

Comprehensive Evaluation of the SLO Process Within an Integrated Planning System at Orange Coast College

Orange Coast College

Institutional Effectiveness Office

Sheri Sterner & Gabrielle Stanco

Background of Evaluation

- Comprehensive evaluation of planning, program review, and student learning outcomes (SLO)/administrative unit outcomes (AUO) processes
- Developed regular evaluation cycle every 3 years (begun spring 2013)
- Overseen by College Council, carried out by IE Office (joint effort)
 - Institutional Effectiveness Office Structure
- Questions & process developed in collaboration with SLO/Program Review faculty coordinators (liaisons to Academic Senate)

Evaluation Plan - Structure

Evaluated each continuous improvement process and overarching areas:

- Program Review process & structure
- SLO/AUO Assessment process & structure
- Planning process & structure
- Support
- Timeframe
- Impact
- Communication
- TracDat

Evaluation Plan – Data Collection

Two component evaluation:

- Focus Groups with each of the four wing planning councils, Academic Senate, & Classified Senate
- Campus-wide perception and opinion survey (all employee groups)

Evaluation Plan – Analysis

- Trends from focus groups
 - Transcripts analyzed for common themes
- Survey results
 - Descriptive statistics for each item
 - Data disaggregated by wing, division, or employee group
 - Open-ended items analyzed vis-à-vis quantitative results
- Combined results into comprehensive report

Evaluation Plan – Analysis (Cont)

- Comprehensive report example:

Instruction 3 - SLO/AUO results are being communicated within departments

Full-time Faculty

80% Agree



Aware of how department **uses** SLO/AUO assessment results

71% Yes



Had **dialogue** across the department about SLO/AUO assessment results

"Our department keeps very good connections with faculty and has continual assessment & dialogue."

Part-time Faculty

78% Agree



Aware of how department **uses** SLO/AUO assessment results

71% Yes



Had **dialogue** across the department about SLO/AUO assessment results

Evaluation Plan – Dissemination & Dialogue

- Institutional Effectiveness Committee
 - Reviewed detailed results
 - Made recommendations for improvement
- Reviewed Institutional Effectiveness Committee recommendations with campus
 - College Council
 - Planning councils
 - Academic Senate – 10+1
 - Classified Senate
- Final Recommendations
 - Academic Senate 10+1
 - College Council

SLO Results – 2013

1. SLO assessment process seen as learning process
2. SLO assessment results being used to improve instruction (but process not communicated across departments)
3. SLO assessment process still compliance driven for some
4. Participation in SLO assessment varies by employee group (less involvement for confidential/classified staff, hourly staff, and part-time faculty)

SLO Results – 2013 (Cont)

5. Need greater distinction between SLOs and assessment unit outcomes (AUOs) for support wings as well as non-classroom based instruction
6. Assessment development challenging and authentic assessment unclear
7. Increase institutional research support for data collection and analysis
8. Time spent on SLO assessment process seen as barrier

SLO Results – 2013 (Cont)

9. Process management seen as barrier
(integrated database seen as potential solution)
10. Preferences for frequency of SLO assessment
vary across departments
11. Increase dialogue in planning councils about
SLO results
12. Dialogue about SLO results occurring at
department level
13. SLO assessment process has had some impact
on planning, but varies by wing

Overarching Recommendations – 2013

1. Explore opportunities for increased involvement for Confidential/Classified, Hourly and Part-Time Faculty in the Program Review, SLO Assessment and Planning processes, where appropriate
2. Implement integrated database to reduce data entry, tracking and workflow demands in program review, SLO assessment and planning processes

SLO Recommendations – 2013

1. Explore ways to clarify processes or develop methods to support primary purpose of student learning
2. Provide training & support for instructional programs to increase SLO assessment
3. Re-define SLOs for support wings (move to AUOs)
4. Expand support from Institutional Research
5. Further evaluate frequency of SLO assessment
6. Determine ways to increase exposure of and dialogue about SLO results

Main Themes & Considerations – 2018

- Desire to keep processes the same for a period of time
- Lessen the culture of fear
- Dialogue & utility of processes needs improvement
 - AUO data collection, peer review, staff/management hiring, staff development
- Some indication process cycles are too short
- Integration across processes not easily observable
- Broaden participation, communication and training

SLO Results – 2018

Instruction Wing:

1. Adequate training for creating and collecting/analyzing SLOs/AUOs
2. Use of SLO results mixed between compliance-focus and improvement-focus
3. SLO/AUO results being communicated within departments

SLO Results – 2018 (Cont)

Support Services Wings:

1. Adequate training for creating/completing SLOs/AUOs when individualized
2. Range of needs for analyzing/collecting data for assessment
3. AUO assessment useful, but cumbersome

TracDat Results – 2018

Pros:

1. Data collected in central location
2. Reporting/Summarizing Capabilities
3. Better than prior Microsoft Office collection

Cons:

1. Navigation within TracDat not intuitive
2. Reports hard to read/access
3. Involves continuous training to use

Overall Recommendations – 2018

- Increase classified staff participation and collaboration in all phases of program review, AUOs and the planning process
- Dialogue about results of program review, SLOs and planning strategies outside of the process. Consider department, division or wing meetings as possible discussion arenas
- Consider length and alignment of process cycles
- Ongoing training of processes to keep purpose and outcomes in the forefront

SLO Recommendations – 2018

- No changes to course SLO process
- Evaluate each department's AUOs/KPIs to ensure they are measurable and meaningful
- Clarify AUO process, three-year cycle and training materials to emphasize that AUOs/KPIs can change annually as needed

TracDat Recommendations – 2018

- Improve navigation and streamlining of modules
- Develop training videos to help on demand support
- Improve tracking reports of processes in TracDat
- Support further integration of technology into TracDat (e.g., Canvas, Microsoft BI)

Next Steps

- Value of integrated evaluation
- Integration within processes
- Cycle & alignment of processes
- Collection of planning, program review & SLO information

More Information

Please contact us for further details and/or copies of the evaluation instruments:

Sheri Sterner: ssterner@occ.cccd.edu

Gabrielle Stanco: gstanco@occ.cccd.edu