



TAFT COLLEGE

WEST KERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Innovation and Effectiveness Plan: March 2016

Institutional Assessment, Research & Planning

March 28, 2016

Taft College Innovation and Effectiveness Plan: March 2016**Overview**

This document presents Taft College's plan for increasing institutional effectiveness by addressing the major recommendations resulting from its Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative site visit and its October 2015 accreditation site visit, which read as follows:

Recommendation 4

In order to meet the standards, the team recommends the College fully integrate the assessment of course and program student learning outcomes (SLOs) into the program review process, including analysis and dialog of results at the department/program level. The team also recommends the College systematically assess the effective use of financial resources and the impact of program changes as a result of implemented program review recommendations.

Recommendation 6

In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the College consistently assess, analyze, and evaluate student learning outcomes for all academic programs and courses. Meaningful SLO data and dialog should be used for continuous improvement of student learning.

The components of these two recommendations are presented on the following pages, with each component of each recommendation being presented on a separate page. The plan format incorporates elements of the planning model presented by Dr. Robert Pacheco at the Taft College Governance Council retreat held on Friday, February 26th, 2016. For each recommendation component, the plan lists the following:

- | | |
|--|---|
| A. Area of Focus | D. Action Steps |
| B. Objective | E. Person Responsible for Action Step |
| C. What are the reasons for the gap? Knowledge, Motivation, or Structure | F. Target Date for Achievement of Action Step |
| | G. Measure of Progress |

A table showing requested resources follows the body of the Innovation and Effectiveness Plan. The plan was put together with input from the Strategic Planning Committee, the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee, the Academic Senate and the Governance Council.

Taft College Innovation and Effectiveness Plan: March 2016

A. Area of Focus	B. Objective	C. What are the reasons for the gap? Knowledge, Motivation, or Structure	D. Action Steps	E. Person Responsible for Action Step	F. Target Date for Achievement of Action Step	G. Measure of Progress
<p>Recommendation 6:</p> <p>In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the College consistently assess, analyze, and evaluate student learning outcomes for all academic programs and courses. Meaningful SLO data and dialog should be used for continuous improvement of student learning.</p>	<p>1. Consistently assess SLOs for all programs (collect data)</p>	<p>1. Knowledge—Faculty not sure what to do</p> <p>2. Structure—Identify “all programs” in spring, roll up programs as necessary</p> <p>3. Structure—Mapping is incomplete</p> <p>4.a. Structure/knowledge—not all assessment data being captured</p> <p>4.b. Structure/Knowledge—Limited usage/functionality of eLumen</p>	<p>1a. SLO procedure to include a calendar of assessment and a guide similar to Cañada College that specifies how many, which ones, when.</p> <p>1.b. Complete and Adopt Administrative Procedure for SLOs</p> <p>2. Add “Identify Programs” to PR Calendar for Governance Council so that all programs are discussed and identified in spring term</p> <p>3. Complete mapping process: clarify relationship between CSLO, PSLO, ISLO & GESLO</p> <p>4.a. Identify & Implement other assessment capture methods, outside of eLumen</p> <p>4.b. Enhance eLumen’s functionality. Provide Professional Development in eLumen and assessment methods.</p>	<p>1. SLOASC</p> <p>2. IR Office</p> <p>3. SLOASC</p> <p>4. SLOASC, SLO Technician, Professional Development Committee</p>	<p>1a. By in-service Fall 2016. Update annually.</p> <p>1b. By in-service Fall 2016</p> <p>2. Implement in spring 2016</p> <p>3. Fully implemented for 2016-2017 Academic Year</p> <p>4a. Fully implemented for 2016-2017 Academic Year</p> <p>4b. Begin Fall 2016; Ongoing</p>	<p>1a. Completed calendar of assessment and completed assessment guide approved by Academic Senate</p> <p>1b. Academic Senate approved administrative procedure for SLOs</p> <p>2. Electronic calendar updated and working as intended</p> <p>3. Mapping process completed</p> <p>4a. Other assessment methods identified and capture methods implemented</p> <p>4b. eLumen’s functionality as it pertains to the relevant objectives fully implemented and all appropriate individuals trained</p>

A. Area of Focus	B. Objective	C. What are the reasons for the gap? Knowledge, Motivation, or Structure	D. Action Steps	E. Person Responsible for Action Step	F. Target Date for Achievement of Action Step	G. Measure of Progress
<p>Recommendation 6</p>	<p>2. Consistently analyze SLOs for all programs</p>	<p>1. Knowledge—Faculty not sure what to do</p> <p>2. Structure—dialog summary must be documented and captured in APR Report</p> <p>3. Structure—Currently, there are seldom widespread discussions about SLO data; culturally we do not discuss how to bolster outcomes</p>	<p>1. Create an “Assessment Guide” similar to Cañada College that defines “analyze” and “evaluate.” What comparisons to use? Across time? Across subpopulations? Across variables? Include examples.</p> <p>2a. Modify APR form to capture “analysis,” “evaluation” and “dialog” at course and program level.</p> <p>2b. Modify APR form prompts to guide faculty and staff with more structured responses</p> <p>2c. Create two dedicated SLO days (7.5 hours) per year within existing August and January in-service schedules, permanently.</p> <p>3. Discuss and assess one ISLO per year, as identified in the Educational Master Plan</p>	<p>1. SLOASC</p> <p>2a. IR Office</p> <p>2.b. PDC</p> <p>3. Academic Senate/ Governance Council</p>	<p>1. By in-service Fall 2016. Update annually.</p> <p>2a. Implement by August 2016</p> <p>2b. (same)</p> <p>2c. Fully implemented for 2016-2017 Academic Year</p> <p>3. Fully implemented for 2016-2017 Academic Year</p>	<p>1. Assessment Guide completed and implemented</p> <p>2a. APR form changes approved by Academic Senate and Governance Council and implemented</p> <p>2b. APR form changes approved by Academic Senate and Governance Council and implemented</p> <p>2c. SLO day incorporated into August and January in-service calendars</p> <p>3. ISLO calendar implemented as presented in EMP</p>

A. Area of Focus	B. Objective	C. What are the reasons for the gap? Knowledge, Motivation, or Structure	D. Action Steps	E. Person Responsible for Action Step	F. Target Date for Achievement of Action Step	G. Measure of Progress
<p>Recommendation 6</p>	<p>3. Consistently evaluate SLOs for all programs ("close the loop" with follow-up)</p>	<p>1. Knowledge—Faculty are not sure how to do this</p> <p>2a. Structure—No dedicated time to "evaluate"</p> <p>2b. Structure—No provision in APR forms to do this</p>	<p>1. Provide professional development exercises, training, or examples as to what faculty need to do during dedicated SLO day: <u>Analysis, Evaluation & Dialog</u> be defined</p> <p>2a. Create two dedicated SLO days (7.5 hours) per year within existing August and January in-service schedules, permanently.</p> <p>2b. Incorporate evaluation into APR process (See Objective 2)</p>	<p>1. SLOASC/IR</p> <p>2a. Admin</p> <p>2b. IR Office</p>	<p>1. Fully implemented prior to August 2017 In-Service</p> <p>2a. Fully implemented by 2016-2017 Academic Year</p> <p>2b. Starting with August 2016 cycle of APR</p>	<p>1. Faculty trained on methods identified in Assessment Guide</p> <p>2a. SLO day approved and implemented</p> <p>2b. APR Forms updated and approved by Academic Senate and Governance Council, and implemented</p>

A. Area of Focus	B. Objective	C. What are the reasons for the gap? Knowledge, Motivation, or Structure	D. Action Steps	E. Person Responsible for Action Step	F. Target Date for Achievement of Action Step	G. Measure of Progress
<p>Recommendation 4:</p> <p>In order to meet the standards, the team recommends the College fully integrate the assessment of course and program student learning outcomes (SLOs) into the program review process, including analysis and dialog of results at the department/program level. The team also recommends the College systematically assess the effective use of financial resources and the impact of program changes as a result of implemented program review recommendations.</p>	<p>4. Fully integrate the assessment of CSLOs and PSLOs into PR, including analysis and dialog at department/ program levels</p>	<p>1a. Structure—No provision in APR forms</p> <p>1b. Structure—No emphasis on SLO during prioritization process</p>	<p>1a. Modify APR forms to fully integrate analysis and dialog</p> <p>1b. Modify prioritization process as appropriate to use SLO data when required</p>	<p>1a. IR Office</p> <p>1b. SPC</p>	<p>1a. End of March 2016</p> <p>1b. Prior to August 2016 In-Service</p>	<p>1a. APR forms updated to include analysis and dialog fields</p> <p>1b. Modified rubrics for prioritization approved by Governance Council and CSEA and implemented</p>

A. Area of Focus	B. Objective	C. What are the reasons for the gap? Knowledge, Motivation, or Structure	D. Action Steps	E. Person Responsible for Action Step	F. Target Date for Achievement of Action Step	G. Measure of Progress
<p>Recommendation 4</p>	<p>5. Systematically Assess the effective use of financial resources and the impact of program changes as a result of implemented PR recommendations</p>	<p>1. Structure—There is no mechanism or process to do this</p> <p>2. Knowledge—Program leads are not aware of how to do this</p> <p>3. Knowledge—Personnel unsure of how to determine appropriate resource requests/interventions based on SLO & other data presented in APRs</p> <p>4. Structure—SLO data provided/presented differently than SAO data in APRs</p>	<p>1. Incorporate the appropriate fields into the APR form</p> <p>2a. Provide appropriate prompts and examples</p> <p>2b. SPC summarize and report out results annually for use in GC and APR</p> <p>3. Professional development in two areas: interpreting SLO data to determine appropriate improvements and assessing effective use or resources to impact program</p> <p>4. Develop and implement parallel processes if possible for SLO data provided to programs for APR</p>	<p>1. IR Office</p> <p>2a. IR Office</p> <p>2b. SPC</p> <p>3. SLOASC, PDC</p> <p>4. SLO Coordinator, SLO Technician, IR Office</p>	<p>1. By end of March 2016</p> <p>2a. Fully implemented by August 2016 In-Service</p> <p>2b. Fully implemented by 2016-2017 Academic Year</p> <p>3. Completely implemented by March 2017</p> <p>4. Fully implemented by 2016-2017 Academic Year</p>	<p>1. Modified APR forms approved by Academic Senate and Governance Council, and implemented</p> <p>2a. (same)</p> <p>2b. SPC identifies and implements appropriate procedure which is approved by Governance Council</p> <p>3. All faculty trained on methods</p> <p>4. SPC to recommend modified procedure and approval by Governance Council</p>

Request for IEPI Resources to Support College Innovation and Effectiveness Plan

Applicable Areas of Focus*	Applicable Objectives	Description of Resources Needed	Cost of Resource
Recommendation 6	Objective 1 Action Step 4b	Consultants to assist with eLumen Presenters/Trainers Training Materials	\$50,000
	Objective 2 Action Step 1	Funds to create Assessment Guide	\$5,000
	Objective 3 Action Step 1	Funds to develop training materials Presenters/Trainers	\$45,000
Recommendation 4	Objective 5 Action Step 3	Professional development (Presenters, consultant)	\$50,000
Total Resources Requested			\$150,000

- Note: The two recommendations are given out of order because it was believed that the logical order to implement would be Recommendation 6 and then Recommendation 4.