

Follow-Up Visit Report  
DeAnza Community College  
21250 Stevens Creek Boulevard  
Cupertino, CA 95014

This Follow-Up Report represents the findings of the evaluation team visited  
DeAnza Community College on April 26, 2018

Submitted to:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Submitted by:

<u>Dr. Jamillah Moore</u>	<u>President</u>	<u>Cañada College</u>
Name of Team Chair	Title	Institution

<u>Stephanie Curry</u>	<u>Academic Senate President</u>	<u>Reedley College</u>
Name of Team Member	Title	Institution

<u>Lisa Beach</u>	<u>Director of Distance Education</u>	<u>Santa Rosa Junior College</u>
Name of Team Member	Title	Institution

## Introduction

An external evaluation team visit was conducted October 9-12, 2017 at DeAnza Community College. At its January 10, 2018 meeting the Commission acted to Reaffirm Accreditation for 18 months and require a follow-up report due no later than March 1, 2019, followed by a visit from a peer review team. The College made the decision to complete and submit the follow-up report far in advance of the March 2019 deadline. An evaluation team comprised of three members, chaired by Dr. Jamillah Moore, reviewed DeAnza College's Follow-Up report and visited the college on April 26, 2018. The purpose of the Follow-up visit was to verify the College's progress on the three recommendations made to meet the Accreditation Standards and Eligibility Requirements.

The team found that the College had made appropriate preparations for the visit. Although initially the team felt the Follow-Up Report did not sufficiently address each of the recommendations to meet the Standard(s), interviews conducted on the DeAnza College campus provided sufficient evidence that the College had made progress on addressing each of the recommendations. The team was able to interview President, Associate Vice President of Instruction and Online Education, The Evaluation Team, Student Learning Outcome (SLO) Core Team Co-Chair and Curriculum Team, Online Faculty Coordinator, Online Education Instructional Designers, Online Faculty Members, and Student Services Learning Outcome and Administrative Unit Outcomes Coordinator. In all, team members interviewed 28 individuals over the course of the day. The College's ALO was responsive to additional requests for evidence before the visit.

The Follow-Up Report and Visit were expected to document resolution of the following recommendations:

**Recommendation 1:** In order to meet the Standard, the College should regularly assess all course, program, and institution-level SLOs and report the findings of articulated learning outcomes and ensure the College documents the use of the assessment of these outcomes for improvement and planning. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.2., I.B.4, I.B.5, I.C.1-3, II.A.1-3, II.B.3, II.C.2)

**Recommendation 2:** In order to meet the Standard, the College should ensure that in every class section students receive a course syllabus that includes learning outcomes from the institutions officially approved course outline. (Standards II.A.2, II.A.3)

**Recommendation 3:** In order to meet the Standard and comply with federal regulations in distance education courses as defined in CFR 602.3, the College should implement processes and structures to ensure regular and substantive interaction with the instructor and initiated by the instructor. (Standard II.A.1, Commission Policy on Distance and Correspondence Education)

## Team Analysis of College Responses to the 2017 Evaluation Team Recommendations

**Recommendation 1:** In order to meet the Standard, the College should regularly assess all course, program, and institution-level SLOs and report the findings of articulated learning outcomes and ensure the College documents the use of the assessment of these outcomes for improvement and planning. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.2., I.B.4, I.B.5, I.C.1-3, II.A.1-3, II.B.3, II.C.2)

### **Findings and Evidence:**

The De Anza College follow up report details the use of learning assessment in college's processes including Institutional Effectiveness, Program Review and Budget allocation. The report details the requirement for programs to report their PLO and SLO assessment each year in their annual program review report. Programs are also required to complete assessment of all active learning outcomes within a 5 year period. The current cycle is due to be complete in June 2019.

In a review of documents and interviews with faculty and administration the team found evidence that the college is focused on completing the current cycle by 2019. There is significant SLO assessment planned for the current and next year. A new policy has been created to include a Student Learning Outcome Assessment Verification Form that requires that all course SLOs be assessed before curriculum changes that are requires as part of the 5 year curriculum review. In addition a new requirement ties budget allocation to the percentage of SLO assessments completed within the 5 year cycle, For FY 2018 it was a 50% requirement with an anticipated increase to 70% in FY 2019.

The visiting team suggests that the college continue its work to reassess the SLO process as detailed in their Quality Focus Essay and assess the newly developed processes including budget and SLO verification holistically. This suggestion would include updating the process to address missing outcomes from programs that do not have full time faculty.

### **Conclusion:**

The team believes that the college has addressed this recommendation and meets the Standard.

**Recommendation 2:** In order to meet the Standard, the College should ensure that in every class section students receive a course syllabus that includes learning outcomes from the institutions officially approved course outline. (Standards II.A.2, II.A.3)

### **Findings and Evidence:**

The follow up report details a meeting in January 30, 2018 with all student services and instructional deans to create a process to "ensure that all syllabi for winter quarter, as well as all syllabi moving forward be updated to include the SLO statements from the official course outline of record." This process included instructions to the faculty as well as a double check system; first by the division assistant and second by the SLO Core Team to ensure that SLOs are on the syllabi. The team reviewed a random sample of current syllabi and found the vast majority in compliance. There were a few syllabi where the wording was either truncated or summarized and did not detail the identical language as in the Course Outline of Record (COR). The team suggests the process to review syllabi ensure that the exact COR SLOS are replicated in the syllabi.

The college has also taken steps to address this recommendation through a new process that allows programs to archive student learning outcomes. Evidenced by a statement in Nuventive "Never

delete a student learning outcomes. Instead check edit icon and change status to ‘Archived’. This will allow for archived SLO assessment when SLOs are changed on the official COR.

**Conclusion:**

The team believes that the college has addressed this recommendation and meets the Standard.

**Recommendation 3:** In order to meet the Standard and comply with federal regulations in distance education courses as defined in CFR 602.3, the College should implement processes and structures to ensure regular and substantive interaction with the instructor and initiated by the instructor. (Standard II.A.1, Commission Policy on Distance and Correspondence Education)

**Findings and Evidence:**

To address the recommendation that the College implement processes and structures to ensure regular and substantive, instructor-initiated interaction with students in online classes, the Online Learning Center has developed a variety of processes in the area of faculty professional development. Some of the changes they have made include adding additional emphasis regarding substantive interactions to their Canvas training program, shifting some of their workshops to evenings for added flexibility, and offering phone consultations for adjunct faculty who may not be onsite regularly. Additionally, the staff reports that they have a process that involves regular check-ins with faculty who are new to online teaching.

Other initiatives include negotiating a peer-evaluation component of the faculty contract to pay faculty to convert their courses to Canvas, the use of a new software program that gives faculty greater access to student feedback regarding their courses, and modification of the online faculty evaluation form.

The Online Learning staff gave the team supervised access to archived classes from previous semesters, which improved the visiting team’s ability to accurately assess the amount of instructor interactions taking place. It was determined that the vast majority of their online instructors were engaging in a variety of instructor-initiated interactions with students within the course management system. These included course announcements, replies to discussion posts, and feedback on individual student assignments in the grade book.

The visiting team suggests that the College initiate a process by which class syllabi are checked to ensure they follow the College’s guidelines for fulfilling the charge for regular, timely and effective student/faculty contact by stating the maximum time within which to expect a reply when student needs assistance, and whether or not there will be communication over weekends and holidays as articulated in the College Distance Education Guidelines.

**Conclusion:**

The team believes the College has addressed this recommendation and meets the Standard.