

NOCE FACULTY SLO ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

A summary showcasing how faculty collaboration, training, and system improvements have advanced the consistent reporting of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).

FALL 2024 – SPRING 2025

Prepared by: SLO Leadership Team in collaboration with the Office of Institutional Research & Planning

Date: September 2025

FACULTY SLO ENGAGEMENT

FALL 2024 – SPRING 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NOCE FACULTY SLO ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY	1
<i>A SUMMARY SHOWCASING HOW FACULTY COLLABORATION, TRAINING, AND SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS HAVE ADVANCED THE CONSISTENT REPORTING OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLOs).....</i>	<i>1</i>
FALL 2024 – SPRING 2025	1
FACULTY SLO ENGAGEMENT	2
INTRODUCTION	3
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND COLLABORATION	3
PROGRESS THROUGH CHALLENGES	4
FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN REPORTING SUMMARY	5
APPENDICES	6
<i>Data Tools for Faculty.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Table A1. CRNs with SLO Assessment Activity by Program</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Table A2. CRNs with SLO Assessment by Modality.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Table A3. Student Assessments Input to the Canvas Learning Mastery Gradebook (LMG) by Program</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Table A4. Distribution of Fall 2024 SLO Outcomes entered into the LMG by Program and Score.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Table A5. Distribution of Spring 2025 SLO Outcomes entered into the LMG Program and Score.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Table A6. Distribution of Fall 2024 Assessment Activity input by Faculty showing Student Registration Status</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Table A7. Distribution of Spring 2025 Assessment Activity by Student Registration Status.....</i>	<i>9</i>
CONCLUSION	10

INTRODUCTION

This Faculty SLO Engagement Report provides an overview of how faculty across NOCE have advanced Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) reporting during the 2024/25 academic year. The report highlights faculty collaboration, professional development, and system improvements that have strengthened assessment practices. It documents both the progress made, such as, increasing faculty participation in data reporting the work already being done within the classroom along with ensuring that all Course Outlines of Record (CORs) now include SLOs, and the challenges addressed along the way.

The pages that follow summarize training and support activities, describe how technical barriers were resolved, and present participation data. Appendices include detailed tables to support program-level reflection, leaving space for faculty notes and discussion. Together, this report is intended as a tool for faculty to review our collective progress and identify next steps toward full participation in SLO assessment.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND COLLABORATION

Faculty engagement in professional development was consistent across terms. In Fall 2023, thirty-four faculty participated in a training focused on inputting results into the Learning Mastery Gradebook. In Fall 2024, thirty-six faculty attended a hi-flex training on Canvas alignment. The following spring, seventy faculty joined a hi-flex workshop, with an additional six participating in a targeted follow-up session.

Faculty also accessed ongoing supports. Office hours, held three times weekly, drew three to four faculty participants each month, with attendance increasing at the 9-, 16-, and 18-week points when courses concluded. Faculty leads expanded participation by facilitating department-level discussions, reviewing courses missing SLO data, and integrating SLO conversations into onboarding. ESL faculty embedded SLO input into new faculty orientations, while CTE faculty cross-checked course schedules against SLO listings to ensure accuracy.

Cross-departmental collaboration reinforced these efforts. Professional Development partnered with SLO leads to hosting Flex workshops, which became a key point of entry for

most SLO data input. Institutional Research engaged early in the cycle to support faculty reflection on results and help design ways to show growth. IT worked side by side with faculty to improve reporting processes, address missing or duplicate course listings, and ensure accurate imports into Canvas. These combined efforts demonstrate the breadth of collaboration across programs and departments in strengthening SLO assessment practices.

Faculty Training and Support Activities, 2023–2025

Term	Training / Activity	Attendance / Participation	Notes
Fall 2023	Faculty training on entering results in LMG	34 faculty	Focused on building comfort with Canvas input
Fall 2024	Hi-flex training on Canvas alignment	36 faculty	Included walkthrough of importing SLOs
Spring 2025	Hi-flex workshop	70 faculty	Main event where most SLO data was entered
Spring 2025	Targeted follow-up session	6 faculty	For faculty needing additional support
2024–25 Throughout	Weekly office hours (3x/week)	3–4 faculty/month	Participation spiked at 9-, 16-, and 18-week marks
2024–25 Throughout	Department meetings & onboarding (via faculty leads)	Varies by program	ESL onboarding included SLO input; CTE verified course-SLO alignment; LEAP provided workshops

PROGRESS THROUGH CHALLENGES

When this cycle began, faculty were entering SLOs in eLumen, a legacy system that had become unreliable. While CurricUNET remained the official source for CORs and SLOs, the reporting process through eLumen created errors such as duplicates, inactive listings, or missing outcomes.

We needed a process that would limit the need to log into another system and would be able to withstand the test of time longer than our previous systems. Working closely with IT, the curriculum coordinator and SLO leadership team collaborated to develop a sustainable process for importing these SLOs directly into Canvas. Because Canvas was already widely used by faculty, this shift allowed the Learning Mastery Gradebook to become the official tool for entering and tracking SLO assessment results each term.

Faculty and IT partnered through biweekly meetings to resolve issues during the transition. For example, ENTR 115 had duplicate active course entries, ELET 210 had no active SLO listing, and courses such as IHST 777, CC 215, CC 415, ESLA 777, and LEAP 777 required corrections before data could be imported. Together, faculty and IT inactivated duplicates, reactivated missing courses, or added new SLOs to ensure each course had a functional record. Institutional Research engaged early in the process to help faculty interpret results and identify how to document growth. Faculty leads and the SLO Coordinator followed up after each term to flag courses missing data, provide coaching, and support colleagues in completing entries. Through these coordinated efforts something we weren't focusing on but ended up a positive outcome, CurricUNET now reflects a cleaner set of records, Canvas imports run more smoothly, and accurate SLOs are in Canvas a tool faculty are familiar with and thus faculty participation has increased. The results are clear in the data: participation in entering SLO results rose from Fall 2024 to Spring 2025.

FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN REPORTING SUMMARY

Building on this foundation, faculty participation in entering SLO results has been documented across terms. The table below summarizes faculty data input participation across terms and highlights the momentum toward full faculty engagement.

Term	Courses Offered	Faculty (Total)	Faculty Participating	Participation Rate
Fall 2024	843	223	105	47.1%
Spring 2025	771	233	134	57.5%

Faculty participation increased from 47 percent in Fall 2024 to nearly 58 percent in Spring 2025. This upward trend demonstrates steady progress, supported by workshops, office hours, and department-level coaching.

APPENDICES

Data Tools for Faculty

The following tables summarize SLO activity across Fall 2024 and Spring 2025. These are provided for reflection and discussion at the program level. Space is left beneath each for faculty notes.

When reviewing them, you may ask:

1. What stands out to you?
2. What do you notice about your program?
3. What additional support would help us improve?

Table A1. CRNs with SLO Assessment Activity by Program
(from *SLO Report Table 1*)

Program	Fall 2024 CRNs w/ Activity	Fall 2024 Active CRNs	Fall 2024 %	Spring 2025 CRNs w/ Activity	Spring 2025 Active CRNs	Spring 2025 %
BSP	39	104	38%	43	116	37%
CTE	92	220	42%	146	234	62%
DSS	39	49	80%	49	52	94%
ESL	81	155	52%	102	178	57%
LEAP	85	225	38%	105	239	44%
Total	336	753	45%	445	819	54%

Table A2. CRNs with SLO Assessment by Modality
(from IR Report Table 2)

Modality	Fall 2024 CRNs w/ SLOs	Fall 2024 Active CRNs	Fall 2024 %	Spring 2025 CRNs w/ SLOs	Spring 2025 Active CRNs	Spring 2025 %
Fully Asynchronous Online	83	159	52%	93	155	60%
Fully In-Person	202	501	40%	292	572	51%
Fully Synchronous Online	9	21	43%	12	20	60%
Hybrid (In-Person + Online)	11	27	41%	14	26	54%
Hybrid (Sync + Async)	27	39	69%	32	43	75%
Unable to Determine Coding	4	6	67%	2	3	67%
Total	336	753	45%	445	819	54%

Many assessments were recorded as “Score 0.” This designation means the outcome was aligned to an assignment, but the student did not demonstrate the outcome. In practice, this could mean the student did not submit work, failed to meet criteria, or was assessed as not showing evidence of mastery. It is distinct from a blank score, which usually indicates no data entry. These results are included here to support transparency, but faculty discussion is encouraged to determine when Score 0 best reflects student learning versus other course factors.

Table A3. Student Assessments Input to the Canvas Learning Mastery Gradebook (LMG) by Program

(from IR Report Table 3)

Program	Fall 2024	Spring 2025
BSP	3,441	2,929
CTE	4,419	7,978
DSS	1,210	6,992
ESL	4,433	7,283
LEAP	2,024	5,015
Total	15,527	30,197

Table A4. Distribution of Fall 2024 SLO Outcomes entered into the LMG by Program and Score

Program	Score 0	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Blank	Total
BSP	2,400	62	39	192	742	6	3,441
CTE	632	111	419	1,420	1,812	25	4,419
DSS	59	119	100	444	486	2	1,210
ESL	1,088	241	609	1,166	1,315	14	4,433
LEAP	150	65	154	512	1,043	100	2,024
Total	4,329	598	1,321	3,734	5,398	147	15,527

Table A5. Distribution of Spring 2025 SLO Outcomes entered into the LMG Program and Score

Program	Score 0	Score 1	Score 2	Score 3	Score 4	Blank	Total
BSP	1,435	75	113	373	815	118	2,929
CTE	1,043	364	419	2,495	3,558	99	7,978
DSS	163	155	584	4,806	1,272	12	6,992
ESL	1,633	391	765	1,975	2,481	30	7,283
LEAP	347	159	732	1,654	2,051	72	5,015
Total	4,621	1,144	2,613	11,303	10,177	331	30,197

Table A6. Distribution of Fall 2024 Assessment Activity input by Faculty showing Student Registration Status

Program	Dropped	No Shows	Registered	Waitlist	Withdrawn	Total
BSP	126	127	3,142	29	0	3,424
CTE	530	126	3,498	232	1	4,387
DSS	69	6	1,082	41	0	1,198
ESL	517	251	3,563	85	0	4,416
LEAP	52	44	1,921	4	1	2,022
Total	1,294	554	13,206	391	2	15,447

Mastery levels sometimes appear for students coded as “Dropped,” “No Show,” “Waitlist,” or “Withdrawn” in Banner. This occurs because NOCE operates on an open-entry/open-exit model, where students may engage in coursework before or after their registration status changes. These results are included here for transparency. Future work will focus on clarifying whether assessments for students not marked as “Registered” should be included in official reporting.

Table A7. Distribution of Spring 2025 Assessment Activity by Student Registration Status

Program	Dropped	No Shows	Registered	Waitlist	Withdrawn	Total
BSP	141	134	2,594	52	0	2,921
CTE	955	340	6,053	569	30	7,947
DSS	543	145	6,078	212	0	6,978
ESL	780	456	5,928	89	4	7,257
LEAP	167	148	4,666	30	2	5,013
Total	2,586	1,223	25,319	952	36	30,116

Blank scores appear when an SLO was aligned but no score was entered in Canvas. This typically indicates missing data entry rather than student performance. Blank scores are included here for transparency but should not be interpreted as evidence of student learning.

CONCLUSION

This report reflects the collective effort of faculty across programs to strengthen SLO assessment. Faculty engagement, collaboration, and persistence made it possible to establish a more consistent and transparent process using Canvas as the shared platform. We recognize that assessment is occurring in classrooms across NOCE; what this report captures is the data that faculty entered into the Canvas Learning Mastery Gradebook. Our next step is to ensure that the full scope of assessment is represented, not only what is tracked through this input tool. When data can be viewed at the course level, it will provide a more complete and meaningful picture of teaching and learning. This progress reflects the persistence and leadership of faculty, and the work ahead will continue to be faculty-driven.