

ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

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: **October 10, 2012**

Institution's Name: **Moorpark College**

Name and Title of Individual Completing Report: Lisa Putnam, Institutional Research Coordinator and Dr. Lori Bennett, Dean of Student Learning

Telephone Number and E-mail Address: 805-378-1492; LPutnam@vcccd.edu

Certification by Chief Executive Officer: *The information included in this report is certified as a complete and accurate representation of the reporting institution.*

Name of CEO: Dr. Pam Eddinger

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): **487**
- b. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: **487**
Percentage of total: **100%**
- c. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: **487**
Percentage of total: **100%**

2. Programs

- a. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college): **62**
- b. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes: **62**;
Percentage of total: **100%**
- c. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: **62**;
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): **19**
- b. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: **18**;
Percentage of total: **95%**
- c. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: **18**; Percentage of total: **95%**

4. Institutional Learning Outcomes

- a. Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined:
22: 18 Gen Ed Outcomes (GEOs) and 4 Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs)
- b. Number of institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment: **7: 3 GEOs and 4 ILOs**

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Moorpark College has a long standing practice of defining measurable learning outcomes, and typical assessment methods, on the official Course Outline of Record (COR) that is reviewed and approved by the Curriculum Committee (1.1). All courses are reviewed by Curriculum on a 5-year cycle - this cycle began in 2010-11 (1.2). The college has been actively coring its curriculum, inactivating courses that are no longer offered on a regular rotation.

Faculty and staff report outcome assessment as part of their annual program planning process (1.3). Each year, programs report their assessment efforts, indicating the specific assessment methods and reporting all results collected. As results are collected, programs note how they use these data in program improvement efforts. These assessment efforts focus on course-level assessment as well as program-level assessment (including outcomes for degrees, certificates, support services, and general education clusters). This formal reporting process has been in place since 2007(1.4).

Eighteen general-education outcomes were adopted Spring 2011, and four institutional-level outcomes were adopted Fall 2011 (1.5). The ILOs are assessed using indirect assessment – student achievement of outcomes is typically assessed within the context of a given course and the course is mapped to institutional outcome/s (1.6). GEOs are also currently assessed using indirect assessment, although many of the instructional programs have adopted GEOs as their own program-level outcomes -- programs such as History, Economics, English, and Mathematics (1.7).

The College has recently implemented commercial software (TracDat) package to help in the management of outcome assessments, results, and curriculum mapping (1.8).

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

Institutional and unit level planning occurs annually through the program planning process and aligns with the college mission, competencies, and strategic goals (2.1). In 2003, faculty began documenting SLO assessment and the process has evolved naturally since then.

Institutional discussion regarding SLOs and assessment is on-going and widespread - taking place at: Fall Fling planning retreats, Y'all Come meetings, Flex Sessions, Division meetings, Department meetings, Curriculum meetings, and CTE Advisory meetings (2.2a-g). SLO assessment informs program planning which then supports Strategic Plans and the Educational Master Plan (2.3, 2.4).

Based on assessment, faculty/staff have implemented many program and course level improvements, as reported in the Fall 2012 Y'All Come (2.5). Earlier improvements, reported on individual Program Plans, include:

- EATM adjusted staff assignments allowing more one-on-one student instruction time.
- ACCESS sought funding to expand math tutoring.
- Health Science added computer-based quizzes and online material to courses.
- Financial Aid explored ways to reach out to students who drop below half-time status.
- Chemistry made a concerted effort to use improved teaching strategies and modalities to increase student comprehension.
- English normed their grading rubrics.
- Student Activities designed an attendance record for student government representative accountability at governance meetings.
- Dance added weekly quizzes and class activities to improve understanding of choreography.
- Psychology revised lecture content to help students apply course topics to their lives.

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

At the institutional level, dialogue about student learning occurs college-wide and within the governance groups during annual planning activities that guide the development of operational plans and the allocation of resources (3.1). Institutional goal-setting relating to student learning and success is conducted during strategic planning and educational master planning and assessment results are documented in these reports (3.2 and 3.3). The college has a cyclical process of goal-setting, implementation, measurement, and improvement, including specific timelines and responsible groups (3.1).

The college planning process is broad-based and well-established in the annual work cycle of the College (3.4). Quantitative and qualitative data are consistently applied, and multi-year trends are available for program analysis. Institutional goals are linked to unit goals, and requests for resources are made in light of goals implementation and program improvement (3.5).

To begin the planning process, division and department meetings are held to analyze program and SLO assessment data and update program goals; followed by individual program review meetings with the executive team to formally evaluate each program's status (3.6). This discussion helps integrate planning with resource allocation. In addition, resource requests from program plans are also reviewed and prioritized by the various governance committees (3.7).

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 with institutional planning and resource allocation.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 4: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Initial planning and resource allocation provided faculty/staff with assessment training and an SLO Coordinator. In 2003, the College adopted the 5-column method to measure program effectiveness, as seen on each Program Plan (4.1). The College also hired a full-time faculty Coordinator of Institutional Research who serves as the SLO Coordinator. Flex activities have been offered focusing on the evolving SLO training needs (4.2). Faculty Development funds have supported registration and travel costs for faculty to attend the RP Student Success Conference each year, allowing additional training in SLO assessment efforts (4.3). Most recently, the College has invested in an online SLO management system, TracDat (4.4). The Coordinator of Institutional Research will continue to provide training to faculty and staff, and will maintain the TracDat database (4.5).

Current institutional planning and resource allocations based on SLOs are beginning to be realized. Much of the College's assessment data were gathered in 2011-12 (4.6); programs are currently analyzing their results and developing their program plans and resource requests for 2013-14. Governance committees charged with the prioritization of resource requests are prepared to review program plans and assessment results (4.7).

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

Each course and program (both instructional and non-instructional) is required to report their assessment work using the TracDat reporting system. The reporting system allows a user to select a course or program and the year that the assessment data were collected. The user reports the outcome, the assessment tool used to collect the data, the assessment results, and how the assessment results were used (5.1) At the course level, the SLO is also aligned with the appropriate program-level outcome's (5.2). A comprehensive report is available within this system, allowing the program to see their data (5.3)

Institution-wide reports are also available, allowing IR to provide both PDF reports and Excel downloads of the data (5.4). As we become more acquainted with TracDat reporting features, IR will provide additional training to the campus community. The ultimate goal is to provide wide access to dynamic institutional reports. However, during this time of transition and learning, institution-wide reports are static PDF files available on the campus' file-sharing site, SharePoint.

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

Course student learning outcomes are directly mapped to degree learning outcomes (Moorpark College refers to these as program learning outcomes). The mapping is identified in the recently implemented commercial software (TracDat) that was purchased for the management of outcome assessments, results, and curriculum mapping (6.1, 6.2). Career Technical Programs tend to offer capstone courses, which have course level outcomes directly measuring their program level outcomes (6.3). Other course assessments in the career technical degrees are mapped to the program level outcomes in which they support. For non-career technical programs, courses are mapped to program level outcomes, including general education outcomes, when appropriate (6.4).

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

Moorpark College uses a variety of methods to communicate SLOs to students, including the College Catalog, Course Syllabi, and the College website.

The College Catalog includes ILOs, GEOs, and Core Competencies. It also includes the Program Purpose and PLOs for each academic program. These materials are available in printed and electronic format and are reviewed annually during the catalog update cycle (7.1).

The Course Outline of Record includes course-level SLOs (7.2). The Curriculum committee technical review process for new programs and course updates requires faculty to include SLOs for each course. Each discipline participates in a full curriculum review every five years (7.3). Course SLO requirements are included in the College CurricuNet Course Outline of Record template.

Course syllabi are required to include the SLOs listed in the Course Outline of Record (7.4). Faculty are asked to submit syllabi to the Division office each semester. Division Deans review syllabi to ensure compliance. New faculty are provided with CORs and sample syllabi to ensure awareness of SLOs. Faculty review their course SLOs with students at the beginning of each semester.

The Moorpark College Website, under Institutional Research, includes Institutional and General Education Student Learning Outcomes (7.5). They are updated as needed.

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 HAVEYOU PLANNED TO ADDRESS NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS?
<p>SELF-ASSESSMENT ON LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION: NARRATIVE RESPONSE</p> <p>Moorpark College meets proficiency level in accordance with the Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Student Learning Outcomes rubric. The College has a well-established, annual cycle of program planning and assessment. Programs and service units have identified and assessed SLOs at the course, program, GE and institution level, having completed at least one full assessment cycle by the end of Fall 2012.</p> <p>The College has a rich history of dialogue, including widespread discussions about institutional planning, SLOs, and assessment. SLO assessment is widely documented in program planning, and assessment results inform resource requests and resource allocation. College leaders show consistent support for SLO assessment and have worked to create a culture of data-driven decision-making. Faculty have taken ownership and leadership in the SLO process. The college continues to provide resources to strongly support SLO assessment including opportunities for faculty/staff training, software to manage the data, and a full-time faculty Institutional Researcher/SLO Coordinator.</p> <p>The annual program planning process provides the link between SLO assessment and resource allocation. As the College progresses toward Sustainability, we will provide further training to faculty/staff in strengthening the tie between assessment results and program planning. We will continue to provide venues for cross-program sharing about assessment. As Moorpark College continues to institutionalize its SLO assessment, we will develop an SLO assessment review committee to help the Institutional Researcher in providing continued faculty training, in overseeing assessment cycles and timelines, and in reviewing assessment results to look for campus-wide issues and opportunities for improved student learning.</p>	

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

TABLE OF EVIDENCE (NO WORD COUNT LIMIT)

- 1.1 (a) CurricUNET Administrative Reports Screenshot and (b) SLO Report from CurricUNET
- 1.2 Curriculum 5-year Cycle
- 1.3 2012-13 Program Plan Samples – Counseling, English, and Nursing
- 1.4 Comprehensive SLO Report
- 1.5 ILOs and GEOs online ([IR Website](#))
- 1.6 Screenshot of Mapping Form in TracDat
- 1.7 General Education Outcome Mapping
- 1.8 Screenshots of TracDat (See Items 1.3, 1.6, and 1.7)

- 2.1 Art Program Plan
- 2.2a Fall Fling Agendas
- 2.2b Y’All Come Announcements
- 2.2c Flex Session Announcements
- 2.2d Division Meeting Minutes
- 2.2e Discipline and Department Meeting Minutes
- 2.2f Curriculum Meeting Minutes
- 2.2g CTE Advisory Meeting Minutes
- 2.3 Strategic Plan 2009-2012
- 2.4 Educational Master Plan 2009-2019 (See page 55 for departmental example)
- 2.5 September 2012 Y’All Come Event (Minutes)

- 3.1 Making Decisions at Moorpark College
- 3.2 Educational Master Plan 2009-2019 (See Item 2.4)
- 3.3 Strategic Plan 2009-2012 (See Item 2.3)
- 3.4 Program Planning Timeline in Making Decision Document (See Item 3.1, pages 22-24)
- 3.5 Sample Program Planning (See Item 2.1)
- 3.6 Program Planning Timeline in Making Decision Document (See Item 3.1, page 22-24)
- 3.7 Development Timeline for Resource Priorities in Making Decision Document (See Item 3.1, pages 26-29)

- 4.1 2012-13 Program Plan Samples – Counseling, English, and Nursing (See Item 1.3)
- 4.2 Flex Session Announcements (See Item 2.2c)
- 4.3 Student Success Conference Attendees 2010-2012
- 4.4 Screenshots of TracDat (See Items 1.3, 1.6, and 1.7)
- 4.5 Program Plan Institutional Research
- 4.6 Comprehensive SLO Report (See Item 1.4)
- 4.7 Development Timeline for Resource Priorities in Making Decision Document (See Item 3.1, pages 26-29)

- 5.1 Screenshots of TracDat (See Items 1.3, 1.6, and 1.7)
- 5.2 Screenshot of Mapping Form in TracDat (See Item 1.6)
- 5.3 Program Specific Comprehensive SLO Report
- 5.4a Institutional Comprehensive SLO Report (See Item 1.4)
- 5.4b Institutional Comprehensive SLO Report (Excel)

- 6.1 Screenshot of Mapping Form in TracDat (See Item 1.6)
- 6.2 Course Outcomes Associated with Program Outcomes Report
- 6.3 Capstone Course Outcomes
- 6.4 General Education Outcome Mapping (See Item 1.7)

- 7.1 College Catalog http://www.moorparkcollege.edu/apply_and_enroll/college_catalog/index.shtml
- 7.2 SLO Report from CurricUNET (See Item 1.01b)
- 7.3 Curriculum 5-year Cycle (See Item 1.2)
- 7.4 Sample Syllabi
- 7.5 ILOs and GEOs online ([IR Website](#))

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