This confirms that your 2016 Annual Report to ACCJC was submitted by Mr. Adrian Gonzales <adriangonzales@palomar.edu> on 03/31/2016.
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
03/31/2016

Palomar College
1140 W. Mission Road
San Marcos, CA 92069-1487

General Information

#	Question	Answer
1.	Confirm logged into the correct institution's report	Confirmed
2.	Name of individual preparing report:	Marti Snyder
3.	Phone number of person preparing report:	(760) 744-1150 x3759
4.	E-mail of person preparing report:	msnyder2@palomar.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://www2.palomar.edu/pages/catalog/files/2015/06/catalog-2015-welcome.pdf
5b.	Provide the URL (link) from the college website to the colleges online statement of accredited status with ACCJC:	http://www2.palomar.edu/pages/accreditation/
6.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment:	Fall 2015: 24,476 Fall 2014: 25,941 Fall 2013: 25,639
7.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in degree applicable credit courses for fall 2015:	22,349
8.	Headcount enrollment in pre-collegiate credit courses (which do not count toward degree requirements) for fall 2015:	5,549
9.	Number of courses offered via distance education:	Fall 2015: 338 Fall 2014: 372

		Fall 2013: 355
10.	Number of programs which may be completed via distance education:	23
11.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in all types of Distance Education:	Fall 2015: 5,036 Fall 2014: 5,103 Fall 2013: 5,055
12.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in all types of Correspondence Education:	Fall 2015: n/a Fall 2014: n/a Fall 2013: n/a
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?	70%
14b.	Successful student course completion rate for the fall 2015 semester:	70.2%
15.	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. 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? — 1100 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? — 1200	
16a.	Number of students (unduplicated) who received a certificate or degree in the 2014-2015 academic year:	2,353
16b.	Number of students who received a degree in the 2014-2015 academic year:	1,423
16c.	Number of students who received a certificate in the 2014-2015 academic year:	1,816
17a.	If your college has an institution-set standard for the number of students who transfer each year to 4-year	1,745

	colleges/universities, what is it?	
17b.	Number of students who transferred to 4-year colleges/universities in 2014-2015:	2,139
18a.	Does the college have any certificate programs which are not career-technical education (CTE) certificates?	Yes
18b.	If yes, please identify them:	American Indian Studies - Certificate of Achievement; Astronomy - Certificate of Achievement; Biology - General Certificate of Achievement; CSU General Education Breadth - Certificate of Achievement; French - Certificate of Achievement; IGETC - Certificate of Achievement; Adult Basic Education Non-credit - Certificate of Completion; English as a Second Language Noncredit - Certificate of Completion.
19a.	Number of career-technical education (CTE) certificates and degrees:	189
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:	189
19c.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees for which the institution has set a standard for licensure passage rates:	5
19d.	Number of CTE certificates and degrees for which the institution has set a standard for graduate employment rates:	189

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:

Program	CIP Code 4 digits (##.##)	Examination	Institution set standard (%)	Pass Rate (%)
Emergency Medical Technicians	51.09	national	92.7 %	96 %
Paramedics	51.09	national	92.7 %	96 %
Nursing	51.38	national	92.7 %	87.5 %
Registered Dental Assistant	51.06	state	92.7 %	76 %
Registered Dental Assistant	51.06	national	92.7 %	100 %

21.	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 (%)

	(##.##)	(%)	
Emergency Medical Technicians	51.09	79 %	85.71 %
Paramedics	51.09	79 %	90 %
Nursing	51.38	79 %	86.54 %
Registered Dental Assistant	51.06	79 %	84 %

22.	Please list any other institution set standards at your college:

Criteria Measured (i.e. persistence, starting salary, etc.)	Definition	Institution set standard
Transfer	Percentage of students showing intent to transfer who transfer within six years after entry. Standard is 40%, the College's 2013 rate was 41%. The Chancellor's Office has not yet updated rates for 2014.	40%

23.	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).
	The institution-set standards are part of the metrics the college evaluates for institutional effectiveness. Annually, the college reviews the institutional effectiveness metrics as it works to update and establish the objectives in its strategic plan. The college has worked through its governance process to establish institution-set standards. A small work group initially reviews historical and other data. The work group recommends values for each standard. Then, the faculty senate reviews and refines the standards. Finally, the college's principal participatory governance body assesses and discusses the recommended standards.

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:	1577
	b. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes	1141
	Auto-calculated field: percentage of total:	72.4
25.	Courses	

	a.	Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs as defined by college):	196
	b.	Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes	148
		Auto-calculated field: percentage of total:	75.5

	Courses		
26.	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://www2.palomar.edu/pages/slo/program-outcomes-review/
28.	Number of courses identified as part of the general education (GE) program:	355
29.	Percent of GE courses with ongoing assessment of GE learning outcomes:	91%
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 *program Student Learning Outcomes*:	328
32.	Number of Institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined:	4
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:	50%
35.	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).
	Guided by the Learning Outcomes Council, the College has assessed six GE/ILOs, each with a common rubric. We have adapted rubrics from various institutions, including the Association of American Colleges & Universities; however, the rubrics are written resulting from our faculty discussion and analysis. The use of a common rubric has resulted in robust discussions of curriculum, institutional goals, and assessment. The

positive responses of faculty to the rubrics are numerous, most notably that faculty value access to a set of guidelines established by experts in that area. Although this method has worked well, we are trying a different assessment method for our digital literacy ILO. Randomly selected students will use an online tool to assess their digital literacy competence. We inform our college community of all assessment results and action by posting in-depth reports of each assessment on our college website and sharing results at various shared governance meetings. We continue to take action based on the results of our ILO assessments and discussion. For example, we are creating math modules and videos to help students and faculty with challenging quantitative concepts. Revealed by our written communication assessment was a need to provide students and faculty with information about non-instructional resources on campus.

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.

36.	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).
	This year we have strengthened the process of aligning curriculum with student learning outcomes. As new courses and those in the review process are examined by the Curriculum Committee, faculty SLO facilitators are responsible for verifying that a complete SLO plan has been identified and properly entered in the SLO database. Curriculum, instruction, and SLO assessment are thus planned and discussed simultaneously, resulting in improved alignment of programs, courses, and GE/ILOs. Faculty proposers of new or reviewed curriculum also present pertinent details of the proposed curriculum to the Curriculum Committee, e.g. how courses are related to a particular program of study; articulation to 4-year institutions; related GE coursework; assessment of outcomes. All programs of study undergo an annual program review process; a comprehensive program review is scheduled every three years. All course and program SLOs are to be assessed and assigned an action plan during this reporting cycle.

37.	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).
	Our annual Program Review process requires programs to consider many factors in their reports, including SLO assessment results. Those results are reviewed by the division dean and by the Instructional Planning Council. The program review report is then published on the College website. Also, departments schedule at least one annual meeting to discuss and make decisions about SLO assessments, results, and actions. To better facilitate communication regarding SLO assessment and planning at the College, each department assigns a faculty member to coordinate activities and discussions and report out to the Learning Outcomes Council (LOC). An LOC workgroup has begun this year to provide structured feedback to the departments regarding SLO assessment reports. This has led to greater discussion of curriculum planning and support for increased student learning. Our continued assessment of GE outcomes includes training and follow-up discussions with faculty of results. These faculty contribute to the decisions for

	subsequent action to support our students with their achievements and learning successes.
38.	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). The assessment of student learning remains a faculty-driven process at the College. SLO plans are identified and assessed by part-time and full-time faculty. Decisions for follow-up action are made within department meetings. All departments submit a summary report of SLO results respective to their programs to the LOC for review and feedback. These assessment results are also summarized and reported annually through the program review process to the Instructional Planning Council who evaluates reports in order to assign resource requests. We have instituted a three-year cycle of program review and SLO assessment; the third-year report constitutes a comprehensive analysis of SLO and other data which have been disaggregated by the Office of Research and Planning. GE/ILO assessments continue to provide the College with valuable information. For example as a result of assessing quantitative literacy, we are creating discipline-specific learning modules to support students across the curriculum with their needs to use mathematical concepts and skills in their coursework.
39.	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). Our GE/ILO assessments continue to provide us with interesting results and fascinating faculty dialogue. During the last year we assessed intercultural competency and knowledge. A workgroup reviewed the findings, discussed the results, and made recommendations for action. We have several exciting activities planned as result of this process. Some of the workgroup's recommendations included offering professional development opportunities to model and teach intercultural competence, holding campus-wide events that celebrate diversity and exploring the creation of shared SLO for our courses that meet our multicultural requirement. Our Child Development department continues to learn valuable information from outcomes assessment. The assessment of one of its SLOs generated conversation with regards to student engagement. Through their discussion, it became apparent that students who are engaged and able to utilize the material in meaningful ways are those who are taught by instructors who are equally engaged and enthusiastic about the instruction. As an outcome from this dialogue, they determined that instructors who are encouraged, enthusiastic, and energetic better serve our students. Therefore, they added energizing practices and discussion as an agenda item at future department meetings.

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: 0 2013-2014: 1 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)	Change in sites offering 50% or more of a program, certificate, or degree
41b.	Explain the change(s) for which you will be submitting a substantive change proposal:	Palomar College has acquired two properties to establish a North and a South Education Center within its geographic District boundaries. The North Education Center has received center status approval from CPEC, and data for the south Education Center is being gathered for submission of the letter of intent for center status. The College has been in contact with ACCJC personnel with respect to the substantive change process and timeline. As the planning for these two new Centers progresses, the College will prepare and submit substantive change proposals at the appropriate time prior to the opening of each Center.

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:	Palomar College Escondido Education Center; Palomar College Camp Pendleton Site; Fallbrook, CA Fallbrook Site (for noncredit ESL certificate); Police Academy and Fire Technology at: Public Safety Training Center; San Marcos Apprenticeship Program at: San Diego, CA San Diego Carpenters Training Center; San Diego, CA San Diego Electrical Training Center; San Diego, CA San Diego Sheet Metal Training Center.
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