ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

COLLEGE STATUS REPORT ON STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES IMPLEMENTATION

INSTRUCTIONS

Colleges are asked to use this report form in completing their *College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation.* Colleges should submit a brief narrative analysis and quantitative and qualitative evidence demonstrating status of Student Learning Outcome (SLO) implementation. The report is divided into sections representing the bulleted characteristics of the Proficiency implementation level on the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, Part III (Rubric). Colleges are asked to interpret their implementation level through the lens of the Accreditation Standards cited for each characteristic. The final report section before the evidence list requests a brief narrative self-assessment of overall status in relationship to the proficiency level, indicating what plans are in place to mitigate any noted deficiencies or areas for improvement. **Narrative responses for each section of the template should not exceed 250 words.**

This report form offers examples of quantitative and qualitative evidence which might be included for each of the characteristics. The examples are illustrative in nature and are not intended to provide a complete listing of the kinds of evidence colleges may use to document SLO status. College evidence used for one Proficiency level characteristic may also serve as evidence for another characteristic.

This report is provided to colleges in hard copy and also electronically, by e-mail, as a fill-in Word document. The reports must be submitted to the Commission by either the October 15, 2012 date or the March 15, 2013 date, as defined on the enclosed list of colleges by assigned reporting date. When the report is completed, colleges should:

a. Submit the report form by email to the ACCJC (accjc@accjc.org); **and**

b. Submit the full report *with attached evidence* on CD/DVD to the ACCJC (ACCJC, 10 Commercial Blvd., Suite 204, Novato, CA 94949).

Although evidence cited in the text of the report may include links to college web resources, the Commission requires actual copies (electronic files) of the evidence for its records.

COLLEGE INFORMATION: DATE OF REPORT; COLLEGE; SUBMITTED BY; CERTIFICATION BY CEO

Date of Report: October 10, 2012

Institution's Name: Crafton Hills Community College

Name and Title of Individual Completing Report: Rebeccah Warren-Marlatt, Interim Executive Vice President, Student Services and Instruction

Telephone Number and E-mail Address: (909) 389-3355; rmarla@sbccd.cc.ca.us

Certification by Chief Executive Officer: *The information included in this report is certified as a complete and accurate representation of the reporting institution.*

Name of CEO: Dr. Cheryl Marshall
Electronic Signature:_ Dr. Cheryl A. Marshall_____

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND AUTHENTIC ASSESSMENTS ARE IN PLACE FOR COURSES, PROGRAMS, SUPPORT SERVICES, CERTIFICATES AND DEGREES.

Eligibility Requirement 10: Student Learning and Achievement

Standards: I.A.1; II.A.1.a; II.A.1.c; II.A.2.a,b,e,f,g,h,i; II.A.3 [See II.A.3.a,b,c.]; II.A.6; II.B.4; II.C.2].

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Evidence demonstrating numbers/percentages of course, program (academic and student services), and institutional level outcomes are in place and assessed. Documentation on institutional planning processes demonstrating integrated planning and the way SLO assessment results impact program review. Descriptions could include discussions of high-impact courses, gateway courses, college frameworks, and so forth.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NUMERICAL RESPONSE
QUANTITATIVE EVIDENCE/DATA ON THE RATE/PERCENTAGE OF SLOS DEFINED AND ASSESSED

1. Courses
   a. Total number of college courses (active courses in the college catalog, offered on the schedule in some rotation): 375 (391 active courses, minus 16 cross-listed courses)
   b. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 375
      Percentage of total: 100
   c. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 249
      Percentage of total: 66.4%

2. Programs
   a. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college): 43
   b. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 43
      Percentage of total: 100
   c. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 20
      Percentage of total: 46.5%

3. Student Learning and Support Activities
   a. Total number of student learning and support activities (as college has identified or grouped them for SLO implementation): 16
   b. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 13
      Percentage of total: 81.3%
   c. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 13; Percentage of total: 81.3%

4. Institutional Learning Outcomes
   a. Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined: 6
   b. Number of institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment: 3, or 50%

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

COURSE LEVEL OUTCOMES

Crafton Hills College has made steady progress toward defining and assessing outcomes at all levels. Comprehensive course-level assessment reports are posted online and are updated as programs complete their assessment cycles (1.1). As of October, 2012, SLOs have been developed for all 375 courses offered within the past two years. Of these, 66.4% (249) have completed the assessment cycle at least once (1.2).

PROGRAM LEVEL OUTCOMES (CERTIFICATES, DEGREES)

Beginning in 2008-2009 and each year thereafter, the college catalog published in hard copy and online, has included program level outcomes for certificates and degrees (1.3-1.6). As of fall, 2012, 100 % of 43 instructional programs had defined program level outcomes, while 46.5% of programs were assessing outcomes on an ongoing basis. Of the 16 learning and support activities on campus, 13 have defined outcomes and engaged in ongoing assessment, with some units completing as many as four cycles (1.7.).

INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL OUTCOMES (ILOS)

The college has six Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs): Critical Thinking; Written and Oral Communication; Interpersonal and Group Skills; Society and Culture; Information Literacy; and Ethics and Values (1.8). Two forms of assessment have been used: 1) mapping lower-level outcomes to institutional learning outcomes and 2) the analysis of relevant data from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement. Three ILO's have been assessed using the course mapping method 1.9), one has been assessed using the CSSEE (1.10), and cycles have been completed for two ILOs: Critical Thinking (1.11) and Society and Culture (1.12).

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 2: THERE IS A WIDESPREAD INSTITUTIONAL DIALOGUE ABOUT ASSESSMENT RESULTS AND IDENTIFICATION OF GAPS.

Standards: I.B.1; I.B.2; I.B.3; I.B.5.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation on processes and outcomes of SLO assessment. Specific examples with the outcome data analysis and description of how the results were used. Descriptions could include examples of institutional changes made to respond to outcomes assessment results.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 2: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Dialogue regarding assessment results has been widespread and continuous Crafton Hills College, evidenced by the 2010 Campus Climate Survey, in which 97% of the staff and faculty respondents surveyed agreed that assessment of outcomes is ongoing (2.1). Dialogue concerning assessment occurs in many settings on multiple occasions. The most prominent of these are: the Outcomes Committee (2.2); the Accreditation Committee (2.3-4); Academic Senate (2.5-6) Professional Development (2.7-9); Planning and Program Review (2.10), Open Forums and Flex Day (2.11-16) and In-Service (2.17,2.18) activities.

The Academic Senate passed a resolution supporting Crafton's efforts to meet or exceed the ACCJC rubric requirements, and reasserting that the assessment of teaching and learning is an academic and professional matter (2.19). The Senate also supported the college-wide Institutional Assessment Plan, proposed by the Outcomes Committee (2.20).

In spring, 2011, using data and research reports developed by the Office of Research and Planning, two well-attended campus-wide forums were held to discuss research concerning stop-out and drop-out points for basic skills students and research-supported best practices (2.21). As a result of the dialogue, curricular re-design to compress the basic skills sequences in both the English (2.22) and Math Departments is taking place.

Based on CCSSE results measuring ILO#4, Society and Culture, plans are in place to design three additional Learning Communities to emphasize the theme of diversity. Additionally, the Professional Development Committee has invited Thomas Brown and Associates to conduct a series of workshops during 2012-13 around the theme of diversity and multicultural appreciation. (2.23, 2.24).

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 3: DECISION MAKING INCLUDES DIALOGUE ON THE RESULTS OF ASSESSMENT AND IS PURPOSEFULLY DIRECTED TOWARD ALIGNING INSTITUTION-WIDE PRACTICES TO SUPPORT AND IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING.

Standards: I.B; I.B.3; II.A.1.c; II.A.2.f; III.A.1.c; IV.A.2.b.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation of institutional planning processes and the integration of SLO assessment results with program review, college-wide planning and resource allocation, including evidence of college-wide dialogue.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 3: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

SLO assessment results are important in two primary planning processes at Crafton Hills College: Educational Master Planning, and Planning and Program Review.

The three-year CHC Educational Master Plan (EMP) (3.1) includes Strategic Directions, goals, objectives, actions, and Quantitative Effectiveness Indicators. Objectives 3.1.4 and 3.1.5 concern the development and assessment of outcomes at the course, program, and institution level (3.1, page 31). Additionally, a Quantitative Effectiveness Indicator "calls out" assessment of SLOs as an institutional priority (3.2). An annual formative evaluation reporting the progress on each objective is posted online (3.3, 3.4).

Planning and Program Review (PPR) forms contain an item gauging the extent to which outcomes have been defined, assessed, and evaluated, and have consistently been used to inform instruction or improve services offered by the program (3.5). In addition, programs are asked to provide a list of additional measures of program effectiveness, outcomes, a benchmark for each, and a discussion of the data and the implications for

program improvement. The Planning and Program Review Committee provides feedback to each participating unit about course- and program-level outcomes and the alignment of outcomes with planning. (3.6, for example). The unit-level objectives that emerge in the planning process are prioritized by the committee and finalized by the President's Cabinet (3.7). Outcomes emerged as the top priority for CHC in 2011-2012 (3.8). The prioritized objectives and resources, and their alignment with the Educational Master Plan are reported to the campus annually by the President in the Spring In-Service (3.9).

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 4: APPROPRIATE RESOURCES CONTINUE TO BE ALLOCATED AND FINE-TUNED.

Standards: I.B; I.B.4; I.B.6; III.C.2; III.D.2.a; III.D.3.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation on the integration of SLO assessment results with institutional planning and resource allocation.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 4: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

The assessment process at Crafton Hills College has been supported at every level. From 2006 through 2012, a full-time faculty Instructional Assessment Specialist was assigned to support faculty and staff as they developed and assessed course and program-level outcomes (4.1). The assessment process is also supported by the Dean of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning (OIERP) and his staff (4.2). As of Fall, 2012, the Instructional Assessment Specialist's load was divided between assessment (20%) and Instruction. Plans are under way to diffuse the responsibility for coordinating SLOs throughout the campus by offering release time to interested and qualified faculty.

The Outcomes Committee, a shared governance committee extant since 2010 (4.3) developed a college-wide plan for assessment (4.4). The Institutional Assessment Plan uses the five-step Nichols Model to report outcomes at all levels (4.5). In addition, a calendar of activities for course, program, and institution-level outcomes assessment is described (4.6).

The college has two methods of reporting and summarizing outcomes. A significant number of faculty use ELumen, which has been in place for five years (4.7). In addition, the college has developed a five-step, easy-to-use Nichols Model in both online (4.8) and Word formats (4.9). Summaries of course, program, and institutional outcomes can be placed on the online web page (4.10, 4.11, 4.12).

The college's integrated planning and program review process considers the results of assessment and the alignment of results with planning to determine the overall health of the program and to allocate appropriate resources (4.13).

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 5: COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT REPORTS EXIST AND ARE COMPLETED AND UPDATED ON A REGULAR BASIS.

Standards: I.A.1; I.B; I.B.3; I.B.5; I.B.6; II.A.2.a; II.B.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation on the process and cycle of SLO assessment, including results of cycles of assessment. Copies of summative assessment reports, with actual learning outcomes.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 5: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

The cycle of assessment is described in the Institutional Assessment Plan, available online on the IEOP website (5.1). The IAP includes the assessment calendar, a glossary of terms, and a description of each of the five steps in the assessment model. Faculty members have individual preferences and methods for assessing, measuring, and reporting student learning outcomes. Some faculty have elected to maintain and report student-level outcomes using ELumen, an online tool that allows faculty to collect, organize, report, and review learning evidence and results from the assessment cycle (5.2). Others prefer the online five-step Nichols Model (5.3). The Institutional Assessment Plan allows for faculty choice in the tool used to collected data and analyze outcomes (5.1).

However, the college is moving toward reporting all outcomes on the SLO website (5.4). The website includes course (5.5), program (5.6), and institution-level outcomes (5.7). Program-level outcomes are also reported for Administrative and Student Services units on this website. Full participation in the use of the online web site for assessment reporting has yet to be achieved.

Additionally, programs have been asked to plan course assessments on a three-year cycle. Faculty may elect to assess each semester, annually, or less frequently, depending on the specific outcome being measured, prior assessment, and the frequency of the course offering (5.8, for example).

Programs report their assessment progress in Planning and Program Review, a self-study process in which each unit participates on a three-year cycle (5.9, for example).

Last, a PowerPoint summarizing some of CHC's major assessment results is posted online (5.10).

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 6: COURSE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ARE ALIGNED WITH DEGREE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES.

Standards: II.A.2.e; II.A.2.f; II.A.2.i.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation on the alignment/integration of course level outcomes with program outcomes. Description could include curriculum mapping or other alignment activities. Samples across the curriculum of institutional outcomes mapped to program outcomes.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 6: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Many program or degree outcomes have been developed and modified as a result of course-level outcomes.

October 2012

Conversely, programs have often modified course outcomes based on the results of program outcomes. For example, using program-level data showing students assessing at the lowest level of basic skills have lower completion and success rates, the English and Math departments have modified basic skills courses and developed Supplemental Instruction to compress student progress through the sequence. The Speech Department has used benchmarking to improve low-end performance in key classes, and has explored cross-grading to improve instructor objectivity and cohesiveness of program expectations. The Spanish department has used program outcomes to increase focus on vocabulary at the course level, and Anatomy and Physiology has examined course sequence success to ensure program outcomes are achieved. (6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4).

In spring, 2012 one of the Flex Day activities concerned program-level outcomes and their alignment with course outcomes (6.5). Units often revise program outcomes based on course or student-level data (6.6 and 6.7, for example). The Fall, 2012 In-Service included a faculty workshop in which course outcomes were mapped to program outcomes (6.8). Participants then discussed the results of their mapping exercises, and identified gaps between course and program outcomes. The results of the mapping exercise led to the assessment of the Critical Thinking ILO and strategies for improving critical thinking (6.9). Program level outcomes are documented on the OIERP website (6.10).

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 7: STUDENTS DEMONSTRATE AWARENESS OF GOALS AND PURPOSES OF COURSES AND PROGRAMS IN WHICH THEY ARE ENROLLED.

Standards: I.B.5; II.A.6; II.A.6.a; II.B.

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE: Documentation on means the college uses to inform students of course and program purposes and outcomes. Samples across the curriculum of: course outlines of record and syllabi with course SLOs; program and institutional SLOs in catalog.

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 7: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

The CHC Catalog includes a listing of program-level outcomes for academic programs (7.1). The catalog is available in print and online formats.

In addition, course syllabi typically include course-level outcomes, and the Part-Time Faculty Handbook directs instructors to include them in the syllabus (7.2). The Curriculum Committee course update and modification forms require the faculty to list SLOs for each course (7.3), and the curriculum approval process includes ensuring the Outcomes assessed are addressed in the course outline of record (7.4).

SELF-ASSESSMENT ON LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION:	YOU PLANNED TO ADDRESS NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS? WHAT LEVEL OF SLO IMPLEMENTATION WOULD YOU ASSIGN YOUR COLLEGE? WHY? WHAT EFFORTS HAVE YOU PLANNED TO ADDRESS NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS?

SELF-ASSESSMENT ON LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

Crafton Hills College has made significant progress toward developing and encouraging a culture of evidence. Strengths lie in the use of SLOs to improve teaching and learning, the transparency and visibility of the outcomes processes, ready access to data and support from the Dean of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and the SLO Coordinator, a program review process that scrutinizes the alignment of outcomes with planning and resource allocation, and an Educational Master Plan that calls out assessment as an institutional priority.

The college continues to explore methods to simplify the reporting process and make it more accessible for faculty and other users. For instance, CHC is currently discussing the use of the college's successful Planning and Program Review Web Tool for outcomes reporting (8.1). Also under discussion is including a mapping process to align course, program, and institutional outcomes in Curriculum Review.

The college must also continue to increase the percentage of active courses and programs with ongoing assessment, consistent with the institution's Educational Master Plan target described in Quantitative Effectiveness Indicator #7 (8.2). In addition, the college must turn its attention to the quality of assessment.

In sum, while CHC meets items 1 through 7 of the ACCJC proficiency rubric, additional work must transpire to ensure assessment processes at Crafton Hills College are sustainable. The college must gain widespread support for a common outcomes reporting tool. Outcomes reporting should be embedded in other well-developed processes. Last, the college should consider dedicating an in-service day to dialogue about outcomes.

TABLE OF EVIDENCE: LIST THE EVIDENCE USED TO SUPPORT YOUR NARRATIVE REPORT, SECTION BY SECTION.

TABLE OF EVIDENCE (NO WORD COUNT LIMIT)

1.1	**COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORTS**
1.2	**ASSESSMENT AND OUTCOMES AT CHC** **(FIRST LINK ON THE OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PAGE)**
1.3	**CHC CATALOG, 2012-2013** **(SEE, FOR EXAMPLE, PP. 90-181)**
1.4	**CHC CATALOG, 2011-2012** **(SEE, FOR EXAMPLE, PP. 78-171**
1.5	**CHC CATALOG, 2010-2011** **(SEE, FOR EXAMPLE, PP. 69-166)**
1.6	**CHC CATALOG, 2009-2010** **(SEE, FOR EXAMPLE, PP. 40-138**
1.7	**PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORTS**
1.8	**ILO ASSESSMENT REPORTS**
1.9	**RESEARCH BRIEFS FROM THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND PLANNING: RESULTS FROM THE ASSESSMENT OF COURSE SLOS MAPPED TO CRAFTON'S ILOS**
1.10	**CRAFTON HILLS COLLEGE-OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT REPORT: INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING OUTCOME 4: SOCIETY AND CULTURE**
1.11	**CRAFTON HILLS COLLEGE-OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT REPORT: INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING OUTCOME 1: CRITICAL THINKING**
1.12	**CRAFTON HILLS COLLEGE-OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT REPORT: INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING OUTCOME 4: SOCIETY AND CULTURE**

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 2: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

2.1	**CAMPUS CLIMATE SURVEY, 2010 (SEE SLIDE 13)**
2.2	**OUTCOMES COMMITTEE MINUTES, 2010-2011; 2011-2012**
2.3	**ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE MINUTES, 2/28/12**
2.4	**ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE MINUTES, 8 23/11**
2.5	**ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTION, STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES**
2.6	**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES APRIL 4, 2011**
2.7	**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGENDA, 3/16/2012**
2.8	**2011-2012 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE**
2.9	**OUTCOMES COMMITTEE AGENDA, 4/26/2012**
2.10	**2012-2013 PLANNING AND PROGRAM REVIEW HANDBOOK** (SEE PAGES 9, 12, 15, AND LINKED RUBRICS)
2.11	**PRESENTATION, WHY DO ASSESSMENT? 2010-2011**
2.12	**PRESENTATION, THE FIVE COLUMN MODEL: ASSESSMENT REPORTING AT CRAFTON 2010-2011**
2.13	**PRESENTATION, DESIGNING EFFECTIVE PROGRAM LEVEL ASSESSMENTS, 2011-2012**
2.14	**PRESENTATION , INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING OUTCOMES: PLAN FOR 2011-2012**
2.15	**PRESENTATION, MAPPING ILOS WITH COURSE SLOS, APRIL 2012**
2.16	**PRESENTATION, DESIGNING EFFECTIVE PROGRAM LEVEL ASSESSMENTS, 2012-2013**
2.17	**IN-SERVICE WORKSHOP AGENDA, FALL 2011**
2.18	**IN-SERVICE WORKSHOP AGENDA, FALL 2012**
2.19	**ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTION, STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES**
2.20	**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES APRIL 4, 2011**
2.21	**RESEARCH TO DRIVE CAMPUS CONVERSATIONS ON STUDENT SUCCESS**
2.22	**PROGRAM REVIEW, ENGLISH, 2011** (SEE 3 B. 4.)
2.23	**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EVENTS, 2012-2013**
2.24	**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES 9 7 12**

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 3: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

3.1	**EDUCATIONAL MASTER PLAN, 2011** (SEE PAGE 14, 15, 31)
3.2	**EDUCATIONAL MASTER PLAN, QUANTITATIVE EFFECTIVENESS INDICATOR**, (2010, 2011) (SEE P. 56)
3.3	**EDUCATIONAL MASTER PLAN, FORMATIVE EVALUATION**, 2011 (SEE PP. 14-15)
3.4	**EDUCATIONAL MASTER PLAN, FORMATIVE EVALUATION, 2012 (SEE PP.16 -17)**
3.5	**PLANNING AND PROGRAM REVIEW HANDBOOK** (SEE PP. 12, 15)
3.6	**PPR COMMITTEE FEEDBACK TO UNITS RE: SLOS , EXAMPLES**
3.7	**PPR PROCESS FOR PRIORITIZING OBJECTIVES**
3.8	**2011 PRIORITIZED OBJECTIVES**
3.9	**AGENDA, SPRING 2012 IN-SERVICE**

October 2012

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 4: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

4.1	CHC CATALOG, 2008-2009 (SEE GARY WILLIAMS, FACULTY LISTING, P. 171)
4.2	OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS WEBPAGE, SLO'S
4.3	OUTCOMES COMMITTEE MINUTES, SEPTEMBER 2010
4.4	INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT PLAN
4.5	INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT PLAN, PP. 1-2
4.6	INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT PLAN, P. 4
4.7	ELUMEN LOGIN PAGE
4.8	WEB FORM, FIVE-STEP OUTCOMES MODEL
4.9	WORD FORM, FIVE-STEP OUTCOMES MODEL (CLICK ON LINK)
4.10	WEB PAGE, COURSE-LEVEL OUTCOMES
4.11	WEB PAGE, PROGRAM-LEVEL OUTCOMES
4.12	WEB PAGE, INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING OUTCOMES
4.13	CHC INTEGRATED PLANNING AND PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS (SEE PP. 4 AND 11, AND LINK ON P. 11)

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 5: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

5.1	INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT PLAN
5.2	ELUMEN LOGIN PAGE
5.3	WEB FORM, FIVE-STEP OUTCOMES MODEL
5.4	CHC OUTCOMES WEB SITE
5.5	WEB PAGE, COURSE-LEVEL OUTCOMES
5.6	WEB PAGE, PROGRAM-LEVEL OUTCOMES
5.7	WEB PAGE, INSTITUTION-LEVEL OUTCOMES
5.8	SAMPLE OF SLO CYCLE, PSYCHOLOGY
5.9	SAMPLE OF ASSESSMENT PROGRESS DISCUSSED IN PROGRAM REVIEW, CIS (SEE ITEMS 3 AND 4)
5.10	ASSESSMENT AND OUTCOMES AT CHC (FIRST LINK ON THE OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PAGE)

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 6: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

6.1	PROGRAM OUTCOMES, ENGLISH DEPARTMENT
6.2	PROGRAM OUTCOMES, SPEECH
6.3	PROGRAM OUTCOMES, FOREIGN LANGUAGES
6.4	PROGRAM OUTCOMES, ANATOMY
6.5	DESIGNING PROGRAM LEVEL ASSESSMENTS, FLEX PRESENTATION
6.6	EXAMPLE OF PROGRAM OUTCOME REVISION, PARAMEDIC
6.7	EXAMPLE OF PROGRAM OUTCOME REVISION, STUDENT LIFE
6.8	FALL 2012 IN-SERVICE DAY AGENDA
6.9	SPRING 2012 CRITICAL THINKING ILO ASSESSMENT
6.10	WEB PAGE, PROGRAM-LEVEL OUTCOMES

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 7: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

7.1	**CHC CATALOG, ONLINE**
7.2	**PART TIME FACULTY HANDBOOK (SEE PAGE 24, COURSE SYLLABUS)**
7.3	**CURRICULUM REVIEW CHECK SHEET**
7.4	**CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES, 8/27/12** ITEM #3, SECOND TO THE LAST BULLET

SELF EVALUATION

8.1	**PLANNING AND PROGRAM REVIEW WEB TOOL**
8.2	**EDUCATIONAL MASTER PLAN** (SEE PAGE 56)

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC)

10 Commercial Blvd., Suite 204, Novato, CA 94949

Telephone: 415-506-0234 ◊ FAX: 415-506-0238 ◊ E-mail: accjc@accjc.org