From: Chialin Hsieh
To: DavidWain Coon; Linda Beam; Cathy Summa-Wolfe; Laura McCarty; Ken Meier; Angelina Duarte; Sara McKinnon; Yolanda Bellisimo;
cc: Anne Gearhart; Becky Reetz; Barbara David; Chialin Hsieh; Kathleen Kirkpatrick; Melody Creel;
Subject: FW: ACCJC Clarifies Assessment Rubric Language for evaluating institutional effectiveness
Date: Friday, July 29, 2011 9:58:11 AM

Dear Cabinet, Sara and Yolanda:

It is my job to update you the information from ACCJC.

Yesterday, I received a letter from ACCJC related to Rubrics for evaluating institutional effectiveness. Please click the following link to view the letter and rubrics. (You can also view more information from Bob Pacheco email attached below.)
http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/RevisedRubricAndCoverMemo_July-2011.pdf

The summary from this letter is that:
(a) ACCJC expecting us to be at the highest implementation level (sustainable) for Planning and Program Review (now).
(b) ACCJC expecting us to be at the 2nd implementation level (development) for SLO (now).
(c) ACCJC expecting us to be at the 3rd implementation level (proficiency) for SLO by fall 2012.

We have used these 3 rubrics to evaluate our planning processes (Planning, Program Review, and SLOs) and I shared the results at PRAC. We will need to review the results again and bring strategies back to PRAC in terms of how to improve our processes. The question I have is, "Are we there yet?"

Thank you for reading!!

p.s. Welcome, Ken!! :)

Chialin

Dr. Chialin Hsieh
Director of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness
College of Marin
835 College Avenue
Kentfield, CA 94904
415.485.9545
chialin.hsieh@marin.edu

From: Learning Assessment [LEARNINGASSESSMENT@LISTSERV.CCCNEXT.NET] On Behalf Of Bob Pacheco [rpacheco@BARSTOW.EDU]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2011 3:37 PM

To: LEARNINGASSESSMENT@LISTSERV.CCCNEXT.NET
Subject: ACCJC Clarifies Assessment Rubric Language

Listserv,

In 2007, the Accrediting Commission of the Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) approved and disseminated a Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness to help colleges assess their progress to meeting the standards for program review, planning and student learning outcomes assessment.

Of particular interest for many colleges is the Commission's anticipated use of the SLO component of the rubric in Fall 2012 when full-adherence to the student learning outcomes elements of the standards is expected.

Any question about whether the rubrics will be a part of the self-evaluation process has been put to rest. The rubrics are front and center in the ACCJC's new Manual for Institutional Self-Evaluation. http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/Manual-for-Institutional-Self-Evaluation_June-2011.pdf Recommendations to colleges from this past Spring's Commission actions directed colleges to use the rubric as a tool for 2012.

The rubric has four levels or stages of outcomes assessment progress: awareness, development, proficiency and sustainable continuous quality improvement (SCQI). By Fall 2012, all colleges are expected to be "proficient" at outcomes assessment, yet applying the general language of the rubric to individual colleges has been an elusive endeavor.

The Commission outreached to the field through a task force to discover the common difficulties colleges were experiencing using the instrument.

The discussions resulted in four additions to the existing language of the rubric elements; three to proficiency and one for SCQI.

Under the modified rubric, proficient colleges use college dialogue about assessment results to "identify gaps." The learning gap analysis, inferred in the rubric previously, now is now an express requirement. Moreover, discussion about results should "align institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning." Thus, institutional change is directly connected to the review of the results.

Comprehensive assessment reports, an end-product of the outcomes process, must now not only be completed, but "updated" on a regular basis, providing an historical perspective on assessment efforts.

Perhaps the most intriguing addition to the rubric was made at the sustainable continuous quality improvement level. Indeed, colleges are not expected to be at SCQI by Fall 2012, but it is a natural progression of a college proficient at outcomes assessment.

Now, colleges at the highest level on the SLO rubric must "evaluate student learning outcomes processes."

This meta-evaluative component requires colleges to periodically examine the SLO mechanism itself to identify and make needed improvements to the processes of assessing

student learning.

See, http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/RevisedRubricAndCoverMemo_July-2011.pdf

To subscribe to this Listserv:
Send an e-mail message to Listserv@Listserv.cccnext.net
Do not put any words in the subject area.
In the body of the email message, Mary Smith would write the following: subscribe LearningAssessment Mary Smith
When sending the message, substitute your first and last names in place of "Mary Smith"

To unsubscribe from this list:
Send an e-mail message to Listserv@Listserv.cccnext.net
Do not put any words in the subject area.
In the body of the email message write the following:
SIGNOFF LEARNINGASSESSMENT

To access the LearningAssessment Listserv archive:
Go to http://listserv.cccnext.net/scripts/wa.exe?REPORT&Z=3
Click on Server Archives (on left column of page)
Click on LearningAssessment
You will have a list of all the postings at this point to choose from