



Midterm Report

Submitted by

College of the Canyons
26455 Rockwell Canyons Rd. Santa Clarita, CA 91355

to

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

December 2025


Certification

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

From: Acting Interim Superintendent/President, Dr. Jasmine Ruys
College of the Canyons
26455 Rockwell Canyons Rd. Santa Clarita, CA 91355

This Midterm Report is submitted to the ACCJC for the purposes of 1) highlighting recent improvements or innovations and 2) providing an update on institutional performance with regard to student outcomes since the last comprehensive peer review. The Midterm Report reflects the nature and substance of this institution, as well as its best efforts to align with ACCJC Standards and policies, and was developed with appropriate participation and review by the campus community.

Signatures:



Dr. Jasmine Ruys, Acting Interim Superintendent/President

Nov 25, 2025



Sharlene Johnson (Nov 25, 2025 14:46:22 PST)

Ms. Sharlene Johnson, Board of Trustees President

Nov 25, 2025



Thea Alvarado (Nov 13, 2025 08:52:37 PST)

Dr. Thea Alvarado, ALO

November 12, 2025



Ms. Lisa Hooper, Academic Senate President

Nov 17, 2025



Mr. Michael Monsour, Classified Senate President

Nov 17, 2025



Amna Fadel (Nov 25, 2025 08:29:25 PST)

Ms. Amna Fadel, Associated Student Government President

Nov 25, 2025

Contents

A. Reflections on Continuous Improvement Since Last Comprehensive Review	4
B. Reflections on Institution-Set Standards and Other Metrics of Student Achievement.....	5
C. Reflections on Assessments of Student Learning.....	11
D. Looking Ahead to the Next Self-Evaluation and Comprehensive Review	19

A. Reflections on Continuous Improvement Since Last Comprehensive Review

- 1. Briefly describe major improvements or innovations since the time of the last comprehensive peer review, focusing on areas where your institution is excelling or showing significant improvement with regard to equitable student outcomes, educational quality, and/or mission fulfillment.**

Since the last comprehensive peer review, the institution has made notable strides in equity, educational quality, and mission fulfillment. Progress in Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) assessment includes expanded individualized training, new program review prompts, and a streamlined ISLO mapping process. A collaborative mapping system now supports curriculum development and has impacted over 200 courses. The Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) process has been overhauled for equity and student success, with a new CPL Advisory Committee, adoption of the statewide Mapping Articulated Pathways (MAP) platform, and revised administrative procedures aligning with Vision 2030.

Support services have expanded significantly. Tutoring for Rising Scholars now includes in-person help at correctional facilities. The Basic Needs Center (BaNC) has enhanced offerings by adding a Housing Navigator and case manager, launching financial literacy workshops, and introducing a mobile laundry truck. Partnerships with local businesses are also reducing food waste. Mental health services have grown through the Student Health and Wellness Center, with more therapy staff, targeted LGBTQ+ support, wellness workshops, and improved opioid prevention efforts. These developments underscore the institution's ongoing dedication to student success, equity, and continuous improvement.

- 2. Briefly describe actions taken in response to any recommendations for improving institutional effectiveness or feedback noted in the Peer Review Team Report for the last comprehensive peer review.**

Recommendation to Improve Quality: In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the Governing Board and College expedite its assessment and review of Board Policies and Administrative Procedures and continue to ensure that timely actions are taken on policies and procedures. (IV.A.5, IV.C.7)

The College continues to utilize a comprehensive shared governance approach to the assessment and review of District Board Policies and Administrative Procedures. Updates to Policies and Procedures are a complex task ensuring they align with legal requirements at the federal, state and local level, reflect local processes, and are properly vetted through the shared governance process. College Policy Council (CPC) comprised of representatives from the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Administration, and the Associated Student Government track meet regularly throughout the year to review and recommend new and revised Policies and Procedures that are developed through an established process documented in the recently adopted Operating Procedures for CPC. Since the Peer Review team visit in March of 2022, 243 Board Policies and Administrative Procedures have been reviewed endorsed by CPC, 109 of which were Policies that were then reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees.

Despite numerous executive-level leadership changes since late 2024, including a change in presidential leadership, the College Policy Committee (CPC) has successfully updated many board policies and administrative procedures. During and after the leadership transition, the CPC met several times in fall 2024

and spring 2025. During the last four meetings, the CPC reviewed, updated, and endorsed 28 Board Policies, and 33 Administrative Procedures. The Board of Trustees has either fully approved or is scheduled to approve these policies before the end of the academic year. Updating policies and procedures is a considerable undertaking, as it ensures these policies meet the legal requirements, reflect our local processes, and are properly vetted through the collegial consultation process. Many deserve recognition for their hard work to address this Standard, including the College Policy Council, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Associated Student Government, and Executive Cabinet this past year, and for the Board of Trustees' thoughtful review and feedback on the policies and procedures that come before them for approval.

3. How are the actions described above helping your institution deepen its practices for continuous improvement and transformation in relation to the 2024 Accreditation Standards?

Since the last review, College of the Canyons has advanced its continuous improvement practices in alignment with the 2024 Accreditation Standards. A key development is the use of disaggregated Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) data by course modality. Achieved through a year-long, cross-departmental effort, this new capability enables analysis across seven instructional formats, supporting data-informed decision-making and aligning with Standard II.A.16.

Improvements to Administrative Procedure 4235 and the Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) process—particularly through collaboration with the Mapping Articulated Pathways (MAP) system—have increased transparency, equity, and faculty alignment, reinforcing standards of academic integrity and accessibility. The College has also expanded tutoring for Rising Scholars at correctional facilities, promoting equitable academic support in accordance with Standard II.C.7. Additionally, Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUOs) and student surveys help refine services based on real-time feedback. This student-centered, data-driven approach ensures that support offerings evolve with community needs and available resources. Collectively, these initiatives underscore a strategic and ongoing commitment to innovation, equity, and responsive transformation in fulfilling accreditation expectations.

B. Reflections on Institution-Set Standards and Other Metrics of Student Achievement

1. Review the most recent ACCJC Annual Report and other meaningful metrics of student achievement. Has the institution met its floor standards? Exceeded its stretch goals? Describe any patterns or trends you see in performance against your institution-set standards and other metrics of student achievement.

Understanding the history behind the College's institution-set standards is important. At the time the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) began requiring the inclusion of institution-set standards in the annual survey, it was unclear that both a "floor" and a "stretch" goal needed to be established. College of the Canyons interpreted this requirement as setting a "stretch" goal, thus not establishing a "floor."

During the annual planning and review process in fall 2023, College of the Canyons engaged the campus community through the College Planning Team, Institutional Effectiveness & Inclusive Excellence Committee, Accreditation Taskforce, and Academic Senate. This collaborative effort aimed to review the college's stretch goals and establish meaningful and informed "floor" goals. Consequently, the establishment of a "floor" and the revision of the "stretch" goals should be viewed within the context of this recent update.

Overall, the college is performing slightly below but within an acceptable range of its metrics for course completion, certificate and degree attainment, and transfer rates, as measured by the 2023-24 actuals. There

is an opportunity to increase the number of students completing certificates and degrees, as indicated by the college's stretch goals and even revisit the metrics using a percentage of the college's headcount or full-time equivalent students instead of actuals. The largest gap between the actuals achieved and stretch goals is in transfers to four-year institutions. This presents an opportunity for the college to reflect on and identify intentional efforts in the upcoming academic year to support students interested in transferring. However, it is important to monitor changes in acceptance rates at the top transfer institutions for our students.

The ACCJC institution-set standards are reflected on at the department and program level through the college's annual program planning and review process, which is supported by data visualizations that allow users to disaggregate data by division/school, department and course and further disaggregate by student demographics, course offering modality, course location (e.g., college campus locations and online) and course length (full vs. short-term in primary terms). Reflection on these data are captured in program review prompts developed in partnership with the Committee for Assessing Student Learning, Program Review Committee and Instructional team.

Table 1. College of the Canyons: Institution Set Standards, Goals vs. Actuals:

Course Completion Rates*	Set Standard	Stretch Goal	Actual	Actual vs. Standard	Actual vs. Stretch
2020-2021	78.00%	78.00%	75.00%	-3.8%	-3.8%
2021-2022	78.00%	78.00%	74.00%	-5.1%	-5.1%
2022-2023	78.00%	78.00%	75.00%	-3.8%	-3.8%
2023-2024	79.00%	80.00%	75.00%	-5.1%	-6.3%
Certificates	Set Standard	Stretch Goal	Actual	Actual vs. Standard	Actual vs. Stretch
2020-2021	1246	1246	1683	437	437
2021-2022	1246	1246	1769	523	523
2022-2023	1246	1246	1456	210	210
2023-2024	1500	1600	1363	-137	-237
Associates Degree (A.A/A.S.)	Set Standard	Stretch Goal	Actual	Actual vs. Standard	Actual vs. Stretch
2020-2021	1821	2629	2104	283	-525
2021-2022	1821	2629	2267	446	-362
2022-2023	1821	2629	2028	207	-601
2023-2024	2000	2300	1927	-73	-373
Transfer	Set Standard	Stretch Goal	Actual	Actual vs. Standard	Actual vs. Stretch
2020-2021	1372	1372	2237	865	865
2021-2022	1372	1372	2191	819	819
2022-2023	1372	1372	2347	975	975
2023-2024	2300	2300	2345	45	45
Licensure Exam: Program RN Pass Rate*	Set Standard	Stretch Goal	Actual	Actual vs. Standard	Actual vs. Stretch
2020-2021	85.00%	85.00%	90.30%	5.3%	5.3%
2021-2022	85.00%	85.00%	96.20%	11.2%	11.2%
2022-2023	85.00%	85.00%	85.42%	0.4%	0.4%
2023-2024	90.00%	95.00%	96.52%	6.5%	1.5%
Licensure Exam: Program MLT Pass Rate*	Set Standard	Stretch Goal	Actual	Actual vs. Standard	Actual vs. Stretch
2020-2021	75.00%	75.00%	95.00%	20.0%	20.0%

2021-2022	75.00%	75.00%	96.00%	21.0%	21.0%
2022-2023	75.00%	75.00%	97.50%	22.5%	22.5%
2023-2024	90.00%	97.00%	91.00%	1.0%	-6.0%
Licensure Exam: Program EMT Pass Rate	Set Standard	Stretch Goal	Actual	Actual vs. Standard	Actual vs. Stretch
2020-2021	70.00%	70.00%	95.00%	25.0%	25.0%
2021-2022	70.00%	70.00%	96.00%	26.0%	26.0%
2022-2023	70.00%	70.00%	97.50%	27.5%	27.5%
2023-2024	85.00%	95.00%	96.25%	11.3%	1.3%
Job Placement: Program RN	Set Standard	Stretch Goal	Actual	Actual vs. Standard	Actual vs. Stretch
2020-2021	50.00%	50.00%	83.00%	33.0%	33.0%
2021-2022	50.00%	50.00%	53.00%	3.0%	3.0%
2022-2023	50.00%	50.00%	76.00%	26.0%	26.0%
2023-2024	65.00%	75.00%	86.00%	21.0%	11.0%
Job Placement: Program MLT	Set Standard	Stretch Goal	Actual	Actual vs. Standard	Actual vs. Stretch
2020-2021	70.00%	70.00%	83.00%	13.0%	13.0%
2021-2022	70.00%	70.00%	53.00%	-17.0%	-17.0%
2022-2023	70.00%	70.00%	76.00%	6.0%	6.0%
2023-2024	70.00%	90.00%	85.00%	15.0%	-5.0%

2. When you disaggregate the data for the institution-set standards and other meaningful metrics of student achievement, what do you see related to equitable student achievement outcomes (i.e., equity gaps)? What patterns or trends excite you? What patterns or trends concern you?

One of the exciting data points for the college is reflected in our Student Equity & Achievement (SEA) metrics. Specifically, the increase in rates of African American/Black student achievement for completing transfer-level Math & English increased from 12 to 18%, and the strides in transfer to 4- year for this group increasing from 28% to 51% in the last 5 years.

While we have seen an increase in the rates of African American/Black student achievement for completing transfer-level Math & English, disproportionate impact remains when examining the overall success rates for the African American/Black and Latinx student populations as shown in Figure 1 below. The DI is not influenced by gender as evidenced in Figures 2 and 3.

Figure 1. Success Rate Equity Gap by Ethnicity & Gender ([Success/Retention Data Fall Terms: Disproportionate Impact](#))





Figure 2. Success Rate Equity Gap by Ethnicity-Female ([Success/Retention Data Fall Terms: Disproportionate Impact](#))





Figure 3. Success Rate Equity Gap by Ethnicity-Male ([Success/Retention Data Fall Terms: Disproportionate Impact](#))



3. What actions has your institution taken/is your institution taking in response to the patterns and trends discussed above? How will you monitor the results of these actions in order to inform future improvements and innovations in support of equitable student achievement?

The Institutional Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (IRPIE) office collects, analyzes, and reports on student success data and other metrics related to the mission and these data are easily accessible on the College’s research website. In addition to collecting, analyzing and reporting on data, the IRPIE office presents data to committees and departments and conducts training on using data to inform planning and decision-making processes.

Recent examples of this process and action plans include the following:

- Review of data and reflection using guided questions is a regular part of the instructional deans’ meetings and retreats. Most recently, in January 2024, the instructional deans engaged in a review of their school/division and discipline-level course retention/success rate data disaggregated by modality, term-length and student demographics. The activity was formulated by a partnership between the Institutional Research, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness office and the Instruction office. Deans shared their initial thoughts when viewing their data, identified the data used to formulate their response to the scenario prompts, shared what data changed their initial thoughts and discussed how the deans can encourage faculty leaders to utilize the data.
- IRPIE presents at the Instructional Advisory Council (IAC) showcasing data visualizations that can help

inform planning at the department and program level. The IAC includes department chairs, full- and part-time faculty, classified professionals, deans and managers.

- IRPIE facilitates program review planning sessions which include breakout rooms for faculty to get assistance uses institutional data and data visualization tools to formulate their department's responses to the prompts.
- IRPIE also provides individual and department level assistance upon requests.

In response to the observed trends in student equity and achievement metrics, the following actions have been taken.

- Securing grant-funding with specialized programs and services for disproportionately impacted students (UJIMA scholars, Title V HSI STEM, Undocumented Resource Center students, UMOJA application, NASSP, LGBTQ+ statewide allocation, Alliances).
- Counseling services: Latinx STEM counselor, Black student counselor, re-allocating counseling time toward supporting programs housed within the Intercultural Center, including undocumented students, students with mixed status, Native American/Indigenous students, Asian American/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students, and LGBTQ+ students.
- Funded a faculty liaison position focused on Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, Anti-Racism and Accessibility (IDEAA) to assist faculty with IDEAA strategies to help create an equitable and welcoming classroom.
- The college's Equity-Minded Practitioners and Intercultural Center help expand the knowledge-base of faculty and staff, featuring topics such as eliminating unconscious bias and understanding the lived experiences of our Black/African-American students through student panels. In addition, the College's Center for Excellence in Teaching & Learning provide cultural humility related training for instructional faculty with additional instructional strategy support available through faculty curated materials in the Inclusion/Diversity/Equity/Anti-Racism/Accessibility (IDEAA) online repository.
- The College applied to have an Umoja program, which will build upon the efforts of the Ujima Scholars and Black Student Alliance which are committed to addressing the social, emotional, academic, and career development needs of underserved students by creating supportive, positive, identity-safe, and inclusive educational and work-based settings.

Ongoing review and monitoring of disaggregated data and development of action plans is currently part of the annual business of the Institutional Effectiveness and Inclusive Excellence committee, Accreditation Taskforce, College Planning Team and Program Review & Planning process. In addition, metrics will be tracked on an annual basis as part of the student equity achievement plan, as well as local data on success and enrollment trends for disproportionate impacted population. Specifically, noncredit, concurrently enrolled and Rising Scholars students will be tracked.

C. Reflections on Assessments of Student Learning

- 1. Review the results of learning outcomes assessment. Describe any patterns or trends related to attainment of learning outcomes observable in these data that may be relevant as you implement improvements and innovations in the design and delivery of academic programs?**

COC's innovative planning is directly informed by regular assessment of student outcomes data. For the purposes of this report, we focus on three critical trends: (1) high success among completers, (2) disproportionate impact among unassessed students, and (3) lower performance in key gateway STEM courses. These trends are particularly relevant to our current program design and delivery strategy. Overall SLO assessment results at COC tend to be encouraging. In 2024, of all the student assessments that took place across all of COC's courses, 87% of assessed students met the standard ([2024 Disaggregation Student Subpopulation](#)). COC's standard target is 70%, so students are meeting outcomes at a considerably higher

rate than the standard. An examination of past data from 2019–2021, however, shows that this may be a bit of a decline ([Disaggregation Student Subpopulations 2019-2021](#)). There are several possible explanations, one of which is that we are collecting more, and therefore have more accurate assessment data. Another possible explanation is post-pandemic learning deficits, which educators have seen across the nation. In general, however, students who persist tend to do quite well on SLO assessment at COC. Students who remain in a course and complete the assessment assignment usually meet the standard of assessment by a much higher percentage than the standard COC target of 70%. When we examine our top 30 courses, for example, only 3 courses are below the target of 70%: MATH104: Pre-Calculus (55%), BIOSCI100: General Biology (68%), BUS211: Business Law (44%) ([Top 30 SLO Results](#)). This also may represent lower success rates in math and the sciences; in the top 30 courses, the average SLO assessment success rate for non-stem courses is about 84%, while for the math and hard science courses, the rate is closer to 78% ([Top 30 SLO Results](#)). More exploration may be necessary.

SLO Success Rates Top 30 Courses

Enrollment Rank # (based on 2023-24 counts)	COURSE	2021FA	2022FA	2023FA	2021SP	2022SP	2023SP	2024SP	2024SP - 2021
1	ENGL-101			93%	94%			96%	94%
2	ENGL-103				97%	97%		96%	97%
3	COMS-105			96%	97%	99%			97%
4	MATH-140						81%		81%
5	PSYCH-101								0%
6	HIST-111						87%		87%
7	POLISC-150	84%	92%	87%		95%	88%	89%	89%
8	SOCI-101	92%	93%	94%	94%	94%	93%	97%	94%
9	COUNS-110	96%	98%	84%		100%			95%
10	BIOSCI-100		68%						68%
11	HLHSCI-100		85%						85%
12	HIST-112						84%		84%
13	CHEM-151	96%							96%
14	BUS-100	91%	99%		100%	100%	99%		98%
15	ECON-201		83%	79%			86%	83%	83%
16	COUNS-150				87%	94%	83%	88%	88%
17	PSYCH-172						86%		86%
18	DANCE-100								0%
19	BUS-201	86%			89%	94%	71%		85%
20	MATH-100			76%					76%
21	ANTHRO-101		78%	89%	87%				85%
22	BUS-211		44%						44%
23	ECON-202		98%				93%		96%
24	MATH-104				65%			44%	55%
25	PSYCH-102		92%						92%
26	HLHSCI-150		94%				94%	88%	92%
27	CINEMA-120			96%					96%
28	BIOSCI-221						88%		88%
29	SPAN-101			92%	89%	95%			92%
30	PHILOS-101	84%					78%		81%

Additionally, disaggregation by student subpopulation often shows that students who complete assessments are meeting the learning outcomes at a high rate across subpopulations. In our top two enrolled courses, ENGL101: English Composition & ENGL103: Critical Reading, Writing, & Thinking, for example, “All ethnicities with a statistically significant population passed the assessment at high rates”; the two lowest pass rates by ethnicity for the ENGL101 Reading SLO were “Asian (88.5%, n=26) and Black/African American (90.4%, n=21)” ([Program Review SLO Prompt Responses](#)). While this does represent a gap from the overall results of 94%, the high pass rates are encouraging. For the ENGL103 Writing (SLO 2 assessment), of those groups with a statistically relevant sample size, the two groups that “scored lower than their peers” were Hispanic/Latinx students and part-time students, but both groups still met the outcomes at a rate over 95%, only slightly down from the overall pass rate of 96% ([Program Review SLO Prompt Responses](#)).

Despite the high success rate for retained students, a notable concern has emerged: since the implementation of AB705 and 1705, more students are being classified as “not assessed.” Much of the potential disproportionate impact in the English department, for example, is nested within this category of students who are not assessed (either because they have dropped the course or did not complete the assessment assignment). In ENGL101, for example, “28–30% of students” are “not assessed” ([Program Review SLO Prompt Responses](#)). However, there is no easy way to drill down to the disaggregated results for this. The best we can do is examine the disaggregated results for a selected ISLO, which is mapped to every English CSLO from the department in a specific term. When we do so, we can see that in Spring 2024, about 27% of students (625) across the entire term were “not assessed”; when we break this down by ethnicity, we see that 1216 or 31% of LatinX students were un-assessed across the term, and 105 or 42% of Black/African American students were un-assessed ([ENGL Not Assessed Students Sample 39](#)).

Overall by Term for Demographic Category: ETHNICITY					
Spring 2024	Meets the standard		Does not yet meet the standard		N/A
	1649	96.04%	68	3.96%	625

Overall by Demographic Element for Demographic Category: ETHNICITY					
	Meets the standard		Does not yet meet the standard		N/A
American Indian	2	100.00%	0	0.00%	0
Asian	164	97.04%	5	2.96%	45
Black or African American	57	93.44%	4	6.56%	44
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	2	100.00%	0	0.00%	3
Hispanic/Latino	799	94.78%	44	5.22%	373
Two or More Races	98	96.08%	4	3.92%	26
Unknown	57	98.28%	1	1.72%	11
White	470	97.92%	10	2.08%	123

This confirms our suspicions that these two subpopulations represent a disproportionate percentage of un-assessed students and that in order to close the gap on disproportionate impact, the department should focus its efforts on retention and persistence. So, while students who persist in a course tend to do very well across subpopulations, disproportionate impact is evident in the populations of students who do not persist. Other departments have similar concerns. The Anthropology and Business department both also reference “attrition” and “retention” rates among their DI concerns ([Program Review SLO Prompt Responses](#)). Overall, the assessment data highlights both areas of success and surfaces critical gaps that will shape our institutional strategies moving forward. These data points collectively guide our program improvement by: 1.) Helping us target efforts to increase persistence among disproportionately impacted groups, 2.) Strengthening instructional support in gateway STEM courses, and 3.) Evolving our tracking process of unassessed students

2. How (i.e., for what subpopulations, modalities, etc.) does your institution disaggregate its assessment results? When you review disaggregated assessment results, what patterns or trends do you see related to equitable attainment of student learning? What patterns or trends excite you? What patterns or trends concern you?


COC continues to disaggregate assessment results based on the following seven student subpopulations: Age, Ethnicity, Financial Aid, First Generation, Gender, Full-time/Part-Time Status, Academic Accommodations

(Disabilities). These disaggregation categories have been available since 2017 and are included in data reports requested from our Academic Coordinator. Departments and programs have been using these disaggregation results continuously in their assessments and loop closing discussions since they have been available (see [Program Review SLO Prompt Responses](#) and [Action Plan Loop Closing](#)).


COC's improvement plan specifically identified the objective to "further engage together to monitor SLOs mastery and achievement data for all modalities" (II.A.16). At the time of our last accreditation visit, there was no way to disaggregate assessment results by course modality as these were not defined within COC's eLumen reporting structure. The project to build out this reporting structure required a concerted year-long collaborative effort across multiple campus teams including SLO/CASL Leadership, IT, Enterprise Applications, Enrollment, Office of Instruction, and eLumen to identify which categories to pull in, how to identify and package them, and how to code them into our eLumen dataloads. As a result of this collaborative effort, COC can now disaggregate SLO assessment data for the following seven course modalities: Hybrid, Hyflex, In-Person, Online, Online Live, Online/OnlineLive, and None/Other. (The "None/Other" category represents sections for justice impacted courses, which are categorized as correspondence courses and are therefore outside the traditional 6 modality categories.) Assessment results disaggregated by modality are now available and included in report requests for spring 2024 assessment data and later.

The 2024 assessment data show that, overall, there is very little variation in SLO assessment rates when disaggregated by age, gender, full- or part-time status, students with disabilities, or first-generation student categories ([2024 Disaggregation Student Subpopulation](#)). (In the following charts, "(Unknown Value)" represents overall assessment results.)


Age




Gender




Full or Part Time Status




Students with Disabilities



First Generation



There is more variation among results in the Ethnicity Demographic Category. The “American Indian” category’s percentage would be alarming except that it is based on a sample size of students “too few to report.” This suggests that this group is underrepresented at COC, but the sample size is too small to draw conclusions about SLO assessment results. (Of the students in 2023/24 who marked "Native American/Alaskan Native" in their student information, 3% marked only Native American/Alaskan Native, 71% also marked Hispanic/Latinx and 26% were also coded as "two or more races" ([Workbook: All Student Profile](#)). Success rates are lowest for Black/African American students (82%), Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (84%) and Hispanic/LatinX (85%) while White students are meeting SLO standards 89% of the time and the college wide average is 87% ([2024 Disaggregation Student Subpopulation](#)).



Of course, these results also vary by department and program. (See the dynamic filter options in [2024 Disaggregation Student Subpopulation](#).) As noted in the response to the previous question, SLO assessment data suggests that students who persist in a course at COC often perform well on assessment across disaggregated categories, but that disproportionate impact is visible especially among certain ethnicities, and that additional DI may be lurking among un-assessed students.

Several programs identify disproportionate impact in their review of SLO assessment for program review. The most commonly identified DI is among Black/African American students and LatinX students, which is consistent with college wide identification of DI in general. For example, the Math department finds that “African American/Black, Latin/x, and Pacific Islanders/Native Hawaiian are the lowest performing groups overall...consistent with the college’s area disproportionate impact” ([Program Review SLO Prompt Responses](#)). Specifically, “the Math 211 SLO report shows that, in Spring 23, although 66% (96 of 146 assessed) of students met the SLO standard, there were significant disparities in performance based on age, ethnicity, gender, and disability status—for instance, older students performed at a 22% lower rate than their youngest peers. Hispanic/Latinx and African American/Black student groups had significantly lower success rates (45% and 33%) than White and Asian groups (76% vs. 71%). By gender, only a third of calculus students were females, and their success rate was 13% lower than that of males. Students with a reported disability performed at a 40% lower rate than peers without reported disabilities” ([Program Review SLO Prompt Responses](#)).

Interior Design, Art, Biological Sciences, Business, Chemistry, Communications, Computer Networking, Electronic Systems, Geology, Humanities, Modern Languages, and Political Science all note disproportionate impact for either for Black/African American students and/or Hispanic/LatinX student ([Program Review SLO Prompt Responses](#)). Other departments including Chemistry, Humanities, and Electronic Systems find that Black/African American students are underrepresented in their programs ([Program Review SLO Prompt Responses](#)) and are seeking ways to encourage enrollment from these populations.

Some programs with traditionally underenrolled groups like females are showing progress in recruiting participants from those groups. Administration of Justice in particular noted its increasing percentage of female students and their continuing success ([Program Review SLO Prompt Responses](#)).

Because disaggregation by modality is newer with data available beginning with the spring 2024, there has not yet been much time for departments to collect sufficient data or dissect it in order to identify trends. However, when we review all available data college-wide (Spring 2024 through Winter 2025), SLO assessment results are similar across modalities: In-Person (87% of assessed students met the standard), Online (91%), OnlineLIVE (86%), Online and OnlineLIVE (86%), Hyflex (84%), Hybrid (78%), Other (83%) ([Disaggregation by Modality](#)). Hybrid, with its mix of modalities, shows the weakest results, but those results are still well above targets. Department specific data varies between programs, but the included filter table suggests comparable rates among modalities across departments and programs unless data is insufficient ([Disaggregation by Modality](#)). Again, however, we must exercise caution and also keep an eye on retention rates, which can be lower in online modalities.

3. What actions has your institution taken/is your institution taking in response to the patterns and trends discussed above? How will you monitor the results of these actions in order to inform future improvements and innovations in support of equitable student learning?

The College is committed to supporting faculty in addressing disproportionate impacts through a variety of professional development opportunities. Examples of key college-wide efforts include:

[Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning \(CETL\)](#)

- **Culturally Responsive Pedagogy Course:** Focuses on cultural competency in areas such as race, class, and culture, and provides strategies for creating inclusive classrooms.
- **Cultural Humility Training:** Offers training for instructional faculty, supported by resources in the [Inclusion/Diversity/Equity/Anti-Racism/Accessibility \(IDEAA\) online repository](#).

Interactive IDEAA Share Workshops

- **Spring 2025 Workshops:** Highlight culturally responsive pedagogical practices from the IDEAA Repository. These workshops are designed as conversation-based, community-building spaces.
- **Future Plans:** Continue offering these dynamic workshops in the fall and spring semesters.

Faculty Support

- **IDEAA Faculty Liaison:** Provides support to faculty, schools, and departments to brainstorm strategies for addressing disproportionate impact stemming from SLO assessment and/or data reflection as part of the Program Planning & Review process.

Equity-Minded Practitioners and Intercultural Center

- **Expanding Practitioner Knowledge:** Features topics such as eliminating unconscious bias and understanding the lived experiences of our diverse student body through student panels.

Student Equity & Achievement (SEA) Program

- **Funded Activities:** Includes additional counseling and support in programs like MESA, Ujima Scholars, and the Intercultural Center.
- **Discipline-Specific Funding:** Aligns with the goals of the College's SEA plan to support faculty and student success.

Humanizing Online Teaching Series

- This series offers training to enhance online instruction including workshops on AI, being a warm demander, OER, Universal Design, etc.

SLO Assessment Trainings

- SLO coordinator(s) have been working to close gaps on missing assessments by identifying and working closely with departments with assessment gaps as well as doing more outreach and college-wide training ([SLO Trainings](#)). As of the beginning of spring 2025, 72 previously unassessed courses had been assessed, and 54 of those had been loop closed. (Additional assessments and loop closing have undoubtedly been completed but numbers are pending). As of Dec 2024, 1,565 CSLOs had at least one completed assessment in eLumen, up from 484 in Dec 2022. Currently, 733 courses out of the 1,471 total courses in eLumen show evidence of assessment within the 2021-2024 assessment window. Only 239 courses have evidence of loop closing from 2021-2024, so there is still much work to be done there ([CSLO Assessment Status](#)).

The college also continues its work on OER and ZTC initiatives to reduce costs for students.

In addition, individual programs and departments are collaborating with campus programs to close equity gaps. For example, both the Math and English departments have utilized embedded tutors and non-credit support courses, which have both been shown to reduce equity gaps. The English department has updated its curriculum and content to increase cultural awareness and add more diverse authors and texts to its curriculum. The English department is currently planning a department meeting around the topic of retaining English 101 students; the department has also lowered the course cap for 101, changed curriculum to support additional one-on-one interactions and feedback between faculty and students, introduced and encouraged contract grading and other equitable grading strategies, collaborated on Ujima counseling and English cohort scheduling, and offered Black/African American Student Success Training ([Program Review SLO Prompt Responses](#)).

SLO Leadership redesigned the SLO Assessment prompts that are incorporated into Program Review for Fall

2024 in order to capture each academic programs analysis of their SLO assessment success rates and planned action steps. This will allow the college to track progress the effectiveness of departments' and programs' action steps across program review cycles. Additionally, eLumen's upcoming assessment platform change promises much better SLO assessment data visualization in the future. Once eLumen Insights is implemented college wide in Spring 2026, SLO assessment data should be available as a Tableau visualization, which will allow individual programs and the college to track assessment trends more easily and effectively.

D. Looking Ahead to the Next Self-Evaluation and Comprehensive Review

Your institution will begin its next comprehensive self-evaluation in 1-2 years. What opportunities, changes, or other internal or external factors do you see on the horizon that are likely to affect the context of your self-evaluation and/or comprehensive peer review?

Opportunities, changes, and other internal and external factors on the horizon that are likely to affect the context of our comprehensive self-evaluation review are primarily focused on our enrollment, persistence, and success growth strategies as they pertain to Student Learning Outcomes by course modalities, the expansion of Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) with the implementation of the Mapping Articulated Pathways (MAP), and Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUOs) with an emphasis on our disproportionately impacted populations.

Opportunities

1. Enhanced Data-Driven Decision Making:

As Section A.3. illustrates, the use of disaggregated Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) data by course modality presents a powerful opportunity for departments to tailor instructional methods, address equity gaps, and improve learning outcomes in specific teaching formats (e.g., online, hybrid, face-to-face) (Section C.2). This allows COC to develop highly targeted interventions to close equity gaps and improve overall student outcomes. This will also allow for an increased focus on new or improved support mechanisms for transfer students as highlighted in Section B.2.

2. Expansion of Equitable Practices:

Enhanced Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) procedures and alignment with the MAP system provide opportunities to recognize diverse student backgrounds and accelerate progress toward completion, especially for adult learners and returning students (Section A.1).

3. Support for Disproportionately Impacted Students

The expansion of incorporating initiatives centered on equity-minded practices in instructional and student-facing roles such as tutoring services for Rising Scholars (Section B.3) will contribute to reducing the achievement gaps for these populations.

4. Real-Time Service Adjustments through AUOs and Surveys:

A robust feedback loop via Administrative Unit Outcomes and student surveys allows for timely adaptation of student services, enhancing student satisfaction and retention and persistence percentages. (Section A.3).

Changes

1. Alignment with 2024 Accreditation Standards:

The College has actively realigned practices with updated accreditation standards, demonstrating proactive

institutional responsiveness and raising expectations for all units to meet new benchmarks through an understanding of “floor” and “stretch” goals (Section B.1).

2. Cross-Departmental Collaboration and System Integration:

The integration between IT, eLumen, and academic leadership reflects a shift toward greater interdepartmental coordination, which may change workflow dynamics and expectations for shared accountability (Section C.2).

Internal Factors

1. Institutional Culture of Innovation and Equity:

The College’s commitment to equity, transparency, and continuous improvement is internalizing a student-centered culture that will influence future planning, resource allocation, and personnel expectations (Section C.3)

2. Enhanced Technological Infrastructure:

The development of SLO disaggregation tools suggests significant internal investment in technology and analytics capacity, which may drive further automation, dashboards, or predictive analytics across departments (Section C.2)

External Factors

1. Evolving Accreditation Expectations (ACCJC 2024 Standards):

New standards are prompting institutions to provide evidence of learning outcomes, equity practices, and responsiveness to student needs, raising the bar for compliance and excellence.

2. State and Federal Focus on Equity and Prison Education:

Legislative and funding support for correctional education and Credit for Prior Learning reflects broader societal and policy shifts, increasing the relevance and visibility of these programs.

3. Accountability and Transparency Demands:

Public and governmental stakeholders increasingly demand transparent, data-driven reporting, placing pressure on institutions to demonstrate impact and equitable outcomes.

College of the Canyons has established a strong reputation for innovation and strategic progress, and we remain dedicated to advancing this legacy through adaptable, forward-thinking planning. Working alongside a wide range of community partners and collaborators, we will continue to embrace future opportunities and lead cooperative efforts that drive meaningful improvement—by imagining, taking risks, designing, creating, persevering, and taking action—all in support of our students and the positive impact we strive to make. COC is making significant strides in assessment, equity, and instructional design, setting the stage for robust self-evaluation and accreditation success. With enhanced data capabilities, equity-focused professional development, and systemic supports for students, the College has a clear opportunity to strengthen outcomes and demonstrate meaningful progress in closing equity gaps across learning modalities and disciplines while increasing retention and persistence.











Midterm-Report_Updated November 5_2025_FINAL SUBMISSION

Final Audit Report

2025-11-25

Created:	2025-11-13
By:	Cyndi Trudeau (Cyndi.Trudeau@canyons.edu)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAw4op5M9G5pMCDRv2fdD78NyboxVLIMI

"Midterm-Report_Updated November 5_2025_FINAL SUBMISSION" History

-  Document created by Cyndi Trudeau (Cyndi.Trudeau@canyons.edu)
2025-11-13 - 4:04:34 PM GMT- IP address: 207.233.56.136
-  Document emailed to Thea Alvarado (Thea.Alvarado@Canyons.edu) for signature
2025-11-13 - 4:07:54 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Thea Alvarado (Thea.Alvarado@Canyons.edu)
2025-11-13 - 4:52:17 PM GMT- IP address: 207.233.56.134
-  Document e-signed by Thea Alvarado (Thea.Alvarado@Canyons.edu)
Signature Date: 2025-11-13 - 4:52:37 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 207.233.56.134
-  Document emailed to Michael Monsour (Michael.Monsour@canyons.edu) for signature
2025-11-13 - 4:52:39 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Michael Monsour (Michael.Monsour@canyons.edu)
2025-11-13 - 8:08:51 PM GMT- IP address: 104.28.116.89
-  Document e-signed by Michael Monsour (Michael.Monsour@canyons.edu)
Signature Date: 2025-11-17 - 7:07:29 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 207.233.120.2
-  Document emailed to Lisa Hooper (lisa.hooper@canyons.edu) for signature
2025-11-17 - 7:07:39 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Lisa Hooper (lisa.hooper@canyons.edu)
2025-11-17 - 7:26:09 PM GMT- IP address: 207.233.56.196
-  Document e-signed by Lisa Hooper (lisa.hooper@canyons.edu)
Signature Date: 2025-11-17 - 7:26:44 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 207.233.56.196



Document emailed to Amna Fadel (amna.fadel@canyons.edu) for signature

2025-11-17 - 7:26:47 PM GMT



Cyndi Trudeau (Cyndi.Trudeau@canyons.edu) added alternate signer asg_pres@canyons.edu. The original signer Amna Fadel (amna.fadel@canyons.edu) can still sign.

2025-11-25 - 4:08:34 PM GMT- IP address: 207.233.56.136



Document emailed to asg_pres@canyons.edu for signature

2025-11-25 - 4:08:34 PM GMT



Email viewed by asg_pres@canyons.edu

2025-11-25 - 4:27:58 PM GMT- IP address: 172.91.247.38



Signer asg_pres@canyons.edu entered name at signing as Amna Fadel

2025-11-25 - 4:29:23 PM GMT- IP address: 172.91.247.38



Document e-signed by Amna Fadel (asg_pres@canyons.edu)

Signature Date: 2025-11-25 - 4:29:26 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 172.91.247.38



Document emailed to Jasmine Ruys (jasmine.ruys@canyons.edu) for signature

2025-11-25 - 4:29:27 PM GMT



Email viewed by Jasmine Ruys (jasmine.ruys@canyons.edu)

2025-11-25 - 4:32:31 PM GMT- IP address: 207.233.56.134



Document e-signed by Jasmine Ruys (jasmine.ruys@canyons.edu)

Signature Date: 2025-11-25 - 4:40:15 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 207.233.56.134



Document emailed to Sharlene Johnson (Sharlene.Johnson@canyons.edu) for signature

2025-11-25 - 4:40:17 PM GMT



Email viewed by Sharlene Johnson (Sharlene.Johnson@canyons.edu)

2025-11-25 - 10:46:07 PM GMT- IP address: 99.27.248.84



Document e-signed by Sharlene Johnson (Sharlene.Johnson@canyons.edu)

Signature Date: 2025-11-25 - 10:46:22 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 99.27.248.84



Agreement completed.

2025-11-25 - 10:46:22 PM GMT



Adobe Acrobat Sign