-f, 1.14a, 1.14b).

In the revised faculty contract (1.12), department chairs play a central role in leading instructional assessment. Competencies and SLOs are determined by faculty in consultation with advisory boards (1.13a-c) and transfer institutions (1.13d, 1.13e). Program-level SLOs are reviewed annually during the annual program review update, and course-level SLOs are reviewed when the course is assessed and when course outlines of record are updated.

Assessment is on-going in every program and is reported through the annual program review cycle. The results are used to inform curriculum and pedagogy modifications, for program improvement, and to support budget requests (1.14a, 1.14b).

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

Assessment processes and outcomes are discussed regularly at department meetings (2.1a-c), meetings of committees - Teaching and Learning (TLC) (2.2a-d), General Education (2.3), CTE (2.4a, 2.4b), Department Chair meetings (2.5a-f), Student Services (2.6a-c); College Assemblies (2.7a, 2.7b), Flex (2.8a-d), and advisory boards (1.13a-c). Results of assessments, gaps and changes are discussed on Assessment Day during Flex (2.9a, 2.9b) and in campus newsletters (2.10a, 2.10b). Results are

included in the annual program review, which support resource allocation requests (1.11a-e, 1.14a, 1.14b).

Data on persistence, retention and completion are provided to programs with the annual program review for department discussion. Beginning 2011, program reviews are reviewed for feedback by teams of faculty, staff and an administrator (2.11).

LMC has revised course content, modified programs and adopted initiatives based on assessment results and institutional dialogue. As a result of CSLO assessments in ESL writing courses and the complementary reading and vocabulary courses, and the dialogue that ensued, ESL faculty have restructured the content, levels, and sequence of intermediate and advanced ESL courses to provide better supports to enable students to build complementary skills and knowledge (1.8a). Similarly, LMC initiated the Transfer Academy Institute to provide academic and student support services to increase completions and transfer after extensive college-wide dialogue about the need to improve completions of students, particularly of traditionally underserved students. An important principle of the Academy is continuous assessment and improvement, while shifting the college towards a college-wide focus on first-year experience opportunities for all incoming students (2.12).

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

The college's newly revised model (1.6) of assessment (passed by both the Academic Senate and the Shared Governance Council in spring 2012) was created after a year and a half of college wide dialogue (1.10) and an extensive Faculty Assessment Survey (3.1, 3.2). The survey was completed by 168 faculty (87 percent of full-timers and 25 percent of adjuncts), which included 821 comments. The revised model, beginning in fall 2012, establishes a five-year cycle of assessment coinciding with the state-mandated course outline revision timeline, and integrates course and program-level assessments with course outline revision, program review, planning and requests for resources. Dialogue begins at the department level (2.1a-c) with analysis of CSLO and PSLO assessment results, also posted on the college's Public drive (5.2) for transparency. The assessment results (1.8a) are included in the annual program review (1.9). An expanded Planning Committee reviews the program review and provides feedback to close the loop (2.11).

When a need for improvement is identified, departments integrate curricular or pedagogical changes through the course outline revision process, and may revise program SLOs as part of the program review process. When improvements call for support in terms of professional development and/or resource allocation, assessment results are used as supporting evidence in making those requests. The

President's Cabinet, Shared Governance Council (1.11d) and CTE Committees (3.3) review and rate resource allocation requests tied to program review.

To expand the dialogue, programs have been showcasing CSLO/PSLO assessment processes, results and improvements made at Department Chair, CTE, and GE meetings, College Assemblies (3.4, 3.5) and Assessment Day during Flex (2.9a, 2.9b).

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

The College has allocated human and fiscal resources (1.6) to meet the SLO assessment needs of the institution, including investing in leadership and college wide learning. At two All-College Assessment Days (2.9a, 2.9b) last year, some faculty presented assessment reports and others received individual coaching. Formal and informal trainings (4.1) conducted by the CSLO/PSLO Assessment Coordinator (on reassigned time) have been conducted for staff, faculty, and management since fall 2010.

The Teaching and Learning Project (TLP) was created as a college wide assessment committee in 2004. With the passage of the Position Paper (1.6), TLP was re-formed into the Teaching and Learning Committee (TLC), an 18-member group representing all college constituencies. Reassigned time is provided to the TLC chair (25%), the CSLO/PSLO Assessment Coordinator (25%) and the General Education Assessment Coordinator (25%). The Committee has an annual operating budget of $41,000.

The college pays for assessment conducted by adjunct faculty (4.2a-c) if pre-approved. Professional development opportunities include participation in conferences such as Student Success and 3CSN, and inviting Power Award winners to the college Assessment Day.

The faculty contract (1.12) identifies coordination of assessment for courses and programs as one of the responsibilities of department chairs for which they receive reassigned time.

Assessment has been integrated into Program Review and Planning (1.11a, 1.11b) and the college Resource Allocation Process (RAP) (1.11c-f).   SLO assessment documents are included within the electronic Program Review site (1.9). RAP is based on documentation of program needs and assessment results in the program reviews. The TLC operating budget was an outcome of this Program Review/Planning/RAP process. Grant funds such as Perkins (3.3) have also supported program and course level assessment and professional development.

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

The college planned to assess courses on a 3-year cycle between 2010 and 2013 (5.1). Course-level assessment reports were being completed every semester and were being submitted electronically to the College's Public drive (5.2). The CSLO Assessment Coordinator has been keeping track of these submissions. Reports (5.3a, 5.3b) indicate which SLOs are being assessed, the assessment tool(s) used, definitions and levels of proficiency and any identified improvements or changes to be implemented to the course curriculum or pedagogy. Templates for course-level assessment (5.4) have been developed and are updated regularly by the TLC.

Program-level assessment is integrated into the Program Review process. Programs submit their assessment results (5.5a, 5.5b) electronically into the submission tool developed by the college Programmer with the Annual Program Review Update (1.9). Program Review templates for instructional programs, student services, and administrative units (1.11a, 1.11b) are developed and updated annually by the Planning Committee.

As part of the revised assessment model (1.6) beginning implementation in fall 2012, all courses will now be assessed and updated at least once every five years. Twenty five per cent of courses will be assessed in each of the first four years starting with this new cycle in 2012-13. This will also enable the college to make sure no course outline of record is more than 5 years old. Program-level assessment will be completed during the fifth year of the cycle and the results will be included in the Comprehensive Program Review.

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

Course-level SLOs are included in the official course outline of record for every course (1.2-1.4) in the college and the alignment with program-level SLOs is documented in every course outline of record (1.2-1.4).

The course-level SLOs in courses that satisfy General Education requirements are aligned with both the program (major) and institutional level (General Education) outcomes (1.4). This is also documented in every course outline of record. The Curriculum Committee reviews this alignment during the course approval process for all new and revised course outlines of record.

The mapping of the course-level SLOs to program and/or institutional-level SLOs is assessed during the program-level assessment process (6.1) and is documented in Program Review.

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 catalogue.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 7: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

The college provides clear and accurate information about educational courses, programs and transfer policies in the college catalogue – in print and online. The Articulation Officer articulates courses with the CSUs (1.13e) and the UCOP (1.13d). The student learning outcomes for institutional (GE) and each program are published in the catalogue (7.1).

Every official approved course outline of record clearly aligns SLOs with institutional (GE) and/or program-level SLOs (1.2-1.4). In every class section, students receive a copy of the course syllabus (7.2a-c) at the first class meeting that is consistent with the officially approved course outline of record. The course syllabus clearly states the student learning outcomes for the course. Students are made aware of the learning outcomes for the course by the professor at the first class meeting and are assessed on the basis of these learning objectives. Copies of the course syllabus are submitted to the Office of Instruction at the start of each semester. A syllabus model (7.3) has been developed and is updated regularly by the Office of Instruction. It is posted on the Office of Instruction website and faculty are reminded by email and at Department Chair meetings every semester to include ideas from the model in preparing their syllabi the following semester.

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

The college continues to assess, reassess, and improve all of its processes to improve alignment of its processes and systematize the cycle of assessment, improvement, planning, and resource allocation. In 2010-2011, the college benefited from a BRIC (Bridging Research, Information and Culture) grant (2.2b) resulting in the college revising its assessment model (1.6) to align and streamline the cycles of various institutional processes. After a year-long faculty-driven process which included widespread dialogue (1.10), a detailed faculty survey on assessment (3.1, 3.2), and additional input from department chairs and committees, the revised model was adopted by the Academic Senate and the Shared Governance Council. Implementation has begun in fall 2012. This model clearly documents alignment and an ongoing cycle of course-level and program-level assessment, program improvements, program review, planning, and resource allocation. It has received widespread institutional support.

The college has contracted with CurricUNET. Once this curriculum management system is implemented, the process of developing and updating course outlines, which align to program-level and institutional level SLOs, will become more streamlined.

The college is redesigning and simplifying its Program Review submission tool in fall 2012. The district-centralized Research Office is providing annual program data through the web-based SQL tool for program review.

After district wide dialog and review of available options, the district has just selected and contracted with the online course management system, Desire2Learn, due to its strong assessment tool.

Professional development for each of these computerized processes is offered during 'roll out' and subsequently.

Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE) has just been conducted in fall, 2012 (8.1).

The college is clearly at the level of Proficiency for Student Learning Outcomes, and is moving towards Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement in some areas.

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

TABLE OF EVIDENCE (NO WORD COUNT LIMIT)

1.1a	List of active courses in the College
1.1b	SLO Assessment Gauge
1.1c	LMC Accreditation Follow-Up Report, 2009
1.2	Course-level SLO example – Course Outline of Record for English 100
1.3	Course-level and Program-level SLOs and alignment example – Course Outline of Record for Child Development 10
1.4	General Education, Program Level and Institutional-level SLOs and alignment example – Course Outline of Record for Biology 10
1.5a	List of Student Services Units with SLOs
1.5b	Student Services SLO Planning example – Counseling
1.5c	Student Services SLO Report example – Counseling
1.5d	Student Services SLO Planning example - EOPS
1.6	Position paper 11/12-1 "Student Learning Outcomes: A New Model of Assessment"
1.7	List of programs with SLOs and assessments
1.8a	Instructional Program Assessment Report example - ESL
1.8b	Student Services Assessment Report example - DSPS
1.9	Program Review online submission tool screen shot – Biology
1.10	Summary of College wide dialogue on newly revised assessment model
1.11a	Comprehensive Program Review Template for Instructional Programs
1.11b	Comprehensive Program Review Template for Student Services
1.11c	Program Improvement and Development Form to request resources (RAP-Resource Allocation Process)
1.11d	Program Improvement and Development Rating Form
1.11e	Program Review Assessment Rubric
1.11f	Print screen of submission tool for Program Review, Assessment and Resource Allocation Requests
1.12	United Faculty Contract (2008-2011)
1.13a	Advisory Board Minutes – Travel Marketing Department
1.13b	Advisory Board Minutes – Welding Program
1.13c	Advisory Board Minutes – Computer Science Department
1.13d	2012 GE Decisions Report (from CSU)
1.13e	Email from UC re TCA 2012-13
1.14a	President's Response to Shared Governance Committee at the conclusion of the Resource Allocation Process (RAP) – spring 2010
1.14b	President's memo to the College at the conclusion of the Resource Allocation Process (RAP) – spring 2011
2.1a	Minutes of department meetings – English
2.1b	Minutes of department meetings – English
2.1c	Minutes of department discussion about English 100 assessment
2.2a	Teaching and Learning Project (TLP) Minutes (college's assessment committee)
2.2b	BRIC Retreat for Teaching and Learning Project (TLP) Notes
2.2c	Teaching and Learning Project report to College Shared Governance Committee

	(spring 2011)
2.2d	Teaching and Learning Project Report to College Shared Governance Committee (spring 2012)
2.3	General Education Committee meeting Minutes
2.4a	Career and Technical Education (CTE) Committee meeting Minutes 3-23-10
2.4b	Career and Technical Education (CTE) Committee meeting Minutes 2-22-11
2.5a	Department Chairs meeting Agenda – October 4, 2011
2.5b	Department Chairs meeting Minutes - October 4, 2011
2.5c	Department Chairs meeting Agenda – April 10, 2012
2.5d	Department Chairs meeting Minutes – April 10, 2012
2.5e	Department Chairs meeting Agenda – September 4, 2012
2.5f	Department Chairs meeting Minutes – September 4, 2012
2.6a	Student Services SLO Committee meeting Minutes 04-12-12
2.6b	Student Services SLO Committee meeting Minutes 03-12-09
2.6c	Student Services SLO Committee meeting Minutes 09-16-10
2.7a	College Assembly meeting Notes - fall 2010
2.7b	College Assembly meeting Notes - spring 2011
2.8a	List of Flex workshops - fall 2010
2.8b	List of Flex workshops - fall 2011
2.8c	List of Flex workshops - fall 2012
2.8d	List of Flex workshops - spring 2012
2.9a	Assessment Day Agenda – Flex fall 2011
2.9b	Assessment Day Agenda – Flex spring 2012
2.10a	Student Services SLO Newsletter – spring 2011
2.10b	Student Services SLO Newsletter – spring 2012
2.11	Program Review Feedback – Child Development program spring 2012
2.12	Transfer Academy Summer Institute 2012 – Notes
3.1	Results of faculty survey on assessment - spring 2011
3.2	Comments included in faculty survey on assessment - spring 2011
3.3	Rating form to rate Perkins proposals completed after assessment and program review
3.4	College Assembly Report on assessment - fall 2011
3.5	College Assembly Report on assessment – spring 2012
4.1	Flyer for Camp Course Outline of Record Workshops to develop SLOs
5.1	Three year assessment plan for courses (2010-2013) – Example for Child Development program
5.2	Screen shot of assessment reports on the College Public Drive
5.3a	Course-level Assessment Improvement Plan – Example for ESL
5.3b	Course-level Assessment Improvement Plan – Example for ESL
5.4	Course-level Assessment Report and Improvement Plan Template
5.5a	Program-level Assessment Report Form (template)
5.5b	Program-level Assessment Report – Example from Chemistry

6.1	Transfer Math PSLO report showing course assessment aligned with program assessment
7.1	LMC Catalogue Program pages listing Program SLOs
7.2a	Course syllabus listing SLOs officially approved in the official course outline of record – English 100
7.2b	Course syllabus listing SLOs officially approved in the official course outline of record – Child Development 10
7.2c	Course syllabus listing SLOs officially approved in the official course outline of record – Biology 10
7.4	Model syllabus memo from the Office of Instruction to department chairs
8.1	Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE)

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