ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

COLLEGE STATUS REPORT ON STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES IMPLEMENTATION

INSTRUCTIONS

Colleges are asked to use this report form in completing their *College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation.* Colleges should submit a brief narrative analysis and quantitative and qualitative evidence demonstrating status of Student Learning Outcome (SLO) implementation. The report is divided into sections representing the bulleted characteristics of the Proficiency implementation level on the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, Part III (Rubric). Colleges are asked to interpret their implementation level through the lens of the Accreditation Standards cited for each characteristic. The final report section before the evidence list requests a brief narrative self-assessment of overall status in relationship to the proficiency level, indicating what plans are in place to mitigate any noted deficiencies or areas for improvement. **Narrative responses for each section of the template should not exceed 250 words.**

This report form offers examples of quantitative and qualitative evidence which might be included for each of the characteristics. The examples are illustrative in nature and are not intended to provide a complete listing of the kinds of evidence colleges may use to document SLO status. College evidence used for one Proficiency level characteristic may also serve as evidence for another characteristic.

This report is provided to colleges in hard copy and also electronically, by e-mail, as a fill-in Word document. The reports must be submitted to the Commission by either the October 15, 2012 date or the March 15, 2013 date, as defined on the enclosed list of colleges by assigned reporting date. When the report is completed, colleges should:

  a. Submit the report form by email to the ACCJC (accjc@accjc.org); **and**

  b. Submit the full report *with attached evidence* on CD/DVD to the ACCJC (ACCJC, 10 Commercial Blvd., Suite 204, Novato, CA 94949).

Although evidence cited in the text of the report may include links to college web resources, the Commission requires actual copies (electronic files) of the evidence for its records.

COLLEGE INFORMATION: DATE OF REPORT; COLLEGE; SUBMITTED BY; CERTIFICATION BY CEO

Date of Report: March 11, 2013

Institution's Name: PALAU COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Name and Title of Individual Completing Report: Deikola Olikong, ALO/SLO Coordinator and Marianne Temaungil, Assistant ALO/Academic Affairs Assessment Coordinator

Telephone Number and E-mail Address: (680) 488-2470/2471 ext. 271; deio@palau.edu / olikongd@gmail.com

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

Name of CEO: Patrick U. Tellei, Ed.D   Signature:_____

(e-signature permitted)

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND AUTHENTIC ASSESSMENTS ARE IN PLACE FOR COURSES, PROGRAMS, SUPPORT SERVICES, CERTIFICATES AND DEGREES.

Eligibility Requirement 10: Student Learning and Achievement

Standards: I.A.1; II.A.1.a; II.A.1.c; II.A.2.a,b,e,f,g,h,i; II.A.3[See II.A.3.a,b,c.]; II.A.6; II.B.4; II.C.2].

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Evidence demonstrating numbers/percentages of course, program (academic and student services), and institutional level outcomes are in place and assessed. Documentation on institutional planning processes demonstrating integrated planning and the way SLO assessment results impact program review. Descriptions could include discussions of high-impact courses, gateway courses, college frameworks, and so forth.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NUMERICAL RESPONSE
QUANTITATIVE EVIDENCE/DATA ON THE RATE/PERCENTAGE OF SLOS DEFINED AND ASSESSED

1. Courses
   a. Total number of college courses (active courses in the college catalog, offered on the schedule in some rotation): <u>319</u>
   b. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: <u>319</u>
      Percentage of total: <u>100%</u>
   c. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: <u>277</u>
      Percentage of total: <u>87%</u>

2. Programs
   a. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college): <u>20</u>
   b. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes: <u>20</u>;
      Percentage of total: <u>100%</u>
   c. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: <u>90%</u>;
      Percentage of total: <u>90%</u>

3. Student Learning and Support Activities
   a. Total number of student learning and support activities (as college has identified or grouped them for SLO implementation): <u>12</u>
   b. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: <u>12</u>;
      Percentage of total: <u>100%</u>
   c. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: <u>10</u>; Percentage of total: <u>83%</u>

4. Institutional Learning Outcomes
   a. Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined: <u>6</u>
   b. Number of institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment: <u>6</u>

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

100% of courses and programs have student learning outcomes (1.1). 87% of courses and 100% of programs have ongoing assessments (1.2). Institutional learning outcomes are in place and assessed regularly through courses, programs, and support services. At the course level, assessment is conducted on a semesterly basis. Program learning outcomes are assessed using a three year cycle following the college's institutional program review calendar. Assessment of courses is reported to the SLO coordinator and faculty assessment coordinator and information is passed on to the curriculum and assessment committees, the Dean of Academic Affairs and the President of the college (1.3). Course learning outcomes are aligned with program learning outcomes which lead to degrees. Both these learning outcomes are aligned with the institutional learning outcomes also (1.4).

Non-instructional programs also assess and report SLO assessment results on a regular basis. The Student Services division has an assessment calendar which its services use for its assessment cycle in addition to the institutional program review calendar (1.5). In addition, non-academic services, such as the Human Resources Division and the Security unit follow the institutional program review calendar also while assessing services according to each department/unit's assessment schedule. These services are also assessed on an annual basis.

All program reviews use assessment data which assists with decision-making and institutional improvement effectiveness (1.6).

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 2: THERE IS A WIDESPREAD INSTITUTIONAL DIALOGUE ABOUT ASSESSMENT RESULTS AND IDENTIFICATION OF GAPS.

Standards: I.B.1; I.B.2; I.B.3; I.B.5.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation on processes and outcomes of SLO assessment. Specific examples with the outcome data analysis and description of how the results were used. Descriptions could include examples of institutional changes made to respond to outcomes assessment results.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 2: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Widespread institutional dialogue takes place in department and committee meetings. The Committee on Programs and Curricula discusses with faculty completed department/program review results, identification of gaps, and/or concerns which need action (2.1). Outcome data is also discussed in the Institutional Assessment Committee (IAC), a subcommittee of the Executive Committee. IAC is comprised of the Deans of Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Continuing Education, Vice Presidents of Administration and Finance and Cooperative Research Extension, Institutional Researcher, and Accreditation and Assistant Accreditation Liaison Officers (2.2).

Meetings with different schools, programs and departments between faculty and IAC representatives discuss action plans which should be centered on actual assessment results. Meetings are held to ensure that members understand the goals of student learning outcomes and create signature assignments which focus on these outcomes and which are used for assessment (2.3). The Student Services Division conducts regular management

meetings where unit assessment results, identifiable gaps, and improvement plans are discussed (2.4).

The non-academic programs, such as Finance and Security, conduct regular meetings to discuss program reviews and yearly assessment results. For example, the Administration and Finance Department meets with its management team to discuss assessment results of their respective areas and to identify any gaps and/or areas that need improvement.

The institutional dialog about assessment results and identification of gaps is ongoing at various levels of the institution from individuals and units up to decision making committees, which include the Executive Committee (2.5). The college revised the academic assessment process, FAMED, to be its institutional planning and assessment process. FAMED now is used as an institutional wide process for assessment, planning, and decision-making (2.6).

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 3: DECISION MAKING INCLUDES DIALOGUE ON THE RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT AND IS PURPOSEFULLY DIRECTED TOWARD ALIGNING INSTITUTION-WIDE PRACTICES TO SUPPORT AND IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING.

Standards: I.B; I.B.3; II.A.1.c; II.A.2.f; III.A.1.c; IV.A.2.b.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation of institutional planning processes and the integration of SLO assessment results with program review, college-wide planning and resource allocation, including evidence of college-wide dialogue.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 3: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Results of program reviews conducted every three years by all institutional programs and services have led the college to make improvements to support student learning. The Agricultural Science Program's review's results showed a need for reliable transportation to laboratory classrooms; this resulted in the purchase of a bus for the program (3.1). The program review results for the Student Life Office resulted in the hiring of an additional counselor (3.2). The relocation of the On Line Laboratory is a result of the lab assessment (3.3). Institutional decisions are also based on review of different institutional plans, such as the 5 Year Technology Plan. The relocation of the Information Technology classroom is a direct result of the review of this plan (3.4).

To ensure ongoing dialogue of assessment results, planning, and decision making in support of student learning improvements, the college created the Institutional Assessment Committee.   IAC's responsibilities include making recommendations regarding improvement of the institutional assessment process and publication of assessment data and reporting the results of the committee's work to the Executive Committee. It also monitors the quality of assessment to ensure findings are valid and actionable and monitors the implementation of the program review recommendations (3.5).

Regular meetings throughout the year are held between IAC members and different programs and service areas to

discuss assessment results and assist with identifying action plans and implementing improvements (3.6). Evaluation tools are also reviewed to ensure that appropriate information is being collected to ensure that the quality of assessment is valid and actionable (3.7).

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 4: APPROPRIATE RESOURCES CONTINUE TO BE ALLOCATED AND FINE-TUNED.

Standards: I.B; I.B.4; I.B.6; III.C.2; III.D.2.a; III.D.3.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation on the integration of SLO assessment results with institutional planning and resource allocation.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 4: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

In 2005, the Dean of Academic Affairs and a faculty member went to the WASC 81st Annual Meeting and some of its workshops and sessions. All paid workshops, plenary and concurrent sessions had different topics with one main embedded theme – "assessment, assessment, and more assessment with documentation". Since 2005, the college has sent representatives from academic and non-academic programs to attend trainings/workshops on student learning outcomes and assessment (4.1).

In August 2010, the college brought in a WASC consultant, Dr. Mary Allen, to provide a two day training for all faculty, staff and administrators. This training allowed time for working sessions where learning outcomes and rubrics were fine-tuned, institutional learning outcomes were reviewed, and signature assignments of courses and other evaluation tools were created (4.2). In fall 2010, the college created a course assessment template. This template is used to report student learning outcomes at the course level and includes the types of signature assignments used, results of assessments, and action plans based on assessment results (4.3).

Since 2010, the ALO/SLO coordinator provides regular trainings and follow-up sessions for academic and non-academic programs. The trainings include learning outcomes/goals/objectives development, assessments, evaluations, results documentation, and implementation of action plans to make improvements (4.4). In fall 2012, the college assigned a full time faculty who has extensive assessment training to assist the ALO/SLO coordinator. This faculty concentrates on the training and follow-up sessions with faculty and provides support to improve faculty's knowledge and understanding of student learning outcomes in course and program levels. In addition, both the ALO/SLO coordinator and the faculty assigned assessment coordinator work closely with the Committee on Program and Curricula chairperson (4.5).

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 5: COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT REPORTS EXIST AND ARE COMPLETED AND UPDATED ON A REGULAR BASIS.

Standards: I.A.1; I.B; I.B.3; I.B.5; I.B.6; II.A.2.a; II.B.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation on the process and cycle of SLO assessment, including results of cycles of assessment. Copies of summative assessment reports, with actual learning outcomes.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 5: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Assessment of courses follows the semester to semester course offering schedule (5.1). Courses offered in the fall are assessed in the fall, courses offered in the spring are assessed in spring, and courses offered in both semesters are assessed according to the schedule of assessment provided by the program/department's faculty. Programs are assessed by a program review every three years. All courses and programs are required to be assessed regardless of their instructional mode and location. Using the course assessment grid and program review template, faculty report on tools used to perform assessment, assessment data, action plans, and what improvements were accomplished (5.2). The assessment tool which is in line with the institutional planning and assessment process called FAMED is used to report assessments of both instructional and non-instructional programs and services (5.3). Non-instructional programs are those services providing support to student learning which include academic advising, counseling, tutoring and library services.

All active courses under a program/department are aligned with program learning outcomes. All courses and programs are aligned with the institutional learning outcomes. Reports of student learning outcomes in course and program levels exist and are available in hard copies and electronic copies (5.4).

Non-academic programs' goals and objectives are assessed regularly using a yearly assessment tool which is aligned with FAMED, the institutional planning and assessment process. Non-academic programs are also required to complete program reviews every three years (5.5). Academic and non-academic program reviews follow the institutional program review calendar which was revised and approved in November 2012 (5.6).

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 6: COURSE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ARE ALIGNED WITH DEGREE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES.

Standards: II.A.2.e; II.A.2.f; II.A.2.i.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation on the alignment/integration of course level outcomes with program outcomes. Description could include curriculum mapping or other alignment activities. Samples across the curriculum of institutional outcomes mapped to program outcomes.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 6: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Student learning outcomes at the course level are aligned with student learning outcomes at the degree level. The student learning outcomes at the course and degree levels are aligned with student learning outcomes at the institutional level (6.1). Since 2010, the college has conducted trainings and follow-up sessions to help faculty align student learning outcomes at the course level with student learning outcomes at the degree level. Both faculty and the members of the Institutional Assessment Committee have worked together to align course and degree student learning outcomes with institutional learning outcomes (6.2).

Degree programs are reviewed every three years as stated in the college curriculum handbook and revisions take place when necessary (6.3). When revisions happen during program reviews, program faculty are required to ensure that the alignment from courses to program to the institutional level takes place also. All degree programs have up to date mappings and listings of all required signature assignments for all courses under the degree programs, and the course – institutional learning outcomes matrix is also updated and available for all faculty and academic administrators (6.4).

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 7: STUDENTS DEMONSTRATE AWARENESS OF GOALS AND PURPOSES OF COURSES AND PROGRAMS IN WHICH THEY ARE ENROLLED.

Standards: I.B.5; II.A.6; II.A.6.a; II.B.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation on means the college uses to inform students of course and program purposes and outcomes. Samples across the curriculum of: course outlines of record and syllabi with course SLOs; program and institutional SLOs in catalog.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 7: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

CLOs are included in syllabi which are given to students at the beginning of the semester. Through the use of signature assignments which are developed to assess course learning outcomes, program learning outcomes and institutional learning outcomes, students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of their enrolled courses and programs. Students are aware that the course content covered leads to specific CLOs. Signature assignments and learning activities may be written, oral or hands on demonstration of these learning outcomes (7.1).

PLOs are also included in the General Catalog along with other program information (7.2). ILOs are printed on various publications and also are in posters which are located throughout the campus (7.3).

As part of the program review, course, program, and institutional learning outcomes are reported and mapping of the alignment is included with the review. Any changes that occur to the courses or programs are reported to and reviewed by the Committee on Program and Curricula through course or program modifications (7.4).

SELF-ASSESSMENT ON LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION:	**YOU PLANNED TO ADDRESS NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS? WHAT LEVEL OF SLO IMPLEMENTATION WOULD YOU ASSIGN YOUR COLLEGE? WHY? WHAT EFFORTS HAVE YOU PLANNED TO ADDRESS NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS?**

SELF-ASSESSMENT ON LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Palau Community College is at the proficiency level of the SLO rubric. Student learning outcome and authentic assessment is in place for courses, programs, student services, certificates and degrees. There is a widespread institutional dialog about the results of the above assessments and identification of gaps. Results of assessments are included in the institutional decision making. Assessment reports exist and are completed and updated on a regular basis.   The student learning outcomes at the course level are aligned with program and institutional level outcomes. Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs of which they are enrolled in.

Palau Community College's plan is to be a data driven institution with decision making in all areas of the college centered on assessment results leading to the overall intuitional effectiveness and continuous quality improvement. Therefore, plans include acquiring a data system, such as TracDat, and establishing an Institutional Research and Planning Office staffed with qualified personnel who are well versed with assessment, research and planning knowledge to move this institution forward into the sustainable continuous quality improvement level.

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

TABLE OF EVIDENCE (NO WORD COUNT LIMIT)

1.1   Sample of Courses and Programs - Student Learning Outcomes
1.2   Samples of Course Assessments and Program Reviews
1.3   Samples of Course Assessment Reports
1.4   ILOs-Course Matrix
1.5   Student Services School Year Calendars (2011-2012 & 2012-2013)
1.6   Academic Program Reviews Action Plans Template and Samples

2.1   Committee on Programs and Curricula Minutes of Meetings
2.2   Institutional Assessment Committee Minutes of Meetings; Trainings and Workshops Reports

2.3   School of Arts and Sciences, School of Business, School of Technical Education and General Education Program Faculty Trainings, Workshops/Training Reports and Meeting Minutes

2.4   Student Services Division Management and Units Meetings Re – Assessments

2.5   Units, Divisions, Departments and Committees Minutes of Meetings Re – Assessment Results

2.6   FAMED Revisions, Workshops and Samples of Different Templates

3.1   Agricultural Science Program Review of 2009; Prove of Purchase of Transportation

3.2   Student Life Unit Evaluation Results Re – Additional Counselor/Academic Advisor

3.3   On-line Laboratory Assessment Results

3.4   5-Year Technology Plan (1st Cycle)

3.5   Institutional Assessment Committee's Appointment Letter, Roles and Responsibilities

3.6   Institutional Assessment Committee Minutes of Meetings

3.7   Samples of Reviewed and Revised Evaluation Tools

4.1   Assessment Trainings and Workshops Trip Reports

4.2   August 2010 Assessment Training Report

4.3   Course Assessment Template

4.4   Assessment Trainings Reports and Attendance Logs

4.5   Faculty Meeting Minutes Re – Student Learning Outcomes

5.1   Semester-by-Semester Course Offering

5.2   Samples of Course Assessments and Program Reviews

5.3   Academic and Non-Academic Program Review Templates

5.4   Samples of Program Mappings and ILOs-Course Matrix

5.5   Institutional Program Review Calendars

6.1   Program Mappings and ILOs-Course Matrix

6.2   Assessment and Learning Outcomes Trainings and Follow-Up Sessions Reports and Attendance Log

6.3   Curriculum Handbook and Academic Program Review Calendar

6.4   Course/Program Signature Assignments

7.1   Sample of Course Syllabus / Outlines

7.2   General Catalog 2012-2016

7.3   ILOs Posters, College Pocket Folders, General Catalog and other publications

7.4   Samples of Course/Program Modification and Committee on Program and Curricula's Minutes of Meetings

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC)

10 Commercial Blvd., Suite 204, Novato, CA 94949

Telephone: 415-506-0234 ◊FAX: 415-506-0238◊E-mail: accjc@accjc.org