Since our ACCJC accreditation visit in October 2011, the College of Marin faculty, staff and administration has been engaged in the following student learning outcomes assessment tasks for instructional programs and student services:

- Revised and approved the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan for instructional programs and student services
- Prepared Student Services Program Level Assessment Plans
- Identified division level and program level SLOs for all Student Service programs
- Added SLOs to all degrees and certificate; deactivated degrees and certificates without SLOs
- Prepared a matrix for reporting degree and/or certificate SLOs, how and when they are assessed, and how they inter-relate to the college-wide SLOs
- Prepared a matrix for each set of GE courses not directly associated with a degree or certificate
- Completed the college-wide SLO rubrics, including:
  - Critical Thinking/Problem Solving
  - Quantitative Reasoning for the physical sciences
  - Quantitative Reasoning for Life & Earth, and Social Sciences
  - Oral Communication
  - Written Communication
  - Information Literacy
- Used the tracking tool to input findings from the common rubrics into a common, college-wide database according to the three semester schedule reported in the matrices
- Completed full and mini program reviews with prompts that addressed student learning outcomes including how outcomes assessment influences resource allocations
- Added SLOs to all credit courses; deactivated courses without SLOs or updated CORs
- Assessed SLOs at the degree, certificate, GE, college-wide, and course level, and student services including the library
- Used assessment data in making resource allocation decisions
- Used assessment data to improve Student Service programs
- Completed Student Services Program-Level Assessment Reports
- Completed Student Services division level SLO report
- Assessed the process through our governance committees for both instructional and student services SLO assessment and resource allocation.

The following is a description of the steps taken to: 1) Identify measurable student learning outcomes for every instructional, library and student support program; 2) Assess measurable student learning outcomes for every instructional, library, and student support program; 3) Incorporate student learning outcome assessment results into program planning; 4) Incorporate student learning outcome assessment results into resource allocation; and, 5) Use assessment outcomes to improve student learning.
RECOMMENDATION: “…the team recommends that the college accelerate its efforts to identify … student learning outcomes for every instructional, library and student support program.”

In order to meet this recommendation, the college completed the following:

I. College of Marin identified measurable student learning outcomes in all instructional programs, the library and student support programs.

   A. Instructional Programs:
      We identified college-wide, measurable student learning outcomes for each degree, for core GE discipline courses that may not be a part of a degree program, for all liberal arts degrees that are interdisciplinary, and for certificates and mapped them using a matrix as an inventory and tracking tool. We deactivated all degrees that did not have SLOs or a completed matrix. We have # of active degrees all with SLOs and a completed matrix.

      We identified measurable student learning outcomes for all credit courses. We required that all credit courses have SLOs and that every course outline of record (COR) was up to date. The Curriculum Committee, with the consent of the Academic Senate, mandated that courses without SLOs or without an updated COR not be offered as of spring semester 2013. We prepared an inventory of courses the beginning of spring semester 2012. At that time COM had a total of 1,155 courses of which 445, or 39%, were last updated sometime between 1988 and 2007. Departments were informed by the Curriculum Committee which of their courses were out of date (from the 445 total) and would not be offered after fall 2012 unless updated CORs were submitted to the Curriculum Committee by May 1, 2012. Of the 445 outdated courses # had passed Curriculum Committee review and Board of Trustees approval process by June 2012. # were under Curriculum Committee review by May 1st. # were removed from the catalog by the departments. # were not updated and the departments were informed that these courses could not be offered spring semester 2013.

      We created two links on the COM home page, one leading students to the SLOs for each course and the other leading faculty to the CORs with SLOs.

      As a result of this work, all degrees, certificates, GE courses not associated with a degree, and interdisciplinary liberal arts degrees have college-wide, measurable student learning outcomes. All credit courses have measurable student learning outcomes. Degree and certificate SLOs are accessible to students at the COM web site and will be printed in the 2012/2013 catalog and subsequent catalogs. Course level SLOs are accessible to students via the COM web site.

      Evidence
      1) Excel spreadsheet of degrees, certificates, and liberal arts degrees (incorporating several disciplines) with the SLOs and matrices completed for each
2) Inventory showing the number of matrices completed for disciplines with GE courses (and no degree)
3) Link to completed matrices
4) Link for student access to SLOs from the COM home page
5) Link for faculty access to SLOs and CORs from the home page
6) Course inventory listing last date updated
7) Link to catalog with SLOs for degrees and certificates

B. **Library:**
We have included the service area of the library in the Student Service SLO process. The library faculty and staff identified division and program level SLOs in spring 2012. These are reported in the Student Services portion of the Assessment Plan and tracked in the Library program review and the Library SLO Annual Plan and Assessment Report.

The instructional area of the Library identified instructional SLOs as well. These are tracked in the Library program review and the **Library SLO Annual Plan**.

Library personnel met over spring semester 2012 and integrated the SLOs from both areas. This integration is reflected in the Library program review for 2011/2012 and will continue to be reviewed by the department and reflected in subsequent program reviews.

**Evidence**
1) Library SLO Annual Plan
2) Library program review for 2011/2012
3) Library meeting minutes from spring semester 2012
4) Relevant emails from Library personnel

C. **Support Programs**
In spring and summer 2011, the programs in Student Services identified division and program level SLOs. These programs are:

- Admissions and Records
- CalWORKs
- Child Development Program
- Community Education
- Counseling
- DSPS
- EOPS
- Financial Aid
- Health Center
- Library Services
- Matriculation
- Outreach
- Student Affairs
- Testing
• Transfer Center
• Tutoring
• Veterans

**Division Level:** The programs came to consensus on four division level SLOs. Each program identified two of the division level SLOs that were relevant to the specific program. Each program would measure the first division level SLO in the 2011-2012 year, and the second division level SLO in the 2012-2013 year. The schedule and the division level SLOs chosen by each program are reported in the Student Services Division Level Matrix.

**Program Level:** In the summer of 2011 members of each Student Service program identified program level SLOs to be assessed beginning fall 2011. Programs identified one program level SLO to be assessed in fall 2011. Programs aligned their program level SLO with the division level SLO they had chosen for that year. In the 2011/2012 year, 13 program level SLOs were focusing on “identifying and using college resources”; two program level SLOs were focusing on “identifying and committing to educational goals”; one program level SLO was focusing on “developing planning skills”; and, one program level SLO was focusing on “demonstrating self advocacy”. Programs developed their assessment tools for program level SLOs. Specific program level SLOs are reported in the Program Level Annual Assessment Plans.

**Evidence**
1) Student Services Division Level SLOs
2) Student Services Division Level Matrix
3) Program Level Annual Assessment Plans
4) Division meeting minutes
5) Individual program meeting minutes
6) Relevant emails related to each program and to the division
RECOMMENDATION: “…the team recommends that the college accelerate its efforts to … assess student learning outcomes for every instructional, library and student support program.”

In order to meet this recommendation, the college completed the following:

II. College of Marin continually assess measurable student learning outcomes for every instructional, library and student support program using a specific cycle for each program.

The instructional programs’ rotation cycle is defined in the matrices. Each GE, degree, certificate, interdisciplinary liberal arts degree has its own matrix identifying its SLOs, the time line for assessing each, 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. New rotation cycles begin every three years, except for the current three semester cycle (explained below).

The Student Services assessment process is identified in the Student Services SLO Assessment Plan and the Student Services SLO Assessment Process document, which shows a complete assessment cycle over the course of a year. Starting last fall 2011, all Student Service programs assessed a division level and program level SLO. SLO assessment will occur every fall semester going forward.

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

A. Instructional Programs

We track SLOs assessment for degrees, GE discipline courses not associated with a degree, interdisciplinary liberal arts degrees, and certificates using a matrix that 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 college-wide SLOs, and the time-frame for assessing SLOs at the degree, GE, and certificate level. College-wide degree, certificate, and GE SLOs are assessed every three years according to the Assessment Plan. The present three-year cycle began spring semester 2012. However, we have asked programs to follow a three-semester cycle in this round of assessment so that all programs will have completed the full cycle by the end of spring semester 2013. This will make it possible for us to sync the SLO cycle to the programs’ program review cycle for each subsequent round of assessment. The matrix for each degree, certificate, or GE program indicates the semester in which the specific SLO is assessed in specific courses. Some assessment dates fall outside the three semester timeframe because the courses will not be offered until or after fall 2013. These are noted on the matrices.

We follow the SLO assessment schedule reported on each matrix. 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 by the end of June. All core courses for each degree, for core GE discipline courses that may not be a part of a degree program, for all liberal arts degrees that are interdisciplinary, and for certificates are assessed. In spring 2012 we assessed # courses using the following rubrics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric</th>
<th># Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written, Oral, Visual Communication</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking and Problem Solving</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some courses were assessed using more than one rubric.

Credit courses not accounted for on the matrices (those that are not core courses or are not part of the core for a degree or certificate or GE program) are assessed by faculty from the discipline using discipline-level assessment tools. Discipline faculty meet to discuss the outcomes from these assessment and report findings in the program’s program review. Evidence of this assessment is a part of the program review process.

Evidence
1) Link to rubrics
2) Link to tracking tool
3) Inventory of all courses where rubrics were entered into the common database checked against the dates listed in each matrix
4) Link to completed matrices
5) Link to program reviews – course-level SLOs assessment questions

B. Library
The service area of the library gathered and analyzed data related to their SLO in spring 2012. The library staff and faculty, along with the Director of PRIE and the Student Services SLO Facilitator met to discuss outcomes, implementation of program changes, and how the Library service SLO assessment findings would be reflected in both the Library services mini-program review and the Library instructional program review. In addition to program and mini-program review, assessment results were also included in the Library services area SLO Annual Report. All reports, assessment data, and the mini-program review are posted on the Student Services SLO webpage.

Evidence
1) Circulation statistic reports
2) Meeting minutes
3) Emails
4) Link to Student Services SLO webpage
5) Link to Library mini-program review
C. Support Programs

Each academic year, every Student Service program and the service area of the Library complete the assessment of one division level and one program level SLO. For the 2011-2012 year, assessments for SLOs were developed in summer 2011 for each program, and completed in fall 2011. The following programs assessed a division and program level SLO:

- CalWORKs
- Child Development Program
- Community Education
- Counseling
- DSPS
- EOPS
- Financial Aid
- Health Center
- Outreach
- Student Affairs
- Testing
- Transfer Center
- Tutoring

Four remaining programs including Admissions, Veterans Affairs, Matriculation, and the service area of the Library assessed division and program level SLOs in spring 2012.

In the 2011/2012 year, 13 programs assessed the division level SLO “identifying and using college resources”; two programs assessed the division level SLO “identifying and committing to educational goals”; one program assessed the division level SLO “developing planning skills”; and, one program assessed the division level SLO “demonstrating self advocacy”. All programs assessed their individual program level SLOs.

During the course of the 2011-2012 academic year, members of the Student Services faculty and staff met as a division multiple times to discuss the progress of their assessments, to share information gained from data, and to discuss how individual program data related to other programs and to the division as a whole. Programs met with area administrators and/or with their departments to discuss outcomes, implementation of program changes related to data analysis, plans for assessment of the efficacy of program changes, and to design the SLO assessment for the new program level SLO for 2012/2013.

During late spring 2012, Student Services faculty and staff reflected on the entire Student Services SLO assessment process including reviewing the assessment plan report, and program review templates, the overall timeline in the SLO cycle, and whether they wanted to revise the division level SLOs for fall 2012. The division also assessed where they believed the Student Services SLO process was in terms of proficiency, by completing survey questions generated directly from the ACCJC proficiency rubric.
Although the Accreditation Report stated that Student Services would be assessing two to three division level SLOs each semester, this was a misunderstanding and not the intention of the Student Services Assessment Plan. Student Services had always planned to assess one program level SLO and one division level SLO each year. Because each program chooses a different division level SLO each year, all four division level SLOs get assessed each year by one program or another (see SS Division Level Matrix). The Accreditation Report also stated that assessment of all Student Service SLOs was not scheduled for completion until 2013-2014. This was also a misunderstanding that likely came from the three year plan template (which has since been changed to a two year plan). As stated earlier, all Student Service programs assess one division and program level SLO each academic year. The three-year plan template was intended as a planning document for three complete three-year cycles.

Evidence
1) Link to assessment tools
2) Link to Assessment Reports (from ExpertScan, as applicable)
3) Link to Program Level Annual Plans
4) Program Level Assessment Reports
5) Two-Year Program Level Assessment Plans
6) Link to SS Division Level Matrix
7) Link to evidence posted on the Student Services SLO webpage
8) Meeting minutes
9) Emails
RECOMMENDATION: “…that the college incorporate student learning outcome assessment results into program planning … for the improvement of student learning.”

In order to meet this recommendation, the college completed the following:

III. College of Marin incorporates student learning outcome assessment results into program planning for its instructional programs, the library, and student services using program review, the college participatory governance process, and our yearly Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC) recommendations. A process for assessing whether allocations and/or program revisions based upon outcomes assessment led to the improvement of student learning is an integral part of the program review process and is reviewed yearly by PRAC. In addition, an informal dialogue among program and discipline faculty and staff is generated by making assessment findings available to stake holders. These conversations take place at chairs’ meetings, department and program meetings, at the Academic Senate, in Student Services division meetings, and in non-structured settings among faculty and staff working across disciplines. The manner in which we incorporate student learning outcome assessment into program planning is described in the college-wide Assessment Plan updated and approved in May, 2012.

A. Instructional Programs
College-wide, GE, Degree, Certificate Assessment and Course-level - Discipline faculty entered the findings from the college-wide rubrics into the tracking tool and forwarded the files to PRIE at the end of each semester according to the time line recorded in the matrix. PRIE, at the end of the school year, compiled findings from the common tracking tool and prepared reports. These reports were available to faculty by July 2012. PRIE assisted faculty members from specific programs with additional research data for informing program improvements and for supporting resource allocation requests for the 2012/2013 program review and resource allocation cycle.

Faculty used the findings to inform pedagogy and make requests through program review for the in-class and out-of-class support necessary to meet student needs. Departments considered SLO assessment results when planning course offerings, discussing changes or modifications to the manner in which a course is taught, or consideration of alternative teaching strategies.

Faculty members completing program review responded to prompts about SLO assessment and findings from these assessments in the program review template. In summer 2012 and prior to the 2012/2013 program review cycle, the Program Review Committee provided feedback to the programs regarding the SLO portion of their program review.

At the end of the school year, PRAC reviewed major findings from SLO assessment as reported in the program reviews and taken from PRIE data and program review resource allocation requests. PRAC reviewed the process for routing SLO assessment data to various committees and subcommittees and made recommendations for improving the process.
Evidence
1) Link to program reviews highlighting the SLO portion
2) Copies of the Program Review Committee’s responses to the SLO portion of the program reviews
3) Link to PRIE reports from the common tracking tool for each college-wide SLO
4) Evidence of additional research requested by departments/disciplines
5) Department minutes reporting dialogue about the SLO findings (I have evidence for Social Science, Communications, Dance)
6) SLOAC minutes
7) Requests from specific programs based on SLO data
8) PRIE data for assessment of specific programs
9) PRAC minutes
10) Link to Data Dashboard
11) Kristi Kuhn write a brief description of the Dance WASC box
12) SLO Assessment Plan

B. Library
For 2011/2012, the Library service SLO focused on assessing the use of instructor-reserved materials by measuring circulation statistics over the last several semesters. Staff at the circulation desk observed an increased student demand for instructor reserve textbooks; anecdotal evidence from staff at the Circulation Desk also suggests that students requesting reserve texts have been asked to wait for longer periods of time. Some waiting lists are so long that students are unable to wait, and are increasingly turned away without being served. Data gathered by the library staff and faculty supported these observations, showing reserve as an ever-increasing percentage of total circulation. Further, these data demonstrated that gifts meant to offset this need, were not sufficient to meet increased demand. These assessment results led Library faculty and staff to seek a continuing, dependable source of library funding for expanding reserve course materials needed by the College of Marin students. Supporting data and SLO assessment outcomes were included in the SLO Annual Assessment Report and the mini-program review. The library faculty and staff also recommended a comprehensive campaign to get the news out to the students that these materials are available to them in the Library. By following the assessment and planning process, the library used its SLO assessment data to determine an increased student need and to incorporate this need into program planning.

Evidence
1) Library Program Level Annual Report
2) Library mini-program review (for services)
3) Library program review (instructional)
4) Meeting minutes
5) Emails
6) Student Services SLO Strategies Document
C. **Support Programs**
The Student Services SLO Assessment Plan was developed to guide the use of SLO assessment in program planning. The Student Services plan is a part of the college-wide SLO Assessment Plan updated and approved in May 2012. The cycle for assessment and planning is reviewed in the Student Services SLO Assessment Process document. In early spring of 2012, members of specific Student Service programs met with the Student Services SLO Facilitator and the PRIE Director to prepare findings for the Student Services Program Annual SLO Report and work on the mini-reviews.

Faculty and staff from each program completed their Program Level SLO Assessment Reports and met to consider the assessment outcomes, analyze and discuss results, and implement methods for improving outcomes based upon the data, and discuss how SLOs connect to program review and resource allocation requests.

Additionally, Student Services programs (including the Library) met to share outcomes and determine how findings might be connected programmatically. Group conversations resulted in the immediate sharing of resources in at least two different programs, just from the initial discussion. **Spell out this example: which programs, what resources were shared.**

An overview of the process, and the strategies developed as a result of the Student Services SLO assessment outcomes were shared with various constituency groups including the Educational Planning Committee (EPC), PRAC, the Academic Senate, and the Classified Senate.

**Evidence**

1) Program Level Annual Reports
2) Mini program reviews
3) Meeting minutes
4) Emails
5) Student Services SLO Strategies Document
6) PowerPoint Presentation for EPC, PRAC, and the senates
7) Student Services SLO Assessment Plan
8) Student Services SLO Assessment Process
RECOMMENDATION: “…that the college incorporate student learning outcome assessment results into … resource allocation for the improvement of student learning.”

In order to meet this recommendation, the college completed the following:

IV. College of Marin 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 our yearly Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC) funding recommendations. Research and development of innovative teaching and learning strategies that are the result of findings from SLO assessment may be funded through IR&D grants and/or the President’s EEIF grants as well.

A. Instructional Programs

In filling out the program review template, faculty members respond to the question: *What do you hope to change in the curriculum, pedagogy, course outline, etc. as a result of what you have learned? (Or what have you already changed?) Will these changes require new resources or a reallocation of resources? If so, explain using data.* This prompt requires review authors to consider whether changes based upon SLO assessment data will require new resources.

Requests for funds, based upon College-Wide/GE SLOs, and reported in program review in fall 2011/spring 2012 were reviewed by the Program Review Committee and the SLO facilitators and routed to the appropriate sub-committees of PRAC. PRAC members read and discussed the SLO sections of the program reviews, both for full and mini reviews. Programs that completed program review and made requests without addressing SLOs were asked by the Program Review Committee to complete that section of the review prior to funding recommendations being finalized by the sub-committees or recommendations being forwarded to PRAC. After making funding recommendations to the superintendent/president, the Program Review Committee chair and the SLO facilitators wrote to programs that were not funded explaining why funding requests were not met.

Faculty members, using SLO assessment data identify the challenge for students, the intervention, and the expected outcomes and track changes in performance that may be the result of the intervention. Instructional programs making requests tied to SLOs included:

**As an example of a resource request tied to SLOs,**

Programs requesting funding based on SLOs were informed by PRAC and the SLO facilitators that they would be expected to 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.

In addition to funding requests through the governance process, faculty may also take advantage of funds through IR&D grants or the president’s EEIF grants to
research and develop alternative teaching and learning strategies prompted by SLO assessment findings. As an example, the Social Sciences Department, in reviewing the findings from the Written Competency rubric for Social Science degree and GE courses discussed the difficulty students have in taking notes and writing essays specific to the Social Sciences. The faculty agreed to apply for an IR&D research grant that would fund mentor/tutors who were trained by the tutoring center specifically to work with Social Science students on essay writing and note-taking. Faculty will research the impact of this intervention using SLO assessment.

**Evidence**
1) PRAC minutes
2) PRAC sub committee tables
3) PRAC letter with recommendations sent to superintendent/president
8) IR&D proposal from the Social Sciences and the Tutoring Center
9) Letters to programs not receiving funding
10) Letters to programs receiving funding

B. **Library**
As a result of SLO assessment findings for instructor-reserved materials, the library staff and faculty requested a permanent source of funding for the purchase of reserve course materials in the library program review. The request was reviewed by the Program Review Committee and the SLO facilitators and routed to the ***Committee, which is a sub committee of PRAC. The sub committee determined X based upon the assessment data provided by the library and sent the recommendation onto PRAC which considered this request as part of the package of requests coming from its sub committees. PRAC ultimately recommended X based upon the sub committee scoring of the request. In the meantime, other Student Service program leaders explored other funding possibilities for the Library and these were discussed in Student Service SLO division meetings.

**Evidence**
1) Library mini-program review
2) Meeting minutes
3) Emails
4) Sub committee scoring sheets
5) PRAC recommendation letter

C. **Support Programs**
The following Student Service programs completed Program Level Annual Reports:
- Admissions and Records
- CalWORKs
- Child Development Program
- Community Education’
- Counseling
- DSPS
- EOPS
Program-level reports described any program improvement based on SLO outcomes. For examples:

- Counseling: more training on consistency in terms of information provided by counselors to students, create a script (operation procedure standards) so counselors provide the standard information to students. Revision of the survey language to be student-centered language and translate the survey to Hispanic for noncredit students.
- DSPS: revision of DSPS Handbook to emphasize the value of self-advocacy and improvement of office procedures for students to make arrangements for accommodations easier.
- EOPS: improvement of the delivery of the orientation curriculum to be more interactive as it could be.
- Library Services: data indicated that an increase in the percentage of total circulation of instructor reserve materials (textbooks) by students, regardless of the changes in total enrollment. A permanent source of funding for the purchase of instructor reserve textbooks and reserve materials is needed to continue this service.
- Veterans: improvement include informing new vet students of the services available to them, assist them with the necessary paperwork, refer them to county and state resources for vets. The vet information will be placed on the student portal, COM website, flyers and posters around campus.

Program-level reports described any needs, based on SLO outcomes, which required resource allocation requests. Programs making resource allocation requests completed a mini-program review and submitted it to PRAC. Some examples of Student Service programs that completed a mini-program review include:

- Child Development Program: Better data regarding students’ mid-term progress will allow staff and the program administrator to encourage students who are not making progress to seek assistance from counselors, the Tutoring Center, and other academic or community resources. The request of resources is to have IT’s assistance to create an ARGOS report
that will generate data at multiple points each semester regarding the academic progress.

- Library Services: data indicated that an increase in the percentage of total circulation of instructor reserve materials (textbooks) by students, regardless of the changes in total enrollment. A permanent source of funding for the purchase of instructor reserve textbooks and reserve materials is needed to continue this service.

- Testing: Based on assessment results, students demonstrated a readiness to take their placement tests. To encourage students to take advantage of all possible preparation resources, the testing center would like to request a fund to purchase Accuplacer practice test books to be available at the Reference Desk of both campus libraries.

- Veterans: Identify a location for a vet’s services center, identify staff to be in the center, identify funds to provide furniture, a phone, and a printer in order to provide the services to vet students.

**Evidence**

- Mini program reviews
- SS Annual Reports
- Meeting minutes
- Emails
- PRAC recommendation letter
RECOMMENDATION: “…that the college incorporate student learning outcome assessment results into program planning and resource allocation for the improvement of student learning.”

In order to meet this recommendation, the college completed the following:

V. College of Marin considers the accountability for improved student learning to be the most crucial feature of the assessment process. Using assessment for improved student learning requires a dialogue within and among disciplines and programs. It requires both 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 accommodate the dialogue, the college provides research data to faculty and staff through the PRIE web page. We provide faculty and staff access to the program reviews and PRAC committee and sub committee members are given the SLO section of the program reviews to read and consider in total. Responses to the SLO section of the review are provided to program review authors by the Program Review Committee chair and the SLO facilitators. Research support and research expertise is provided by the PRIE office.

Above all the formal measures, access to research data provide groups of faculty and staff, whether by discipline, department, or cross discipline, the opportunity to dialogue about findings, consider alternative strategies, implement and test those strategies in a continual effort to improve student learning.

A. Instructional Programs

The use of SLO assessment results to improve student learning is reported in the program review. Programs report the impact of interventions in response to specific prompts. This applies to programs not making resource allocation requests through program review as well as those that do. The prompt specifically asks: What improvements have you made or do you plan to make in the future based on the results of your SLO assessment? How have changes (previously made) affected student learning? Use qualitative and quantitative data to support your response.

As an example, an Early Childhood Education faculty member uses a student self-evaluation at the end of the semester asking students to self report achievement of specific course SLOs. Those evaluations are reviewed and analyzed, particularly in regard to which SLO students indicated achievement was not met, partially met or where students were unsure. In 2011, based on the previous semester in-class video analysis results and student assessment of their achievement on course SLOs, the instructor changed the choice of videos for the in-class video analysis exercise. Although student success with the in-class exercise was improved in both spring 2011 sections, student evaluation of achievement on the SLO still was ranked “not sure” or “partially met” by about 1/3 of the students. The instructor then examined the course outline and content and topics, which revealed that this
SLO is not a top priority achievement in relation to the content of the course. The instructor determined from this that the intervention needed to be further refined. In spring 2012 the instructor used the same video selections as used in spring 2011 but framed the presentation differently by introducing the task clearly as related to the SLO and by focusing student attention on the purpose of the activity and its relationship to a specific SLO. The instructor will then assess whether this approach improves students’ ability to recognize and report greater achievement for that SLO. DISCUSSED IN DEPARTMENT MEETINGS?

Programs also report in department meetings how they use SLO assessment results to improve pedagogy and efforts to improve learning in specific courses or groups of courses is a part of the ongoing dialogue at the department level.

As an example, the Dance Department

Evidence
1) Program Reviews SLO sections
2) Peggy’s SLO section of the program review for ECE
3) Written responses from SLO facilitators and Program Review Committee chair
4) Department meeting minutes as examples
5) Dance notes

B. Library
If resource allocation requests are funded by PRAC, a section of the mini-program review discusses the potential impact of the program changes. For example, if the Library receives permanent funding for increasing instructor reserve textbooks, students will have better access to the materials and will have shorter wait times at the Circulation Desk. The outcome strategies are also summarized in the SS SLO Strategy summary document. Additional program changes that are included in the mini-program review, but not tied directly to SLO outcomes will be discussed in department meetings.

Evidence
1) Library mini-program review
2) SS SLO Strategy summary doc

C. Support Programs
If the resource allocation requests are funded by PRAC, a section of the mini-program review discusses the impact of the program changes. The outcome strategies are also summarized in the SS SLO Strategy summary document. Other program changes that are not included in the program reviews are discussed in department meetings.

Some examples of outcome strategies that could potentially impact student learning include:
• **Health Center**: Funds will allow Health Services to become more visible both physically via posters and brochures and as an on-line presence.

• **Veterans**: Funds will allow Veteran Services to have a fully functioning office and for veteran students to have a “place” where they can have questions answered, where referrals can be made and a place that will be “theirs” and for their needs. Funds will allow better communications to the campus community about the services and location for veteran services.

• **Tutoring**: Addition of another permanent staff member as Coordinator, while retaining the current 1.0 FTE position at grade 16 (to provide technical and other support) will allow for proper support of existing services at both campuses as well as new services to online, evening and IVC students.

**Evidence**

1) Mini-program reviews

2) SS SLO Strategy summary document