



**ACCREDITING
COMMISSION
for COMMUNITY and
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

*Western Association
of Schools and Colleges*

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

Chairperson
SHERRILL L. AMADOR
Public Member

Vice Chairperson
STEVEN KINSELLA
Administration

President
BARBARA A. BENO

Vice President
SUSAN B. CLIFFORD

Vice President
KRISTA JOHNS

Vice President
GARMAN JACK POND

Associate Vice President
JOHN NIXON

Associate Vice President
NORVAL WELLSFRY

MEMO TO: Dr. Sandra Caldwell, President
Reedley College
995 North Reed Avenue
Reedley, CA 93654

FROM: Barbara A. Beno, President

DATE: December 3, 2013

SUBJECT: Enclosed Report of the External Evaluation Team

Previously, the chairperson of the External Evaluation Team (Evaluation Team) that recently visited Reedley College sent you a draft External Evaluation Report (Report) affording you the opportunity to correct errors of fact. We assume you have responded to the Team Chair. The Commission now has received the final version of the Report, a copy of which is enclosed for you. Please examine the enclosed Report.

- If you believe that the Report contains inaccuracies, you are invited to call them to the attention of the Commission. To do so, you should submit a letter stating recommended corrections to the ACCJC President. The letter should arrive at the Commission office by end of day **December 17, 2013**, in order to be included in Commission materials. The letter may also be sent electronically as a PDF attachment.
- If the institution also wishes to submit additional material to the Commission, it should exercise care, keeping in mind the Commission cannot read and absorb large amounts of material on short notice. Material should arrive at the ACCJC office no later than end of day **December 17, 2013**.
- ACCJC policy provides that, if desired, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) may request an appearance before the Commission to discuss the Report. The Commission requires that the institution notify the Commission office **by end of day December 6, 2013**, or earlier, of its intent to attend the meeting. This enables the Commission to invite the Team Chair to attend. The CEO must provide any materials for distribution to Commissioners by December 17, 2013. Materials will not be accepted after that date.

The next meeting of the Accrediting Commission will be held on **January 8-10, 2014**, at the Sheraton Grand Sacramento Hotel, Sacramento, California. The enclosure, "Procedures for an Institutional Chief Executive Officer's Appearance Before the Commission," addresses the protocol of such appearances.

Please note that the Commission will not consider the institution as being indifferent if its CEO does not choose to appear before the Commission. If the institution does request to be heard at the Commission meeting, the chairperson of the Evaluation Team will also be asked to be present to explain the reasons for statements in the Report. Both parties will be allowed brief testimony before the Commission deliberates in private.

The enclosed Report should be considered confidential and not given general distribution until it has been acted upon by the Commission and you have been notified by letter of the action taken.

BAB/tl

Enclosure

cc: Dr. Michael White, Accreditation Liaison Officer (w/o enclosure)



**ACCREDITING
COMMISSION
for COMMUNITY and
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

*Western Association
of Schools and Colleges*

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

Chairperson
SHERRILL L. AMADOR
Public Member

Vice Chairperson
STEVEN KINSELLA
Administration

President
BARBARA A. BENO

Vice President
SUSAN B. CLIFFORD

Vice President
KRISTA JOHNS

Vice President
GARMAN JACK POND

Associate Vice President
JOHN NIXON

Associate Vice President
NORVAL WELLSFRY

Procedures for an Institutional Chief Executive Officer's
Appearance Before the Commission

The Commission considers institutional accreditation actions in January and June of each calendar year. ACCJC policy provides that when the Commission is deliberating or acting upon matters that concern an institution, it will invite the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the institution to meet with the Commission in Executive Session.¹ The appearance is for the purpose of discussing issues of substance and any Accreditation Standards deficiencies noted in the report. There is no requirement that the CEO attend the Commission meeting. If the Commission is considering institutional action as a result of an evaluation team visit, and if the CEO elects to attend the meeting, the Commission will also invite the Chair of the Evaluation Team (Team Chair) or designee to attend.

An institution must send written notification to the ACCJC office at least 15 working days before the scheduled Commission meeting if the CEO wishes to attend. The institution should bear in mind the evaluation of the institution is based upon the conditions at the institution at the time of the team visit.

At the meeting, the institutional CEO will be invited to make a brief presentation, followed by questions from the Commission. The CEO is expected to be the presenter, and should consult with Commission staff if there are plans to invite other representatives to join the CEO. On the day of the Commission meeting, ACCJC staff will escort the CEO (and additional representatives) to and from the designated waiting area to the meeting at the appropriate time. An institution's presentation should not exceed five (5) minutes. The Commission reserves the right to establish a different time limit on such presentations.

The Team Chair or designee will also attend the presentation, normally by conference call. The Commissioners may ask questions of the Team Chair after college representatives have exited. The Team Chair will then be excused, and the Commission will continue its deliberations in closed session.

The CEO will be notified in writing of the subsequent action taken by the Commission.

¹ Policies that are relevant to this process are the *Policy on Access to Commission Meetings*, *Policy on Commission Actions on Institutions*, *Policy on Commission Good Practice in Relations with Members Institutions*, and *Policy on the Rights and Responsibilities of ACCJC and Member Institutions*.

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2013

*Accrediting Commission for
Community and Junior Colleges*

Follow-Up Visit Report

Reedley College
995 North Reed Avenue, Reedley, CA 93654

A Confidential Report Prepared for the Accrediting Commission
For Community and Junior Colleges

This Report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited

Reedley College

On

November 4, 2013

<u>Edmund Buckley</u>	<u>Vice President of Academic Affairs (Retired)</u>	<u>Santa Rosa Junior College</u>
Team Chair	Title	Institution

<u>Carol Kozeracki</u>	<u>Dean, Academic Affairs</u>	<u>East Los Angeles College</u>
Team Member	Title	Institution

DATE: November 18, 2013
TO: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
FROM: Ed Buckley, Team Chair
SUBJECT: Report of Follow-Up Visit Team to Reedley College, November 4, 2013

INTRODUCTION

Following a comprehensive visit to Reedley College on October 27-20, 2011, the Commission placed the College on Warning status in January 2012 and required the institution to submit a Follow-Up Report followed by a visit. A visiting team conducted the site visit on October 9, 2012.

At its meeting on January 9-11, 2013, the Commission acted to remove Warning, reaffirm accreditation, and require the College to submit a second Follow-up Report, followed by a visit. The primary focus of the visit was to resolve the issues related to District Recommendation 1 and College Recommendation 1.

2013 FOLLOW-UP REPORT AND VISIT

The members of the 2013 visiting team were Dr. Edmund Buckley and Dr. Carol Kozeracki, both of whom had served on the 2011 comprehensive visiting team. Prior to the visit, both team members had read the Follow-Up report and reviewed over 280 associated documents of evidence. On November 1, the team was provided with an Addendum, including further documentation, which described the most recent developments since the original report was completed. The team also reviewed all of the major institutional plans. It was clear that both the College and the District communicated regularly with the various stakeholders and constituencies throughout the year.

The site visit occurred on Monday, November 4, 2013. The visit was divided into morning and afternoon sessions, with the morning session devoted to District Recommendation 1 and the afternoon session devoted to College Recommendation 1. In each case, the focus was on the subordinate sections of each recommendation. Participants from the District and College were primarily the members of the respective writing teams, with the addition of others who came in at various times to share special expertise. The groups included 26 senior administrators, faculty members, and classified staff. The format of the visit allowed the visiting team to engage in intensive dialog and dig deeply into the issues at hand. In the course of the day, it became clear that the College and the District have a strong commitment to the continued evolution and alignment of their planning processes.

District Recommendation 1

In order for the colleges and district to fully meet the intent of the previous recommendation, the State Center Community College District (SCCCD) must engage in continuous, timely, and deliberative dialogue with all district stakeholders to coordinate long-term planning and examine the impact of the planned increase in the number of colleges and the future roles of the centers on the existing institutions. This includes creating, developing and aligning district and college plans and planning processes in the following areas:

- district strategic plan
- facilities
- technology
- organizational reporting relationship of centers
- location of signature programs
- funding allocation
- human resources
- research capacity

(Standards I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, I.B.7, III.A.2, III.A.6, III.B.1.a, III.B.2.b, III.C.2, III.D.1, IV.A.5, IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.c)

Findings and Evidence

District Strategic Plan and the Integrated Planning Model

In accordance with the District's timeline and the Integrated Planning Model, the Board of Trustees approved the 2012-2016 District Strategic Plan in July 2012, and the updated 2013-2017 strategic plans for the colleges and centers. All constituent groups have been represented in the work on this project, with strategic initiatives at the College level aligned with District initiatives. The District has trained leaders in integrated planning through the Society for College and University Planning (SCUP), and has included implementation strategies in the Integrated Planning Manual. The Model and Manual are intended to guide institutional planning, resource allocation for planning initiatives, and the assessment of the quality of institutional planning itself. The Board of Trustees has received updates as well, and has participated in and supported the direction that the District is taking. They officially received the final draft of the Integrated Planning Model at their October 10, 2013 meeting.

Facilities

Working with several architects, engineers, and other professionals, the District developed the *SCCCD Facilities Master Plan 2012-2025*, which was approved by the Board of Trustees in August of 2012. The document helps to prioritize major facility needs at each site. More recently, the District called upon the assistance of the Counselors of Real Estate Consulting Corps to assist in evaluating options for utilizing various property assets throughout the district. The District-wide Facilities Planning Committee meets monthly to support district-wide facility planning.

Technology

On October 1, 2012, the Technology Task Force was created to develop and implement a District-wide Technology Plan, with the goal of integrating technology planning with institutional planning. The group proposed a District-wide Technology Committee with wide representation, who were to divide the work into multiple writing teams. The Committee began operating in the fall of 2013, with the Technology Plan scheduled to go to the Chancellor's Cabinet in December 2013. The District has contracted with Campus Works to provide assessments in IT security, organization and staff.

Organizational Relationships of Centers

ACCJC granted Willow International Community College Center (WICCC) Candidacy status in March 2013 and in April requested that the organizational structure be aligned so as to reflect the

Center's status. This occurred by Board of Trustees action in June 2013. The WICCC campus President now reports directly to the District Chancellor. Additionally, in September 2012 the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recognized the WICCC Senate as the 113th member of the organization. Madera Center and Oakhurst Center continue to be aligned with and part of Reedley College.

Signature Programs

A task force "was charged with recommending a process to guide the identification, support, and evaluation of new and existing signature programs." The group has created definitions for these programs and a process by which programs can apply for "signature" status. A final draft of their document was approved by the Task Force in August 2013, and will be discussed throughout the District beginning in the fall.

Funding Allocation

A task force charged with recommending an allocation plan for the distribution of district resources and providing input into financial matters of the District, began work in spring 2011. In October 2012, the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration held open forums throughout the District, presenting a draft budget allocation model. The task force "transitioned" to the District Budget and Resource Allocation Advisory Committee (DBRAAC), which began meeting in May. A Resource Allocation Model (RAM) was developed in August; it is currently being reviewed by the appropriate shared governance councils and will be presented to the Board of Trustees in January of 2014 with the intent to implement it for the 2014-15 fiscal year. The five-year Basic Allocation Transition Plan results in a reallocation of approximately \$750 thousand in the first year from Fresno City College, most of which will go to the Willow International Community College Center. Reedley College and Willow International Community College Center will contribute equally to the estimated \$750 thousand initial loss to Fresno City College. There is a step-down of 25 percent each year until 2018-2019, when the District-wide adjustment will be zero. The funding transfer will occur over a five-year period, per a proposed transition plan to allow Fresno City College to plan proactively for its reduced funding.

Human Resources

In October 2012 the Human Resources Staffing Plan Taskforce was created. It began meeting in November, and in spring 2013 reviewed the colleges' hiring, approval, and prioritization practices. The Task Force is modifying and adapting the staffing model of Palomar College, which utilizes a variety of demographic data, legal and regulatory information, comparative employee studies, and institutional needs to develop evidence-based rubrics for assigning staffing priorities. The Chancellor's Cabinet will review a draft plan in January 2014.

Research Capacity

College and District researchers have been meeting as the District Research Work Group since fall 2012 to connect District research services with campus research. The group addressed District-wide research agendas related to prerequisite validation and District-wide priorities. A permanent part-time research assistant was hired to assist with research related to student success. Given budget constraints, there is a focus on using the District Research Work Group to increase the research capacity District-wide.

Conclusion

The District has effectively used a task force-based approach to deal substantively with the topics within this recommendation, with the understanding that the task forces will evolve into standing committees. The District has demonstrated its commitment to integrated planning, focusing on the alignment of District and College objectives, governance structures, and resource allocation processes. There is evidence that critical leaders and stakeholders understand that continuous quality improvement demands rigorous assessment of programs, institutional plans, and the Integrated Planning Model itself. The visiting team concludes that District Recommendation 1 has been fully addressed.

College Recommendation 1

As recommended by the 2005 Accreditation Team and to build on its achievements to date in developing program review and improving institutional planning, the college should develop a practical, integrated planning model with the following characteristics:

1. A focus on a limited number of mid- to long-term initiatives to improve student learning and student support services.
2. A plan with concrete strategies and actions that are specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented and time based, and that specify individuals or groups responsible for their completion.
3. A process that clearly ties this planning model to the college's resource allocation processes.
4. Processes for regularly assessing not only the progress in achieving the goals of the plan but also the effectiveness of the integrated planning model itself.
5. A model that is inclusive of all institutional planning activities and that clarifies the functions of program review and the various resource committees.
6. A planning model that clarifies the relationship of the planning processes at Reedley College and the other planning processes of the State Center Community College District.

(Standards I.B.1 through I.B. 7; II.A.2, II.B, II.C, III.A, III.A.6, III.B, III.B.2, III.C, III.C.2, III.D, III.D.I, III.D.3, IV, IV.A, IV.A.I, IV.A.5, IV.B.I, IV.B.3.g.)

Findings and Evidence

The 2009-10 Educational Master Plan had been created under the guidance of a consultant to set the direction for the College through the year 2025. It includes an analysis of internal and external data and concludes with a set of 10 recommendations intended to highlight mid-range and long-term priorities for the College. This 15-year plan is intended to be a fluid document and subject to refinement in response to the changes in the shorter-term Strategic Plan and Program Review reports. An ad hoc group of the College Council began a review of the Educational Master Plan in Spring 2013 and has asked the College Council to undertake a major revision of the document to reflect the inclusion of the Oakhurst and Madera Centers, to update the internal and external data serving as the basis for the recommendations, to modify the recommendations as needed, and to formalize a review process for the document. The intent is to focus on six areas – facilities, technology, budget, instructional programs, student services, and community needs – and transition the plan from a consultant-driven plan to a College-directed plan. The Educational Master Plan is implemented through the College's Strategic Plan.

The District Strategic Planning Committee, with the participation of College representatives, recently revised its District Strategic Plan. The new 2012-2016 District Strategic Plan was used to guide the development of the College's 2013-2017 Strategic Plan to ensure that the College goals are aligned with the District goals and priorities. The District Strategic Planning Committee, with the consent and participation of College representatives, created a District Strategic Plan Objectives Matrix to assign responsibilities and timeframes for each objective to District and College personnel. In discussion with the College's Strategic Planning Committee, it was made clear that the College is committed to the alignment of the College and District plans and to the achievement of both sets of goals and objectives.

In addition to aligning its new Strategic Plan with the District plan, the College evaluated its progress on the prior plan and gathered internal and external input for its Strategic Plan through demographic research, community charettes, and an internal survey. The College's 2013-17 Strategic Plan, which defines six institutional strategic goals and 25 objectives, serves as the foundation for department and program goals specified in the Program Review reports and annual updates, and is used to justify resource requests. In September 2013, the President's Advisory Council met to determine the priority objectives for the 2013-14 academic year. The group identified six high-priority objectives for the year, with an initial focus on three "drivers." Each of these was assigned to one or more groups for implementation.

The College is in the last phase of its Program Review, Cycle Three, which is conducted on a staggered basis every six years. The programs at the Oakhurst and Madera Centers are incorporated into Reedley's Program Review process. This extensive process, which is conducted by each operational area or department, includes a program description, staffing summary, listing of courses and degrees (for academic programs), facilities overview, equipment and supply requirements, an analysis of how each program supports the College Mission and Strategic Plan, the program response to prior program review recommendations, a quantitative and qualitative analysis of their services, a budget summary for their area, a summary of their student learning outcomes assessment results, and the resources needed to accomplish those goals. Goals must be specifically linked to the evidence presented in the Program Review. These documents are reviewed by the Program Review Committees and presented to the College Council for input and approval. The

substantiation of Program Review goals is a formal part of this process. The Program Review documents serve as the source for annual updates and resource requests that are required under the new budget and resource allocation process. The Program Review Committee is preparing to transition to Program Review Cycle Four, which will be implemented in 2014-15.

As requested at the last accreditation follow-up visit, the college has revised its Resource Action Plan Proposal (RAPP) process. The original RAPP process, had linked planning to the budget allocation process for distributing lottery funds. The revised process requires that the allocation of all discretionary general funds to be linked to planning. The new process, overseen by the Budget Committee, is based on a comprehensive zero-based college allocation model that requires departments and programs to submit a worksheet for all non-personnel budget requests (other than temporary and student workers). Each program and unit must complete an annual Budget Worksheet that links requests to a substantiated Program Review goal and a specific Strategic Plan and Objective. The worksheet requires the sign-off of the deans and vice presidents and includes information about potential funding sources. Prioritization occurs throughout the process, specifically at the chair, dean, vice president, and budget committee levels. This process was approved by the shared governance bodies and introduced to the College and affiliated Centers (Oakhurst and Madera) through a series of training workshops. It was piloted in Spring 2013 and used to create a tentative budget for 2013-14. Modifications were made in response to feedback from participants and the process will be fully implemented for the 2014-15 academic year.

The Budget Committee is responsible for an annual review of the budget allocation process and the College Council is responsible for the annual analysis of the integrated planning process and the Educational Master Plan.

Conclusion

In addressing College Recommendation 1, the Reedley was asked to ensure that its integrated planning model reflected six characteristics of effectiveness. A summary of its responses follows:

1. A focus on a limited number of mid- to long-term initiatives to improve student learning and student support services.

Reedley College's 2009-10 Educational Master Plan establishes the college's mid- and long-term educational directions and parameters. It is subject to ongoing review and updating by the College Council.

2. A plan with concrete strategies and actions that are specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented and time based, and that specify individuals or groups responsible for their completion.

Its 2013-17 Strategic Plan, which was developed to implement the Educational Master Plan objectives and to align with the 2012-16 District Strategic Plan, defines six institutional strategic goals and 25 objectives. In September 2013, the College's President's Advisory Council prioritized six objectives for the current academic year and assigned the implementation of each of three "drivers" to specific groups, including the Program Review Committee, Student Success Committee, Distance Education Committee, and President's Cabinet.

3. A process that clearly ties this planning model to the college's resource allocation processes.

In Spring 2013 the college piloted a new budget allocation process to ensure that budget allocation is linked to planning for all discretionary general funds rather than just for lottery funds, as had been done in prior years. The process was used to create a tentative budget for 2013-14. Each program and unit completes an annual Budget Worksheet that links requests to a substantiated Program Review goal and a specific Strategic Plan and Objective. This process was approved by the shared governance bodies and introduced to the College and affiliated Centers (Oakhurst and Madera) through a series of training workshops. Modifications were made in response to feedback from participants and the process will be fully implemented for the 2014-15 academic year.

4. Processes for regularly assessing not only the progress in achieving the goals of the plan but also the effectiveness of the integrated planning model itself.

The Budget Committee is responsible for an annual review of the budget allocation process and the College Council is responsible for the annual analysis of the Educational Master Plan, the Integrated Planning Process and the updates for the Integrated Planning Manual.

5. A model that is inclusive of all institutional planning activities and that clarifies the functions of program review and the various resource committees.

The College has a well-established Program Review process that requires all departments and programs to create goals and resource requests that are data-driven and linked to the College's goals and the programs' student learning outcomes. It is conducted every six years by all areas of the College – academic programs, student services areas, and administrative units. Student learning outcomes assessment is an integral part of the Program Review process.

6. A planning model that clarifies the relationship of the planning processes at Reedley College and the other planning processes of the State Center Community College District.

The creation of the District Strategic Plan Objectives Matrix, undertaken with the colleges' active participation, clarifies the relationship between the planning processes of the College and District.

Conclusion

With the updates to the Strategic Plan and Educational Master Plan, and the creation of a budget allocation process that links all discretionary spending to Program Review and the Strategic Plan, the visiting team concludes that College Recommendation 1 has been fully addressed.

Commendations

The visiting team was impressed by the substantial amount of work done by District and College staff over the past year to establish planning processes that are coordinated among the District, Colleges, and Centers, and that include review processes to ensure effectiveness.

The visiting team also commends the District for establishing an Enrollment Management Committee that links enrollment management to the district's strategic priorities.

FINDING

Reedley College has fully addressed the recommendations and corrected the deficiencies. It is in full compliance with Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission Policies.