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| **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: 10/10/12  Institution’s Name: Reedley College  Name and Title of Individual Completing Report: Eileen Apperson, SLO Coordinator  Telephone Number and E-mail Address: (559)638-3641; eileen.apperson@reedleycollege.edu  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: Marilyn Behringer 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 2. Total number of college courses (active courses in the college catalog, offered on the schedule in some rotation): 502 3. Number of college courses with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 502 Percentage of total: 100% 4. Number of college courses with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 484 Percentage of total: 96.4% 5. Programs 6. Total number of college programs (all certificates and degrees, and other programs defined by college): 52 7. Number of college programs with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 52; Percentage of total: 100% 8. Number of college programs with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes: 52; Percentage of total: 100% 9. Student Learning and Support Activities 10. Total number of student learning and support activities (as college has identified or grouped them for SLO implementation): 31 11. Number of student learning and support activities with defined Student Learning Outcomes: 31; Percentage of total: 100% 12. Number of student learning and support activities with ongoing assessment of learning  outcomes: 31; Percentage of total: 100% 13. Institutional Learning Outcomes 14. Total number of institutional Student Learning Outcomes defined: 11 15. Number of institutional learning outcomes with ongoing assessment: 11 | |
| **Proficiency Rubric Statement 1: Narrative Response**  Nearly all courses and programs (including academic degrees, certificates and support services) conduct ongoing assessments, with 91% of courses, 88% of academic programs, and 100% of student services programs completing at least one assessment cycle to date.  While 67% of course assessments state that their results are positive, other responses such as “conduct further assessment” (21%), “use new or revised teaching methods” (20%) “develop new ways of evaluating student work” (13%), “plan the purchase of new equipment and supplies” (9%), and “revise course syllabus or outline” (8%) illustrate how these assessments are influencing teaching and learning at the College. Action plans for support services show “results are positive” (32%), “conduct further assessment” (13%), “use new or revised resources or services” (19%), “develop new methods of evaluating student learning” (16%), “plan purchase of new equipment or supplies” (6%), and/or “engage in professional development about best practices” (6%).  This data will guide our professional development and assessment planning activities on campus.  Assessment types for courses include any variety of item analysis of exams (67%), assignments based on rubrics (38%), direct observation of performances (50%), student self-assessments (13%), and/or capstone projects (17%). Instructional programs show similar assessment types. For student support programs, assessments types include direct observation of performances (6%), student self-assessments (29%), and/or external/internal data (32%). [1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6]  Course outcomes are posted on the College website and program outcomes posted on the website and in the College catalog. | |
| **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**  Outcome process and data is routinely shared with the College. [2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.11, 2.12]  The yearly Reedley College Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary provides the current data on completion of course, academicand student support programs and highlights assessment activities, results, and action plans. [2.4]  Additionally, the Institutional Outcomes (GELOs) assessments are systematically summarized each semester and results shared with the College. [2.5]  One example of the dialogue and identified gaps occurred during the creation of the blended degree outcomes. Faculty teaching within these degrees determined that several of their degrees were being under-awarded. This dialogue reached college-wide as the need to decide on degree offerings for students. It was also determined within many program meetings that many certificates and courses were not being sought by students, spurring a clean-up of courses and certificates and a discussion of the breadth and purpose of the particular programs. [2.1, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9]  Perhaps the main gap identified is the use of assessment results and subsequent action plans to influence college-wide planning, allocation of resources, and “improvement and further alignment of institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning”. In response to this gap, the Program Review Committee and Student Learning Outcome Assessment Advisory Committee is in the process of revising the Cycle Three Handbook to incorporate SLO assessment planning, mapping, and reporting of results and action plans exclusively within the program review report. This streamlining will address this gap as programs use their assessment results to help determine their goals for their programs and those goals are made known to the College. [2.10] | |
| **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**  The current Cycle Three Program Review Handbook asks how SLO assessments are used for program improvement. Assessment results and action plans, along with quantitative and qualitative data, direct the program’s goals. The SLO action plans influence the curriculum review that systematically follows. Summaries of the Program Review reports are presented to College Council (comprised of representatives of the College-wide constituency groups). Program oral presentations are open to the College and recorded. Programs are encouraged to share their assessment findings as a part of their oral presentations. Assessment progress is one criterion in the Annual Program Review report. [3.1, 3.2, 3.3]  The Program Review and SLO Assessment Advisory Committees are revising the Program Review Handbook as a place for course, program, degree, and certificate SLO results to be exclusively analyzed and action plans established.   Mapping and assessment analysis were placed into the Cycle Two handbook in 2007.  The SLO section of the handbook was revised to more direct questions regarding results and action plans in the Cycle Three handbook (spring 2009); however, a separate SLO process worked alongside although not exclusively within the program review process.  This mirrored process helped the College work its way toward proficiency. [2.9, 3.1, 3.4]  The Program Review committee is also more specifically asking for alignment between SLO-influenced program goals and the strategic plan as well as revising committee membership to include representatives from the Budget Committee and College Council.  This proposed change will solidify our integrated planning based on program and SLO needs.  This will also aid communications among these committees. [2.10] | |
| **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**  Resource needs are addressed in program review reports. Programs consider facility, personnel, and technological needs. Additionally, as a part of the funding allocation process, those programs seeking additional funding are required to use student learning outcome assessment data, results, and action plans within their Resource Action Plan Proposal (RAPP). [4.1, 3.1, 3.2, 4.2, 4.12, 4.13]  The College has committed to an SLO Coordinator at each the College and north campuses. [4.11] The College has agreed to support adjunct faculty who are sole instructors in their program or course within a program by compensating for their development and reporting of student learning outcomes. [4.9, 4.10]  Programs use Class Climate to conduct assessment surveys while Blackboard is used to store and share such assessment data. [4.3]  Since fall 2006 a series of formal and informal trainings have taken place College-wide. These have included Norena Badway presentation (fall 2006), CCCAOE workshop (fall 2008), Janet Fulks (Bakersfield College, ASCCC) and Bob Pacheco (Barstow College, RP Group) presentation (spring 2010), Division Assessment Summits (fall 2010) where disciplines and support areas across four campuses gathered to address assessment practices, mapping, course outline content, and student learning, and semesterly workshops on process and assessment strategies by the SLO coordinator and well as countless individual consultations. [4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8] | |
| **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**  All course and program (academic and support services) student learning outcome assessment reports are posted on Blackboard within a program’s folder and linked to on the College website. Evidence of assessments also located with each program’s folder is a three-year assessment timeline, mapping of course to program to institution (GE) outcomes, proof of dialogue, and assessment tools. These are updated on a continuous basis by each program. While budget has prohibited the purchase of reporting software, the current system is organized, accessible, and functional. [5.1, 5.2]  Faculty and staff have taken advantage of these folders to store and share data, a variety of assessment tools, and assessment information with their adjunct faculty. Updated regularly, this system of posting and reporting allows faculty and staff to be fully invested in the outcomes assessment process.  The SLO Coordinator relies on these reports for yearly assessment summaries, collecting data on assessment types, results and action plans, and highlighting programs and courses which have been positively influenced by their assessments. [2.4]  Faculty and staff report their current SLO assessment results and action plans within their annual program review reports. [3.2] | |
| **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**  A key component of the fall 2010 Assessment Summits was the implementation of mapping course and/or programs to the College’s Institutional/General Education Learning Outcomes. Prior to this, within the Cycle Two Program Review reports, courses were linked to degrees and certificates. As courses revise their outcomes statements, mainly due to their assessment results and action plans, these outcomes are approved by the Curriculum Committee as a part of the COR approval process. Programs then update their mapping, along with timelines and assessment tools accordingly. As academic programs and support services programs revise their program outcomes based on assessment results and action plans, the updated outcomes are provided to the SLO coordinator and Chief Curriculum Officer for inclusion on the website and College Catalog. Mapping also exists for blended degrees and is re-examined as needed. [4.4, 5.2, 3.4, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3] | |
| **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**  Most faculty members include the course’s student learning outcomes in their course syllabus. While outcomes are not required, course objectives are. Copies of the syllabi are reviewed by the Division Dean at the beginning of the semester. Faculty evaluations ask: “Instructor clearly states instructional objective for the class session or week” as a part of the observation. [7.1, 7.2]  In addition, students are also made aware of the GE learning outcomes through the website and informational posters. Graduates are provided a survey with their graduation packet which self-assesses their acquirement of the College’s institutional (GE) outcomes. [7.3, 7.4]  All program outcomes are posted on the web page and in the College catalog. [6.1] | |
| **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**  Reedley College has made great strides in reaching SLO proficiency with nearly 100% courses and academic programs and 100% of support services programs completing at least one assessment cycle.  While feeling confident about our assessment methods and results, there is room for improvement, particularly regarding the continued support of adjunct faculty as they conduct their assessments and in the reporting of GE outcomes. We look forward to analyzing our Institutional/GE LO Graduate Survey data to identify gaps.  In the coming years we will continue to stress the importance of conducting rigorous assessments and meaningful analysis of data within academic and student services programs, allowing those results to influence our processes.  Work is ongoing with the revision of our allocation of resources process and we anticipate stronger connections between SLO results and action plans and their positive influence on our student-centered practices. | |
| **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 SLO Inventory fall 2012](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Course%20SLO%20inventory%20fall%202012.xlsx)  1.2 [Program SLO Inventory fall 2012 Instructional](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Program%20SLO%20inventory%20FALL%2012%20Instructional.xlsx)  1.3 [Program SLO Inventory fall 2012 non-instructional](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Program%20SLO%20inventory%20FALL%2012%20Non-Instructional.xlsx)  1.4 [MAG 31 Fuel System Course Assessment Form](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\MAG%2031%20Fuel%20System%20Course%20Assesment%20Form.doc)  1.5 [EOPS Program Assessment Report SLO #4 non-instruction](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\EOPS%20Program%20Assessment%20Report%20SLO#4 non-insruction.doc)  1.6 [Social Science Degree Summary, fall 2011](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Social%20Science%20Degree%20Summary,%20fall%202011.docx)  2.1 [Duty Day PP fall 2012](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Duty%20DayPP%20fall%202012.ppt)  2.2 [Duty Day, fall 2011](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Duty%20Day,%20fall%202011.pptx)  2.3 [Evidence Deadline Email](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Evidence%20deadline%20email.docx)  2.4 [Reedley College Student Learning Outcome Assessment Summary, 2011-2012](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Reedley%20College%20Student%20Outcomes%20Assessment%20Report.doc)  2.5 [GELO Assessment Summary SP 2012](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\GELO%20ASSESSMENT%20SUMMARY-SP%202012.docx)  2.6 [Curriculum Minutes 9.06.12](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Curriculum%20Minutes%2009-06-2012.docx)  2.7 [Curriculum Minutes 9.13.12](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Curriculum%20Minutes%2009-13-2012.doc)  2.8 [Department Chairs Meeting 3.6.12](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\DC%20Meeting%203-6-12.doc)  2.9 [Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Student Learning Outcomes](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Charactersitic%20of%20Institutional%20Effectiveness%20in%20Student%20Learning%20Outcomes.docx)  2.10 [Program Review Cycle Three Handbook Revision](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Program%20Review%20Cycle%203%20Handbook%20Revision%20mark-up%209.24.12.docm)  2.11 [Board Report 12 7 10v3](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Board%20Report%2012%207%2010v3.ppt)  2.12 [The Wonderful World of Assessment](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\The%20Wonderful%20World%20of%20Assessment.pptm)  3.1 [Program Review Cycle 3 Handbook 11.23.10](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Program%20Review%20Cycle%203%20Handbook%2011.23.10.doc)  3.2 [Communication 2011-12 Reedley College Program Review Progress Report](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Communication%202011-12%20Reedley%20College%20Program%20Review%20Progress%20Report.doc)  3.3 [Counseling Program Review Summary Report](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Counseling%20Program%20Review%20Summary%20Report.docm)  3.4 [OLD-Program Review Handbook Cycle Two](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\OLD-Program%20Review%20Handbook%20Cycle%20Two.docm)  4.1 [2012-2013 Resource Action Plan Proposal Form](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\2012-2013_ResourceActionPlanProposal%20Form.doc)  4.2 [Reedley College Integrated Planning](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Reedley%20College%20Integrated%20Planning.docx)  4.3. [Library PLO Assessment Survey SP12](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Library%20PLO%20Assessment%20Survey%20SP12.pdf)  4.4 [Spring 2010 Duty Day](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Spring%202010%20Duty%20Day.ppt)  4.5 [SLO Assessment Summit Agenda](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\SLO%20Assessment%20Summit%20Division%20A.rtf)  4.6 [Evaluation Discoveries and Closing the Loop](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\evaluation%20discoveries%20and%20closing%20the%20loop.docx)  4.7 [Student Services Assessment Summit](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Student%20Services%20Assessment%20Summit.docx)  4.8 [Open Day Agenda sp 10](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\OpenDayAgenda%20sp%2010.pdf)  4.9 [SLO FAQ for adjunct](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\SLO%20FAQ%20for%20adjunct.pdf)  4.10 [SLO Processes Guide](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\SLO%20Processes%20Guide.pptx)  4.11 [How can Administration Help in the Assessment Process](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\How%20can%20Administration%20Help%20in%20the%20Assessment%20Process.doc)  4.12 [SLOACC 2.16.10 minutes](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\SLOACC%202.16.10%20minutes.doc)  4.13 [2012-13 Resource Action Plans Budget Committee Evaluation Rubric](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\2012-13%20RAP%20Budget%20Committee%20Evaluation%20Rubric.docx)  5.1 [Timeline example Spanish 1, SP2010](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Timeline%20example%20Spanish%201,%20SP2010.doc)  5.2 [Mapping Example Biology 1, FA 2010](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Mapping%20Example%20Biology%201,%20FA%2010.xlsx)  6.1 [Reedley College Catalog 2012-2014](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Reedley_College_Catalog_2012-2014%5b1%5d.pdf)  6.2 [Physical Science Degree SLO Mapping Grid](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Physical%20Science%20Degree%20SLO%20Mapping%20Grid.xlsx)  6.3 [GE grid](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\GE%20grid.xls)  7.1 [Sample Syllabus English 1A FA 12](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Sample%20Syllabus%20English%201A%20FA%2012.pdf)  7.2 [Faculty Evaluation Form](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Faculty%20Evaluation%20Form.doc)  7.3 [Learning Outcomes Poster](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\LearningOutcomesPoster.pdf)  7.4 [Graduate GELO Survey](file:///C:\Users\jd006\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\1N685UW5\proficiency%20evidence\Graduate%20GELO%20survey.pdf) | |
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