

Program Reflections on Student Learning:

Why You are Expected to Participate

This afternoon, some of you will participate in something you haven't done before, and if you're anything like me, you're thinking, "Why do I have to do this? I really don't need more to do right now."

I'm here to explain why we're doing this!

The foundation of this process was created in 2002, when the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) rewrote the Accreditation Standards. These standards emphasized student learning. Let me read to you the introductory paragraph of the "Introduction to the Accreditation Standards," which is entitled, "Shaping the Dialogue:"

The primary purpose of an ACCJC-accredited institution is to **foster learning in its students**. An effective institution ensures that its resources and processes **support student learning**, continuously assesses that learning, and pursues institutional excellence and improvement. **An effective institution maintains an ongoing, self-reflective dialogue about its quality and improvement."**

Unfortunately, the emphasis on dialogue got lost to some degree, primarily because accreditation standards required Student Learning Outcomes and assessment.

As you know, all courses were (and are) required to have SLOs.

All programs were required to have SLOs.

All services were required to have SLOs.

So we created SLOs. And then we moved to the next step: assessment.

As members of the Accreditation Self-Study team and the SLO subcommittee, Fred and I went to a conference to see how others were assessing all of these SLOs. First, we were introduced to assessment jargon. Here are some of the things we were told:

"You must create a culture of evidence as well as a culture of inquiry."

"You must be a champion of plans who aligns SLOs, GEOs, and ILOs."

You may use course embedded assessment, but it is also important to triangulate your assessment. "

“You must validate on a longitudinal basis and close the assessment gap.”

“You must strategize on memorializing the discussion to provide evidence and build intellectual capital.”

Second, we were introduced to complicated assessment processes that were, from our perspective, costly in respect to time and money.

When we returned from the conference, Fred wrote a report detailing his take on the conference, and I wrote a fairy tale entitled, “Journey to Assessalot.”

At that time, Fred and I agreed that MPC did not want to journey to Assessalot. We were confident that the college didn’t want to create or purchase complex assessment tools; we already had a number of assessment methods in place.

- Instructors use essay-writing, tests, quizzes, and so on to measure outcomes.
- Student Services and Administrative Services use statistical information to discern how well they are supporting student learning.
- We have an Office of Institutional Research that provides data relevant to student learning.

And, for the most part, these elements helped the college to receive reaffirmation of accreditation.

However, we weren’t out of the woods. MPC received 4 recommendations, 3 of which related to SLOs. One of the recommendations, Recommendation 1, indicated that the college needed to “complete the process of assessment to guide improvement of student learning.” Uh-oh. Did that mean we needed to journey to Assessalot? Were we going to have to triangulate assessment?

The Student Learning Outcome Committee, which is made up of Fred, Grace Anongchonga-Calima, Marty Johnson, and I decided that the recommendation did not indicate a need for quantitative assessment. We decided the best way to fulfill this recommendation was to promote dialogue about student learning. We also decided to review and improve program review processes for all parts of the college, emphasizing student learning and ongoing improvement.

To promote dialogue about student learning, the committee created the program reflections process. It emphasizes the fact that ALL of us are employed to provide ACCESS, SUPPORT, or OPPORTUNITIES for student learning.

To ensure that all programs and services complete a student learning-centered program review process, we have been redesigning the program review process for Academic Affairs, Administrative Services, and Student Services. (Please see attached.) Thus far, we have created a comparison chart. The actual Program Review Self-Study materials for each area are still being designed.

So... This afternoon everyone will have opportunity to talk about challenges that impact our ability to support student learning, provide access to student learning, and/or provide opportunities for student learning, and what we can do to overcome these challenges to advance student learning at MPC.

Please meet and complete the form.

Keep a copy in preparation for your area's program review, and send a copy to Academic Affairs.

If you have any questions... please send them all to Marty!

**Program Review Self-Study Elements:
Academic Affairs, Administrative Services, and Student Services**

Academic Affairs Opportunities for Student Learning	Administrative Services Support for Student Learning	Student Services Access to Student Learning
Description of review process	Description of review process	Description of review process
Calendar	Calendar	Calendar
Mission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support of college’s mission • Program mission • Program Improvement Plan 	Mission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support of college’s mission • Program mission • Program Improvement Plan 	Mission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support of college’s mission • Program mission • Program Improvement Plan
Program Overview Course Offerings & Scheduling <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current offerings • Scheduling of courses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Program completion ○ Scheduling pattern • Program Improvement Plan Program Vitality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 year enrollment trends • WSCH, FTES, and FTE • Gender and ethnicity • External factors • Program coordination • Community involvement • Other considerations • Program Improvement Plan 	Program Overview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program description <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Key services ○ More important goals • User demand <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Compared to prior PR ○ Future changes expected Program’s Services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program accomplishments • Processes developed and/or followed to support services • User assessment • External factors • Program coordination • Community involvement • Other considerations • Program Improvement Plan 	Program Overview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program description <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Key services ○ More important goals • Student demand <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Compared to prior PR ○ Future changes expected <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student demographics • Program accomplishments • Program compliance • Program coordination • Campus-wide assessment • Other considerations • Program Improvement Plan
Student learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Delivery modes • SLOs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SLOs created for all courses? ○ Program reflections on student learning - summaries ○ Course alignment process 	Student Learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program support of student learning • SLOs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Program reflections on student learning - summaries • Student services • Facilities/equipment/supplies • Program Improvement Plan 	Student Learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program support of student learning • SLOs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Program reflections on student learning - summaries • Student services • Student satisfaction • Facilities/equipment/supplies

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Multiple course consistency • Student achievement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Retention rates ○ Success rates ○ Retention/success rates by age, gender, ethnicity ○ Strategies to address barriers ○ Traditional vs. online courses ○ Occupational program issues • Student services • Facilities/equipment/supplies • Other considerations • Program Improvement Plan 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Improvement Plan
---	--	--

<p>Staffing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty/staff's workload • Faculty/staff's staff development • Faculty/staff satisfaction • Adequacy of staffing • Program Improvement Plan 	<p>Staffing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizational chart • Primary responsibilities • Staff development • Staff Satisfaction Survey • Adequacy of staff • Program Improvement Plan 	<p>Staffing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizational chart • Primary responsibilities • Staff development • Staff Satisfaction Survey • Adequacy of staff • Program Improvement Plan
<p>Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarize, prioritize Program Improvement Plans • Distinguish between budget dependent and non-budget dependent items • Steps to accomplish plans (timeline and responsible persons) • Relate to Action Plan 	<p>Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarize, prioritize Program Improvement Plans • Distinguish between budget dependent and non-budget dependent items • Steps to accomplish plans (timeline and responsible persons) • Relate to Action Plan 	<p>Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarize, prioritize Program Improvement Plans • Distinguish between budget dependent and non-budget dependent items • Steps to accomplish plans (timeline and responsible persons) • Relate to Action Plan
<p>Division Office Self Study</p>		
<p>Support Team Review</p>	<p>Support Team Review</p>	<p>Support Team Review</p>
<p>Program Review Update</p>	<p>Program Review Update</p>	<p>Program Review Update</p>