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: March 11, 2013
Institution’s Name: Hartnell Community College District
Name and Title of Individual Completing Report: Cheryl O’Donnell, SLO Coordinator and Stephanie Low, Interim VP of Academic Affairs
Telephone Number and E-mail Address: 831 755-6740, codonnell@hartnell.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: Dr. Willard Lewallen Signature: //Dr. Willard Lewallen (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 catalog, offered on the schedule in some rotation): 802 *
   b. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 703  
      Percentage of total: 88%
   c. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 362  
      Percentage of total: 57%

* Active courses for assessment reporting purposes are defined as those in the college catalog that have been offered in the last 3 years. This definition was created by the Student Learning Outcome committee and approved by the Academic Senate in November 2012. (1.a)

2. **Programs**
   a. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college): 67
   b. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 67  
      Percentage of total: 100%
   c. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 12  
      Percentage of total: 18%

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): 30
   b. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 21;  
      Percentage of total: 70%
   c. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 15; Percentage of total: 50%
4. Institutional Learning Outcomes
   a. Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined: 6
   b. Number of institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment: 5

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

At Hartnell College, student learning outcomes and assessment have been integrated into curriculum, assessment and planning processes. For instructional areas, student learning outcomes are defined at the course, program and institutional level and are being assessed at varying percentages for each level. In 2008, the Academic Senate, based on the recommendation of the SLOA committee, approved of a course embedded method of assessment. (1.b) This method incorporates the use of actual student work required in class, thus minimizing additional work for faculty and students.

Courses moving through the curriculum process are required to have defined SLOs. Course outcomes are aligned with corresponding program and institutional outcomes (core competencies). Once entered into CurricUNET, the course SLOs appear on the course outline cover sheet. (1.c) Since its last accreditation visit, the college adopted an annual planning process with a 5th year comprehensive review in academic disciplines and a 2nd year review in career technical education. (1.d) Outcome assessment and data are addressed in annual planning documents and the comprehensive document. (1.e, 1.f) The use of data is addressed on the resource request form. (1.g)

In addition to instructional areas, outcomes are defined in support areas, such as Student Affairs, IT and Library. In Student Affairs, nine of thirteen departments have defined outcomes with 75% on-going assessment. All six Library areas have outcomes defined with on-going assessment of 100%. Information Technology areas have outcomes defined and are determining assessment methods; Administrative Services areas are currently defining outcomes and assessment methods.

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

Dialog about student learning outcomes and assessment has been prevalent at the College for many years and occurs in a variety of ways. College flex days have been excellent opportunities for discussions of SLO assessment and have been devoted to outcomes and assessment in a consistent manner since 2008. (2.a – 2.j) In addition, discussion of outcome assessment occurs at the division level and the departmental level for instructional disciplines. (2.k, 2.l, 2.x) Results are also discussed at
Committee meetings including the SLO Committee, PPA Committee, Title V research group, and the Academic Senate. (2.m) Discussion of assessment results also occur at non-instructional area meetings and are addressed in instructional and non-instructional planning documents. (2.n, 2.o, 2.w, 2.y)

Assessment data from two iterations of a core competency assessment were analyzed in 2009-2010 by the Title V research group, which includes faculty, staff, and managers who meet every week to discuss student success. (2.p) Questions prompted from the assessment data led to the development of online research tools that are now used as part of the instructional annual planning process. (2.q) This group received a P.O.W.E.R. (Promising Outcomes Work and Exemplary Research) award in 2011 for those tools and have since presented at conferences. (2.r, 2.s)

In addition, gaps were identified from two cycles of assessment of two core competencies and closing the loop measures were taken, which included a follow-up focus group meeting, a writing across the curriculum workshop, and the purchase of Turnitin.com. (2.t, 2.u, 2.v)

**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 followed the commitment it made to the ACCJC on its first follow-up visit in October 7, 2007 and implemented and completed a full-cycle of the Program Planning and Assessment (PPA) model. (3.a, 3.b) As the new PPA documents were developed, the questions addressing Student Learning Outcomes and assessment data were integrated into the templates. (3.c, 3.d) In the 2010–2012 academic years, all disciplines went through a comprehensive PPA review. (Step 3 of the model) (3.e) Upon completion of the plans, division meetings were held and resource requests were discussed and prioritized. (Step 4 of the model) A summary of these requests were forwarded to the PPA committee. The committee reviewed and summarized the resource requests into appropriate categories and forwarded those requests to the appropriate committees for review (Step 5 of the model). (3.f) Requests were then forwarded to the FIS committee and subsequently taken to the Resource Allocation Committee for final review. As a result, in the fall of 2012 resources totaling approximately $190,000 were allocated to various disciplines based on requests generated through the PPA process. (3.g)

At the September 2012 flex day attended by all employees of the College, a presentation was made about outcomes, assessment of those outcomes, the link to planning and the requirements of accreditation. After the presentation, all areas on campus broke into smaller groups to discuss assessment that is taking place in their areas and the status of outcomes for their divisions. (3.h, 3.i)
Professor 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.

Professor Rubric Statement 4: Narrative Response

Resources are allocated by the College to support student learning and services based on assessment results. Program Planning templates address outcomes, data and resource needs. (4.a, 4.b) Some examples of resource allocations that have occurred based on assessment results include:

Instructional:

Assessment of the information competency and written communication core competencies identified a need for improvement in both areas. (4.c) Discussions occurred with the SLO committee and the Title V Research Group. A possible intervention that could address both competencies was proposed, which resulted in the purchase of TurnitIn.com. In the 2012-2013 year, the software is now being used in several disciplines. The hope is that the College will see improvement in student writing skills and information competency skills as a result of the use of this software.

Student Affairs:

As a result of the program review process and assessment data, the Student Affairs area brought forth the request for a Veterans Center. (4.d) This request included facilities, and staffing requests as well as some other resources. Through a series of meetings with the College President, the VP of Student Affairs and the Resource Allocation Committee, the new center opened in the Fall of 2012. (4.e)

Service Areas:

In 2010-2011, an external review was conducted addressing the College’s IT department. (4.f) Based on the assessment results from that review, new initiatives and activities were launched that required resources. These are reflected in the new IT Technology plan. (4.g) Through assessment, planning and resource allocation, the College subsequently created a new VP of Information Technology position that was filled in September 2011. (4.h)
**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**

Initially, course level SLOs were calendared by faculty on a semester-by-semester basis beginning with two courses per semester. As the College moved to integrate outcome assessment data with program planning, course level and program level outcomes scheduling was incorporated into the Instructional Program Planning and Assessment Action Plan document. (5.a) It is through this document that faculty indicate which course and program SLOs will be assessed in the upcoming academic year. After course level outcomes are assessed, course level assessment summary reports are completed by faculty. The forms include information such as the outcome assessed, the assessment tool used, dialog/discussion information, analysis of data and action plans based on assessment results. (5.b) Once completed, these forms are stored on a campus network drive. (5.c)

The implementation of the process for assessing program outcomes began in 2011. Information was presented at division meetings and faculty received documentation that outlined the process. (5.d, 5.e) Program outcome assessment forms indicate the various course level SLOs that map to the higher level program outcome, the data used for assessment at the course level, results of discussion and analysis of data, and improvements to learning that were made. (5.f) After data have been gathered at the course level, discipline members collectively review the data to assess the higher level outcome. The program outcome assessment forms are also stored on a campus network drive.

**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**

When faculty first began working with learning outcomes, each discipline went through a mapping exercise at a flex day in January 2008 when they mapped each of their courses to the appropriate College Core Competencies. (6.a, 6.b) After program level outcomes were defined, faculty repeated this process as well at two flex days in October 2010 and January 2011. (6.c, 6.d, 6.e, 6.f, 6.g)
The College continues to address the alignment of course to program to institutional outcomes within the curriculum process. As faculty enter their course outlines into the curriculum management system, course level outcomes are aligned with both program level outcomes and the College’s core competencies (institutional outcomes). (6.h)

In addition to the curriculum process, course level outcomes are mapped to the appropriate program level outcome(s) and are reported on the Program Outcome Assessment Summary Report. (6.i)

**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**

Student Learning Outcomes are presented and made available to students for all levels of outcomes in a variety of formats. Core Competencies (Institutional outcomes) and Program Outcomes for degrees and certificates have been published every year in the college catalog since 2009-2010. The Core Competencies appear in a separate section of the catalog, and program outcomes appear on the pages of the catalog that present degrees and certificates. (7.a., 7.b., 7.c) The catalog is available to students both online and hard copy. (7.d, 7.e) In addition, the Core Competencies are listed on the College’s website on the SLO page and program level outcomes will be listed on a new web page for the Office of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness. (7.f)

Course level outcomes are presented to students on the course syllabi. (7.g, 7.h, 7.i, 7j, 7k, 7.l) At flex day in January 2012, a workshop was presented on Best Practices for Your Course Syllabus. (7.m) The inclusion of learning outcomes on the syllabus was presented as a requirement of accreditation, and a rubric was distributed for syllabus design that includes criteria for the inclusion of student learning outcomes. (7.n)
# Self-Assessment on Level of Implementation: Narrative Response

The implementation of student learning outcomes to assess instruction at Hartnell College has continued since 2007 – 2008 and meets the proficiency level of the rubric. Course, program and institutional outcomes (core competencies) are defined and are being assessed at various levels as referenced in Response 1.

While all three levels of outcomes have been defined and have assessment occurring, there is still work to be done. The following activities address some of this work:

- By the end of the 2012 – 2013 academic year, 100% of courses will have defined outcomes.
- Workshops addressing program level outcome assessment at the main campus and Alisal campus will be conducted this semester.
- Streamlining of our core competency assessments by the SLO committee is underway. The goal is to have all six core competencies assessed by the end of the 2013 – 2014 year.

The implementation of outcomes to assess non-instructional programs at the college is at various stages of the rubric for SLO implementation. Student Affairs and Library Services areas have outcomes defined with ongoing assessment and are at the proficiency level. The Administrative areas and Information Technology areas are in the process of defining their outcomes and determining methods of assessment and are at the development level of the rubric. Both of these areas have indicated that by the completion of the spring 2013 semester, outcomes will be defined as well as the assessment methods for those outcomes.

The templates for program planning for both instructional and non-instructional areas address student learning outcomes and data from assessments. The use of this assessment data to support resource requests is also included in the planning process.

In order to better track assessment of outcomes and have data more accessible to administrators, faculty and staff, the college is researching various technology solutions, such as Elumen and Tracdat.
TABLE OF EVIDENCE: LIST THE EVIDENCE USED TO SUPPORT YOUR NARRATIVE REPORT, SECTION BY SECTION.

### TABLE OF EVIDENCE (NO WORD COUNT LIMIT)

#### Evidence for Response 1:

- Resolution to define active courses for assessment and associated documentation (1.a)
- SLO Assessment Philosophy Statement and Plan (1.b)
- Examples from CurricUNET . . . course outline cover sheet and screen shots (1.c)
- March 2008 Progress Report, pg. 19 (1.d)
- Copies of the prompts from annual and comprehensive PPA reports (1.e, 1.f)
- Resource request section in annual planning document (1.g)

#### Evidence for Response 2:

- Flex Day Agendas (2.a – 2.j)
- Agendas from area meetings (2.k, 2.l)
- Minutes from meetings (SLO committee) (2.m)
- Instructional and non-instructional Annual Planning templates (2.n, 2.o)
- PowerPoint from flex days for written communication scoring (2.p)
- Screen shot of Title V research tools (2.q)
- Power Award notification & web link (2.r, 2.s)
- Examples of Closing the Loop activities(2.t, 2.u, 2.v)
- Email and Minutes from Library Programs & Services Meeting (2.w)
- Agenda from department meeting (2.x)
- Non-instructional program planning template (Student Affairs) (2.y)

#### Evidence for Response 3:

- PPA flow chart (3.a)
- Copy of Progress Report 1 (3.b)
- Annual Planning Template samples (3.c, 3.d)
- List of Yr. 4 & Yr. 5 discipline breakdown as well as the timelines (3.e)
- Summary of Resource Requests (3.f)
- Program Review Funding Allocations document (3.g)
- September 2012 Flex Day agenda (3.h)
- PPT presentation for September 2012 Flex Day (3.i)

#### Evidence for Response 4:

- Annual Planning templates (4a, 4b)
- Instructional — Assessment results from 2009 and 2010 (4.c)
- PEER review for Vets Center (4.d)
- Vets Center Opening Flyer (4.e)
- IT external review document from 2010 (4f)
- IT 2011 – 2021 Technology Plan (4g)
Hiring announcement for VP of Information Technology (4h)

**Evidence for Response 5:**

- Instructional PPA action plan (5.a)
- Course Assessment Summary Form (5.b)
- Screen shot of r: drive folder (5.c)
- Handouts for faculty with timelines depicting the outcome assessment reporting process (5.d, 5.e)
- Program Outcome Assessment Summary Form (5.f)

**Evidence for Response 6:**

- January 2008 Flex day agenda (6.a)
- Results of core competency mapping from exercise completed at January 2008 flex day (6.b)
- Agendas for Flex days, October 2010 and January 2011 (6.c, 6.d)
- Program mapping form used at flex days in October 2010 and January 2011 (6.e)
- Samples of completed program mapping forms (6.f, 6.g)
- Screen shot of CurricuNet SLO entry process (6.h)
- Program outcome assessment summary form (6.i)

**Evidence for Response 7:**

- Core Competencies (Institutional Outcomes) page in catalog (7.a)
- Sample pages of degree listings with program outcomes (7.b, 7.c)
- College catalog page on website (7.d)
- Downloaded catalog file (7.e)
- SLO web page where core competencies are presented (7.f)
- Samples of course syllabi from each division on campus (7.g, 7.h, 7.i, 7.j, 7.k, 7.l)
- Flex Day Agenda, January 2012 (7.m)
- Rubric for syllabus design (7.n)