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President’s Message

Butte College is a place where faculty, classified staff, and managers make a real difference in the lives of our students and in the vitality of our communities.

Student learning is at the heart of what we do. Because student learning is so important it must be assessed and the results of these assessments must be used to improve teaching and learning as well as the systems and processes that support it.

The college’s first Outcomes Assessment Plan was approved in spring 2011. It resulted in a number of improvements in the college’s outcomes assessment processes. This plan updates that original plan and aligns it with the new Educational Master Plan.

The purpose of this plan is to continue this effort with the goal of fully integrating outcomes assessment into the college’s systems and processes and, by so doing, to bring the college to the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement level on the implementation of Student Learning Outcomes. By taking a more systematic approach our efforts will be more focused and better aligned. Because decisions will be based on accurate and meaningful data we’ll become more flexible and better able to change our direction and our pedagogy as needed to achieve better outcomes. As a result student learning will improve and more of our students will achieve their goals.

Research is a key component of the outcomes assessment effort and the action matrix at the end of this document also serves as the college’s research agenda. It is approved by Outcomes Assessment Committee and will be reviewed and updated each year.

Since the success of our students is the reason we’re here I know that I can count on your support as we work to fully integrate systematic processes to assess and improve our outcomes.

Kimberly Perry, Ed.D.
Butte College Mission Statement

Butte College provides quality education, services, and workforce training to students who aspire to become productive members of a diverse, sustainable, and global society. We prepare our students for life-long learning through the mastery of basic skills, the achievement of degrees and certificates, and the pursuit of career and transfer pathways.

Butte College Values

Students First: Student success is our purpose and focal point of decision-making and resource allocation.

Excellence: We strive to offer the highest quality in education and service through continual self-assessment, evaluation, professional development and ethical commitment.

Respect: We value each other and engage openly and considerately with one another’s ideas, philosophies, and perspectives.

Diversity in community: We value individual attributes, capabilities, and differences; and we foster the collaboration and social responsibility that create a vital institution with a global perspective.

Communication: We value professionalism in our interactions and cultivate an open, friendly environment of fairness and integrity.

Accountability: We are accountable to one another and for our responsibilities. As responsible stewards of the public trust, we use our resources effectively to fulfill the mission and obligations of the college.

Sustainability: We promote and model practices that result in positive outcomes for our human and natural environments.
Background

The original Outcomes Assessment Plan was approved in Spring 2011. It was developed collaboratively by an Assessment Task Force consisting of representatives from the Academic Senate (Dr. Kenneth Bearden), Curriculum Committee (Lyman Hagen and Boyd Trolinger), Office of Institutional Research (Dr. Baba Adam), Student Learning Outcomes Coordinators (Dr. Kenneth Bearden), Deans (Dr. Samia Yaqub), Department Chairs (Penny Lillie), Student Services Managers (Eric Hoiland), Student Success Committee (Dr. Samia Yaqub, Dr. Kenneth Bearden), and Administration (Dr. Ken Meier and Les Jauron).

This plan was developed by the college’s Outcomes Assessment Committee and approved by the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Management Association, Administration, and the Board. It brings that original plan up-to-date to reflect improvements that have occurred since 2011 and to align it with the new Educational Master Plan that was approved in August 2014. This plan is designed to fully integrate outcomes assessment into the colleges systems and processes and, by so doing, bring the college to the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement level on the implementation of Student Learning Outcomes.

The Outcomes Assessment Committee will review the implementation of this plan and update the Outcomes Assessment Matrix each year. Refinements based on these reviews will be approved, disseminated, and discussed as described in the previous paragraph.
Institutional Planning and Assessment

The *Educational Master Plan*, approved in August 2014 describes the college’s integrated planning process and its outcomes assessment process. This section includes the college’s Multi-year Integrated Planning System, the Strategic Initiatives. It also includes the model for integrated planning process includes two components - the Multi-year Integrated Planning System (MIPS) and the annual Planning, Budgeting, and Assessment Process.

The *Multi-year Integrated Planning System (MIPS)* links the college’s long-range, episodic, and annual processes into an integrated system. A diagram and description of MIPS is below.

Multi-year Integrated Planning System

Key components of the college’s multi-year integrated planning process include:

**Institutional Bedrock.** These items, with the exception of the Institutional Assessments, are conducted approximately every six years. A Task Force is established to update the Mission and Values, the Vision is developed by the Board with input from the College Council, and the Community Input is obtained from the community forums.
Strategic Initiatives. These are established at an all-campus retreat and approved through the college’s general participatory governance process with the Planning and Budgeting Committee providing oversight for this process.

Educational Master Plan. This is developed by the Educational Master Planning Committee and provides the basis for the development of Supporting Plans, informs Program Review, and provides alignment for the development of Unit Plans. The Strategic Direction, which is the college’s implementation strategy for its Strategic Initiatives, is updated by the Educational Master Planning Committee each year as part of the Planning, Budgeting and Assessment (PBA) Process.

Supporting Plans. These are developed by existing teams based on guidance provided in the Educational Master Plan. The idea is to use the existing governance group for each functional area to develop the supporting plan for that area. For example, the Technology Master Plan is developed and reviewed by the Technology Council.

Program Review. These are conducted every six years for the Academic and Student Services areas and annually for Administrative programs.

Academic Programs. The program review template for academic programs is developed under the leadership of the Academic Senate. The program review process includes a self-study, an external validation and curriculum review. Although the self-study and curriculum review are both conducted on six-year cycles these are scheduled to occur in different years. The Office of the Vice President for Student Learning and Economic Development manages the program review and curriculum review schedules. Completed program reviews, and the recommendations that result, are provided to and discussed with the Dean and the Vice President for Student Learning and Economic Development. A summary of the program review and recommendations are discussed with the College Council. The members of the College Council are expected to share the results and recommendations with their constituencies.

Student Services Programs. The program review template is developed by the Student Services managers. The process includes the program review and an external evaluation. The Office of the Vice President for Student Services manages the schedule for Student Services program review. Completed program reviews, and the recommendations that result, are provided to and discussed with the Student Services managers and the Vice President for Student Services. A summary of the program review and recommendations are discussed with the College Council. The members of the College Council are expected to share the results and recommendations with their constituencies.

Administrative Programs. These are conducted annually during the unit planning process and the results are submitted using the automated unit planning tool. Administrative programs are required to include administrative
unit outcomes, the method used to assess these outcomes, the cycle for conducting these assessments, assessment results and analysis of assessment results as part of the Program Description in the unit plan. Future development strategies will include strategies to close gaps between current levels of performance and administrative unit outcomes as well as the timelines for implementing these changes. Completed administrative program reviews, to include proposed future development strategies, will be reviewed by the vice president for each administrative unit. The College Council reviews a portion of the administrative program reviews each year. This group, which includes leaders from each constituent group, then disseminates the results of these program reviews throughout the campus.

**Unit Plans.** These are conducted, using the automated process, every year as part of the college’s PBA process. Unit plans are aligned with the college’s Strategic Direction and outcomes assessment results. A major objective of the unit planning process is to align resource requests with the annual budgeting process.

### Strategic Initiatives

In 2012-2013 the college developed new Strategic Initiatives. This process included the following steps:

**Strategic Planning Retreat.** On January 9 – 10, 2013 the college conducted its Strategic Planning Retreat. This event was open to the entire campus community and there were more than 80 participants. At the retreat the participants used the Appreciative Inquiry (AI) process to define the college’s previous successes and to develop strategies to build on these successes in the future. The outcome for this event was a set of eight provocative propositions.

**Consultant Report.** Based on the results of the retreat the consultant hired by the college produced a report to document the process, the eight provocative propositions, and measures of success.

**Process Approval.** The Planning and Budget Committee developed and approved the process for gaining approval of the Strategic Initiatives.

**Strategic Planning Retreat Participants Review.** The retreat participants reviewed the Consultant Report to ensure that it adequately captured what occurred at the Strategic Planning Retreat.

**Educational Master Planning Committee Review and Refinement.** The Educational Master Planning Committee conducted a detailed review of the provocative propositions. As a
result of this review the eight provocative propositions became six draft Strategic Initiatives. The information from the two provocative propositions that did not become stand-alone Strategic Initiatives were incorporated into other initiatives.

**Planning and Budget Committee Coordinating Draft Approval.** The Planning and Budget Committee then approved the coordinating draft and established a process for incorporating suggested changes from the constituent groups into the document.

**Coordinating Draft Dissemination.** The coordinating draft was then shared with the entire campus community.

**Constituent Group Review.** The constituent groups – Butte College Associated Students, Management Association, Classified Senate, and Academic Senate then reviewed the document and suggested changes.

**Planning and Budget Committee Final Draft Approval.** The Planning and Budget Committee approved a Final Draft of the Strategic Initiatives that incorporated the changes suggested by the constituent groups.

**President Approval.** The President approved the Final Draft of the Strategic Initiatives and authorized that these go to the Board for approval

**Board Approval.** The Board approved the Strategic Initiatives in August 2014.

*The process described on the previous page resulted in the six Strategic Initiatives shown below.*

**Strategic Initiatives**

1. **Enhancing a Culture of Completion and Academic Achievement**
   Focused on student-centered learning, Butte College strives to be the first choice for students seeking degrees, transfer, certificates, and job skills to meet their career and life goals. The college’s faculty, staff, services and schedule encourage and support students to achieve their educational goals and complete their academic programs in a reasonable period of time.

2. **Supporting Student, Faculty and Staff Success**
   Butte College recognizes that student success depends on student engagement, employee development, and enhancing a collaborative environment that provides the opportunity for varying perspectives to be heard. Precisely because of its focus on student success the college provides support tools and resources so that students, faculty and staff can be successful.
3. **Using Data-Informed Processes for Continuous Improvement**
   At Butte College every process is focused on improving the overall effectiveness and accountability of the college. These processes are data-informed, efficient, and integrated to add value to the campus and community.

4. **Maximizing Resources to Support Student Learning**
   Butte College actively shapes its enrollment, efficiently manages its existing resources, and strategically develops external revenue sources to maximize the funding available to support student learning.

5. **Modeling Sustainability**
   Butte College embraces sustainability by engaging students, staff and the community in dialogue and fostering sustainable practices and operations.

6. **Enhancing a Culture of Inclusiveness**
   Butte College fosters community by actively promoting an environment that celebrates the uniqueness of each individual. The campus climate is characterized by diversity, understanding, mutual respect, and inclusiveness.
In 2012-2013 the college began developing a Student Progress and Completion Model. It was approved as part of the 2014 Educational Master Plan. This model is based on a design from Completion by Design, a private organization funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. The intent is to provide a flow-based organizational framework for student success. The idea is to look at major loss points as students progress through their educational experience and to design and implement “best process” and “best practice” interventions to help students gain momentum and completion.
Student Achievement Standards and Goals

The 2014 Educational Plan establishes standards for student achievement and goals for improvement in the student achievement areas. The college’s accrediting agency now requires the institutions have standards of performance in the areas of course success, persistence, certificates, degrees, and transfer. Performance toward meeting the standards and goals will be monitored by the Educational Master Planning Committee.

Definitions:

- Standard. A level of performance the college commits to meet each year. Failure to meet a standard results in detailed institutional introspection that to develop actions to bring the college back into compliance.
- Goal. A desired outcome based on the actions the college is taking to improve performance.

Standards and Goals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>3 Yr Goal</th>
<th>5 Yr Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Success (College – Overall)</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer/General Ed</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career and Technical Ed</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Education (any)</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale: Course success rates vary greatly by course type and modality. For this reason the college has established an overall standard and goals for course types and the distance education modality.

Strategies: The intentional approach to completion outlined in Initiative 1 should result in higher levels of preparedness, greater student focus on an educational goal and increased consequences for course failure. These steps should result in higher levels of student commitment which should translate into improved completion rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006-2007</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>3 Yr Goal</th>
<th>5 Yr Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persistence (Three term - Scorecard)</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale: Persistence is impacted by external, such as the economy, as well as internal factors such as the number of short-term certificates. Because of the sensitivity of this indicator to external factors and projected improvements to the economy the college’s goals are relatively modest.

Strategies: The completion agenda outlined in Initiative 1 should result in greater persistence because of the intentional focus on student progression.
Certificates (FTF 6 yr Cohort, CAs)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006-2007</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale:** Because many students earn multiple certificates, the college believes that tracking the percentage of students achieving a certificate is more important than tracking the number of certificates of achievement awarded. For this reason the college is tracking the percentage of a first time freshmen cohort earning a certificate of achievement over six years. The six year tracking methodology should reduce the year-to-year fluctuations in this indicator and provide

**Strategies:** The intentional approach toward completion outlined in Initiative 1 should result in a greater percentage of first time freshmen being awarded a certificate of achievement.

Associate Degrees (FTF 6 yr Cohort)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006-2007</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale:** Because many students earn multiple degrees, the college believes that tracking the percentage of students earning a degree is more important than tracking the number of degrees awarded. For this reason the college is tracking the percentage of a first time freshmen cohort earning a degree over six years. The six year tracking methodology should reduce the year-to-year fluctuations in this indicator and provide long-term trends that are more useful for planning. Based on the anticipated elimination of several popular degree programs the percentage of students earning a degree is expected to go down over the next few years. However, over time, the full implementation of transfer degrees should significantly increase the percentage of students earning a degree.

**Strategies:** The completion agenda outlined in Initiative 1 should result in a greater percentage of first time freshmen being awarded a certificate of achievement.

Transfers (UC and CSU)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>746</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale:** The number of transfer is highly dependent on the enrollment management strategies of the UC and CSU campuses – particularly CSU, Chico. The number of transfers in 2011-2012 was among the highest ever for Butte College. Based on historical levels of transfer the standard for this indicator is significantly lower than the current performance level.

**Strategies:** The completion agenda outlined in Initiative 1 and the full implementation of transfer degrees should result in the college maintaining and then improving its level of performance.
Annual Strategic Direction

The annual Strategic Direction is the college’s current strategy for implementing its strategic initiatives. As part of the college’s annual Planning, Budgeting, and Assessment process the Strategic Direction is reviewed and refined by the Educational Master Planning Committee. This updated Strategic Direction then provides the annual institutional focus for unit planning and resource prioritization.

Institutional Priorities

As it updates the annual Strategic Direction the Educational Master Planning Committee recommends that certain objectives in the Strategic Direction be considered institutional priorities for the upcoming year. The Planning and Budget Committee then reviews and refines these priorities and recommends the refined institutional priorities to administration for implementation. Planning, Research and Organizational Development (PROD) area works with the responsible managers, faculty, and committees to provide an update to the Educational Master Planning Committee to inform the development of the subsequent Strategic Direction.
Planning, Budgeting, and Assessment (PBA) Process

The PBA process, shown below, is the college’s annual planning process. It has been in use for many years and is reviewed and refined by the Planning and Budget Committee each year.

This process includes the following steps:

1. Review and Refine Process. Each year the Planning and Budget Committee reviews and, as necessary, refines the process. The Accreditation Follow-Up Survey is used to help assess the process.

2. Prioritize Faculty Hiring Requests. The prioritization for new faculty occurs before the submission of unit plans based on the need to get positions advertised in early January. The hiring process takes place in the spring.

3. Begin Unit Planning. The Planning and Budget Committee develops Unit Planning Guidance to focus departments as they develop unit plans. This guidance also includes

4. Submit Unit Plan/Admin Program Reviews and SLO Reports

5. Refine Strategic Direction

6. Prioritize Augmentation Requests

7. Communicate Prioritization Results to Departments

8. Develop Budget

9. Approve Final Budget

Unit Planning Guidance provides general criteria for prioritizing resource requests. Unit Plans must be aligned with Mission, Values, Strategic Direction, Program Review, and Student Learning Outcomes.

The Board updates its Budget Criteria annually and reviews student success and achievement standard data at its winter and summer retreats.

Approved: September 2014
general criteria for prioritizing resource requests. Departments then develop unit plans. As they develop future development strategies as part of unit planning, departments ensure that these are aligned with the Strategic Direction, Program Review, and Student/Program Learning Outcomes. Unit plans are normally submitted in late January.

4. Submit Unit Plan, Admin Program Reviews and SLO Reports. Departments submit their unit plans and administrative areas submit program reviews using the online unit planning system by the date established in the unit planning guidance. These unit plans are reviewed by the appropriate deans, directors, and vice president and the approved augmentation requests are then consolidated for the President’s Leadership Team. SLO Reports are submitted using the Outcomes Assessment Module in CurricUNET. Programs are responsible for ensuring that resource requests identified during program review and outcomes assessment are included in the unit plan.

5. Refine Strategic Direction. In Spring, during non-planning years, the Educational Master Planning Committee reviews and refines the Strategic Direction so that it is finalized and approved so that departments can refer to it as they do their unit planning in the subsequent Fall.

6. Prioritize Augmentation Requests. In the Spring the resource requests identified during are prioritized based on the general priorities identified in the Unit Planning Guidance. Requests are prioritized by department, dean/director, vice president, and by the President’s Leadership Team. The Planning and Budget Committee reviews the resulting list, recommends refinements if necessary, and recommends the approval of the refined list.

7. Communicate Prioritization Results to Departments. Each department submitting a request for resources is informed, through the automated unit planning process, of the status of its request. Deans and Directors are encouraged to discuss the status of requests face-to-face with department chairs and coordinators.

8. Develop Budget. In the summer the college staff prepares a tentative budget for the Board. The Board Budget Criteria is used to guide the staff as it develops the tentative budget.

9. Approve Final Budget. After the state budget is finalized the staff updates the tentative budget and presents it to the Board for final approval.
Outcomes Assessment Process

The Outcomes Assessment Process, diagrammed below, shows the alignment of institutional outcomes, program outcomes (Student Services, degrees and certificates, general education and administrative units), and course outcomes (Student Services departments, course, and administrative departments).
The Outcomes Assessment Committee provides institutional oversight for this effort and is responsible for the development and annual review of the Outcomes Assessment Plan. As part of this effort, the college provides a number of assessment mechanisms to support the Outcomes Assessment Process and to inform the refinement of the Multi-year Integrated Planning System (MIPS) and PBA process.

Institutional assessment mechanisms include: institutional level these include:

**Balanced Scorecard.** This document, which is provided to the Planning and Budget Committee in late Spring and to the Board in early summer, provides a global view of how well the college is meeting the outcomes it has identified in its Strategic Direction. These include indicators that about Student Success, Transfer Performance, and Workforce and Economic Development.

**Demographic Snapshot.** This document sets the stage for planning by providing information about the college’s service area, student demographics, student enrollment patterns, and staffing. It also contains the college’s Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis.

**Strategic Direction Review.** Each year, as part of the PBA process the college reviews its performance toward achieving the initiatives and objectives contained in the Educational Master Plan. Based on this assessment the Educational Master Planning Committee updates the Strategic Direction. These reviews are available on the Educational Master Planning Committee page in MyBC.

**Accreditation Review.** Each year, as part of the college’s ongoing accreditation process, champions for each standard (component) conduct a review of the college’s compliance with their assigned standard (component). The result of this review, along with the evidence that supports it, is captured in MyBC. The champions then provide an annual compliance update to the participatory governance committee with responsibility for the (sub) standard and the Accreditation Steering Committee.

**Surveys.** The college conducts several institutional surveys to inform the review and refinement of the Strategic Direction and Program Review. These include the following:

- **Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE).** This survey, which is conducted every three years, provides college data and comparison information in five benchmark areas: Active and Collaborative Learning, Student-Faculty Interaction, Student Effort, Support for Learners, and Academic Challenge.

- **Accreditation Follow-Up Survey (Faculty and Staff).** This survey, which is conducted every year, provides information about the effectiveness of a number of college processes – primarily in the areas of planning, budgeting, and participatory governance.

- **Completers and Leavers Survey.** This survey, which has been conducted once but is planned to be conducted every three years, provides feedback to the college from
program completers and leavers as well as salary information from students transitioning into the workforce. The results of this survey are available on the Outcomes Assessment Committee page in MyBC.

**Accreditation Surveys.** These surveys, which are conducted every year, are administered to students, faculty, and staff. They provide feedback on student participation on campus, programs and services as well as information about institutional processes such as college planning, instructional and student support programs, and support functions such as technology and facilities.

In addition to institutional indicators the college uses a number of program level indicators to assist programs to conduct self-assessments and program review.

**Reports Server.** Each time a report is requested the template for the report is updated in the Reports Server and the report is automatically populated. The Reports Server includes over 300 reports in the areas of Business Office, Facilities, Institutional Research, Instruction, Scheduling, and Student Services. The Institutional Research area includes reports on Enrollment Management, Cohort Tracking, Funding, Program Review, and Scheduling.

**CurricUNET SLO Module.** This module includes the repository for focused program and course student learning outcomes assessments. It was implemented in 2013-2014.
Assessment in Student Learning Programs

History
Butte College has focused on assessment for a number of years. Work on identifying and assessing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) began in 2002. In 2004 the college established an SLO Committee, co-chaired by a faculty member and a dean, to research best practices. Reports were given to various constituencies, including the Academic Senate and the Curriculum Committee, and this dialogue helped shape the directions the institution has taken. In Spring 2005, the Academic Senate and the Curriculum Committee assumed responsibility for outcomes development and assessment, reinforcing the faculty-driven nature of the process. In Fall of 2006 the Academic Senate adopted its Philosophy on Assessment, and in Spring 2006, Student Learning Outcomes were approved for the college’s Associate’s Degree general education requirements, including each of the six areas, and a more encompassing Philosophy of General Education was added in Spring 2008.

Communication
Information about SLOs and assessment has been shared with faculty through numerous workshops (including visits by experts such as Mary Allan and Dr. Tom Angelo, department meetings, and via both the institution’s Curriculum Committee website and Assessment website. Several workshops have highlighted departments or programs that completed assessments or implemented changes based on assessments. The college provides updates on assessments, all-faculty sessions at Institute Day, and through the web page. The SLO Coordinator also works with individual departments as requested.

General Education
The General Education Subcommittee was formed in Fall of 2009 and began its work in the Spring of 2010. This committee evolved into the General Education Assessment Committee which is now a standing committee of the Academic Senate. Comprised of faculty from across many disciplines as well as three administrators, the subcommittee has tackled a number of issues: size of the college’s general education program, criteria for inclusion in the areas, the college’s board policy on general education, outcomes language, faculty and student awareness of general education complexities, alignment with the college’s sister university, and possible methods of general education assessment (including employer surveys, graduate surveys, and focus groups). Statewide initiatives (such as SB 1440, regional initiative (such as CSU, Chico’s general education reform), and local initiatives (Butte College’s own transfer initiative) have all added yet more complexity to the work undertaken by the group. California’s budget situation has also added complexity, forcing the college to consider even more carefully every dollar it spends.

Institutional Support and Integration
Outcomes Assessment is envisioned as a driving force behind strategic planning and budgeting as well as overall improvement in student learning. Advancing the progress has been a wide array of institutional support that places the faculty at the heart of the creation and approval of
outcomes and strategies for attaining them, assessment of those outcomes, and dialogue about how the results can lead to improvement. The college’s first Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator, a faculty member who receives reassigned time to lead efforts on campus, was approved in Spring 2006 and began work the following Fall. Also approved was additional reassigned time for the Curriculum Committee Chair who plays an integral role in learning outcome and assessment activities. The process of outcomes development and assessment has been integrated into the college’s Planning, Budgeting, and Assessment (PBA) process through unit planning as well as Curriculum and Program Review processes.

**Current Status**

The college has established clear requirements and guidelines for identifying student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees, for assessing student achievement of outcomes, and for using assessment results to make improvements. An SLO Requirements and Timeline quick sheet available on the Student Learning Outcomes webpages of the Butte Website serves as a convenient reference for faculty of what is needed to ensure compliance.

First on the SLO Requirements and Timeline quick sheet is the mandate that program student learning outcomes (PLOs) exist for all certificates and degrees. At the time of this writing, only three programs are still at work developing their PLOs. (In the cases of Interior Design and Visual Merchandising, the delay is explained by the lack of full-time faculty; the SLO Coordinator is currently working with associate faculty and the area dean to identify PLOs. In the case of the interdisciplinary Liberal Arts program, this degree is currently under review in light of the new Associate Degrees for Transfer developed through the Chancellor’s Office.) In addition to certificate and degree programs, faculty have identified PLOs for programs such as First Year Experience, Study Abroad, Library Instruction, and General Education. Although these are not programs that lead to certificates or degrees, they involve carefully selected courses intended to produce measureable student learning outcomes.

Previously, program learning outcomes “lived” on Program Review and SLO reporting documents, which posed challenges in terms of accessibility, consistency, and updating. Now that PLOs have been fully incorporated into the program module of the CurricUNET system, faculty can easily verify active PLOs, and revisions that occur through the regular curriculum and program review process are applied uniformly in all necessary places. And, starting with the 2013-2014 Catalog, program learning outcomes are published on the catalog page for each program so that prospective students are aware of expected outcomes in their course of study.

The SLO Requirements and Timeline quick sheet also mandates that student learning outcomes exist for all courses. All active courses at Butte College list student learning outcomes in the Objectives section of the official Course Outline of Record. Course SLOs are also a required element of course syllabi, so that regardless of instructor students are aware of expected outcomes in their courses. The SLO Coordinator, the Technical Review Subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee, and the full Curriculum Committee all play an active role in supporting faculty in writing SLOs that are specific, observable, and measureable.
The SLO Requirements and Timeline quick sheet reminds faculty that learning outcomes must be aligned between the program level (including General Education) and the course level. This mapping occurs, and is reviewed, in multiple places. The Program Review Self-Study has as a component the review and updating of Program SLO Reporting templates that include mapping of PLOs to learning outcomes in courses required for the certificate or degree. In the case of new program or course development, the SLO Coordinator, Curriculum Technical Review Subcommittee and the full Curriculum Committee play a role in confirming alignments between program and course learning outcomes. As another example, on Institute Day in Spring 2013, all full-time faculty with courses in General Education participated in an alignment exercise—mapping course learning outcomes to newly adopted General Education learning outcomes.

In Spring 2014, the much-anticipated SLO Module went live in CurricUNET. An advantage of the module is that it reinforces alignments between program and course learning outcomes. When creating a Course SLO Report, the instructor must indicate, by selecting from prepopulated lists, which program outcomes (including GE) are directly supported by the course-level assessment activity. As stated above, storing PLOs in CurricUNET helps to ensure consistency, and also allows PLOs to be prepopulated in SLO Reports so that they are readily reviewable by faculty.

Assessment is ongoing for all program and course learning outcomes, and the college recognizes that every artifact that a student produces in a course—quiz, essay, speech, computer program, skills demonstration and so forth—is a valid assessment. The college also recognizes, however, that for dialogue to occur about teaching and student learning, discipline faculty must develop and implement specific assessment activities that allow for analysis and that reveal areas for improvement. Faculty record these focused activities and findings in annual SLO Reports due each January. Until Spring 2014, SLO Reports were completed using a variety of templates, and posted to the Butte College website. While this process served its purpose, there was frequent confusion about the multiple templates in play, and faculty often resorted to using their own format sometimes did not include all of the required information. The SLO Module, used for reporting for the first time in Spring 2014, is a huge improvement to the college’s processes. The SLO Module removes any doubt about the appropriate template, and has already demonstrated its efficacy in regard to consistency of format and information provided. A report created in the SLO Module can be “launched” only after the following fields have been completed:

- Outcomes Assessed
- Assessment Plan
- Assessment Results
- Collective Dialogue
- Planned Improvements

Another refinement to the college’s processes for assessment of student learning outcomes is the Assessment Planning Schedule, also known as “the Matrix.” Introduced as a new requirement for all disciplines/programs in Fall 2013, the Assessment Planning Schedule identifies which course(s) and course outcome(s) will be assessed in a given semester, as well as the alignment between the outcome(s) being assessed and program/GE outcomes. The
Assessment Planning Schedule advances three goals: it helps to ensure that disciplines/programs conduct focused assessment activities in each semester, as it eliminates some of the indecision that can stall assessment efforts in a given semester; it confirms alignments between program and course outcomes; and it provides an assessment cycle, verifying that purposeful assessment occurs for all courses and across all learning outcomes.

Communication and dialogue about student achievement of learning outcomes occur at multiple levels. Naturally, most sharing happens at the department level among discipline faculty. The Fall and Spring semesters both open with a two-hour Institute Day session in which full-time faculty dialogue about assessment results from the prior term, and plan improvements. These conversations typically are continued that same evening, when both full-time and associate instructors are present. Additionally, SLOs are an agenda item for department meetings throughout each semester. The review of assessment results by discipline faculty is expected to lead to changes—to teaching, curriculum, resource use, or outcomes/assessments—geared toward improvement. Professional development workshops constitute another level of communication and dialogue. During each Fall Institute Week, the General Education Assessment Committee hosts a session in which it presents assessment activities and results for one or more GE Areas. The intent is to foster dialogue about student learning among faculty who teach in different disciplines but who have in common GE learning outcomes. Again, the expectation is that faculty will use information about assessment results to plan changes and improvements in their teaching and programs.
Assessment in Student Services

Student Services utilizes annual outcomes assessments for planning and budgeting decisions and to comply with requirements delineated within the Matriculation Regulations of Title V Education Code.

1. Program Review. Student Services Program Review is the systematic process of gathering, analyzing, and reporting data about a program and the effectiveness of its service(s). Program review, analysis, and evaluation are essential parts of institutional planning and development if the college is to meet the ever-changing needs of the community it serves. Therefore, each Student Services program will conduct a Program Review on a regular cycle.

2. SPS Student Learning Outcomes. Prior to 2007 Student Services identified unit-level SLO’s with each unit being responsible for outcomes assessments. In 2007, the SPS SLO Task Force introduced three divisional-level SLOs and mapped the unit-level SLOs to the divisional-level SLOs. In fall, 2009 and SPS Divisional-Level SLO Assessment Methodology was developed to assess two divisional-level SLOs (listed below). Student Services are required to communicate their SLO plan within the structure of the Unit Planning process.
   • By the end of their first semester, students will be able to identify the various support programs and services at the College.
   • By the end of their first semester, students will be able to identify the steps necessary to utilize the various support programs and services at the College.

3. Unit Planning. Based on guidance from the Planning and Budgeting Committee each Student Service prepares a Unit Plan describing the mission, future development strategy, SLO plan, linkage to the strategic direction, and resource requests (both ongoing and one-time).

4. Matriculation. The Matriculation Regulations of Title V Education Code require ongoing assessment of the Matriculation components including Assessment, Orientation, Counseling and Registration. The following assessments are conducted annually or per Matriculation requirements.
   • Orientation (START) Evaluation. Two survey assessments are administered to new students during New Student Orientation. The data collected is used by the College’s Matriculation Committee for future planning and budgeting decision making.
   • Placement Level Distributions. Data is collected each fall from the Reports Server summarizing the placement level distributions into Reading, English and Math courses from the College’s Basic Skills Assessment. This data is used in the yearly AARC Basic Skills Survey and communicated to the appropriate academic areas for course scheduling planning.
   • Disproportionate Impact. This analysis is mandated by Matriculation Regulations to determine if a disproportionate impact is occurring for certain groups of students in their placements in remedial, associate and transfer-level class.
   • Assessment Validation. This analysis is mandated by Matriculation Regulations to ensure that prerequisites (cut scores) are appropriately applied for placement into Reading, English and Math courses. This data must be submitted to an external evaluator to maintain the test instruments on the Chancellor’s Office “approval list.”
Program Review

Program Review is the mechanism that programs use to maintain their focus on student learning and student success, to set their future development strategy, and to request the resources needed to implement their future development strategies. Since the college is an integrated group of programs, the program review process is one of the most important components of the college’s planning processes. At Butte College there are three types of program review. These are listed below:

- Academic. These programs conduct program review on a six year cycle. This process includes three parts – the written program review, an external validation, and curriculum review. The Academic Senate is responsible for developing the academic program review process and the schedule for academic program review is managed in the office of the Vice President for Student Learning and Economic Development.

- Student Services. Student Services program reviews are conducted every six years. This process includes the written program review and an external evaluation.

- Administrative. The unit plan is used as the program review for administrative areas. Additionally, these areas provide an update on the accomplishment of their Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUOs) at least every three years.

The College Council reviews program reviews. This group, which includes leaders from each constituent group, then disseminates the results of these program reviews throughout the campus.
Current Status of Assessment at Butte College

In March, 2013 the college submitted a status update on the implementation of Student Learning Outcomes at Butte College. This update is organized by the proficiency statements in the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness for Student Learning Outcomes. It has been updated to reflect progress in the past year. The evidence cited is available at the Butte College Office of Institutional Research.

**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.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): 1,079  
   b. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 1,043  
      Percentage of total: 96.7%  
   c. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 1043  
      Percentage of total: 96.7%

2. Programs  
   a. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college): 118  
   b. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 106;  
      Percentage of total: 90%  
   c. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 103;  
      Percentage of total: 87%

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): 2

b. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 2; Percentage of total: 100%

c. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 2; 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: 100%

P0RFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Work on student learning outcomes began in 2002. The diagram “Outcomes Alignment at Butte College” shows how outcomes are established, assessed, dialogued about, and result in changes at the institutional, program, and course levels. (1-13). SLOs are an integral part of program review. (1-14)

At the course level, the Curriculum Committee focuses on ensuring measurable objectives, formatted as Student Learning Outcomes, for every course. The outcomes for each course are carefully examined not only at the Curriculum Committee but also at the Technical Review (an initial review before a course goes before the entire Curriculum Committee) and during the formal Curriculum Review process (accompanies the Program Review every six years) (1-1, 1-2 and 1-3).

The college began focusing on program, certificates and degrees student learning outcomes in 2003. For the past four years departments have reported their status on cycles of assessment in conjunction with their annual unit plans as part of the college’s annual Planning, Budgeting, and Assessment (PBA) process (1-4, 1-5, 1-6 and 1-7).

This report includes:

- Student Learning Outcomes
- Plan (including assessment method(s) and timeline)
- Results
- collective dialogue has occurred as a result of the assessment activity.
- Improvements or Changes
- Timeline for Improvements or Changes

Program Level

Assessment

Discuss what

Planned

Proposed
Programs are modified based on assessment. Most of the programs without learning outcomes are a result of recent program changes. The development of outcomes for these programs is in progress.

According to Board Policy 3260, Outcomes Assessment, the college’s institutional outcomes, as defined in the Educational Master Plan are reviewed and updated each year (1-8, 1-9 and 1-10).

Student Services and Administrative areas review and refine their outcomes during program review and review these each year during unit planning. (1-11) (1-12)

**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 diagram “Outcomes Alignment at Butte College” shows how outcomes are established, assessed, dialogued about, and result in changes at the institutional, program, and course levels. (1-13)

The college provides relevant data to support planning, resource allocation and scheduling. Annually each academic department receives a data template to support unit planning (2-1). Additionally there is a wide variety of reports, to include cohort tracking reports, available in the reports server. (2-2, 2-3 and 2-4). The Balanced Scorecard and the Strategic Direction Review support an informed dialogue about institutional outcomes. (2-5, 2-6 and 2-7).

The wide availability of data provides the basis for informed dialogue about outcomes, gaps, and potential improvements in curriculum and program development, strategic planning, enrollment management, budget prioritization, meetings, and professional development.

The last two Institute Days, mandatory for all full-time faculty, focused on SLO assessment, identifying gaps, and developing strategies for improvement (2-8 and 2-9). Additionally a number of workshops have been conducted on outcomes assessment. (2-13)

Many changes have resulted from outcomes assessment. (2-13). As examples, based on data showing low progression rates of lower-level basic skills students and widespread dialogue the college eliminated Basic Math, is piloting an accelerated pathway in English, and has refined its scheduling criteria to maintain the same number of basic skills Math sections while reducing the overall schedule by approximately 15% (2-10, 2-11 and 2-12)
The Accreditation Follow-up survey (Fall 2011) and subsequent surveys have shown improvements in the availability and use of data. *(2-14)*

**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**

For the past six years the college has used its Planning, Budgeting and Assessment (PBA) process to intentionally link SLO assessment results, departmental unit planning, program review, the college’s Strategic Direction, and resourcing decisions. This process is designed to ensure that informed dialogue occurs at each step in the process.

In fall 2012 the college implemented IPAR (Integrated Planning, Assessment and Resourcing) system to automate the elements of its PBA process. This system links resource requirements from the program SLOs with the college’s annual unit planning and resource allocation processes while ensuring dialogue and transparency. *(3-6).*

The college uses its professional development program to support the implementation of authentic assessment. This has included sessions with national leaders in assessment to include Tom Angelo and Mary Allen as well as frequent sessions during faculty flex *(3-1, 3-2 and 3-3).*

The college’s Student Success Committee, which consists of faculty, classified staff, students, and administrators from across the campus, was initially responsible for overseeing the implementation of projects funded by the college’s Title III grant. These projects, to include supplemental instruction, applied academics, learning communities, and accelerated basic skills have significantly improved student learning and student success *(3-4).* Based on evidence of its impact on student success supplemental instruction was institutionalized. Since the Title III grant’s completion this committee has focused on maintaining a holistic and comprehensive institutional dialogue about student success.

In 2010-2011 a task force, consisting of faculty, administrators and managers developed a comprehensive Outcomes Assessment Plan to include an Outcomes Assessment Model. After the plan was approved a committee was established to oversee its implementation *(3-5 and 3-5).* This committee annually reviews and refines the Outcomes Assessment Plan.

According to the Accreditation Follow-Up Survey (Fall 2011) there has been improvement in the percentage of faculty and classified staff agreeing that educational processes influence the direction of the college and that institutional dialogue results in improvement. This improvement has been reflected on subsequent surveys. *(2-14)*
**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**

For the past six years the college has used its Planning, Budgeting and Assessment (PBA) process to intentionally link SLO assessment results, departmental unit planning, program review, the college’s Strategic Direction, and resourcing decisions. (1-4, 1-5, 1-6 and 1-7). This process is designed to ensure that informed dialogue occurs at each step in the process.

In fall 2012 the college implemented an online unit planning system to automate the elements of its PBA process. This system links program SLOs with the college’s annual unit planning and resource allocation processes while ensuring dialogue and transparency. (3-6).

As the college began its emphasis on assessment it sent three cadres of faculty and administrators to attend the Indianapolis Assessment Institute (4-1). At this conference faculty and administrators were exposed to the latest trends in assessment and integrated planning and used this effort to inform the college’s assessment effort and to refine the college’s existing resource allocation process into a more integrated planning process.

For the past six years the college has provided 50% faculty reassign time to support one or two faculty to serve as SLO Coordinators. These faculty have attended SLO Regional Workshops and the Accreditation Institute.

The SLO Coordinators have spearheaded professional development activities on assessment to include sessions with national leaders such as Tom Angelo and Mary Allen (3-1 and 3-2). More importantly they provided structure for the program and individual training sessions for department chairs and faculty. (4-2)

**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**

Course and program-level assessment efforts are documented via a standard reporting template (5-1). Each year the college’s Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) disseminates Unit Planning Guidance (1-6). This guidance defines program SLO reporting requirements that are reported, using the standard template, by the programs along with their annual unit plans. After review by the SLO Coordinator and the Vice President for Student Learning, the Program SLO reports are posted on the Planning, Budget, and Assessment web site with the associated unit plan. Student Services and administrative units establish their outcomes during...
program review and update the status of implementation as part of annual unit planning. (1-13)

This process ensures that programs are following through with cycles of assessment and that alignment exists between program student learning outcomes, program review results and department unit plans. Currently four years of SLO Reports posted on the college website (5-3).

In 2013-2014 the college implemented the CurricUNET SLO Module to supplement the online unit planning system. Under this automated system the reports remain the same but it is easier for faculty to create or edit their assessment reports, align course and program level SLOs, and receive feedback from departmental faculty. Additionally, the online unit planning system ensures greater alignment between unit planning, resource requests from program review and SLO assessment and greater transparency about resourcing decisions. As part of the process of assessing the effectiveness of the college’s integrated planning effort a report is prepared each year to inform dialogue about the alignment of resourcing decisions with the strategic initiatives, program review, and outcome assessment. When approved the SLO reports from CurricUNET SLO Module and online unit plans are posted on the Planning, Budgeting and Assessment website so that the public has access to the most recent assessment information (3-6).

**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**

At Butte College degrees are assessed in two parts – the major and general education. The current reporting templates used to document program-level assessment work also require an alignment of the course level objectives with the major, certificate or program outcomes associated with that course (5-1).

Programs include general education as well as other courses that are linked together such as basic skills strands (6-1 and 6-2). This alignment has been required not only of programs with degrees but of any program that contains a sequence or “strand” of related courses.

Work on redesigning the General Education (GE) program was extremely complex and faculty working groups developed overarching outcomes for GE as a whole as well as for each of the each of the college’s General Education areas (6-3). Assessment of the redesigned GE outcomes has begun.

Another significant change has been the requirement to include the alignment of course outcomes with program-level SLOs as part of initial program creation and during cyclical program reviews (6-4). With the shifting of assessment reporting to the SLO Module in CurricUNET, the initial thought was to shift the matrix that shows the alignment of course and program outcomes into CurricUNET’s program module. This was not possible so matrices that show the alignment of course and program learning outcomes are still prepared manually and shown on the Planning, Budgeting and Assessment (PBA) webpage. Any changes
that are then made must be made through formal action at the Curriculum Committee, ensuring a much more thorough level of accountability for program improvement (6-5).

**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**

The college catalog contains, as part of its course listings, the general course description, to convey to students the general goals and purposes of each course. Course outlines of record go into more detail, including measurable course objectives, and those outlines are made publicly available on the college’s website (7-1). The institution requires instructors to include in their course syllabi the objectives that have been delineated on the course outline of record. Many programs make explicit to students how the assessments they engage in are reflective of their mastery of specific outcomes (7-2).

The college’s catalog provides students with general information about the goals and purposes of the degrees and certificates offered as well as the program level-SLOs (7-3). Program SLO reports are available on the college’s website and many programs include their outcomes in promotional literature (7-4).

With the implementation of the SLO Module in CurricUNET the college is establishing a direct linkage between program level outcomes, currently housed in the college’s curriculum management system, and the program website so that any student seeking information about a program, of study has only to click on a link to view the program’s outcomes.

According to the Fall 2012 student survey:

- 80% of students surveyed were aware of what they needed to do in order to complete their degree or certificate, or to transfer to another institution. (80% in 2007)
- 85% felt the courses required for their degree or certificate would provide adequate preparation or skills for their career or transfer goals. (84% in 2007)

**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

Based on an evaluation of its current status using the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, Part III (Rubric) Butte College is at the proficiency level on implementation of SLOs and is close to sustained, continuous improvement in most areas. The systems supporting outcomes assessment at Butte College are infused into the college’s processes and evaluated periodically to ensure that iterative improvement continues to occur.

The college is currently continuing its journey from proficiency to sustained, continuous quality improvement. Specific areas of focus include:

Refining the online unit planning process and the CurricUNET SLO Module as the college goes through the PBA process each year.

Automating academic, student services, and administrative unit program reviews and integrating these more tightly with IPAR and the CurricUNET SLO Module.

Developing a new Outcomes Assessment Plan and, as part of this process, improving the indicators available to college programs – particularly those related to the transitions from high school to college, college to university, and college to the workforce.
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College Status Report on SLO Implementation submitted in March 2013

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC)

10 Commercial Blvd., Suite 204, Novato, CA 94949
In response to a request for feedback from the college that accrediting commission provided the following report on the College SLO Report.

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

DATE: April 7, 2014

TO: Baba Adam
    Accreditation Liaison Officer
    Butte College

CC: Lester Jauron

FROM: Krista Johns
    Vice President for Policy and Research

SUBJECT: Feedback on College Status Report on SLO Implementation

Butte College
College Status Report on SLO Implementation submitted in March 2013

This report has been prepared at your request, to provide feedback on the 2012-2013 SLO report. In order to understand your college’s scores, below, please refer to your College Status Report along with this feedback report. The information provided here is for use in discussions at the college about how your report compared with the review criteria that were applied, with the average scores across the region, and with where you are and want to be in your SLO practice. Please note that the scores are only useful to gain a broad sense of results across the Western Region. They are a gross measure of a particular point in time as self-reported among peer institutions. However, the review criteria for this report may be helpful to spark conversations about where the Proficiency expectations in college practice were in 2012-2013, and where meeting Accreditation Standards for SLOs will be from this point forward.

In accordance with ACCJC practice for monitoring annual self-reports from member institutions, staff reviewed the 2012-2013 College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation and prepared a composite report on the results for review by the Commission. Each college’s report was also retained for inclusion with annual reports, annual fiscal reports, audits, and other college materials for external evaluation teams when conducting a review of the institution.

The 2012-2013 SLO reports completed by all institutions provided a means for gaining understanding of progress across the Western Region in the implementation of student learning outcomes assessment. The Commission based this report on the Proficiency implementation level on the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, Part III (Rubric), as that had become very familiar to individuals at the campuses who worked with SLOs. Moving forward, colleges are reminded they must demonstrate the Accreditation Standards are met as to student learning outcomes.
In order to gather a snapshot of SLO implementation across the region, a scoring rubric was used to pull together elements from the submitted reports. The rubric was based upon the information provided by colleges in their reports as it related to the Proficiency level. While the scoring rubric elements captured the largest aspects of practice and majority of reported items, there were a few unique responses provided by colleges to some questions, and these were scored to give benefit to the institution.

**Scoring Rubric**

5- Exceeds Norm of Effective Practice  
(Described practices indicate breadth, depth, innovation, or other aspects beyond expected effective practices)

4- Solidly Meets Expectation of Effective Practice  
(Effective Practices in all aspects of this element of SLO implementation are present)

3- Barely Meets Expectation of Effective Practice  
(Effective Practices are Present in all areas, but they may be at a basic level or just starting out)

2- Doesn’t Fully Meet Expectation of Effective Practice  
(Some aspects of effective practice are not present)

1- Doesn’t Meet Expectation of Effective Practice  
(Performance in this area is deficient)

The scoring rubric above was applied to each question in accordance with the levels defined for the question. Both the numerical and narrative responses were evaluated. A score of 4 indicated the information self-reported by the college met the 2012-2013 expectations of effective practice as defined for this review.

**Numerical Responses**

The 2012-2013 expectation was that student learning outcomes were being assessed regularly in all venues where students are learning. The scoring of numerical responses took into account variations at colleges of how certain activities were conducted or defined.

**Proficiency Rubric Statement 1: Student Learning outcomes and Authentic Assessments are in Place for Courses, Programs, Support Services, Certificates and Degrees.**
Quantitative Evidence/data on the rate/percentage of SLOs defined and assessed

1.1 Courses

d. Total number of college courses (active courses in the college catalog, offered on the schedule in some rotation).

e. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes.
   Percentage of total: This item was not rated separately for the SLO implementation review. Colleges are expected to have completed the definition of SLOs. Expectations for a College response (to get a score of 4): 95% or greater.

f. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes.
   Percentage of total:
   Scoring: Expectations for College Response: 75% or greater
   [5=95+; 4=75+; 3=65+; 2=55+; 1=<55; 0=dnr]

   Average score: 3.66

   Your college score: 5

1.2 Programs

d. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college).

e. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes.
   Percentage of total: This item was not rated separately for the SLO implementation review. Colleges are expected to have completed the definition of SLOs. Expectations for a College response (to get a score of 4): 95% or greater.

f. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes:
   Percentage of total.
   Scoring: Expectations for College Response (to get a score of 4): 85% or greater
   [5=95+; 4=85+; 3=75+; 2=65+; 1=<65; 0=dnr]

   Average score: 3.49

   Your college score: 4

1.3 Student Learning and Support Activities

d. Total number of student learning and support activities (as college has identified or grouped them for SLO implementation).

e. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes.
   Percentage of total: This item was not rated separately for the SLO implementation review. Colleges are expected to have completed the definition of SLOs. Expectations for a College response (to get a score of 4): 95% or greater.
f. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes. Percentage of total:
   Scoring: Expectations for College Response  (to get a score of 4): 85% or greater
   \[5=95+; 4=85+; 3=75+; 2=65+; 1=<65; 0=dnr\]
   Average Score: 4.14
   Your college score: 5

1.4 Institutional Learning Outcomes
   c. Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined:
      This item was not rated separately for the SLO implementation review. Colleges are expected to have completed the definition of these SLOs.
   d. Institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment:
      Scoring: Expectations for College Response  (to get a score of 4): 75% or greater
      \[5=90%; 4=75%=; 3=66%+; 2=50%+; 1=<50%; 0=dnr\]
      Average Score: 4.07
      Your college score: 5

Narrative Responses

1.5 Proficiency Rubric Statement 1: Narrative Response

Student Learning outcomes and Authentic Assessments are in Place for Courses, Programs, Support Services, Certificates and Degrees.

Expectations for College Response  (to get a score of 4):
   - Narrative supports numerical data provided
   - addresses courses, programs, certificates, degrees and support services
   - Discusses \textit{authentic} assessment (assessment that leads to understanding about student learning and gaps which need to be addressed)

Average Score: 3.51
Your college score: 4
Proficiency Rubric Statement 2: There is a widespread institutional dialogue about assessment results and identification of gaps.

2. Proficiency Rubric Statement 2: Narrative Response

Expectations for College Response (To Get a Score of 4):

- Beyond providing a listing of meetings at which assessment is addressed, the narrative addresses specifically where/how/for what purpose assessment results are discussed
- Describes processes for identifying gaps and instituting changes to address the gaps
- Institutional messages value assessment and improvement

Average Score: 3.38
Your college score: 4

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.

3. Proficiency Rubric Statement 3: Narrative Response

Expectations for College Response (To get a Score of 4):

- Descriptions in narrative about how decision-making includes results of assessment
- Discussion of how institution-wide practices are aligned/realigned to support and improve student learning

Average Score: 3.29
Your college score: 4

Proficiency Rubric Statement 4: Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.

4. Proficiency Rubric Statement 4: Narrative Response

Expectations for College Response (To Get a Score of 4):

- Discussion of how resources are allocated and fine-tuned to improve student learning
- Mention of all kinds of resources: fiscal, employee, technology, and physical
- Institutional resource allocation/fine-tuning is oriented toward student learning

Average Score: 3.22
Your college score: 4
5. Proficiency Rubric Statement 5: Narrative Response

Expectations for College Response (To Get a Score of 4):
- Narrative describes the cycle and format of assessment reports
- Participation in report completion/updating, and comprehensive nature of assessment reports is addressed

Average Score: 3.15
Your college score: 3

6. Proficiency Rubric Statement 6: Narrative Response

Expectations for College Response (To Get a Score of 4):
- Description of alignment of course level outcomes with degree level outcomes
- Indication of completeness of alignment work in this regard
- Alignment includes discipline and general education components of degrees

Average Score: 3.54
Your college score: 4

7. Proficiency Rubric Statement 7: Narrative Response

Expectations for College Response (To Get a Score of 4):
- Narrative discusses the manner in which students are made aware of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled
- Basis for determining that students demonstrate awareness

Average Score: 2.63
Your college score: 4
8. Proficiency Rubric Statement 8: Narrative Response

Expectations for College Response (To Get a Score of 4):
- College states the level of SLO implementation it believes to have achieved
- Narrative discusses basis for this self-assessed level
- Discussion of planned improvement efforts (more than “keep doing what we are doing;” focus is on improving the value of SLO assessment rather than on instrumentalities of SLO assessment)

Average Score: 3.25
Your college score: 3

Table of Evidence: List the evidence used to support your narrative report, section by section.

Not rated separately for this report. Many of the colleges took an “everything but the kitchen sink” approach that was not helpful in understanding the relevance—for the college—of items included in evidence to the points being made in the report. If we were to ask of college leaders at various places in the organization, “as to this criterion or standard, please tell us what you regularly review to assess college progress,” the answer would also inform the selection process for evidence to external evaluators. This list would be further refined by determining which of that evidence is critical to decision-making, communication, and improvement.

Overall average score: 3.44
Your college’s overall average score: 4.08

Enclosed with this report are two documents:
- “Crosswalk Linking Proficiency Level of SLO Implementation to the ACCJC Accreditation Standards,” one of the documents included with the College Status Report on SLO Implementation form.
Butte College Outcomes Assessment Action Plan

Based on the 2014-2015 Strategic Direction, the priority objectives established in 2013-2014, and the current status of SLO implementation the Outcomes Assessment Committee established the following action plan. This action plan is designed to support the college as it transitions to the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement level on the implementation of Student Learning Outcomes and documents the results of the annual evaluation of the student learning outcomes process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Resources Required*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete data to support the Student Equity Plan</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete and disseminate the Unit Planning “Closing the Loop Report” to document alignment of resourcing with strategic initiatives, program review, and student learning outcomes assessment</td>
<td>PROD/IR/IT</td>
<td>Complete Report – September 2014</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brief Planning and Budget Committee – September 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disseminate to campus – October 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss with Managers – November 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminate Community College Survey of Student Engagement Results</td>
<td>PROD</td>
<td>Academic Senate – Fall 2014</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Council – Fall 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide data to support the accreditation self-study</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Assessment Matrices</td>
<td>SLO Coordinator, Department Chairs</td>
<td>Complete - September 2014</td>
<td>PROD funding for student help for crosswalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post on PBA page – October 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cross walk with Program Learning Outcomes – October 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine the SLO Module in CurricUNET</td>
<td>SLO Coordinator, Scheduling Center</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a report to the campus on transfer based on National Student Clearinghouse match</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete the Stackable Success Model</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Fold in Transfer Data – Fall 2014</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade the PBA Page</td>
<td>PROD</td>
<td>SLOs, Program Data, Program Review, Program Review Charts and Graphs – September 2014</td>
<td>PROD funding for student help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the improved online unit planning module</td>
<td>PROD/IT</td>
<td>Develop – Summer/Fall 2014</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot – Fall 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implement – Fall/Spring 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Milestones</td>
<td>Resources Required*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop the data and reports to support the Student Progression and Completion Model (see appendix I)</td>
<td>PROD/IR/IT</td>
<td>Develop – Fall 2014 Report with Balanced Scorecard – Spring 2015</td>
<td>Programmer time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop management reports to support the implementation of the Student Success and Support Program</td>
<td>Student Services, IT</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Programmer time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop management reports to support the implementation of the Student Equity Program</td>
<td>Student Services, IR, IT</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Programmer time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a research study on general education scheduling. Question: does what Butte College schedule of classes match the requirements of CSU general education</td>
<td>PROD/IR/IT</td>
<td>Begin - Fall 2014 Complete and Report Out – Spring 2015 Develop summary report by CSU GE area – Spring 2015</td>
<td>Researcher and programmer time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Strategic Scheduling by developing better projections of student demand and to support the scheduling of appropriate course offerings, locations, and modalities</td>
<td>Director, Admissions and Records, OSLED, IT</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>Programmer time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the impact of Enrollment Management initiatives.</td>
<td>Director, Admissions and Records, IT, IR, PR&amp;M</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Staff time and funds for analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully implement the Degree Audit and Educational Planning modules</td>
<td>Student Services, IT, OSLED</td>
<td>Implement Student Records component of Image Now – Fall 2014 Continue to refine data for Degree Audit – 2014-2015 Implement Educational Planning Module with staff - Spring 2015 Implement Educational Planning Module with students – Fall 2015</td>
<td>Programmer and staff time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a report to support the development of pre-requisites</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>Programmer time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Milestones</td>
<td>Resources Required*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a research study CSU students co-enrolled at Butte College. Question: How is our primary term and winter/summer scheduling impacting university student attendance?</td>
<td>PROD/IR/IT</td>
<td>Begin and Complete - Spring 2015 (in time to support outreach effort for CSU students during Summer) Develop report to support scheduling for CSU students</td>
<td>Researcher and programmer time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the development of an online program review and curriculum review for academic programs and student services programs</td>
<td>Academic Senate, Student Services, PROD, IT</td>
<td>Develop plan - 2014-2015 Implement – 2015-2016</td>
<td>Programmer time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Student Services and Student Learning to begin a structured dialogue with high schools about student preparation based on high school reports</td>
<td>Student Services Assistant Dean for Recruitment and Outreach, OSLED, PROD, IR</td>
<td>Develop plan Spring 2014-2015 Implement beginning in 2015-2016</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the electronically mediated communication to students (website, social media, wi-fi access)</td>
<td>PROD, Student Services, IT, Institutional Advancement</td>
<td>Continue to refine messaging to students – ongoing Establish a task force to refine the web site and MyBC – 2014-2015 Begin implementing the task force recommendations – 2015-2016</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a research study – using mandatory CCCApply data to predict student persistence, success, and yield from recruitment efforts. How do students persist, succeed and complete based on the mandatory indicators.</td>
<td>PROD/IR/IT</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Researcher time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct an Accreditation Follow-Up Survey to assess the effectiveness of integrated planning</td>
<td>PROD, IR</td>
<td>Implement in Fall 2015</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a second Leavers and Completers Survey</td>
<td>PROD, IR</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Staff and researcher time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot and implement Common Assessment, Educational Planning Initiative, and Online Education Initiative grants</td>
<td>OSLED, Student Services, PROD, Tech Center</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 1. Example SLO Requirements and Timeline Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Requirements and Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What’s Needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) are in place for degrees and certificates</td>
<td>Programs that do not yet have PLOs listed in the catalog must identify PLOs right away; they should <strong>not</strong> wait until Curriculum Review comes around again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) are in place for all courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map alignments between Course SLOs and PLOs (and/or GELOs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create an assessment and reporting schedule for Course SLOs and PLOs built around a 6-year cycle</td>
<td>Disciplines or programs that do not yet have a schedule in place must create one right away; they should <strong>not</strong> wait for the next Curriculum Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is not necessary to assess every course and outcome every semester, or even every year. Each course and each PLO in the discipline/program, though, should be the focus of an assessment and reporting activity at least once during the 6-year cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aim for broad participation by faculty when identifying what courses will be assessed in a given semester. All instructors should participate in an assessment activity and/or the department dialogue about assessments in every semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ultimately, we should strive to cycle through course outcomes as well as courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Requirements and Timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify a specific assessment strategy and timeline, following the assessment schedule</td>
<td>Be specific in identifying how faculty will assess the selected SLOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is not necessary that all instructors of a particular course use the same assessment tool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and dialogue about planned assessments and assessments tools</td>
<td>First quarter or half of every semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain notes on meeting dates and the dialogue, to include in the SLO Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share and dialogue about assessment results</td>
<td>End of every semester, or at the start of the next semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify planned improvements and the timeline for implementing changes</td>
<td>Maintain notes on meeting dates and the dialogue, to include in the SLO Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note successes and identify gaps in student achievement of outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete and submit the official SLO Report</td>
<td>Due annually, usually in late January or early February, with the Unit Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submit reports for assessment activities conducted in the prior Spring and Fall semesters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2. Example Image from SLO Module

**History - Spring 2014 Information**
- **Title:** History - Spring 2014
- **What are you assessing?** Course SLO

**Course SLO**
- **Subject:** HIST
- **Course:** HIST 8

**Assessment Plan**
Describe the assessment plan, including what assessment method(s) will be used, what courses will be involved, and what the timeline will be.

Attach a copy of the assessment instrument (if applicable)
### Appendix 3. Example SLO Assessment Planning Schedule (The Grid)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE NUMBER</th>
<th>SLO for each COURSE</th>
<th>PLO supported by course SLO</th>
<th>SEMESTER ASSESSMENT WILL BE REPORTED OR ASSESSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCS 12</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS 13</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS 16</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS 20</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS 24</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS 28</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS 31</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS 33</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS 46</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS 47</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS 50</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS 51</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS 59</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS 60</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS 62</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS 63</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS 70K</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS 70L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS 75</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS 76 (NEW)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS 84</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS 85</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS 86</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = SLO assessment  
R = SLO assessment reporting  
CA - Computer Applications  
LOA - Legal Office Administration