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SLO assessment model introduced amid confusion

- ACCJC changed 10 standards to 4 with outcomes embedded in all standards
- ASCCC opposed outcomes;
- Changes in Executive level leadership at Sierra do not take SLOs seriously claiming they “will never have teeth”
- Faculty union expresses concerns
- Some departments try to use outcomes and assessments, but..

2005: the times they are a’changin...
1. Identify assessment measures and establish dates for completing outcome assessment at institutional level and for all courses, programs and services
2. Develop performance measures to assess and improve effectiveness
3. Disseminate information widely and use in resource allocation process
4. Include effectiveness in producing outcomes in faculty evaluations

ACCJC WARNING IN 2007
Brand new VPI eager to ensure no further sanctions mandates “big push”

Creates one SLO Coordinator position with 100% reassign time to facilitate the development and assessment of course, program and institutional outcomes for all instructional, student services, library and learning resources areas

Organization structure and SLO planning
Six Student Learning Outcomes Faculty Ambassadors, each with 20% reassigned time for the 2008-2009 academic year to assist in planning and implementation of SLOs and Assessment, write course and program SLO handbooks, SLO website design and support, and work with faculty on developing course, program, and institutional outcomes and assessments.

Student Learning Committee formed as standing committee of Academic Senate.

District purchases Tracdat to track assessments and allocation requests.
2008 Follow up report details how we will address each of the recommendations with timelines included

Progress report from ACCJC concludes we have “partially implemented the recommendations for SLOs” and gives us more time

WE PROMISE ACCJC
WE’LL DO BETTER
Budget cuts hit college in 2009-10
SLO Coordinator reassign time cut from 100% to 60%
SLO Ambassador reassign time cut completely
Faculty union increases opposition to SLOs
Coordinator alone faces political fears and backlash festering for years

ONLY WE DON’T DO IT!
SLO Coordinator reassign time reduced to 60%, then to 20% with stipend
Change in SLO leadership; still a single person in charge
New coordinator attempts to address faculty disillusionment with TracDat by instituting a paper form to track SLOs
Ambassador positions eliminated
Student Learning Committee membership falls
We still think we are doing okay

2009-12: More Budget cuts
Sierra is placed on warning for a second time for the same recommendations.

We learn that a second warning for the same deficiency can lead to the college being placed directly on show cause.

We attend a ASCCC plenary session and San Francisco City College feels sorry for us....

2013: Another Accreditation
New Dean of Planning and Research is hired in 2013 and identifies two problems:
A. the data pulled from TracDat differs from the data we have reported to ACCJC
B. According to the latest TracDat report, SLO assessments have decreased

Description From Research Perspective
The Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) 2019 members:

1. Debra Sutphen, Vice President, Instruction and ALO
2. Mandy Davies, Vice President, Student Services
3. Chris Yatooma, Vice President, Administrative Services
4. Roberta McKinney, Executive Secretary, Instruction
5. Jane Haproff, Faculty, Academic Senate President
6. Erik Cooper, Dean, Research, Planning and Resource Development
7. Jane Hemmerling, Faculty, Education Effectiveness/Accreditation Coordinator
8. Johnnie Terry, Faculty, Educational Policy and Information Coordinator
9. Rebecca Bocchicchio, Dean, Liberal Arts
10. Aimee Myers, Faculty, Curriculum Chair
11. Beth Ervin, Faculty, Coordinator, The Hub (Student Success)
12. Denise Bushnell, Faculty, Computer Information, CTE Chair
13. Sue Michaels, Director, Marketing
14. Tosh Campanella, Multimedia Graphics Specialist, Marketing
The expanded Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) 2019 members:

1. Debra Sutphen, Vice President, Instruction and ALO
2. Mandy Davies, Vice President, Student Services
3. Chris Yatooma, Vice President, Administrative Services
4. Roberta McKinney, Executive Secretary, Instruction
5. Jane Haproff, Faculty, Academic Senate President
6. Erik Cooper, Dean, Research, Planning and Resource Development
7. Jane Hemmerling, Faculty, Education Effectiveness/Accreditation Coordinator
8. Johnnie Terry, Educational Policy and Information Coordinator
9. Rebecca Bocchicchio, Dean, Liberal Arts
10. Aimee Myers, Faculty, Curriculum Chair
11. Beth Ervin, Faculty, Coordinator, The Hub (Student Success)
12. Denise Bushnell, Faculty, Computer Information, CTE Chair
13. Sue Michaels, Director, Marketing
14. Tosh Campanella, Multimedia Graphics Specialist, Marketing
15. Vernon Martin, Faculty, SLO Task Force
16. Christy Magnani, Faculty, SLO Task Force
17. Sonia Klenner, Faculty, SLO Task Force
18. Soni Verma, Faculty, SLO Task Force
19. Jason File, Faculty, SLO Technician
Ad-hoc Student Learning Committee:

- Brenna Chapman - Art History
- Kent Fortin – English
- Jane Hemmerling – Educational Effectiveness Coordinator
- Donna Knifong - Communication Studies
- Vernon Martin - Philosophy
- Aimee Myers – History
- Christy Magnani – Business
- Soni Verma - Psychology
- Jane S. Viemeister - Music
Dec 13, 2013 – SLO Workday:

Sierra College District and Sierra College Faculty Association (SCFA) created an MOU establishing stipends for faculty to participate in an institution-wide SLO work on the last workday of the semester.
Dec 13, 2013 – SLO Workday:

- 136 faculty representing all college departments and programs participated in the following:
  - Reviewed existing CSLOs and PSLOs
  - Wrote CSLOs for all courses
  - Created PSLOs for all college programs
  - Mapped CSLOs to associated PSLOs
  - Created 3-yr department and program assessment plans
  - Reviewed Student Learning Assessment Summary (SLAS) form to complete the assessment process for SLOs
Jan 2014: Formation of a Resourced SLO Taskforce

In January 2014 the Office of Instruction, in concert with the Academic Senate, formed and resourced a new SLO Taskforce

- Taskforce Members
  - Sonia Klenner Nutrition/Sciences and Math
  - Christy Magnani Business/Business and Technology
  - Vernon Martin Philosophy/Liberal Arts
  - Soni Verma Psychology/Liberal Arts

- Taskforce was charged with meeting ACCJC accreditation standards
- Formalized SLO and assessment processes across all levels of the institution
SLO Taskforce: Processes and Tools

- Developed a SLO Mapping and Planning Spreadsheet to capture program, degree, and certificate outcomes.

- Using the spreadsheet the SLO Taskforce assisted chairs in aligning CSLOs to PSLOs to ISLOs.

- Established processes for maintaining ongoing accuracy and completeness for course and program SLOs.
  - SLO Assistants function as liaison between department chairs and TracDat.
  - Updated SLOs are forwarded by SLO Assistants to personnel responsible for making changes to Banner, TracDat, and the SLO website.
Outcomes Assessment

Assessment must be an integral part of any successful institution. A well-planned and executed assessment process will help the college accomplish its mission and goals.

Our Mission Statement

Sierra College provides a challenging and supportive learning environment for students having diverse goals, abilities, and needs interested in transfer, career and technical training, and life long learning. The College’s programs and services encourage students to identify and to expand their potential. Sierra College students will
Planning & Assessment Day

Institutional Planning & Assessment Day at the beginning of each semester for faculty in instructional and student-service programs.

During this workday, all faculty in instruction and student services engage in:

- comprehensive discussions to update SLOs
- curriculum review
- analyze SLO assessment results
- program review
- identify improvement plans
- update department resource requests tied to SLO assessments
Off Warning: Accreditation Reaffirmed, Feb 6, 2015

Results and Reports

Accreditation 2013–2019

- Accreditation Reaffirmed, February 6, 2015
- Follow-Up Report, October 2014
Vice President, Instruction

Deb Sutphen
“In the face of early and persistent denial that Ebola was real, health messages issued to the public repeatedly emphasized that the disease was deadly, and had no vaccine, treatment, or cure. While intended to promote protective behaviours, these messages backfired.”

- Dr. Margaret Chan
  Director-General of the World Health Organization
  London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. Women in Science Lecture Series
  10 March 2015
Distributed Leadership

“...academic leadership exists in a highly specialized, professional environment that is not built simply upon hierarchical relationships. Distributed leadership identifies leadership as the contribution of many people engaged in a complex interplay of action.”

- Leadership = traits, skills, behaviors of individual leaders
  *Instead...*

- Involves everyone and considers how people relate to one another

- Context dictates a more collaborative and shared form of leadership
Conceptual Model of Distributed Leadership
...a leadership approach in which **individuals who trust and respect each other’s contributions collaborate together** to achieve identified goals. It occurs as a result of an open culture within and across an institution. It is an approach in which reflective practice is an integral part enabling **action to be critiqued, challenged and developed** through cycles of planning, action, reflection and assessment and re-planning. It happens most effectively when people at all levels engage in action, accepting leadership in their particular areas of expertise. It **needs resources that support and enable collaborative environments** together with a flexible approach to space, time and finance which occur as a result of diverse contextual settings in an institution. Through **shared and active engagement**, distributed leadership can result in the development of leadership capacity to sustain improvements in teaching and learning (Jones, Harvey, Lefoe and Ryland, 2011, p. 27).
Distributed Leadership must be supported to be effective

Requires:
- Institutional support
  - Trust, emotional support, recognition
- Resources
  - Accreditation and SLO Website
- Professional development
A framework to measure
Distributed Leadership in action

Check all that apply:

- people were involved;
- processes were supportive;
- professional development was provided; and
  resources were available.
- there was a context of trust;
- there was a culture of respect;
- there was an environment of change that recognized contribution at all levels; and an environment that valued relationships through collaboration.

Comparing the old versus the new way

- Hierarchical
- Inconsiderate of culture/context
- Individual effort and singular accountability
- Not supported by institution
- “one against”

- Inclusive
- Strategic involvement from informal and formal leaders
- Integrates into existing processes
- Considerate of culture/context
- Trust
- Environmental shift – willingness to try new things
- Shared responsibility
How would your institution be impacted by the loss of primary leaders?

Would your accreditation be at risk with the loss of a primary leader?

Does your institution resemble the distributed leadership framework?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard I:</td>
<td>The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that</td>
<td>ALO, Dean of Research,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>emphasizes student learning and student achievement. Using</td>
<td>Academic Senate,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>analysis of quantitative and qualitative data, the institution</td>
<td>Management Senate,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>continuously and systematically evaluates, plans, implements, and</td>
<td>Classified Senate, Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>improves the quality of its educational programs and services.</td>
<td>Senate, Strategic Council,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The institution demonstrates integrity in all policies, actions,</td>
<td>Dept Chairs, Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and communication. The administration, faculty, staff, and</td>
<td>Team, BOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>governing board members act honestly, ethically, and fairly in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the performance of their duties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A. Mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B. Academic Quality and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>C. Institutional Integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Standard II: Student Learning</td>
<td>The institution offers instructional programs, library and</td>
<td>VPSS, VPI, Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programs and Support Services</td>
<td>learning support services, and student support services aligned</td>
<td>Senate, Program Review,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with its mission. The institution’s programs are conducted at</td>
<td>Curriculum Committee,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>levels of quality and rigor appropriate for higher education.</td>
<td>Dean of Planning and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The institution assesses its educational quality through methods</td>
<td>Research, Marketing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>accepted in higher education, makes the results of its</td>
<td>Dept Chairs, EEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>assessments available to the public, and uses the results to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>improve educational quality and institutional effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The institution defines and incorporates into all of its degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>programs a substantial component of general education designed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to ensure breadth of knowledge and to promote intellectual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inquiry. The provisions of this standard are broadly applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to all instructional programs and student and learning support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>services offered in the name of the institution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A. Instructional Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>B. Library and Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>C. Student Support Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Standard III: Resources</td>
<td>The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology,</td>
<td>Parac, VP Finance, Ed Tech,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and financial resources to achieve its mission and to improve</td>
<td>EEC, Executive Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>academic quality and institutional effectiveness. Accredited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>colleges in multi-college systems may be organized so that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>responsibility for resources, allocation of resources, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>planning rests with the district/system. In such cases, the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>district/system is responsible for meeting the Standards, and an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>evaluation of its performance is reflected in the accredited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>status of the institution(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>