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Background

• NVC requested permission to use the new standards. (Yes, we really asked to do this!)
• Good history of positive evaluations and relationship with Commission.
• History of campus-wide participation in past self-evaluation processes.
• Co-chairs that like a challenge!
I. Challenges

DID WE DISAGGREGATE OUR DATA?

DATA?
QFE Challenges

• Unfamiliarity with new component of self-evaluation process. (ACCJC was developing materials as NVC was writing report and QFE.)

• Underestimated role / timing of QFE in overall evaluation process.

• Process for determining projects / planning.

• Ensuring that QFE was clearly derived from SER. Differing opinions on function of the QFE!

• Campus participation and buy-in.
II. Strategies
Strategies to Address Challenges

• Developed topics and direction for QFE from analysis of evaluation and action plan components of SER to ensure that QFE was aligned with findings in the self-evaluation.

• Held campus-wide forums dedicated to the QFE, and informed campus community of 3 areas of focus as they emerged from drafts of SER.

• Worked with Steering Committee (President’s Cabinet and constituent group leadership) to identify plans and personnel going forward.

• Worked to integrate plans from QFE into existing college plans, structures, and committees.
### Sample Spreadsheet Used to Identify Areas of Focus for QFE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard #</th>
<th>Standard Language</th>
<th>Status Eval</th>
<th>Category for QFE</th>
<th>Specific areas for improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.B.02</td>
<td>The institution defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services.</td>
<td>Meets, needs improvement</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>While NVC has defined SLOs for all courses, instructional programs, and student learning and support services, assessment is not an ongoing, systemic process across the entire institution. In some cases, no sustained, substantive assessment work has been completed at the program or course level in Instructional programs. There are pockets of good, ongoing practice, but these are the exception.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.04</td>
<td>The institution uses assessment data and organizes its institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement.</td>
<td>Meets, needs improvement</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>The area for improvement is tied to the problems noted under I.B.2: we don't have enough assessment data to fully support that we use it to organize institutional processes to support student learning and achievement. We meet the standard, but at a very basic level and primarily in structure and theory, not in evidenced practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.06</td>
<td>The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human, fiscal and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies.</td>
<td>Meets, needs improvement</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Assessment data is not currently collected or tracked at the level of individual students, which would allow for full disaggregation of assessment data by subpopulations of students. Disaggregations in current use provide good information, but not the same level of detail provided in disaggregation of student achievement data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.07</td>
<td>The institution regularly evaluates its policies and practices across all areas of the institution, including instructional programs, student and learning support services, resource management, and governance processes to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of mission.</td>
<td>Meets, needs improvement</td>
<td>Regular Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>We can improve with regard to &quot;regularly evaluates...policies and practices...[in] governance.&quot; Our policies and practices are evaluated, but not regularly or in regards to their effectiveness in &quot;...supporting academic quality and accomplishment of mission.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of Analysis of SER for QFE

Three areas for improvement:
- Student Learning Assessment
- Integration of Planning & Resource Allocation
- Institutional Effectiveness, Evaluation & Review

6 priority areas for targeted improvement identified in SER
- All 6 of these Standards were associated with 3 components of QFE
- Highlighted in evaluation portions of SER ("meets the Standard at a basic level"; "needs to build on effective practices to strengthen use and consistency")

SER included action plans associated with an additional 36 Standards
- Majority (78%) of those Standards were related to 3 areas for improvement outlined in QFE (19%, 33%, and 25%, respectively) (p. 329 of NVC SER)
III. The Product
Structure of QFE

Four sections of the QFE:

1. Overview and Background
   - How APs were identified
   - Purpose/Objective of each AP
   - Philosophy/Approach toward APs/QFE

2. Findings from Self-Evaluation
   - Issues identified
   - Solutions to explore
   - Description of recent improvements and effective practices
Structure of QFE

   - Describe what SL assessment and regular evaluation and review will “look like” once changes are implemented
   - Intended as a starting point for the QFE Teams

4. Timelines, Observable Outcomes, & Structures to Monitor Progress
   - General description of timeline and outcomes
   - Proposed structure for QFE Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>o Expand conceptual/vision maps to include more detail</td>
<td>o Implement improvements/solutions to approach the vision outlined in the conceptual maps</td>
<td>o Expand effective practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Clarify roles and expectations for three Action Projects</td>
<td>o Evaluate as changes are implemented</td>
<td>o Strengthen integration between three components of Action Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Identify solutions/what needs to be done to implement the vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Student Learning Assessment AP

Purpose/Objective: To increase the effectiveness of the institution in using student learning assessment data to inform dialogue at all levels, increase student learning and achievement, and ensure accomplishment of mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Update 5+1 Assessment Cycle, define expectations for “ongoing assessment”</td>
<td>o Develop/Update assessment plans at all levels (according to new cycle and new structure)</td>
<td>o Discussions of SL, SB, and SA directed at improving SL and SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Explore mechanisms for collecting student-level data (uniform, centralized collection)</td>
<td>o Implement data collection across programs and services</td>
<td>o Strengthen integration with planning and resource allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Pilot data collection to develop sample reports</td>
<td>o Disaggregate data by course characteristics and subpopulations of students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Integrate Inquiry Groups/ILO assessment into existing structures</td>
<td>o Provide regular opportunities for discussion of SL, SB, and SA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Develop central repository to share effective practices and results</td>
<td>o Communicate results of assessment at all levels to a variety of audiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Implement PLO template across instructional programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vision Map for Student Learning Assessment

- Student Learning
- Student Behavior
- Student Achievement

CLO/PLO Assessment Data: Used to analyze the relationship between student learning and student behavior. Dialogue between faculty and student learning and support services.

CLO/PLO Assessment and Student Achievement Data: Evaluated to analyze the relationship between student learning and student achievement, particularly to identify gaps between learning and achievement. Dialogue within faculty.

SSO/AIO Assessment Data and Student Achievement Data: Used to analyze relationship between student behavior and student achievement. Dialogue between faculty and staff regarding campus processes and environment.

Data-driven Institutional Dialogue on Student Learning, Student Behavior, and Student Achievement (ILO Assessment, GEO Assessment, PLO Assessment)

Institutional Planning, Budgeting, and Operations Based on Institutional Dialogue
Institutional Effectiveness, Evaluation, and Review AP

Purpose/Objective: To increase the effectiveness of the institution in conducting regular evaluations of organizational structures and practices, communicating the results of those evaluations, and implementing changes in a timely manner to support student achievement, student learning, and accomplishment of mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Clarify roles, responsibilities, and processes</td>
<td>o Apply evaluation cycle to institutional review and evaluation processes</td>
<td>o Evaluate effectiveness of improvements implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Focus on effectiveness and results</td>
<td>o Review Decision-Making Guide (ongoing) and refine to clarify practices, processes, policies as changes are implemented</td>
<td>o Expand evaluation and communication mechanisms to other areas, as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Expand and complete Decision-Making Guide, including roles of committees in accreditation</td>
<td>o Implement effective methods for communicating purpose of evaluation activities, anticipated outcomes, and results of evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Develop effective methods for communicating purpose of evaluation activities, anticipated outcomes, and results of evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vision Map for Regular Evaluation

- What Is Being Evaluated?
- Why Is It Being Evaluated?
- Who is Responsible for the Evaluation?
- What is the Timeline?
- Evaluate
- Communicate Results
- Implement

Regular Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness
IV. Lessons Learned

Russia? In Winter?
Lessons Learned

• QFE was a much larger component of the SER process than it appeared at first.

• “Cooling off” time between SER and QFE would have been beneficial.

• Involve as many people as possible in developing themes and projects for QFE. Buy-in for the analysis is crucial for institutionalization.

• Use existing committees and processes to integrate results of QFE into institutional structures.

• Interesting balance between forward-looking, positive approach and wanting to “fix” all of the problems made evident in the self-evaluation process.
Questions?

Thank you!