ACCREDITING COMMISSION for COMMUNITY and JUNIOR COLLEGES

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

10 COMMERCIAL BOULEVARD
SUITE 204
NOVATO, CA 94949
TELEPHONE: (415) 506-0234
FAX: (415) 506-0238
E-MAIL: accjc@accjc.org
www.accjc.org

April 5, 2012

Memo to: Chief Executive Officers and Accreditation Liaison Officers

From: Barbara Beno, Ph.D. Barbara A Beno

Subject: 2012-13 Institutional Reports on Institutional Status on Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment of Learning

A few years ago, this office informed you that the Commission expected institutions to demonstrate they were implementing the (2002) Accreditation Standards that deal with student learning outcomes by showing the institution to be at the Proficiency Level on the ACCJC's Rubric on Institutional Effectiveness, Part III, by fall 2012. On February 24, 2012, I wrote to inform you that the Commission would be conducting a special assessment of institutional status with respect to implementation of the standards about student learning outcomes during the 2012-13 academic calendar year; included was information about whether your institution's report was due October 15, 2012 or March 15, 2013.

Attached please find the *College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation* to be used for completing the college report. The report form is also being sent to you in electronic form so that you can easily download and use it. Instructions appear on the form itself. You will find the report a useful document for assessing your own institution's progress in meeting Standards and you should keep it in the college's accreditation library for use in future institutional self-evaluation work.

The Commission will receive a summary report on institutional performance based on fall 2012 reports at its January, 2013 meeting, and a second summary report on institutional performance based on spring 2013 reports at its June meeting. The Commission may use an institution's report to take action to require follow-up for purposes of assuring institutional compliance with Accreditation Standards.

Please contact our offices if you have any questions about this report by calling Vice President Krista Johns or sending an email to kjohns@accjc.org. Of course, as always, please feel free to contact me as well at bbeno@accjc.org.

BAB/mjb

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:

Institution's Name:

Name and Title of Individual Completing Report:

Telephone Number and E-mail Address:

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: Signature:_____
(e-signature permitted)

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): _____
   b. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: _____
      Percentage of total: _____
   c. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: _____
      Percentage of total: _____

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

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): _____
   b. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: _____; Percentage of total: _____
   c. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: _____; Percentage of total: _____

4. Institutional Learning Outcomes
   a. Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined: _____
   b. Number of institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment: _____

PROFICIENCY RUBRIC STATEMENT 1: NARRATIVE RESPONSE

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

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

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

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

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

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
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

TABLE OF EVIDENCE: LIST THE EVIDENCE USED TO SUPPORT YOUR NARRATIVE REPORT, SECTION BY SECTION.
TABLE OF EVIDENCE (NO WORD COUNT LIMIT)

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

ACCREDITING
COMMISSION
for COMMUNITY and
JUNIOR COLLEGES

10 COMMERCIAL BOULEVARD
SUITE 204
NOVATO, CA 94949
TELEPHONE: (415) 506-0234
FAX: (415) 506-0238
E-MAIL: accjc@accjc.org
www.accjc.org

July 2011

Memo to: **ACCJC Member Institutions**

From: **Barbara Beno, President** Barbara Beno

Subject: **ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness**

Attached you will find a copy of the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, updated by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges/WASC in June 2011. This Rubric was first published in 2007 and has undergone two previous editorial revisions. The 2011 edition reflects language added to provide some additional detail.

Since 1994, the Commission's Accreditation Standards have required institutions to engage in a systematic and regular review of program quality as well as in short-and long-term planning, and an allocation of resources to assure that institutions achieve their stated mission and assess and improve institutional effectiveness. The 2002 Accreditation Standards added requirements that institutions become more intentionally supportive of student learning by defining intended student learning outcomes, assessing learning, and incorporating the results of assessment into decisions about institutional priorities and improvement plans.

The Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness was developed to assist colleges as they conduct self evaluation, and to assist external review teams as they examine institutional quality during accreditation reviews. The Rubric gives institutional members, evaluators, and the Commission a common language to use in describing the institution's practices in three key areas of the continuous quality improvement process – Program Review, Integrated Planning, and Student Learning Outcomes.

It is important to note that the sample behaviors described in each text box of the Rubric are not new criteria or standards for evaluation of an institution's quality, but rather are examples of behavior that, if characteristic of an institution, would indicate the institution's stage in the implementation of the Accreditation Standards, particularly Standard IB and important sections of Standard II and Standard III. The Rubric should be used in conjunction with the Accreditation Standards and the *Guide to Evaluating Institutions*, and *Guide to Evaluating Distance Education and Correspondence Education.*

The Commission has previously announced its expectations for institutional performance with regard to the practices described in the Rubric, as follows:

- The Commission expects all accredited institutions to be at the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement level in Program Review (Part1 of the Rubric) and Planning (Part 2 of the Rubric).
- At present, the Commission expects all accredited institutions to be at least at the Development Level or above in Student Learning Outcomes (Part 3 of the Rubric).
- The Commission expects all accredited institutions to be at the Proficiency Level in Student Learning Outcomes by fall 2012. The Commission will assess all member institutions during the 2012-13 year.

Institutions in the ACCJC membership widely share a commitment to the purposes of assessment – to improve student outcomes. The Commission hopes that institutional leaders will find the 2011 Rubric helpful as they assess their own institution's quality and work to achieve greater student success.

The Commission welcomes any ideas for improving the Rubric and for improving institutional practices in continuous quality improvement. [1] Please direct comments to accjc@accjc.org.

BAB/bd

Attachment

[1] The ACCJC's Task Force on Student Learning Outcomes met in spring 2011 to provide the updates contained in the 2011 Rubric.

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

Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part I: Program Review

(See cover letter for how to use this rubric.)

Levels of Implementation	Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Program Review *(Sample institutional behaviors)*
Awareness	• There is preliminary investigative dialogue at the institution or within some departments about what data or process should be used for program review. • There is recognition of existing practices and models in program review that make use of institutional research. • There is exploration of program review models by various departments or individuals. • The college is implementing pilot program review models in a few programs/operational units.
Development	• Program review is embedded in practice across the institution using qualitative and quantitative data to improve program effectiveness. • Dialogue about the results of program review is evident within the program as part of discussion of program effectiveness. • Leadership groups throughout the institution accept responsibility for program review framework development (Senate, Admin., Etc.) • Appropriate resources are allocated to conducting program review of meaningful quality. • Development of a framework for linking results of program review to planning for improvement. • Development of a framework to align results of program review to resource allocation.
Proficiency	• Program review processes are in place and implemented regularly. • Results of all program reviews are integrated into institution-wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making. • The program review framework is established and implemented. • Dialogue about the results of all program reviews is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness. • Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples. • The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes.
Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement	• Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement. • The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness. • The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.

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

Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part II: Planning

(See cover letter for how to use this rubric.)

Levels of Implementation	Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Planning *(Sample institutional behaviors)*
Awareness	• The college has preliminary investigative dialogue about planning processes. • There is recognition of case need for quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in planning. • The college has initiated pilot projects and efforts in developing systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning and implementation (e.g., in human or physical resources). • Planning found in only some areas of college operations. • There is exploration of models and definitions and issues related to planning. • There is minimal linkage between plans and a resource allocation process, perhaps planning for use of "new money". • The college may have a consultant-supported plan for facilities, or a strategic plan.
Development	• The Institution has defined a planning process and assigned responsibility for implementing it. • The Institution has identified quantitative and qualitative data and is using it. • Planning efforts are specifically linked to institutional mission and goals. • The Institution uses applicable quantitative data to improve institutional effectiveness in some areas of operation. • Governance and decision-making processes incorporate review of institutional effectiveness in mission and plans for improvement. • Planning processes reflect the participation of a broad constituent base.
Proficiency	• The college has a well documented, ongoing process for evaluating itself in all areas of operation, analyzing and publishing the results and planning and implementing improvements. • The institution's component plans are integrated into a comprehensive plan to achieve broad educational purposes and improve institutional effectiveness. • The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes. • The college has documented assessment results and communicated matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies (documents data and analysis of achievement of its educational mission). • The institution assesses progress toward achieving its education goals over time (uses longitudinal data and analyses). • The institution plans and effectively incorporates results of program review in all areas of educational services: instruction, support services, library and learning resources.
Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement	• The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning. • There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust and pervasive; data and analyses are widely distributed and used throughout the institution. • There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes. • There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes.

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

Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part III: Student Learning Outcomes

(See cover letter for how to use this rubric.)

Levels of Implementation	Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Student Learning Outcomes *(Sample institutional behaviors)*
Awareness	• There is preliminary, investigative dialogue about student learning outcomes. • There is recognition of existing practices such as course objectives and how they relate to student learning outcomes. • There is exploration of models, definitions, and issues taking place by a few people. • Pilot projects and efforts may be in progress. • The college has discussed whether to define student learning outcomes at the level of some courses or programs or degrees; where to begin.
Development	• College has established an institutional framework for definition of student learning outcomes (where to start), how to extend, and timeline. • College has established authentic assessment strategies for assessing student learning outcomes as appropriate to intended course, program, and degree learning outcomes. • Existing organizational structures (e.g., Senate, Curriculum Committee) are supporting strategies for student learning outcomes definition and assessment. • Leadership groups (e.g., Academic Senate and administration), have accepted responsibility for student learning outcomes implementation. • Appropriate resources are being allocated to support student learning outcomes and assessment. • Faculty and staff are fully engaged in student learning outcomes development.
Proficiency	• Student learning outcomes and authentic assessments are in place for courses, programs, support services, certificates and degrees. • There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results of assessment and identification of gaps. • Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning. • Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned. • Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed and updated on a regular basis. • Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes. • Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.
Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement	• Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic and used for continuous quality improvement. • Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive and robust. • Evaluation of student learning outcomes processes. • Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing. • Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college. • Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews.

Rev. 10/28/2011

Crosswalk Linking Proficiency Level of SLO Implementation to the ACCJC Accreditation Standards

NOTES:

- *Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness—Part III: Student Learning Outcomes*
- Representative Sections of the Accreditation Standards are cited. There are other Standards which also address SLOs, student learning, and assessment.

These documents are available on the accjc.org website.

Proficiency Rubric Statement: Student learning outcomes and authentic assessments are in place for courses, programs, support services, certificates and degrees.

ER 10 Student Learning and Achievement
The institution defines and publishes for each program the program's expected student learning and achievement outcomes. Through regular and systematic assessment, it demonstrates that students who complete programs, no matter where or how they are offered, achieve these outcomes.

I.A.1. The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character and its student population.

II.A.1.a, The institution relies upon research and analysis to identify student learning needs and to assess progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes.

II.A.1.c The institution identifies student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees; assesses student achievement of those outcomes; and uses assessment results to make improvements.

II.A.2.a,b,e,f,g,h,i
a. The institution uses established procedures to design, identify learning outcomes for, approve, administer, deliver, and evaluate courses and programs. The institution recognizes the central role of its faculty for establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs.

b. The institution relies on faculty expertise and the assistance of advisory committees when appropriate to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution regularly assesses student progress towards achieving those outcomes.

e. The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an on-going systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans.

f. The institution engages in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning to assure currency and measure achievement of its stated student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution systematically strives to improve those outcomes and makes the results available to appropriate constituencies.

g. If an institution uses departmental course and/or program examinations, it validates their effectiveness in measuring student learning and minimizes test biases.

h. The institution awards credit based on student achievement of the course's stated learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education.4

i. The institution awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program's stated learning outcomes.

II.A.3. General education has comprehensive learning outcomes for the students who complete it... [See II.A.3.a,b,c.]

II.B.4. The institution evaluates student support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

II.C.2. The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

Proficiency Rubric Statement: There is a widespread institutional dialogue about assessment results and identification of gaps.

I.B.1. The institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.

I.B.2. The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.

I.B.3.The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.

I.B.5. The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.

Proficiency Rubric Statement: Decision making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning.

I.B. The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.

I.B.3. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.

II.A.1.c The institution identifies student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates and degrees; assesses student achievement of those outcomes and uses assessment results to make improvements.

II.A.2.f The institution engages in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning to assure currency and measure achievement of its stated student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution systematically strives to improve those outcomes and makes the results available to appropriate constituencies.

III.A.1.c Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes.

IV.A.2.b The institution relies on faculty, its academic senate other appropriate faculty structures, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning and programs and services.

Proficiency Rubric Statement: Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.

I.B. The institution also organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to effectively support student learning.

I.B.4. The institution provides evidence that the planning process is broad-based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.

I.B.6. The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.

III.C.2. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of technology resources and uses the results of evaluation as the basis for improvement.

III.D.2.a Financial documents, including the budget and independent audit, reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services.

III.D.3. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of financial resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

Proficiency Rubric Statement: Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed and updated on a regular basis.

I.A.1.The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purpose, its character, and its student populations.

I.B. The institution demonstrates its effectiveness by providing evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes... The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.

I.B.3. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.

I.B.5. The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.

I.B.6. The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.

II.A.2.a The institution relies on faculty expertise and the assistance of advisory committees when appropriate to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education and degrees. The institution regularly assesses student progress towards achieving those goals.

II.B. The institution systematically assesses student support services using student learning outcomes, faculty and staff input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of these services. [See whole section.]

Proficiency Rubric Statement: Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.

II.A.2.e The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an on-going systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans. Standard II.A.2.e.

II.A.2.f The institution engages in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning to assure currency and measure achievement of its stated student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees.

II.A.2.i The institution awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program's stated learning outcomes.

Proficiency Rubric Statement: Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.

I.B.5.The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.

II.A.6. The institution assures that students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information about educational courses and programs and transfer policies. The institution describes its degrees and certificates in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected student learning outcomes. In every class sections students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning outcomes consistent with those in the institution's officially approved course outline.

II.A.6.a The institution makes available to its students clearly stated transfer-of-credit policies in order to facilitate the mobility of students without penalty. In accepting transfer credits to fulfill degree requirements, the institution certifies that the expected learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable to the learning outcomes of its own courses.

II.B. The entire student pathway through the institutional experience is characterized by a concern for student access, progress, learning, and success. [See whole section.]

Colleges Scheduled to Submit a Fall 2012 Report For the Proficiency Level in Student Learning Outcomes

Reports Due October 15, 2012, in electronic format.

- American River College
- American Samoa Community College
- Antelope Valley College
- Bakersfield College
- Cabrillo College
- Cañada College
- Cerro Coso Community College
- Chabot College
- Citrus College
- College of the Desert
- College of Marin
- College of San Mateo
- College of the Canyons
- College of the Redwoods
- College of the Sequoias
- Columbia College
- Contra Costa College
- Cosumnes River College
- Crafton Hills College
- Cuesta College
- Cuyamaca College
- DeAnza College
- Diablo Valley College
- El Camino College
- Evergreen Valley College
- Fashion Institute of Design & Merchandising
- Folsom Lake College
- Foothill College
- Fresno City College
- Grossmont College
- Hawai'i Community College
- Heald College (12 Branch Campuses)
- Honolulu Community College
- Irvine Valley College
- Kapi'olani Community College
- Kauai Community College
- Lake Tahoe Community College
- Las Positas College
- Leeward Community College
- Long Beach City College
- Los Medanos College
- Merced College
- Modesto Junior College
- Monterey Peninsula College
- Moorpark College
- Mt. San Antonio College
- MTI College
- Napa Valley College
- Northern Marianas College
- Oxnard College
- Porterville College
- Reedley College
- Rio Hondo College
- Sacramento City College
- Saddleback College
- Salvation Army Crestmont College
- San Bernardino Valley College
- San Diego City College
- San Diego Mesa College
- San Diego Miramar College
- San Jose City College
- Santa Ana College
- Santa Barbara City College
- Santiago Canyon College
- Shasta College
- Sierra College
- Skyline College
- Solano Community College
- Southwestern College
- Taft College
- Ventura College
- Windward Community College
- Woodland Community College
- Yuba College

Colleges Scheduled to Submit a Spring 2013 Report For the Proficiency Level in Student Learning Outcomes

Reports Due March 15, 2013, in electronic format.

- Allan Hancock College
- Barstow College
- Berkeley City College
- Butte College
- Carrington College California
- Cerritos College
- Chaffey College
- City College of San Francisco
- Coastline College
- College of Alameda
- College of Micronesia-FSM
- College of the Marshall Islands
- College of the Siskiyous
- Copper Mountain College
- Cypress College
- Deep Springs College
- Defense Language Institute
- East Los Angeles College
- Feather River College
- Fullerton College
- Gavilan College
- Glendale Community College
- Golden West College
- Guam Community College
- Hartnell College
- Hawai'i Tokai International College
- Imperial Valley College
- L. A. County College of Nursing & Allied Health
- Laney College
- Lassen College
- Los Angeles City College
- Los Angeles Harbor College
- Los Angeles Mission College
- Los Angeles Pierce College
- Los Angeles Southwest College
- Los Angeles Trade-Technical College
- Los Angeles Valley College
- Mendocino College
- Merritt College
- Mira Costa College
- Mission College
- Moreno Valley College
- Mt. San Jacinto College
- Norco College
- Ohlone College
- Orange Coast College
- Palau Community College
- Palo Verde College
- Palomar College
- Pasadena City College
- Riverside City College
- San Joaquin Delta College
- San Joaquin Valley College
- Santa Monica College
- Santa Rosa Junior College
- Victor Valley College
- West Hills College Coalinga
- West Hills College Lemoore
- West Los Angeles College
- West Valley College