RECOMMENDATION 1 (2008) – USE OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

“The college should determine a template for student achievement data and related analyses that is to be included in all program reviews and should use the institutional research staff and others knowledgeable about data analyses to guide the faculty and ultimately the college in discussions of what these data show about student success; these discussions should become part of the culture and practice of the institution. (IIA.1a and c, IIA.2.a, IIA.2.e)”

Completed Actions and Implementation
As noted in the ACCJC team report, for several years the College has been including templates of student achievement data in program review reports and these data have been the basis for program review analyses (link to 2011-2012 archives, link to 2010-2011 archives). Each year, the data sets have been evaluated. Evaluations have been used to make revisions for improved accuracy and easier interpretation. For example, each indicator in the 2012-2013 program review data sets is prefaced with a detailed prompt that guides the author through the process of interpreting the data. (link to new data set)

The office of Institutional Research has historically provided data for program review templates. (Evidence: 2008-9 archived PR.) Institutional Research now directly reports to the President, giving data a stronger role in dialogue and planning. (Evidence from convocation session led by Angelina Hill.) Under the leadership of the new permanent Director of Institutional Research, Institutional Research staff have led faculty, staff, administrators and Board members in discussions of the use and meaning of student achievement data. The following list is evidence of these efforts:

- **Sessions held for faculty during October, 2011 (October 6 and 12)** - Data-informed Decision Making
  Topics included establishing and tracking student cohort groups, investigating trends over time, obtaining data from Institutional Research, and strategies for gathering data. (evidence of agenda, notes or announcement)

- **Discussions of the ARCC Report & Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard.**
  IR led presentations and facilitated discussion of the ARCC Report and the Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard, which contains elements of the ARCC report.
  February 7, 2011 – ARCC 2011 Report to the Board of Trustees (agenda)
  March 20, 2012 – Scorecard presented to the Strategic Planning Committee (agenda)
  March 29, 2012 – Scorecard presented to the Education Master Planning Committee (agenda)
  April 2, 2012 – Scorecard presented to the Enrollment Management Committee (agenda)
  April 30, 2012 -- ARCC 2012 Report presented to the Enrollment Management Committee July 10, 2012 – Scorecard presented to the Board of Trustees (agendas)

- **Enrollment Management Committee Presentations and IR led Discussions**
  IR led several data-informed discussions with the Enrollment Management Committee.
  IR also worked with Service Areas (DSPS, EOPS, Basic Skills Committee) to summarize
survey reports and discuss the results. Agendas and Minutes from the EMC reflect these discussions (agendas).

October 17, 2011 – IR led discussion about the newly released report from the Committee on Measures of Student Success (agenda)
February 6, 2012 – IR led presentation and discussion: Tracking the Progress of a Cohort in Developmental, Transfer and Career Technical Education (agenda)
March 5, 2012 – Discussion of DSPS Survey Results (agenda)
April 2, 2012 – Review and discussion of Basic Skills placement and achievement data (agenda)
April 16, 2012 – Discussion of EOPS Survey Results (agenda)

• **Cal-PASS presentation for all faculty and service area staff - May 3, 2012**

Cal-PASS expert Mary Kay Patton visited the College to provide an orientation to Cal-Pass data for tracking student progress from K-12 to community college, and from community college to other colleges and universities in California. (agenda)

At a **March 23, 2012 dialogue session** the Director of Institutional Research presented math and English achievement data to faculty, student services staff, and administrators. Participants concluded that the data showed basic skills and at-risk students needed more support to increase course success and retention across semesters. Consequently, the College made a decision to appoint a student development advisor to work with students, faculty and staff to develop a first-year experience framework (evidence of this program’s development).

As part of this sustained institutional dialogue, the College continues to require analyses of student achievement data in its program review process. The dialogue is carried to the highest level when the **Program Review Master Executive Summaries** are presented to the Board of Trustees (link to agenda) and the Academic Senate (link to agenda) for discussion. These summaries include trends based on the analyses of student achievement data as well as Program Review Committee recommendations. For example, the 2011-2012 Executive Summary provides trends concerning achievement in online learning and notes a need for further analysis. To inform planning on all levels, the executive summary also highlights the percentage of students placing into English and math basic skills.

Although Institutional Research has played a lead role in organizing dialogue on student achievement data, dialogue has also emerged from many other areas of the College. As data has come to play a more central role in the college’s continuous improvement process, more faculty and staff have the experience and knowledge to lead these discussions. The next several paragraphs provide examples of times when both student achievement and student learning outcomes data have been used to inform institutional dialogue.

A list of dialogue sessions held during Spring 2012 can be found on the Assessment Friday website and dialogue resulting from the May 13-15 Assessment Summit is posted on the Assessment Web site (the actual forum in password protected). The April 13, 2012 English and mathematics basic skills session (evidence of meeting notes) is an example of this type of institution-wide discussion. The Institutional Research Director led a group of faculty and student services staff through a discussion of basic skills data. The group evaluated the data, how the data could be improved (e.g., provide last date of attendance for students not passing courses), and how to best use the data to make program changes to improve student achievement (e.g., participation
in Math Jam).

Other dialogue sessions have been targeted at more specific discussions of student achievement data. An April 20, 2012 session (agenda) focused on the achievement of nursing students and their preparation and success in biology and chemistry courses. (evidence – we do not yet have these notes posted). Also, an August 3, 2012 basic skills data was presented to the Student Development Assessment Retreat to inform development of 2012-13 goals and student and program learning outcomes. (evidence of the retreat agenda)

**Summary and Sustainability**

The examples and evidence presented above show that the College is using Institutional Research staff and others knowledgeable about the use of data to guide the college in discussions about student achievement data and how to use those data to improve programs and institutional effectiveness.

There are institution-wide discussions of student achievement data and these discussions are being guided by those knowledgeable about data and data analysis. This has been instituted as part of the College’s practice and culture in several ways.

First, individual programs are prompted to discuss student achievement data in their program reviews. At the middle level of planning, the Basic Skills committee, Enrollment Management Committee, and Student Equity plan all make regular use of student achievement data. At the highest level of planning, the program review committee is charged with providing the College with an annual Master Executive Summary of program review analyses (including student achievement data). This summary is presented annually for discussion at the Academic Senate and at the Board of Trustees (link to Board Calendar). It is also included as part of the Annual Plan discussion (evidence from Thursday Convocation session; and Planning Manual process). At all levels, there is dialogue on what student achievement data show about student success.

Second, the newly defined duties of the Assessment Committee (link to document of duties) include the requirement that the Assessment Committee regularly organize dialogue sessions. All of these sessions will be facilitated by members of the Assessment Committee. Annually, the Director of Institutional Research provides the Assessment Committee training on institutional data and its analysis. (Evidence: link to duties and responsibilities of assessment committee and coordinator.) Many of these sessions will include both the analysis of student achievement data and student learning outcomes assessment data.

Third, the Office of Institutional Research presents the ARCC Report & Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard to the Board of Trustees for discussion on an annual basis (link to Board calendar). In addition, Institutional Research is in the practice of providing sessions to engage the college in discussions of data. For example, the Director of Institutional Research led the Program Review Committee through interpretation of a revised “common” data set (evidence of PRC agenda) to help update the program review templates and they held sessions for faculty and staff at the fall 2012 Convocation to train employees on the use of these data sets (Convocation agenda and notes/sign in sheet from the Wed Program review session).

The College provides student achievement data sets to be included in program reviews and the Office of Institutional Research provides training on analysis and interpretation of these data.
Moreover, the College has institutionalized regular college-wide discussions of student achievement data and provided the forums and structure to sustain a culture and practice of routinely analyzing this data for use in improving institutional effectiveness.

The College has moved beyond discussions about what student achievement data show about student success. It has integrated its discussion of student achievement data with its discussion of student learning outcomes data. It has established and maintained processes that use student achievement data to make improvements at both the program and institution-wide basis.

**Conclusion**

The College has resolved Recommendation 1 (2008) and meets the related standards, as shown in the “Standards and Eligibility Requirements” section of this document.