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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.

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.

Efforts are underway to fully implement the CurricUNET Program Review Module and monitor the effectiveness of the assessment component

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” document was created which includes similar questions that are 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/](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 fully implement the CurricUNET Program Review Module and monitor the effectiveness of the assessment component.

- Although the CurricUNET Program Review module is fully implemented, there continue to be numerous glitches within the program so the college and the Governet programmers are working to resolve these issues.
- 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.
- Fall 2011: 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:
- Jeff Roberts, Kinesiology: Athletic Training program
- Dave Topham, Computer Science
- Rakesh Swamy, Basic Skills

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.

Spring 2012 Student Learning Outcome Assessment Project Presentations at SLOAC Meetings:
- 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: Library Science, KG Greenstein and Kathy Sparling
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
• January 2012 Fixed Flex
• Collected information from all college faculty related to assessment projects being completed at the course level.
• 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.

GE Committee Role
• Approve or reaffirm 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.
• Modified guidelines for GE approval and reaffirmation of GE course. These guidelines were also approved by the Curriculum Committee. Revised guidelines include:
  o GE rationales must show how the course SLOs aligns with the GE area SLOs.
  o Courses approved for GE Plan A must show how GE SLOs are addressed by the course content.
  o GE rationales must include how GE SLOs will be assessed.
• 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. Will focus on “closing the loop” to improve student learning in GE courses.
• Publicized the new GE Plan A area definitions and outcomes.
• Assessment of GE Plan A SLOs: Encouraged 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.

**SLOAC Role**

- Expanded membership during the 2011-12 academic year to include faculty and deans representing all academic divisions. 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.
- 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). **SLOAC LINK**
• ACCJC/WASC Assessment Retreat, October 27-29, Berkeley: Team consisted of 14 deans and faculty. Team Leader is Leta Stagnaro, AVP, Academic Affairs
  o Campus Promising Practices
    ▪ Working with the Faculty Senate we have expanded our Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (a formal shared governance Senate Committee) to include faculty and dean representation from all academic areas of the college, including counseling faculty
    ▪ We have integrated course and program student learning outcomes and assessment into our Program Review database system using the CurricUNET Program Review Module. This module also formally links with College planning and goals, including budget planning and program improvement.
  o Project: Create a process that engages faculty in Student Learning Outcomes Assessment in our Ohlone College General Education Plan A Pattern
  o Follow-up discussions with SLOAC

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.
Stacey, Sherman, Swamy
Quinta, Topham, Niccolls
Birkedahl, T. Roberts
Warden, J. Roberts
Gertz, Pauliukonis
Buehler, Greenstein
Carli, Einfalt
Also: Stagnaro, MacEwan, O’Connell, Wright, Parziale
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.

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

Committee Membership:
The committee will be composed of nine faculty and deans representing various Academic Divisions and the Office of Institutional Research.
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.
See the accomplishments of SLOAC above which provide detail on how SLOAC has become a forum for the sharing of faculty assessment work.

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

Following dialog at the program/departamental levels, faculty update their Official Course Outlines in the CurriUNET 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.

**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.

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

A “Course Assessment in a Box” document was created which includes similar questions that are 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.

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 (e.g. 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
This strategy has been pursued with very good success. The result is a Framework for Course SLO Assessment and a Master Course List for 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 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 Master List of Courses for Assessment. The following factors 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 (est. 40 courses with very 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 Master Course List for Assessment is 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.

Frequency of Formal Course 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.

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
- Assessment Tracker Tool
- 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 also well done. They have also 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.

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.

January Letter

Fixed Flex Presentations and Dialogue

Spring 2012 Projects

Faculty are engaged in ongoing authentic assessment of student learning in assessing and grading students
at the course level. In May and August 2011, two surveys were sent to faculty related to assessment of
student learning.

Survey Results: Faculty Use of Assessment Strategies May 2011
   a. Results disseminated. 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.

2. Survey results: ACCJC/WASC Rubric Self-Assessment, August 2011
      MeNU1LO5HQ_3d
   b. Results disseminated. Jim, do you have the survey results summary you sent out?