MEMO TO: Mr. Michael White, Interim President
                 Reedley College
                 995 North Reed Avenue
                 Reedley, CA 93654

FROM: Barbara A. Beno, President

DATE: December 6, 2012

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 10, 2012,** in order to be included in Commission materials. The letter may also be sent electronically as a PDF.

- 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 **December 12, 2012,** or earlier, of its intent to attend the meeting. This enables the Commission to invite the Team Chair to attend.

- 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 with the written notification that the CEO has accepted the invitation to address the Commission, no later than December 17, 2012.

The next meeting of the Accrediting Commission will be held on **January 9-11, 2013,** at The Hyatt Regency Hotel, San Francisco Airport, 1333 Bayshore Highway, Burlingame, 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 chief administrator 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. Marilyn Behringer, Accreditation Liaison Officer (w/o enclosure)

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

The Commission considers accreditation actions institutional 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. If the institution wishes to bring written material to the meeting, it must send the material to the Commission at least 15 working days prior to the scheduled meeting, with the institution's written acceptance of the invitation to appear before the Commission. 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 Commission reserves the right to establish a time limit on such presentations.
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 Team Chair or designee will also be invited to attend. 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 relative 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.*

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 9, 2012

| __Elizabeth Armstrong__ | Former Interim President | San Diego Mesa College__ |
| Name of Team Chair | Title | Institution |

| __Dr. Carol Kozeracki__ | Dean, Academic Affairs | East Los Angeles College__ |
| Name of Team Member | Title | Institution |

Follow-Up Visit Report

DATE: 5 December 2012

TO: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

FROM: Elizabeth Armstrong, Team Chair

SUBJECT: Report of Follow-Up Visit Team to Reedley College, November 9, 2012

Introduction

A comprehensive visit was conducted to Reedley College in October, 2011. At its meeting of January 10-12, 2012, the Commission acted to require Reedley College to submit a Follow-Up Report followed by a visit. The visiting team, Ms. Elizabeth Armstrong and Dr. Carol Kozeracki, conducted the site visit to Reedley College on October 9, 2012. The team chair also visited the State Center Community College District office.

The purpose of the team visit was to verify that the Follow-Up Report prepared by the College was accurate through examination of evidence, to determine if sustained, continuous, and positive improvements had been made at the institution, and that the institution has addressed the recommendations made by the 2011 and 2005 comprehensive evaluation teams, resolved the deficiencies noted in those recommendations, and meets the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies.

The team learned that, since the October 2011 visit, there have been changes in administrative personnel. The Reedley president, new at the time of the 2011 visit, unexpectedly resigned in July 2012; the former vice president of student services has been appointed as interim president. The Reedley vice president of instruction retired in June, 2012, although still continuing to serve as the accreditation liaison officer for purposes of the Follow-Up visit. Both of these vice president positions have been replaced with a single administrator, formerly a Reedley dean, serving as interim vice president of instruction/student services, and an interim dean of instruction has been appointed to fill the resultant vacancy. An interim dean of student services has replaced the vice president of student services position. The current administrative structure reflects the same total number of administrative positions at Reedley College. These changes at Reedley are in addition to administrative changes at Willow International Community College Center (addressed on pages 18-19 of this report). The College is preparing to advertise the president's position and studying whether or not to continue the combined vice president of instruction/student services position.

The Follow-Up Report documented broad involvement of College and District constituencies in its preparation and provided a timeline and additional sources of evidence. Faculty, administrators, classified and students from Reedley College, Madera Center, the Oakhurst

Campus, Willow International Community College Center and the district all participated. The standing Accreditation Committee served as the Follow-Up Report Steering Committee; separate committees were assigned to the preparation of each recommendation.

The team met with college and district administrators including the Reedley interim president, Willow International Community College Center president, and the SCCCD chancellor; members of the Accreditation Follow-Up Report Steering Committee, College Council, Strategic Planning Committee, Educational Master Plan Committee, Budget Committee; Willow International Community College Center administrators, faculty and classified leadership; SLO Coordinators and liaisons; department chairs and program directors; and members of the SCCCD Strategic Planning Committee. Included were members of the administration, faculty, staff, and students. In all, the team met with 69 different individuals, with some participating in more than one meeting.

The team found that the College had prepared well for the visit by arranging for meetings with the individuals and groups agreed upon earlier with the Team Chair and by assembling appropriate documents in the meeting room used by the team. Additional documents requested by the team were provided. The College also provided an addendum to the Report describing activities occurring since the submission of the Report supported by extensive additional district and college evidence. This new evidence, together with that previously provided, demonstrated continuing substantial efforts and commitment.

It was clear that the College and District have taken the task of responding to the recommendations seriously and with enthusiasm. One individual stated that while the Report was accreditation driven, the work was not solely about accreditation but was due to a broad commitment to true participatory governance, communication, and transparency in planning and improvement of student success. Several spoke of a district-wide culture shift towards transparency, trust, and open communication among and between constituencies.

In particular, the team would like to commend the College and District for:

- the conscious effort at Reedley College and across the District to include all constituent groups and site locations in governance and planning;
- the strong sense of ownership by college and district members of planning processes;
- the excellent collaboration and communication between all the colleges, centers and the district;
- the inclusion of the community in planning at both district and college level;
- an intentional systems approach to governance and planning;
- the commitment of Reedley faculty leadership to implement student learning outcomes and assessment in a meaningful way;
- the Reedley College Readiness Forum to promote student success by working with the feeder high schools to assess preparation and align high school and college curriculum; and
- the strong leadership of the Chancellor and interim college President in all aspects of planning.

The Follow-Up Report and visit were expected to document resolution of the following recommendations:

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 must engage in continuous, deliberative, and timely dialog with all District stakeholders to coordinate long term planning and examine the impact on all the stakeholders of the planned increase in the number of colleges and the future roles of the centers. This includes creating, developing, and aligning district and college plans and planning processes in the following areas: strategic planning, facilities planning, technology planning, organizational reporting relationships of centers, locations of signature programs, funding allocation, and human resources and 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)

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 which 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, IIIC.2, III.D, III.D.1, III.D.3, IV, IV.A, IV.A.1, IV.A.5, IV.B.1, IV.B.3.g.)

College Recommendation 2

In order to meet the Standard and the Commission's 2012 timeline to be at the "proficiency level" in the identification, assessment and use for improvements of student learning outcomes, the team recommends that the college accelerate its activities to ensure that each course and program has measurable outcomes that are published widely, that those outcomes are regularly assessed, that the results of that assessment are clearly documented, widely discussed, and used

4

in decision-making aimed at aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning. (II.A.1.a, II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c, II.A.2, II.A.3).

College Recommendation 3

In order to meet Standards, the team recommends that the college further clarify its participatory governance decision-making structures and processes to identify clearly the responsibilities of committees and individuals for decision-making. (Standard IV.A.2.a, IV.A.3, IV.A.5)

College Responses to the 2011 External Evaluation Team Recommendations

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 must engage in continuous, deliberative, and timely dialog with all District stakeholders to coordinate long term planning and examine the impact on all the stakeholders of the planned increase in the number of colleges and the future roles of the centers. This includes creating, developing, and aligning district and college plans and planning processes in the following areas: strategic planning, facilities planning, technology planning, organizational reporting relationships of centers, locations of signature programs, funding allocation, and human resources and 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:

The 2011 Team found that the State Center Community College District was at the beginning stages of a renewed focus on comprehensive, integrated planning with efforts toward increased participation of district, colleges, and community stakeholders and broader communication. The Follow-Up Report described, and the 2012 team visit confirmed, that during the 2011-2012 year an intensive, coordinated effort has occurred to advance SCCCD planning on many fronts. Reedley College representatives, including Willow International Community College Center, Madera Center and the Oakhurst Campus, were active on all the task forces and committees involved in planning activities. The Follow-Up Report included an SCCCD Strategic Plan Timeline from March 2011 through July 2017.

The SCCCD planning efforts have included more than 81 presentations on strategic planning in the past year. These included board of trustees Visioning Sessions and Strategic Conversations; district, and college/center Forums and Town Hall meetings; and community Charrettes. Assistance to planning has been provided by The College Brain Trust. In spring 2013, plans are for district-wide leaders to participate in a SCUP training session on integrated planning, indicating a continued commitment to establishing a culture of informed planning and decision-making.

The SCCCD Board of Trustees has approved a new Mission, Vision and Values statement. There is a newly created 2012-2016 SCCCD Strategic Plan grounded in regional demographic, educational and economic data. The new Strategic Plan is accompanied by the SCCCD 2012-13 Integrated Planning Model and a draft SCCCD Integrated Planning Manual, including a 2012-2016 Strategic Plan Responsibility Matrix. The Planning Manual is comprehensive in its coverage of all district and college planning activities including planning schematic diagrams, definitions, timelines, relationships between different planning activities, relevant accreditation standards, and establishment of baseline data to measure the accomplishment of goals and objectives. Included is implementation of District Administrative Services Unit Review (ASUR) program review for centralized services, to analyze, track and improve the quality of services. For each district Strategic Objective, the Strategic Plan Responsibility Matrix provides specific objectives, action steps, baseline measures, success measures, timelines, and responsibility.

A newly-formed group, the District Decision Making Taskforce (DDMT), approved by Chancellor's Cabinet in August, 2012, is charged to coordinate long-term planning activities of several planning bodies and to examine the impact of the increase in the number of colleges and the future roles of the centers on the existing institutions. This task force will examine how decisions are made and develop a resource manual intended to improve communication and trust among constituents. Also to improve communication on planning, SCCCD now publishes The Linkage Report, an electronic monthly accreditation and integrated planning newsletter.

The Board approved the Educational Master Plans for the colleges and centers in 2010 which were then combined into a District-wide Educational Master Plan; this document serves as guidance regarding growth in the colleges and centers and the location of signature programs. It was referenced at the February 2012 Strategic Conversation. One outcome of the Conversation was the formation of a district-wide SCCCD Signature Programs Task Force.

At the time of the 2011 team visit, the District-wide Resource Allocation Model Task Force (DRAMT) was newly formed, charged with the development of a comprehensive resource allocation model that provides a fully integrated allocation process, intended to provide flexibility for colleges and centers to effectively support their strategic plans. The task force has studied other district's allocation models and the outcomes of budget simulations on the college and center budget allocations. DRAMT members drafted Phase I of the model in spring 2012 with Phase II originally scheduled for completion in fall 2012. Phase I, covering categorical funds has been implemented. Phase II was shared district-wide with forums held in October at Reedley College and Madera Center to gather input on the model. Using the input gained at the forums, DRAMT intends to modify the Phase II model, thus postponing implementation by one year, from the 2013-2014 fiscal year to the 2014-15 fiscal year . The process of gathering data and input from constituents and then modifying the model accordingly is illustrative of the overall approach to district planning.

Through the Strategic Planning for District-wide Facilities Committee (established in 2005), a new Facilities Master Plan was developed, reviewed at Town Hall meetings at all sites, and approved at the September 20, 2012 Board of Trustees meeting.

Planning for technology commenced with a district-wide Technology Summit in June 2011. Subsequently, Campus Works, Inc. was retained to conduct a technology assessment and recommendations for technology planning. Reports were presented to the Board of Trustees in April 2012. A new District-wide Technology Task Force began meeting in October 2012 with the charge of developing and implementing a district technology plan to assure technology planning is integrated with institutional planning.

With respect to human resources planning, the district has created a Human Resource Staffing Plan Task Force whose work will be based on existing planning data including that from the College Brain Trust, the SCCCD 2012-2016 Strategic Plan and baseline research data. In response to findings from the College Brain Trust regarding research as well as to respond to accreditation recommendations, the district position of associate vice chancellor, workforce development and educational services has been changed to vice chancellor of educational

services and institutional effectiveness, including coordination of district-wide institutional research. This position had just been filled at the time of the Follow-Up visit. To build research capacity and to support increased planning, resource allocation and decision-making, a district-wide Institutional Research Group has been established and has begun work; its charge, reporting structure and membership was approved by Chancellor's Cabinet in September, 2012. Similarly, a Signature Programs Taskforce has been formed and is in the process of establishing its charge.

The broad inclusion of individuals representing all constituent groups and colleges/centers has resulted in strong links between the college and the district planning efforts. Committee members are charged with reporting in both directions and take responsibility for forum presentations with a standard Powerpoint. Planning timelines have been adjusted so that the SCCCD Strategic Plan covers 2012-16 and the Reedley College Strategic Plan covers 2013-2017. The district budget model has been mirrored by the development of an integrated Reedley College budget planning model. The district strategic plan's use of baseline data has been reflected in the newly developed Reedley College Research Agenda. The district's community charrettes are reflected in the Reedley College and centers community forums.

In the past year, great strides have been made in planning for the new Willow International Community College Center. A Willow International Transitional Staffing Plan details the human resources and costs that need to be functional by fall 2016 if initial accreditation is granted; a recent update shows the progress made.

To assist the transition at Willow International Community College Center, faculty release time was granted to aid the transition from a Faculty Association to a Faculty Senate. In addition, Willow International Community College Center committees, including Program Review/Student Learning Outcomes Assessment, now operate as subcommittees of the respective Reedley College committee. The 2012-13 Reedley College Participatory Governance Handbook includes the approved "Operating Policies and Procedures" for these committees.

Conclusion:

The team that visited Reedley College in 2005 made two recommendations regarding planning. The 2011 team concluded that progress had been made but that the 2005 recommendations had not been fully addressed. Their conclusions read in part as follows:

> *2006 Recommendation 2: Institutional Planning*
> *"While the team recognizes that all constituent groups have made significant strides in developing and implementing a comprehensive strategic plan, efforts should continue at the same level of commitment if the college is to achieve the recommendation listed in the Commission's report of October 2005."*
>
> *2006 Recommendation 6: College Strategic Planning with District Strategic Planning*
> *The 2006 Team concluded that "...the team recommends that Reedley College and the North Centers continue to work with the district in order to fully satisfy the Commission's recommendation."*

The 2011 team concluded that:

> *"aspects of the planning process still need to be addressed, particularly the development of concrete, well-focused, results-oriented strategies and action plans, and protocols to assure that institutional planning is firmly connected to the strategic resource allocation."*

And that

> *"Reedley College and the State Center Community College District need to continue their efforts to coordinate strategic planning between the college and the district."*

Since the 2011 visit, the State Center Community College District has made excellent progress in institutional district-wide planning including broad input from all constituencies and sites. It is evident that there is strong commitment from the board, the chancellor and other leaders to achieving an integrated, system approach to planning that serves the students and the SCCCD community.

As evidenced by the Follow-Up Report and confirmed by the team, several task forces and committees have been formed and are working effectively; others are presently being formed and starting work. There is a board-approved Strategic Planning Model that integrates district, college and center planning; a comprehensive Strategic Planning Handbook; Phase I of a budget allocation model; and a new Facilities Master Plan. A Human Resources Staffing Plan and a Technology Plan are in development. There is a new Signature Programs Taskforce and a new Institutional Research Group. Overall integration of all planning efforts will be guided through the new District Decision Making Taskforce (DDMT). And a Willow International Community College Center Transitional Staffing Plan has been developed to guide the transition of Willow International Community College Center to a separate college. The impact of the creation of the new Willow International Community College Center is being addressed through these committees.

The main district planning structure, the 2012-2016 SCCCD Strategic Plan, is in place and operational, accompanied by the Integrated Strategic Planning Model, Integrated Strategic Planning Manual, and Strategic Plan Responsibility Matrix. Also completed are Phase I of the district-wide budget allocation process, the Educational Master Plan, and the Facilities Master Plan. Some of the supporting planning processes (Human Resources, Technology, Phase II Budget Allocation and the District Decision Making Task Force) are still a work in progress. The accomplishments to date and the strong commitment to integrated planning are an excellent indicator of continued progress. Both faculty and classified spoke positively of transparency in governance and stated that the open, systems approach to governance and planning has led to a district-wide cultural change. There was noticeable enthusiasm from college and district individuals for the changes that are occurring.

The team concludes that the District has made excellent progress toward addressing most aspects of this Recommendation. The efforts underway promise to successfully complete this Recommendation.

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 College publishes four major planning documents: the Educational Master Plan, the Strategic Plan, the Facilities Master Plan, and the Technology Plan. The 2009-10 Educational Master Plan was designed to set the direction for the College through the year 2025. It includes an analysis of internal and external data that were used to develop specific directions and parameters for the implementation of programs and activities related to the educational and support services of the College. It serves as the driving force behind the Facilities Plan and the Technology Plan, and is intended to exist in an interdependent relationship with the Strategic Plan and the Program Review Reports, being revised in response to those documents.

The 2008-2012 Strategic Plan, which defines seven institutional strategic goals and 23 objectives, was developed as a means to implement the college's Educational Master Plan and the district's strategic goals. The Strategic Plan document does not include specific measurements, responsible groups, and time frames for these goals and objectives. However, the President and college researcher have developed a draft research agenda that links the District's strategic plan goals and the College's strategic goals to a set of reports and benchmarks to be used in defining these measures and how they can be assessed. These goals and objectives serve

as the foundation for department and program goals developed for the program review reports and annual updates, and are used to justify resource requests.

The District Strategic Planning Committee, with the participation of several college representatives, recently revised its Strategic Plan. The new 2012-2016 District Strategic Plan will help to guide the development of the College's 2013-2017 Strategic Plan to ensure the college goals are aligned with the district goals and priorities. As part of the district revision process, it conducted a community charrette in March 2012 to gain input on the District Strategic Plan. The College participated in this process and also recently created a survey that is being sent to internal constituents to help prioritize the goals and objectives for the next Reedley College Strategic Plan. Once the college Strategic Plan is updated, the Educational Master Plan will be reviewed and modified as appropriate. A discussion with representatives from the Strategic Planning Committee and the Educational Master Plan Committee indicated that the Educational Master Plan Committee would be convened to discuss needed revisions.

Representatives from the College have also been involved in the creation of the District Budget and Resource Allocation Advisory Committee, which will determine the process for calculating the overall allocation of budgets to each college and center in the district. To guide the spending of funds that have been allocated to the College by the District, the "2010-2012 Integrated Planning at Reedley College" document describes three budget-related annual planning processes: unit planning and program review annual updates, annual budget development and approval, and annual resource allocation for ongoing programmatic needs and one-time projects.

One example cited in the Follow-Up Report describes the funding process for a "one-time project." The request for an Entrepreneurship Center followed the college's "Resource Action Plan Proposal" (RAPP) process, which had been used by the College to distribute lottery funds. Annual progress reports, which respond to the most recent program reviews, were submitted by each department or program. These included goals/recommendations, activities/objectives, and resources requested. These proposals were reviewed by the Strategic Planning Committee to determine their alignment with college goals. They were then evaluated by the Budget Committee, which used an eight-measure rubric to examine the proposal's costs and benefits. All this information was then sent to the College Council to be prioritized and presented to the president for final approval. This initiation and approval process provides a good example of linking planning to resource allocation. Historically the lottery funds were allocated for special projects, but in recent years, these funds were required for operating expenses. In 2011-12, there were 104 Resource Action Plan Proposals (RAPPs) submitted for consideration by the College Council.

In 2012, the College began the process of expanding its planning-driven RAPP process to include all discretionary general funds rather than just the lottery funds. A new budget and resource allocation process is being developed and introduced to the constituency groups and governance committees on campus. It is based on a comprehensive zero-based college allocation model that will require departments and programs to submit a worksheet for all non-personnel budget requests (other than temporary and student workers). As currently proposed, requests must be linked to a substantiated program review goal and a Strategic Plan goal. At the November Budget Committee meeting, a proposal was made to link requests to learning

outcomes assessment results. Budget requests will be prioritized based on program review, the Strategic Plan and college goals. A budget development planning calendar to align with the district budget calendar is being created. This new process is a much more comprehensive resource allocation model that relates planning to a wide range of resource requests. Under this new model, only faculty and staff hiring will be prioritized in a separate process. This process will be tested in 2012-13, along with the existing RAPP process, and fully implemented in 2013-14.

A planning model that presents the long and short term planning cycles is provided in the Integrated Planning Insert. The model demonstrates that the annual unit plans provide the link between the strategic planning cycle and the annual planning cycle. The Program Review Handbook, Cycle Three, provides detailed information about the process and timing of the program review process, which departments and programs undergo every six years. 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 their program supports the college mission and Strategic Plan, their 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 their new goals and resources needed to accomplish those goals. These documents are reviewed by the Program Review Committees and presented to the College Council for input and approval. The Program Review documents serve as the source for annual updates and resource requests that will be part of the new budget and resource allocation process.

Conclusion:

The College was asked to address six specific recommendations:

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.

Reedley College's Educational Master Plan established the college's mid- and long-term educational directions and parameters (recommendation 1). Its Strategic Plan, which defines seven institutional strategic goals and 23 objectives, was developed as a means to implement the college's Educational Master Plan. A research agenda was developed to link the District's strategic plan goals to a set of reports and benchmarks to be used in defining these measures and how they can be assessed (recommendation 2). Currently, the strategic plan is being evaluated

by the Strategic Planning Committee to assess progress on the plan and establish priorities for the next Strategic Plan. This review process is being done in conjunction with the revised District Strategic Plan to ensure alignment of the district and college plans. College representatives actively participated in the development of the District Strategic Plan. The college review process includes an online survey to provide campus-wide input into the priorities for the next Strategic Plan (recommendations 4 and 6). Once the college's new Strategic Plan is developed, it will trigger a review of the Educational Master Plan.

The College has a well-established Program Review process, which 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 (recommendation 5). Program Review is conducted every six years by all areas of the college – academic programs, student services areas, and administrative units.

Through 2011-12, the Resource Action Plan Proposal (RAPP) process was the primary link between planning and budgeting. This process prioritized department and program requests for lottery funds on the basis of alignment with the Strategic Plan and a cost/benefit analysis to the college. Beginning in 2012, this planning-based resource allocation process is being expanded to ensure that budget allocation is linked to planning for all discretionary general funds rather than just for lottery funds. This more comprehensive process is being shaped to ensure that all requests include data from program review and outcomes assessments (recommendation 3).

The College has made good progress in addressing this Recommendation. Upon the successful conclusion of the process currently underway to revise the budget allocation process, this Recommendation will have been met.

College Recommendation 2

In order to meet the Standard and the Commission's 2012 timeline to be at the "proficiency level" in the identification, assessment and use for improvements of student learning outcomes, the team recommends that the college accelerate its activities to ensure that each course and program has measurable outcomes that are published widely, that those outcomes are regularly assessed, that the results of that assessment are clearly documented, widely discussed, and used in decision making aimed at aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning. (II.A.I.a, II.A.I. b, II.A.I.c, II.A.2, II.A3)

Findings and Evidence:

Reedley College has developed student learning outcomes (SLOs) at the course and program level for the academic programs and has developed program level outcomes for its student services and administrative areas. Academic programs with available degrees, including six interdepartmental "blended degrees," also have defined learning outcomes. Eleven general education learning outcomes (GELOs) have been developed and were approved by the Academic Senate in 2010. These serve as the institutional learning outcomes. Instructional program and general education learning outcomes are assessed by mapping course-level outcomes to the

program or institutional level and by a graduate survey. Non-instructional program outcomes are largely assessed indirectly through student satisfaction surveys.

The learning outcomes effort is headed primarily by a full-time faculty member at Reedley College with 60% reassigned time for this function. Other coordinators are situated at the Willow International Community College Center, Madera Center and the Oakhurst Campus. locations and work with the Reedley College coordinator. The College has developed an electronic repository using Blackboard that allows designated representatives from each department or program to regularly update the outcomes, assessment instruments/rubrics, and assessment reports on their programs. Unfortunately, the repository does not generate reports that track outcomes identification and assessment, so that function must be performed manually by the SLO coordinator, who creates periodic summary reports from the data available on the Blackboard site. These reports are available online and were provided as evidence in the Follow-up Report. The College is beginning to consider the purchase of a commercial software program that will facilitate the reporting responsibility for SLO and PLO assessment results.

Program outcomes are included in the college catalog and posted on the Blackboard SLO assessment site. Course SLOs are included in all course outlines of record in Curricunet. Course-level student learning outcomes are not required on the syllabi, but the SLO coordinator affirmed that most faculty do include them along with the required course objectives. Students interviewed during the Follow-Up visit indicated that SLOs were provided on course syllabi and were discussed by the instructors. Student learning outcomes are featured topics at the flex day activities offered each fall and spring. Faculty participation in the assessment of student learning outcomes is an expected duty of all instructors. A limited number of adjunct faculty who teach courses that are not taught by full-timers have received stipends to develop the learning outcomes for those courses

A report provided by the SLO coordinator in the addendum to the follow-up report indicates that outcomes have been identified and assessed for 98.4% of active courses, 100% of instructional and non-instructional programs (including student services and administrative services), and 75% of the GELO/ILOs (General Education Learning Outcomes/Institutional Learning Outcomes). The eight active courses that have not been assessed represent 1.6% of total active courses, all of which will be assessed at the Willow International Community College Center when they are offered in spring 2013. The remaining GELO/ILOs are on a schedule to be assessed by the end of the spring 2013 semester. Interviews with the coordinator and faculty revealed that faculty teaching sections of the same course have largely agreed to participate in common assessment procedures, generally either using the same questions on an exam or a common rubric for assignments. General education learning outcomes, which are mapped from the course-level outcomes, are assessed through a review of the mapped course outcomes and, more recently, a graduating student survey, which is being implemented during fall 2012. The compilation of the general education level outcomes information is led by the SLO coordinator.

A spot check of the Blackboard site revealed that the comprehensiveness of the assessment reports vary substantially, with some providing an extensive description of the assessment, results and next steps, and others providing a single statement indicating that the desired proportion of students achieved the outcomes. Discussions with the SLO Coordinator indicated

that the training of the faculty continues to address the issue of assessment report quality to ensure that the college is going beyond the minimum reporting requirements. Interviews with some of the faculty, including English and mechanized agriculture, revealed a number of programs in which the assessment results have led to changes in the teaching approaches being utilized in the classes and programs.

The results of SLO assessments are used as part of the College's planning process. Outcomes assessments are requested to justify resource requests in the program review documents, which are completed every six years, and they are also reported on the annual progress reports that are submitted as updates to program review recommendations. In addition, when departments or programs completed a Resource Action Plan Proposal to request funding for special projects, assessment results were expected as one justification for the requests. As part of the development of the new, more comprehensive resource allocation process, the budget committee recommended at its November meeting that the budget worksheet include a link to the student learning outcome and/or program learning outcome as part of the justification for the resource request.

Conclusion:

The College, under the strong leadership of the SLO coordinator, has worked very hard to meet the Commission's expectation of full compliance with SLO and PLO identification, assessment, and utilization by the end of 2012. According to the summary reports compiled by the SLO Coordinator from the reports submitted on Blackboard, all instructional and non-instructional program learning outcomes have been assessed and most course outcomes have been assessed. Outcomes are discussed at professional development activities and within departments. Assessment outcomes are used in the planning and resource allocation processes of the College, specifically program review, annual planning updates, and budget worksheets. The College has continued to allocate appropriate resources for the SLO process in the form of reassigned time for coordinators and stipends for some adjunct faculty to develop SLOs. Work remains to be done to ensure that assessment reports are uniformly comprehensive, but discussion of the SLO assessment process and training on how to improve the process continues to be done on a regular basis. Based on a review of the documentation provided and interviews with the SLO coordinators and other faculty, it appears that the College is at the proficiency level for student learning outcomes and is well-positioned to attain the level of sustainable continuous quality improvement.

College Recommendation 3

In order to meet Standards, the team recommends that the College further clarify its participatory governance decision-making structures and processes to identify clearly the responsibilities of committees and individuals for decision-making. (Standard IV.A.2.a, IV.A.3, IV.A.5)

Findings and evidence:

Since the 2011 visit, Reedley College has made several changes to address this recommendation. The Integrated Planning Model, developed by the College Council and the Strategic Planning Committee, and approved by all constituencies, is now included in the new version of the Reedley College Participatory Governance Handbook. The Handbook includes a timeline of integrated planning, budget, program review, and all participatory governance committee meetings. Committees have met to work out and eliminate meeting schedules so as to facilitate participation by all constituents. Committee operating agreements (COA) have been updated and now include their linkage to the college's goals and strategic directions. These COAs are published in the new Participatory Governance Handbook.

Student participation in governance has been strengthened by the formal change of the Associated Student Body to Associated Student Government (ASG), the implementation of a $1 student rep fee to support activities that support student advocacy, leadership training, and strengthen student representation. Effective fall 2011, students are now formally represented on selection committees.

The Reedley College Academic Senate and the Madera Faculty Association have collaborated intensively on issues relating to the Willow International Community College Center transition and the establishment of Willow International committees under the purview of Reedley College. The Willow International Community College Center Academic Senate has been established as a standing subcommittee functioning under the purview of the Reedley College Academic Senate to "exist until the Center becomes an independent college." The Center Senate President now has a seat as a member of the Reedley College Senate Executive committee to assure open lines of communication and facilitate participation and governance. The team heard that frequent regular meetings and communications occur between the senates. In collaboration with the Reedley College parent committees, Willow International Community College Center has established a Curriculum Committee, an Academic Standards Committee, an Equivalency Committee, and a Program Review/Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee, all of which function as subcommittees of the respective RC committees.

The Reedley College Classified Senate has developed a monthly bulletin to improve communication and has actively worked to fill committee vacancies. The Willow International Community College Center classified staff has established a Classified Senate and now participate on the Center's committees.

Efforts for full communication to all constituents have been redoubled. The interim president sends out electronically a weekly communication of activities including campus events, his own meetings, and his site location for each day. The Reedley College Council now includes on its agenda reports from representatives on participatory governance committees and emphasizes the importance of full communication in both directions. Each month, a list of summary reports from each participatory governance committee is distributed to the campus and centers. As a result of a meeting calendar analysis, the College Council now meets twice rather than once monthly with the result that decision-making, communication and coordination with other committees is improved. The Willow International Community College Center president and other administrators have joined the Full Cabinet of Reedley College and the Madera Center dean of instruction now attends the weekly instructional deans meeting. Starting in fall 2012, the

Madera Center's dean of the student services attends the Reedley College Student Services Leadership Council via poly-com. The College is well represented on district-wide committees and task forces. Members are expected to provide reports in both directions resulting in good communication, collaboration, consistency of core themes, and the alignment and integration of district/college plans.

Willow International Community College Center now has its own president who is solely dedicated to the Center. The Willow International Community College Center President reports directly to the Reedley College interim president and indirectly to the SCCCD chancellor. Since Madera Center and the Oakhurst Campus now report directly to Reedley, administrative coverage is provided by Reedley's administrators, not Willow International Community College Center administrators. There is an administrator from Reedley present fulltime at the Madera Center and a fulltime faculty coordinator at the smaller Oakhurst Campus.

Conclusion:

All constituent groups have worked diligently to address this Recommendation with many substantive changes made. Committee structures, meeting times, memberships, and communication have been examined and modified. In particular, the new academic senate operating agreements have brought clarity to the relationship between the College and the centers on participatory governance matters. The integration of Willow International Community College Center president and administrators into Cabinet and administrative meetings facilitates communication and decision-making. The team heard that there is now much greater communication between Reedley College, Madera Center, the Oakhurst Campus and Willow International Community College Center and greater administrative support for Madera Center and the Oakhurst Campus.

The College is to be commended for the efforts towards greater communication and inclusion of all constituents and sites. The College has met this recommendation.

Additional Observations

In addition to the Recommendations above, the 2011 team made the following statement regarding Eligibility Requirement #4, Chief Executive Officer:

> *In accord with this Eligibility Requirement, Reedley College has a president who is the chief executive officer appointed by the governing board whose full-time responsibility is to Reedley College and who possesses the requisite authority to administer board policies at Reedley College. Through long-standing practice, the North Centers (Willow International Center, Madera Center and Oakhurst Campus) are administered by a vice chancellor who has been assigned the responsibility of chief executive officer and who reports to the chancellor of the district. Given the communications between Reedley College and the Commission regarding the candidacy of Willow International for separate college status, there is a seeming contradiction between the current*

17

administrative structure and this Eligibility Requirement and with Standard IV.B.2 that the team is unable to resolve without clarification from the Commission.

Findings and Evidence:

The 2012 Follow-Up visit found that the District has addressed Eligibility Requirement #4, the authority of the Reedley College president through title and organizational reporting changes. In March 2012, the Board approved a title change from vice chancellor of the North Centers to campus president, Willow International Community College Center/Vice Chancellor, North Centers. The then-vice chancellor was appointed to the position followed soon after by his planned retirement in June, 2012. The Willow International Community College Center President position was advertised and filled in summer 2012. The Campus President is assigned exclusively to Willow International Community College Center and reports directly to the president of Reedley College, with an indirect reporting relationship to the chancellor. The Willow International Community College Center president meets regularly with the Reedley interim president and sits on the Reedley Cabinet.

Madera Center and the Oakhurst Campus are now under the direct administrative supervision of the Reedley College interim president. The team was provided with organization charts demonstrating the current Reedley College administrative organization structure and reporting relationship for Willow International Community College Center, Madera Center and the Oakhurst Campus, and for the State Center Community College District. Full administrative coverage for Madera and Oakhurst is provided by Reedley administrators with the Reedley interim president spending one day each week at the centers and other administrators covering the other four working days. Additionally, there are two full-time administrators assigned to the Madera Center, a dean of instruction and a dean of student services. The team heard that the change in the reporting structure has resulted in a much closer relationship between Reedley College and its centers.

Conclusion:

The Follow-Up team found that the college has resolved this issue satisfactorily and that Reedley College now meets Eligibility Requirement #4.