

Quality Focus Essay

Development of the Quality Focus Essay

An important component of the writing of the College's Institutional Self Evaluation Report was the identification of areas for improvement. Areas in need of change were identified by Standard committees. Information about these areas was reviewed by the Institutional Planning Coordination Committee (IPCC), which organized a gap analysis process.

Gap Analysis

While collecting evidence related to each Standard and developing responses to each, Standard committees looked for areas where there were differences between the requirements of the Standard and the College's current practices or policies. When such items were identified, they were recorded in a gap analysis document [[REF QFE-1](#)]. From June 19, 2014 through May 9, 2016, examination of this document was agendaized at every IPCC meeting where members addressed existing gaps and worked to gradually resolve them. These meetings included the superintendent/president; the vice president of instructional services; the vice president of student services; the vice president of administrative services; the associate vice president of human resources; the accreditation liaison officer; the faculty coordinator of accreditation, program review, and planning; and the dean of research, planning, and grants. Gaps were tracked and addressed through the vice presidents, and many of the gaps that were initially identified were resolved.

Identification of Action Projects

In examining gaps, specific areas emerged as excellent candidates for the multiyear action projects of the Quality Focus Essay (QFE). The content of the QFE was a regular topic of discussion at the IPCC meetings in 2015-2016. Using the areas for improvement as a foundation, the IPCC created an outline for the QFE and subsequently coordinated the composition of the essay, which included participation from the Learning Outcomes Committee. The responsibility for writing initial drafts of each section of the QFE was assigned to different IPCC members.

The College will embark upon the following action projects:

1. Improve integration of plans
2. Improve use of learning outcomes assessments

Action Project 1. Improve Integration of Plans

INTRODUCTION

In 2010, the College developed and implemented a new integrated planning system, which is defined in the Integrated Planning Handbook [[REF QFE-2](#)]. This new system strengthened and integrated the processes for planning, program review, and resource allocation. Since 2010, the system for writing program reviews that include resource allocations tied to College plans, annual goals, and assessment results has been working. The integrated planning system is continuous, broad based, and systematic, as required in Standard I.B.9. However, ensuring that integration among plans is consistent could further enhance these processes.

The College has begun to address some of the issues leading to inconsistent integration. The planning flowchart has been simplified since its introduction in 2010. The relationships among the mission, vision, Educational Master Plan (EMP) goals, and other plans were clarified through an organizational diagram in the form of a pyramid [[REF QFE-3](#)]. A process for approving College plans was approved in 2014 [[REF QFE-4](#)]; this process is being used for some plans but not others.

RATIONALE

Planning represents a significant method by which the College accomplishes its mission. While the relationships among planning, resource allocation, and institutional effectiveness have been improved in recent years, this action project will strengthen the relationships and lead to better use of resources focused on improving student learning and achievement. The College has identified the following issues affecting the consistent integration of the planning process.

- **Mismatched planning timelines.** The timelines for development, approval, and implementation of most College plans are not aligned. In many cases, it is not possible to align such timelines because of external agency requirements—primarily the requirements and deadlines of the Chancellor’s Office of the California Community Colleges.
- **Inconsistent plan approval processes.** While the College established a process for approving plans, this process has not been used for all plans. The use of a single process for approving all plans is complicated by issues such as the requirement for some plans (e.g., the Student Equity Plan) to receive approval by the Board of Trustees and the state Chancellor’s Office.
- **Inconsistent tracking of plan implementation.** Plans are the responsibilities of multiple offices and committees. Currently, there is no single system for tracking offices or committees that are developing plans and there is no consistent method of sharing information about completion of planned activities.

- **Inconsistent links between plans and resource allocation.** While resource requests in the program review process are linked to the EMP goals and annual goals, there is not a simple system for linking program review resource requests to other College plans. Further, different plans based on grant or other external funding sources have different methods, forms, timelines, and processes for requesting resources.

STRATEGIES

Centralize Tracking of All Plans

The College has been working toward a comprehensive list of institutional plans for several years. The IPCC began this process when it first started meeting in 2009, but complexities—including new programs, new funding sources, and different timelines—have made it difficult to keep up with the many plans developed by the College. The plan approval process approved in 2014 provided the IPCC a way to keep track of plan development. One action step of this QFE project will involve institutionalizing information about different College plans in order to track them even better.

The IPCC will develop and implement a centralized system to track all College plans, including the goals identified by the plans. An online system will be created that lists plans and goals, and includes hyperlinks between the plans so that users can see how the plans relate to each other, the mission and vision, and the overarching goals of the EMP. Understanding a plan's alignment with the EMP and other plans provides plan managers and coordinators a mechanism for coordinating their planned activities with those of other plans.

Although the requirements of external agencies preclude the ability to synchronize the disparate timelines of all plans, the tracking system will at least help increase the efficiency of the development, approval, and implementation of plans' action items. This system of centralized tracking will resolve the problem of inconsistent monitoring of plan implementation and will clearly identify the offices, departments, or committees associated with each plan.

Integrate Plans Better

Some College plans do not include references to other College plans, and some do not reference the mission and vision statements. Therefore, another action step of this QFE project will involve establishing guidelines for plans (including those plans that require the use of templates from external agencies such as the Student Equity Plan and Student Success and Support Plan), as well as recommending that they include how their elements relate to the mission and vision and the goals of the EMP. One goal of relating each plan to the mission statement is to strengthen how well the mission guides decision-making and planning. Although this action step alone will better integrate plans, when implemented in concert with the centralized tracking system, the College can better ensure that integration among plans is consistent.

More Efficiently Tie Plans to Resource Allocation

Resources from unrestricted funds are tied to planning through the program review and the resource allocation process. Resources from categorical funds such as Student Equity and the Student Success and Support Program are tied to these plans through the respective planning processes. The College has implemented steps to more closely link general resource allocation and multiple funding sources. For example, after validated resource requests are prioritized by governance committees, the Budget Committee and the vice presidents discuss possible funding sources, including unrestricted, restricted, and Foundation funding sources. However, it is possible that the effectiveness of the process could be improved by using a common request form and process across the different plans and funding sources. This might also resolve the problem of inconsistent plan approval processes. Additionally, while short-range and long-range planning are included in program review and the individual College plans, explicit processes for handling multiyear resource allocation are not part of the integrated planning system. Strategies to more efficiently tie plans to resource allocation include investigating common processes for resource allocation across multiple planning processes, and explicitly including long-range requests into the resource allocation process.

Communicate Planning More Widely

The integrated planning system has been in place since 2010. During the 2010-2011 academic year, the new system was communicated through presentations and special meetings. As the system has evolved, communication has continued to specialized audiences such as the Master Planning Committee and the Board of Trustees, but there has not been consistent communication with the College community as a whole. Strategies for increasing communication include presentations to increase stakeholders' awareness of institution-set standards and institutional effectiveness goals (Standard I.B.3), assessment results (Standard I.B.8), academic quality issues and student achievement outcomes (Standard I.C.3), and integrated planning and continuous improvement (Standard I.B.1).

RESOURCES

The IPCC will be the responsible party in the coordination of this action project. It primarily involves implementing more efficient processes for integrating various College plans, so the main resources necessary are committee and staff time. Additional resources will include some technology resources for setting up Web-based resources and improving the online integrated planning system.

MEASURABLE OUTCOMES

The high-level outcomes of this action project will be more efficient processes for planning so the processes are better understood and resources are better allocated to improve student learning and achievement. The following list shows the measurable outcomes of this action project:

- Completion of a Web-based resource listing College plans, including the goals of the plans and how the plans are tied to resource requests
- Development of a regular report showing the completion of plan goals and the funding of resource requests based on individual College plans
- Results of the annual faculty/staff survey will show improvement in understanding of planning and the relationship between planning and resource allocation

ACTION PROJECT 1. IMPROVE INTEGRATION OF PLANS

	BY	DESIRED GOALS
		• ACTION STEPS
<p align="center">Centralize Tracking of All Plans</p> <p>Standards I.A.3 I.B.1 I.B.5 I.B.8 I.B.9</p>	Fall 2016-Spring 2017	Develop system to track plans and goals
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinate the development of an online system containing information about all College plans and their goals
	Fall 2017	Implement tracking system
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinate the implementation of the tracking system and populate it with information from College plans
		Communicate use of tracking system
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use informational videos and visits to committees to communicate how to use the tracking system, both to update the information in the system and for the College community to get information out of the system
<p align="center">Integrate Plans Better</p> <p>Standards I.B.9 III.B.2 III.D.2</p>	Fall 2017	Establish guidelines for College plans
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initiate a set of guidelines for plans, recommending how they should link their goals and objectives to the College mission and vision and the goals of the EMP
		Communicate guidelines for College plans
	Spring 2018	Assess effectiveness of plan integration
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use surveys and regular evaluation processes to assess how well the mission guides decision-making and planning through better integration of College plans

<p style="text-align: center;">More Efficiently Tie Plans to Resource Allocation</p> <p>Standards I.B.6 I.B.9 III.B.2 III.B.4 III.C.2 III.D.2 III.D.11</p>	Spring 2017	Investigate common resource request form	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigate the development of a common resource request form extending the resource request process beyond program review and unrestricted general funds to other areas such as categorical and grant-funded programs 	
		Design process for multiyear resource allocation in program review	
			Incorporate longer-term resource needs into program review explicitly through the resource request/allocation process
	Fall 2017	Implement updated resource request process	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update resource request process to be more inclusive of different funding sources, as appropriate 	
		Implement multiyear resource allocation through program review	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise its program review document and resource request process to include longer-term resource needs
	Spring 2018	Evaluate effectiveness of resource allocation process	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Through surveys and evaluation processes, the College will evaluate the effectiveness of its redesigned processes 			

<p>Communicate Planning More Widely</p> <p>Standards I.B.1 I.B.3 I.B.8 I.C.3</p>	Spring 2017	<p>Improve communication about institution-set standards and institutional effectiveness goals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information about institution-set standards and institutional effectiveness goals, including outcome data related to these measures, will be presented to an expanded audience including the general faculty and staff
		<p>Improve communication about integrated planning and continuous improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information about processes for integrated planning and continuous improvement will be presented to an expanded audience including the general faculty and staff
		<p>Improve communication about academic quality and student achievement outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information about quality measures and student achievement outcomes will be presented to an expanded audience including the general faculty and staff
		<p>Improve communication about learning outcomes assessment results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information about learning outcomes assessment results will be presented to an expanded audience including the general faculty and staff, in conjunction with improvements made to tracking systems described under Action Project 2 (Improve Use of Learning Outcomes Assessments)
	Fall 2017- Fall 2018	

Action Project 2. Improve Use of Learning Outcomes Assessments

INTRODUCTION

The College seeks to establish and sustain a culture of inquiry that uses learning outcomes attainment results and other institutional effectiveness indicators for data-driven institutional planning, program review, resource allocation, and other processes that support the mission's goals for student learning and achievement. The connection between postsecondary education and one's capacities for the workplace and lifelong learning is unambiguous. Recognizing this, the College had already incorporated into its mission statement institutional learning outcomes that are essential for one to adapt to the rapidly changing demands of the Information Age. Thriving in modern society requires the ability to think critically, communicate effectively, acquire and evaluate information, reason about quantitative information, develop an awareness of the diversity of other cultures and nations, and understand that each individual has an internal locus of control for how she or he responds to events and therefore is accountable for one's own decisions and actions. To ensure institutional effectiveness and the continuous improvement of academic quality, the College is committing deliberate attention and resources to learning outcomes for one of its multiyear action projects.

RATIONALE

The College has worked diligently, and in collaboration with the instructional and support services units, to improve the percentage of courses assessed to its current level of 93 percent. Despite this, much can be done to address potential concerns regarding data quality, to increase College wide understanding that learning outcomes are fundamental to meeting students' educational needs, and to establish systematic dialog that links learning outcomes results to planning, faculty development, and other College initiatives.

STRATEGIES

Improvement of Data Quality

A self-reflective institution must analyze the data it has collected and scrutinize its own processes to be confident in the integrity of that data. Accurate data is vital to the ability to derive meaningful conclusions for the continuous and systematic evaluation, planning, implementation, and improvement of quality of educational programs and services (Standard I.A.2). In addition, it is imperative that the College can assure the accuracy and integrity of learning outcomes information given to current students, prospective students, and all organizational personnel (Standard I.C.1).

In pursuit of this, the research office staff must carefully appraise the accuracy of existing outcomes data and where it is compromised. Research office staff will also need to initiate—in concert with the Learning Outcomes Committee—modifications to the current methods of collecting, entering, processing, and managing data. Examination will include whether (1) the current method of deriving course-level outcomes attainment is effective; (2) database entry procedures have been able to provide a measure of how representative the findings are of each class section, course, department, division, program, or general education area; and (3) the inventory of outcomes data in the database is complete. Already, action steps have been

planned to revise assessment forms to acquire sample size information and update procedures for sampling students within multi-section courses.

Standard I.A.2 emphasizes the use of data to evaluate effectiveness in accomplishing the mission and whether the mission directs priorities in meeting students' educational needs. In order to increase the quality of the data collected, there will be a conscious effort to broadly communicate guidance on the use of the current homegrown database. The learning outcomes website will publish training materials that will facilitate users' ability to enter assessment data, search for information, and extract data summary reports for their respective operational units. By increasing users' proficiency in interfacing with the database, there will be less confusion and fewer errors in data entry, as well as in understanding what the data indicate. The Learning Outcomes Committee will be the responsible party for this action step.

It will also be important to explore a means of collecting learning outcomes data at the student-level to derive a richer understanding of what learning outcomes various student groups have acquired. In particular, Standards I.B.5 and I.B.6 seek the disaggregation and analysis of learning outcomes for program types, modes of delivery, and subpopulations of students. Fulfilling these will first require a collaborative effort between the learning outcomes database coordinator and research office staff to determine if the current homegrown database is capable of this and if the College has the staff to structure the database for this complex purpose. If it is determined that the database cannot be augmented for disaggregation, meetings will occur with commercial learning outcomes database vendors in pursuit of a system that can provide this functionality. To reduce the time and effort of research office staff in fulfilling research requests, a key feature of a new database should be the ability for end users to easily generate their own data summary reports. Otherwise, it will be up to the Learning Outcomes Committee and research office personnel to develop a means of disaggregating data and providing summary reports to College constituents. Whether or not the current database is replaced with a commercial system, compliance with Standards I.B.5 and I.B.6 will necessitate that the Learning Outcomes Committee and research office team gain a clear understanding of the types of information and sequence of data processing needed to identify gaps in learning outcomes attainment among student groups.

Assessor Proficiency and Data Fluency

Cultivating proficiency in those who conduct learning outcomes assessments will require sustained communication about continuous improvement of student learning for the assurance of academic quality and institutional effectiveness (Standard I.B.1). One action step that will be completed by the Learning Outcomes Committee is the creation of a handbook that contains instructions for how to conduct assessments and fill in assessment report forms, provides the schedule of assessment cycles, and gives examples of assessment reports and program reviews. Additionally, there will be a joint effort by professional development personnel and the Learning Outcomes Committee to spearhead training events and professional development workshops on assessment best practices.

As mentioned earlier, Standard I.A.2 prescribes the use of data to ultimately close the loop of the improvement cycle of academic quality. There will be efforts to help faculty and student services individuals interpret their student outcomes data through the use of data coaches and training in comprehension of quantitative findings. Also, consumers of this data will be given guidance on how to apply outcomes data to the submission of program review reports. The responsible parties for these action steps will consist of the vice president of instruction; instructional and student services deans; the dean of research, planning, and grants; the program review manager; and the Learning Outcomes Committee.

Comprehensive and Regular Assessment

Course-level student learning outcomes have been defined and regularly assessed for all instructional programs and student and learning support services. The College must now build upon this progress by systematically striving to improve programs and courses for the enhancement of learning and achievement (Standards I.B.2, II.A.3, and II.A.16). To maintain regular measurement of learning outcomes, the learning outcomes coordinator will implement a system to periodically remind the leaders of operational units of assessments that are upcoming. To confirm that ongoing assessment of all programs includes Community Services Education (CSE), the administrative dean of workforce development and continuing and community education will verify that student learning outcomes are collected for all courses. These documents are collected and stored annually at the office of CSE. To establish linkage among existing levels of assessment, division faculty will map course-level student learning outcomes to their respective program, general education, and institutional learning outcomes. Likewise, the learning outcomes database coordinator will electronically link levels of assessment within the database.

Communication, Dialog, and the Use of Data to Drive Institutional Processes

Decision-making about institutional priorities and processes should be informed by objective evidence. Standard I.B.4 discusses the use of assessment data to organize processes to support student learning and achievement. Instructional units will be provided with outcomes results aggregated into department, division, program, and general education areas. Such units will engage in dialog about this feedback and actuate needed changes to such areas as pedagogy, curriculum, resources, scheduling, and outcomes assessment. Communication and collaboration in the development of new ideas, needed changes, and approaches to implementation will draw upon various committees and College initiatives (e.g., Faculty Development, Staff Development, One Book One Glendale, etc.) and can spark creativity while simultaneously stimulating constituent buy-in regarding outcomes and assessments.

To meet the differential needs of subpopulations of students, it will be important to identify performance gaps in outcomes attainment among groups (Standards I.B.5 and I.B.6). The learning outcomes database coordinator, learning outcomes coordinator, and members of the Learning Outcomes Committee will need to work with the research office team to initiate a mechanism for student-level data collection and examine data disaggregated for the comparison of ages, ethnicities, genders, modes of delivery, campus locations, day vs. evening courses, and full- vs. part-time enrollments. Also, to better focus the efforts of the Learning Outcomes Committee, the committee's mission statement will be revised

to mirror the scope and vision of the committee and align with the mission statement and educational master plan of the College. Completion of these action steps will ensure that College stakeholders will be able to engage in dialog about outcomes findings toward the improvement of instructional support, student support services, and institutional processes.

Awards are Based on Outcomes Attainment

Standard II.A.9 states that the awarding of course credit, degrees, and certificates is based on student mastery of learning outcomes. The Learning Outcomes Committee, vice president of instruction, instructional deans, and division chairs will collaborate on the review of relevant best practices by other districts, development and dialog of strategies, and the implementation and evaluation of solutions. Another action step that can be pursued immediately is providing division chairs notification within the last five weeks of a regular term regarding students who will be completing a degree or certificate program at the College. Knowing who is completing a program will facilitate the reporting of program-level learning outcomes.

Assure Quality of Student Support Services

Compliance with Standard II.C.1 involves the regular evaluation of student support services and a demonstration that they support student learning and increase completion of the mission, regardless of the campus location or mode of delivery. The vice president of student services, dean of student services, and the student services division chair will be the parties responsible for enhancing the coordination of their assessment cycles, and the communication and discussion of the results.

RESOURCES

Implementing and sustaining this longitudinal action project will necessitate a variety of human, technological, and financial resources. As is common in other community college districts, skepticism among College constituents toward learning outcomes assessment is very much present at GCC. Considering the resistance among faculty toward course-level outcomes assessment and data entry, the most daunting of tasks will involve acquiring faculty buy-in and commitment to entering student-level outcomes data into the database. Strong leadership from the administration is essential for galvanizing those who are disinclined to engage in the added work that will be required. Therefore, responsible parties for leading this action project will include vice president of instruction and instructional deans. Additionally, as referenced earlier, completion of many action steps will involve significant participation by the research office staff, learning outcomes coordinator, learning outcomes database coordinator, and members of the Learning Outcomes Committee.

One solution that can rectify numerous weaknesses in the College's learning outcomes effort is the purchase and implementation of a commercial database specifically designed to meet the outcomes requirements of the U.S. Department of Education and the Accrediting Commission. Database systems that have the most functionality and ease-of-use tend to have a commensurate annual financial cost. Considering the College's experience in managing prior and current efforts to organize, collect, and productively use assessment data, such a financial investment is necessary and will help develop College wide buy-in regarding the importance of assessment data and its relationship to institutional learning outcomes. Options

will be explored for the possible use of student success or equity-associated state grants. A primary concern is the long-term financing of such a database system when the availability of such state grants varies from year to year.

MEASURABLE OUTCOMES

Throughout this multiyear action project, progress on several measurable outcomes will serve as evidence that the College is strengthening alignment of its institutional practices with the goals of its mission. The Learning Outcomes Committee will coordinate with planning personnel to quantify the number of institutional processes, practices, and decisions initiated or modified based upon learning outcomes attainment results. The committee will also collaborate with professional development personnel to track the number of pieces of evidence that document dialog about learning outcomes attainment results. Such evidence can include minutes from department, division, or standing committee meetings, motions passed at planning, student government, or Senate meetings, or report summaries from professional development workshops. The Learning Outcomes Committee will also be able to provide the number of course outlines that have been revised due to consideration of learning outcomes data. Lastly, the professional development team will be able to assist the Learning Outcomes Committee in tracking the number of learning outcomes-related training events and workshops that occur and quantify the results of surveys about attendees' gains in knowledge about learning outcomes.

**ACTION PROJECT 2.
IMPROVE USE OF LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENTS**

	BY	DESIRED GOALS
		• ACTION STEPS
Improvement of Data Quality Standards I.A.2 I.B.5 I.B.6 I.C.1	Spring 2016	Explore means of student-level data collection, disaggregated outcomes results, and easy output of data summary reports
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> meetings occur with commercial database vendors for systems with this functionality gain an increased understanding of the types of information and the sequence of data processing necessary to identify gaps in attainment among student groups determine homegrown database's capabilities for this
		Ensure data collected College wide is consistent
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> rewrite and organize student services learning outcomes to acquire data that is able to be entered into the database
	Summer 2016	Broadly communicate guidance on use of current homegrown database
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> training materials on how to use existing homegrown database for common functions is published on learning outcomes website
	Summer 2016 - Fall 2016	Analyze data and scrutinize processes
		Research Office staff examines existing data and with learning outcomes committee and division chairs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> evaluates the integrity of existing inventory of outcomes data implements needed changes to current methods of data collection, database entries, and/or data management continuously evaluates the quality of the outcomes data and adjusts processes as needed

<p style="text-align: center;">Assessor Proficiency & Data Fluency</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Standards I.A.2 I.B.1</p>	Fall 2016	Promote assessor proficiency
		<p>Create assessment handbook that contains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assessment procedures • assessment report forms • examples of model assessment reports and program reviews • schedule of assessment cycles <p>Training events and professional development workshops scheduled for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how to conduct assessments • how to complete assessment reports • how to show relationship between course outline's exit standards and learning outcomes
		Begin educating constituent groups in understanding their data
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • embark on the use of data coaches • provide training in interpretation of data for improving learning outcomes • provide training for use of outcomes data in program review
<p style="text-align: center;">Comprehensive and Regular Assessment</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Standards I.B.2 II.A.3 II.A.16</p>	Summer 2016	Maintain the regular completion of assessments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • implement a system to remind division chairs of pending assessment cycles
		Establish linkage among levels of assessment
	Fall 2016	Ensure breadth of assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • verify assessment process for community education courses and if decision is made to archive it outside of the database, make that data easily available 		

<p>Communication, Dialog, & the Use of Data to Drive Institutional Processes</p> <p>Standards I.B.4 I.B.5 I.B.6 I.B.8 II.A.9</p>	Summer 2016	<p>Comprehensive and regular analysis of data for improving learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> analyze outcomes data aggregated into departments, divisions, programs, general education areas, and institutional learning outcomes categories
		<p>Alignment between learning outcomes committee and College</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> revise committee mission statement to mirror the scope and vision of the committee and align with College mission statement and educational master plan
	Fall 2016	<p>Coordinate data-sharing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> non-instructional student services outcomes data are entered into database for access by other constituent groups meetings occur between vice presidents, deans, learning outcomes committee, distance education committee, and curriculum committee to establish baseline for types of data to share
		<p>Identify gaps in outcomes attainment among groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> implement mechanism for student-level data collection examine data disaggregated by at least age, ethnicity, gender, mode of delivery, campus location, day vs. evening, and full- vs. part-time
	Spring 2017	<p>Dialog about outcomes results for improvement of pedagogy, support services, and institutional processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> broadly communicate attainment results in the College newsletter, College newspaper, website, on-campus presentations, and presentations to community groups division, department, and student services units hold meetings to discuss attainment results and improvement to instruction and support services begin regular sharing of attainment results at planning group meetings to inform master and strategic planning meetings occur for instructional and student services standing committees where attainment results inform program review, resource allocation, and other institutional processes new grants address student deficiencies in outcomes attainment and performance on institutional effectiveness indicators (e.g., set-standards)

<p>Awards are Based on Outcomes Attainment</p> <p>Standard II.A.9</p>	<p>Fall 2016 - Spring 2017</p>	<p>Students are awarded course credit, degrees, certificates based on attainment of learning outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • division chairs begin receiving notification of student program completion • best practices from other districts are reviewed • practical strategies are discussed • solutions are implemented and evaluated
<p>Assure Quality of Support Services</p> <p>Standard II.C.1</p>	<p>Fall 2016 - Spring 2017</p>	<p>Implement improvements to Student Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • act upon findings regarding student services support outcomes • enhance coordination of assessment cycles and sharing of results
<p>Continuous Cycle of Improvement</p> <p>Standards I.B II.A</p>	<p>Fall 2017 - Fall 2018</p>	<p>Data-driven decision-making for improvement in learning and achievement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • incentivize revisions to student learning outcomes on course outlines • continuously evaluate the integrity of the outcomes data and adjust processes as needed • assessment, analysis of attainment, dialog, and implementation of changes for improved academic quality and institutional effectiveness occurs on a regular cycle

See narrative for responsible parties, resources needed, and measurable outcomes.

EVIDENCE

- REF QFE-1. Gap Analysis Document, <http://glendale.edu/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=31360>
- REF QFE-2. Integrated Planning Handbook, <http://glendale.edu/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=30073>
- REF QFE-3. Integrated Planning Pyramid Diagram, <http://glendale.edu/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=29297>
- REF QFE-4. Plan Approval Process, <http://glendale.edu/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=31362>