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.

Date of Report: October, 2012

Name and Title of Individual Completing Report: Yolanda Bellisimo, SLO Facilitator and Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Council (SLOAC) Chair; Sara McKinnon, Academic Senate President and Co-Chair Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC); Becky Reetz SLO Facilitator for Student Services; Rebecca Kenny, Vice President of Student Learning and Co-Chair PRAC; Chalain Hsieh, Director of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE).

Telephone Number and E-mail Address: 415-457-8811 X7446; yolanda.bellisimo@marin.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: David Wain Coon, Ed.D. Superintendent/President

Signature: [Signature]
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Eligibility Requirement 10: Student Learning and Achievement Standards: I.A.1; IIA.1.a; IIA.1.c; IIA.2.a,b,e,f,g,h,i; IIA.3 [See IIA.3.a,b,c.]; IIA.6; IIB.4; IIC.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 I: 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): 1,184
   b. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 1,184
      Percentage of total: 100%
   c. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 1,184
      Percentage of total: 100% of courses offered

2. **Programs**
   a. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college): 95
   b. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 95;
      Percentage of total: 100%
   c. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 95;
      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): 17
   b. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 17;
      Percentage of total: 100%
   c. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 17; Percentage of total: 100%

4. **Institutional Learning Outcomes**
   a. Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined: 5
   b. Number of institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment: 5
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**Proficiency Rubric Statement 1: Narrative Response**

All degrees, certificates, GE courses not associated with a degree, and interdisciplinary liberal arts degrees have college-wide, measurable student learning outcomes. All credit and noncredit courses have measurable student learning outcomes as does the instructional area of the library. Student Services programs have division and program level SLOs. COM continually assesses measurable student learning outcomes for every instructional, library and student support program using a specific cycle for each program reported in the Assessment Plan and the Integrated Planning Manual.

The instructional programs’ rotation cycle is defined in the matrices. Each instructional program has its own matrix identifying its SLOs, the semester in which the specific SLO is assessed in specific courses, and the assessment tools. The current rotation cycle began in spring 2012 and will be completed spring 2013 for all SLOs identified in all the matrices. Henceforth, COM will use a three-year rotation cycle.

Following the schedule, faculty track student performance on one or more of the college-wide rubrics and report results using the PRIE tracking tool. Data, once entered by faculty, are submitted to PRIE, which then publishes the aggregate data on the college website and reports findings at Convocation or at Flex week seminars.

Every Student Service program and the service area of the library assess one program level SLO each year, which is aligned with the division level SLO chosen for that year. Assessment occurs every fall semester.

Programs are held accountable for their time line and assessments through the program review process.

**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**

Using assessment for improved student learning requires dialogue within and among disciplines and programs. It requires formal and informal means for studying outcomes, considering alternative strategies for improved performance, instituting innovation, testing the impact of interventions, and making adjustments as indicated by research findings. In order to encourage and support dialogue, COM provides research data to faculty and staff, and access to the SLO portion of all program reviews to read and consider. Committee reviews of the Curriculum, SLO and Point of Improvement sections of the program reviews are available. Curriculum Committee workshops are held on preparation of course outlines which include SLOs, and discipline faculty periodically meet with SLO facilitators to discuss preparation of matrices, and their assessments and reporting of findings.
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Formal dialogue includes college-wide and department level discussions of SLO findings. PRIE, at the end of the school year, compiles findings from the common tracking tool and prepares reports, which are made available to faculty on the college web site. At their first meeting of the semester, departments review SLO findings, discuss potential strategies for program improvement and respond to prompts on an SLO form. The forms, when completed, are compiled and made available on the SLO web site.

Student Services areas conduct division and program level meetings to discuss SLO assessments and findings. Presentations are given to governance committees.

Informal discussions take place at governance committee and senate meetings, at department meetings, and among cross-discipline faculty and staff who are working on specific strategies for improvement.

**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**

Over the last several years, SLO assessments of student achievement have resulted in strategies to improve both student success and access. As an example of the use of assessment results to improve practices that will support and improve student learning, the Athletic Department, in recognizing high course dropout rates and low grades among athletes developed a mandatory tutoring program with BEIF funding.

In the area of student access, data regarding degrees granted, number of years to graduation or program completion, and transfers led the Academic Senate and the VPSL to create a task force that developed a transfer program blue print and department-level scheduling plans that made it more likely students could complete a program in less than six semesters. The college developed a preliminary Master Schedule that adjusted scheduling patterns around core classes. This process, and the development of the matrices, has also led to updating the degrees COM offers.

The Assessment Plan outlines the manner in which PRAC and Senate committees engage in dialogue and take actions that result from assessment. Program Reviews, SLO Assessment Reports, and the Data Dashboard provide tools for recording and sharing results. Data from these reporting tools helped to inform the Education Planning Committee’s analysis of institutional progress made on the 2009-2019 Ed Master Plan and on the 2009-2012 Strategic Plan. It also informed the development of Action Steps for the 2012-2015 Strategic Plan on enrollment management, on a Student Success Initiative and on improving teaching and learning strategies.
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PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 4: APPROPRIATE RESOURCES CONTINUE TO BE ALLOCATED AND FINE-TUNED.

Standards: 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

COM incorporates student learning outcome assessment results into resource allocation for its instructional programs, the library, and student services using program review, the college participatory governance process, and yearly PRAC funding recommendations. Research and development of innovative teaching and learning strategies that are the result of findings from SLO assessment may also be funded through BSI, IR&D grants and/or the President’s EEIF grants. Follow-up assessment is used to determine the impact of interventions and results are reported in subsequent program reviews.

Program review asks respondents to use SLO assessment data to identify challenges for students, the intervention, and the expected outcomes. Faculty and staff are asked to describe how they will track changes in performance that may be the result of the intervention. The program review prompt asks if changes based on SLOs will require new resources or a reallocation of resources. Programs making requests must complete a justification section for each request in the program review to be considered.

Programs requesting funding based on SLOs must track improvements/changes in outcomes to determine if the funded intervention achieved the intended results. Tracking prompts are addressed in the program review for subsequent years.

Student Services support programs and the library complete program-level reports that describe needs, based on SLO outcomes, which require resource allocation requests. If making resource allocation requests, these programs complete a program review and submit it to PRAC.

PRAC reviews requests and makes funding recommendations based upon PRIE data and data provided in the program reviews.

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.
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PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 5: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

The process and cycle of assessment is outlined in the Assessment Plan and tracked on the matrices and reported in program reviews. The SLO Tracking Tool captures results from college-wide SLOs, including: (a) problem solving/critical thinking; (b) written comprehension; (c) quantitative reasoning; (d) information literacy; and (e) visual communication. Reports of these 5 College-wide SLOs are disseminated to faculty, department chairs, SLOAC, and deans. Reports are discussed at department meetings and faculty use a reporting tool to record the nature and content of the discussions and projected interventions based upon assessment results.

Each semester, faculty members and department chairs submit course SLO results for the five College-wide SLOs to PRJE, which compiles and publishes reports. The College-wide SLO reports are regularly reviewed and assessed by SLOAC, which also reviews the specific department reports.

The Data Dashboard includes enrollment data, pass rates, drop-out rates and other data relevant to assessing program outcomes. This information is available to faculty and staff who are preparing program reviews for instructional programs and student services. This data is used to help determine program improvements and the allocation of resources.

Student Services support programs identified program SLOs and developed two-year assessment plans, collected SLO data, generated and analyzed data results, completed program-level assessment reports and mini program reviews, required for resource allocation. This process repeats annually.

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

COM identified measurable SLOs for 100% of degrees, GE and certificates. We mapped these SLOs to the course-level and college-wide SLOs using a matrix as an inventory and tracking tool. Of the 19 AA degrees and 29 AS degrees, each has a matrix specific to that program.

Of the approximately 217 GE/degree courses offered each semester, 100% are assessed over three semesters using one or more of the college-wide rubrics that align course, GE/degree and college-wide SLOs. (100% of the approximately 182 CTE courses offered each semester are assessed over four semesters.)

The matrix identifies the courses in the program, the college-wide SLOs that the courses address, the
course level SLOs and the manner in which course level SLOs relate to degree and college-wide SLOs. The matrix includes the time-frame for assessing degree/GE or certificate SLOs. We follow the Assessment Plan’s three semester cycle for assessing all degree-level SLOs (four semesters for CTE). The current cycle runs spring 2012 through spring 2013.

Following the schedule, faculty track student performance on one or more of the college-wide rubrics related to course and degree SLOs and report results using the PRIE tracking tool. Data, once entered by faculty, are submitted to PRIE, compiled and made available through the college web site, via flex workshops, and department meetings. Discipline faculty meet to discuss the outcomes of these assessments and report findings in the program’s program review. Evidence that the assessment was conducted is a part of the program review process.

**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**

The COM Course Outline of Record requires listing SLOs for each course and 100% of active COM courses have SLOs. Students can refer to the SLO link on the home page to reference course SLOs. All degree and certificate programs have SLOs and these are reported in the catalog. Students can access them via a link on the COM home page. Students can reference the course SLOs and can consult the catalog to determine the goals and purposes of programs prior to enrolling in courses or committing to degree/CTE programs.

Each department keeps its current course syllabi on file in the department office and faculty are expected to list the SLOs on the syllabus.

Instructors often reference specific SLOs when gathering feedback from students. As an example, ECE uses a student self-evaluation where students self-report achievement of specific course SLOs.

Instructors routinely use SLOs when designing exam questions, library and classroom instructional methods and materials, and when designing assessment rubrics for specific class assignments. These rubrics show students their level of proficiency on specific course and/or degree/GE objectives. As an example, Comparative Politics students completing the country comparison project are given a rubric for the assignment that is based on the core objectives for the course. The rubric explains what is required to achieve proficiency. The rubric is also used to grade the assignment and is returned with the student’s paper.

These methods reinforce student awareness of program, course and assignment objectives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELF-ASSESSMENT ON LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION:</th>
<th>WHAT LEVEL OF SLO IMPLEMENTATION WOULD YOU ASSIGN YOUR COLLEGE? WHY? WHAT EFFORTS HAVE YOU PLANNED TO ADDRESS NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SELF-ASSESSMENT ON LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION: NARRATIVE RESPONSE**

COM is proficient in all levels and sustainable in two levels.

**Proficiency:**
- Outcomes and assessment are in place for 100% of courses, programs, degrees, services
- Widespread formal and informal dialogue involves faculty and service staff
- Assessment identifies areas that need improvement and data is relayed by PRIE, discussed by stake-holders, and addressed in program reviews
- Decision-makers, from the program level to PRAC and its sub-committees, acknowledge and respond to assessment results
- COM aligns its institution-wide practices to the improvement of student learning through program-level matrices, the program review process, and PRAC funding recommendations
- Resources are allocated to improve learning through the program review and PRAC recommendation process
- Using faculty and student service-generated data, semester and yearly assessment reports are completed and posted
- Course, degree, and college-wide outcomes are aligned through the program matrices
- Students are aware of course and program goals via published SLOs, feedback questionnaires, rubrics.

**Sustainable:**
- COM institutionalized ongoing, systematic use of continuous quality improvement strategies via program review, funding recommendations, and SLO tracking process
- SLOs are linked to program review through program review template prompts and SLOAC feedback.

**Needed Improvements:**
Our goal is to sustain pervasive, credible research around SLOs. We have an institutionalized system in place that ensures sustained, pervasive assessment and its use to continually improve student learning. We are working on developing credible research outcomes. Given the nature of the SLO research model, we must depend upon longitudinal data to give credibility to our findings.