

DRAFT 4/19/10

INTRODUCTION

San Diego Mesa College is in varying stages of developing and assessing student learning outcomes (SLOs) and administrative unit outcomes (AUOs) at the course, program, service area and degree level. The following report describes evidence gathered to date, how it is being used, and what plans exist for the continued expansion of this effort. The College initiated its SLOs and AUOs at the program and service area levels. Faculty and staff are using TaskStream to map program/service area level SLOs and AUOs to the course and degree levels. More detail concerning SLOs and AUOs can be found in the appropriate parts of Standard IB and IIA.

The goal of the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Survey 2009 was to gauge the progress, needs, and perceptions of all Instructional, Student Services, and Administrative Services programs/service areas, referred to in this report as units, concerning administrative unit outcomes (AUOs) and student learning outcomes (SLOs). For the sake of brevity, the term “SLO” is used in a broad sense throughout this report to refer to both AUOs and SLOs. The purpose of the last year’s survey was to collect baseline data. The College administers the survey annually to measure progress over time.

METHODOLOGY

The original survey instrument was created in Spring 2008 and administered to the Research Committee, SLO Subcommittee, and Program Review Committee for feedback. Based on feedback from the Dean of Research and SLOAC Coordinator, the 2008 instrument was refined and the finalized version of the SLO Survey 2009 appears in Appendix C. The survey was primarily conducted online via web-based survey software, and a follow-up paper survey administration also occurred. Survey invitations were distributed via email to all designated unit SLO contacts on October 26, 2009. Two reminder emails were sent, and the survey closed on November 20, 2009 for a four-week administration timeframe.

As this was a census survey, non-respondents were contacted after the official survey timeframe and encouraged to respond. Since the online survey had closed by this time, late respondents completed paper surveys. Responses were received from the designated SLO contacts for all 70 units by January, 2010. Programs were unlikely to have made marked progress with SLOs from late November through January due to holiday breaks. Therefore, the extended timeframe for data collection is not of significant concern.

Of the 70 units that responded, 53 (76%) were Instructional, 12 (17%) were from Student Services, and 5 (7%) were from Administrative Services. Changes from last year’s respondent profile include the addition of the Cooperative Work Experience Program (Instructional) and the addition of five Administrative service areas.

HIGHLIGHT OF THE FINDINGS

Progress in the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle (SLOAC)

The Mesa College Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle (SLOAC) for 2009 comprises four steps, reduced from the five steps in 2008 due to the assumption that all units have written their SLOs:

Step 1. The program-level / service area-level SLOs to be assessed and ways to assess them have been identified, i.e., your unit has discussed assignments or activities through which the outcomes can be assessed.

Step 2. Assessment of the program-level / service area-level SLOs for at least one course or service area activity/event has been conducted. A shared rubric has been adopted and used to measure the students' levels of facility with the SLO.

Step 3. Results of the assessment have been documented and analyzed and any necessary changes determined, i.e., the results have been translated into “action plans” for improved learning in the future via changes in program design, instruction or service

Step 4. The next iteration of the SLO assessment cycle, starting again with Step 1, has begun.

With regard to the four steps in the SLOAC, respondents were instructed as follows: *For your unit, please indicate whether each step in the program-level / service area-level SLO assessment cycle is COMPLETED, IN PROGRESS, or NOT STARTED. If you are unsure or unaware for any of these steps, please select PROGRESS UNKNOWN.*

Of the 70 units, 32 units (46%) have “Completed” Step 1, while 27 units (39%) have “Completed” Step 2. Units were in varying stages of development with regard to Step 3, and half (n = 34 out of 68 item respondents) has “Not started” Step 4 (see Table 4). Compared to the 2008 baseline data, marked progress has been made in all areas of SLOAC. Tables 1 and 2 in Appendix A provide a snapshot of where each unit stands with regard to the four steps in SLOAC, while Table 3 provides an overall view of the College’s progress compared to the 2008 baseline data.

SLO Assessment

Based on their responses to unit progress in the SLOAC, respondents were routed to the appropriate questions. Respondents were only asked questions pertaining to those steps in the SLOAC with which their units were “COMPLETED”. Please note that Administrative Services adopted their AUOs in 2009 and have not yet begun the assessment portion of SLOAC.

On the Instructional side of the house, when asked, “Have course-level SLOs been adopted for the courses listed?”, 18 of the 20 (90%) item respondents replied “yes” while 2 of the 20 (10%) item respondents replied “no.” In Student Services, 2 of the 3 (67%) item respondents replied “yes” and 1 of the 3 (33%) item respondents replied “no” (see Table 4).

Of the 21 Instructional units that completed Step 2 in SLOAC, 17 units (81%) indicated that they used a shared, unit-wide rubric to measure their SLOs and 4 units (19%) indicated that they did not (see Table 4). Of the 6 Student Services units that completed Step 2 in SLOAC, 2 units (valid 40%) indicated that they used a common, unit-wide rubric to measure their SLOs and the remaining 3 (valid 60%) indicated that they did not while 1 unit declined to respond (see Table 5).

Respondents were asked to indicate whether their units conducted direct assessment, which involves observable demonstrations of student learning; indirect assessment, which involves self-reported student learning; or both. Of the 27 College units that completed Step 2 in SLOAC, 17 units conducted direct assessment only (15 Instructional units and 2 Student Services units), 4 units conducted indirect assessment only (3 Instructional units and 1 Student Services unit), and 6 units conducted both kinds of assessment (3 Instructional units and 3 Student Services units) (see Table 6).

Among the 23 units that conducted direct assessment, the most popular direct assessment activities were common exam questions and written or oral reports, used by 10 units each (43%); followed by course-embedded assessment and “other activities not listed”, both of which were used by 7 units each (30%) (see Table 7). Units may have used a variety of direct assessment activities.

Among the 10 units that conducted indirect assessment, 9 units administered surveys and 1 unit conducted interviews (see Table 8). Units may have used more than one type of indirect assessment activity.

Of the 15 units that completed a full cycle of SLO assessment and began another cycle, 7 units (47%) kept the same SLOs and assessment methods from one iteration of the cycle to the next while 8 units (53%) modified their SLOs and/or assessment methods (see Table 9).

Dialogue and Praxis

Seven Likert-scale items were constructed based on the Student Learning Outcomes rubric provided by the Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). These items focus on dialogue and praxis, defined as the intersection of reflection and action.

Descriptive data for these seven items are shown in Table 10 and are compared with the 2008 baseline data in Table 11. According to a paired-samples t-test, the 2009 means on four of the seven items were significantly higher ($p < .05$) than last year’s 2008 baseline means, bringing the means for all seven items above 3.0 in 2009 (based on a 4-point Likert rating scale). The items which showed statistically significant improvement from last year to the current year of 2009

stated (in order of appearance on the survey instrument): 1) dialogue about student learning involves all faculty/staff in my unit; 2) the dialogue that occurs in my unit about student learning is robust; 3) student learning outcomes assessment occurs in a systematic fashion in my unit; and 4) results of student learning outcomes assessment are used for continuous quality improvement in my unit.

Units Requesting Assistance from the SLO Committee

Table 12 lists the units that requested assistance with the various stages of the SLOAC . Five units requested assistance from the Committee with selecting an SLO to be assessed and a way to assess it (Step 1), 15 units need help assessing the selected SLO (Step 2), 12 units would like assistance documenting and analyzing the data (Step 3), and 14 units requested assistance with starting the next iteration of the SLOAC (Step 4).

Decisions Informed and Actions Prompted by SLO Assessment Results

Respondents from all units were asked, *Please describe any decisions informed or actions prompted by your documented program-level / service area-level SLO assessment results.* Verbatim responses are listed in Appendix B.

Unique Circumstances or Challenges

Respondents from all units were asked, *Please use this space to elaborate on any of your responses to the [survey] questions. You may also use this space as an opportunity to tell us about any unique circumstances or challenges your unit has faced.* Verbatim responses are listed in Appendix B.

SUMMARY

The SLO Survey gathered data regarding progress among all College units on the four steps of the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle (SLOAC) listed below:

Step 1. The program-level / service area-level SLOs to be assessed and ways to assess them have been identified, i.e., your unit has discussed assignments or activities through which the outcomes can be assessed.

Step 2. Assessment of the program-level / service area-level SLOs for at least one course or service area activity/event has been conducted. A shared rubric has been adopted and used to measure the students' levels of facility with the SLO.

Step 3. Results of the assessment have been documented and analyzed and any necessary changes determined, i.e., the results have been translated into “action plans” for improved learning in the future via changes in program design, instruction or service

Step 4. The next iteration of the SLO assessment cycle, starting again with Step 1, has begun.

Of the 70 units, 32 units (46%) have “Completed” Step 1 – Choose an SLO and a way to assess it, while 27 units (39%) have “Completed” Step 2 – Conduct assessment of your chosen SLO. Units were in varying stages of development with regard to Step 3 – Document and analyze SLO assessment data, and half (n = 34 out of 68 item respondents) has “Not started” Step 4 – Begin the next iteration of SLOAC (see Table 4). Compared to the 2008 baseline data, marked progress has been made in all areas of SLOAC. Of those units that have completed Step 2 – Conduct assessment of SLOs, the strong majority of College units have adopted course-level SLOs and used a shared unit-level rubric to assess their chosen SLOs. Units used a mix of direct and indirect assessment methods. Direct assessment activities varied from unit to unit, whereas almost all units who engaged in indirect assessment conducted surveys. Regarding the items on a four-point likert scale pertaining to dialogue and praxis about SLOs, the results of a paired-sample t-test comparing the 2008 baseline means and the 2009 means suggest that the College has made significant progress in four areas, all of which happen to be the areas in which the College scored lowest on the 2008 SLO Survey. The four items stated, “Dialogue about student learning involves all faculty/staff in my unit;” “The dialogue that occurs in my unit about student learning is robust;” “Student learning outcomes assessment occurs in a systematic fashion in my unit;” and “Results of student learning outcomes assessment are used for continuous quality improvement in my unit.” Also, compared to 2008 survey results, in 2009, many more units requested assistance with all steps of the SLOAC.

APPENDIX A. TABLES

Table 1 of 2

Unit progress in SLOAC: Step 1 completed

| STEP 1 | STEP 2 | STEP 3 | STEP 4 | What is the official title or name of your unit? |
|-----------|-------------|------------------|------------------|--|
| Completed | Completed | Completed | Completed | Chemistry |
| | | | | Communication Studies (Speech) |
| | | | | Languages |
| | | | | Mathematics |
| | | | | Student Health Services |
| | | | | Transfer Center |
| | | | In progress | Accounting |
| | | | | Business |
| | | | | Disability Support Programs and Services |
| | | | | Economics |
| | | | | Financial Aid |
| | | | | Marketing |
| | | | | Music |
| | | | | Radiologic Technology |
| | | | | Real Estate |
| | | | Not started | Physical Education |
| | In progress | Not started | Not started | Assessment and Orientation |
| | | | | Fine Art |
| | | | | Philosophy |
| | | | | Physical Therapist Assistant |
| | | | | Teacher Education |
| | | | In progress | Dance |
| | | | | Dramatic Arts |
| | | Not started | Progress unknown | Physics Program |
| | | | Not started | History |
| | In progress | Completed | Completed | Cooperative Work Experience Program |
| | | Not started | Not started | Biology |
| | | | | Computer Business Technology Education (CBTE) |
| | | | | Physical Sciences (Astr, Geol, Phyn) |
| | | | Progress unknown | Computer and Information Sciences |
| | | Progress unknown | Progress unknown | ACP - Math |
| | Not started | Not started | Not started | Multimedia |

Table 2 of 2
 Unit progress in SLOAC: Step 1 not completed

| STEP 1 | STEP 2 | STEP 3 | STEP 4 | What is the official title or name of your unit? |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--|
| In progress | In progress | In progress | In progress | American Sign Language / Interpreter Training Program |
| | | | | Anthropology |
| | | | | Engineering |
| | | | | Evaluations |
| | | | | Medical Assisting |
| | | | | Nutrition |
| | | | Not started | ACP - Political Science |
| | | | | Consumer Studies |
| | | Not started | Not started | Black Studies |
| | | | | Hospitality |
| | | | | Learning Resources Center |
| | | | | Psychology |
| | | | | Student Affairs |
| | | | Progress unknown | Animal Health Technology |
| | | | In progress | Admissions/Records & Veterans |
| | | | | Fashion Program |
| | Not started | Not started | Not started | Chicano Studies |
| | | | | Child Development |
| | | | | Counseling |
| | | | | Geographic Information Systems |
| | | | | Political Science |
| | | | | Sociology |
| | | In progress | Not started | EOPS |
| | Completed | Completed | In progress | Career Center |
| | | | Not started | Dental Assisting |
| | Progress unknown | Not started | Not started | Reprographics |
| | | | | Stockroom |
| | | Progress unknown | Not started | Tutoring |
| Not started | Not started | Not started | Not started | Employment/Payroll/Admin/Tech Support & Information Services |
| | | | | Architecture |
| | | | | Business Services |
| | | | | Interior Design |
| | In progress | Not started | Not started | English |
| Progress unknown | In progress | In progress | In progress | Geography |
| | Progress unknown | Progress unknown | Progress unknown | Building Construction Technology |
| | | | | Health Information Technology |
| | | | | Student Accounting Office |

Table 3
Overall institutional progress in SLOAC

| | Completed | | In progress | | Not started | | Progress unknown | | Total | |
|--|-----------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | % in 2008 | % in 2009 | % in 2008 | % in 2009 | % in 2008 | % in 2009 | % in 2008 | % in 2009 | Total # in 2008 | Total # in 2009 |
| Step 1. The program-level / service area-level SLOs to be assessed and ways to assess them have been identified, i.e., your unit has discussed assignments or activities through which the outcomes can be assessed. | 35% | 46% | 56% | 41% | 8% | 7% | 1% | 6% | 66 | 70 |
| Step 2. Assessment of the program-level / service area-level SLOs for at least one course or service area activity/event has been conducted. A shared rubric has been adopted and used to measure the students' levels of facility with the SLO. | 20% | 39% | 38% | 34% | 39% | 19% | 3% | 9% | 66 | 70 |
| Step 3. Results of the assessment have been documented and analyzed and any necessary changes determined, i.e., the results have been translated into "action plans" for improved learning in the future via changes in program design, instruction or service | 12% | 28% | 15% | 25% | 70% | 42% | 3% | 6% | 66 | 69 |
| Step 4. The next iteration of the SLO assessment cycle, starting again with Step 1, has begun. | 8% | 10% | 18% | 31% | 70% | 50% | 5% | 9% | 66 | 68 |

Table 4
Course-level SLOs

| | | Instructional Programs | | Student Services | |
|--|-------|------------------------|-------|------------------|-------|
| | | Count | Row % | Count | Row % |
| Has your unit adopted course-level SLOs? | Yes | 18 | 90% | 2 | 67% |
| | No | 2 | 10% | 1 | 33% |
| | Total | 20 | 100% | 3 | 100% |

Table 5
Use of unit-wide rubric in completion of SLOAC Step 2

| | | Instructional Programs | | Student Services | |
|--|-------|------------------------|-------|------------------|-------|
| | | Count | Row % | Count | Row % |
| Were your SLOs measured using a common, unit-wide rubric? (Although the assessment activities may have varied, the rubric was the same). | Yes | 17 | 81% | 2 | 40% |
| | No | 4 | 19% | 3 | 60% |
| | Total | 21 | 100% | 5 | 100% |

Table 6
Use of direct and indirect assessment in completion of SLOAC Step 3

| | | Instructional Programs | | Student Services | | Total College-Wide | |
|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------|----------|------------------|----------|--------------------|----------|
| | | Count | Column % | Count | Column % | Count | Column % |
| What kind of program-level / service area-level SLO assessment did your unit conduct? | Direct assessment ONLY | 15 | 71% | 2 | 33% | 17 | 63% |
| | Indirect assessment ONLY | 3 | 14% | 1 | 17% | 4 | 15% |
| | BOTH direct and indirect assessments | 3 | 14% | 3 | 50% | 6 | 22% |
| | Total | 21 | 100% | 6 | 100% | 27 | 100% |

Table 7

Direct assessment conducted in SLOAC Step 3 (23 programs / service areas)

| | Count | Row % |
|--|-------|-------|
| Capstone projects (final projects which synthesize essential course objectives) | 3 | 13% |
| Common exam questions (items designed to elicit student understanding of essential course objectives) | 10 | 43% |
| Course-embedded assessment (representative student work generated in response to typical course assignments) | 7 | 30% |
| Performance exams (e.g., external licensing examinations) | 3 | 13% |
| Portfolios (collections of student work which demonstrates growth and development over time) | 2 | 9% |
| Reports, written or oral | 10 | 43% |
| Other activities not listed above | 7 | 30% |

Table 8

Indirect assessment conducted in SLOAC Step 3 (10 programs / service areas)

| | Count | Row % |
|--------------|-------|-------|
| Surveys | 9 | 90% |
| Focus groups | 0 | 0% |
| Interviews | 1 | 10% |

Table 9

Restarting the cycle in completion of SLOAC Step 4

| | | Count | Column % |
|--|--|-------|----------|
| As you began another SLO assessment cycle this year, what happened to your program-level / service area-level SLOs and the methods you chose to assess them? | We kept the same program-level / service area-level SLOs and assessment methods from one iteration of the cycle to the next. | 7 | 47% |
| | We modified our program-level / service area-level SLOs and/or assessment methods from one iteration of the cycle to the next. | 8 | 53% |
| | Total | 15 | 100% |

| | disagree | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | Count | Row % | Count | Row % | Count | Row % | Count | Row % | Count | Count |
| Dialogue about student learning occurs on an ongoing basis in my unit. | 0 | 0% | 9 | 13% | 34 | 50% | 25 | 37% | 68 | |
| Dialogue about student learning involves all faculty/staff in my unit. | 0 | 0% | 8 | 12% | 36 | 54% | 23 | 34% | 67 | |
| The dialogue about student learning that occurs in my unit is robust. | 1 | 2% | 8 | 12% | 36 | 55% | 21 | 32% | 66 | |
| Student learning improvement is a visibly high priority in my unit. | 0 | 0% | 6 | 9% | 32 | 47% | 30 | 44% | 68 | |
| Student learning outcomes assessment occurs on an ongoing basis in my unit. | 0 | 0% | 12 | 18% | 30 | 45% | 25 | 37% | 67 | |
| Student learning outcomes assessment is conducted in a systematic fashion in my unit. | 1 | 2% | 14 | 21% | 32 | 48% | 19 | 29% | 66 | |
| Results of student learning outcomes assessment are used for continuous quality improvement in my unit. | 0 | 0% | 11 | 17% | 30 | 45% | 25 | 38% | 66 | |

Table 10

Dialogue and praxis: Frequencies

Table 11

Dialogue and praxis: Comparison of 2008 and 2009

*Note: n represents number of paired responses from 2008 and 2009. Please note that Administrative

| | Comparison of 2008 (Baseline) Means and 2009 Means | | |
|--|--|--------------|---------|
| | 2008 MEAN | 2009 MEAN | Sig. |
| Dialogue about student learning occurs on an ongoing basis in my unit. (n = 65) | 3.20 | 3.22 | No |
| Dialogue about student learning involves all faculty/staff in my unit. (n = 64) | 2.97 | 3.22 | p < .05 |
| The dialogue about student learning that occurs in my unit is robust. (n = 61) | 2.79 | 3.15 | p < .05 |
| Student learning improvement is a visibly high priority in my unit. (n = 64) | 3.33 | 3.36 | No |
| Student learning outcomes assessment occurs on an ongoing basis in my unit. (n = 63) | 3.06 | 3.22 | No |
| Student learning outcomes assessment is conducted in a systematic fashion in my unit. (n = 62) | 2.82 | 3.06 | p < .05 |
| Results of student learning outcomes assessment are used for continuous quality improvement in my unit. (n = 61) | 2.90 | 3.26 | p < .05 |

Services was not included in the 2008 SLO Survey administration.

Table 12
Units requesting assistance from SLO Committee

| Step in which assistance is requested | Unit requesting assistance |
|---|---|
| Step 1. The program-level / service area-level SLOs to be assessed and ways to assess them have been identified | Child Development Health Information Technology Student Accounting Office Student Health Services Tutorial Centers |
| Step 2. Assessment of the program-level / service area-level SLOs for at least one course or service area activity/event has been conducted | Employment/Payroll/Admin/Information Services & Tech Support Architecture and Environmental Design Black Studies Business Services Chicano Studies Department Child Development Computer Business Technology Educ Dental Assisting Geography Health Information Technology Stockroom Student Accounting Office Student Affairs Student Health Services Tutorial Centers |
| Step 3. Results of the assessment have been documented and analyzed and any necessary changes determined | Admissions/Records & Veterans Anthropology Architecture and Environmental Design Chicano Studies Department Child Development Dental Assisting Health Information Technology Student Accounting Office Student Affairs Student Health Services Testing and Orientation Tutorial Centers |
| Step 4. Continue the cycle | Animal Health Technology Architecture and Environmental Design Child Development Counseling Dance Dental Assisting Fashion Program Health Information Technology Physical Sciences (Astr, Geol, Phyn) Physical Therapist Assistant Student Accounting Office Student Health Services Teacher Education Program Tutorial Centers |

APPENDIX B. OPEN ENDED RESPONSES

All comments are verbatim and have not been edited except to protect the identity of a specific person. Identifiable information has been replaced with asterisks (***)

Please describe any decisions informed or actions prompted by your documented SLO assessment results.

Assessment still in progress

assessments have not yet begun. Process still in progress.

Change of workshop format to more interactive small group sessions. Focus more on student autonomy rather than simply providing information. Focus on access to resources.

Changes in assessment questions and addition of learning activities to one course

Completed 5 year assessment cycle in 2008. Met with our program assessment committee and revamped our goals (SLO's) and restructured some measurement tools. In process of new assessment cycle #1.

Decided to use same test in different PE classes during Spring semester 2010. Same SLO will be assessed in spring. 2nd SLO will begin assessment in Fall 2010.

Issue arose through analysis of spring 2009 presurvey results. While students taking work experience for the second time did rate their ability to write SMART learning objectives higher than students who had not taken the course before, the difference was minimal. We discussed this at our fall instructor meeting. Then, implemented the following: Instructors were to review how the orientation presentations and program materials could be improved in order to help students with the development of SMART objectives. Actions included putting the student handbook in PDF format and sending it to students so they could read it prior attending orientation. We are also changing the format of our learning objectives worksheet.

No decisions made at this time

One instructor found that student repeat performance of homework improved exam results. Another instructor will increase the question and answer sessions to improve learning opportunities; also, assignments will be changed to assure a better grasp of financial statement analysis and lecture on select topics will be increased.

Prompted training for writing rubrics

Still discussing data collection methods. Have held surveys for 2 semesters. We are comparing results and deciding if the measuring tool is effective.

The FA office collects a great deal of data, the question is how best to use that data, what does the data show us, and what data should we collect to provide a clearer picture of what our students may be learning from their FA experiences. It was decided to create and track data in the area of Student Academic Progress. The ability of the student to analyze their academic issues, seek counseling advice, communicate their issues in writing clearly and devise a plan of action is essential for a successful outcome of the Appeal process. A log template was devised where each of the Financial Aid Technicians would be able to keep statistics on these various elements as they relate to Appeal denials and approvals. The number of Appeal approvals, denials and reasons for denial are logged after each weekly Appeal meeting. The logs are examined at the end of each semester by the Financial Aid Officer and statistics are compiled. After the statistics are analyzed and discussed, recommendations are made to change elements of

the Appeal communication process to help lower the percentage of Appeal denials due to unclear student communication, or any other issue which becomes apparent.

We also used the state exam results

Please use this space to elaborate on any of your responses to the above questions. You may also use this space as an opportunity to tell us about any unique circumstances or challenges your unit has faced.

As a result of the evidence several new tactics were used to help students with their Appeal process: -A "Helpful Hints" sheet was prepared to make sure students realize why they need to appeal, and to help guide them in writing their Appeal letter. Issues covered include: Completion rate, Low GPA, Prior Degree and attempting more than 90 units. The effectiveness of this handout has been tracked through many semesters and the form is adjusted when the SLO analysis results indicate a need. -Additional information was added to the Appeal Cover Sheet and the actual Appeal Form to continue to make the Appeal process as transparent and comprehensible as possible. -Financial Aid Adjunct counselors have been hired to work specifically with Appeal students. In former years Counseling was unable to complete Student Education Plans for Appeal students during several months in the summer due to their own high office impact. Counselors were also unavailable to assist on the Appeal committee from mid-July, when students are initially notified that they need to appeal, until mid-September. In order to make sure all student appeals were treated with academic equality it was decided that an academic counselor needed to be present for each Appeal Committee meeting. -Communication at the Financial Aid front counter has been enhanced as a result of the new written material included with the Appeal Form. Students are instructed to read the information, make sure they understand why they need to appeal and ask questions of the office staff. They are now able to receive their Appeal decision verbally without having to wait for e-mail or letter confirmation. Challenges: Every year the pieces of information which students seem to have difficulty with seem to change. We are constantly having to identify new student perception issues and try to amend verbage for better understanding. It is an on-going process. Whenever we think we have an element ideally worded, the government makes a change and we need to start over.

Assessing a course per term as originally proposed by *** appears manageable. Putting the assessments on Task Stream, which I believe will consume much time and help desk assistance is another matter. Also, the goal of having all courses assessed by the end of 2010 and put on Task Stream is not feasible in light of the work load issue. In this department, 30 courses are offered of which 21 (70%) are taught solely by adjuncts. In our view, only the teacher can assess the course. The developing consensus is that the current SLO assessment process needs serious reevaluation.

Budget initiations have scaled back the types of outreach done and adjustments had to be made which has slowed the process. Also, the move to the Modular Village interrupted the flow of the office as adjustment to the new environment continues

I DO NOT REMEMBER WHAT THE SLO FOR THE COURSES WERE, OR IF THEY WERE EVEN DEVELOPED. WE HAVE DISCIPLINE SLO THAT CAN BE FOUND IN THE MESA CATALOG. NOR DO I REMEMBER WHICH COURSES WERE ASSESSED. ANOTHER PERSON IN THE DEPARTMENT HAS THAT INFORMATION AND HE IS UNAVAILABLE RIGHT NOW. I DO NOT HAVE THE SLO RESULTS; SOMEONE ELSE IN THE DEPARTMENT HAS THEM AND HE IS UNAVAILABLE RIGHT NOW.

I have no idea how SLOs for tutoring can be measured

I only teach in the Fall semester, so I've been out of the loop.

*** met with our department 11/16/09. Immensely helpful and will help again as needed. We will be tying in our implementation steps with our january department meeting.

Last two items not filled out due to previous answers regarding status. I will be discussing with Dept. Chair.

My department is one of the ones with a fair amount of resistance to the SLO process and assessment cycle; because ***, perhaps they expect me to "do it all for them." Planning has been sporadic at best. Perhaps if we had a liaison from the "new" SLO Committee, complete with due dates, we could get moving.

Our area affects student learning outcomes indirectly. We strive to provide best customer service so faculty & staff can concentrate on student needs & success.

Q9 - Laboratory practice exams

Regarding the questions below: Student learning outcomes and their assessment have always been a vital part of our teaching and learning even before the current accrediting cycle. Long before SLOs were a fad, we developed and modified courses, creating teaching and learning techniques that addressed student needs to assure their success. We accomplished this in a more timely and comprehensive manner than prescribed by the current SLO cycle mandate. The SLO cycle as prescribed by the ACCJC is a time consuming, gross over simplification of our traditional assessment and is therefore detrimental to our teaching. The assessment of three or four concepts in our department is perfunctory at best and could never replace our current methods of assessment. Therefore when we choose to agree with the following statements it is congruent with our time tested methods not with the current mandated and marginally tested SLO cycle.

Sorry but I'm new at this program. My supervisor retired and so I'm not sure where she left off. I would have to find her stuff and we moved recently so I'm not sure if I can find them

The language used in this survey should be made very simple to understand regarding the data your seeking to obtain departments. My department makes extended efforts to address many of these issues outside of defined SLO's so its confusing as to what your seeking to obtain. We engage what you define as SLO's into our core curriculum values & standards.

There are many adjunct faculty in CBTE. It is a challenge to train them in taskstream. It is also not clear what the work flow of adjuncts would follow to have the SLO's assessed and recorded. As of now, we think the contract faculty are responsible but we unsure of how to gather the SLO assessment data, judge it and input it for a class we didn't teach.

There are no contract faculty in GIS. I am taking the responsibility for the SLO's for GIS as this program is included in my department (CBTE/MULT/GIS). We were able to write the program SLOs. I cannot assess SLO's in the classroom as I teach in CBTE and MULT.

There are two SLO that I will need help on in assessing.

There is no current discussions being conducted on the status of SLOs in the department. I'm not sure that the courses offered are being are measuring student learning outcomes or if they are utilizing assessment measures. The original energy has waned.

WE ARE MEETING WITH *** TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE SLO PROCESS.

We need to see how we can assess the AUOs. The rest of the survey does not realte to us. There should have been another box entitled "N/A."

We plan to expand to assess a fourth course

We requested help earlier in the semester, but have worked through the problems and now have a pilot assessment in place for the end of the semester.

We started the initial SLO list during our program review and identified 5 SLO's. We have attended a SLO workshop/ webinar this semester. Our entire department is moving to new offices and we are totally overwhelmed with planning and are unable to do anything more on SLO's at this time. However, we all are involved with student learning just not in the systematic fashion that this process has asked us to use. (see below)

APPENDIX C. SURVEY INSTRUMENT

San Diego Mesa College Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Survey 2008

The goal of this survey is two-fold: to learn about the progress that your unit has made in the area of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and to identify any areas of SLOs in which the Mesa SLO Committee might be of assistance to your unit.

In what area of the College does your unit (program or service area) reside?

- Administrative Services
- Instructional Programs
- Student Services

What is the official title or name of your unit? *For units comprising two or more disciplines / service areas, please see your department chair / supervisor if coordination questions arise.*

As of Summer 2009, all college units have adopted their program-level / service area-level SLOs. For your unit, please indicate whether each step in the SLO assessment cycle is **COMPLETED**, **IN PROGRESS**, or **NOT STARTED**. If you are unsure or unaware for any of the steps, please select **PROGRESS UNKNOWN**.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Completed | In progress | Not started | <i>Progress unknown</i> |
| Step 1. The program-level / service area-level SLOs to be assessed and ways to assess them have been identified , i.e., your unit has discussed the assessment of your SLOs and chosen assignments or activities through which they will be assessed. | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Completed | In progress | Not started | <i>Progress unknown</i> |
| Step 2. Assessment of the program-level / service area-level SLOs for at least one course or service area activity/event has been conducted . A common, unit-wide rubric has been adopted and used to measure the students' levels of facility with the SLO. | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Completed | In progress | Not started | <i>Progress unknown</i> |
| Step 3. Results of the assessment have been documented and analyzed and any necessary changes determined , i.e., the results have been translated into "action plans" for improved learning in the future via changes in program design, instruction or service delivery. | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Completed | In progress | Not started | <i>Progress unknown</i> |
| Step 4. Continue the cycle , i.e., begin the next iteration of the SLO assessment cycle, starting again with Step 1. | | | | |

Please list the program-level / service area-level SLOs your unit has chosen to assess this year. You may list up to five SLOs.

SLO A: _____

SLO B: _____

SLO C: _____

SLO D: _____

SLO E: _____

In which courses has your unit conducted SLO assessment? You may list up to five courses.

SUBJECT ABBREVIATION + COURSE NUMBER _____

SUBJECT ABBREVIATION + COURSE NUMBER _____

SUBJECT ABBREVIATION + COURSE NUMBER _____

SUBJECT ABBREVIATION + COURSE NUMBER _____

SUBJECT ABBREVIATION + COURSE NUMBER _____

Have course-level SLOs been adopted for the courses listed above?

- Yes
- No

Were your SLOs measured using a common, unit-wide rubric? (Although the assessment activities may have varied, the rubric was the same).

- Yes, we used a unit-wide rubric.
- No, we did not use a unit-wide rubric.

What kind of SLO assessment did your unit conduct?

- Direct assessment ONLY (observed demonstrations of student learning)
- Indirect assessment ONLY (reported perceptions of student learning, including surveys, interviews, and focus groups)
- BOTH direct and indirect assessments

Which of the following activities did you use to observe students' facility with the outcome in your direct assessment? Please select all that apply.

- Capstone projects (final projects which synthesize essential course objectives)*
- Common exam questions (items designed to elicit student understanding of essential course objectives)*
- Course-embedded assessment (representative student work generated in response to typical course assignments)*
- Performance exams (e.g., external licensing examinations)*
- Portfolios (collections of student work which demonstrates growth and development over time)*
- Reports, written or oral*
- Other activities not listed above*

**Which of the following activities did you use to gather information for your indirect assessment?
Please select all that apply.**

- Surveys*
- Focus groups*
- Interviews*

Please describe any decisions informed or actions prompted by your documented SLO assessment results.

As you began another SLO assessment cycle this year, what happened to your program-level / service area-level SLOs and the methods you chose to assess them?

- We kept the same program-level / service area-level SLOs and assessment methods from one iteration of the cycle to the next.*
- We modified our program-level / service area-level SLOs and/or assessment methods from one iteration of the cycle to the next.*

Please indicate the areas of the SLO assessment cycle in which you would like assistance from the SLO Committee. Please select any or all that apply. If no assistance is needed, please leave the items blank.

- Step 1. Identify the SLOs to be assessed.*
- Step 2. Identify a way to assess the selected SLOs in particular courses or service area activities/events.*
- Step 3. Conduct assessment of the program-level / service area-level SLOs.*
- Step 4. Close the loop: analyze the documented results of the assessment and determine whether any changes should be made.*

Please use this space to elaborate on any of your responses to the above questions. You may also use this space as an opportunity to tell us about any unique circumstances or challenges your unit has faced.

Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements about your unit's stages of development with regard to SLOs.

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| Dialogue about student learning occurs on an ongoing basis in my unit. | <i>Strongly agree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Agree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Disagree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Strongly disagree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Dialogue about student learning involves all faculty/staff in my unit. | <i>Strongly agree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Agree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Disagree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Strongly disagree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| The dialogue about student learning that occurs in my unit is robust. | <i>Strongly agree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Agree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Disagree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Strongly disagree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student learning improvement is a visibly high priority in my unit. | <i>Strongly agree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Agree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Disagree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Strongly disagree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student learning outcomes assessment occurs on an ongoing basis in my unit. | <i>Strongly agree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Agree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Disagree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Strongly disagree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student learning outcomes assessment is conducted in a systematic fashion in my unit. | <i>Strongly agree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Agree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Disagree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Strongly disagree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Results of student learning outcomes assessment are used for continuous quality improvement in my unit. | <i>Strongly agree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Agree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Disagree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Strongly disagree</i> <input type="checkbox"/> |

Thank you for participating in the SLO Survey!

After clicking below to "submit" your survey, you will be immediately redirected to the Mesa SLO web site.

