Data Dialog on Assessment

24 Steps to Successful SLO and Program Review development

1. Assessment began with the formation of an assessment committee in fall 2001. Two faculty assessment coordinators were identified and given reassigned time to lead the effort of developing a comprehensive plan for incorporating SLOs into programs and courses. (spring and fall 2002)

2. Assessment coordinators held a series of Saturday workshops for career-technical program coordinators. (summer 2002 through spring 2003)

3. Funds were secured to provide stipends to career and technical program faculty who participated in assessment procedures and completed the required report. (2003-04)

4. A reference guide filled with extensive researched background, examples, and forms, was prepared and distributed to provide concrete examples of successful procedures. (2002-03)

5. Course outlines were updated with SLOs based on r MCC and UH standards: critical thinking, oral and written communication, information retrieval & technology, and quantitative reasoning (COWIQs). (2003-04)

6. Curricular grids were constructed to display coverage of the five COWIQ standards in each course. (2003-04)

7. Mission statement for each career-technical program was defined. (2003-04)

8. Vision statement for each career-technical program was defined. (2003-04)

9. Goals for each career-technical program were defined. (2003-04)

10. SLOs were established to delineate career-technical program goals, in consultation with other faculty, advisory committees, students, and/or systemwide program coordinating councils (PCCs). (2003-04)

11. Career-technical program coordinators submitted annual reports on 2002-03 assessment activities. (May 2003)

12. Additional reference guides were prepared by assessment coordinators to clarify activities: 1) Self-Study Guide for Annual Assessments and Comprehensive Program Reviews; 2) Timeline for Annual Assessments; 3) Timeline for Comprehensive Program Reviews; 4) Procedures and Timeline for Annual Assessment and Program Review Validation Teams; and 5) Guidelines for Program Review Validation Teams. (2002-03)

13. New format was shaped for annual assessment budget submittals tied to college mission, strategic plan, action strategies. (2004-05)

14. General Ed faculty initiated a review of the liberal arts curriculum with an eye toward developing SLOs. (fall 2004-present)

15. SLOs for distance classes were judged equivalent to those taught in "live" classes, according to academic senate committees. (fall 2004)

16. OCET was one of three programs, and first in non-instruction, to undergo a pilot comprehensive program review. (2003-04)

17. Molokai, the first outreach program scheduled for a comprehensive program review, included "mini" reviews by the 7 federally funded programs housed at the Molokai center. The overall process was valuable, for these reviews provided the college & community with a clear picture of the scope of services offered on Molokai. (fall 2004)

18. Lunch hour workshops were scheduled for career-tech support, student services, and administrative support coordinators. Focus has moved from developing SLOs to discussing methods to assess SLOs. (2005-06)

19. Curriculum committee required SLOs to be included in all proposals of new and modified curriculum. (2003-04)

20. Program review schedule is put in place. All college programs are required to submit an annual review, and once every five years (four years for administrative affairs) a comprehensive program review, with a SLOs component. This schedule involves instructional programs (including liberal arts and outreach) and programs in academic affairs, student affairs, administrative affairs. (2003-04)

21. A review committee, made up of external and internal members, validated comprehensive program reviews, which were then referred to the executive committee and administration for final validation and action. The chancellor's executive summary was prepared and posted on the web and results of the reports used in planning, budgeting, and resource allocation. (2004-05)

22. Institutional researcher provided extensive data & analyses for program evaluation in career-technical & liberal arts programs and worked with assessment/program coordinators to define SLOs & program reviews. (fall 1982-present)
Academic senate adopted an annual and comprehensive program review template developed by the assessment coordinators working with instructional department chairs and administrators. (Dec 2004)
To ensure a consistent profile in support of ACCJC requirements, the UHCCs developed a system program review template, developed by a subcommittee of systemwide VCs academic affairs in conjunction with the system institutional research cadre, which the MCC institutional researcher is an active participant. (fall 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What’s Next</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A new interim assessment coordinator is appointed &amp; awarded assigned time commencing with the upcoming fall 2006 term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned time is being requested for program coordinators to develop and trial test measurable SLO indices and procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monies are being secured to invite an expert in the field to spend several days working with faculty and staff on the development and measurement of SLOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of assessment indices and collection of data in liberal arts and career and technical programs is scheduled to begin during the upcoming academic year, according to the college implementation timetable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-instructional programs are next in line for further development of program SLOs, according to the college implementation timetable. While many of these programs have developed mission and vision statements and goals—and some have already assessed SLOs—the next step is to formalize outcomes in terms of internal measures of student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim assessment coordinator will ensure that SLOs appear in the syllabi for all courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHCC systemwide template, planned for program review reports starting with fall 2006 submittals, is under discussion at a 2-day workshop planned for institutional researchers and administrators in Aug 2006. It is now evident that official data are unavailable for 9 of 33 (27.3%) required elements and the MAPS reports are posted too late for use in required elements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>