

Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

I.B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

The institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student learning. The institution also organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to effectively support student learning. The institution demonstrates its effectiveness by providing 1) evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes and 2) evidence of institution and program performance. The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.

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

Institutional Research and Planning Committee; the Physical Resources Committee; the Program Review Committee; the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee; and the Student Services Committee.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The institutional structure of Citrus College is designed to facilitate ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes. This is reflected in the [Mission Statement](#)¹ of the College, in [Board Policy](#)² and [Administrative Procedure 2510, Participation in Local Decision Making](#)³ in the statement on governance philosophy in the [Organization and Governance Handbook](#)⁴, and in the representation of all constituent groups, including students, faculty, staff, and management on the standing shared governance committees of the College. These include [the Steering Committee](#)⁵; [the Academic Senate](#)⁶; [the associated students](#)⁷; [the College Information Technology Committee](#)⁸; the Educational Programs Committee and its subcommittee, the Distance Education Committee; the Financial Resources Committee; the Human Resources and Staff Diversity Committee; the Institutional Effectiveness Committee; the

A central component of self-reflective dialogue at the College is the institutionalized process of assessing student learning outcomes. Faculty, staff, administrators, and students all share in the student learning outcomes and assessment process and have been committed to it more than ten years. [Core competencies](#)⁹, adopted in 2003, institutional outcomes, and learning-focused outcomes are in place for institutional support, general education, degrees and certificates, instructional programs, student services, and courses, including both traditional, on-campus courses and distance education courses. The Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee, known as the HotShots, adopted a mapping mechanism to link course-level outcomes to program/degree/certificate outcomes. Course-level learning outcomes are mapped to higher-level learning outcomes in the following ways:

1. Via curriculum maps to program outcomes

2. Via curriculum maps to discipline-specific degrees and certificates
3. Via core competency to general education patterns and broader degrees
4. Via assignment to general education patterns, and degree, or certificate to the College mission

The College has [three institutional student learning outcomes](#)¹⁰ that originate from the [mission statement](#)¹¹. In 2012, the College completed a mission revision, and the institutional outcomes have been revised accordingly, demonstrating Citrus College's ongoing commitment to improvement of student learning. In fall 2014, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee initiated a desk review process of the mission, mission objectives, vision, and values. The desk review was approved by the [Steering Committee](#)¹² and the Board of Trustees on [November 18, 2014](#)¹³.

Through the curriculum process, faculty members lead in developing outcomes and meaningful assessment at course and program levels. Recommendations generated from assessment are integrated into institutional planning through the program review process. The College has met proficiency in student learning outcomes and assessment, as documented to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges in the [Citrus College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation](#)¹⁴, and is working at the highest level for student learning outcomes: sustainable and continuous quality improvement. Student learning outcome processes are evaluated via the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee known as the HotShots, the Program Review Committee, and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. In addition, the

Distance Education Committee, led by a faculty coordinator appointed by mutual agreement of the Academic Senate president and the vice president of academic affairs, evaluates, through program review, how well distance education courses fulfill the College's commitment to the distance education modality as an integral part of its mission. Also, the committee assesses the demand for distance education courses and how well the College meets that demand. The review of the distance education program includes assessment of data on success and retention for distance education courses. In addition, each instructional program review includes assessment of success and retention for any distance education courses in that program. The primary goal of the Distance Education Committee is to improve success and retention for distance education courses, as expressed in its purpose statement.

Student learning outcomes for every course, regardless of modality, are assessed at least once within the five-year program review cycle and frequently more often to ensure reliability. Faculty members participate in the discussion and dialogue about student learning outcome assessment data in the fall at convocation and again at the spring flex day. The student learning outcomes reflection document in section VII of program review provides instructional faculty the opportunity to document the reflection of one full year of student learning outcomes assessment, and this dialogue leads to identification of gaps and plans for improvement. All campus units participate in program review and have the opportunity to discuss and reflect on student learning outcomes assessment data.

At the institutional level, assessment data focus on broader outcomes, such as the annual general education assessment dialogue and the assessment of the institutional outcomes. Academic support, student services, and institutional support areas collect data and reflect on assessments on an annual basis. The Integrated Planning Manual documents the flow of information in the planning process. Program review data, including student learning outcomes assessment, are linked to resource requests and to strategic plan objectives.

Some specific examples illustrate how collegial, self-reflective dialogue occurs on an ongoing basis as a result of the processes developed to facilitate it. [Faculty Inquiry Groups](#)¹⁵ in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics disciplines conduct course-level action research on a variety of relevant topics, making appropriate curricular and pedagogical adjustments. For example, the spring 2012 Biology 105 inquiry group focused on the strength of connection between lecture and lab. Faculty bridged the gap between lecture and lab by including short lab-like demos in lecture to make the material more hands on.

Students who observed a demonstration with eggs in lecture and lab performed better than the groups that either did not see the demonstration at all or saw it only in lab.

As a result of their findings, many instructors now include more demonstrations in lecture. The faculty inquiry group began the conversation on revising the Biology 105 lab manual to include more hands-on experiments that are simpler in protocol, and still emphasize the core concepts. The revised lab manual was first used in fall 2014 and was

received well by students and faculty. A follow-up group prepared a literature review as discussion continued. A group of science faculty members met regularly throughout the fall 2014 semester to discuss literature and strategies they can apply in the classroom to enhance student learning.

[Student Services](#)¹⁶ hosts an annual retreat at which each department reports outcomes from the prior year and describes the top two recommendations for the upcoming year, leading to collaboration opportunities. One outcome resulted in a change effective in the fall 2013 semester that enables students to acquire a Board of Governors fee waiver without completing the full financial aid application process.

In May 2014, HotShots participated in the third annual [general education assessment dialogue](#)¹⁷. This faculty and staff dialogue, which will include students in the next session, aims to assess the academic excellence institutional learning outcome as well as all five general education student learning outcomes. The dialogue also confirms that assessment of course-level student learning outcomes for courses that satisfy general education requirements provide evidence for accomplishment of the general education learning outcomes at the institutional level.

HotShots developed the [Student Learning Outcomes Handbook](#)¹⁸, which included collaboration and edits, throughout fall 2013 and spring 2014. The handbook serves as a resource to all campus units, instruction, student services, institutional support, and academic support, as they continue to write, revise, assess, analyze, and reflect on their student learning

outcomes. This handbook details the process from writing student learning outcomes to implementing an improvement plan that articulates with the College's planning and allocation process. Recommendations generated from assessment analysis are integrated with institutional planning through the processes of program review. The Student Learning Outcomes Handbook includes narrative examples of their best practices and faculty's unique approach to the process of student learning outcomes and assessment. This handbook was presented to the [Steering Committee](#)¹⁹ on May 12, 2014.

Members of HotShots help fulfill the 2013-2014 institutional plan to [maintain sustainable continuous quality improvement](#)²⁰. To meet the goal of maintaining proficiency and reaching sustainable continuous quality improvement in student learning outcomes, the committee created a plan of activities and objectives. This plan identifies 26 action items based on input from participants throughout the College. The plan was shared through the governance committees including steering, Academic Senate, and educational programs. An accreditation standard column indexes each action item to corresponding accreditation standards.

Biennially, the Academic Senate invites the director of institutional research, planning, and effectiveness to present the results of the [Community College Survey of Student Engagement](#)²¹. Members of the Academic Senate use this information to compare and contrast the perceptions of student engagement from the student and faculty perspectives. After reviewing the 2012 Community College Survey of Student Engagement results, the

Institutional Research and Planning Committee, working with staff members from the Office of Institutional Research, conducted a series of student focus groups to better understand students' thoughts and experiences regarding student engagement. Results of the qualitative study were presented to faculty at the 2014 spring flex day, and faculty shared their best strategies and best practices to improve student engagement in group discussions at the October 8, 2014 [academic senate meeting \(scroll to page 5\)](#)²². This dialogue on student engagement, which has been shown to help students learn and achieve their goals, is a prime example of the learning-centered culture at Citrus College.

The Academic Senate has ongoing responsibilities regarding the program review process. Every course, whether taught on campus or through distance education, is assigned to a discipline and is subject to program review, which provides the evidence to support planning and budget decisions. The Program Review Committee is responsible for the ongoing review of the program review reports and for providing feedback to the authors of the reports.

The College meets the Standard.

Analysis and Evaluation

Citrus College maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional process. This is evident in the governance structure and in the minutes of its standing shared governance committees.

The student learning outcomes assessment and program review processes result in self-reflective dialogue about the

continuous improvement of student learning and the creation of records that facilitate ongoing reflection that allows year-to-year comparison of outcomes. Student learning outcome assessment and program review occur at the course level, regardless of teaching modality, at the program level, and at the level of the College as a whole. This self-reflective dialogue is documented in the program review reports in all four areas: academic support, institutional support, instruction, and student services. There is an ongoing, self-reflective dialogue about the student learning outcomes assessment and program review processes that is led by the HotShots, program review, and institutional effectiveness committees.

The Academic Senate is a forum for faculty members to engage in formal discussion about continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes, as documented in the minutes of the meetings of the senate.

1.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.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Citrus College's [values](#)²³ consist of seven elements: student focus, excellence, collaboration, diversity, lifelong learning, integrity, and technological advancement. The College has stated its purpose of promoting these values in its [mission](#)

[statement](#)²⁴ and [vision statement](#)²⁵. The College sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with these purposes through an integrated planning model that begins with the [2011-2016 Strategic Plan](#)²⁶. This plan articulates focus areas, institutional goals, and strategic objectives that form the foundation of all other College plans.

The strategic plan, initiated by the superintendent/president in 2009-2010, was completed by an ad hoc committee of the Steering Committee in spring 2011, and was adopted by the Steering Committee in fall 2011. After formulating the strategic objectives, the committee assigned responsibility for each objective to one or more of the following plans: the 2011-2020 Educational and Facilities Master Plan, the human resources plan, the technology plan. The 2011-2016 Strategic Plan is implemented and progress is monitored annually. At the beginning of each academic year, an [Annual Implementation Plan](#)²⁷ is created, detailing the activities necessary to achieve the strategic objectives with projected measurable outcomes for each activity. At the end of the academic year, a [progress report](#)²⁸ is produced. This report documents the outcomes and achievement of each strategic objective.

In the execution of plans, the responsible parties solicit input from key constituencies and articulate the objectives in measurable terms in an ongoing effort to improve institutional effectiveness. The Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness provides data to ensure that the College goals and objectives are assessed in measurable terms that are discussed in the program review process. [Data packets](#)²⁹ provided for instructional program review include student success

and retention, disaggregated by age, gender, and ethnicity. Program review data packets also include five-year longitudinal comparison of success and retention rates by course modality (traditional vs. distance education). A review of the data shows lower success and retention rates for distance education classes when compared to traditional classes. As a result, the distance education committee produced a handbook and instituted training for all new distance education instructors. The program review coordinator provides faculty members prepopulated templates for annual program review reports. The director of institutional research, planning, and effectiveness reports the results of the Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges data to the Board of Trustees annually. Additionally, the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness conducts campus surveys of students and faculty regarding effectiveness and awareness of program review and student learning outcome assessment. It conducts the Community College Survey of Student Engagement every two years and reports the results to the Academic Senate.

In regard to institution-set standards, the College formed a workgroup to review historical data in the last five years on course success, number of degrees and certificates awarded, and number of students transferred to four-year colleges and universities. With representatives from institutional research, faculty, student learning outcome coordinators, administrators, and others, the workgroup discussed the standards and their rationales. The Steering Committee vetted the final institution-set standards before the annual report was submitted to the Accrediting Commission.

The superintendent/president distributes regular budget updates and highlights of the meetings of the Board of Trustees and the Steering Committee to faculty and staff so that everyone is informed about important issues regarding the achievement of the goals and objectives of the College.

The adoption of the theme “Citrus College: A College of Completion” illustrates the institution’s focus on student learning, its broad-based understanding of the goals, and the varied constituent groups that help to achieve them. In 2012, members of the Citrus College chapter of the Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society, inspired by a survey research project they presented at a conference, organized the Citrus College Completion Corps. This corps addresses students’ concerns and interests, such as effective time management, using the College’s academic support services, and mentoring one another. Its goal is to increase the number of students who complete their studies at Citrus College and continue to pursue higher education and career opportunities. This action on the part of the students inspired the members of the committee in charge of organizing convocation day activities to make “Citrus College: A College of Completion” the theme of convocation 2012. Faculty members pledged to support this project. Subsequently, the Steering Committee has engaged in a series of discussions and [literature review](#)³⁰ on making Citrus College a college of completion, analyzing peer reviewed academic articles on this topic and sharing ideas. The results indicate an increase in the number of degrees and certificates granted to graduates. Faculty members worked with the curriculum committee to create new

courses and degrees, including transfer degrees that guarantee admission at the upper-division level to California State University and University of California. Citrus College ranks as one of the top colleges in California in meeting or exceeding its goal in numbers of transfer degrees created. The number of transfer degrees awarded increased from 39 in 2011-2012 to 231 in 2012-2013. There has been an increase in transfers by students majoring in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics fields, referred to as STEM. Also, there has been enhanced student success due to efforts such as [supplemental instruction](#)³¹ and the [Writing Cafe](#)³².

The College meets the Standard.

Analysis and Evaluation

Citrus College sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. This is evident in the way the College has adopted and implemented its strategic plan that formulates strategic objectives that are consistent with its mission and values.

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. This is shown by the way in which the College plans the implementation of the goals identified in the strategic plan and details them in the other planning documents. At the beginning of the academic year, an annual implementation plan is developed. The annual implementation plan identifies specific activities that will help achieve the goals and assigns them to responsible parties. The annual implementation plan also projects measurable outcomes for each activity. At the end of the academic year, the progress report documents the

evaluation and discussion of the outcomes. Further, as faculty members, staff, and managers participate in program review, they articulate outcomes in their areas in measurable terms, discuss them, and collaborate in the achievement of them. The Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness helps by providing [data packets](#)³³ for program review.

The widespread participation in the adoption and implementation of the theme “Citrus College: a College of Completion” and the significant increase of the number of transfer degrees awarded from 2011-12 to 2012-2013 offers further evidence that institutional members, including students, participate in the setting of goals, understand them, and work collaboratively toward their achievement, is.

1.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.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The [Citrus College integrated planning model](#)³⁴ ensures not only that plans are coordinated, but that responsibilities for carrying them out are clearly assigned and that results are then assessed with a view to further improvement. [Program review](#)³⁵ is an integral part of planning, executing, and evaluating in instructional programs, academic support programs, student services programs, and institutional support areas. Resource allocation is

directly tied to program reviews. For example, in the instructional area, the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness provides extensive data to faculty each year through the program review process. Student success rates, retention rates, and student demographics are all part of the data sets. The Program Review Committee has constructed program review templates to aid faculty in the process of analyzing and applying these data. The committee solicits feedback from faculty and has revised the template in light of it. The program review templates make this quantitative data readily available for faculty members to use in reviewing the effectiveness of their programs. In addition, the templates include areas for qualitative assessment of student success. Requests for equipment, supplies, and staff or faculty must be supported by evidence documented in program reviews. The effectiveness of such resource allocation is then assessed in subsequent program reviews.

In addition to the program review process for all courses, the discipline dean reviews each course taught in the distance education mode once every three years for Americans with Disabilities Act compliance, regular and effective contact, and other best practices identified by the Distance Education Committee. The deans use the distance education site review rubric developed by the Distance Education Committee to carry out this review. In addition, the Distance Education Committee conducts student satisfaction surveys for all courses offered through distance education every semester.

In fall 2011, the Steering Committee identified the need to review the planning process itself. In March 2012, the [Institutional Effectiveness Committee](#)³⁶

was established to be, in effect, “the program review of planning.” Cochaired by the program review coordinator and the director of institutional research, planning, and effectiveness, the committee meets monthly during the fall and spring semesters to allow the various constituent groups to come together to discuss trends and issues in their areas. In March and April of 2012, the committee conducted a survey to assess the status of Citrus College in program review, planning, and student learning outcomes using the ACCJC rubric of institutional effectiveness. Results were collected from nine standing committees of the College: the Information Technology Committee, the Institutional Research and Planning Committee, the Educational Programs Committee, the Financial Resources Committee, the Physical Resources Committee, the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee, the Human Resources and Staff Diversity Committee, the Academic Senate, and the Student Services Committee. The results showed that 87 percent of the respondents agreed that the College was at the sustainable, continuous quality improvement level regarding program review; a total of 79 percent agreed that the College was at the sustainable, continuous quality improvement level regarding planning; and 67 percent agreed that the College was at the proficiency level regarding student learning outcomes. The HotShots worked during the fall 2013 semester to ensure the College reaches the goal identified in the 2013-2014 institutional plan to maintain Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement, identifying 26 action items and persons responsible for carrying them out.

Additionally, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee has solicited

input from all faculty and staff regarding participation in the program review process. The feedback has been shared with the 2011-2012 Program Review Task Force, which revised the template and changed from a six-year to a five-year cycle of comprehensive program reviews. Subsequently, in fall 2013, the College established the [Program Review Committee](#)³⁷ and made it a standing committee of the Steering Committee.

The College supports the positions of student learning outcomes and assessment coordinator and program review coordinator by granting release time to the full-time faculty members who are appointed to these coordinator positions. Student learning outcomes assessment is embedded in the program review that faculty members in each program complete. Time is set aside on convocation day in the fall and flex day in the spring for faculty members in each program to consult with each other and complete the learning outcomes assessment and core [program review](#)³⁸ plus one of five “plus one” addenda.

Programs rotate through the five year cycle, completing each of the supplements along the way.

- Year 1 = Core + Mission
- Year 2 = Core + Course Curriculum
- Year 3 = Core + Degrees, Certificates, Transfer, and Employment
- Year 4 = Core + Program, Degree, and Certificate Learning Outcome Assessment
- Year 5 = Core + Program Self-Evaluation and Summary

In the fifth year, faculty members conduct a self-evaluation and summary of the progress made over the previous four years of annual reviews, and all “plus one”

reports are compiled and submitted to the Program Review Committee before being forwarded to the Steering Committee and the Board of Trustees. The Program Review Committee forms reading groups to evaluate the program reviews reports and provide feedback according to a rubric before they are forwarded to the Steering Committee and the Board of Trustees. Recommendations for curricular changes, budget requests, and program development all arise from and are documented in the program review process. Programs in noninstructional areas such as [academic support](#)³⁹, [student services](#)⁴⁰, and [institutional support](#)⁴¹ are reviewed annually and comprehensively on a five-year cycle, with a view to how they contribute to student learning.

The Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness convenes with each grant team along with relevant faculty and administrators quarterly to review and discuss outcome data for project components. For example, the STEM [internal evaluation](#)⁴² team closely monitored its project services, and, therefore, was able to proactively refine them. [Interviews](#)⁴³ with Supplemental Instruction (SI) participants in spring 2009 provided feedback and strategies in areas such as scheduling SI sessions at more flexible times, recruiting SI leaders with different styles, and promoting SI so more students will participate (pages 17 -19 in the linked report). Additionally, quantitative analyses consistently show that SI is making a positive difference in student success. However, [data](#)⁴⁴ indicated that the positive effects of SI were significantly less pronounced for Biology 105 during the winter and summer terms. After thorough discussion, the internal evaluation team and Biology 105 faculty determined that SI would not be provided

for Biology 105 classes during winter and summer terms but would continue in fall and spring terms. In general, statistical analyses, such as chi square, logistic regression, and ANOVA analysis, are run for each course offered with a supplemental instruction section or a facilitated study group to evaluate its effectiveness. This provides an opportunity to discuss how services are meeting grant goals and objectives including outcomes for the target population(s).

The College meets the Standard.

Analysis and Evaluation

Citrus College 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 reevaluation. The College employs an [integrated planning model](#)⁴⁵ that coordinates its planning activities, assigns responsibilities, and ensures that results are systematically assessed. The College has established a Program Review Committee to assess the effectiveness and ease of program review procedures. This committee has used suggestions from faculty members to revise the instructional program review procedure. Also, the College has established an Institutional Effectiveness Committee to assess, on an ongoing basis, the effectiveness of the planning procedures. Citrus College bases decisions regarding resource allocation on evidence supplied in program reviews.

Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data. The Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness supplies quantitative

data on student success rates, retention rates, and student demographics that faculty members analyze in program review. Faculty members use qualitative data, such as assessments of student writing and critical thinking skills, in the assessment of student learning outcomes and in their reflections on this assessment that is incorporated in program review. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee has combined use of both qualitative and quantitative data in its survey of the nine standing committees of the College regarding progress as measured by the ACCJC's rubric of institutional effectiveness. This is further evidence of the Citrus College's ongoing assessment of its progress toward achieving its stated goals.

1.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.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Citrus College publishes an [integrated planning manual](#)⁴⁶ that describes the major planning components of the College. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee, which represents the views of administrators, managers, faculty, staff, and students, is responsible for reviewing the planning process annually to ensure that all constituent groups participate in and contribute to college planning. The committee revises the integrated planning manual as needed and publishes the results each year.

The College publishes its five-year [strategic plan](#)⁴⁷, [annual implementation](#)

[plan](#)⁴⁸, and annual [progress reports](#)⁴⁹ on implementation of the strategic plan. Each year, the progress report aligns strategic objectives with an institutional goal and focus area identified by the strategic plan, along with a timeline and the person or persons responsible for implementing the goal. The progress report then lists specific activities, projected measurable outcomes, and an update of the results of those activities in measurable terms for each strategic objective formulated in the strategic plan.

The College publishes the [Organization and Governance Handbook](#)⁵⁰, originally adopted in spring 2009 and revised annually in the fall semester. This handbook details the participation by all the constituent groups in the planning process and the ongoing governance of the College. As the handbook shows, faculty, classified staff, managers, supervisors/confidential, and students are represented in all shared governance committees.

The method of linking resource allocation to planning begins at the instructional program level with the program review process, regardless of the course offering modality. Faculty conducting program reviews may request resources for equipment, supplies, and staff or faculty members as a way to improve student learning outcomes supported by the program. They consider connections to the [2011-2016 Strategic Plan](#)⁵¹ and the [2011-2020 Educational and Facilities Master Plan](#)⁵² as they identify program needs. The Program Review Committee, using rubrics developed in spring 2013, reviews program reports for completion and quality. Resource requests from individual programs are collected at the division level, where needs are prioritized through

a discussion of annual goals for the division. The deans then meet to discuss needs across all divisions and prioritize needs accordingly. The prioritized needs are then forwarded for consideration at the institutional level depending on the type of need. Needs for new faculty members are sent to the Faculty Needs Identification Committee, with members from both administration and faculty, as stated in [Board Policy](#)⁵³ and [Administrative Procedure 7201](#)⁵⁴, Recruitment and Selection of Full-Time Faculty, the committee discusses and votes on prioritization of the faculty positions and creates a faculty hiring priority list. The committee forwards this list to the superintendent/president for review and input. [The board of trustees \(page 90\)](#)⁵⁵ identifies the number of faculty positions to be filled for the given year. Needs for equipment, supplies, or staff other than faculty within each division are forwarded to the Financial Resources Committee which reviews all requests and then makes a recommendation regarding which requests to fund to the Steering Committee. The vice president of finance and administrative services is responsible for ensuring that all funded requests are within budget. The College has compiled a list of approved requests from program review.

This process has served the College well, both during the economic downturn that began in 2008 and the subsequent recovery. During the downturn, the institution was able to cut back on expenditures in the budget while managing to retain the necessary resources for maintaining strong academic programs. As the economy improved, the process was flexible enough to begin reallocating resources to areas that had been cut.

As an example of how the College takes seriously the goal of ensuring that participation in the planning process is broad based, in spring 2014 the Program Review Committee presented a roadshow of the work of the committee to faculty members at their various division and unit meetings. The purpose of the roadshow was to provide a better understanding of how the three key areas of the continuous quality improvement process – learning outcomes and assessment, program review, and the [integrated planning model](#)⁵⁶ – all work together as means to demonstrate and ensure institutional effectiveness.

In summer and fall 2014, the committee presented the roadshow to institutional support, academic support, and student services areas. The roadshows were very well received by all of the instructional, student services, and institutional support programs. The post-roadshow assessment results reveal:

- 95 percent of the roadshow attendants agreed or strongly agreed that they have a better understanding of why the college conducts and documents student learning outcomes.
- 94 percent of the roadshow attendants agreed or strongly agreed that they have a better understanding of the program review process.
- 93 percent of the roadshow attendants agreed or strongly agreed that they have a better understanding of how student learning outcomes and program review work together.
- 91 percent of the roadshow attendants agreed or strongly agreed that they have a better understanding of how to access resources available related to student learning outcomes and program review.

- 87 percent of the roadshow attendants agreed or strongly agreed that they have a better understanding of the College planning model.

During the spring 2014 semester, the Distance Education Committee reviewed its choice of learning management systems for distance education courses, as the contract with the vendor, Blackboard, approached its expiration or renewal date. Since all faculty members, including those who do not teach distance education courses, have access to Blackboard for use in their courses, all faculty members as well as staff members of the Technical and Computer Systems department were invited to presentations by potential vendors and were provided with online access to their systems. At the end of the process, a majority of participants voted to continue with Blackboard.

Yet another example of ensuring that the planning process is broad based is that the Institutional Effectiveness Committee conducts surveys across the College concerning participation in program review. [A survey](#)⁵⁷ of faculty members conducted in November 2012 showed that 97.4 percent of respondents were either contributors (75.3 percent) or the primary author (22.1 percent) of that year's program review. In contrast, a survey the committee conducted in May 2013 among employees in the academic support and institutional support areas showed that 54.7 percent of respondents considered themselves to be non-participants in that year's annual program review. As a result, the committee adopted the following as one of its responsibilities in its [2013-2014 purpose statement](#)⁵⁸: "Initiate the discussion and facilitate a consensus in moving forward with campus wide engagement in program review." That

discussion led to an effort to include classified staff in the program review process following the model of Admissions and Records, which holds regular meetings with all staff to discuss program review components and new goals. The presentation of the series of program review, student learning, and planning roadshows also helped to improve the understanding of how the three key areas of the continuous quality improvement process—learning outcomes and assessment, program review, and the institutional planning model—all work together to improve institutional effectiveness.

By surveying participants of program review of the four types, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee also carried out a systematic evaluation of the instructional program review process in the 2012-2013 academic year, which resulted in streamlined and improved quality of reviews. The College had already allocated resources to support the program review process in the form of release time for faculty members who fill the positions of student learning outcomes and assessment coordinator and program review coordinator. In 2012-2013, the College established a Program Review Committee, reporting to the Steering Committee, to further assist with and oversee this vital work.

The College meets the Standard.

Analysis and Evaluation

Citrus College provides evidence that the planning process is broad based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness. The College publishes documents that provide such evidence,

including the integrated planning manual, the 2011-2016 strategic plan, the annual implementation plans, progress reports, and the Organization and Governance Handbook. The Integrated Planning Manual describes how the planning documents of Citrus College are integrated under the Strategic Plan and how administrators, managers, faculty, and staff participate in the planning process. The 2011-2016 Strategic Plan, the annual implementation plans, and the annual progress reports provide further evidence of input by appropriate constituencies and the allocation of resources based on the criterion of improvement of institutional effectiveness. The Organization and Governance Handbook provides evidence that all constituent groups are represented in the planning process by detailing the purpose and the membership of each standing committee and the role of each in the planning process. Consistent with the principle of broad-based participation is the committee membership that produced the Organizational and Governance Handbook, which included an administrator, two managers, three faculty members, a student representative, and a representative of classified staff.

Citrus College has established the Institutional Effectiveness Committee to assess how well the planning process leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness, and the College publishes the meeting minutes on the Citrus College website.

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

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Citrus College communicates matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies both internally and externally, and it does so using documented assessment results.

The superintendent/president communicates documented achievements to all employees on a regular basis through the [Citrus Bulletin](#)⁵⁹ and the [Citrus View](#)⁶⁰ email newsletters, which are produced by the Office of External Relations, the [Board Highlights](#)⁶¹ and Steering Committee Highlights email reports, and emailed reports on the budget of the College in relation to budget reports from the California governor's office. The College conducts a [budget forum](#)⁶² twice a year to inform managers, staff, faculty, students, and members of the public about the budget process. The Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness collects and assesses evaluations filled out by attendees of each budget forum, and reports back to the Office of the Superintendent/President so that such forums may be continually improved.

The Academic Senate keeps faculty members and students informed of its activities involving assessment through its regularly scheduled meetings, which include representatives from the associated students, through the Academic Senate website, and through regular emails of the agendas and minutes of its meetings. The [Academic Senate posts the agenda](#)⁶³ of each meeting online and on campus. The

senate sponsors special presentations as needed to keep constituencies informed about quality improvement efforts and the assessment of them. For example, the transfer degree presentation in spring 2013, which encouraged future efforts and documented the College's success up to that time, responded to the new law concerning transfer degrees by creating 12 new transfer degrees that help students to four-year universities at the junior level.

All courses, regardless of teaching modality, are evaluated through the student learning outcomes assessment and program review processes, which are then reviewed by the HotShots and reported to the Program Review Committee. In addition, the Distance Education Committee uses Blackboard to communicate best practices in distance education teaching to instructors teaching distance education courses. The instructional dean reviews each distance education course every three years for Americans with Disabilities Act compliance and regular and effective contact. The distance education coordinator reports the results of these assessments to the Educational Programs Committee.

In spring 2012, the Community College Survey of Student Engagement was administered throughout the institution. Analyses indicate that Citrus College students were less engaged than the nationwide cohort in three key areas—active and collaborative learning, student effort, and student-faculty interaction. To better understand students' needs and their perceptions about levels of engagement and to gather student input on how to improve engagement and provide research-based recommendations to the institution, the Office of Institutional

Research, Planning, and Effectiveness and the Institutional Research and Planning Committee designed and implemented a campus wide [CCSSE qualitative follow-up study](#)⁶⁴. The process used semi-structured focus group interviews to gather qualitative data that was analyzed and presented to faculty and staff on the staff development day, known as flex day, in February 2014. The committee presented the focus group study results at the [academic senate meeting on September 24, 2014](#)⁶⁵, with faculty members breaking into groups sharing their best practices and strategies on how to enhance active and collaborative learning, student effort, and student-faculty interaction among their students. The Academic Senate executive members provided a special presentation on the break-out group discussions at the [October 8, 2014 academic senate meeting](#)⁶⁶.

Citrus College communicates matters of quality assurance using documented assessments to the surrounding community in its annual [Report to the Community](#)⁶⁷, the [Citrus College News Magazine](#)⁶⁸, [press releases](#)⁶⁹, [fact sheets](#)⁷⁰, the [Citrus College Fact Book](#)⁷¹, and the link to the community, news, and highlights section on its website. The College communicates quality assurance to the community, as well as receives advice from it, through the medium of the career and technical advisory councils that exist, one for each program, in career and technical education.

The College reports annually to the [Citizens' Oversight Committee](#)⁷² on the implementation of Bond Measure G, approved by voters in the Citrus Community College District in March 2004. Implementation of the measure is spelled out in the 2011-2020 Educational

and Facilities Master Plan, derived from objectives identified in the strategic plan. Each year, the College publishes the annual implementation plan that assesses the accomplishment of previously identified goals and objectives in terms of measurable outcomes. The plan also sets forth new goals and details the projected measurable outcomes that will be used to assess further progress in achieving goals and objectives.

The College meets the Standard.

Analysis and Evaluation

Citrus College uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies. Documented assessment results are reported at meetings of the Steering Committee and at public meetings of the Board of Trustees. The superintendent/president communicates highlights of these meetings to all employees in regular and frequent email newsletters. The Academic Senate keeps faculty members and students informed about quality assurance at its meetings and through emails of the agendas and minutes of its meetings. For example, a senate meeting in spring 2013 included a presentation on the creation of new transfer degrees. Demonstrating an example of the College communicating a matter of quality of assurance to students, the Institutional Research and Planning Committee organized student focus groups to follow up on the Community College Survey of Student Engagement in spring 2012. The committee then analyzed the results of this study and reported it to faculty and staff at the staff development day in February 2014.

The Office of External Relations uses documented assessment results to

communicate matters of quality assurance to the broader public. Press coverage and increased donations to the Citrus College Foundation show that these efforts have been successful. In June 2014, Citrus College earned the 2014 Readers Choice Award for Best Community College in the San Gabriel Valley's Best competition, conducted annually by the *Pasadena Star-News*, *San Gabriel Valley Tribune*, and *Whittier Daily News*. There has been an increase in donations to the foundation over the last three years, and in January 2013, the foundation received one of the largest [charitable gifts](#)⁷³ in the history of the College from the estate of distinguished Citrus alumni. In 2014, the College formed the President's Circle of generous business partners to advance the goal of being a "College of Completion."

More evidence of effective communication to the public about institutional quality comes in the form of recognition such as the following:

- The 2011 redesign of the English curriculum to improve student success has been highlighted at state and national conferences and included in the *Effective Practices* handbook (page 60) on the [California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office website](#)⁷⁴,
- In 2013, *The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education* recognized Citrus College as one of the top 50 colleges nationwide in awarding associate degrees to Hispanic students.
- An eight-member team of Citrus College students known as the Rocket Owls were chosen to participate in the 2013-2014 NASA Student Launch Projects, a highly selective rocketry competition. Citrus College is one of only two California colleges or universities to be selected to

participate in the program, sharing the honor with California Polytechnic University, Pomona. Citrus College is one of only three community colleges nationwide to be chosen.

- In 2010, Citrus College received a Center of Excellence for Veteran Student Success grant from the U.S. Department of Education. The College also received *G.I. Jobs* magazine's military friendly school designation, placing the institution in the top 15 percent of U.S. colleges and universities that provide the most support to student veterans.
- The Public Policy Institute of California ranked Citrus College third among the state's community colleges in awarding transfer degrees.
- In 2012, Citrus College's sustainability template resulted in the college receiving the California Community College Board of Governors' inaugural Energy and Sustainability Leadership Award. The College received the 2012 Leadership Award in Energy at the Green California Community College Summit.
- Citrus College is one of only 150 community colleges in the nation—and one of eight in the state—selected to compete for the \$1 million 2015 Aspen Prize for Community College Excellence award, which aims to shine a spotlight on community colleges that deliver exceptional student completion outcomes.

1.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.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Within the organizational structure of Citrus College, three committees concentrate on ensuring the effectiveness of the ongoing planning and resource allocation processes of the College by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the planning and resource allocation cycle, including institutional and other research efforts. These are the [Institutional Research and Planning Committee](#)⁷⁵, the [Institutional Effectiveness Committee](#)⁷⁶, and the [Program Review Committee](#)⁷⁷.

The Institutional Research and Planning Committee carries out the design and implementation of assessment tools by which the effectiveness of the planning and resource allocation processes can be measured. For example, in spring 2014 the committee engaged in four major research projects.

1. Preparing the data for the Citrus College application for the Aspen Prize for Community College Excellence, based on delivering exceptional student completion outcomes, one of the major goals of the College
2. Administering the Community College Survey of Student Engagement and compiling and evaluating the results
3. Administering the Citrus College employee survey, which measures the degree to which all constituencies are satisfied with their ability to have input into the planning and resource allocation process
4. Preparing the [data packet](#)⁷⁸ of key performance indicators provided to managers, faculty, and staff on fall convocation day for the annual review of each program

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee is charged with reviewing, assessing, and making recommendations for improvement of the integrated planning process and the means by which it is linked to the budget process. The committee assesses how well the various plans and program reviews align with the strategic plan. It considers such factors as the completion rate of the annual program reviews in all categories, the use of learning outcome assessment data in program review, and the link between requests for resource allocation and program review. For example, in winter 2014, members of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee generated long-term projections for each program listed in the educational and facilities master plan in alignment with the objectives in the Strategic Plan. This project provided specific examples of how college wide plans connect and relate to each other. Additionally, the committee revises and publishes the [integrated planning manual](#)⁷⁹ annually. In fall 2013, members of the committee reviewed the survey used to assess the effectiveness of the program review process in the student services area and revised two questions and added two more to further clarify the information obtained.

Program review serves as the vehicle for the ongoing integration of student learning and completion data and assessment of program needs and recommendations for improvements. Program review provides the links to resource allocation and institutional planning. The Program Review Committee reviews the program review process each year and recommends improvements as needed. The committee provides templates to each program to facilitate the review process and solicits

feedback on the helpfulness of the templates. As a result, the templates have been revised to enhance their effectiveness. In 2012, the program review task force recommended a change from a six-year cycle of annual and comprehensive reviews to a five-year cycle, adopted after due consideration by the constituent groups. Given the wide importance of program review, this taskforce was elevated to a standing committee of the Steering Committee in fall 2013. In spring 2014, working with representatives from all areas of the College, the Program Review Committee developed rubrics for reviewing program review reports. The rubrics provide guidance and standards for the reviewers when reading the program review reports, providing check points in the following areas:

- The report is informative and consistent.
- There are strong connections within the report.
- There are clear links to 2011-2020 Educational and Facilities Master Plan, 2011-2016 Strategic Plan, and other institutional planning documents.
- There is effective analysis and use of data.
- Conclusions, recommendations, and requests are based on analysis of SLOA and other data.

The vice president of finance and administrative services works closely with the vice president of academic affairs and the vice president of student services in considering requests for resources that have been initiated in the program review process. The [Financial Resources Committee](#)⁸⁰ has worked with the Program Review Committee to modify for best practices the flow of information to the Financial Resources Committee, which

now uses a rubric to recommend funding the various program review requests. This has been formalized in the minutes of the Financial Resources Committee.

Evidence exists that Citrus College's efforts in systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes have been effective, such as successes in achieving goals and objectives identified in the planning process. There has been an increase in the number of degrees and certificates awarded, including newly created transfer degrees. There were 39 transfer degrees awarded in 2011-2012. That number jumped to 231 in 2012-2013. In particular, there has been an increase in transfers by students majoring in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics. There has been measurably enhanced student success that may be attributed to the supplemental instruction program and the Writing Café, as evidenced in the annual grant evaluation reports produced by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness.

The College meets the Standard.

Analysis and Evaluation

Citrus College ensures 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. This is evident in the minutes of the meetings of the Institutional Research and Planning Committee, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, the Program Review Committee, and the Financial Resources Committee.

The minutes of the Institutional Research and Planning Committee show that the

committee surveys student engagement in campus life and employee participation in planning and resource allocations and prepares analyses of the results. Further evidence of the committee's work consists of the convenient [data packets](#)⁸¹ the committee provides for managers, faculty, and staff to use in program review. These packets include key performance indicators such as student retention, success, and completion rates, and student demographics.

The minutes of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee show the committee at work overseeing the integrated planning process, which includes the support of decisions about resource allocation with evidence provided in program reviews. A product of this work is the annual revision and publication the Citrus College website of the integrated planning manual, which describes in detail the planning and resource allocation processes of the College.

The minutes of the Program Review Committee provide evidence of the committee's work in revising the program review process based on input from those using the program review templates created to facilitate the process. The record also shows that the committee has recommended a change, which has since been adopted, from a six-year to a five-year cycle of assessment, and has created a rubric for reviewing program review reports.

The minutes of the Financial Resources Committee show that this committee, coordinating its work with that of the Program Review Committee, has created a rubric for recommendation on resource

allocation based on program review evidence.

1.B.7. The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

At Citrus College, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee systematically reviews the effectiveness of the evaluation mechanisms in instructional programs, academic support programs including the library and other learning support services, student services programs, and institutional support programs. The committee conducts annual surveys among employees in all four program review areas to determine the degree to which employees are actively engaged in the program review process and to solicit constructive criticisms and suggestions for improving the process. The committee then uses the results to formulate its own action plan, ultimately reporting and making recommendations to the Steering Committee. For example, the 2013 surveys showed that, in contrast to the widespread engagement in program review among faculty members in instructional programs, certain staff members in the academic support and institutional support programs felt they were not included in the program review process. As a result, the committee adopted as one of its responsibilities for 2013-2014 to initiate the discussion and facilitate a consensus in moving forward with campus wide engagement in program review.

In addition to the oversight of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, a systematic review of the effectiveness of student learning outcomes assessment and program review is built into those processes. These assessments occur every year in both the student learning outcomes assessment and program review processes in the four areas of instructional programs, academic support programs, student services programs, and institutional support programs. Faculty members articulate student learning outcomes and meaningful assessment mechanisms of them at the course and program levels. They assess the outcomes for every course taught every year. They reflect on these assessments in a review of each program, resulting in a conversation that leads to identification of gaps and potential plans for improvement of the programs. This sometimes leads to improvements in the formulation and assessment of student learning outcomes. Many faculty members have made suggestions to the program review coordinator and, more recently, the Program Review Committee for improving the program review templates that guide the process; the templates have been revised accordingly. Requests for new faculty members are based on program reviews and go through the Faculty Needs Identification Committee, which prioritizes positions for new faculty based, in part, on the program reviews. Participants in program review in the academic support, student services, and institutional support areas also collect and reflect on student learning and outcomes data each year. The program review process requires that requests for resources and plans for program improvements be supported by reflections on assessment of student learning outcomes.

The following examples show that the program review and student learning outcomes and processes, with their built-in assessments of evaluation mechanisms serve the College well.

Program review recommendations leading to program improvement

- The kinesiology program review recommended the hiring of a faculty member to work on developing certificates with an emphasis on strength and conditioning. The Faculty Needs Identification Committee approved the request, which led to hiring a new faculty member.
- In its 2012 program review, the honors program recommended adding biology and psychology honors courses to increase the capacity of honors students to complete general education requirements to support most majors. The courses were developed and added to the schedule of honors program classes in 2013-2014.
- The history program review recommended adding History 131, 132, and 222 to the schedule in support of the major; this has been accomplished.
- The Social and Behavioral Sciences Division identified a need in several program reviews for more DVDs for course supplementation. Budget constraints had delayed fulfillment of this request. In 2013, the dean of natural and physical sciences and library services purchased streaming video through the library, satisfying the need identified in the social and behavioral sciences program reviews. Many faculty members now use the video streaming service.
- As of fall 2014, three new philosophy courses have been created as part of a new transfer degree in philosophy

because faculty in the philosophy program, as part of their program review, recommended this action through the transfer model curriculum process.

- The library program review recommended enhancing the affiliation with the Interlibrary Loan System by contracting with WorldShare and its EZProxy authentication. This has been implemented and puts the library on a par with libraries throughout the world, allowing students to have access to many more resources.

Student learning outcome assessments leading to program improvement

- Faculty members teaching Math 210 analyzed a particular student learning outcome in spring 2013, and found a 73.7 percent success rate. They thought they could achieve better results and agreed to devote more time to real-world application problems during the class. They assessed the same outcome in fall 2013, and found an improvement from 73.7 percent to 88.5 percent success.
- An English 099 instructor, over two semesters and four course sections, compared the number of student online hours at the end of the course with final course letter grades. English 099 is a 5-unit course with 90 lecture hours. A positive correlation of .78 indicates that planned online engagement activities that support and enrich students contribute to their final success in the course. Blackboard, the learning management system, generated the analytics. As a result of this information, the instructor posts weekly student online hours and requires students to demonstrate a minimum amount of hours per week. The assessment data has been shared

with the Distance Education Committee and with students to enhance their awareness of their online time and engagement.

- Student learning outcomes data across multiple courses suggested that faculty and students were not maximizing library resources for research papers and course writing assignments. Based on these data and requests from faculty, library staff increased the number of library orientations they provided, increasing student contact by 58 percent between 2002 and 2012.
- An outcome identified by the Admissions and Records Office stated that “students will be able to successfully utilize the waitlist process.” An assessment of this outcome identified a need to improve communication about the waitlist, and the committee recommended ways to make this improvement. As a result, the committee revised the [How to Waitlist for a Closed Class](#)⁸² manual by including language about how to check for waitlist placement and how to add a class. The committee also revised the waitlist web pages, the waitlist flyer, and the language on the waitlist found in the schedule of classes. The results of these changes will be assessed in the student learning outcomes and assessment process next year.
- In 2012, counselors assessed the effectiveness of participation in new student orientation, using pre- and post-tests. In September 2012, a survey yielded 361 usable results (pre-test 40.1 percent showing good awareness of registration processes, post-test 85.3 percent). The counselors agreed on a goal to increase the post-test results to 90 percent. To achieve this, student services provided additional services such as College 101 and registration

assistance workshops. In July 2013, a survey yielded 306 usable results (pre-test 67 percent/post-test 92 percent). This showed a significant improvement in students' abilities to use their placement results to register for classes.

The College meets the Standard.

Analysis and Evaluation

Citrus College assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services. The College has established the Institutional Effectiveness Committee for the purpose of conducting such a systematic review on an ongoing basis. The Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee and the Program Review Committee regularly review the effectiveness of the student learning outcomes and assessment and program review processes. Faculty members, managers, and staff members conduct assessments of student learning outcomes and reflect on the effectiveness of their assessments in the annual review of their programs.

Evidence of the systematic review work conducted by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee can be found in the minutes of its meetings. When the

committee found, for example, that the 2013 survey of program reviews showed that a relatively low percentage of staff members in the academic support and institutional support areas felt that they were included in the program review process, the committee resolved to improve the situation by initiating further discussion about it. Consequently, a series of roadshows on program review, student learning outcomes and assessment, and data were presented to programs across campus, leading to higher levels of awareness and participation in program review and integrated planning.

The Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment and the Program Review Committees have each revised the assessment processes, as shown in their minutes. In fall 2015, for example, the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee streamlined the student learning outcomes and assessment process, making it simpler and more effective. Similarly, individual faculty members have revised their own assessments of student learning outcomes by making them simpler and clearer. The particular examples cited in the descriptive summary above, present ways in which the program review and student learning outcomes and assessment processes have led to program improvements and provide further evidence that Citrus College meets the Standard.

Evidence

- I-B-1 [Citrus College Mission Statement](#)
- I-B-2 [Citrus College Board Policy BP 2510](#)
- I-B-3 [Citrus College Administrative Procedure AP 2510](#)
- I-B-4 [Organization and Governance Handbook](#)
- I-B-5 [Citrus College Steering Committee – Home](#)
- I-B-6 [Citrus College Academic Senate – Home](#)
- I-B-7 [Associated Students of Citrus College – Home](#)
- I-B-8 [Citrus College Information Technology Committee – Home](#)
- I-B-9 [SLOA > Core Competencies](#)
- I-B-10 [SLO > Institutional Learning Outcomes](#)
- I-B-11 [Citrus College Mission Statement](#)
- I-B-12 [Steering Committee Minutes, October 13, 2014](#)
- I-B-13 [Board of Trustees Minutes, November 18, 2014](#)
- I-B-14 [Accreditation Mid Term Report, SLO Implementation](#)
- I-B-15 [STEM > Faculty Inquiry Groups](#)
- I-B-16 [Steering > Student Services Committee](#)
- I-B-17 [SLOA > GE Assessment Dialogue](#)
- I-B-18 [Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Handbook](#)
- I-B-19 [Steering Committee Agenda, May 12, 2014](#)
- I-B-20 [SLOA Documents > Continuous Quality Improvement](#)
- I-B-21 [CCSSE Documentation](#)
- I-B-22 [Academic Senate Minutes, October 8, 2014](#)
- I-B-23 [Citrus College Mission, Vision, Values](#)
- I-B-24 [Citrus College Mission, Vision, Values](#)
- I-B-25 [Citrus College Mission, Vision, Values](#)
- I-B-26 [Citrus College Strategic Plan 2011-2016](#)
- I-B-27 [Strategic Planning](#)
- I-B-28 [Strategic Planning](#)
- I-B-29 [English Program Review Data Pack](#)
- I-B-30 [Steering Committee Reading List screenshot](#)
- I-B-31 [Research>Quantitative Study: Supplemental Instruction](#)
- I-B-32 [Research > Writing Café Reports](#)
- I-B-33 [History Program Review Data Pack](#)
- I-B-34 [Integrated Planning Model Diagram](#)
- I-B-35 [Program Review – Home](#)
- I-B-36 [Institutional Effectiveness Committee](#)
- I-B-37 [Program Review Committee – Home](#)
- I-B-38 [Instructional Program Review](#)
- I-B-39 [Academic Support Program Review](#)
- I-B-40 [Student Services Program Review](#)
- I-B-41 [Institutional Support Program Review](#)
- I-B-42 [STEM Grant Projects Index](#)
- I-B-43 [STEM Project Internal Evaluation, July 1, 2009](#)
- I-B-44 [STEM Supplemental Instruction Report, March 28, 2014](#)
- I-B-45 [Integrated Planning Model Diagram](#)
- I-B-46 [Integrated Planning Manual 2014-2015](#)
- I-B-47 [Citrus College Strategic Plan 2011-2016](#)
- I-B-48 [Strategic Planning](#)

- I-B-49 [Strategic Planning](#)
- I-B-50 [Organization and Governance Handbook](#)
- I-B-51 [Citrus College Strategic Plan 2011-2016](#)
- I-B-52 [Educational and Facilities Master Plan 2011-2020](#)
- I-B-53 [Citrus College Board Policy BP 7201](#)
- I-B-54 [Citrus College Administrative Procedure AP 7201](#)
- I-B-55 [Board of Trustees Agenda, November 18, 2014](#)
- I-B-56 [Integrated Planning Model Diagram](#)
- I-B-57 [Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes, November 26, 2012](#)
- I-B-58 [Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes, September 23, 2013](#)
- I-B-59 [Citrus Bulletin Library](#)
- I-B-60 [Citrus View Index 2015](#)
- I-B-61 [Board Highlights Index](#)
- I-B-62 [Finance > Budget Forums Presentations](#)
- I-B-63 [Academic Senate Library of Agendas and Minutes](#)
- I-B-64 [Research > CCSSE Documentation 2014](#)
- I-B-65 [Academic Senate Minutes, September 24, 2014](#)
- I-B-66 [Academic Senate Minutes, October 8, 2014](#)
- I-B-67 [Information to the Community – Home](#)
- I-B-68 [Citrus College News Magazine](#)
- I-B-69 [Citrus College External Relations – Home](#)
- I-B-70 [Citrus College Facts in Brief Index](#)
- I-B-71 [Citrus College Fact Book](#)
- I-B-72 [Finance > Bond Oversight Committee – Home](#)
- I-B-73 [Citrus College Foundation, Press Release January 10, 2013](#)
- I-B-74 [Basic Skills Completion: Effective Practices](#)
- I-B-75 [Steering>Institutional Research Planning Committee – Home](#)
- I-B-76 [Institutional Effectiveness Committee](#)
- I-B-77 [Program Review Committee – Home](#)
- I-B-78 [English Program Review Data Pack](#)
- I-B-79 [Strategic Planning](#)
- I-B-80 [Steering > Financial Resources Committee – Home](#)
- I-B-81 [English Program Review Data Pack](#)
- I-B-82 [Admissions & Records > Waitlist](#)