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: February 27, 2013

Institution's Name: Los Angeles Pierce College

Name and Title of Individual Completing Report: Mia Wood, Faculty Accreditation Coordinator

Telephone Number and E-mail Address: 818-710-2200; woodmc@piercecollege.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: Kathleen Burke-Kelly   Signature:_____

                                                                          (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): 806 (Offered Fall 2011-2012)
   b. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 806
      Percentage of total: 100
   c. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 779 Percentage of total: 97% The remaining 3% of courses, 27, without ongoing assessment are courses which are approved by the college but have not been offered in the last 6 semesters. When these courses are scheduled they will be assessed in the term offered.

2. Programs
   a. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college):
   b. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 96;
      Percentage of total: 100
   c. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 96;
      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): 24
   b. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 24;
      Percentage of total: 100%
   c. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 24; Percentage of total: 100

4. Institutional Learning Outcomes
   a. Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined: 6
   b. Number of institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment: 6 (100%)

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Los Angeles Pierce College's faculty and administration engage in institution-wide dialogue on student learning. There is ongoing discussion about the development, assessment, reporting of, and planning improvements for courses, programs, and degrees. Courses are aligned with program and institutional outcomes in order to facilitate dialogue about assessment results and improvement plans.

The *Pierce College Catalog* contains program learning outcomes for all degree and certificate programs; course syllabi contain student learning outcomes (*Pierce College Catalog 2012-2014*: 1.1, Sample Course Syllabi: 1.2, College Outcomes Database Link: 1.3). Courses and programs are on identified assessment cycles, and assessment results are used in institution-wide improvement and resource allocation planning (Citations: Annual Plan Samples: 1.4, Resource Advisory Committee Prioritization List 2011-2012: 1.5).

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

Los Angeles Pierce College has engaged in dialogue about student learning outcomes for more than six years (Senate Minutes: 2.1, Salon Announcements: 2.2, PAD Flyers: 2.3 and PAD Reports: 2.4). This dialogue has occurred at the discipline, department, program, and institutional levels. At the institutional level, the Pierce College Academic Senate appointed faculty "coaches"* to assist colleagues with the development of course-level and program-level outcomes, assessment methods, and assessment results interpretations. In 2011, the administration supported the Outcomes Team's plan to develop an outcomes management program. To that end, an online database was created to provide a centralized reporting and report housing mechanism (Outcomes Database Link: 1.3). The database houses SLO and PLO reports, the latter of which includes the college's institutional outcomes reports (General Education Learning Outcomes [GELOs]) (GELOs: 2.5). This centralization has furthered cross-disciplinary outcomes discussions.

The college's twice-yearly Pierce Assessment Day (PAD), which began in the 2011-2012 academic year, provides faculty, staff, and administrators a venue for dialogue on a variety of outcomes issues, from interpretation of assessment results to implementing improvement plans and resource requests (PAD Flyers: 2.3 and PAD Reports: 2.4).

*The Outcomes Team consisted of coaches, outcomes coordinator, student worker, Web master, and college researcher.

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 structures its ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes through a variety of forums, most importantly, its committee/governance structure. As documented in the *Pierce College Planning and Decision-Making Handbook,* the Pierce College Council (PCC) and the Academic Senate are the overarching structures that facilitate dialogue (*Pierce College Planning and Decision-Making Handbook*: 3.1, College Governance Organization Chart: 3.2). These shared-governance bodies engage in ongoing dialogue and are the foundational structures for pursuing and implementing systems to improve student learning and institutional processes (Sample PCC Minutes: 3.3 and Sample Senate Minutes: 3.4).

Institutional processes throughout the College support an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continual improvement of student learning. Two areas—the Student Success Committee and the Achieving the Dream Initiative—have had a quantitative and qualitative impact on Pierce College (Pierce College Student Success Page: 3.5 and 2011-2012 AtD Report: 3.6).

The College Outcomes Committee (COC), a sub-committee of the Academic Senate's Educational Planning Committee, was chartered in Fall 2012 (College Outcomes Committee Charter: 3.7 and College Outcomes Committee Page: 3.8). Its main objectives include facilitating the improvement of student learning and completion rates and promoting the professionally-guided use of assessment results in institution-wide resource allocation decisions. Academic and service area annual plans include resource requests driven by SLO, PLO, and SAO assessment results (Annual Plan Samples: 1.4 and RAC Prioritization Sample: 1.5). Each annual plan forms the basis for two- and six-year program review cycles (Program Review Samples: 3.7).

In summer 2011, the College chose to revise institutional learning outcomes (Senate Minutes: 3.8). The result was the General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs: 2.5). All courses are mapped to one or more GELO, and course assessment reports are sampled in the GELO review process (Course-to-GELO Mapping Document: 3.9). Faculty from across the curriculum serve on six GELO review teams. The reviews culminate in one report for each of the six GELOs (i.e., six reports), which are housed in the outcomes database (Sample GELO Reports: 3.10). Beginning in Spring 2013, the College Outcomes Committee will review and revise the GELO evaluation process.

*The College Outcomes Committee charter calls for representatives from faculty, staff, and administrative areas.

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 within institutional planning and resource allocation.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 4: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Academic and service area annual plans include resource requests driven by SLO, PLO, and SAO assessment results (Annual Plan Samples: 1.4 and RAC Prioritization Sample: 1.5). Each annual plan forms the basis for two- and six-year program review cycles (Program Review Samples: 3.7).

The College process to allocate resources has evolved to be fully integrated with the annual planning processes. Previously, budgets were rolled over annually and special requests were brought to the Budget Committee (BC) for consideration and allocation (Pierce College President's First Monday Report Sample 09-05-12: 4.1, Pierce College President's First Monday Report Sample 11-05-12: 4.2). Recognizing this process did not integrate planning and resource allocation, the College has utilized Annual Plans from academic disciplines, Student Services, Administrative Services, and the President's Office as a vehicle to prioritize institutional resource requests.

The College's current resource allocation process ensures that plans are the primary method for securing resources. Recently, economic conditions have led to diminishing college resources. In response, Pierce College has reallocated existing resources to ensure college priorities are funded. In 2011-2012, the president prioritized in the annual planning process to dedicate $100,000 of the General Fund budget to fund institutional priorities. The president's priorities were reflected in budget development and the funds were utilized to fund institutional priorities. This demonstrates the commitment of the College to fund planning priorities received resources which would lead to institutional improvement (Citation: Pierce College Resource Advisement Committee [RAC] Prioritization List 2011-2012: 1.5).

More recently, in the 2012-2013 academic year, the College was able to identify funding to support institutional priorities. The College's RAC recommended priorities in the spring of 2012 and subsequently, all of the recommendations were funded when proposition 30 passed in the Fall of 2012 (PCC Minutes: 4.3 and RAC Minutes: 4.4).

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

Course and program-level student learning outcomes are established, assessed, and improvement plans are created by faculty. Through evaluation, department chairs, deans, and the College Outcomes Committee have the opportunity to reflect upon the alignment between outcomes and courses, and courses and programs, and adjust as needed (SLO Database Link: 1.5). Faculty regularly assess course and program outcomes according to outcomes assessment plans (Course Assessment Cycle Planning Matrix Form: 5.1 and Program Assessment Cycle Planning Matrix Form: 5.2.) Faculty are also responsible for developing the measurements and rubrics for courses and programs in their disciplines and departments. The resulting planning process is developed through outcomes data and professional judgment to support improvement in student learning (Sample SLO Rubric: 5.3).

Pierce College created a centralized, online reporting and report housing mechanism (Outcomes Database Link: 1.3). The database houses SLO and PLO reports, the latter of which includes the college's institutional outcomes reports (General Education Learning Outcomes [GELOs]: 2.5). This centralization has furthered cross-disciplinary outcomes discussions (Sample Course Reports: 5.4 and and Sample Program Outcomes Reports: 5.5).

Administrative Services and Student Services Service Area Outcomes (SAO) reports are maintained on the College Outcomes Committee Web page, and updated according to planned reporting cycles (College Outcomes Committee Link: 5.6 and Sample Assessment Cycle Plans: 5.7).

All reports may be revised as needed, and successive reports provide a longitudinal view of student learning developments at the course and programmatic levels.

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

All course outcomes are mapped to discipline-specific program outcomes and to General Education Learning Outcomes, which serve to unite and align the entire curriculum (PLO Mapping Samples: 6.1 and Course-to-GELO Mapping Document: 3.9).

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

Program information is published in both the print and web-based versions of the *College Catalog*, in department-prepared brochures, planning sheets, and on the Departments/Programs page, the Admissions and Records page, and the Transfer Center page on the Pierce College Web site (Citation: Media Arts Program Brochure Link and Horse Science Program Brochure.) Information in the catalog is reviewed annually by the department chairs, various committees, the Academic Senate, and academic administrators.

It is college policy that all faculty prepare and distribute a syllabus including student learning outcomes at the first class meeting (Citation: Student Success Syllabus Checklist). Department chairs verify course syllabi include student learning outcomes. College policy requires that all faculty, both full-time and adjunct, are to submit copies of their syllabi for all their classes to both department chairs and an online syllabi repository available through Moodle (Citation: Moodle Syllabus Repository Link). An element of the faculty basic and comprehensive evaluation processes is a review of the inclusion of SLOs in class syllabi (Citation: American Federation of Teachers Contract (AFT), Appendix C, p. 193).

Department chairs are responsible to ensure that faculty adhere to the course outline of record as measured by in-class observations conducted during faculty evaluations. Demonstrated awareness of goals and purposes of goals of courses is achieved in part through outcomes assessment implementation. It is also achieved through other elements of course syllabi, such as objectives, course summaries, and schedules of work to be completed.

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

Pierce College has made significant improvements in all aspects of achieving outcomes proficiency. The College is fully proficient and working toward sustainable quality improvement. All three areas of the college – academic, student support, and administrative services – have assessed their learning outcomes, analyzed their assessments, and made and implemented improvement plans.

The College developed and launched a centralized, online outcomes reporting and management system, and is now in a position to reflect on its strengths and weaknesses in order to plan for and implement improvements.

In addition, the College's Academic Senate has created an institution-wide College Outcomes Committee. This committee is charged with, among other things, integrating assessment results across

areas – academic, student support, and administrative services – and program review to improve institutional planning. The College Outcomes Committee is in the process of reviewing current practices with an eye toward improving quality at all phases. This improvement includes increased integration of outcomes results and action plans from the three areas is monitors: academic programs, administrative services, and student services.

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

TABLE OF EVIDENCE (NO WORD COUNT LIMIT)

Pierce College Catalog 2012-2014: 1.1
Sample Course Syllabi: 1.2
College Outcomes Database Link: 1.3
Annual Plan Samples: 1.4
Resource Advisory Committee Prioritization List 2011-2012: 1.5

Senate Minutes: 2.1
Salon Announcements: 2.2
PAD Flyers: 2.3
PAD Reports: 2.4
GELOs: 2.5

Pierce College Planning and Decision-Making Handbook: 3.1
College Governance Organization Chart: 3.2
Sample PCC Minutes: 3.3
Sample Senate Minutes: 3.4
Pierce College Student Success Page: 3.5
2011-2012 AtD Report: 3.6
College Outcomes Committee Charter: 3.7
Program Review Samples: 3.8
Senate Minutes: 3.9
Course-to-GELO Mapping Document: 3.10
Sample GELO Reports: 3.111

Pierce College President's First Monday Report Sample 09-05-12: 4.1
Pierce College President's First Monday Report Sample 11-05-12: 4.2
PCC Minutes: 4.3
RAC Minutes: 4.4

Course Assessment Cycle Planning Matrix Form: 5.1
Program Assessment Cycle Planning Matrix Form: 5.2
Sample SLO Rubric: 5.3
College Outcomes Committee Link: 5.6
Sample Assessment Cycle Plans: 5.7

PLO Mapping Samples: 6.1

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