

RUBRIC ABSTRACTS

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The program review process, developed and implemented beginning in 2005, was a direct result of the Las Positas Accreditation visit of 2003. In order to promote awareness of the process and the importance of the review, a collaborative effort between the Office of Academic Services and the Academic Senate was begun. The ensuing dialogue included a review of program review models, a process for inclusion of pertinent quantitative data from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning, and a timeline for process development.

The first program review model (2005/2006) is on the Intranet and accessible from both the Academic Senate and the Office of Academic Services websites.¹⁰ The initial review document included analyses by faculty of quantitative and qualitative data, the development of goals based on those analyses, and limited resource-allocation planning. The completed reviews were sent to division deans for review and approval,¹¹ and then forwarded to the Vice President of Academic Services; they were also posted on the Intranet.¹²

The second phase of the program review process was the collegial review. This phase included evaluation and discussion of each program review by faculty in the same division but from a discipline other than that of its original authors. As facilitated by the Vice President of Academic Services, faculty and staff then dedicated a division meeting to the review of goals, placement of goals into institutional planning categories, prioritization of goals, and a summary of goals to be documented. The outcome of this collegial review was disseminated to the college at a town meeting with open discussion by the entire campus.¹³

The final phase of the original program review included an evaluative review of the process, a review of the integration of the program review plan into the educational master plan, and a review of the program review process as it relates to institutional planning. It also included a survey of faculty to determine what changes were needed for improvements in procedural effectiveness.

In 2006, a formal review of the 2005 program review process was undertaken by a Program Review Task Force. This team consisted of four faculty representatives, the past and present Academic Senate Presidents, the Director of Institutional Research and Planning, and the Vice President of Academic Services. The review included discussions by campus constituents regarding the final phase of the process and the consideration of faculty responses to guide improvements.

The review of the 2005 process initiated several changes, including a revised timeline for process frequency (from every two years to every four years); a planning template for program review assistance and for increased ease of process; data review and analysis assistance per discipline sponsored by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning; and continued integrated planning every fall semester.¹⁴

¹⁰ 2005-06 Documents

¹¹ 2006 Program Reviews by Discipline

¹² Vice President Responses to 2006 Program Reviews

¹³ 2006-09 Program Review Process

¹⁴ Planning Cycle Grid

RUBRIC ABSTRACTS

This integrated planning included Student Learning Outcomes planning in fall 2007 and a Curriculum Review planning template to be integrated into the program review process in fall 2008. The Program Review Task Force agreed to provide faculty with a resource allocation chart for inclusion in the process. The resource allocation chart provides program faculty with a list of potential institutional resources, a timeline for resource requests, and appropriate forms and processes for resource allocation approval.¹⁵ The Office of Academic Services, in collaboration with the Academic Senate and the Student Learning Outcomes Committee, informed the college about the Student Learning Outcomes planning process in fall 2007.¹⁶ Each discipline was asked to move forward according to the Student Learning Outcomes timeline and to consider possible resource allocation requests for their specific planning needs.¹⁷

In fall 2008, faculty were trained in the implementation of the Curriculum Review planning process.¹⁸ Preparation for the divisions included a college-wide Curriculum Celebration/Workshop,¹⁹ followed by focused training for division representatives through the Curriculum Committee and division meetings. The revised process with Student Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Review integration was shared with the faculty at large through campus memo.²⁰ The Program Review Task Force agreed to reconvene in fall 2008 to review the yearly update summaries for each discipline's review. The fully integrated program review process will be implemented in fall 2009 with a complete integrated model to be used for institutional planning.²¹

In spring 2008, each discipline submitted a one-year evaluation and review of its program goals through the use of a spreadsheet that had been revised based on feedback from faculty.²² This process included faculty review of completed goals, qualitative response to completed goals and increased program effectiveness, and creation of new goals as necessary. New goals submitted by disciplines were reviewed by the division deans and forwarded to the Vice President of Academic Services; they were then entered into a database. This database was distributed to both the discipline faculty and to every planning committee and/or resource allocation body to be used for yearly planning and decision making. This one-year evaluation process provides the college with a regular continuous planning effort that fosters decision making based on updated needs, completed goals, and program effectiveness, along with resources requested for the attainment of goals.

A program review process is also completed by the Student Services programs. This review, occurring every three years, responds to data and input from several sources. In point-of-service surveys, conducted over a two-week period, students assess their own experience with a Student Services program. College-wide surveys are distributed to faculty and staff whose work connects directly to Student Services. Survey results are documented and reported by the matriculation researcher. These surveys, in addition to internal evaluations and retention and persistence data, help to identify areas of focus for future planning. In 2006, Student Learning Outcomes were also included in program review. Student Services has now submitted SLOs in each program area, and SLO assessment data was used to modify practices in fall 2008.

15 Resources Allocation Grid

16 SLO Archives

17 SLO Cycle

18 Aug 2008 Convocation Presentation

19 Flyer for Curriculum Meeting-Party 9-3-08

20 2008 Fall Letter to all College

21 Planning Cycle Grid

22 2008 Yearly Program Review Updates

RUBRIC ABSTRACTS

Feedback from the college surveys states that at present staff consistently agree that there is a clear connection to program planning and the college mission and that such planning has a link to resource allocation. The survey responses also note a majority agreement that student learning planning and program planning is connected to allocation planning; however, a large enough contingency noting that they “don’t know” indicates that the college needs continued communication and development of resource allocation linked to program planning. A majority of staff agreed that there is consistent evaluation of planning process and constituent input into planning as well as a majority of agreement that the college traces progress made through planning and that the college dialogues, reviews and modifies all parts of planning including institutional planning and research efforts.

In the 2008/2009 academic year, the college will begin its full integration of the program review process into the educational master plan. The development of integration processes and timelines has been assigned to responsible offices by the President. Continued research on integration, budget allocation integration, and effectiveness review will be discussed by the college throughout fall 2008 and spring 2009.²³

Over the past several years, program review has become a vital planning process at Las Positas College. Through dialogue, development, process review, revision, and evaluation, the college has developed the process into a tool for the college to use in maintaining and improving its quality programs. As the college moves forward with increasingly integrated processes, the program review model serves as a foundation for the pursuit of excellence through planning.

Using the rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, Program Review the college places itself in the Proficiency Level.

²³ Presidential Priorities 2008 – 10

RUBRIC ABSTRACTS

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

Las Positas College has made great strides in implementing a student learning outcomes assessment cycle. It has been a long and challenging, but ultimately rewarding experience. The following is a brief synopsis of the process and decision making that went into developing the Las Positas College Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Cycle that is referenced throughout the self-study.

2002-2003: Dialogue

Las Positas College began discussing the concept of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in fall 2002, responding to the new Accreditation standards presented by WASC. Early in 2002, lead administrators, faculty, and classified staff attended workshops and conferences, collecting information about SLOs and introducing these concepts to the entire campus community at several town meetings and key committees. Informal dialogue began as faculty, administrators, staff, and students discussed how Las Positas College would incorporate the SLO assessment process, while adhering to the college's culture, values and mission. This inclusive and candid opening dialogue allowed the college community to begin a "bottom-up" understanding of SLOs and an open reflection about each constituency's involvement in the SLO and assessment process.

2004: Planning

In January 2004, a large group of interested faculty and staff attended a WASC workshop on SLOs at Chabot College, after which the campus community felt ready to form SLO leadership roles. In fall, 2004, the SLO Task Force (a body reporting to the college president and the Academic Senate) was established; faculty co-chairs for the SLO Task Force were selected by the Academic Senate and approved by the college president, and funds were allocated for continued faculty training. SLO leadership attended the "Assuring Improvement in Student Learning" conference in October 2004, which highlighted the importance of campus culture and timeline planning, as well as the integration of course, program, and institutional outcomes and assessment. With this foundation, the faculty co-chairs collaborated with the college's institutional researcher to create a rough timeline based on the priorities revealed in the preliminary campus dialogue and the information retrieved at workshops.

One of the Task Force's main goals for the first year was to create a list of core competencies for the college. The Task Force decided that this would be a way for the college to work collaboratively on shared student learning goals, rather than begin our SLO process working individually and without coordination on course or program SLOs. With representation from all constituencies at the college, the Task Force worked to complete a list of institutional SLOs

RUBRIC ABSTRACTS

(LPC's Core Competencies). The Core Competencies were presented and discussed as drafts at town meetings and a final draft was ultimately approved by the college president, the Academic Senate, and the district. The Task Force agreed that the Competencies would be revisited on a regular basis, serving as the college's general education, student services and elective outcomes, coordinated with both program and course outcome goals. The Task Force then began to create plans for a course/service-embedded assessment of Core Competencies, forming the foundation of LPC's assessment process.

The second main goal set by the Task Force was to begin hands-on training in writing authentic SLOs and creating effective assessment tools at the course level. To achieve this goal, the Task Force organized an SLO flex-day workshop, facilitated departmental SLO workshops, and established a pilot program for SLO projects. Anxious to ensure that open dialogue about SLOs at Las Positas College would continue, the Task Force established an intranet (college access only) site, providing a repository for documents and tutorials.²⁴ At the end of fall 2004, the LPC community had a foundational understanding of SLOs and assessment, some hands on work with creating SLOs (core competencies), and the training needed to initiate the course SLO and assessment process that was planned for the spring.

2005-2006: Development and Practice

In spring 2005, the SLO Task Force continued to hold several college-wide training sessions, providing the faculty and staff with the LPC-specific terminology, reporting process, and time line that had been developed in the planning phase. With the information and experience from training sessions, many faculty decided to begin developing course-level SLOs, realizing the potential for immediate classroom benefits. To facilitate the development of course-level assessment, the SLO intranet site was made fully public on the Internet at this time, along with a revisable timeline for implementation of the LPC assessment cycle.²⁵

The Task Force also recruited a "vanguard" group of faculty to serve as mentors in the SLO process. These faculty began setting up course and assignment-level SLO Pilot Projects; project proposals were then presented to fellow faculty during a Flex Day held at the beginning of the fall 2005 semester. During the fall semester, ten SLO pilot projects were implemented by LPC faculty and five SLO-focused departmental workshops were held.²⁶ Also in fall 2005, an Assessment Philosophy Statement was drafted and submitted to the Academic Senate and the college president for approval.²⁷ This statement provided the college community with a clearly articulated philosophy of SLO assessment at LPC, based on the dialogue and development of SLOs that had occurred over the past two years. As a summative report of its year-long process, the SLO Task Force drafted, revised and submitted "Student Learning Outcomes: Report and Recommendations" to the college president and the Academic Senate, as well as a semester-by-semester action plan for a two-year trial of the proposed SLO assessment cycle.²⁸

²⁴ SLO homepage

²⁵ SLO timeline

²⁶ SLO Faculty Projects

²⁷ SLO Assessment Philosophy

²⁸ SLO Plans

RUBRIC ABSTRACTS

At the spring 2006 Flex Day, the “vanguard” faculty presented their SLO Pilot Project assessment results, which led logically to suggested modifications for improved teaching and learning.²⁹ During the spring 2006 semester, meetings were held between the SLO Task Force, the Curriculum Committee Chair and the Staff Development Chair to coordinate SLO activities and plans for the following year; Staff Development faculty offered seven SLO department workshops over the course of the semester. Revisions were made to the “Student Learning Outcomes: Report and Recommendations” document based on Senate, Curriculum and Staff Development feedback, and the Academic Senate approved LPC’s “Assessment Philosophy Statement” (2/22/06).^{30, 31}

At this point, LPC was actively creating course SLOs, coordinated with the institutional SLOs (Core Competencies); however, it was clear that some electronic repository and data analysis process was needed if we were to avoid a collection of SLOs and assessment that was difficult to access and use for improved teaching and learning. The Task Force began to vigorously research, analyze and evaluate technology support for SLOs and assessment reports, listening to presentations/demonstrations made by eLumen, Trac Dat and WEAVE. After analysis of all options, eLumen was selected as our electronic support system, and a budget and human resource recommendation for SLO efforts was submitted to the college president (3/2/06).³²

Summer 2006 saw the purchase of a license to use the eLumen software for the college’s SLO assessment cycle tracking. At this point, the Task Force established one of its co-chairs as an SLO Technology Liaison, who would establish a working relationship with the eLumen vendor. The liaison communicates faculty needs to the company, which revises its software to suit the college’s needs as much as possible. This unique relationship creates a feedback loop that gives the college maximum flexibility for a sustainable assessment of SLOs which is ongoing, systematic and used for continued quality improvement.

Fall 2006 marked the beginning of the SLO Task Force’s third year of engagement with the SLO assessment cycle. LPC’s SLO Technology Liaison continued to work with the vendor, the college, and district ITS to configure eLumen for use by the faculty.

A second “vanguard” group of faculty was established to serve as SLO department leaders, and an adjunct faculty member was officially designated as the campus SLO and eLumen trainer. Much time and energy was spent in configuring the software and making it available to faculty. Realizing that the research and planning phases were coming to a close, the SLO Task Force re-named itself the SLO Steering Committee.

2007-2008: A Systematic, Ongoing Process

The spring 2007 semester saw the continued development and revision of the eLumen software as faculty wrote outcomes for their courses and designed appropriate assessments.³³ “Vanguard”

29 SLO Faculty Projects

30 SLO Report, Spring 2006

31 Assessment Philosophy Statement

32 SLO Report, Spring 2006

33 SLO Minutes, 03/05/07

RUBRIC ABSTRACTS

faculty began training to use the eLumen software; they also began to develop program-level SLOs, working on ways to incorporate this level of assessment into the software.³⁴ Meanwhile, the SLO Steering Committee began to examine the relationship between SLOs and the “Expected Outcomes” that are listed on our Course Outlines of record.³⁵ Committee members began serving as SLO faculty mentors to their colleagues, providing multiple workshops and training sessions throughout the semester.³⁶

In fall 2007, revisions were made to the eLumen software, reflecting requests by the SLO Steering Committee for best adapting it to the LPC assessment cycle. The college’s SLO website provided faculty members with a new Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document, as well as an extensive online tutorial which led them, step-by-step with video examples, through the process of writing SLOs and entering them and their corresponding assessment plans into the eLumen software.³⁷ ³⁸ Once provided with these tools, faculty members were directed to develop a minimum of one SLO, along with an accompanying assessment plan, for each of 10 courses by the end of the semester. Faculty support for this process began with an August Flex Day eLumen training session and a block of time dedicated for SLO-related work during the first division meeting; SLO mentors/trainers were there to provide assistance. As in the previous year, the second hour of each monthly town meeting was devoted to writing SLOs and eLumen training. Additional support was added by an increase in reassigned time for the SLO Steering Committee Chair from 5 to 6 CAH in order to allow more time for one-on-one mentoring across the campus.

Looking Forward

The LPC SLO assessment plan indicates that all courses will be assessed on a rotating basis; while the first semester (spring 2008) will see the assessment of two courses per discipline, next semester these courses will be reassessed, and two additional courses will begin the assessment cycle. The plan, therefore, calls for the rotating assessment of four courses per discipline per semester, beginning in fall 2008. Disciplines with more than ten courses will create SLOs and assessment plans for two more courses each semester until all courses are provided with SLOs and accompanying assessment plans.³⁹

By fall 2008, all disciplines were asked to create timelines in which each course is scheduled for assessment. This 24-month plan is as follows:

- Fall 2007: Write course-level outcomes, design scoring rubrics, and establish assessment tools;
- Spring 2008: Assess two courses;
- Fall 2008: Re-assess two courses, assess two new courses;
- Spring 2009: Re-assess two courses, assess two new courses.

³⁴ SLO Minutes, 04/02/07

³⁵ SLO Minutes, 03/05/07

³⁶ SLO Plan, Spring 2007

³⁷ SLO FAQs

³⁸ SLO Tutorial

³⁹ SLO Timeline

RUBRIC ABSTRACTS

Additionally, in fall 2009 and spring 2010, the college will engage in an assessment of this SLO plan. This will be a time for reflection, dialogue, and evaluation. Based on our experiences and this reflection, we will make changes to the SLO assessment cycle, always with an eye to creating a systematic, sustainable plan.

Concurrently with the above goals, the Committee will continue to engage the faculty in discussions involving the publication of SLOs, linkages between course-level, program-level, and institutional outcomes, and the relationship of SLOs to institutional planning.^{40, 41}

The committee plans for the assessment of program outcomes and Core Competencies (institutional outcomes) in numerous ways. Primarily the data in eLumen will be used to assess each Core Competency. Individual course/service assessments are each linked to a Core Competency. It is possible to compile these assessments and analyze them for trends, benchmarks, successes, and challenges. Additionally, faculty will be able to create Learning Outcome Case studies using eLumen. Once the assessment data is in eLumen, it can be used to create case-studies of actual students who achieve certain goals such as a degree or certificate. All the outcomes and assessments from courses in a certain degree patterns can also be examined. This can be done for hypothetical students by pulling up courses the “typical” transfer-student would take or the “typical” student in a Career Technology program would take.^{42, 43, 44, 45}

The SLO data in eLumen will become the basis upon which programs evaluate themselves in the program review process. Programs will have access to their data as well as the data from other programs for comparison purposes. Data is only available in summary form. Faculty can only look at their own data at the class level.

In addition to this quantitative data, the SLO committee plans to examine qualitative data by creating “Institutional Portfolios.” The college’s institutional researcher plans to collect samples of student course work demonstrating competency in course-level outcomes. These portfolios will be in themes based on the Core Competencies. The college will produce a “Communication” portfolio that gives examples of student work that provides evidence of Communication. This qualitative option may give the college another way of understanding, evaluating, documenting, and publicizing student learning.

This timeline provides a clear narrative of the extensive dialogue and planning that went into developing the Las Positas College SLO assessment cycle. All constituencies in the college were involved in the decision making and have accepted responsibility for student learning outcomes implementation. This institution has clearly shown a commitment of resources, including training, reassigned time for leadership, meeting time, and technology support. These are the early stages of a sustainable, continuous, systematic cycle of SLO assessment and improvement – one that reflects the culture and mission of this unique institution – that will move the college forward on its path of continuous improvement in teaching and learning, as well as allocation of institutional resources based on our assessment-improvement cycle.

40 SLO Minutes, 11/05/07

41 SLO Agenda, 12/03/07

42 Core Competencies Talking Points

43 Core Competencies First Draft

44 Core Competencies Second Draft

45 Core Competencies Final Draft

RUBRIC ABSTRACTS

Using the rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, Student Learning Outcomes the college is completing the Development Level and is poised to enter the Proficiency Level.

RUBRIC ABSTRACTS

INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND EFFECTIVENESS

Institutional Planning

The three major planning cycles at Las Positas College are program review (Academic and Student Services), the educational master plan, and discipline planning.^{46, 47} The college is developing a system for coordinating program review with the educational master plan and other college processes. The College Enrollment Management Committee oversees the discipline planning process, which is central to program development and resource allocation.

Program Review

The instructional program review is conducted every four years, with annual goal updates. During this process, each program performs a data-driven analysis of its progress toward meeting its stated goals. The Annual Goal Spreadsheet keeps track of the status of progress toward each goal, links actions related to the goal to the appropriate college funding source, process, office, or college governance body, and tracks how that goal has improved institutional effectiveness. Student Services, which conducts a separate program review process, does complete the same Annual Goal Spreadsheet as the instructional programs. The program review process links each program's goals and mission with the college's mission, uses quantitative data to support actions, and documents improvement in institutional effectiveness. The program review processes for instruction and Student Services are ongoing, systematic, and designed to continually assess and improve teaching and learning. The addition of SLO assessment will further quantify the effects of each program's activity on student learning, and with the fall 2008 addition of curriculum review to program review, the college will have integrated instructional and Student Services planning into one inclusive cycle.⁴⁸

Currently, there is no formal program review process for non-instructional offices. LPC is researching models and will begin to review these programs in the 2008-2009 academic year. All reviews (instructional, student services, non-instructional) will complete the same Annual Goal Spreadsheet for review by the college so that any future planning in any of these sectors can be evaluated and integrated into long-term strategic planning.

In fall 2008, the Program Review Task Force met to review the program review template and process. This task force will evaluate how well the last process went and consider emerging needs that suggest template and procedural changes. This template will then be approved via the collegial collaboration process, with the Academic Senate taking primary responsibility for the final outcome. The next full program review will be written in fall 2009, with validation occurring in spring 2010.

⁴⁶ Program Review

⁴⁷ Educational Master Plan

⁴⁸ Program Review Cycle and Timeline

RUBRIC ABSTRACTS

Educational Master Plan

The current form of the educational master plan was originally developed in 2003.⁴⁹ Two years later, the 2005-2015 educational master plan was created, and a hard copy of this comprehensive plan was distributed to all faculty and staff at the College. Since fall 2005, there have been two updates to the educational master plan 2005-2015. In 2006, the status of progress toward each program goal was updated. In 2006-2007, progress toward goals was again updated to reflect any changes that occurred through the program review process. All updates have been distributed to all staff for inclusion into their individual hard copies.

Currently, the college is refining processes for coordinating the program review and educational master plan. The next edition of the educational master plan (spring 2010, after the program review) will incorporate all goals from each program review (instruction, student services, non-instructional). In essence, the educational master plan will become the Annual Goals Spreadsheet from each program review with college goals and vision integrated into the long-term strategic plan. Additionally, the educational master plan will systematically include all developing college planning: the Student Equity Plan, the Facilities Master Plan, the Technology Plan, and the Distance Education Strategic Plan.^{50, 51, 52, 53} In this way, the college's component plans will be integrated into a comprehensive plan that describes the role of every college function in advancing the college's mission, thereby guiding the college to ongoing improvement of institutional effectiveness through resource allocation planning.⁵⁴

Resource Allocation

The Program Review Annual Goals Sheet ties each program's goals to a funding process, committee, or college resource.⁵⁵ The responsibility to engage in the process to acquire the resources to implement their goals lies with the individual programs. Some areas, such as technology and facilities, have their own budgets. Educational master plan goals are also tied to college funding processes, but historically these processes have not been evaluated for effectiveness.

Discipline Planning

The annual Discipline Planning Process is a primary activity of the College Enrollment Management Committee (CEMC).⁵⁶ This process determines the size of each of the College's programs as measured in units of Full Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF) and Full Time Equivalent

49 Educational Master Plan

50 Student Equity Plan

51 Facilities Master Plan

52 Technology Master Plan

53 DE Strategic Plan

54 Educational Master Plan

55 Program Review forms

56 College Enrollment Management Council homepage

RUBRIC ABSTRACTS

Students (FTES). It also determines the character of each program as summarily expressed by the efficiency ratio of contact hours with students per faculty unit (WSCH/FTEF). The outcome of the process is a class schedule that maximizes student access to courses by allocating a limited resource in a way that maximally promotes student success and is consistent with the principles of equity.

The Discipline Planning Process, while continually revised for improvement, follows the outline described in the committee's charge. Each fall, the CEMC analyzes historical enrollment and demographic trends, and then dialogues with the District Enrollment Management Committee (DEMC) to determine a college enrollment (FTES) target, a defined resource (FTEF), and an efficiency goal for the forthcoming academic year. Next, the committee uses these decisions to develop a planning guidance document that is distributed to each program and office at the College. Faculty, in consultation with their deans, use this planning guidance, in conjunction with local enrollment data and their own program mission and goals, to develop a schedule proposal—a discipline plan—for each program or area. Faculty and deans present their proposals to the CEMC, who then considers the plans both individually and in aggregate, and adjustments rising from the ensuing dialogue bring the aggregate plan into alignment with the College's enrollment projection and efficiency target. The final approval of the aggregate plan represents the largest regular allocation decision made by the college through shared governance. Since its inception in 2001, the process has shown increasing ability to guide enrollment growth through collective planning while responding to shifting community needs and financial circumstances.⁵⁷

Evaluation of Planning Processes

New leadership, new faculty, and a 4% average enrollment growth rate has mandated that the college become more aggressive in its decision-making processes as they relate to planning and budget allocation. In the 2008-2009 academic year, a planning task force will be formed to review current planning cycles and recommend changes to the overall planning processes and mechanisms for evaluating institutional effectiveness. Areas of attention will include integrating the program review/educational master planning cycles, instituting non-instructional program review, building in the use of data to form and evaluate plans, building in systematic ways to evaluate progress made on plans, building in a systematic method of evaluating planning cycles, using technology to publicize, integrate, track, and evaluate plans, updating strategic plans, updating college goals, centralizing all planning cycles, templates, and evaluations.

Using the rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness Planning, the college places itself in the final phases of Development and is and is poised to enter into the Proficiency level.