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Overview of SRJC Process

www.santarosa.edu/projectlearn
Project LEARN at SRJC

Project LEARN has joint oversight by the Academic Senate (faculty) and the Office of Academic Affairs (administration)

- **i-LEARN** (institutional level)
- **pro-LEARN** (program level)
- **c-LEARN** (course level)
Project LEARN’s Mission

Santa Rosa Junior College is a learning-centered institution. The college, through Project LEARN, provides a foundation for a community of inquiry, where ongoing collegial dialogue, collaborative review of evidence, and deliberate reflection support the improvement of teaching and learning.
How well do we achieve our educational objectives?

Gather Evidence

Interpret Evidence

Mission/Purposes

Educational Objectives

Enhance teaching/learning; inform institutional decision-making, planning, budgeting

– Peggy Maki, AAHE
“Santa Rosa Junior College’s mission is to increase the knowledge, to improve the skills, and to enhance the lives of those who participate in our programs and enroll in our courses throughout the District... We recognize that each member of our institution contributes to carrying out our mission.”
Assumptions Adopted by i-LEARN

- Outcomes should apply to all SRJC students, regardless of course of study.
- In assessing outcomes, we will consider the level of student engagement with SRJC (e.g. total units completed, number of semesters enrolled).
- Use an approach to developing and assessing outcomes that “closes the assessment loop” by reflecting on findings and implementing change for the next assessment cycle.
What are **Institutional** Learning Outcomes?

- An indication of our collective educational values
- Skills, knowledge and attitudes/values we wish SRJC students to possess
- The lifelong impact of SRJC on students
- A palette of primary colors SRJC students can use to paint the picture of their future
Overview of i-LEARN’s Process

Phase I: Developing institutional learning outcomes
- 13 forums held district-wide to gather input from faculty, staff, students, with over 250 individuals participating
- Input distilled and synthesized by the i-LEARN committee, and then sent out district-wide for feedback

Phase II: Assess

Phase III: Interpret and Reflect upon Evidence

Phase IV: Institution-wide dialog re: improvement

(Repeat the cycle)

Note: Process based on accreditation standards
(see back-up packet for more detail about SRJC’s process)
SRJC’s Institutional Learning Outcomes

1. Foundational Skills
   • Perform mathematical operations
   • Utilize technology
   • Read and write at the college level

2. Personal Development and Management
   • Develop self-awareness and confidence
   • Manage resources, such as time and money, in order to advance personal and career goals
   • Maintain or improve health
   • Appreciate the value of lifelong learning

3. Communication
   • Listen actively and respectfully
   • Speak coherently and effectively

4. Critical Analysis
   • Locate, analyze, evaluate and synthesize relevant information
   • Draw reasonable conclusions in order to make decisions and solve problems

5. Creativity
   • Creatively respond to ideas and information

6. Intercultural Literacy and Interaction
   • Recognize and acknowledge individual and cultural diversity
   • Practice respectful interpersonal and intercultural communication
   • Recognize and understand the ideas and values expressed in the world’s cultural traditions

7. Responsibility
   • Understand and demonstrate personal, civic, social and environmental responsibility and cooperation in order to become a productive local and global citizen

(Note: These outcomes are included in your handout)
Assessment Strategy for $i$-SLO’s at SRJC

- **Indirect Assessment of all 7 $i$-SLO’s**
  - SRJC Student Survey
  - Inventory Chart included in PRPP

- **Direct Assessment of one $i$-SLO:**
  1. **Foundational Skills**
     - Perform mathematical operations
     - Utilize technology
     - Read and write at the college level
Results:
Student Self-Reported Gains

- 2,729 students (approximately 10% of credit students) completed “SRJC Student Survey” in the classroom, Fall 2007
- In addition to various other questions, students were asked to self-rate their progress in achieving institutional learning outcomes
- The news is good: overall, students report gains in institutional learning outcomes
Self-Reported Gains in Institutional Learning Outcomes

- Writing Skills
- Reading Comprehension Skills
- Performing Mathematical operations
- Using technology

- A lot
- Some
- A Little
- None

%
Student Self-Reported Gain in Institutional Learning Outcomes, by Student Status

- Writing
- Math
- Technology
- Personal health
- Lifelong learning
- Listening
- Speaking
- Information analysis
- Problem solving
- Creativity
- Social/civic responsibility
- Environmental responsibility
- Local and global citizen
- Diversity
- Interpersonal/intercultural
- World culture
- Resource management

3=A lot, 2=Some, 1=A little, 0=None

New SRJC Student
Continuing SRJC Student
Trends: Student Self-Reported Gains

- In general, current and past Basic Skills/ESL students report greater gains than non-Basic Skills/ESL students.
- First Generation college students, non-native speakers of English, students born outside of the USA, and financial aid recipients report higher gains than their counterparts.
- The oldest and youngest age groups (19 or younger, 50+) report lower gains.
- No significant differences by work status, gender.
- Ethnicity has varying results, and is likely confounded with first generation status, nativity, basic skills/ESL status, and financial aid status.
Results: Direct Assessment of Student Computational Skills

- 1124 SRJC students took the assessment in class in Fall 2007
- Questions focused on basic computational skills, including interpreting a chart, and one algebraic equation
- Average score = 5.67 out of 9, or 63% correct
- Overall, students who have had more exposure to college post higher scores
Computational Skills Score by Student Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Computational Skills Score by Units/Degrees Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units/Degrees Completed</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-15 units</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-29 units</td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-59 units</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+ units</td>
<td>5.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/AS degree</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Computational Skills Score by Level of Course in Which Student is Enrolled

Notes: Transfer = 0-99 (n=952), College = 100-299 (n=98), Basic Skills = 300+ (n=74)
Interesting Trend: The Interaction of Age and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=19</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>7.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Trends: Computational Skills Assessment

- Overall, higher scores are posted by:
  - Men
  - Native English Speakers
  - Younger students (aged 29 or younger)
  - Older students (aged 40 or older)
  - Students who have completed high level math courses
The Assessment Loop

Gather Evidence

Interpret Evidence

Mission/Purposes

Educational Objectives

Enhance teaching/learning; inform institutional decision-making, planning, budgeting

How well do we achieve our educational objectives?

– Peggy Maki, AAHE