Introduction

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) requires associate degree granting institutions to meet four standards that ensure that the public receives a valuable education. In other words, the standards ensure that “the education earned at the institutions is of value to the student who earned it; and employers, trade or profession-related licensing agencies, and other colleges and universities can accept a student’s credential as legitimate.” (ACCJC.org website). The four standards are designed to foster discussion about the institutions effectiveness and ways to enhance it.

The four standards are as follows:
The institution provides the means for students to learn, assess how well learning is occurring, and strives to improve that learning through ongoing, systematic, and integrated planning (Standard I).

Instructional programs, student support services, and library and learning support services facilitate the achievement of the institution’s stated student learning outcomes (Standard II).

Human, physical, technology, and financial resources enable these programs and services to function and improve (Standard III).

Ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization guides the accomplishment of the mission and supports institutional effectiveness and improvement (Standard IV).

The guidance provided in this document is specifically designed to help the institution meet Standard II as it pertains to Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). For guidance on how to meet the other three standards, please refer to the ACCJC website.

1) What are Student Learning Outcomes or SLOs and how do they differ from course objectives?

According to the ACCJC, Student Learning Outcomes are the “knowledge, skills, abilities, and attitudes that a student has attained at the end (or as a result) of his or her engagement in a particular set of collegiate experiences” (ACCJC Standards Adopted 2002, Standards Glossary, p.6). In other words they are the “specific observable or measurable results that are expected subsequent to a learning experience.” The SLO Glossary produced by ASCCC in 2010 further clarifies by stating that “SLOs describe a student’s ability to synthesize many discreet skills using higher level thinking skills and to produce something that asks them to apply what they’ve learned. SLOs usually encompass gathering together of smaller discrete objectives through analysis, evaluation and synthesis into more sophisticated skills and abilities (ASCCC, 2010, p. 13).”

SLOs differ from course objectives in that the latter are specific teaching objectives that drive course content and activities (ASCC.org). Objectives are small steps that lead toward a goal, for instance the discrete course content that faculty cover within a
discipline. Objectives are usually more numerous and create a framework for the overarching student learning outcomes which address synthesizing, evaluating and analyzing many of the objectives (ASCCC, 2010, p. 10).

2) Why should I participate in this?

The Academic Senate views outcomes assessment as a productive activity that can improve teaching practices and thus enhance student learning. For this reason, effective assessment practices are important not only to meet accreditation demands but also to benefit the college, the faculty, and the students.

According to the “Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment,” Principle Eleven: “Faculty should engage in SLO development and assessment not because it is a requirement for accreditation but rather because it is good professional practice that can benefit programs and students (page 25).”

Faculty’s chief responsibility is to provide students with an effective and rewarding learning experience. The responsibility involves participation in development of curriculum at the course, program and college level, and not just the responsibility for one’s own classes. Furthermore, “decisions regarding curriculum development should be based on collegial and authentic analysis of data…and for this reason SLO assessment can provide informative and beneficial input for making curricular evaluation and discussion at all levels more valuable and purposeful (Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, 2010, page 25).

The Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, 2010, also states that “Outcomes and their assessments therefore must remain under the purview of those responsible for teaching the courses and those who are most qualified to make decisions regarding curricular practices. Faculty should have control of assessment processes and take the lead in analysis and use of the data. Collection of data should be led by the faculty members in the courses they teach. In all aspects of SLO development and assessment, faculty should assume primary responsibility (26).” In other words, because faculty have the necessary expertise, curricular decisions need to remain under their control. For this reason faculty need to be the ones that engage in assessment of student learning outcomes and the curricular decisions that follow.

“When designed and implemented appropriately, SLO assessment can provide significant benefits as a tool for evaluating and revising curriculum and for improving student learning, and these benefits should be the primary reason for faculty to participate in assessment work (Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, 2010, page 26).”

“If faculty do not accept these responsibilities and fail to see SLO assessment as a beneficial professional practice, both faculty and students may suffer. If assessment becomes a task done only to satisfy the ACCJC, faculty will be less likely to engage in authentic discussions of valid data, and indeed the data collected itself may well be less informative. Curricular development and decision making will be less effective, thereby
depriving students of the maximum educational experience. In addition, faculty who do not engage in assessment activities may find that decisions regarding curriculum are made for them, either by smaller groups of individuals who have chosen to become involved or, worse yet, by non-faculty who have taken on the responsibilities rightly due to the instructional experts (Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, 2010, page 26).”

3) But we already assign grades, so why do we have to do this other thing?

According to the Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, Principle 8, Principle Eight: SLO Assessment processes and grading are different but mutually compatible activities and should complement rather than conflict with each other (page 21). Grades and student learning outcomes are not the same thing because they have different approaches and have different purposes. Grading usually involves assigning a letter to some assignment or class the student participated in. The grade tells you very little or nothing about what skills the student can perform. Grades also tell you nothing about how the student can improve.

According to the publication “Grades vs. SLOs” by Joan Sholars (2009), “It is very difficult to trace back the learning of specific skills from a general grade. For example, if a student earns a “B” in the course, it is not possible to determine which skills or topics within the course were grasped well by the student simply by looking at the grade the student earned. Different faculty members teaching the same course could vary in the way they measure the combination of the different skills to produce the grade. For instance, Professor A might count the research paper for that course as 20% of the student’s overall grade, while Professor B might count the research paper for that course as 15% of the student’s overall grade. If that same research paper was used to assess an SLO, the faculty would score the skills that the faculty determined important on a faculty-developed rubric. The faculty would have been normed on the rubric. Consequently, a student could earn an “A” in the course, but have scored only a 3 out of 4 on a faculty-developed rubric. (Mt. San Antonio College SLO Coordinator December 2009 Whitepaper).”

It is not just faculty that should be aware of the skills attained by a student after an assignment, but also the student. Students should be assigned a grade on an assignment and also a score that pertains to the SLO. If the student is familiar with the rating scale on the rubric, and what skills each score represents for a particular SLO, the student would be aware of what skills he or she has attained and which have not yet been mastered. Therefore, “formative SLO assessment involves evaluating student performance with the aim of providing feedback that will enhance student learning through improved instruction. Formative assessment helps the student and the instructor to ascertain what has been learned and what still needs to be learned and thereby can improve both teaching and learning.” (Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, 2010, page 26).”

Thus, student learning outcomes are more useful for helping students understand how to improve their performance in a class and in future classes. Data from SLO assessment
also provides feedback to faculty about how to improve instructional practices in a
current class and in subsequent classes.

Grading and outcomes assessment need not conflict with each as both serve necessary
functions. “Faculty who employ only grades or only outcomes assessment may be
depriving their students of important feedback. For example, a composition instructor
who reads a student essay and simply assigns a letter grade or score, or even one who
offers brief, general written comments to the student, has done little to improve the
student’s writing. More productive comments would target specific expectations or
outcomes for the paper and explain to the student where and how those expectations have
or have not been satisfied. Through such feedback students can advance their skills and
enhance their understanding of the course material. Thus, grading and outcomes
assessment both serve important though separate roles and, rather than conflicting, should
work in concert to provide the different levels of input necessary for complete and
effective student evaluation.”

4) Okay so I have to do this. How do I do I begin?

According to the SLO Glossary produced by ASCCC in 2010, SLOs describe a student’s
ability to synthesize many discreet skills using higher level thinking skills and to produce
something that asks them to apply what they’ve learned. SLOs usually encompass
gathering together of smaller discrete objectives through analysis, evaluation and
synthesis into more sophisticated skills and abilities. (ASCCC, 2010, p. 13). An SLO
refers to an overarching outcome for a course, program, degree or certificate, or student
services area (such as the library).

Therefore, you should begin by examining at the specific course objectives listed in the
Course Outline of Record (COR) for the particular course. You should then try combine
2 or 3 or more of them into one logical cohesive outcome that can be assessed.

For example, at AVC PSY 101 course has the following course objectives:

1) Explain the historical context of the field of psychology.
2) Identify, describe, and compare different research methodologies used in the
scientific study of psychology.
3) Recognize, inspect, question, and evaluate various theories and concepts that
presently influence the field of psychology
4) Examine and analyze various topics and concepts in psychology.
5) Assemble and critically analyze recent information on topics in General
Psychology through the use of current literature and scientific journals.
6) Assess the complexity and diversity of behavior including the impact of culture
on human behavior.
7) Inspect and describe the interaction of nature (genes) and nurture (culture) on
human behavior.
8) Recognize and appraise scientific journals in the field of psychology.
9) Identify and demonstrate APA writing style.
Objectives 5, 8, and 9 could be combined and rewritten as: Students will be able to recognize scientific journals in the field of psychology, critically evaluate their content, and synthesize the information into APA format.

The other objectives can be combined similarly to yield other student learning outcomes.

Bloom’s taxonomy is a well-known description of levels of educational objectives. It may be useful to consider this taxonomy when defining your SLOs.

5) Ok. I have written SLOs for my courses, now what do I do with them?

SLOs are specific measurable outcomes that are expected subsequent to a learning experience. Therefore, an assessment tool must be found or developed that can yield data that determines whether that outcome has taken place. In other words, the assessment tool should be able to tell you whether students can really do what the SLO states. According to the Guiding Principles for SLO Assessment, principle one: “Faculty have the primary responsibility for developing assessment tools and determining the uses of data that are collected, and therefore faculty engagement and active involvement in SLO assessment is essential (page #9).”

As mentioned previously, only faculty have the necessary expertise, training, background, and experience necessary to develop effective methods of SLO assessment for their courses and programs. According to the Guiding Principles for SLO Assessment, principle one:

“This same principle applies not only to classroom instruction, but also to student support services, library services, and all other areas of a student’s academic experience (page 9).”

6) But I don’t know much about assessment. What are the different types of assessments that I can use?

In “The Concept of Formative Assessment” (2002), Carol Boston offers the following explanation and definition of the concept of assessment:

Black and William (1998b) define assessment broadly to include all activities that teachers and students undertake to get information that can be used diagnostically to alter teaching and learning (Guiding Principles of SLO assessment, page 8).

There are many different assessments: The following, though by no means exhaustive, is a list of some of the most common ones:

Portfolios: a compilation of an individual’s work over time. Faculty decide what and how much evidence will be presented in the portfolio to allow assessment of program goals. Multiple choice questions
Essays
Standardized tests
Licensure exams
Projects
Quizzes
Short answer questions
Research papers
Lab assignment
Performance
Recital
Simulation
Interview
Survey

According to the Guiding Principles for SLO Assessment: If the term “assessment” refers to the process of collecting data, then “assessment results” are the data or evidence produced by this process. Such data need not always be quantifiable or measurable in numerical terms. Assessment results may take various forms, including not only quantitative data such as numerical or statistical scores but also qualitative evidence such as portfolios, narratives, performances, or other data that may be more dependent on observation than computation. Any information produced by assessment processes that can be used for analysis and improvement of student achievement and learning would fall under the category of assessment results (page 8).”

7) How do I know I have good assessment tool for my SLOs?

This question is best answered by the Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment (page 16), Principle Five: SLO assessment should be as authentic as possible and should be minimally intrusive to the educational experience of students and the instructional planning and performance of faculty.

Good assessment needs to simulate real world experiences and involve the application of critical thinking to tasks that approximate real world conditions like the workplace and other situations outside the classroom (Grant Wiggins, 1990). Appropriate SLO assessment should not be simply a reproduction of information without context to anchor it. Authentic assessment is meaningful and involves application of knowledge and skills, not just simply memorization of information. The ACCJC’s 2012 SLO Rubric notes the importance of authentic assessment as an aspect of SLO proficiency: “Student learning outcomes and authentic assessment are in place for courses, programs, and degrees” (p. 5).

Faculty also need to consider providing assessments at certain intervals of a course rather than just at the end. Such assessments are more useful because they can track student progress and provide more useful feedback to improve student learning. In other words, ongoing authentic assessment can improve the input that faculty provide to students as an aspect of instruction throughout their classes. As Arthur Chickering and Zelda Gamson’s (1987) “Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate
Education" states, “In classes, students need frequent opportunities to perform and receive suggestions for improvement” (Appendix C, para. 15).

Assessments should also be integrated into courses so they non-obtrusive and as least disruptive as possible. “Other, more formal assessment practices also might be developed as a part of the standard instructional program for a course. Assessment data can be collected from work students do as required course activities, projects, or assignments, requiring minimal additional course preparation or student performance documentation (Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, Principle 5, page 16).” Faculty can plan for such standards assessments in advance by incorporating them into their classes as part of the normal expectations for students in the course. This insures that SLO assessment will be as efficient and practical as possible.

Furthermore, according to the Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, Principle Six, page 18: Rather than relying on one assessment method for all situations, effective assessment may benefit from a variety of methods, even within a single course, that can respond to different learning outcomes, teaching styles, and student learning needs.

8) Where do we collect the data?

For a particular set of SLOs developed for a particular course, data should be collected from all sections of that course. While, this would be ideal, it is also acceptable to randomly sample from certain sections if many are available.

At Antelope Valley College, each area or discipline has an assessment facilitator who collects SLO data from the various individuals who teach the course. Usually those teaching the course record the number of students that took the course and the number of students that met the assessment criteria (i.e. passed). This data is reported in WEAVE, an online course data management system that tracks SLO data and related matters.

Assessment criteria must be established for each SLO prior to collecting data. Assessment criteria refers to the percentage or ratio of questions answered correctly. For example, a multiple-choice test may require that 75% of the questions be answered correctly for the SLO to be met. Therefore the assessment criteria would be 75%. Assessment criteria can also be set for more complicated assignments like papers, projects, etc. by following a rubric.

An achievement target must also be set for each SLO before data is collected. The achievement target refers to the overall percentage of students that successfully meet the assessment criteria for the SLO. For example, a particular course might require that 80% of the students be successful when assessed for a particular SLO. Thus, for this particular SLO, 80% would be the achievement target.
9) What do we do with the data once it is collected?

Faculty need to take part in a discussion of the SLO results for their courses. All faculty who teach a particular course need to discuss the SLO results in order to decide whether they need to modify the SLO, the assessment tool, the assessment criteria, or the achievement target. More importantly, faculty need to decide what the results mean for that particular course in order to modify it or improve it. AVC has developed an Action Plan Form that should be filled out after such a discussion. It is the job of the assessment facilitator to enter this information into WEAVE (i.e., AVC’s online course data management system).

According to the Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, principle one, page 9: Faculty are in direct contact with students, have the greatest knowledge and deepest understanding of the students’ needs and abilities, and have the responsibility for developing and delivering the curriculum and course content, and therefore faculty can better understand the context of the data. “By accepting and embracing their responsibility for SLO design and assessment, faculty will be in the best position to examine assessment data, ask questions about what the data suggest, and make appropriate changes to classroom and institutional practices in order to improve student learning (Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, Principle one, page 9).”

10) Who should be involved in this process?

According to the Guiding principles of SLO Assessment, Principle Two (page 10): Outcomes assessment is a process that should involve all appropriate participants at each level of the college, not just select groups or individuals. SLO assessment must involve full-time faculty, part-time faculty, staff, administrators, and anyone else directly or indirectly serving students. Faculty need to take primary responsibility for developing SLOs, the assessments, analyzing data, coordinating discussions. Part-time faculty need to be involved as well as they are a majority of the faculty at most colleges. Faculty should be the ones making curricular decisions, especially those concerning how it can be changed and improved by using SLO data. Staff also need to be involved. Staff need to be involved in preserving data, maintaining and recording it, as well developing software tools and systems. Staff are thus needed to support the entire SLO assessment process.

Discussion should also be held at the college level by faculty under the leadership the academic senate. Instructional and student support service faculty should also be involved. According to the Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, principle two: “A comprehensive system of support services exists, and is characterized by a high degree of integration among academic and student support services”. Instructional and student support services faculty should not work in isolation from each other, but rather should collaborate and share information at all levels in order to more fully inform and strengthen the delivery of all aspects of a student’s educational experience. (page 11?). There must also be assistance from college researchers to aid in the design and implementation of SLO instruments as well as evaluating their validity and applicability. Administrators also play an important role in the SLO process. Administrators need to
support and facilitate the process. They need to make available sufficient staffing, technology, resources, compensation and other needs. Not only this, administrators must also support the SLO process through organization, scheduling, facilitating, coordinating, and encouraging, and approval of other necessary efforts to make the process more effective. According to the Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, principle two: “If the entire college is involved in assessment efforts, with each area or constituent group fulfilling its appropriate role while understanding and respecting the faculty’s primacy in SLO processes, all areas will be able to work cooperatively toward the common goal of serving students in the most effective ways possible (page 11?).”

11) Ok. SLOs have been defined, assessment tools have been developed, data and action plans have been collected. Am I done?

No. The process is supposed to be ongoing and lead to “continues quality improvement” of the courses, programs and services offered by the college. According to principle one of the Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, page 9: “The purposes of student learning outcomes include assessing student achievement, evaluating the strength of courses and programs, and identifying instances in which instruction and student learning can be improved.” Furthermore, According to the Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, “Principle Three (page 10): SLOs and SLO assessment should be connected to the overall culture of the college through the college vision or values statement, program review processes, and college curriculum, planning, and budgeting processes.”

SLO assessment is not an end to itself but a vehicle for program and educational improvement. It needs to be an ongoing activity which uses current data to inform instructional practices. It should not a periodic exercise that uses outdated assessments and data to inform current practices and decisions. The Academic Senate’s SLO Terminology Glossary (ASCCC, 2010, p. 4) defines “closing the loop,” as “the use of assessment results to improve student learning through collegial dialogue informed by the results of student service or instructional learning outcome assessment. It is part of a continuous cycle of collecting assessment results, evaluating them, and using the evaluations to identify actions that will improve student learning, implementing those actions, and then cycling back to collecting assessment results, etc.”

This requires a commitment by all people across all levels of the college. Faculty are more likely to believe in the process and devote their effort if they feel it will lead to budgetary decisions that will enhance students’ educational experience. The college needs to make budget decisions that will support the projects and innovation that will lead to curriculum improvement. ACCJC emphasizes the importance of using assessment data as a basis for decision making throughout the college: “Results of assessment are being used for improvement and further alignment of institution-wide practices (p. 5).” Colleges must therefore integrate SLO assessment into its program review. In other words, data from SLO assessment needs to inform the decision making reflected in program review. Programs need to be analyzed based on concrete information, thus making the program review process more data driven. This allows SLO assessment to connect logically and meaningfully to both short-term and long-term college planning.
SLO data can inform decisions for improvement of programs, the setting of goals and implementation of strategies, as well as allocation of resources to address these needs. Programs can use concrete data to support their budgetary requests thereby making budget discussions more meaningful and better informed. The decision making process will tie resource allocation directly to the SLO process.

“Perhaps the highest level at which SLOs and SLO assessment can be incorporated into the culture of a college is by connecting general education outcomes directly to the college vision, values, or mission (Guiding principles of SLO Assessment, page 10). Colleges might want to revise their mission statement, if necessary, to make an obvious connection with its institutional learning outcomes. Institutional learning outcomes should also have an explicit connection with the general education outcomes.

12) Do SLOs remain the same once established or can we change them?

SLOs can be revised as needed. According to the Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, Principle 3, page 10: “The process and the SLOs themselves must remain open to revision and adjustment. Student needs and curricular practices change, and colleges must continuously reflect on their practices and expectations in order to serve students as fully as possible. The job of SLO development and assessment is never finished, and SLOs should not be seen as fixed or unchangeable. For SLO data to be effective in informing decision making at all levels of the college, the SLO assessment process should be revised as necessary to reflect changes in the college’s curriculum, needs, and culture.”

At Antelope Valley College, the SLO Committee homepage concerns various forms to help you revise your SLOs. Note the SLOs can be revised at any time but you should contact your division or area SLO representative or the SLO Committee Faculty Co-chair. This insures that revisions are done properly and that the appropriate forms are filled out for documentation purposes. Keep in mind that well-written SLOs are linked to course objectives and course content, and should thus always be reviewed (and possibly revised) whenever course revisions are made as well.

13) Okay, we are continuously assessing student learning outcomes, revising them as needed, and using them to inform program review. Now are we done?

No. Program learning outcomes, general education outcomes, and institutional outcomes must also be developed. Program learning outcomes (PLOs) have been defined as “Broadly inclusive statements that might be considered areas of competency within a given discipline or general area of competency within a GE program” (Marshall, ACCJC Conference, 2013). PLOs must be developed for any sequence of courses that leads to a certificate or degree. The college catalog for Antelope Valley College lists the specific programs and their objectives. Objectives at this level can be used to develop program learning outcomes.

According to the Guiding Principles of SLO assessment, Principle Four, page 15:
“SLOs should be clearly mapped and aligned throughout a course sequence and among various levels (course, program, institution) to achieve the most efficient and effective assessment.” The mapping of these outcomes needs to be thoughtful and involve dialogue among all necessary parties. This includes not only faculty, but also staff and administration.

“When dealing with outcomes and assessment, it is important to determine that course outcomes align or match up with program outcomes; that institutional outcomes align with the college mission and vision” (ASCCC, 2010 p.1). Doing this makes the assessment process more practical and efficient.

“For example, if program outcomes are designed and mapped to reflect direct connections to the SLOs of the courses that comprise the program, then assessment of the program outcomes may be conducted using data provided through the process of course SLO assessment (Guiding principles of SLO Assessment, principle 4, page 15). This means that means that SLO assessments, if appropriately designed and assessed, can double as program learning outcomes. Furthermore, program learning outcomes assessment need not incorporate data from every course that comprises the program. Certain programs that have mastery courses, where students master a skill that was introduced in previous courses, might choose to focus assessment at the courses where mastery occurs.

Assessment of general education and institutional outcomes requires a broader dialogue. The SLO Terminology Glossary (ASCCC, 2010, p.9), states that institutional learning reflect “the knowledge, skills, and abilities a student is expected to leave an institution with as a result of a student’s total experience.” Thus, they combine expertise found in several areas or a combination of areas and not a single discipline. Institutional learning outcomes include those related to institutional effectiveness (degrees, transfers, productivity) as well as learning outcomes.

“Successful attainment of general education and institutional outcomes depends on the overall educational experience that is founded on the course and program level. If students do not achieve the expected outcomes at the course and program level, then they are also unlikely to attain the college-level outcomes. For this reason, colleges should work to establish explicit alignment between program outcomes and those at the general education and institutional level. If students are successful in achieving course and program level outcomes, and if those outcomes provide direct and clear connection to the general education outcomes, then assessment will once again be simplified and the overall educational experience of students will have greater coherence and will therefore be enhanced (Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment, principle 4, page 16).

14) Can results of SLO, PLO assessment be used against me?

No. According to the “Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment”: “SLO assessment of student learning outcomes is a process that is separate from faculty evaluation.” (Principle Ten, page 24).
ACCJC Standard III.A.1.c “Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes.” Though some believe this means that SLO assessment data can be used to evaluate faculty, the Academic Senate strongly disagrees. The 2004 paper entitled “The 2002 Accreditation Standards: Implementation” justifies strongly warns that:

“[U]sing SLO s as a basis for faculty evaluations (III.A.1.c) demonstrates an egregious disregard for local bargaining authority and interjects a threatening tone into what the ACCJC claims is a collegial peer process. Moreover, III.A.1.c is particularly coercive to non-tenured and adjunct faculty; and is viewed by the Senate as nothing less than an attack on our profession (p. 12).”

A 2007 Senate Rostrum article titled “Accreditation and Faculty Evaluations?” stated: “Placing student learning outcomes data within a faculty member’s evaluation would create a downward pressure on the rigor of the outcomes and a strong motivation to create assessments that validate or justify the content, pedagogy, and assignments” (Alancraig & Fulks, p. 2). Thus SLO assessment results would not be a true indicator of whether learning has taken place or whether the results should be used to improve the courses, programs, or services the college offers.

The Rostrum article “Accreditation and Faculty Evaluations?” and the “Guiding Principle of SLO Assessment” make it clear that ACCJC Standard III.A.1.c. should mean that faculty “evaluation involves the faculty member’s participation in assessment activities, not the results of assessment data used to judge some faculty as less fit.”

Need:
OOS or SSO (Student Service Outcomes) and AUOs (Administrative Unit Outcomes)
References

Guiding Principles of SLO Assessment (2010). Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. ASCCC.org
SLO Glossary (2010). Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. ASCCC.org