

This confirms that your 2016 Annual Report to ACCJC was submitted by Dr. Lori Gaskin <lgaskin@sbcc.edu> on 03/29/2016.

Below is a copy of the information submitted. You may also re-print the report by logging on at <https://www.accjc.org/annualreport>.



Western Association of Schools and Colleges
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

2016 Annual Report
Final Submission
 03/29/2016

Santa Barbara City College
 721 Cliff Drive
 Santa Barbara, CA 93109

General Information

#	Question	Answer
1.	Confirm logged into the correct institution's report	Confirmed
2.	Name of individual preparing report:	Melanie Rogers
3.	Phone number of person preparing report:	(805) 965-0581 x2807
4.	E-mail of person preparing report:	rogers@sbcc.edu
5a.	Provide the URL (link) from the college website to the section of the college catalog which states the accredited status with ACCJC:	http://www.sbcc.edu/catalog/2014_2015/02_Title%20Page.pdf
5b.	Provide the URL (link) from the college website to the colleges online statement of accredited status with ACCJC:	http://www.sbcc.edu/accreditation/
6.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment:	Fall 2015: 21,484 Fall 2014: 23,374 Fall 2013: 23,060
7.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in degree applicable credit courses for fall 2015:	18,550
8.	Headcount enrollment in pre-collegiate credit courses (which do not count toward degree requirements) for fall 2015:	2,738
9.	Number of courses offered via distance education:	Fall 2015: 192 Fall 2014: 180

		Fall 2013: 156
10.	Number of programs which may be completed via distance education:	29
11.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in all types of Distance Education:	Fall 2015: 6,777 Fall 2014: 6,686 Fall 2013: 5,960
12.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in all types of Correspondence Education:	Fall 2015: 0 Fall 2014: 0 Fall 2013: 0
13.	Were all correspondence courses for which students enrolled in fall 2015 part of a program which leads to an associate degree?	n/a

Student Achievement Data

#	Question	Answer									
14a.	What is your Institution-set standard for successful student course completion?	73.7%									
14b.	Successful student course completion rate for the fall 2015 semester:	73.5%									
15.	<p>Institution Set Standards for program completion: While institutions may determine the measures for which they will set standards, most institutions will utilize this measure as it is core to their mission. For purposes of definition, certificates include those certificate programs which qualify for financial aid, principally those which lead to gainful employment. Completion of degrees and certificates is to be presented in terms of total numbers. Each student who receives one or more certificates or degrees in the specified year may be counted once.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>a.</td> <td>If you have an institution-set standard for student completion of degrees and certificates combined, per year, what is it?</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b.</td> <td>If you have separate institution-set standards for degrees, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of degrees, per year?</td> <td>1199</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c.</td> <td>If you have separate institution-set standards for certificates, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of certificates, per year?</td> <td>1036</td> </tr> </table>		a.	If you have an institution-set standard for student completion of degrees and certificates combined, per year, what is it?	N/A	b.	If you have separate institution-set standards for degrees, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of degrees, per year?	1199	c.	If you have separate institution-set standards for certificates, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of certificates, per year?	1036
a.	If you have an institution-set standard for student completion of degrees and certificates combined, per year, what is it?	N/A									
b.	If you have separate institution-set standards for degrees, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of degrees, per year?	1199									
c.	If you have separate institution-set standards for certificates, what is your institution-set standard for the number of student completion of certificates, per year?	1036									
16a.	Number of students (unduplicated) who received a certificate or degree in the 2014-2015 academic year:	2,108									
16b.	Number of students who received a degree in the 2014-2015 academic year:	1,510									
16c.	Number of students who received a certificate in the 2014-2015 academic year:	1,215									
17a.	If your college has an institution-set standard for the number of students who transfer each year to 4-year	1,437									

	colleges/universities, what is it?											
17b.	Number of students who transferred to 4-year colleges/universities in 2014-2015:	1,514										
18a.	Does the college have any certificate programs which are not career-technical education (CTE) certificates?	Yes										
18b.	If yes, please identify them:	BI-MARSCI-C Marine Science-C BI-NATHIS-C Natural History-C CS-COMPSC-C Computer Science-C (Transfer) EN-CRWRGE-C Creative Writing-Gen Emph-C EN-CRWRPR-C Creative Writing-Prof Emph-C GL-GLOBST-C Global Studies-C HN-HHHUMN-C Highest Honor-Hum/Social Sci-C HN-HHSCIE-C Highest Honors-Sciences/Math-C HN-HON-SCI-C Honors-Sciences/Mathematics-C HN-HONHUM-C Honors-Humanities/Social Sci-C LS-CSUGEB-C CSU GE Breadth Transfer-C LS-IGETC-C IGETC Transfer-C NC-ESLLV3-CC ESL Intermediate Low NC-ESLLV4-CC ESL Intermediate High										
19a.	Number of career-technical education (CTE) certificates and degrees:	207										
19b.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees which have identified technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards and other standards, including those for licensure and certification:	207										
19c.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees for which the institution has set a standard for licensure passage rates:	15										
19d.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees for which the institution has set a standard for graduate employment rates:	11										
20.	2013-2014 examination pass rates in programs for which students must pass a licensure examination in order to work in their field of study:											
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Program</th> <th>CIP</th> <th>Examination</th> <th>Institution</th> <th>Pass</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Program	CIP	Examination	Institution	Pass						
Program	CIP	Examination	Institution	Pass								

	Code 4 digits (##.##)		set standard (%)	Rate (%)
Alcohol and Drug Counseling	51.15	state	80 %	80 %
Associate Degree Nursing	51.16	national	90 %	100 %
Certified Nursing Assistant	51.16	national	90 %	97 %
Cosmetology: Practical	12.04	state	85 %	100 %
Cosmetology: Written	12.04	state	65 %	88 %
Esthetician: Practical	12.04	state	90 %	100 %
Esthetician: Written	12.04	state	90 %	100 %
Emergency Medical Technician	51.09	national	75 %	82 %
Health Information Technology	51.07	national	90 %	90 %
Radiography	51.09	national	90 %	97 %
Vocational Nursing	51.16	national	90 %	97 %

2013-2014 job placement rates for students completing certificate programs and CTE (career-technology education) degrees:

Program	CIP Code 4 digits (##.##)	Institution set standard (%)	Job Placement Rate (%)
Administration of Justice	22.9999	75 %	100 %
Business Administration	52.0101	75 %	100 %
Child Development/Early Care and Education	13.1210	90 %	100 %
Culinary Arts/School of Culinary Arts and Hospitality Mgmt	12.0500	84 %	100 %
Diving and Underwater Safety/Marine Diving Technology	49.0304	80 %	100 %
Health Information Coding/Health Information Systems	51.07078	90 %	88 %
Licensed Vocational Nursing	51.1613	90 %	100 %
Multimedia Technologies	50.0706	80 %	100 %
Radiologic Technology	51.0911	92 %	100 %

Please list any other institution set standards at your college:

Criteria Measured (i.e. persistence, starting salary, etc.)	Definition	Institution set standard
Completion of Degree, Certificate or Transfer	Percentage of degree, certificate and/or transfer-seeking students tracked for six years who completed a degree, certificate or transfer-related outcomes	63%
Persistence	Percentage of degree, certificate and/or transfer-seeking students tracked for six years who enrolled in the first three	71.7%

		consecutive terms	
	Completion of 30 Units	Percentage of degree, certificate and/or transfer-seeking students tracked for six years who achieved at least 30 units	70%
	Career Technical Education	Percentage of students tracked for six years who completed more than eight units in courses classified as career technical education (or vocational) in a single discipline and completed a degree, certificate or transferred	55.4%
	Remedial Math	Percentage of credit students tracked for six years who started below transfer level in mathematics and completed a college-level course in the same discipline	42%
	Remedial English	Percentage of credit students tracked for six years who started below transfer level in English and completed a college-level course in the same discipline	53.3%
	Remedial ESL	Percentage of credit students tracked for six years who started below transfer level in ESL and completed a college-level course in the same discipline	17.7%
23.	<p>Effective practice to share with the field: Describe examples of effective and/or innovative practices at your college for setting institution-set standards, evaluating college or programmatic performance related to student achievement, and changes that have happened in response to analyzing college or program performance (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).</p> <p>We have two active committees whose charters focus on evaluating program performance and student achievement: the Program Evaluation Committee (PEC) and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC). The PEC is charged with creating a rubric for the evaluation of programs and their effectiveness in terms of student outcomes and achievement, and also with evaluating and improving the program review process itself. Three examples of change resulting from this analysis are (1) the move to a 3-year cycle of detailed readings and evaluation of program review submissions; (2) improvements in the prompts in the program review templates; (3) making data more readily available. The IEC focuses on analyzing student outcome and achievement data, prioritizes research projects, makes recommendations to the College Planning Council (CPC) based on these analyses, and fosters institution-wide dialog and ongoing assessment of the institution's effectiveness in support of student learning. In addition, the IEC is responsible for monitoring and reporting progress on the Educational Master Plan. A recent improvement arising out of the IEC is the consolidation and codification of the college's institution-set standards.</p>		

Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

Note: Colleges were expected to achieve the proficiency level of Student Learning Outcomes assessment by fall 2012. At this time, colleges are expected to be in full compliance with the Accreditation Standards related to student learning outcomes and assessment. All courses, programs, and student and learning support activities of the college are expected to have student learning outcomes defined, so that ongoing assessment and other requirements of Accreditation Standards are met across the institution. In preparation for the 2016 reporting, please refer to the revised Accreditation Standards adopted June 2014.

#	Question	Answer
---	----------	--------

24.	Courses	
	a.	Total number of college courses: 1268
	b.	Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes 1268
	Auto-calculated field: percentage of total: 100	
25.	Courses	
	a.	Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs as defined by college): 78
	b.	Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes 78
	Auto-calculated field: percentage of total: 100	
26.	Courses	
	a.	Total number of student and learning support activities (as college has identified or grouped them for SLO implementation): 23
	b.	Number of student and learning support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 23
	Auto-calculated field: percentage of total: 100	
27.	URL(s) from the college website where prospective students can find SLO assessment results for instructional programs:	http://www.sbccc.edu/prospective/PSLO_Assessment_Results.pdf
28.	Number of courses identified as part of the general education (GE) program:	507
29.	Percent of GE courses with ongoing assessment of GE learning outcomes:	100%
30.	Do your institution's GE outcomes include all areas identified in the Accreditation Standards?	Yes
31.	Number of GE courses with Student Learning Outcomes mapped to GE <i>program Student Learning Outcomes</i> :	507
32.	Number of	6

	Institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined:	
33.	Percentage of college instructional programs and student and learning support activities which have Institutional Student Learning Outcomes mapped to those programs (courses) and activities (student and learning support activities).	100%
34.	Percent of institutional outcomes (ILOs) with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes:	100%
35.	<p>Effective practice to share with the field: Describe effective and/or innovative practices at your college for measuring ILOs, documenting accomplishment of ILOs in non-instructional areas of the college, informing college faculty, staff, students, and the public about ILOs, or other aspects of your ILO practice (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).</p> <p>We use course-based assessment, mapping CSLOs to ISLOs. As our ILO scores are close to grade distributions, we wanted more information and insight. During the 2014 winter intersession we established a workgroup to use ISLO data to inform changes in teaching and learning across disciplines. They made a series of recommendations and handed off the project to the Committee on Teaching and Learning. After Spring and Summer planning, CTL developed two Fall 2014 pilots, both designed as Faculty Inquiry Groups (FIGs). The first, "Make Waves," was dedicated to promoting our 6th ISLO (VI. Personal, Academic, and Career Development) across campus and in the community. The second used AAC&U Value Rubrics to measure student (critical thinking) assignments and in class surveys of students asking them to assess their and college's achievement SBCC's ISLOs. Each participant focused on one ISLO with its subordinated competencies. Most selected ISLO 1 ((I. Critical Thinking. Problem Solving, Creative Thinking). They produced final reports summarizing survey results and discussing the recommendations for faculty and student coming out of their work regarding learning priorities. They presented their results at Spring 2015 In Service and invited those in attendance to continue the work Spring semester 2015.</p>	
<p>Each of the following narrative responses is limited to 250 words. As you develop your responses, please be mindful of success stories that can be reported in the last question of this section. We look forward to including this information from colleges in our report to the Commission and the field in June.</p>		
36.	<p>Please discuss alignment of student learning outcomes at your institution, from institutional and course to program level. Describe your activities beyond crosswalking or charting all outcomes to courses in a program (often called "mapping"), to analysis and implementation of alignment in the planning of curriculum and delivery of instruction. Discuss how the alignment effort has resulted in changes of expected outcomes and/or how students' programs of study have been clarified. Note whether the described practices apply to all instructional programs at the college (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).</p>	

Alignment is built into the mapping process. Beyond mapping we have undertaken the project described in #35 above. In establishing CSLOs we achieved alignment, sequence, progression within department offerings. The dialogue associated with such decisions was among the most productive and inclusive we have had. It has affected curriculum, measurement, matriculation. The extended dialogue into which we have recently entered draws together many innovative initiatives designed to help students achieve a greater command of the academic skills needed for transfer and success in the workplace. Our intent is to change the way these skills are taught and reinforced across all disciplines and services. We are working to revise our ISLOs so that they will be more readily understood by students. We are expanding their number so that we are more inclusive of civic and ethical outcomes. The dialog about and effort to be more inclusive, to achieve equity, involves faculty, students, staff, counselors, and administration. We will be devoting the next two years to the process of integrating the teaching of these essential skills to engage all students in all classes, in all counseling sessions, in all tutorial and other interactions between students and SBCC personnel to promote their achievement.

Describe the various communication strategies at your college to share SLO assessment results for usage by internal and external audiences. Explain how communications take into account how the information is expected to influence the behavior or decisions of particular audiences. Discuss how communication of student learning outcomes assessment information and results impacts student behavior and achievement (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).

37.

CSLOs are listed in all syllabi and CORs. They are discussed the first day of class, revisited during the course of instruction and focused on again at the end of the course. We have piloted the same for select ISLOs (see 35) and plan to continue expanding this process. CSLOs are assessed on a regular basis by faculty. Proposed changes are included in each CIP. We have a web site devoted to SLOs (slo.sbccc.edu) and coordinate eLumen and Curricunet SLO databases to assure that each is current and accurate. All submissions are reviewed and revised when necessary. No formal studies have been completed, to our knowledge, that have determined the impact SLOs per se have on behavior or achievement. It is clear at SBCC, however, that the discussion of SLOs and ISLOs is valuable in that it clarifies to students the promise of the course and the college's instructional impact on their preparation and future prospects. The uses of rubrics and other learning-centered methods inherent in the SLO movement have shown our commitment to active learning and student success. This commitment is communicated to our students in the many interactions and the feedback we provide. Their success is our highest priority. SLOs give us the opportunity to discuss and demonstrate that commitment.

Explain how dialog and reporting of SLO assessment results takes place at the departmental and institutional levels. Note whether practices involve all programs at the college. Illustrate how dialog and reporting impact program review, institutional planning, resource allocation, and institutional effectiveness (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).

38.

SLO cycle is aligned with 3-year Program Review cycle. Assessment of PSLO achievement is integrated into Program Review. We use CSLO scores and faculty comments assessing students' greatest needs– the causes of difficulties in the areas where they do not make as much progress as expected– and proposed solutions for better ways to get students past certain obstacles. Results are used during department discussions to inform Course Improvement Plans (CIPs) for each class. New CIPs are written at minimum every 3 years. Data and comments are collected in all classes from faculty regularly during that 3-year period, which fuel the dialog and shape the changes made each cycle in instruction and in curriculum. At the institutional level, the senate and administration are in constant dialog about ISLO achievement, about improving process, and collecting meaningful information. The college

	<p>created an Institutional Effectiveness Committee to facilitate dialogue, collect and use data, and make recommendations for resource allocation. SBCC has also established the SLO Coordinating Committee and an attendant workgroup to oversee SLO informed budgeting and curriculum development. The EVP chairs this committee and is directly involved in planning, assessment, and resource allocation, insuring administrative commitment to this process.</p>
39.	<p>Please share with us two or three success stories about the impacts of SLO practices on student learning, achievement, and institutional effectiveness. Describe the practices which led to the success (1,250 character limit, approximately 250 words).</p> <p>Dialog is the great value of the SLO process. ESL faculty, for example, met to discuss standards and progression across their 5 levels because of the SLO process. Before their coming together to write CSLOs, ESL teachers taught their sections without formally discussing standards or expectations. In developing CSLOs, they compared expectations and exit standards and discovered that some at lower levels were asking more of their students than those at higher levels, that some proposed SLOs were the same as those proposed two levels above their classes. The SLO dialog changed their curriculum, sequencing of instruction, and standards for each level. They also shared techniques, methodologies, and materials, which resulted in a much stronger program, more carefully scaffolded to help students achieve their goals. The continuous discussion of CIPs has led across all disciplines to ambitious restructuring of subject areas, integration of skills instruction across subjects, and demonstrates the desire of faculty to constantly improve instruction. The college has recently integrated Continuing Education into Educational Programs, which resulted in the development and aligning of robust CSLOs and PSLOs. The same constructive, program building results have been achieved by Non-Credit programs in ESL, Short Term Vocational and GED/HS.</p>

Substantive Change Items

NOTE: These questions are for monitoring purposes only and do not replace the ACCJC substantive change approval process. Please refer to the Substantive Change Manual regarding communication with the Commission.

#	Question	Answer
40.	Number of submitted substantive change requests:	2014-2015: 1 2013-2014: 0 2012-2013: 0
41a.	Is the institution anticipating a proposal for a substantive change in any of the following change categories? (Check all that apply)	Delivery mode (Distance Education or Correspondence Education)
41b.	Explain the change(s) for which you will be submitting a substantive change proposal:	An increase in the number of degrees and certificates that can be completed fully online.

Other Information

#	Question	Answer
42a.	Identify site additions and deletions since the submission of the 2015 Annual Report:	N/A

42b.	List all instructional sites other than the home campus where 50% or more of a program, certificate, or degree is offered:	N/A
43.	List all of the institutions instructional sites out of state and outside the United States:	N/A

The data included in this report are certified as a complete and accurate representation of the reporting institution.

If you need additional assistance, please contact the commission.

Sincerely,

ACCJC
10 Commercial Blvd., Suite 204
Novato, CA 94949
email: support@accjc.org
phone: 415-506-0234