Goal Statement

The major goal of this Two-Year Action Plan is to continue our faculty-driven approach to meeting Accreditation Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC)/Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Accreditation Standard II.A.1.c:

The institution identifies student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees; assesses student achievement of those outcomes; and uses assessment results to make improvements.

A focus of the 2011-12 and 2012-13 academic years will be to assist faculty to be actively engaged in ongoing authentic assessment of student learning at the college, program and course levels, aimed at improving teaching and learning. We aspire to support a system that is both Proficient and Sustainable, as defined by the 2007 ACCJC/WASC “Rubric for Institutional Effectiveness for Student Learning Outcomes” (See Attachment 1).

Faculty-Driven Continuous Improvement of Teaching and Learning at Ohlone College

According to the directives of AB 1725 (Faculty Senate 10 + 1 Responsibilities) and by long-term understandings with the Ohlone Board of Trustees, the District “relies primarily” on the Faculty Senate for the development, oversight, and continual review of the college curriculum. (See Attachment 2)

This responsibility also includes faculty direction and review of activities related to ACCJC/WASC Accreditation Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services (A. Instructional Programs; B. Student Support Service; and C. Library and Learning Support Service). Core elements of faculty involvement in Standard II activities are instructional program review, and the identification and assessment of student learning outcomes at the program and course levels.

The Faculty Senate has a number of important committees dedicated to the 10+1 Responsibilities including the Curriculum Committee, the General Education Committee, the Distance Education Committee, and the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee.

Individual faculty members, along with their departments, play key roles in the fulfilling the 10+1 Responsibilities of the Faculty Senate by engaging in the follow activities:

- Course development and course review
- Program development and program review
- Identification and assessment of student learning outcomes at the program and course levels
- Participation in the Faculty Senate and its committees

Characteristics of Ohlone’s Approach to Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

We want our system and strategies for identifying and assessing student learning outcomes and assessment to be faculty-driven.

We interpret Standard II.A.1.c as a call for ongoing professional critical thinking about teaching and learning practice for the purpose of continuous improvement. The associated activities can take many forms but the core elements are consistent.
Of course, we want to meet accreditation standards. However, we want to do that in a pragmatic way that builds from what faculty are already doing, so no wheels need to be re-invented (although that does not preclude new wheels from being invented!).

Assessment of student learning outcomes should not be viewed as some mysterious additional process to be superimposed on faculty work. Faculty are already actively engaged in assessing student learning outcomes (to give grades). Assessment for course improvement can use the information faculty already generate but simply looking at it in aggregate as it relates to program and course student learning outcomes.

We want our approach to meeting this standard to have practical value for faculty and students and not result in meaningless bureaucratic busy work. We want to encourage creativity and avoid cookie cutter approaches (although this does not preclude using a good cookie cutter!).

Robust dialogue amongst faculty regarding student learning outcomes, assessment results, and improvements plans is strongly encouraged.

Current Status of Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Activities

All programs and courses have Student Learning Outcomes stated.

Following dialog at the program/departmental levels, faculty update their Official Course Outlines in the CurricUNET Course and Program Approval module. Course outlines contain course student learning outcomes (CSLOs) and correlated content, assignments and methods of evaluation. The assignments and methods of evaluation provide the foundation for the ongoing authentic assessment of CSLOs. Faculty are engaged in aligning course, program and GE Plan A (when applicable) SLOs. When all outcomes are aligned, course level assessments for SLOs can be used to assess program and GE Plan A SLOs as well. This process is called “embedded” assessment.

A list and brief description of course student learning outcomes (CSLOs) assessment projects for Spring 2012 is available in Attachment_.

The following operational definitions are in effect at Ohlone:

**Student Learning Outcomes** are *student* focused. They are global and broad measurable statements that clearly state the knowledge, skills, abilities, and attitudes a *student* has attained upon completion of a course, program, GE Plan A, and upon receiving student services. Student Learning Outcomes:

- Focus on what the student can do
- Demonstrate the student is competent
- Include a measurable expectation
- Use active verbs (Bloom’s Taxonomy) (SLOPE 3/4/04)

**Evaluation** is the judgment of a *student’s work* to determine the learning achieved, the grade earned, and/or the graduation requirements satisfied. (SLOPE approved 3/4/04)

**Assessment** is aimed at *improving the teaching/learning process*. It is the systematic collection, analysis, and interpretation of information, which provides continuous feedback about student success in reaching the stated objectives, goals, and learning outcomes. Everyone is involved in the assessment process. (SLOPE 3/4/04)

“Evaluation” focuses on the individual student to provide feedback and assign a grade. “Assessment” focuses on a sampling of all students taking the course to determine how well the students are meeting
stated course student learning outcomes. Assessment results are used to make any needed improvements in curriculum or pedagogy.

Following the review of assessment data for SLOs, faculty write an analysis and include any planned or implemented improvements within the CurricUNET Program Review module.

The CurricUNET Program Review Module integrates program level assessment of Student Learning Outcomes with a planning and documentation component. There is also a Student Learning Outcomes Matrix component linking courses with program outcomes.

A template and process for course level assessment of student learning outcomes is now being integrated into the CurricUNET Program Review Module. It is hoped that this tool will provide direction for faculty but also allow maximum flexibility in approach.

A template and process for course level assessment of student learning outcomes was integrated into the CurricUNET Program Review Module August 2011 with the goal of providing direction for faculty but also allowing maximum flexibility in approach. A new page to assess course level student learning outcomes was added to the Ohlone College CurricUNET Program Review module.

A “Course Assessment in a Box” template (Attachment ____) was created for ease of use, which includes similar questions as those contained in the Courses SLO Assessment page in the program review module and is available on the SLOA web site. This tool is a Word document and allows faculty to work through their assessments outside of the CurricUNET module, which provides needed flexibility for many faculty.

Documentation within the CurricUNET module can be completed through:

- Direct input into the module on the “Course SLO and Assessment” page.
- Use of the “Course Assessment in a Box” template and attaching it to the module.
- Placing a link to a course/program assessment website or blog on the “Course SLO and Assessment” page. The Basic Skills Program is an excellent example of this approach. Basic Skills Initiative website: http://www.ohlone.edu/org/basicskills/
- The need to “close the loop” is emphasized. Faculty are encouraged to make three recommendations for improvement, implement improvements, and reassess in 1 – 2 years. We will continue the dialog on the best way to document this process.

Efforts are underway to complete implementation of the CurricUNET Program Review Module and monitor the effectiveness of the assessment component. Although implementation of the Module is nearly complete, there continue to be numerous glitches within the program so the college and the Governet programmers are working to resolve these issues.

During Fall 2011, a CurricUNET oversight committee was established which met four times during the semester. Members of this Task Force included the Faculty Coordinator of Program Review, CurricUNET, and SLOA; the VP Academic Affairs, the AVP Technology; the Dean of College Research and Planning. Others were invited to share their feedback and provide ideas for possible solutions. The AVP of Technology has communicated with the Governet Programmers on several occasions to assist in the resolution.

The Faculty Coordinator of Program Review, CurricUNET, and SLOA conducted several conference calls with Steve Thyberg, VP Business Management, Governet, to discuss and resolve several issues.

- Fall 2011: Governet made an operational improvement to allow users to choose the priority of the problems entered into the ticket system: low, normal, high, urgent.
- February 14, 2012: Conference call with Governet VP Technology, Ohlone AVP Technology, and Faculty Coordinator of Program Review, CurricUNET, and SLOA to discuss ongoing issues needing resolution.

- February 21, 2012: Steve Thyberg conducted a site visit at Ohlone for the purpose of assessing what was working well and what improvements were deemed necessary in the CurricUNET modules. Over a full day’s time, Steve met with 19 users. The last meeting of the day consisted of a wrap-up session with the College President; VP, Academic Affairs, and Faculty Coordinator of Program Review, CurricUNET, and SLOA. (Attachment – matrix of CurricUNET improvements and their status)

- March 2012: Governet made an operational improvement by developing a new testing team that ensures the task was completed as asked and verifies that other issues have not arisen due to these changes. Now most changes will not be moved to live until the ticket has passed the testing stage.

- March 2012: All improvements needed that were identified during Steve Thyberg’s visit were entered into the Governet Ticket System and the programmers began to work on them. The faculty coordinator tracks progress by monitoring CurricUNET improvements and their status.

Dialogue on course level assessment of student learning outcomes has been active and examples of good practice have been identified.

**Fall 2011 Student Learning Outcome Assessment Project Presentations at SLOAC Meetings:**

- **October 20, 2011**
  - Course Level SLOA project: English, Rachel Sherman, ENGL101A
  - Course/Program Level SLOA project: Kinesiology, J. Roberts

- **November 17, 2011**
  - Program/Course Level SLOA project: Computer Studies, Dave Topham

**Fixed Flex, January 20, 2012:** The following Student Learning Outcome Assessment Project Presentations were given:

- Course/Program Level SLOA project: Kinesiology, J. Roberts
- Program/Course Level SLOA project: Computer Studies, Dave Topham
- Program/Course Level SLOA project: Basic Skills, Rakesh Swamy

Following these presentations, dialog occurred between all full-time faculty and academic deans and then faculty had time to meet with their colleagues to work on their own departmental SLOs with additional collaboration during lunch.

**During the Spring 2012 semester the following Student Learning Outcome Assessment presentations were made at SLOAC Meetings, with all faculty invited:**

- **February 20, 2012**
  - Course Level SLOA project: Chemistry, Yvette Niccolls

- **March 15, 2012**
  - Course Level SLOA project: History, Heather McCarty, Darren Bardell
Wednesday, April 4, 2012

Program/Course Level SLOA project: Personal Development, Jennifer Harper
Course Level SLOA project: PE/Wellness, Robin Kurotori
Course Level SLOA project: Computer Applications, Rick Arellano

Thursday, April 26, 2012

Course Level SLOA project: Biotech/Biology, Laurie Issel-Tarver, Angelique Finney

Wednesday, May 9, 2012

Course Level SLOA project: Deaf Studies, Nancy Pauliakonis

Academic Leadership Groups Involved in Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

• Faculty Senate
• Curriculum Committee
• General Education Committee
• Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee
• Academic Deans

Faculty Senate Role

January 2012 letter to faculty and January 2012 Fixed Flex forum on SLOA
Collected information from all faculty on course assessment projects underway.
Endorsed Master Course List for Assessment
Participate in planning Learning College Week August 2012

Curriculum Committee Role

Assist faculty in writing course level SLOs and an integrated course outline.
Encourage faculty to align CSLOS with PSLOs and GE Plan A SLOS.
Conduct discussions on what the Curriculum Committee role will be related to course level assessment.

General Education Committee Role

The General Education (GE) Committee approves or reaffirms courses for inclusion on the GE Plan A during the 6 year course review process completed by the Curriculum Committee. The GE Committee conducts the approval review for a course to be included on or reaffirmed for the GE Plan A and makes its recommendation to the Curriculum Committee. Final approval of all GE Plan A courses occurs at the Curriculum Committee.

The GE Committee modified guidelines for GE approval and reaffirmation of GE course. These guidelines were also approved by the Curriculum Committee. Revised guidelines include:

• GE rationales must show how the course SLOs aligns with the GE area SLOs.
• Courses approved for GE Plan A must show how GE SLOs are addressed by the course content.
• GE rationales must include how GE SLOs will be assessed.

The GE Committee developed examples to accompany the revised guidelines. The goal is to set the standards, publicize the standards, and be consistent in applying the standards. GE members will assist the Chair in helping faculty to write effective GE rationales that meet the above criteria and will focus on “closing the loop” to improve student learning in GE courses.
In 2010-11 the GE Committee reviewed and revised the GE Plan A area definitions and outcomes and disseminated these modifications to all Deans and faculty.

The GE Committee encourages faculty to align CSLOs with PSLOs and GE Plan A SLOS. Then course SLO assessment can be used for course, program, and GE SLO assessment. Mike Bowman, Dean of Research and Planning, provided an “Assessment of Student Activity GE Plan A” spreadsheet. Assessment will focus on the highly enrolled and regularly offered courses. Many courses have low enrollments or have not been offered in the last year. GE Committee members suggested that we consider excluding courses from GE Plan A that have not been offered in one year and reevaluate the appropriateness of the courses in Area III Fine Humanities/Fine Arts and Area V Physical Education/Wellness, GE Plan A, the two largest GE areas.

Current faculty assessment projects that include GE courses are detailed in the GE Assessment committee meeting minutes for February 9, 2012.

Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (SLOAC) Role

SLOAC membership during the 2011-12 academic year was expanded to include faculty and Deans representing all academic divisions. SLOAC is Co-Chaired by Vice President of Academic Services with assistance from Faculty Coordinator of SLOA and Assistant Vice President of Academic Services.

SLOAC has become a venue for dialogue about faculty assessment projects. Every meeting 1 – 3 assessment projects are presented and followed by dialogue with committee members.

The SLOAC Coordinator and members facilitate numerous workshops and provide individual assistance with writing SLOs, completing assessments, and using the CurricUNET program Review module to document work.

Academic Deans Role

The Academic Deans job description has been modified to include the following:

Oversee and facilitate the Program and Services Review process within the Division. Program and Services Review drives institutional planning, integrates with the College Strategic Plan, the Educational Master Plan, the District Facilities Plan, the Technology Plan, and the annual budget planning process. For instructional programs, Program and Services Reviews also integrate student learning outcomes assessment at the course and program levels.

Develop and implement student learning outcomes and assessment activities at the program and course levels. Experience with accreditation standards of the Accreditation Commission for Junior and Community Colleges and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, or similar accreditation group is desired.

The Academic Deans handbook includes the updates in the following sections:

Program Review

Although we want to encourage faculty and staff involvement in Program and Services Review, it is ultimately the responsibility of the Deans and Vice Presidents to ensure the reviews are done properly and are updated annually. You must approve all Program and Services Review updates; thus, you need to be knowledgeable of all the reviews in their Divisions. You should become a skilled user of the CurricUNET Program Review Module. You play an important role in assisting faculty and staff in the
review process, especially in the development of Program Improvement Objectives and work on Student 
Learning Outcomes and Assessment.

Program Reviews are updated them on a yearly basis. Again, you will need to review the changes and 
may need to make suggestions before giving the Program Review your approval. You will also be 
responsible for ensuring that Program Reviews are updated.

Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

Deans need to be actively involved with faculty efforts to meet accreditation standards related to Student 
Learning Outcomes and Assessment at both the program and course levels. Further, this is a vital process 
of professional critical thinking about teaching and learning, the effectiveness of courses, and to 
implement continuous improvements. You need to be knowledgeable about the SLOA process in order to 
provide direction and support to faculty. This includes active participation as members of the Student 
Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (SLOAC).

SLOA Emphasis in the Hiring Process for Faculty and Academic Deans

During 2011-12, we hired six faculty members and two Academic Deans. Our emphasis on SLOA was 
included into the interview process for these positions.

In the final interviews for all six faculty positions the President of the college and the Vice President of 
Academic Affairs asked the candidates to discuss their understanding of, and experience with, student 
learning outcomes and assessment. The six successful candidates each have solid understanding of, and 
good experience with, SLOA.

The interview committee for one of the Academic Dean positions asked each candidate to give a 10 
minute presentation that would motivate faculty to embrace SLOA. This generated some very interesting 
presentations and the candidate who was hired had made an excellent presentation on the topic. The 
interview committee for the other position incorporated a focused question on SLOA into the interview 
process, again generating very interesting responses, with the candidate who was hired having given an 
excellent answer to the question.

Action Plan Strategies

Ohlone’s accreditation timeline:
2011-12 Continue on self-identified improvement agenda items from the 
2007-08 Self Study and Site Visit.
2012-13 FA12 organize and begin self-study; SP13, engage in self-study 
2013-14 FA13 complete self-study; SP14, site visit in March

Expand the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee to include the Deans and ensure a 
faculty representative from each Division.

The SLOAC has been expanded as planned. The following is the charter of the committee:

Parent Committee: Faculty Senate

Committee Goals:
1. Provide support and serve as resource to programs completing the Program and Discipline Review 
Process.
4. Oversee the implementation of student learning outcomes and assessment in alignment with accreditation standards.
5. Assist programs to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of their own assessment processes.
6. Evaluate the quality and effectiveness of the overall assessment process.
7. Provide the forum to address questions arising from the implementation and use of assessment.
8. Educate faculty, staff, and administrators on student learning outcomes and assessment.

Committee Membership:

The committee will be composed of nine faculty and deans representing various Academic Divisions and the Office of Institutional Research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mikelyn Stacey*</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Humanities, Social Science and Math</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Sherman</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakesh Swamy*</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>ECL Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walt Birkedahl*</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Fine Arts, Business and Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Roberts*</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>CC Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Quinta</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Science and Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Topham*</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvette Niccols*</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Science Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Warden*</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>PE, Athletics and Community Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Roberts</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genie Gertz*</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Deaf Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Pauliukonis*</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Deaf Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gale Carli</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Health Science and Environmental Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Dameron</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheryl Einfalt</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Physical Therapist Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley Buehler*</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>LRC and Academic Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.G. Greenstein*</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Library/LRC</td>
<td>GE Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie West</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>International Programs/Counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse MacEwan*</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>Curriculum Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Myers*</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Wright</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff O'Connell*</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Faculty Senate President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leta Stagnaro*</td>
<td>AVP</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb Parziale</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>SLOA and Staff Development</td>
<td>SLOAC Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Dodson</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>One Stop Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Robbie</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Curriculum and Scheduling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Bowman*</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Institutional Research and Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See the accomplishments of SLOAC above which provide detail below on how SLOAC has become a forum for the sharing of faculty assessment work.

During the Spring 2012 semester the role of the SLOA Coordinator was adjusted to serve as SLOAC Faculty Co-Chair with the Vice President Academic Affairs. This supports the general direction of infusing responsibility for SLOA across all Deans and faculty in all Divisions and Departments. This is a 25% reassignment for the Faculty Co-Chair.
Promote the fact that many faculty already use authentic assessment techniques to evaluate individual student performance and use that data as a basis for courses assessment and improvement.

Promote the concept of ongoing professional critical thinking and dialogue about teaching and learning practice.

See Attachment 3: A Pragmatic Approach to Meeting Accreditation Standards Using Existing Processes and Faculty Driven Approaches to Add Value to Teaching and Learning Through Continuous Improvement

Develop a baseline inventory of courses regularly offered (primary and non-special topics) offered SU10/FA10/SP11 to form a framework for course level assessment of student learning outcomes. The framework will identify volume of sections offered and course clusters by type and/or intent (e.g. Basic Skills, Plan A Math, General Education, etc…), course clusters in more structured cohort-type and semi-cohort Career Technical Education programs (eg. Nursing, RT, PTA, IPP, BIOT, CNET, etc…)

This analysis of our courses will identify full time faculty and Deans who direct course assessment activities (See Attachment 4). These clusters include:

- Basic Skills courses that are highly sequential with high section volume (ENGL, MATH, ESL)
- CTE high structured cohort programs, with high integration of course and program student learning outcomes (NURS, PTA, RT, INT)
- CTE programs that are less structured cohort programs, but still have high integration of course and program student learning outcomes (ECS, BRDC, EDT, MM)
- CTE programs which are more course-based with low section volume but aimed at specific student needs (e.g., AH, CFS, CAOT, etc…)
- General Education courses with high section volume (e.g. HIST, PSY, SPCH, etc…)
- General Education courses clustered around specific student goals (ART, MUS, SPCH, etc…)
- General Education courses with low section volume

Framework for Course SLO Assessment and Master Course List for SLO Assessment

For the past year the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (SLOAC) has been working within context of a Two-Year Action Plan, 2011 – 2013, which was developed in the Spring of 2011. One of the goals of the plan was to develop a baseline inventory of regularly offered courses (primary and non-special topics) to form a framework for course level assessment of SLOs. The purpose of this framework is to provide a realistic list of courses across disciplines to be assessed and the frequency of assessment, as part of our overall plan to meet accreditations standards for SLOs at the Proficiency/Sustainable levels, as defined by the ACCJC effectiveness rubric.

While the Two-Year Action Plan was being developed an analysis was conducted of all courses and sections offered during the 2010-11 academic year. This analysis included a review of how the courses and sections were arranged by programs. The result was a set of course clusters shown in Attachment 1.

Since the cluster analysis was first developed, dialogue with Deans and faculty, and review by the SLOAC have led to further refinement of the clusters. This has resulted in the development of a Framework for Course SLO Assessment and a Master List of Courses for Assessment. The framework identified the following factors that were considered when creating the list:

- Included courses that are offered on a regular basis, at least two sections per year in at least two of the three terms.
- Nursing, PTA, RT and INT already do regular courses assessment integrated with their Program Review and outside Accreditation processes.
- Basic Skills has developed a sustainable approach to regular course assessment.
• Within Basic Skills, Deaf Studies in pursuing a portfolio based assessment strategy.
• Potential target courses linked to the GE Assessment plan are identified.
• Combined sequential A,B,C courses, which are often stacked.
• Combined other sequential courses (e.g., 121, 122) where the assessment of the last course in the sequence would constitute an assessment of all in the sequence, especially when taught by the same person.
• Excluded department-specific 195 work experience classes (40 courses with little enrollment).
• Excluded department-specific Special Projects (201, 202, 203).
• Excluded courses rarely offered.
• Excluded Consortium courses.

The categories of clusters and programs were also refined from 8 to 6 as follows:

1. General Transfer
2. Basic Skills
3. Structured CTE Cohort Programs
4. Semi-Structured CTE Programs
5. Course-Based CTE
6. Languages

The resulting Framework for Course SLO Assessment and Master Course List for Assessment are shown in Attachment 2. The list is meant to be an ongoing guide for our SLO assessment work and subject to adjustment as we move forward. We will use the list to track course assessment over time.

The Master Course List includes 282 courses or course clusters for ongoing assessment. We have established a three-year cycle of course assessment to allow for the improvement loop to take place. Departments may decide to use a shorter cycle or a longer cycle up to four years, if the nature of the improvement plans warrant.

Of the 282 courses or course clusters on the Master Course List for Assessment, at total of 94, or 33%, were under assessment by faculty during Spring 2012. A list of assessment projects by department is attached in Attachment __

Program-Level Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

All Degree and Certificate have program level student learning outcomes that are published in the college catalog.

There are 52 Degree/Certificate Program areas and 43 areas (83%) were determined to have Program SLO assessment ongoing as of spring 2012, many blended with course assessment. Most program level SLO assessment is documented in the CurricUNET Program Review Module.

College-Level Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

College-Level SLOs are defined at Ohlone as the SLOs for General Education Plan A. These SLOs were recently reviewed and updated by the GE Committee.

We had been exploring the options for assessment of GE SLOs and decided to send a team of SLOAC members to the ACCJC/WASC Assessment Retreat, October 27-29, in Berkeley. Our team consisted of 14 members, 7 Deans and 7 faculty. All teams were to choose Project to work on during the retreat and the Ohlone project focused on creating a process that engages faculty in Student Learning Outcomes Assessment in our Ohlone College General Education Plan A Pattern.
An Initial Action Plan (Attachment ___) was developed by the retreat team and reviewed during follow-up discussions with SLOAC. In conjunction with this planning the Office of Research and Planning conducted an Analysis of Course Enrollment Activity by GE Areas (Attachment ___) resulting in courses with high volume being identified as target courses for assessment to be linked with GE assessment.

As SLOAC was documenting course assessments being conducted during the Spring 2012 semester, it was found that most of the GE Plan A target courses were being assessed by faculty. This led to the creation of a chart showing how the GE Plan A Area Definitions and SLOs could be integrated with course assessments in the target courses (Attachment ___). This integration will be a focus for development during the 2012-13 academic year.

Create a simple, yet robust and longitudinal system of online database tools for documenting and tracking course level assessment activities. Faculty dialogue can also be facilitated using online interactions techniques. Several tools are in development and could be used concurrently to form the overall system:

- CurricUNET Course Module
- Course Assessment Template
- Course Dialogue Blogs
- Other faculty-created tools….

Document and regularly showcase internal best practices.

Program and Services Review Monthly Spotlights

September 2011, Biology

This report shows a good example of SLO assessment related to their Program SLO #2. Their SLO Matrix is well done. They have done a very good job stating their PIO and associated resource needs.

October 2011, Kinesiology

This Program Review demonstrates an excellent framework and approach for blending Course-Level Student Learning Outcomes Assessment (SLOA) with Program-Level SLOA using Capstone Course assessment as the unifying strategy.

November 2011, ESL

This review clearly describes an excellent program. Data has been collected and analyzed for two program student learning outcomes. The loop was completed by implementing improvements in curriculum and teaching strategies. Dialogue and coordination among full and part time faculty has been facilitated by and ESL Instructor wiki, posting sample assignments and rubrics, and sharing links and student work.

February 2012, Transfer Center

This an exemplary Student Services review. It includes thorough descriptions of the numerous services the Transfer Center provides Ohlone College students. It provides reasoned analysis of how the Center supports College Goals and Objectives and demonstrates the purposeful use of data to inform decision-making about the allocation and reallocation of resources. The review includes thoughtful articulation of how the Transfer Center helps students achieve Student Services Learning Outcomes (SSLO) and the Program Improvement Objectives (PIOs) clearly connect to the needs of the Center and students it serves.

March 2012, Personal Development
This review provides an excellent description of the program and does an outstanding job integrating assessments of SLOs in three core courses. These course assessments also serve as assessments of the program level SLOs. The PIO is well-stated with a very thorough action plan.

April 2012, English

The Program Review Spotlight this month is on the English Department Program Review. This review gives a clear description of the English Department and its four major program areas: 1. The Basic Skills reading and writing classes; 2. Transfer level classes in composition, critical thinking, and introduction to literature, as well as literature and creative writing electives; 3. The AA Degree program in English; and 4. The English Learning Center, which supports all aspects of the English program with tutoring as well as staff support and materials for the lab programs in the Basic Skills classes and in English 101A, the Freshman composition class at Ohlone.

Faculty in the English Department have participated in an ongoing assessment project for ENGL 101A, Composition, since Spring 2009, documenting their process and results in their Program Review. ENGL 101A is the most highly enrolled course at the college, a required course for transfer and graduation, and the primary course taken by students to meet Ohlone GE Plan A Area IVA. Faculty designed, normed, standardized, and implemented a rubric for grading students' final research papers and for assessing the SLO collective students' results on the SLO. Annual attachments to the program review include an analysis of data, improvements made, and reassessment of results following implemented improvements. Results showed favorable achievement rates in the skills measured and assessment efforts shifted to measure other Program and Course SLOs.

The ENGL 101A project continued through Fall 2011 and is now on hiatus to allow faculty to focus on assessment in several other courses. Assessment frameworks for each of these courses have been established in the Program Review. Transfer level ENGL 101C, Critical Thinking and Composition, is another important course taken by many students to transfer and it is a primary course used to fulfill Ohlone GE Plan A Area IVB. The English Course Coordinators in the Basic Skills Initiative are leading assessment work in ENGL 162, Developmental Reading; ENGL 163, Techniques of College Reading; ENGL 151A, Fundamentals of Composition; and ENGL 151B, Fundamentals of Composition. These assessments are being linked to the online assessment and dialogue blogs established on the Basic Skills Initiative website with the intent to involve part time faculty more fully in the assessment and dialogue processes.

The PIOs in the Program Review are well stated and clearly practical. One of the PIOs involved the need for full time faculty positions in the Department. The PIO was a central component of a faculty position proposal recommended by the Faculty Position Planning Committee to the President and approved. This position was recently recruited and filled and the new faculty member will join the Department for the fall 2012 semester.

Integrate “assessment of the assessment processes” into the existing ongoing course review process.

During 2011-12 we are asking all faculty members to participate in some fundamental activities within this particular accreditation standard:

• Make sure you are fully aware of the Student Learning Outcomes for the courses you are teaching. Course Student Learning Outcomes are located in the Official Course Outlines of Record in the online CurricUNET Course Module.
• Include the course Student Learning Outcomes in your course syllabus and make sure you review them with students at the beginning of each semester.
• Make sure your methods of evaluating student work, and the content of these methods, are related to the Student Learning Outcomes of your course.
• Participate in assessment, dialogue and improvement activities. These might be individual activities if you are the sole teacher of course sections or involvement in group/department activities for course taught by multiple instructors.
• The Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee, which is an active team of faculty and Deans, will be providing direction and support for these activities. Regular workshops for individual faculty and department will be conducted. Please take advantage of these workshops.

Self-Assessments

Faculty are engaged in ongoing authentic assessment of student learning in assessing and grading students at the course level. In May and August 2011, a survey was conducted to ascertain strategies being used by faculty to assess student learning, which were repeated in May 2012.

Survey Results: Faculty Use of Assessment Strategies May 2011

http://www.ohlone.edu/org/sloacomm/docs/20110500courselevelassessmentsurveysummary.pdf
Results were disseminated to all faculty. 196 faculty completed this survey; 190 faculty indicated they use student assessment techniques in class; 53% stated they are currently assessing course SLOs at this time; 57.9% stated that if not assessing course SLOs at this time, they would implement an assessment plan (question deemed to be somewhat confusing); 55.5% of faculty stated that if teaching a section, they would coordinate with other faculty teaching the same course, to develop an assessment plan and make course related improvements; 67.2 % of faculty who responded to this survey were adjunct.

Survey Results: Faculty Use of Assessment Strategies May 2012

As a form of self-evaluation, a survey based on the Proficiency and Sustainability Levels of the ACCJC/WASC Rubric was completed by SLOAC members in August 2011, and repeated in May 2012.

SLOAC Self-evaluation survey results, August 2011

http://www.surveymonkey.com/sr.aspx?sm=z6dVu3MjdrbpdmAHiwjn1_2bkzs6Z8yo5EMeNU1LQ5HQ_3d

SLOAC Self-evaluation survey results, May 2012
GE Activity Analysis
Area I Natural Sciences

Definition
Courses in the natural sciences are those which examine the physical universe, its life forms, and its natural phenomena. To satisfy the General Education requirement in natural sciences, a course shall be designed to help the student develop an appreciation and understanding of the scientific method, and encourage an understanding of the relationships between science and other human activities. This category includes introductory or integrative courses in astronomy, biology, chemistry, general physical science, geology, meteorology, oceanography, physical geography, physical anthropology, physics, and other scientific disciplines.

Student Learning Outcome
Analyze and apply concepts of biological and/or physical science obtained through the scientific method.

GE Assessment Projects as of March 2012
CHEM102 Preparation for General Chemistry (Niccolls)
CHEM109 Biochemistry for Health Science and Biotechnology (Niccolls)
ENVS108 Human Ecology (Watanabe)
BIOT 105 Introduction to Cell and Molecular Biology (Issel-Tarver)

Area II Social and Behavioral Sciences

Definition
Social and behavioral science courses increase the understanding of individual and group-influenced behavior in a variety of contexts: geographic location, economic structures, historical background, political institutions, social groups, societies, and the individual person.

Courses will challenge students to think critically about these contexts and should promote appreciation of how societies and social subgroups operate within them. Courses will also develop students’ abilities to recognize and apply appropriate methods of inquiry to the particular social science areas that they are studying.

Student Learning Outcomes
Identify and apply the major theories and methods of inquiry of the relevant social or behavioral science to a variety of contexts in order to investigate, analyze, or predict individual or group behavior.
Describe how individuals and/or groups are influenced by their social, cultural, and/or historical contexts.
Apply disciplinary knowledge from the social or behavioral sciences to contemporary ethical or social dilemmas.

GE Assessment Projects as of March 2012
HIST105 History of California (Bardell, McCarty)
HIST117A History of the U.S. California (Bardell, McCarty)
HIST117B History of the U.S. 1945- California (Bardell, McCarty)
BA102A Principles of Economics-Macroeconomics (Mosleh)
BA102B Principles of Economics-Microeconomics (Mosleh)

Area III Fine Arts/Humanities

Definition
Courses in the fine arts and humanities area cultivate intellect, imagination, sensibility, and sensitivity. Courses fulfilling this requirement study great works of the human imagination; increase awareness and appreciation of the traditional humanistic disciplines such as fine and performing arts, literature, music, philosophy, history, and communications; impart an understanding of the interrelationship between
creative art, the humanities, and the self; provide exposure to both Western and non-Western cultures; may include a foreign language course that contains a cultural component as opposed to a course that focuses solely on skills acquisition.

**Student Learning Outcomes**

A. Fine Arts.
Analyze and value modes of artistic expression.

B. Humanities.
Identify the influence of culture on human experience and/or expression.

**GE Assessment Projects as of March 2012**

B. ART139A Beginning Digital Photography (Mueller)
B. TD114 Acting for the Camera (Blank, Tomblin)
B. MUS110A Music Theory and Harmony (Roberts, McManus)
B. MUS 111A Musicianship (Roberts, McManus)
B. SPAN 101A Elementary Spanish (Lemon)
B. ART106A Descriptive Drawing (Mencher)
B. ART 104A 2D Design (Frank)
B. ART 121A Introductory Ceramics I (Frank)

**Area IV Language and Rationality**

**Definition**
Courses in Language and Rationality provide students with the opportunity to develop their critical thinking and communication skills, as well as their computational skills. Courses in these areas focus on writing, argument, analysis, problem solving, and verbal communication.

**Student Learning Outcomes**

A. English Composition
Write a well-organized paper in Standard English which presents a main idea supported by effective documentation and details.
Demonstrate the ability to write effectively for a variety of purposes, using correct grammar and appropriate style.

B. Analytical Thinking and Oral Communication
Think logically and critically to solve problems, draw conclusions, and evaluate evidence.
Communicate an idea clearly, either verbally or in written form.

C. Math Proficiency
Demonstrate the ability to think analytically by applying the concepts and techniques of algebra to the solution of real world math applications.

**GE Assessment Projects as of March 2012**

A. English Composition
ENGL101A Reading and Written Composition (Sherman, contact person)

B. Language and Rationality
ENGL101C Critical Thinking and Composition (Brosamer, Gallagher, Hurley, Madden, Sherman, Tull)

C. Math Proficiency (Bradshaw, Hirsch, Honma, Katz, Munding, Nguyen, O’Connell, Pelimiano, Smedfjeld)
MATH152 Algebra II
MATH159 Introduction to Statistics
Math 153 Intermediate Algebra
Area V Physical Education/Wellness

Definition
Physical Education courses are activity based. Wellness courses are not necessarily activity based and have a focus on such topics as nutrition, stress management, weight management, fitness, and personal wellness.

Student Learning Outcomes
A. Physical Education
Value the importance of and develop a regular regimen of physical activity and/or exercise.
Demonstrate fundamental skills incorporating the techniques, rules, and strategies of the activity.

B. Wellness
Formulate a personal wellness plan incorporating the basic principles of a healthful lifestyle.

GE Assessment Projects as of March 2012
*Note: GE SLOs are assessed as part of program and course review.
HLTH 101 Contemporary Health Issues (Kurotori)
HLTH 150 Women’s Health Issues (Kurotori)

Area VI Intercultural/International Studies

Definition
The Intercultural/International Studies requirement is intended to instill in students an appreciation of peoples and cultures other than their own. Students who fulfill this requirement should be able to empathize with and respect those from different cultural backgrounds, and realize the interconnectedness of all peoples. The requirement is meant to help ensure that Ohlone College graduates acquire the perspective necessary for an enlightened, diverse global citizenry. Students taking a course in these areas will be able to recognize and negotiate the complex ethics and politics of construing meaning and building social relationships across differences; e.g.: ethnocentrism, nationalism, cultural imperialism, cultural appropriation, and homogenization of nations and cultures.

Courses which satisfy the Ohlone College Intercultural/International Studies requirement shall be courses wholly focused on the following topics: culture, race, ethnicity, gender, religion, age, sexual orientation, disability, socioeconomic background, and/or language. Courses that satisfy the Intercultural/International Studies requirement may focus on any of the aforementioned topics within a U.S. context, or within an international or global context such as technology, economic development, cross national communication, cultural relations, and world art and literature.

Student Learning Outcomes
Analyze the ways historical, cultural, and/or social conditions impact a particular intercultural/international group or culture.
Develop sensitivity and skills for living and working in a culturally diverse world.

GE Assessment Projects as of March 2012
HLTH 150 Women’s Health Issues (Kurotori)

Area VII Information Competency

Definition
Information Competency is the ability to identify an information need, to find the needed information efficiently, and to use information effectively and ethically. Information Competency combines aspects of library literacy, research methods, critical thinking, and technological literacy.
Student Learning Outcomes
Develop effective research strategies.
Locate, retrieve, evaluate, and use information ethically and legally.

GE Assessment Projects as of March 2012
SPCH101 Introduction to Public Speaking (Ahntholz, Duggal, Greenstein, Massimo, Sparling)
COMM100 Introduction to Communication Theory (Ahntholz, Duggal, Greenstein, Massimo, Sparling)