

Accreditation Progress Report

**Submitted by
Crafton Hills College
11711 Sand Canyon Road
Yucaipa, CA 92399**

**Gloria Macías Harrison, President
Crafton Hills College**

**Dr. Donald Averill, Chancellor
San Bernardino Community College District**

October 2006

To

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

**Barbara A. Beno, Executive Director
Novato, California**

**Accreditation Progress Report
Crafton Hills College
October 15, 2006**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Statement of Report Preparation..... 2

Responses to the Recommendations from the 2002 Team 3

 Recommendation 1. 3
 “Crafton Hills College should follow through with its intent to complete a comprehensive, long-range planning process that establishes clear links between the college mission statement, institutional research, and allocation of resources.”
 (Standards 1.3, 3A.1, 3A.3, 3A.4, 4B.2, 3B.3, 3C.1, 9A.1, 9A.2)

 Recommendation 4. 6
 “The faculty should demonstrate its responsibility for maintaining program standards by establishing and clearly communicating instructional program requirements and expected learning outcomes.” (Standards 4.B.1, 4.B.3, 4.B.4, 4.B.5)

 Recommendation 6. 10
 “The college should integrate program review into institutional evaluation and planning, develop and implement clearly-stated transfer of credit policies, and develop processes and procedures to ensure program effectiveness of distributed education.”
 (Standards 4.D.1, 4.D.2, 4.D.4)

 Recommendation 7 13
 “The college should develop a comprehensive research agenda that includes systematic collection of data for monitoring, evaluating, and improving student services programs.” (Standards 3A.1, 3A.4, 3B.2, 5.3, 5.10)

List of Supporting Documents 16

**Accreditation Progress Report
Crafton Hills College
October 15, 2006**

Statement of Report Preparation

Several meetings of faculty and instructional administrators were held in the Spring and Fall of 2006 to develop responses to the recommendations made by the accrediting team. Action plans were developed and progress reports from constituent groups were collected in the office of instruction. These reports were reviewed by the accreditation steering committee, the college president, and the chancellor of the San Bernardino Community College District. The final report was completed by the director of research and planning, the past president of the academic senate, the college president, and the chancellor.

Prepared by:

Daniel Bahner	Past President, Academic Senate
Alex Contreras	Vice President, Student Services
Tina Gimple	Instructional Assessment Technician, DSPS/ President, Classified School Employees Association
Gloria Harrison	College President
Virginia Moran	Director, Research and Planning
Charlie Ng	Vice-President, Administrative Services
Dennis Partain II	President, Associated Students
Susan Shodahl	Vice President, Instruction
Mark Snowwhite	Department Chair, English & Reading

Approved by the
San Bernardino Community College District Board of Trustees
October 12, 2006

Responses to the Recommendations from the 2002 Team

Recommendation 1.

“Crafton Hills College should follow through with its intent to complete a comprehensive, long-range planning process that establishes clear links between the college mission statement, institutional research, and allocation of resources.”
(Standards 1.3, 3A.1, 3A.3, 3A.4, 4B.2, 3B.3, 3C.1, 9A.1, 9A.2)

Standard 1.3 Institutional planning and decision making are guided by the mission statement.

Standard 3A.1 Institutional research is integrated with and supportive of institutional planning and evaluation.

Standard 3A.3 The institution has developed and implemented the means for evaluating how well and in what ways it accomplishes its mission and purposes.

Standard 3A.4 The institution provides evidence that its program evaluations lead to improvement of programs and services.

Standard 3B.2 The institution defines and integrates its evaluation and planning process to identify priorities for improvement.

Standard 3B.3 The institution engages in systematic and integrated educational, financial, physical, and human resources planning and implements changes to improve programs and services.

Standard 3C.1 The institution specifies intended institutional outcomes and has clear documentation of their achievement.

Standard 9A.1 Financial planning supports institutional goals and is linked to other institutional planning efforts.

Standard 9A.2 Annual and long-range financial planning reflects realistic assessments of resource availability and expenditure requirements. In those institutions which set tuition rates, and which receive a majority of funding from student fees and tuition, charges are reasonable in light of the operating costs, services to be rendered, equipment, and learning resources to be supplied.

Although most campus programs and services areas have dutifully followed the annual program review and planning process during the last five years or so, last year marked the first time these entities engaged in a process that directly links program review and planning to budgeting. Following submission and review of annual planning priorities for each division (instruction, student services, administrative services), the president’s

cabinet (president and the three vice president's) disseminated a list of funding priorities and their amounts to the campus.

Each year for several years now the college has incrementally enhanced the annual program review-planning process. This year's improvements include the following:

- A detailed map has been created of the process flow (see attached), which specifies timelines, milestones, deliverables, and roles and responsibilities of all the stakeholders. The intent here is (1) to create more consistency of practice across campus, and (2) to make expectations more explicit and public. In this way, communications about planning-related issues will continue to improve.
- The president's cabinet has committed the college to developing an Educational Master Plan, scheduled for development November-December 2006 with implementation starting in January 2007. Discussions have begun about how to link annual operational planning processes to strategic long-range planning. At the beginning of the 2006-07 school year, the whole campus began the educational master planning process, with the ultimate goal of developing explicit ties with the annual operational planning process. Once the Educational Master Plan is in place, more informed discussions can occur among all campus constituencies about how individual units can contribute to the overarching campus vision. To date, suggestions which have been offered are quite viable—for example, to include long-term planning discussions at the unit level once individual plans have been submitted, which could culminate in a *Major Initiatives/Program Innovations* section of the unit's planning documents. In point of fact, this section already exists, but unfortunately few units have completed it—perhaps because they do not have the overarching vision the Educational Master Plan will offer them.

With respect to campus-wide long-range planning, the president's cabinet has developed an aggressive schedule for both educational master planning and strategic enrollment management planning. A detailed work plan has been established that includes objectives, tasks, responsibility centers, and deadlines for the Educational Master Plan. At this writing, progress on development of a Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) Plan includes general benchmarks only: The president's cabinet intends to have an SEM Plan developed by the end of the 2006-2007 academic year, for implementation starting July 1, 2007.

To summarize the college's progress on this recommendation, we have followed through with the intent to complete a comprehensive, long-range planning process by making explicit the link between annual allocation of resources and institutional research in the form of annual program review. In addition to describing the process on paper and communicating it to stakeholders, the process was implemented during the 2005-2006 academic year and culminated last month in an update by the college president to the academic senate on which of the identified college-wide priorities actually received funding for this year.

Neither the link between this annual process and the college mission of “promoting learning through self-discovery and the acquisition and application of knowledge and skills,” nor the link between annual operational planning and more long-range planning have been explicated. At this writing, such links are being discussed and framed within a college-wide effort to craft a long-range vision (*i.e.*, Educational Master Plan) for the college’s future.

Supporting documentation:

- Process map for annual operational planning
- Status report of college funding priorities as of Spring 2006
- List of college priorities funded for Academic Year 2006-2007

Recommendation 4.

“The faculty should demonstrate its responsibility for maintaining program standards by establishing and clearly communicating instructional program requirements and expected learning outcomes.” (Standards 4.B.1, 4.B.3, 4.B.4, 4.B.5)

Standard 4.B.1 The institution demonstrates that its degrees and certificate programs, wherever and however offered, support the mission of the institution. Degree and certificate programs have a coherent design and are characterized by appropriate length, breadth, depth, sequencing of courses, synthesis of learning, and use of information and learning resources.

Standard 4.B.3 The institution identifies and makes public expected learning outcomes for its degree and certificate programs. Students completing programs demonstrate achievement of those stated learning outcomes.

Standard 4.B.4 All degree programs are designed to provide students with a significant introduction to the broad areas of knowledge, their theories and methods of inquiry, and focused study in at least one area of inquiry or established interdisciplinary core.

Standard 4.B.5 Students completing degree programs demonstrate competence in the use of language and computation.

Crafton Hills College offers a wide variety of degrees and certificates, all of which clearly support the mission of the community college. Discipline faculty are responsible for the design of degrees and certificates which are subsequently scrutinized and approved by the appropriate departments and the curriculum committee. The college has begun developing student learning outcomes assessment cycles at the course, program, and college level. All of the career and technical programs (e.g., paramedic and respiratory care) have developed program outcomes, as required by their various accrediting agencies, and they systematically use the results of state and national testing to assess the success of their students in meeting those outcome and to make appropriate adjustments.

The college has worked to get the academic areas to follow suit. Professional development activities continue to be offered to raise faculty awareness of the importance of identifying and assessing learning outcomes and to provide them with the strategies and tools necessary to do so. For example, Dr. Norena Badway from the Higher Education Evaluation Research Group conducted a workshop on campus on March 9, 2006, entitled “Closing the Loop on Assessing and Improving Student Learning.” This workshop was well attended by both full-time and part-time faculty. Dr. Badway emphasized the importance of faculty dialogue and presented a step-by-step process for engaging in the full student learning outcomes assessment cycle.

In February 2006, the academic senate created the Student Learning Improvement Cycle (SLIC) committee to facilitate the development of student learning outcomes assessment

cycles (SLOACs) at all levels—course, program, and institutional. With an aggressive meeting schedule, the committee re-worked the cycle template provided by Dr. Badway and began working with faculty to develop cycles at the course level. By the end of the semester, work was completed on basic courses in chemistry, child development, computer information systems, English, health education, mathematics, and speech, to use as templates for courses across the curriculum. This information was shared with members of the Instructional Council (faculty chairs, coordinators, and deans) in the spring and with part-time faculty who attended the Part-Time Faculty Workshop in August 2006.

To address college-level learning outcomes, the general education task force, with representatives from across the college, has met regularly since spring 2003 to review and reconfigure general education requirements in light of the college mission and philosophy of general education. As a result of these bi-weekly extensive dialogues, the English and mathematics graduation requirements were raised (from Preparation for College Writing to Freshman Composition and from Elementary Algebra to a mathematics course requiring Elementary Algebra or higher as a prerequisite), effective 2006-2007. The academic senate also approved the recommendation to change the reading requirement (to satisfactory completion of Freshman Composition or an equivalent English composition course), effective 2007-2008.

Throughout the Fall 2005 Semester, the general education task force held biweekly discussions, to which all faculty were invited and the majority of full-time faculty attended, to define the precise language for 13 measurable learning outcomes in general education. In spring 2006, the academic senate adopted the 13 general education learning outcomes, thus providing a basis for a new general education requirement. The 2006-2007 goal of the general education task force is the creation of shared assessment instruments for these 13 general education learning outcomes. All faculty will once again be invited to participate in collectively and collaboratively developing these assessment instruments, as well as the rubrics necessary for scoring them.

Also, in October 2005 the college was awarded a Title V grant, which provided the opportunity to hire a full-time instructional assessment specialist. This faculty position, filled in September 2006, was created to address the following charges:

- To present assessment options to departments, programs, and support units.
- To assist in training in the assessment of student learning outcomes (SLOs) of college faculty, managers, staff, and members of the staff development committee.
- To work with instructional and student services, faculty, administrative units, and staff to design and implement SLO assessment cycles developed to improve teaching and learning in the classroom and within support programs and services.
- To disseminate results of assessment research as appropriate.
- To examine and assure the efficacy of assessment tools and to recommend appropriate assessment tools.
- To assist in the preparation and maintenance of a variety of narrative and statistical reports relevant to the SLO assessment cycle.

- To provide leadership in the creation of a common format for planning and reporting outcomes.
- To evaluate the implementation of SLO assessments and their effectiveness.

The college expects this specialist to work closely with the college SLIC committee as well as with the general education task force in the development of SLO cycles at all levels.

Once SLOs have been established and the cycle of collecting relevant data begins, the college plans to use this data to improve learning. To this end the San Bernardino Community College District has contracted with eLumen to purchase a system that will allow for the comprehensive collection, management, and analysis of learning outcomes. This system is designed to coordinate all direct learning measures throughout the college, provide instructors the means to easily and electronically collect student achievement scores, and produce aggregated information on student achievement. The college plans to implement the system during the 2006-07 school year.

To increase the college's capacity to develop, assess, and update its courses and programs, the college has implemented CurricUNET, an online curriculum development and workflow automation program designed to facilitate all phases of curriculum development and approval via an electronic delivery system. This program should not only facilitate the curriculum process but also increase the vigilance required to assess and ensure the quality of degree and certificate program offerings (Standard 4B.1).

The college has made progress in meeting this recommendation but is still in the early stages of establishing the foundation necessary to effectively assess student learning outcomes on all levels (course, program, and institutional). The college has taken great care in developing numerous elements to move the college forward to achieve its goal of becoming a learning-centered institution.

The newly-hired instructional assessment specialist will serve as an important resource for the SLIC committee and the general education task force. The Staff Development Committee will continue to provide the training necessary to include all faculty in the dialogue about outcomes and to provide them with the tools necessary to implement the SLO assessment cycles. The implementation of eLumen will make the tracking of outcomes more manageable. The Curriculum Committee will increase its vigilance regarding the quality of programs and certificates.

At this writing, full SLO assessment cycles have been completed in only a handful of courses and programs. The current holding pattern is attributed to the absence of the instructional assessment specialist and the eLumen software to be used to manage assessment data. Once these are in place (in the next two or three months), it is anticipated that full SLO assessment cycles will be completed across the disciplines.

In summary, through their participation in academic senate and other committee work described above, faculty members have clearly demonstrated ownership over maintaining program standards by developing a process for defining, assessing, and understanding student learning outcomes in the service of instructional improvement. Additionally, resources (personnel, software, and training) have been directed to supporting the SLO assessment cycle.

Supporting documentation:

- Student learning outcome templates
- SLIC (student learning improvement cycle) committee minutes
- General Education Taskforce minutes
- Academic Senate Resolution S06.06, General Education Outcomes

Recommendation 6.

“The college should integrate program review into institutional evaluation and planning, develop and implement clearly-stated transfer of credit policies, and develop processes and procedures to ensure program effectiveness of distributed education.” (Standards 4.D.1, 4.D.2, 4.D.4)

Standard 4D.1 The institution has clearly defined processes for establishing and evaluating all of its educational programs. These processes recognize the central role of faculty in developing, implementing, and evaluating the educational programs. Program evaluations are integrated into overall institutional evaluation and planning and are conducted on a regular basis.

Standard 4.D.2 The institution ensures the quality of instruction, academic rigor, and educational effectiveness of all of its courses and programs regardless of service location or instructional delivery method.

Standard 4.D.4 The institution has clearly stated transfer of credit procedure. In accepting transfer credits to fulfill degree requirements, the institution certifies that the credits accepted, including those for general education, achieve educational objectives comparable to its own courses. Where patterns of transfer between institutions are established, efforts are undertaken to formulate articulation agreements.

Integration of program review into institutional evaluation and planning:

For the past three years institutional evaluation has been integrated with operational planning; however, planning year 2005-2006 marked the first time that evaluation informed the budget allocation process. As a result, at the end of the year the planning committee disseminated across campus a list of college priorities with identified funding sources. An updated report will also be distributed during the fall term of the academic year 2006-2007, once the impact on the district of the adopted state budget is fully understood.

The evaluation, or program review, component of the integrated operational planning process is comprehensive, including both quantitative and qualitative data. However, there continues to be wide variation in the quality of the program reviews conducted, owing in part to variations that exist among planning stakeholders in their understanding of how to interpret and use data. Career and technical programs have state and national standards they must follow to meet their accreditation mandates. With academic programs, however, there is no clear consensus about what constitutes a healthy program or service, which makes it difficult for stakeholders to address “areas in need of improvement,” as the program review documents ask them to, which lead to varying interpretations of need for action.

Transfer of credit policy:

The Counseling Office developed clearly stated transfer of credit policies, which have been published in the 2006-2007 college catalog. Students must complete a request-for-

services form at the Counseling Office to initiate a formal evaluation, as well as to request their official transcripts. Only full-time counselors evaluate transcripts. Transcript evaluators must first check the accreditation status of the college from which the transcript is received. The college does not accept incoming transfer college credits from technical and career colleges, non-accredited colleges, or colleges pending accreditation. The college does accept all University of California and California State University extension courses (100 through 900 levels) to apply to the associate's degree requirements as elective credit. Based on the official transcripts available, a counselor completes the college's transfer credit evaluation. The Counseling Office distributes copies of the evaluation results to the Office of Admissions and Records for proper posting and imaging. The evaluation is available in imaged form to all counselors for use in advisement and development of a student education plan.

Students who request an evaluation of transcribed coursework from a foreign institution must have their transcripts evaluated by a member company of the Association of International Credentials Evaluators (AICE). After an AICE evaluator evaluates the transcripts, the student must have an official copy of the evaluation sent to the Office of Admissions and Records. A counselor completes the college's transfer credit evaluation, and the results are submitted to the Office of Admissions and Records for proper posting and imaging. The evaluation is available in imaged form to all counselors for use in advisement and development of a student education plan.

Program effectiveness of distributed education:

The Educational Technology Committee has developed a system for faculty development and certification for teaching online courses. In addition, the committee has developed a process for proposing, developing, offering, and reviewing distributed education courses, which addresses and ensures that all distributed education courses comply with the various sets of standards articulated in the CHC Distributed Education Plan approved by the academic senate in fall 2005. These standards include the following parameters: Teaching and Learning Standards; Course Media and Materials Standards; Accessibility Standards; Privacy and Protection Standards; Program and Course Review Standards; and Departmental and Discipline-Specific Standards. The Education Technology Committee has also operationalized these standards by developing and implementing, starting in fall 2006, a DE Course Content Guidelines and Evaluation Form, as well as a Course Certification Check-off Sheet (see attached). If a course does not meet the rigor of the established standards, a Faculty Support and Development Team assists the developing faculty member to re-conceive and reconfigure the course to meet the required standards.

In summary, the college has followed through on this recommendation as follows (evidenced by the supporting documents herein): (1) it has implemented an annual integrated program review and planning process that is linked to funding allocations; (2) the college developed a clearly-stated transfer of credit policy and communicated it to the public in its catalog; and (3) the college has developed a foundation for its distributed education offerings that includes processes and procedures for monitoring of effectiveness.

Supporting documentation:

- Process map for annual operational planning
- Status report of college funding priorities as of spring 2006
- Distributed Education Curriculum Addendum
- Distributed Education Plan
- Distributed Education Course Content and Evaluation Form
- Distributed Education Course Certification and Check-off Sheet

Recommendation 7

“The college should develop a comprehensive research agenda that includes systematic collection of data for monitoring, evaluating, and improving student services programs.” (Standards 3A.1, 3A.4, 3B.2, 5.3, 5.10)

Standard 3A.1 Institutional research is integrated with and supportive of institutional planning and evaluation.

Standard 3A.4 The institution provides evidence that its program evaluations lead to improvement of programs and services.

Standard 3B.2 The institution defines and integrates its evaluation and planning process to identify priorities for improvement.

Standard 5.3 The institution identifies the educational support needs of its student population and provides appropriate services and programs to address those needs.

Standard 5.10 The institution systematically evaluates the appropriateness, adequacy, and effectiveness of its student services and uses the results of the evaluation as a basis for improvement.

Student Learning Outcomes

In spring 2005 the Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) office piloted a procedure for identifying outcomes and developing criteria and assessment tools for determining student support and program outcomes consistent with the mission of the EOPS office and that of the college. This process also included identifying the criteria for assessment, as well as the tools to be used to assess the level of successful achievement of the outcomes. The template EOPS has developed identifies and articulates three types of levels of outcomes: Student Learning Outcomes, Student Support Outcomes, and Program Outcomes. With each outcome, assessment criteria have been defined and a rubric or other measure identified. EOPS will begin collecting and analyzing data in the 2006-07 academic year.

Student Services Retreat

In spring 2006, all segments of Student Services met to review the services of each office, to report on achievements that year, and to lay a foundation for the development of learning outcomes for each area. Again, during the half-day session on outcomes, student service personnel were introduced to the three aforementioned types or levels of outcomes: Student Learning Outcomes, Student Support Outcomes, and Program Outcomes.

Following the template created by EOPS, the various areas in Student Services (e.g. Admissions and Records, Financial Aid, Counseling, and DSP&S) will proceed throughout the 2006-07 academic year to develop the specific outcome language appropriate to its particular service, as well as the assessment criteria and appropriate

rubric. Each area knows its own level of service, the characteristics of students served and each will work within its scope to improve upon that.

Data collected in student services programs need to be presented in a campus forum for discussion. Specifically, in addition to regular reports of the numbers and demographics of students served published on the college website, the college would be well served by formal presentations made to such bodies as the academic senate, the president's cabinet, and the student services council. The only mechanism that has heretofore existed for bringing together individual sources of data for evaluation is the annual program review and planning process. A more coordinated effort of setting priorities for the improvement of the institution is needed; it is hoped that the continuing development of our student learning outcomes effort will serve in this capacity. With a campus-wide, coordinated effort to transform data into information and information into knowledge through honest, vigorous dialogue, such as the master education planning process will involve, the college hopes to gain the capacity to systematically plan appropriate services and programs to address the needs of current and future students.

Recognizing the need to improve, the campus is making a concerted effort to gather student services data in a systematic manner. This will include sharing information on the numbers and kinds of students served, as well as progress toward identifying, defining, and assessing student learning outcomes. The campus' planned purchase of software for managing student learning outcomes (eLumen) that can be used by all interested parties should help greatly in this regard. The addition of the instructional assessment specialist dedicated to working across campus to develop a more coordinated system of defining and assessing learning outcomes as the first step toward improvement of the college's services will also greatly facilitate our progress on this recommendation.

The office of research and planning will work more closely with individual departments and student services as a whole to establish baselines, provide needed figures and assist in the interpretation of collected data used to determine student persistence and student success. Such gathered data will then be systematically shared with the campus. Specifically it will be presented to student services council, instructional teams, and the academic senate, with subsequent discussions as to its implications. Such data will be formally reported to the Planning and Budget Committee with the intent to inform decision making as funds become available.

Launching such practices will go a long ways toward the college's development of a comprehensive research agenda that provides systematic collection of data leading to the improvement of student services programs.

To summarize, systematic data collection is common practice in student services, and has been used to monitor, evaluate, and improve those services. Although no comprehensive research agenda exists, a basic framework is in development. Earlier this year, the entire student services division participated in a one-day retreat for the purpose of (1) sharing knowledge across units; and (2) developing common student outcomes for all areas within student services. The EOPS office is well on its way to implementing its outcome assessment cycle, having started collection of student-level data.

No comprehensive agenda exists to drive research efforts in student services, beyond the usual mandated studies—*e.g.*, course placement and prerequisite validation, or disproportionate impact of placement tests. In addition, management of student outcome data poses certain challenges that must await the arrival of the instructional assessment specialist and the eLumen software. However, efforts to develop the basic framework continue, with counseling office personnel holding a work session on September 15th to develop its student outcomes.

Supporting documentation:

- Extended Opportunities Programs & Services Outcomes, 2006

List of Supporting Documents

- Process map for annual operational planning
- Status report of college funding priorities as of Spring 2006
- List of college priorities funded for Academic Year 2006-2007
- Student learning outcome templates
- SLIC (student learning improvement cycle) committee minutes
- General Education Taskforce minutes
- Academic Senate Resolution S06.06, General Education Outcomes
- Distributed Education Curriculum Addendum
- Distributed Education Plan
- Distributed Education Course Content and Evaluation Form
- Distributed Education Course Certification and Check-off Sheet
- Extended Opportunities Programs & Services Outcomes, 2006