

Documents to review as a basis for the Midterm Report.
Please report by email to Alice and Bob by Jan. 6.

The chart includes page numbers only as a guide. The three documents are in pdfs linked at wlac.edu/accreditation. You might want to consult the 2012 Self Study, also linked there.

"Volunteer"	Recommendation	Follow-Up Visit Team Report (April 2013)	WLAC Follow-Up Report (Mar 15, 2013)	2012 Accreditation Evaluation Report (March 2012)
Rebecca	1 (and 5 of 2006) Measurable Goal Setting	pp. 6-7	pp. 8-18	p. 12, 19-20, 22
Rebecca	2 Systematic Evaluation and Planning	pp. 7-9	pp. 19-29	pp. 11, 13, 20-22, 39-42
Mary-Jo	3 Student Learning Outcomes	pp. 9-11	pp. 30-44	p. 11, 26-27, 30-31, 39
Mary-Jo	4 Student Learning and Service Level Outcomes	pp. 11-13	pp. 45-49	pp. 32-35
Ara	5 College Catalog Currency	p. 13	p. 50	p. 32
Kathy	6 (and 7 of 2006) Library Collection Development and Security	pp. 13-14	pp. 51-56	pp. 36-40
Ken	7 Financial Resources	pp. 15-16	pp. 57-63	pp. 11, 22, 50-51, 53
Phyllis	6 of 2006 (counseling)	pp. 22-23	pp. 88-89	p. 13
Adrienne	13 of 2006 (participation)	pp. 23-24	pp. 90-92	p. 15, 18-19, 55-60

Recommendation 3 | Student Learning Outcomes

Please address these questions, with reference to “your” recommendation as it appears in the three reports:

1. What specifically troubled the Commission?

<http://www.wlac.edu/accreditation/2012accjcreport.pdf>

- Course-level SLOs are not routinely developed or assessed though it was stated that course level SLOs are not discouraged after PLO assessment if the PLOs do not fit the course. (26)
- Learning outcomes expressed in course syllabi were generally PLOs. (27)
- There is little evidence that faculty use the results of assessment to improve student learning through the modification of courses and programs. (27)
- The institution is making progress toward meeting this standard. However, as stated before, evidence regarding development of SLOs at the course level and authentic assessment of those SLOs in addition to valid assessment of learning outcomes at the program and institutional level is incomplete. (30)
- There is adequate evidence that campus wide dialogue is occurring to support improvement of educational programs and courses, though there appears to be some confusion regarding the description or characterization of course-level SLOs. (30)
- *Recommendation 3 – The team recommends that the college identify student learning outcomes that are related to course objectives for all courses; evaluate all courses and programs through an on-going systematic review of the relevance, appropriateness, and achievement of student learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans; and conduct authentic assessment of student achievement at the course, program, and institutional levels in order to improve student learning.* (31)
- A review of Library and learning skills course outlines reveals SLOs have been added to the Library and Learning Skills course outlines; however, the identified course SLOs are not always clearly measurable, and in some cases course level SLOs have not been identified; instead, program level SLOs have been applied to the courses. (39)
- The SLO work connected with the Learning Skills classes describes how faculty would determine the course grade rather than a specific assessment of an SLO. (39)

2. What are we supposed to be doing now? (That is, what does the Commission say we are, or should be, doing to respond to the recommendations? What did we say we were doing or planning to do?)

<http://www.wlac.edu/accreditation/2013%20Follow%20Up%20Team%20Rpt.pdf>

- Form an online database of outcomes assessment work so that information will not only be available to students but will allow for efficiency in providing data reports where ever needed. (10)

- Maintain a systematic mapping of courses to programs to institutional outcomes in its commitment to developing multiple and integrated strategies for assessing student achievement and regularly identifying areas that require improvement. (10)

3. Which committees should be involved in what we should be doing now? (Note what they should be doing.)

- Student Learning Outcomes Committee – providing leadership on the outcomes cycle; reviewing progress; identifying needs
- Curriculum Committee – connecting with SLOs with COR; reviewing recommendations from SLO Committee
- Academic Senate – receiving progress reports on SLOs; reviewing recommendations from SLO Committee through Curriculum Committee
- Divisional Council – operationalizing Student Learning Outcomes Assessment with faculty

4. Which college employees have responsibility for what we should be doing now?

- SLO Coordinator
- Dean of Teaching & Learning
- Office of Research & Planning
- VP of Academic Affairs
- Instructional Deans
- Division Chairs
- Faculty

5. What evidence did we use in our presentations to the Commission or visiting team? What evidence might we use in the Midterm report? (Include evidence we should be collecting, as well as what is already available.)

These all look back to the events of the last two years, but they are sure to trigger some ideas about developments since the 2013 Follow-Up Visit Report. Do jot those down, too!

- Committee Minutes
- SLO Assessment Tools
- SLO Progress/Tracking Reports
- SLO Handbooks
- SLO Newsletters
- Assessment Data
- Changes as a Result of Assessment

Recommendation 4 | Student Learning Outcomes

Please address these questions, with reference to “your” recommendation as it appears in the three reports:

1. What specifically troubled the Commission?

<http://www.wlac.edu/accreditation/2012accjcreport.pdf>

- While some of the student services program reviews reference elements of data analysis, clear evidence was not provided that the use of data in planning and evaluation of student needs and access to services is consistent, ongoing, and well integrated into the planning and evaluation process. (34)
- In some cases, the connection is not clear between the established SLOs and the questions on the survey; moreover, the methodology and response rate to the survey is not always discussed as it relates to SLO assessment (Point of Contact Surveys, District wide Surveys, SLO website).
- Improvements or changes described in the 2010 program review as a result of SLO assessment cannot always be connected to the identified SLOs for the program. In the more recently developed service level outcomes and assessments completed by some of the programs, the identified outcome, method of assessment, and findings are more consistent and clearly connected. (35)
- Student Services needs to continue to build on the progress already made to ensure that:
 - Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.
 - The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.
 - Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning.
 - Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed and updated on a regular basis employing longitudinal data wherever possible.
 - Use of data in planning and evaluation of student needs and access to services is consistent, ongoing and well-integrated into the planning and evaluation process. (35)
- *Recommendation 4 – In order to fully meet the Standards, the team recommends that the college review and revise as necessary its developed student learning and service level outcomes to assure that they are measured in both quantitative and qualitative terms. These measures should be adequate for evaluating whether services are meeting identified student needs so that results can be used to improve the delivery of support services. (35)*

- 2. What are we supposed to be doing now? (That is, what does the Commission say we are, or should be, doing to respond to the recommendations? What did we say we were doing or planning to do?)**

<http://www.wlac.edu/accreditation/2013%20Follow%20Up%20Team%20Rpt.pdf>

- For 2012-13, Student Services has inaugurated the cycle of assessment for the first two outcomes. Admissions and Records, Athletics, DSPS, Financial Aid, and International Students completed assessments for Technological Competence and Civic Responsibility early in the Spring 2013 semester. Seven other departments are scheduled to complete assessments later in the semester. (11-12)
- The close tie between service level outcomes assessment and institutional program review and recommendations for change informs the college-wide reports that will be due in the Fall when program review is conducted. (12)

- 3. Which committees should be involved in what we should be doing now? (Note what they should be doing.)**

- Student Learning Outcomes Committee – providing leadership on the outcomes cycle; reviewing progress; identifying needs
- College Council – receiving progress reports on SLOs
- Student Services Council – operationalizing Service Learning Outcomes Assessment with faculty and staff
- Administrative Services Council – operationalizing Service Area Outcomes Assessment with staff

- 4. Which college employees have responsibility for what we should be doing now?**

- SLO Coordinator
- Dean of Teaching & Learning
- Office of Research and Planning
- VP of Student Services
- VP of Administrative Services
- Student Services Deans
- Department Managers
- Department Staff

- 5. What evidence did we use in our presentations to the Commission or visiting team? What evidence might we use in the Midterm report? (Include evidence we should be collecting, as well as what is already available.)**

These all look back to the events of the last two years, but they are sure to trigger some ideas about developments since the 2013 Follow-Up Visit Report. Do jot those down, too!

- Committee Minutes
- SLO Assessment Tools
- SLO Progress/Tracking Reports

- SLO Handbooks
- SLO Newsletters
- Assessment Data
- Changes as a Result of Assessment