

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: 10/10/2012

Institution's Name: San Luis Obispo County Community College District

Name and Title of Individual Completing Report: Student Learning Outcomes Co-coordinators, Greg Baxley and Sally Demarest

Telephone Number and E-mail Address: Baxley—546-3100, x2669, gbaxley@cuesta.edu; Demarest—546-3100, x2814, sarah_demarest@cuesta.edu

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

Name of CEO: Dr. Gilbert H. Stork

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): 771
- b. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 771
Percentage of total: 100%
- c. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 771
Percentage of total: 100%

2. Programs

- a. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college): 136 certificates, degrees, and instructional programs
- b. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 136 ;
Percentage of total: 100%
- c. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 136 ;
Percentage of total: 100%

3. Student Learning and Support Activities

- a. Total number of student learning and support activities (as college has identified or grouped them for SLO implementation): 22
- b. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 22 ; Percentage of total: 100%
- c. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 22 ; Percentage of total: 100%

4. Institutional Learning Outcomes

- a. Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined: 6
- b. Number of institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment: 6

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

The San Luis Obispo County Community College District (SLOCCCD) complies with Eligibility Requirement 10 and the relevant sections of the ACCJC Standards I and II. The district has defined and assessed learning outcomes for 100% of courses, degrees, certificates, and programs (Ev 1.1, 1.2, 1.3). The district publishes a web hyperlink to degree and certificate program learning outcomes in the Cuesta College Catalog (Ev 1.4, 1.5, 1.6). All course-level outcomes are published on syllabi, and student service outcomes are published on placards throughout the campus and on departmental web pages (Ev 1.7, 1.8, 1.9). Administrative program outcomes are published on departmental pages (Ev 1.10). Student achievement of outcomes is systematically reported through program review, which includes the Annual Program Planning Worksheet, the Unit Plan, and the Comprehensive Program Planning and Review report (Ev 1.11). All district programs (instructional, administrative, and student service) complete this report on a regular cycle (every four years for career-technical education, every five years for all other programs) (Ev 1.12, 1.13). Through program review, all programs document SLOs, assessment, analysis of results, evidence of dialogue, related allocation requests, and efforts to improve student learning.

Each year, the program review reports are evaluated by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee for common themes or issues, and for determining the district's effectiveness in assessing student learning (Ev 1.14). In addition, the district website makes public the data regarding student achievement, such as number of degrees awarded, success and retention rates, persistence, and license exam success rates, and this data is used in district master planning (Ev 1.15, 1.16). Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) were developed and assessed in Spring 2012 (Ev 1.17, 1.18).

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

The current SLOCCCD institutional goals and objectives were developed after the district analyzed evidence to identify gaps in and challenges to student learning, and these goals and objectives are documented in the Educational Master Plan Addendum and the 2012-2014 Strategic Plan, respectively (Ev 2.1, 2.2). Faculty and staff document contributions to these goals and objectives through program review and in the annual Strategic Plan Progress Report (Ev 2.3, 2.4, 2.5).

For courses, degrees, certificates, and other programs, assessment dialogue begins within programs and is then documented and shared in Course of Program Assessment Summary forms (Ev 2.6). These documents are included in Comprehensive Program Planning and Review reports, which are the central comprehensive reports in the program review process (Ev 2.7). SLO assessment results are then used as

one criterion in the institutional resource allocation process (Ev 2.8). Also, each year, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee reviews the comprehensive reports, along with other institutional assessment data, in order to discover common themes and distribute recommendations for improvements or dialogue about existing gaps in student achievement of outcomes (Ev 2.9).

The SLOA co-coordinators publish several newsletters each year, provide training, and discuss SLO-related issues at the district's opening day meeting each semester (Ev 2.10, 2.11, 2.12). At the opening day meetings in the fall, "Best SLOs in SLO" awards are given to the programs and courses with exceptionally high quality assessments (Ev 2.13). The results of an ILO assessment were also discussed on opening day in Fall 2012 (Ev 2.14). Data from the ILO assessment tool has led to institution-wide dialogue about gaps in the areas of reading comprehension and technological fluency.

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

The district relies on dialog about assessment results when making decisions about student learning via the program review process (Ev 3.1, 3.2). In this process, dialog begins within programs and is documented in Course or Program Assessment Summaries. The dialog is carried forward and broadened through annual and comprehensive program review reports. Dialog at the course and program level also occurs through departmental meetings and the peer-evaluation process (Ev 3.3). Specific details of how assessments have shaped instruction and resource allocation are provided separately as evidence (Ev 3.4).

As the dialogue moves beyond the program level, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee analyzes assessment results from across campus programs and makes recommendations regarding areas for improvement, further dialogue, and/or the need for additional assessments (Ev 3.5). For example, in spring 2012, the committee recommended that the district implement the SENSE and the CCSSE to assess student engagement, a key indicator of learning, and that the district construct a website to house all district planning documents (Ev 3.6, 3.7). In fall 2012, the committee reviewed program review documents and ILO assessment results to make recommendations to improve student learning across the institution (Ev 3.8).

Additional examples of institution-wide dialogue about assessment include the collaboration in Spring 2012 to develop institutional goals and objectives (as well as the action steps for achieving these objectives), and the dialogue begun in Fall 2012 about ILO assessment results, which have identified potential gaps in student learning and areas for improvement (Ev 3.9, 3.10, 3.11).

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

Resource requests based on SLO assessment results are identified in program planning and review documents, and given priority at the unit, the cluster, and the institutional level. As is stated in the Integrated Planning Manual, “Requests that address needs related to Institutional Goals and/or Institutional Objectives or that address needs identified in the assessment of SLOs receive the highest priority for unit-level and cluster-level funding” (Ev 4.1). Specific details of how assessments have shaped instruction and resource allocation are provided separately as evidence (Ev 4.2).

For the cluster and institutional levels, cluster managers meet with unit-leaders and initiate dialogue to prioritize resource requests that are submitted in program review documents in March of each year. Managers then forward resource priorities to the Planning and Budget Committee. That committee makes recommendations for institutional resource prioritization, guided by the Resource Allocation Rubric (Ev 4.3). This rubric was revised in 2012 to include SLO assessment results as one of five criteria for institutional budget prioritization. This rubric was used to establish institutional priorities in spring 2012 and led to the funding for additional staffing in the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment for increased SLO assessment support (Ev 4.4, 4.5). The Integrated Planning Manual provides details of how the resource allocation process is evaluated (Ev 4.6).

The district also actively supports SLO implementation by funding two SLOA co-coordinator positions, attendance at assessment and accreditation workshops, compensation for part-time faculty who complete assessment work, and part-time lead faculty in numerous CTE programs (Ev 4.7, 4.8, 4.9).

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

The district requires the following assessment reports that contribute to program review and the Integrated Planning Model:

1. Course or Program Assessment Summary documents include assessment results for all courses, programs, degrees, certificates, or service units. These documents are submitted with each Comprehensive Program Planning and Review report, which are scheduled at regular intervals (**Ev 5.1**).
2. Comprehensive Program Planning and Review reports include a thorough analysis of program information, including outcomes assessment summaries (**Ev 5.2**).
3. Each year, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee reviews the assessment results of the Comprehensive Program Planning and Review documents and other campus assessments, in order to find common themes and concerns related to student learning that should be addressed institution-wide. The committee then makes recommendations based on their findings (**Ev 5.3**).

In addition, the SLOA Co-coordinators produce the following reports to monitor implementation progress:

4. The SLOA Rubric Report Self-Assessment describes the status of SLO implementation as based on the ACCJC standards and the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness. This report includes an analysis of Course or Program Assessment Summary documents for programs, along with SLO implementation across campus (**Ev 5.4**).
5. A report discussing the Institutional Learning Outcomes Assessment (Spring 2012) was prepared and shared with district staff in August 2012 (**Ev 5.5**). This report was also submitted to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and is posted on the SLOA website (**Ev 5.6**).

The SLO Handbook describes the central role faculty play in the development of curriculum and SLOs, the creation and assessment of SLOs and assessments, and the implementation of plans for improvement for courses and programs (**Ev 5.7**).

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

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

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

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 6: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Course student learning outcomes are aligned with program, certificate, or degree outcomes, and this alignment is reported through program review. As has been stated above, the assessment work of each course and program must be documented in a Course or Program Assessment Summary. This document includes a section for faculty and staff to indicate whether or not course-to-program mapping has been completed (**Ev 6.1**). These maps are required to be included in Comprehensive Program Plan and Review documents (**Ev 6.2**). The program review process ensures that courses, degrees, certificates and programs are evaluated on a regular cycle (**Ev 6.3**). This process also documents the efforts that each program has made towards improving outcomes and assuring the currency of all district programs.

The recently developed Institutional Learning Outcomes are mapped to the outcomes for general education. In addition, in 2006, a Program Review of General Education was conducted, and this review included a student learning outcomes “audit,” during which programs were required to report on the alignment of their course and program outcomes with the student learning outcomes for General Education (Ev 6.4, 6.5, 6.6).

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

Students are informed of learning outcomes through various methods. In 2011, the Academic Senate Council approved a SLOA Committee recommendation that all faculty include course SLOs on syllabi (Ev 7.1). In this way, students are informed of course learning outcomes. Instructors are required to create syllabi for courses, and syllabi for all faculty are reviewed as a component of the evaluation process (Ev 7.2, 7.3).

Program-level outcomes for instructional programs are published in CurricUNET and can be accessed through links from the Cuesta College Catalog (Ev 7.4). ILOs are published through a link in the College Catalog (Ev 7.5, 7.6). Also, the Curriculum Committee requires that learning outcomes be submitted for all new and revised courses, certificates, and degrees prior to approval, and these outcomes are published in CurricUNET.

The district publishes documented assessment results—such as data regarding student success, degree earners, license exam pass rates, and ILO and SLO analysis reports—in order to communicate matters of quality assurance to its constituencies (Ev 7.7). The district publishes its transfer policies in the annual college catalog and on the Counseling Department website (Ev 7.8).

Student Service programs are assessed in order to improve the effectiveness of their services. These programs publish their outcomes on departmental web pages, on placards visible in their work locations, and in informational booklets that are available to students throughout campus (Ev 7.9). Assessment results and analysis are documented in program review.

Administrative outcomes are published on the Administrative Services web pages, and results and analysis are documented in program review (Ev 7.10).

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

The SLOCCCD has implemented SLOs to the proficient level and has processes in place that will allow the district to meet the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement requirements. In accordance with the Integrated Planning Manual and the Institutional Assessment Plan, the district’s instructional, service, and administrative programs have implemented assessment processes that have led to meaningful improvements across campus.

After assessing our current status (**Ev SA.1**), the district has found a few areas for improvement, which include utilizing additional ILO mapping to gather additional assessment data about student achievement of institutional outcomes, incorporating additional direct ILO assessment questions into the assessment tool, developing a method to disaggregate ILO assessment data, and improving the quality of course and program assessments in some areas. In addition, the SENSE is being administered in fall 2012, and the CCSSE will be administered in spring 2013 (**Ev SA.2**).

Also, to help the district reach the sustainable level, a step has been added to the program review process. As is indicated in the Integrated Planning Manual (**Ev SA.3**), academic deans will meet with unit-leaders following the submission of Comprehensive Program Planning and Review documents in order to review the documents, including the SLO assessment and analysis sections (**Ev SA.4**).

The assessment of SLOs and use of results for institutional improvement is ongoing. The district has achieved the proficient level, with processes and practices in place that meet accreditation standards and provide the means to improve student learning.

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

TABLE OF EVIDENCE (NO WORD COUNT LIMIT)

Evidence for Statement #1

- Evidence 1.1: Report Preparation Statement
- Evidence 1.2: 2012 Proficiency—Courses by Division
- Evidence 1.3: 2012 Proficiency—Programs
- Evidence 1.4: CurricUNET Program Outcomes Report Screen Shot
- Evidence 1.5: CurricUNET Sample Program Outcomes Report—Nursing
- Evidence 1.6: Cuesta College Catalog Screenshot of Link to Program Outcomes and ILOs_page 63
- Evidence 1.7: Academic Senate Council Minutes 1-28-11—SLOs in Syllabi, see page 2
- Evidence 1.8: SLO Placard Photo—Library
- Evidence 1.9: SLO Placard Photo—Library Close-up Image
- Evidence 1.10: Administrative Service Outcomes Sample
- Evidence 1.11: Institutional Program Planning and Review Document 2013-2014

- Evidence 1.12: Institutional Program Review Timeline
- Evidence 1.13: Comprehensive Program Planning and Review document sample-Financial Aid
- Evidence 1.14: Institutional Effectiveness Committee SLO Assessment Review and Recommendations 2012
- Evidence 1.15: Institutional Effectiveness Outcomes Report 2012
- Evidence 1.16: San Luis Obispo County Community College District *Educational Master Plan 2011-2016 Addendum*, pp. 35-37
- Evidence 1.17: Cuesta College Institutional Learning Outcomes
- Evidence 1.18: Institutional Learning Outcomes Assessment Report 2012

Evidence for Statement #2

- Evidence 2.1: San Luis Obispo County Community College District, *Cuesta College Educational Master Plan 2011-2016 Addendum*
- Evidence 2.2: *San Luis Obispo County Community College District Strategic Plan 2012-2014*
- Evidence 2.3: Institutional Program Planning and Review Document 2013-2014
- Evidence 2.4: *San Luis Obispo County Community College District Integrated Planning Manual 2012*, pp. 15-18
- Evidence 2.5: *SLOCCCD_Spring_2012_Progress_Report*
- Evidence 2.6: Course or Program Assessment Summary Sample—Academic Skills Program 2012
- Evidence 2.7: Comprehensive Program Planning and Review document sample-Financial Aid
- Evidence 2.8: Resource Allocation Rubric
- Evidence 2.9: Institutional Effectiveness Committee SLO Assessment Review and Recommendations 2012
- Evidence 2.10: SLO Life Newsletter Sample-April 2011
- Evidence 2.11: Workshop—Creating Assessment Plans 2010
- Evidence 2.12: SLO presentation opening day fall 2012
- Evidence 2.13: SLO presentation opening day fall 2011, SLO presentation opening day fall 2012
- Evidence 2.14: Institutional Learning Outcomes Assessment Report 2012

Evidence for Statement #3

- Evidence 3.1: Institutional Program Planning and Review Document 2013-2014
- Evidence 3.2: *San Luis Obispo County Community College District Integrated Planning Manual 2012*
- Evidence 3.3: Cuesta College Triennial Review Self Evaluation Form for Full-time Tenured and Full-Time Tenure Track Faculty
- Evidence 3.4: Examples of SLO Assessment Results Used for Program Improvement and Resource Allocation, 2012
- Evidence 3.5: Institutional Effectiveness Committee Description
- Evidence 3.6: Institutional Effectiveness Committee Recommendation Form regarding the SENSE and CCSSE
- Evidence 3.7: Institutional Effectiveness Committee Recommendation Form regarding the Accreditation website
- Evidence 3.8: Institutional Effectiveness Committee SLO Assessment Review and Recommendations 2012
- Evidence 3.9: San Luis Obispo County Community College District, *Cuesta College Educational Master Plan 2011-2016 Addendum*
- Evidence 3.10: *San Luis Obispo County Community College District Strategic Plan 2012-2014*
- Evidence 3.11: Institutional Learning Outcomes Assessment Report 2012

Evidence for Statement #4

- Evidence 4.1: *San Luis Obispo County Community College District Integrated Planning Manual 2012*, page 21
- Evidence 4.2: Examples of SLO Assessment Results Used for Program Improvement and Resource Allocation, 2012
- Evidence 4.3: Resource Allocation Rubric
- Evidence 4.4: Resource Allocation Score sheet 2012-2013
- Evidence 4.5: Planning and Budget 2012-13 Allocation Priorities
- Evidence 4.6: *San Luis Obispo County Community College District Integrated Planning Manual 2012*, p. 33
- Evidence 4.7: Student Learning Outcomes Co-coordinators Job Description 2012-2014

Evidence 4.8: SLOA Committee Description

Evidence 4.9: Cuesta College Federation of Teachers_PT_Faculty_SLO_pay_form

Evidence for Statement #5

Evidence 5.1: Institutional Program Review Timeline

Evidence 5.2: Institutional Program Planning and Review Document 2013-2014, pp. 17-19

Evidence 5.3: Institutional Effectiveness Committee SLO Assessment Review and Recommendations 2012

Evidence 5.4: 2012_SLO Rubric_Report_ACCJC_Rubric_Self-Assessment

Evidence 5.5: Institutional Learning Outcomes Assessment Report 2012

Evidence 5.6: http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa/ilo/Institutional_Learning_Outcomes_Assessment_Report_2012.pdf

Evidence 5.7: Cuesta College Student Learning Outcomes Handbook

Evidence for Statement #6

Evidence 6.1: Course or Program Assessment Summary

Evidence 6.2: Institutional Program Planning and Review Document 2013-2014, page 18, item V.B.

Evidence 6.3: Institutional Program Review Timeline

Evidence 6.4: General Education Outcomes Audit Memorandum

Evidence 6.5: General Education Outcomes Audit 2005-2006—Template Form

Evidence 6.6: General Education Outcomes Audit Sample 2005-2006—ENGL 201A

Evidence for Statement #7

Evidence 7.1: Academic Senate Council Minutes 1-28-11—SLOs in Syllabi, see page 2

Evidence 7.2: Administrative Policy 5070, Class Attendance and syllabus requirement, page 5, section E.1

Evidence 7.3: Instructional Peer Evaluation Form

Evidence 7.4: CurricUNET Program Outcomes Report Screen Shot

Evidence 7.5: Cuesta College Catalog Screenshot of Link to Program Outcomes and ILOs_page 63

Evidence 7.6: http://academic.cuesta.edu/sloa/docs/Cuesta_ILO_final.pdf

Evidence 7.7: Institutional Learning Outcomes Assessment Report 2012

Evidence 7.8: Transfer of Credit Policies

Evidence 7.9: Student Services Outcomes Screenshot

Evidence 7.10: Institutional Learning Outcomes Assessment Report 2012

Evidence: Self-Assessment of Implementation

Evidence SA.1: 2012_SLO Rubric_Report_ACCJC_Rubric_Self-Assessment

Evidence SA.2: *San Luis Obispo County Community College District Integrated Planning Manual 2012*

Evidence SA.3: *San Luis Obispo County Community College District Integrated Planning Manual 2012*, page 21-22

Evidence SA.4: Dean's Reflection Observation of CPPR

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