

EVALUATION REPORT

Reedley College

995 North Reed Avenue
Reedley, CA 93654

A confidential report prepared for
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that
visited Reedley College from October 17 to October 20, 2011

James W. Hottois
Chair

Visiting Team Roster

Dr. James W. Hottois Superintendent/President Palo Verde College	Team Chair
Dr. Elizabeth Armstrong Former Interim President San Diego Mesa College	Team Member
Ms. Kathy Blackwood Interim Executive Vice Chancellor San Mateo County Community College District	Team Member
Dr. Edmund Buckley Former Vice President, Academic Affairs/Assistant Superintendent Santa Rosa Junior College	Team Member
Ms. Merrill Deming Interim Dean, School of Mathematics and Science Chaffey College	Team Member
Ms. Lurelean Gaines Chairperson, Department of Nursing East Los Angeles College	Team Member
Dr. Sherrie Guerrero Vice President of Instruction and Student Services Chaffey College	Team Member
Dr. Carol Kozeracki Dean, Research and Planning Los Angeles Pierce College	Team Member
Dr. Donna McGill-Cameron Professor Woodland Community College	Team Member
Ms. Kerrin McMahan Dean, Academic Affairs East Los Angeles College	Team Member
Ms. Carrie Mullion Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent/President Palo Verde College	Team Assistant

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION REPORT

INSTITUTION: Reedley College, State Center Community College District

DATES OF VISIT: October 17 – October 20, 2011

TEAM CHAIR: James W. Hottois

An eleven-member accreditation team visited Reedley College from October 17 to October 20, 2011, for the purpose of evaluating how well the institution is achieving its stated purposes, analyzing how well the college is meeting the Commission Standards, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitting recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the status of the college.

In preparation for the visit, team members attended an all-day training session on September 1, 2011, conducted by the ACCJC and studied Commission materials prepared for visiting teams. Team members read carefully the college's self study report, including the recommendations from the October 25 through 27, 2005 visiting team, and assessed the evidence provided by the college.

Prior to the visit team members completed written evaluations of the self study report and began identifying areas for further investigation. On the day before the formal beginning of the visit, the team members spent the afternoon discussing their views of the written materials provided by the college, reviewing evidence provided by the college and reviewed the Progress Report completed by the college in October of 2006 along with other materials submitted to the commission since its last comprehensive visit. Those other materials included the report and recommendations of a Team which visited Reedley College on behalf of the Commission in October 2006. The team also reviewed the College's 2008 Interim Report to the Commission.

During the visit, the team met with over 100 faculty, staff, administrators, members of the Board of Trustees, and students. The team chair and other members of the team met with members of the Board of Trustees, the president of the college and various administrators at Reedley and at each of the North Centers. In addition, team members visited the satellite campuses at Willow-International, Madera and Oakhurst. The team also attended two open meetings to allow for comment from any member of the campus or local community.

The team's visit was made more complex by the fact that a second team was visiting the Willow International Center with the purpose of determining candidacy status for that center. According to the Willow International self study it appears that the proposed new college will include the Madera and Oakhurst Centers both of which, along with the Willow International Center, were under the administrative supervision of the Vice Chancellor for North Centers rather than the President of Reedley College at the time of

our visit. However, discussions with various administrators at the District and at Reedley College indicated that at the time of this visit there was no clear decision about the future organizational status of Madera and Oakhurst and that the Commission's rules preclude a candidate college from having off-campus centers or sites.

The team felt that the self study report was comprehensive and thorough. College staff members were very accommodating to team members and available for interviews and follow-up conversations. The college was well prepared and ready for the team's visit.

MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE OCTOBER 17 – 20, 2011 VISITING TEAM

Commendations:

1. The college is commended for its ability to acquire approximately nine million dollars of grant funding which has helped the college provide excellent programming in a number of academic areas. These grant awards are a testament to the hard work of college employees in the service of students.
2. The college is to be commended for having, with Fresno City College, one of the only psychological services programs for students in California community colleges that is accredited by the American Psychological Association. This program provides invaluable counseling and intervention services for students.
3. The college is commended for the extensive array of agriculture and natural resources programs existing at the college, along with significant partnerships with business that provide invaluable training and internship opportunities for students.
4. The college is to be commended for the enthusiasm, attention, and collegiality it has brought to assuring broad communication on all matters to the members of the college community and for developing formal and informal structures and processes, such as the Participatory Governance Handbook, to facilitate participation.
5. The college is commended for their robust Disabled Student Programs and Services (DSPS), which excel in providing outreach to all groups of students to ensure they receive needed assistance.

Recommendations:

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.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 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)

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)

District Recommendation 2

In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the District document the process for review of board policies and ensure that district governance and

decision-making processes are regularly evaluated (Standards: IV.B.1.e, IV.B.3.g.)

ACCREDITATION EVALUATION REPORT FOR REEDLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Introduction

Reedley College is one of two colleges within the State Center Community College District.

Reedley Junior College was established in 1926 as part of the Reedley Joint Union High School District. On July 1, 1946, Reedley Junior College was renamed Reedley College. In September 1956, Reedley College moved to its present 72-acre site, which is located on Reed and Manning Avenues. The College's site now includes 300 acres used as farm land.

One of two community colleges that currently make up the State Center Community College District, Reedley College serves several municipalities and communities located outside of the City of Fresno, California. The college hosts three major educational centers located in the communities of Madera, Clovis, and Oakhurst, referred to collectively as the North Centers. At the time of this visit, the North Centers were not under the administrative authority of the President of Reedley College. The college also provides educational opportunities to citizens located in rural communities south of Reedley. These locations are referred to as South Centers/Community Campus Program.

The Reedley College campus is located in the City of Reedley, California, which is an ethnically diverse area with a population of approximately 26,000 people. Student enrollment for Reedley College (including the North Centers) for the 2010 fall semester was 14,768. FTES enrollments for Fall 2010 was 5,259. Reedley College accounted for 50% of the FTES enrollment with the North Centers accounting for the other 50%.

Hispanics make up 64 percent of the student enrollment with Caucasians the next largest group at 22 percent. The ethnic make-up of the College has not changed appreciably since the last comprehensive Team Visit.

The college has fostered close relationships with its surrounding communities, and those communities exhibit a strong sense of support for the college. Student enrollment at the North Centers is approximately 9,200 students with about 60 percent enrolled at the Willow International Center, which is located in Clovis, a suburb of Fresno. Approximately 93,000 people live in Clovis, and it is the fastest growing population in the Fresno area with a 36% increase between 2000 and 2009. FTES enrollments during the fall 2010 semester at the North Centers were reported as follows: Oakhurst Center - 143, Madera Center - 820, and Clovis Center – 1,652. Having achieved a steady growth over the past five years, the Clovis Center is now the largest of the North

Centers, generating almost 1,652 credits FTES in 2010—a 47% increase since 2005. By contrast, Reedley College’s campus growth was 16% during the same period.

The Willow-International Center is seeking candidate status as a community college. At present the North Centers make up slightly over 50% of Reedley College’s enrollment.

In the last several years, enrollment growth and responsible fiscal stewardship, coupled with funds secured through the passage of a local construction bond measure, have provided the college with the resources necessary to expand services, hire additional faculty and staff, and improve campus maintenance. While still focusing on its successful vocational programs, the college has placed a strong emphasis on improving transfer in recent years.

Reedley College and the North Centers are well kept and attractive due to the district’s investments in basic maintenance and the dedicated building and grounds staff. The morale of administrators, faculty, and staff is very positive, as evidenced by the self study and through interviews by the visiting team.

Evaluation of Institutional Responses to Previous Recommendations

The report of the Team which visited Reedley College in October, 2005 included six recommendations. All six recommendations were adopted by the Commission at its January meeting in 2006. Apropos of this report, the Commission added the following comment in its January 31, 2006 letter to the College: “The Commission is unclear regarding the District’s Plans for Reedley College’s center in Clovis and Madera which the team heard would eventually grow into colleges.”

On October 31, 2006, after reviewing the progress report prepared by the College in response to the Team and Commission recommendations, a team visited Reedley College and arrived at conclusions based on its observations. Those conclusions are summarized after each recommendation.

2006 Recommendation 1: Student Learning Outcomes

The team recommends that the college conduct meaningful, timely, and inclusive dialogue with all constituent groups to identify, develop, and implement student learning outcomes at the course, program, and degree level. The college should determine and implement relevant assessment methodologies and procedures to evaluate student learning outcomes and enhance institutional effectiveness. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.4, I.B.7, II.A.1c, II.A.2a, II.A.2b, II.A.2e, II.A.2f, II.A.2g, II.A.2i, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.A.6a, II.B.1, II.B.4, II.C.1a, II.C.2, III.A.1b, III.A.1c, IV.A.1, IV.A.2b, IV.B.1b)

Conclusion of the 2006 Team: By fall of 2006 a progress report visiting team found that the college had “...made significant progress in understanding student learning outcomes” by attending workshops and retaining a consultant. The 2006 team recommended “that in order to fully meet the standards the college continue efforts to institutionalize the student learning outcomes/assessment/analysis/improvement cycle.”

Conclusion of the 2011 Team: In the Self Study the college asserts that its Curriculum and Program Review committees have continued the work on the process of identifying student learning outcomes and assessment methods in the Course Outlines of Record and that all courses currently have SLOs.

The program review process was revised in March 2007 to include the process by which SLOs are developed, assessed and evaluated at the certificate, degree and program levels. The faculty met in spring 2009 and fall 2010 (to work on course and program assessment); during 2010-2011 academic year a series of division Student Learning Outcomes summits were held for each department to work on mapping the relationships of course-program-general education (institutional) outcomes. In 2008 the faculty member who chairs the Program Review Committee was reassigned to work with faculty and staff on the development, assessment and evaluation of student learning outcomes and is currently taking inventory of the completed program review annual progress reports and SLO assessments; these are posted each semester on the Blackboard Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment site.

The college asserts that Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) have been identified for all programs although "... the process of assessment and improvement of each is still in progress for the majority of our programs." The identified PLOs are said to be listed in the college catalog. A review of the 2010-2012 catalog does not reveal evidence of these outcomes although the online Addendum to the catalog does list PLOs for those programs that have been recently reviewed.

Degree level outcomes (General Education Learning Outcomes or GELOs) have been identified.

A process was developed that would map key courses to the appropriate GELO or program outcome on the assumption that successful completion of the key courses would constitute achievement of the learning outcome. This mapping activity appears to be conducted at the department level and is captured for those on the Blackboard SLO site for those departments that have completed it. There is evidence that the college has identified key courses that incorporate the outcomes of the GELOs and that these have begun to be evaluated.

The team concludes that Reedley College has met this recommendation

2006 Recommendation 2: Institutional Planning

The team recommends that the college develop, implement, and evaluate a college wide strategic plan that incorporates the individual planning efforts of the college and centers. The college wide strategic plan should include assessment of student and community needs in order to determine the efficiency of college programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. Additionally, the strategic plan should identify and define the allocation of fiscal, physical, human, and technical resources that are required during all operational hours for existing centers and campuses and those that will be needed as future centers and campuses are developed. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, I.B.7, III.A.2, III.B.1, III.B.1a, III.B.1b, III.B.2, III.B.2a, III.B.2b, III.C.1, III.C.1.a, III.C.1c, III.C.1d, III.C.2, III.D, III.D.1a, III.D.1b, III.D.2b)

Conclusion of the 2006 Team: "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."

Conclusion of the 2011 Team: The college notes that since the last visit, Reedley College has developed a Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) with representatives from all constituencies including the North Centers College Council. The SPC has a clearly-defined purpose and has conducted a series of focus groups that have resulted in an approved Reedley College five-year Strategic Plan and a Strategic Planning and Action Planning Master Calendar. In 2009-2010, the Reedley College Resource Action Plan proposal form was developed that links the college strategic plan and goals with the

outcomes of program review. An Educational Master Plan was developed in 2009-10. In fall 2010, the SPC evaluated the Strategic Plan and determined that a consistent use of data by programs was necessary; therefore a template was generated to address this need. The response indicates that further revisions were to be considered in spring 2011. The college is currently reviewing a draft version of an overall integrated strategic planning process.

The college is addressing this recommendation and has begun to put into place an integrated planning process. The college has been assessing its integrated planning process and changes have been made to improve the effectiveness of that process. Thus progress has been made. However, 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 strategic resource allocation.

The team concludes that the college has not fully addressed this recommendation.

2006 Recommendation 3: Dialogue

The team recommends that the college improve communication by engaging in dialogue that is inclusive of all constituents, informed, and intentional about institutional quality and improvement. The dialogue should purposefully contribute to planning and institutional change. This dialogue must include formal and informal pathways for effective communication links and conflict resolution mechanisms so that information and recommendations are equally accessible to all constituent groups and centers. (Standards I.A.3, I.4, I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, IB.5, IB.6, IB.7, IVA.1)

Conclusion of the 2006 Team: “While this recommendation has been partially met, the team recommends that constituent groups at Reedley College and the North Centers continue this important effort to improve communication to fully meet the Commission’s recommendation.”

Conclusion of the 2011 Team: The team found that a variety of methods have been instituted to address this recommendation. These include workshops and all-college retreats; regular meetings of constituent groups and leadership; governance representation on committees including students; use of technology for communication and college business; Tiger Talk gatherings between employees and administrators; wide distribution of agendas and minutes; charrettes for review of strategic planning; and newsletters. In discussions with members of the college community, the team confirmed that there is a high level of satisfaction with the efforts made to enhance communication and afford all the opportunity for input.

The Team found that this recommendation has been met. Reedley College has a culture in which input from all constituents is valued.

2006 Recommendation 4: Program Review

The team recommends that the college implement the revised program review process. This process should include the assessment of student learning outcomes along with other assessments that yield quantitative and qualitative data for analysis. This information should be used for planning, decision-making, program improvement, and resource allocation. (Standards I.B, II.A.2, II.A.1c, II.B.1, II.B.3, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.A.1c, III.A.6, III.C.2, IV.A.1, IV.A.2)

Conclusion of the 2006 Team: “The ... revised program review policy appears to be a good effort to conduct a reliable self-assessment of all programs and tie the results to planning and budget allocations. ... However, while this recommendation has been met, the team recommends that the college continue to apply and evaluate the revised program review process to ensure that expectations of the Commission continue to be satisfied.”

Conclusion of the 2011 Team: In the Self Study the college describes the Program Review, Cycle 2 process as including the identification of student learning outcomes and the assessment method by which student achievement of those outcomes will be measured as well as data analysis of student demographics, course and enrollment information, and student achievement indicators. All programs at the college undertake such a review every six years with annual reports due in non-review years. The results of the program review are presented to the College Council which also deals with planning and resource allocation.

In addition the program review may be referenced when applying for non-general fund resource support through the college’s Resource Action Plan initiated fall semester 2007. The parallel process for the North Centers is the Action Plan Funding Request. Since 2007 the College Council (the College Center Council at the North Centers), which is responsible for planning and resource allocation, reviews and accepts program review summary sheets.

The team concludes that the college has met this recommendation.

2006 Recommendation 5: Library and Learning Resources

The team recommends that the college fully implement the previous team’s recommendation by ensuring that professionally qualified library and learning resource staff provide support at all locations where these services are offered currently and will be needed as future centers and campuses are developed. (Standards II.C.1a, II.C.1b, II.C.1c, II.C.2)

Conclusion of the 2006 Team: “... the Commission should continue to monitor the college’s effort to fill this position as recommended by two evaluation teams (2000 and 2005).”

Conclusion of the 2011 Team: Since the 2005 report, a professional librarian has been hired to serve the North Centers. This librarian is assisted by two part-time classified staff

working 19 hours per week each to provide evening service at the Madera and Clovis Center libraries. On the main campus, there are 2.5 FTE librarians and 4.5 FTE support staff. A half-time bibliographic instruction librarian is being paid by grant funds. In general, library and other learning support services are available to all students, but on an unequal basis, depending on the student's location and the mode of course delivery. However, the numbers of professional librarians and support staff may be inadequate as Willow International moves toward separate accreditation. The college adequately responded to this recommendation, but needs to plan immediately for forthcoming changes in staffing needs.

The team concludes that this recommendation has been met.

2006 Recommendation 6: College Strategic Planning Connection with District Strategic Planning

The team recommends that the college develop, implement, and evaluate a college-wide strategic plan that 1) incorporates the individual planning efforts of the college and 2) results in a cohesive planning framework. Simultaneously, the college should remain cognizant of the strategic direction of the State Center Community College District as it moves toward increasing the number of colleges in the district. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, I.B.7, III.A.2, III.B.1, III.B.1a, III.B.1b, III.B.2, III.B.2a, III.B.2b, III.C.1, III.C.1a, III.C.1c, III.C.1d, III.C.2, III.D, III.D.1a, III.D.1b, III.D.2b)

Conclusion of the 2006 Team: "... the team recommends that Reedley College and the North Centers continue to work with the district in order to fully satisfy the Commissions' recommendation."

Conclusion of the 2011 Team: Reedley College and the State Center Community College District need to continue their efforts to coordinate strategic planning between the college and the district.

The team concludes that the college has partially met this recommendation.

Eligibility Requirements

1. AUTHORITY:

Reedley College operated under the California approvals and authorities associated with the State Center Community College District. Reedley College was founded in 1926 and approved as a California Community College in 1963. The Willow International Center (formerly the Clovis Center), the Madera Center and the Oakhurst Center conduct educational programs under the jurisdiction of Reedley College. However, as noted below, in many ways those Centers, operating as the North Centers, are administratively separate from Reedley College.

2. MISSION:

The team confirmed that Reedley College's Mission Statement is regularly reviewed by the College's constituent groups and that a revised Mission Statement for Reedley College was adopted by the Board of Trustees of the State Center Community College District in 2011. Since Willow International is working toward accreditation, Willow International has developed its own Mission Statement which is distinct from Reedley College's Mission Statement.

3. GOVERNING BOARD:

The State Center Community College District Board of Trustees consists of seven members elected for staggered four-year terms from areas within the district. A non-voting student member is selected by students on an annual basis. The Team confirmed that the Board of Trustees make policy for the District and the College and supervises the operations of both. Board members have no employment, family or personal interest in the District and file an annual conflict of interest statement to this effect.

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

5. ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY:

The team determined that Reedley College has sufficient administrative staff, all adequately prepared and experienced to operate the college.

6. OPERATIONAL STATUS:

The team found that Reedley College is fully operational with students actively pursuing degree and certificate programs in an appropriate number of fields.

7. DEGREES:

The team confirmed that a substantial proportion of the institution's educational offerings are programs leading to degrees or certificates and a significant proportion of the College's students are enrolled in and complete those programs.

8. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS:

The team confirmed that Reedley College offers a range of programs, including numerous programs that are two years in length and that those programs are congruent with the college's mission and the Commission's eligibility requirements.

9. ACADEMIC CREDIT:

The team found that Reedley College grants academic credit based on generally accepted practices in degree-granting institutions of higher education.

10. STUDENT LEARNING AND ACHIEVEMENT:

The college has identified learning outcomes at the program and institutional level. Although the printed 2010-2012 catalog does not contain the program outcomes, the online addendum does delineate them. The college has regular timelines for the assessment of the program outcomes and is compiling information about student achievement.

11. GENERAL EDUCATION:

The team confirmed that Reedley College has defined and incorporated into all of its degree programs a substantial general education component which insures breadth of knowledge and which is designed to promote intellectual inquiry. That general education component includes demonstrated competence in writing and computational skills. It also introduces students to major areas of knowledge.

12. ACADEMIC FREEDOM:

The team found that Reedley College subscribes to the American Association of University Professors' (AAUP) statement on Academic Freedom and observed no impediments on the freedom of students and faculty to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of study.

13. FACULTY:

In the Fall of 2010 Reedley College had 122 full-time faculty members and 352 part-time faculty members. North Centers employed an additional 72 full-time and 297 part-time faculty members. The team confirmed that faculty responsibilities include development and review of curriculum and assessment of learning.

14. STUDENT SERVICES:

The team found that the Student Services provided by Reedley College are consistent with the needs of the college's students, that they support student learning, and that they are consistent with the College's mission.

15. ADMISSIONS:

Reedley College adheres to admissions policies which are consistent with its mission and with the requirements of its instructional programs.

16. INFORMATION AND LEARNING RESOURCES :

Reedley College operates libraries at the Reedley College campus and Madera and Clovis centers. Access to its library collections and electronic databases is provided at all three of its major locations. The team found that additional professional staff has been provided to accommodate existing service.

17. FINANCIAL RESOURCES:

The team found that Reedley College and the State Center Community College District have an enviable record of fiscal prudence which has permitted it to maintain its program base through challenging budget times for post-secondary education nationally.

18. FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY:

The team examined the report resulting from the District's 2010 independent audit which concluded that there were "no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under the Government Auditing Standards."

19. INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING:

Reedley College meets this Eligibility Requirement. The college is engaged in developing its planning processes, documenting student learning outcomes, and addressing its educational goals. As noted elsewhere in this report, the college needs to improve its model for an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. The college makes information regarding planning and evaluation available to the public on its website.

20. PUBLIC INFORMATION:

Reedley College's catalogue includes precise, accurate, and current information. The catalogue is supplemented by other college publications which are available in print and electronic formats.

21. RELATIONS WITH THE ACCREDITING COMMISSION:

The team found that the Board of Trustees of the State Center Community College District along with the President of Reedley College have provided assurance that the College adheres to the Eligibility Requirements and Standards of the Commission.

STANDARD I

Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

Standard I.A: Mission

General Observations:

Reedley College's mission statement was reviewed by an ad hoc committee of the College Council, Reedley College's participatory governance council, and was approved by the Council in Fall 2010. The mission statement was approved by the board of trustees on January 13, 2011. The mission statement is focused on student learning and is appropriate for the diverse student population served by the college. The mission statement is published in the catalog and is available on the college website, but is not widely posted across the campus. The mission provides a foundation for the college's planning documents, specifically program review, the educational master plan, and the strategic plan. However, the college has not sufficiently established a link between the plans and the decisions made on the basis of these plans, particularly in relation to the allocation of resources and the extent to which recommendations made in the program review documents are enacted.

There is a concern that the North Centers, which are affiliated centers of Reedley College, have established their own mission statement, as well as educational master plan and strategic plan that are distinct from the plans created by Reedley College. The North Centers do not have independent operating authority and should be part of the planning processes established by Reedley College, although the team is aware that the Willow International Community College Center is seeking Candidacy for college status and is in the midst of meeting the requirements for Candidacy.

Findings and Evidence:

The college's mission statement asserts that the educational programs at Reedley are designed to be student centered and provide high-quality learning opportunities in the critical areas of basic skills, associate degree programs, career and technical education, and transfer. Student demand for basic skills classes is evidenced by the large number of sections of pre-collegiate math and English offered each semester. Students' educational goals indicate that the majority of students are interested in either transfer or obtaining an associate degree, which includes students interested in career-related programs. An additional 12 percent of the students specify a career-related goal. Approximately 60

percent of degrees and certificates awarded are in vocational fields of study. In 2009-10, 400 students transferred to a CSU or UC campus. (I.A.1)

The mission statement was reviewed by the primary planning committees at Reedley College: the Strategic Planning Committee and the College Council. The Strategic Planning Committee discussed the mission statement at its September 23, 2009 meeting and produced a draft of the mission statement, which was sent to the College Council for review. The College Council created an ad hoc committee to review the mission statement and created an updated version of the mission statement that was approved by the College Council on October 13, 2010 and the board of trustees on January 13, 2011. The mission statement is published in the college catalog and is available on the college website, but it is not in the schedule of classes. The mission statement is also posted in most public areas, such as the library, bookstore, or student services offices, although a copy is posted in the student cafeteria. (I.A.2, I.A.3)

The mission statement is referenced as a foundation for the development of the college's major planning documents, namely the program review reports, the educational master plan, the strategic plan, and the technology action plan. Program review reports from all major divisions of the college (instruction, student services, and administrative services) include a requirement for the program completing the document to "describe how your program supports the College/Centers Mission Statement." The Admissions and Records Office (A&R), for example, discusses the role of A&R in fostering student access to the college. Engineering's program review emphasize that its program is both accessible and student-oriented, citing the ample amount of assistance available to students from counselors, instructors, and tutors to assist them in their educational process, and the high retention and success rate of students in the program. (I.A.4)

The 2008-2012 Strategic Plan, which was developed by the college's Strategic Planning Committee and approved by the College Council, presents seven strategic directions and objectives that are designed to be "congruent with the mission, vision and values of the college." The goals related to "teaching and learning excellence" and "student services" most closely match the emphases of the college's mission. The Educational Master Plan cites the college's strategic plan, with its roots in the college's mission statement, as the major foundation for the development of all planning efforts by the college. Furthermore, the overview of the Educational Master Plan echoes the mission statement in its assertion that "the students and their educational needs are the basis for programs and services provided by the college." Student input on the Educational Master Plan was obtained, with cost and logistical issues emerging as the highest concerns of the student respondents. The Educational Master Plan's culminating recommendations largely reflect the student-centered focus of the mission statement, including the needs of second-language learners, the development of a process for the expansion of programs, the facilitation of credit transfer among the colleges in the district, and the development of new facilities that meet the needs of the instructional and student services programs. Finally, as indicated in the college's self-evaluation, the Fall 2010 Technology Action Plan developed by the Technology Planning Committee includes ten objectives that support student success by facilitating student access to educational technology,

improving technology-related facilities and equipment, and training faculty and staff to assist students in effectively using technology to enhance their educational progress. (I.A.4)

As demonstrated above, Reedley College's mission has been instrumental in the development of the institutional planning documents. However, the link between the various plans and the decisions made, including resource allocation, is less clear. For example, until Spring 2011, program review documents were only updated every six years, meaning that their resource-related recommendations/goals were not used in funding decisions because they may no longer have been needed by the programs. In addition, the college's strategic plan does not include timelines and assignments of responsibility, which disallows accountability and prevents the systematic tracking of progress. The college needs to strengthen the links among the mission, planning, and decision-making functions at the college. (I.A.4)

While the North Centers have developed their own mission statement, educational master plan, and strategic plan, and have communicated this information to the ACCJC, Reedley College still retains authority for the North Centers. The District needs to clarify the relationship of the planning processes at Reedley College and the other planning processes of the State Center Community College District.

Conclusions:

The college partially meets the standard. The mission statement is appropriate to the student population, is reviewed and updated regularly, is approved by the governing board, and is utilized in the development of institutional plans. However, the college is encouraged to more systematically link the mission and planning to decision making, particularly in determining resource allocation and in ensuring that plans are evaluated and updated regularly. The District needs to clarify the relationship of the planning processes at Reedley College and the other planning processes of the State Center Community College District.

Recommendations: See Recommendation 1 and District Recommendation 1

Standard I.B: Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Comments:

The college has been strongly committed to the improvement of institutional effectiveness since at least the last accreditation visit. In the intervening period it has developed student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels and begun the process of assessing them. Program review now occurs not only in instructional and student services programs but also in the administrative units. The

college is currently aligning its major institutional plans and is working to improve its integrated planning model and protocols. While there are significant hurdles to overcome before its planning processes are truly integrated, the major planning components are in place, and the college leaders are determined to put an effective planning model in place.

As noted above, the college is in the process of addressing the recommendation of the 2006 Team and has begun to put into place an integrated planning process. The college continues to assess its integrated planning process and changes have been made to improve its effectiveness. Thus progress has been made. However, 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 strategic resource allocation.

Findings and Evidence:

Since the last accreditation visit, Reedley has been very proactive in identifying a variety of forums for carrying out discussions about student learning, SLOs, and planning. These include seminars with outside experts, flex day activities, online communications using Blackboard, and discussions within committees. As a result of these advocacy efforts, the college has moved forward with SLO/PLO development and reports that it is at the 50% level of assessment for SLOs. The program review process is undergoing a third cycle of program review, which has incorporated outcomes assessment into its format. (I.B.1)

The college has been energetic in its efforts to develop a set of goals to improve its effectiveness. The *Reedley College Educational Master Plan 2009-2010*, prepared for the college by the Maas Companies, provides an extensive analysis of the college and concludes with several recommendations related to college administrative organization, instruction for second language learners, the possible expansion of programs, enhanced staff development, "green" activities, articulation with Fresno City college, instructional program efficiency (i.e. WSCH/FTEF), and district wide budget operations. The *Reedley College 2008-2012 Strategic Plan* contains seven "strategic directions," under which are listed a total of twenty objectives. The eight goals in the *Reedley College Annual Goals 2010-2011* are aligned by reference to specific objectives in the both the Reedley strategic plan and to the District strategic plan, as well as to Accreditation recommendations and Accreditation planning agendas.

These linkages reflect the college's effort to begin integrating its institutional plans. Another laudable effort is a document developed immediately prior to the visit entitled *Integrated Planning at Reedley College*. The paper provides a graphic that describes the cycle for evaluating Reedley's integrated planning. It identifies the Mission Statement, the Educational Master Plan, the Strategic Plan, and program review reports as "key documents" and lists the Technology Plan, the Facilities Plan, the Budget Plan, the Staffing Plan, and the college committee and grant action plans as components of the budget allocation prioritization process.

Clearly the college is making strides in the complex task of integrating its institutional planning. However, real integration has yet to be achieved because the college has not articulated its goals and stated the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed.

The Educational Master Plan appears to be an excellent document to assist the college in facility planning, and it contains what looks like very useful data about the college's service area, its students, and instructional productivity (WSCH/FTES), but most of its recommendations (technically it has no goals) are not measurable.

The Strategic Plan's objectives are not measurable either. For example, Objective 2.3 is "Ensure a safe campus environment." This is a worthwhile objective, but it is almost meaningless without further language describing what the college means by the word "safe" in this context. This may be difficult, but it is not impossible. Wrestling with these questions is an essential part of the collaborative dialogue needed in order to make real, demonstrable improvements in the college. (I.B.2)

In response to this standard, the college cites examples of evaluation at four levels, the course level, the program level, the program level, the institutional level, and the regional level. Examples of such evaluations are those for SLOs, periodic course revision, program review outcomes evaluations, non-cyclical assessment, and evaluations that take place through the institutional plans. However, the college does not document here "an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and reevaluation." Nor could the team validate such a systematic cycle. Both in the team's discussions with the college community and within the text of the self-study there seemed to be conflicting notions about the roles of the College Council, the Strategic Planning Committee, the Educational Master Plan and the Strategic Plan in institutional planning processes. (I.B.3)

The team was able to affirm that the college community is broadly represented in planning activities. In spite of deficiencies in the integration of planning already noted, the team took note of a willingness of all the constituent groups to work together to improve the institution. It was especially heartening to see evidence of collaboration in the sharing of scarce resources. (I.B.4)

The college's commitment to the dissemination of assessment results to assure quality is strong. College level data such as the Accountability Report for community Colleges (ARCC) report as well as enrollment data, program review information and various survey results are widely shared via the college website and the Blackboard site. The college publishes an attractive *Annual Report* for the community; the major college planning documents as well as accreditation documents are available on the college website.

The college addresses this Standard by describing the Participatory Governance Handbook, the Educational Master Plan, and operations in Human Resources, Physical Resources, the Budget Committee, the Technology Committee, Institutional Research,

and Grant Resources. Each of these documents or functions is cited as evidence of institutional planning or the linking of one plan to another. (I.B.5)

The Standard asks the college if it *systematically reviews* its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes, and makes changes in the cycle if needed. The team was able to verify that a systematic review has occurred in the past, but the review has not been consistent in recent years. (I.B.6, See also the discussion of Standard III.C.2)

The college asserts that "the primary means of institutional evaluation is the program review process," and describes it in some detail. Program review has a five-year cycle. Programs spend the first two semesters gathering data and assessing student learning outcomes. In the third semester, data is analyzed and a final report is completed, with goals. In each cycle, changes are made to improve the process for the next cycle. (I.B.7)

In contrast to the planning going on at Reedley College, the team found that the State Center Community College District is in the early stages of planning. The district has begun the process of developing a number of plans including a budget allocation model. The team found evidence that many decisions at the district level have in the past been made on a seemingly ad hoc basis and without broad understanding of the basis for the decision—or, in some cases that a decision had even been made. For example, while the district has focused significant effort on preparing Willow International to be a separate college, there was no seeming understanding of how that would affect the administration of the Madera Center and the Oakhurst campus which are currently under the administrative supervision of the Vice Chancellor for North Centers. Similarly, there seemed to be no plans for the continued provision of services which are currently shared between Reedley College and the North Centers.

In discussions with individuals at the district, the team found that there have not been systematic and ongoing planning processes at the district which could articulate with planning at the College. The team also found that there has not been a process for assessing district services to the college—a process which should be part of an ongoing planning process.

Conclusions:

The college partially meets this Standard. The college has effectively engaged in self-reflective dialogue to develop SLOs, program review, and an institutional planning process. Program review is going well at Reedley College, and it can serve as a model for the continued development of integrated planning. However, the team found that the college only partially meets Standard I.B.3. While the evaluation of planning activities may take place at the four levels identified, the college has not addressed the critical importance of integrating the planning activities in a cycle of evaluation, planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. The district is not yet at a place where it can integrate its plans with the college's plans.

While Reedley College has made significant progress, engaging in collaborative dialogue that is improving its institutional planning, the college has yet to develop institutional goals, objectives, and action plans in terms that allow for a true assessment of progress. This is a crucial next step for the development of planning integration and accountability. The district is beginning to engage in collaborative dialogue as part of its nascent planning process.

This standard asks the college if it systematically assesses its own evaluation mechanisms. The team did not find that such a systematic assessment practice exists at the college or district level. In addition, the team did not find that services are being appropriately evaluated at either level.

Recommendations:

College Recommendation 1

As recommended by the 2005 Accreditation Team and building 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 which 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 both progress in achieving the goals of the plan and the effectiveness of the integrated planning model itself.
5. A model which is inclusive of all institutional planning activities and clarify the functions of program review and the various resource committees.
6. A planning model which clarify 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.1, III.D.3, IV, IV.A, IV.A.1, IV.A.5, IV.B.1, IV.B.3.g.)

District Recommendation 1

As recommended by the previous accreditation team and reaffirmed by this visit, the State Center Community College District should 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: district strategic plan,

facilities plans, technology plans, organizational reporting relationships of centers, locations of signature programs, funding allocation, 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)

STANDARD II

Student Learning Programs and Service

Standard II.A: Instructional Programs

General Observations:

The self study report descriptions were cohesive, comprehensive and documented. Evaluations sections were brief; the college had no “planning” section for this portion of the Standard. Inasmuch as the adoption, assessment, and implementation of student learning outcomes is in progress, it is somewhat surprising that the college did not identify a commitment to continued institutional action.

Reedley College addresses the educational needs of communities across its service area through the offering of individual courses and programs leading to the awarding of Associates degrees and vocational certificates. Academic programs and services are provided on the main campus, at several off-campus locations (although services at the North Centers – Willow International, Madera, and Oakhurst – are provided and supervised by the office of the Vice Chancellor, North Centers), and through the delivery of an expanding distance education offering. College employees’ strong concern for the quality and relevance of its educational offerings is evident through surveys and activities conducted for this Self-Study. Students also express appreciation for the educational and cultural resources made available by the college, whether it be for the purpose of earning an associates degree, transferring to a baccalaureate level institution, preparing for entry-level or continued employment, enhancing basic learning skills, or pursuing general interests.

Actions by which the college can evaluate its effectiveness and plan for improvement in meeting the learning needs of its students have received attention since the last accreditation. Reedley College has apparently accepted the concept of the regular and consistent assessment of student learning as a core institutional process. That the college is still struggling with the differences between learning objectives and student learning outcomes, however, is apparent through the various uses of the two concepts throughout the Self Study. So strong is the tradition of “objectives” that even the language of one Accreditation Standard (II.A.6.) was modified in the document (page 174). The college is moving forward by analyzing its current practices, revising them as needed, and establishing new procedures to be more effective in the future.

Findings and Evidence:

As a result of the team’s review of information and conduct of the visit, the team finds that the college’s programs are appropriate to its mission and support a positive

reputation in the communities it serves. The North Centers (which adhere to a different mission statement and administrative structure) enjoy the positive impact of Reedley's educational offerings and programs as do the southern Community Campus Educational Sites. As noted above, the college extends its programs into the many communities it serves, either through programs physically located throughout the district or through distance education. Structures that are in place to assure consistently high levels of quality are the curriculum approval, the process of program review (which includes the results of SLO assessment), the articulation of transfer courses and programs, and industry advisory committees.

All of these processes include the distance education offerings of the college. The Curriculum Committee has primary responsibility for ensuring that DE courses are of comparable quality to traditional class offerings. The institution also ensures that its DE program offerings fit the stated mission of the institution through the review and recommendations of the college Distance Education Committee.

DE programs and services are also assured to be of high quality and comparable with institution's face to face offerings by evaluation and review through the college program review process. Student achievement outcomes of the DE programs are expected to be assessed and conducted regardless of course modality and are equivalent across all modes of delivery as evidenced within the Reedley College Curriculum Handbook.

Decisions as to what courses will be offered online are made at the department level and cleared by the Curriculum Committee. The Blackboard course management system drives the organization and delivery of online, hybrid, and web-supported classes.

At the present, the North Centers participate in all of these at the instructional/department level. Those Centers (Madera and Oakhurst as well as Willow) appear to be increasingly moving toward a more independent stance on curriculum, instruction, and faculty activities. (II.A.1)

The college regularly conducts research into the needs and achievement of its students in a variety of situations. The Office of Institutional Research routinely surveys the demographic, economic, and learning opportunities of the community. Course data, enrollment information, and student achievement data are also routinely collected and used in the program review process as well as for the evaluation of other institutional effectiveness markers. The assessment of student learning outcomes has been integrated into this data collection, although it is unclear as to how the results of the various assessments are captured. There are no separate means in place for determining students' educational preparation for online learning. Data on outcomes of DE students as opposed to traditional students are not available. This continuous institutional assessment results in programs that are robust in their service to a diverse student population. (II.A.1.a).

The self study documents the considerable effort that Reedley College expends on addressing the learning needs of a diverse population. Its research and data analysis capability is apparently an integrated and valued part of the institution. In addition to a

set of standard reports on the service area, on courses and enrollment, and on students and their achievement, the institutional researcher is able to provide reports to assist with specific decisions.

In response to its extensive service area and the varied educational needs of its students, Reedley College has expanded its distance education program as well as offering classes **in** with differing modes of instruction and with varying schedule configurations. An increasing number of fully on-line classes are delivered each semester; the college anticipates that the demand for these classes will continue to grow. A substantive change proposal was approved in March, 2011, allowing the college to offer General Education, Business Administration, Information Systems, and Small Business Administration at a distance.

The college approves courses intended for electronic delivery through the same curriculum process as all other courses. To be considered, courses to be offered at a distance must address not only the Standard required areas for curriculum approval, but also the appropriate interaction between students and faculty and among students; decisions regarding appropriate technology and methodology requirements for instructional integrity are justified by the same method. The Curriculum Committee is the gatekeeper when a course is proposed to be offered in DE mode. The committee requires instructors to show that offering the course online will compromise neither curriculum objectives nor students' needs. The Distance Education Committee is charged with ensuring that delivery systems and modes of instruction are facilitating student learning.

Courses are reviewed on a consistent cycle in concert with the program review for the discipline. The college Distance Education Committee makes recommendations for improvement in delivery.

Reedley College participates in the development of district-wide practices for the improvement of distance education through a Title V cooperative grant. Faculty training opportunities are available for orientation, training, and instructional design support. However, there is no indication that faculty who teach at a distance are required to have a particular level of training.

Regardless of the delivery mode, the content of courses is determined by faculty and approved by the regular curriculum process. Faculty members at the North Centers participate with their own department colleagues at Reedley. (II.A.1.b).

The Team finds that Reedley College has been and continues to be engaged in an extensive dialogue vis-à-vis student learning. Activities have included faculty institutes, Flex sessions, departmental discussion, Faculty Senate dialogue, curriculum process discussions, and reports.

For the instructional programs, the results of this interchange first included the adoption (through the curriculum process) and dissemination (through the syllabi) of Student Learning Outcomes at the course level and a timeline for assessment.

These outcome statements have been developed by faculty and vary greatly in their format and composition; strategies for attaining the outcomes and the specific methods for assessment are not evident. The assessments of the stated outcomes for the course are contained within the regular quiz, test, and practical application or capstone project assessments for the course and are evident only to the instructor of the course. There is no transparent link between the class evaluation processes and the assessment of a particular student learning outcome. As the results of the assessments become topics for college-wide dialog, these issues will make it difficult to determine the degree of success of students in meeting the outcomes, to analyze patterns within that success, or to present the information to a variety of stakeholders. The discussion of the attainment of the outcomes and their use in program improvement is currently limited to department faculty.

Evaluation of the achievement of the outcomes is likewise obscure. A template was developed so that faculty could capture and report the results of their own assessment; there is evidence that at least some departments have used common assessments/rubrics although it is unclear as to how the results are shared or documented. A website was developed to organize the departmental information. As part of the revised Cycle Two program review, departments were expected to address SLOs. In the samples presented as evidence, the departments did mention the topic but did not indicate results of the assessment or of any plan for improvement. The self study is silent as to the accountability mechanism to address follow-through on recommendations emanating from the process.

The faculty met in spring 2009 and fall 2010 (to work on course and program assessment); during 2010-2011 academic year a series of division Student Learning Outcomes summits were held for each department to work on mapping the relationships of course-program-general education (institutional) outcomes. In 2008 the faculty member who chairs the Program Review Committee was reassigned to work with faculty and staff on the development, assessment and evaluation of student learning outcomes and is currently taking inventory of the completed program review annual progress reports and SLO assessments; these are posted each semester on the Blackboard Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment site.

Program and Institutional SLOs are handled through a mapping matrix; it is assumed that if the student successfully completes the course mapped to the program/institutional outcome, the student will have achieved the outcome. The college asserts that Program Learning Outcomes have been identified for all programs although "... the process of assessment and improvement of each is still in progress for the majority of our programs." The identified PLOs are said to be listed in the college catalog. A review of the 2010-2012 catalog does not reveal evidence of these outcomes although the online Addendum to the catalog does list PLOs for those programs that have been recently reviewed.

Degree level outcomes (General Education Learning Outcomes or GELOs) have been identified.

A process was developed that would map key courses to the appropriate GELO or program outcome on the assumption that successful completion of the key courses would constitute achievement of the learning outcome. This mapping activity appears to be conducted at the department level and is captured for those on the Blackboard SLO site for those departments that have completed it. There is evidence that the college has identified key courses that incorporate the outcomes of the GELOs and that these have begun to be evaluated.

Furthermore, the program review process was revised in March 2007 to include the process by which SLOs are developed, assessed and evaluated at the certificate, degree and program levels.

Occupational programs follow a similar process with input from advisory committees and are free to choose assessment processes consistent with their own program evaluations to determine student success. They are in the process of developing overarching program learning outcomes that are consistent with the need for technical and professional competency.

Student Learning outcomes in the DE mode are no different than those offered in traditional teaching mode. Retention and Success Rate comparisons of Distance Education courses versus traditional classes are documented in the DE Totals/Comparison compiled by the Office of Institutional Research (II.A.1.c).

Reedley College conducts research into the demographic, educational, and economic needs of the communities it serves and offers the full range of courses expected at a comprehensive community college. The content and learning outcomes of each course are determined by faculty with an appropriate approval process through the Curriculum Committee and are consistent regardless of the location mode of delivery of the course. Departments recommend delivery mode based on facilities and program goals. The college does not offer developmental, pre-collegiate, community education, short-term training, international student, or contract education programs in DE mode (II.A.2). The team found that effective practices of curriculum development, as well as a formal curriculum review and approval process, support the quality and integrity of the academic programs. A substantially revised program review process has existed since the last accreditation. Cycle Two which was completed in 2010 incorporated the establishment of student learning outcomes for all courses as well as expanded student achievement and course-taking data. The self study is silent as to the accountability mechanism to address follow-through on recommendations emanating from the process.

Course development including content, student learning outcomes, and assessment are controlled by the faculty following accepted statewide and local guidelines. Faculty have engaged in a variety of training activities in order to respond to new requirements related to the assessment of student learning. The processes for development and evaluation of courses and programs in the DE mode are not different from those for traditional courses and programs. Faculty members teaching online are encouraged—but not required—to obtain a certificate in online teaching. Department chairs are responsible for ensuring that instructors assigned to teach online possess the requisite skills. Surveys are also

conducted by the DE coordinator to assess training needs. Workshops are provided at the main campus and North Center sites in Blackboard and Tegrity, which are used for both online and hybrid classes. A multitude of administrative processes are in place to determine the appropriate offering of the approved courses including those offered at a distance (II.A.2.a).

The college uses faculty and business/industry representative dialogue, through the vocational advisory committee process, to assure program relevance. A process of initiating the development and assessment of student learning outcomes has been developed which relies on curriculum approval and regular review of programs. Key to the process is the faculty's (with the advice of external stakeholders when appropriate) determination of learning outcomes, a timeline of assessment, and an annual progress report. Structures have been established to document the results on a section by section basis at the course level; the college has not yet completed these evaluation processes at the program and institutional levels. No evidence was presented for the integration of the results into planning. The college does conduct research into student achievement and progress which is widely shared, however that information is not disaggregated by mode of instruction. The college makes no distinction between DE and traditional delivery methods in determining competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes, quality and level of instruction, and makes no separate policies for the award of academic credit for DE programs and courses as opposed to traditional programs and courses (II.A.2.b, II.A.2.c, II.A.2.f).

Reedley offers courses in a variety of delivery modes. The Self-Study addresses various teaching methodologies used in the classes and the attention with which faculty members consider the learning styles of students. There is no indication that the college assesses the learning style of its students in order to assist them in choosing an appropriate delivery method for a class. Student support structures have increased in recent years – notably the Writing Center (and the online Writing Center), the Math Study Center, and the Tutorial Center. There is no indication that results from student assessments are used in planning, implementing, evaluating and improving program curricula or the faculty's instructional strategies.

There is no assessment of student learning styles and teaching methodologies for DE courses, although while the number of online courses has increased considerably over the past few years, the evidence indicates that retention and success rates have not increased as rapidly as those of traditional course offerings. The college does have an online area where students can answer a series of questions to assist in determining whether online education is an appropriate mode for him/her. However, there is no evidence provided to show that a formal online orientation to DE learning is available except through a recommended Introduction to Online Learning class. Individual DE instructors take the responsibility in conveying this information to the students either through their syllabus, BlackBoard, or email (II.A.2.d.).

The college has a well established instructional program planning process by which programs and courses are reviewed at least every six years. All pertinent information

about a course (regardless of the mode of delivery) is included along with student achievement and outcomes assessment information.

In the Self Study, the college describes the Program Review, Cycle 2 process as including the identification of student learning outcomes and the assessment method by which student achievement of those outcomes will be measured as well as data analysis of student demographics, course and enrollment information, and student achievement indicators. The college completed a review of the process during 2010 and determined that additional budgeting and staffing information was needed as well as a formal process of including Deans. These recommendations were included in the Cycle 3 process. All programs at the college undertake such a review every six years with annual reports due in non-review years. The results of the program review are presented to the College Council which also deals with planning and resource allocation.

In addition the program review may be referenced when applying for non-general fund resource support through the college's Resource Action Plan initiated fall semester 2007. The parallel process for the North Centers is the Action Plan Funding Request. Since 2007 the College Council (the College Center Council at the North Centers), which is responsible for planning and resource allocation, reviews and accepts program review summary sheets as well as the departments' annual Progress Report instituted in 2010. To continue to meet the Accreditation Standard for Program Review, the team urges Reedley College to assure that the results of all program reviews are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning and resource allocation processes and that dialogue about the results is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness (II.A.2.e).

Departmental course or program exit exams are not currently used (II.A.2.g).

The college catalogue section related to the awarding of credit is silent as to student learning outcomes. The college asserts that credit is awarded in courses based on achievement of the various proficiencies detailed in the Course Outline of Record which includes SLOs. Likewise the college awards degrees based only in part on the program learning outcomes and the general education learning outcomes. Both PLOs and GELOs are assumed to have been attained by passing courses "mapped" to them.

Through a review of curriculum and curricular approval procedures, the team found that the Carnegie Unit is universally applied for the college's award of academic credit and, as such, is appropriate. The college should consider placing such a statement within the college catalog to meet the Commission's standard that generally accepted forms for higher education are the basis for the college's award of academic credit (II.A.2.h.i).

The catalog clearly contains a statement of the general education philosophy of the college. Reedley's Core Values Statement as well as the mission statement affirm the importance of this philosophy. The general education pattern presented to students includes the learning outcomes for those courses as identified in the course outlines of record. Acceptance of a course as meeting the general education requirement is not,

however, a separate process from approval of the course by the curriculum committee. Students are assumed to have acquired the appropriate outcomes by completion of the various courses - - courses are in the process of being mapped to the general education learning outcomes. Approximately one-third of all available DE courses are offered in the general education area. The college's pattern of general education curricula is comprehensive and meets Accreditation Standards (II.A.3.a.b.c).

Degree programs meet the Standard for focused study (II.A.4).

Aided by advisory committees, occupational programs are developing student learning outcomes that are consistent with the need for technical and professional competency. In addition to evaluation of such programs by external agencies, the college has fostered partnerships with local employers which advise programs as to the preparation of program completers. The college conducts research to analyze student success in these programs (II.A.5).

The college purports to appropriately and clearly represent itself to current and prospective students, the public and its personnel through its publications, in hard copy documents and on-line. Interviews with college personnel support the claim that the college regularly reviews such publications, as well as policies and procedures, to assure accuracy, and therefore integrity, of these documents and statements. The college asserts that to inform students of the expectations of a course of study, student learning outcomes at the program level are included in the catalog. There is no evidence of such a listing in the printed 2010-2012 catalog; the addendum does have them for most programs that have been recently reviewed. To inform students of course expectations, student learning objectives/outcomes are incorporated into the syllabus. Transfer policies and articulation agreements are readily available, continuously updated, and presented to students in readily available formats. The self study is silent on the subject of awarding transfer credit based on the certification that expected learning outcomes are comparable.

The college assures that information regarding DE courses is represented in both hard copy and online regarding the current class schedule. DE students receive a course syllabus that includes student learning outcomes that are consistent with the official course outline of record. Articulation agreements for DE programs are developed, implemented, and evaluated in the same manner as traditional courses.

The team found that the college is concerned about making appropriate arrangements for students to complete their educational goals should programs be eliminated or program requirements significantly changed. A "draft" procedure exists for program revitalization or discontinuance, however; the self study points to a student's "catalog rights" as the process. The team urges the college to complete the adoption of this policy (II.A.6.a.b.c).

Board policies and college procedures regarding faculty academic freedom and ethical behavior are clearly communicated in writing but are not included in the catalog. There are statements in the catalog regarding Board policies on academic dishonesty and the associated password. An instruction to change their password on the first time logging into the system is recommended.

Reedley College does not seek to instill particular beliefs or world views (II.A.7.a.b.c).

Reedley does not offer curricula in foreign locations to students other than U.S. nationals (II.A.8.).

The college addresses academic dishonesty clearly online and within the student conduct guidelines within the college catalog and class schedule. The main BlackBoard log-in page demonstrates that the college utilizes a secure log-in verification policy of requiring users to log in using their seven digit student or employee id as their username and

Conclusions:

Reedley College partially meets this Standard.

The team finds that Reedley College has made significant progress toward the identification, evaluation and documentation of student learning since the last accreditation. The College has established an institutional framework with support from existing organizational structures. Leadership groups have accepted responsibility for student learning outcomes implementation and faculty and staff are fully engaged in student learning outcomes development. As reported in the Self-Study, this endeavor is a work in progress and is proceeding with a degree of unevenness; progress in the identification and assessment of program learning outcomes is well underway. Many departments are well into the cycle and are regularly assessing the outcomes that have been established while others are in the development stage. However, to fully meet this standard and to achieve the “proficiency level” in the identification, assessment and use of Student Learning Outcomes for improvements in student learning, the college must accelerate its activities to assure that each course and program has measurable outcomes that are published widely, that those outcomes are regularly assessed, that the results of those assessments are clearly documented, widely discussed and used in decision-making. To achieve the next steps in the process--dialogue about student achievement of the outcomes, about implications of those results for learning at Reedley College, and about the institution-wide commitments needed to support that learning - - will demand continuing attention by all parties.

Recommendations:

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.1.a, II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c, II.A.2, II.A.3).

Standard II.B: Student Support Services

General Observations:

Reedley College provides more than twenty programs and services within the Student Services division to address the educational, health and well-being of a diverse set of students. Those programs and services range from the traditional assessment, admissions and registration, financial aid, counseling, and other matriculation related areas to the learning communities of categorical programs such as EOPS/CARE, CalWORKs and DSPS.

All student support services are provided at all locations and available online. However, there are two key points of service delivery, Reedley College and the Willow International College Center. Reedley College provides full services to the Reedley College site and shares some resources (e.g., DSPS, EOPS, and Financial Aid) with the Willow International College Center. Student services faculty and staff at the Willow International College Center assume primary responsibility for providing services to the Oakhurst and Madera Centers.

The 14,768 students at the Reedley College reflect the diversity of the service area with a higher percentage of Hispanics/Latino(a)s (64%) than Whites (22%) at the Reedley Campus. The Madera Center follows a similar pattern, with Hispanics/Latino(a)s at 56 percent and Whites at 23 percent. At the Willow International Center and the Oakhurst Center, however, the pattern is reversed, with Whites reflecting 54% and 61%, respectively and Hispanics/Latino(a)s reflecting 22% and 20%, respectively. Eighty percent of incoming students assess at one or more basic skills level.

The college filed a Substantive Change Proposal for Distance Education in 2011. In this report the college cites student access as a primary motivation for establishing distance education classes. Dialogue about distance education takes place under the purview of the college Distance Education Committee. This committee meets regularly to discuss all aspects of the DE program, including improving processes, developing curriculum, and establishing standards for online instruction.

Students can self-test their readiness to take an online course via a link on the college website. However, open admission prevails in DE as in traditional classes, except for classes with specific prerequisites.

The college provides outreach and matriculation services to local high schools and community entities and has an active K-16 bridge program for local K-12 students.

Findings and Evidence:

The college effectively assures the quality of student support services through the program review process. For example, the Counseling Department is currently undergoing its third cycle of program review. Student learning outcomes have been developed for all Student Services programs at Reedley. However, consistent, recurring assessment of SLOs is not evident throughout Student Services. Some programs (e.g., Counseling, EOPS), have completed at least one full assessment cycle. Others, such as DSPS, have not yet assessed but have plans to do so. The college is encouraged to accelerate completion of the assessment cycle and use the results for service improvements in order to comply with the Commissions 2012 proficiency deadline. (See Recommendation 2).

Student learning and support needs are identified through the ongoing assessment of its programs and services, including program review and analysis of survey and institutional data. Two examples are the Student Services Managers Committee which meets monthly and discusses issues or plans for service improvements. The Vice President of Student Services has also formed a College Readiness Forum which includes regional math and English faculty and administrators and includes representation from California State University, Fresno. The goal of the forum is to assist feeder high school faculty with the implementation of the Expository Reading and Writing Course requirements.

With regard to distance education, the college makes networked computers available to students who do not otherwise have Internet access. In addition, wireless access is available to students on campus who use their own laptop computers (II.B.1).

The College Catalog is thorough, precise and accurately reflects current, key aspects about the institution such as its mission, contact information, course offerings, requirements, and the majority of the policies and procedures. The College Catalog is available both in printed and electronic format. The location or publications where other policies may be found are also made clear. The class schedule, student handbook, board policies and the college website are the locations where this information can be found.

Admission policies, requirements, and fees are the same for distance education programs and traditional programs. There is no distinct process for recording complaints and grievances from DE students as opposed to traditional students. All student complaints are handled through the college's (or center's) vice president of instructions (II.B.2).

The majority of the information required by the Commission exists in the catalog. For example, information concerning the college mission; course, program, and degree offerings; available student services; and major policies are all included in pages 20 through 48 in the catalog. However, no phone numbers are included in the contact information of the college, and no academic freedom policy is included. However, the college does have an academic freedom policy housed online, and it was printed in the Summer/Fall schedule of classes. To more fully meet the standard, the college is

encouraged to include both contact phone numbers and the academic freedom policy in the catalog (II.B.2.a, II.B.2.b, II.B.2.c).

The catalog is current, complete, clear, and easy to understand. Until 2007, the catalog was reviewed by a district-wide Common Catalog Language Committee consisting of individuals from Fresno College, Reedley College, and the North Centers. That committee was disbanded and the catalog information is now reviewed by the college Academic Standards Committee and the district-wide vice-presidents' meetings (II.B.2.d).

The college addresses the needs of its students in concerted ways and effectively from intake, advising, resource allocation services e.g., financial aid, to course placement, student life engagement activities, instructional support services and career services. The first point for identifying student needs is on the initial online or hard copy application that has a section that allows students to identify support needs. The application for admission has 15 areas where students can specify special services they may need to become successful. This includes financial aid information, academic counseling, services for disabled students, career counseling, and/or other support services. These requests are used by student support services to contact students and provide information about the available services. In addition, the college researches and identifies the support needs of its student population. It provides appropriate services and programs to address those needs. It has employed effective practices to identify the support needs of students. It is using program reviews, student surveys, and regular meetings with student services professionals (including students) to assess and review effective practices. The research office is diligent and responsive in its support (II.B.3).

Reedley College provides equitable access to all of its students regardless of service location or delivery method. Student support services are provided throughout the day, during selective evening hours, and on Saturdays during peak registration periods. There are several delivery methods for students to access services which include face-to-face, online, and web-based media. Many of these services have evaluation surveys that allow for student feedback and satisfaction ratings.

Student services available for distance education include online include admissions, orientation, registration, counseling, tutoring (Writing Center only; this is asynchronous, not "live" tutoring), and class schedule. Financial aid questions can be submitted by email or telephone. Student can access e-books and online journals and databases, and can order library books. Not all learning resources available to traditional students are available to DE students. Specifically, tutorial services other than asynchronous Writing Center service are not available online (II.B.3.a).

Reedley College provides an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students. One way this is accomplished includes the Associated Student Body who sponsors student activities such as Hispanic Heritage Month, African American History Month, and Women's History Month. Another personal development opportunity

afforded students is through varied academic programming. For example, the Music and Art departments provide performance experiences for students. Other examples include the Honors program, student publications, and learning communities (II.B.3.b).

The institution designs, maintains and evaluates counseling and academic advising programs to support student development and success. Supporting student development and success is sought through a comprehensive set of counseling and advising services for all students. Those services are organized rationally to guide students through the matriculation process. They include assessment interpretations, orientation, student education plan development and early alert follow-up services for students on probation offered via the Counseling Center. An additional fifteen student support services units including DSPS, EOPS/CARE, MESA, reentry services, and Veteran Services also provide those services.

In addition to the traditional student services functions, the Health Services Department provides a robust package of psychological assistance to students which include short-term psychological counseling, stress and anger management counseling, suicide prevention, and group instruction. Every student is entitled to eight free counseling sessions per year, and Health Services personnel routinely survey students on pertinent issues (e.g., eating disorders, alcohol abuse, depression, etc.). This package of psychological services (offered at both Fresno and Reedley) is the only community college program of its type in California that is certified by the American Psychological Association.

The college provides professional development support with regular training of all counselors within the college. Counselors regularly participate in professional growth opportunities such as conferences and Flex Day activities. In addition, the counseling faculty and staff from all locations regularly convene to participate in program review and student learning outcome processes. Both full-time and part-time counselors meet minimum qualifications for their positions and are regularly evaluated in accordance with the established collective bargaining agreement. This evaluation process provides for both peer and student feedback pertaining to counseling services (II.B.3.c).

Reedley College maintains a commitment to diversity. The college supports its diverse student population through student organizations, activities, and clubs, and supports programs that emphasize and celebrate diversity, student recruitment, and outreach activities. The non-discrimination policies are translated in both Spanish and Hmong. The DSPS and EOPS programs offer special support to low income and first generation students. Bilingual counselors are available. Many courses at Reedley College cover multicultural concepts. Hiring procedures emphasize the value and importance of diversity by ensuring the committees include proper ethnic and gender representation and by hiring individuals who share the college's commitment to diversity (III.B.3.d).

The institution regularly evaluates placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases. Placement tests and cutoff scores are used to determine optimal placement for English and math courses. The college uses only those

assessment tests approved by the California Community College Chancellor's Office. The college uses the Accuplacer exam for placing students in English, reading and mathematics. The College Board determines ability to benefit scores for students who are seeking financial aid resources but do not have a high school diploma. The college has a self-identified planning agenda address and update validation studies for English, ESL, and Math courses. The college is encouraged to develop a timeline with an action agenda for accomplishing that task (II.B.3.e).

The institution maintains student records permanently, securely and confidentially with provision for secure backup of all files regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. The institution publishes and follows established policies for release of student records. Records are maintained in the admissions and registration, DSPS, financial aid, health services, deans and vice president of student services offices. The college has transitioned from storage of records that are primarily the traditional paper documents and micro-film to electronic storage via the Datatel system.

The institution takes steps to insure that it complies with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), California Education Code, Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, other pertinent bodies of law, and local board policies and procedures (II.B.3.f).

Each program area undergoes a systematic Program Review every five years with annual review of recommendations. Each program area has well-documented Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) which are linked to both Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs). However, there has not been consistent, cyclical assessment of these learning outcomes. Student service programs continuously survey students on service delivery including express counseling, Registration-To-Go, New Student Welcome, CCC Apply application process, live-help counseling, online probation workshops, and health services. Services are well documented within Datatel, SARS, and online counseling programs which provides data used in decision making processes. Assessment information is used in the planning processes (strategic plan, staffing patterns, and budget allocations) and to continuously improve services to their student population (II.B.4).

Conclusions:

Overall, the college's report of conditions, priorities and actions in Standard II.B reflect concerted efforts to address the support needs of students from diverse backgrounds. However, the college must accelerate completion of the assessment cycle and use the results for service improvements in order to comply with the Commissions 2012 proficiency deadline.

Recommendation: See College Recommendation 2

C. Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations:

The proliferation of independent centers has resulted in thinly stretched library and learning support resources. The wide geographic area of the college and its centers makes it difficult to ensure equal access to information and tutoring. On-site libraries exist at Reedley College and at the Willow International and Madera centers, but students at Oakhurst have no physical library facility. Students at Reedley College have access to Tutorial, Math, and Writing Centers. Tutorial centers, but not Math or Writing centers, are available at the Madera and Willow International centers. The college attempts to level the playing field by providing access to online resources to all students regardless of location; however, library reference services are not available online. (II.C)

Findings and Evidence:

The library uses an enterprise resource planning system to track resources and circulation. Librarians have conducted program review for self-evaluation on a six-year cycle. A formalized collection development policy guides acquisition decisions. Librarians rely on formal and informal feedback from users to assess the effectiveness of the collection, in addition to the computerized resource planning system. (II.C.1.a)

The collection development policy incorporates the library's primary goal, which is to develop the collection to support the educational programs of Reedley College. A librarian sits on the curriculum committee to identify areas for collection development. Collection recommendations are solicited from faculty, staff, and administrators. In addition, resources are purchased in consultation with vocational programs to meet their needs. (II.C.1.a)

The library has identified and assessed three Library Services Program Level Outcomes, and based on assessment results is piloting a revised assessment instrument in spring 2012. (II.C.1.a)

The library has defined information competency skills as the ability to find, access, evaluate, and use appropriate information in an academic setting. Librarians use student reference and research requests as opportunities to teach such skills. At Madera and Willow International, a faculty librarian is available only about 14 hours per week, and not at all in the evenings, so access to this kind of instruction is limited away from the Reedley College campus. A part-time bibliographic librarian, hired with grant funds, provides formal classroom instruction in bibliographic and research methods in collaboration with teaching faculty at Reedley College. Materials and workshops

created by this librarian are shared with center locations. The library and tutorial/writing centers provide written instructional guides on information competency topics, and the tutorial/writing centers provide one-on-one and small group instruction. (II.C.1.b)

The Tutorial Centers have reference materials available to teach skills in note-taking, test-taking, textbook study, memorization, and time management. The Writing Center, available to Reedley students only, has reference materials on documenting sources, prewriting, revising, grammar, and literature. Students in online classes can get asynchronous help from the Writing Center. There appear to be no other online tutoring services available. The self-study indicates (page 244) that online tutorial service is available through the Tutorial Center at Fresno City College, but the Reedley College website does not provide this information, and the “Online Tutoring” link under “Online Services” has not been updated since 2008. (II.C.1.b)

Information competency is taught via numerous methods, both formal and informal. As information competency is a General Education Learning Outcome at the college, students receiving an associate’s degree must demonstrate competency. Competency is considered to be demonstrated by completion of one or more specific academic courses that have information competency explicitly or implicitly stated as one of their Student Learning Outcomes. (II.C.1.b)

At Reedley College, there are 2.5 FTE faculty librarians and 4.5 FTE library support staff. Madera and Willow International share the services of one full-time librarian, and each has 1.0 FTE library support staff and 5 evening instructional aides. The Reedley College library is open from 7:30 a.m. to 8 p.m. Monday through Thursday, and Fridays from 7:30 a.m. to 3 p.m. Madera and Willow International libraries are open from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. Monday through Thursday, and Fridays from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m. Oakhurst students have no library. None of the libraries has weekend hours. Few classes are offered on weekends. Databases, e-books, and an online catalog are available to all students via the library web site 24 hours a day. Reference services are not available online. (II.C.1.c)

A faculty librarian is available at Reedley College during all library open hours. Students at Madera and Willow International have access to a faculty librarian only 10 hours per week, and not at all during evenings. All students can request books through inter-district library loan. (II.C.1.c)

Tutorial Centers are open as follows: Reedley College, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday through Thursday, and 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. Friday; Madera Center, 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. Monday through Thursday; and 8 a.m. to 2 p.m. Friday; Willow International; 9 a.m. to 2 p.m. Monday and Wednesday, and 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. Tuesday and Thursday. (II.C.1.c)

At Reedley College only, the Writing Center is open 8 a.m. to 2 p.m. Monday through Thursday. The Math Study Center is open 8:30 a.m. to 3 p.m. Monday through Thursday, 8:30 to noon Friday, and Wednesday evenings from 4 to 6 p.m. (II.C.1.c)

In general, library and other learning support services are available to all students, but on an unequal basis, depending on the student's location and the mode of course delivery. Numbers of professional librarians and support staff are, or soon will be, inadequate as Willow International moves toward separate accreditation. (II.C.1.c)

The college meets this Standard, but needs to plan immediately for forthcoming changes in staffing needs. (II.C.1.c)

Maintenance of buildings is the responsibility of the campus facilities department. Campus police provide general security services for the library and learning support facilities. Security gates and RFID tags are used to deter theft of library materials. The college provides adequate maintenance and security for library and learning support services. (II.C.1.d)

Library and learning support services are provided in-house. (II.C.1.e)

Library and learning support services are evaluated primarily through the program review process and the learning outcomes process. Library Student Learning Outcomes and Program Level Outcomes have been developed and assessed, and the assessment instrument revised as a result. (II.C.2)

Student Learning Outcomes have been developed for the Writing center, but assessment is not complete. Students using Tutorial Centers enroll in specific Interdisciplinary Studies or English courses, and the Tutorial Centers derive their SLOs from the SLOs for these courses. Assessment takes place each semester. (II.C.2)

Employee and student survey items also address library services. The survey of students shows only 64% were satisfied with library services available to them. In contrast, 79% of faculty and staff members believed library resources were adequate to meet the needs of students and instructors. A faculty/staff survey found 82% agreeing that the library provides ongoing training in information competency. (II.C.2)

Conclusions:

Reedley College currently meets this standard. However, as the college and Willow-International prepare to become two colleges, attention should be paid to library services. In particular, the creation of two independent colleges will require timely planning to accommodate the staffing needs of both institutions as well as the remaining North Centers. (II.C.1.c)

Recommendations: None

STANDARD III Resources

Standard III.A: Human Resources

General Observations:

At present human resources are sufficient to support student learning wherever it occurs. The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated SLO's, and to improve institutional effectiveness. However, as noted above, with the organizational changes which are currently underway, planning to provide appropriate staff for two independent colleges as well as the remaining North Centers becomes of very important.

Findings and Evidence:

The process for prioritizing positions is collegial and involves numerous faculty and staff and committees. Once decided, the hiring process is sound and results in the employment of qualified personnel. Reedley College has determined that faculty who teach Distance Education (DE) need DE expertise and experience. As such, the job announcements include those desirable skills and the interview process addresses DE qualifications. The interview committee includes a faculty member with DE experience (III.A.1.a).

Evaluations are formal and timely. While the standards for defining and evaluating effective teaching are the same for DE and non-DE courses, the process for evaluation of DE courses includes observation in the on-line environment (Blackboard) by administrators and peers as well as student evaluations. Various standard data are collected to assess the effectiveness of DE teaching such as retention, successful completion and GPA. In addition, there was a study done of students taking DE courses between 2007 and 2010. The college is beginning a process with cycle three of program review that will compare DE statistics with face-to-face statistics in order to ensure that the DE courses are meeting the needs of the students (III.A.1.b).

The faculty contract holds faculty “responsive to the educational needs of students by exhibiting awareness of and sensitivity tostudent goals and aspirations” and “evaluation of student progress in keeping with the course objectives and institutionally adopted course outlines.” The evaluation of all faculty, including DE faculty, includes the “evaluation of student progress in keeping with the course objectives and institutionally adopted course outlines.” SLOs are part of course outlines for both traditional and DE courses. Faculty also complete a self-evaluation (III.A.1.c).

The institution has codes of ethics in board policy, labor agreements and contained in the merit system. There are no references to DE in the faculty code of ethics which mirrors the AAUP Code of Ethics (III.A.1.d).

The institution strives to determine staffing needs and priorities through a shared governance model. The retirement incentive in 2010-2011 reduced classified positions without addressing the impact of where the vacancies occurred. While the number of classified employees has decreased, it remains sufficient and comparable to colleges of comparable size (III.A.2).

The institution systematically develops personnel policies and procedures that are available for information and review. There are policies and regulations to ensure fairness in all employment procedures and practices. The institution makes provision for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Each employee has access to his/her personnel records in accordance with the law (III.A.3.a, II.A.3.b).

The institution has policies and practices that demonstrate understanding and concern for issues of equality and diversity. To ensure equal treatment of its staff, students, and the communities it serves, the district regularly provides training for its management staff, and it has been done in the last four years. Additionally the Academic Senate annually honors faculty members who have made special contributions addressing issues involving diversity. The website postings, minority publications, and other identified resources reveals the institutions commitment to equal opportunity employment (III.A.4.a, III.A.4.b, III.A.4.c).

Through its mission and philosophy, benefits package, special services, release time for senate officers, leadership development programs, both students and college employees are allowed to develop to their fullest potential. All personnel have opportunities for professional development consistent with the institutional mission based on teaching and learning needs through a comprehensive program of staff development for all employees, and the funds are managed by the Staff Development Committee (faculty, management, and classified representatives). The distance education coordinator is responsible for surveying faculty and then determining faculty development needs for those teaching DE, and organizes and conducts trainings in technology for those teaching distance education or supplementing their courses with online technology. Evaluations are completed at the end of each training. In the most recent survey conducted 2010, personnel strongly agreed that the professional development programs offered reflected work related needs and interest. (III.A.5.a, III.A.5.b).

The Planning Agenda states that the college will complete the written faculty hiring prioritization process in 2011-2012. Along with a process for prioritization for classified and administrative positions, the process needs to be integrated into institutional planning. While the program review process may be used to develop staffing requests, the requests are not prioritized consistently and uniformly and the requests are not put into the context of the colleges overall strategic and master plans (III.A.6). *See Recommendation #1.*

Conclusions:

The college generally has policies and procedures in place to provide qualified and trained personnel to meet its needs. In the future, with diminishing resources, the college will need to place greater emphasis on planning its human resource needs. Thus, the team concludes that Reedley College and the State Center Community College District must include planning for human resources within their overall planning processes.

Recommendations: See College Recommendation 1 and District Recommendation 1.

Standard III.B: Physical Resources

General Observations:

Reedley College provides safe and sufficient physical resources to support student learning in a variety of disciplines. Those physical resources support and assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services where ever their clients are located by whatever means necessary.

The college is located on 410.8 acres, with 409,976 square feet of building space, made up of 71 buildings ranging in age from 1 to 50 years old. The age of the campus buildings presents challenges to the Building Services, Maintenance Services and Grounds Services departments. Local bond Measure E and a number of grants have provided much needed funding for facilities improvement.

Findings and Evidence:

The physical facilities on the Reedley College Campus include multiple classroom buildings, 15 computer labs, a library/learning resource center, an aviation hanger with two classrooms, automotive lab, welding lab, machine tool technology lab, three greenhouses, two administration buildings, a cafeteria, student center, child development lab, dental assisting lab bookstore, student services building, and a new student residence hall. The college also has comprehensive indoor and outdoor athletic facilities, a modern residence hall, and a 300 acre laboratory. As a result of continuous growth some programs are housed in modular buildings. (III.B.1.a)

The \$5,880,000.00 Library/Learning Resources Center remodeling and expansion project was completed in 2006 providing 12,000 additional square feet of new space and remodeling of 18,000 square feet of existing space creating a 32,622 square foot state of

the art facility. A space utilization and allocation inventory is maintained by the district operations department under the associate vice chancellor of business and operations. Reedley College continued to make use of the Measure E bond money by completing the new Residence Hall, a new Student Center, remodeled Physical Science and Art classrooms, and renovation of the Cafeteria.

Reedley College has a campus managed Building Services which is responsible for providing a clean and safe environment, campus wide event management, and mail processing for students, faculty, staff, and visitors. The department goals support the campus and district goals and are reviewed as a part of the department manager's evaluation.

Maintenance and grounds services are centrally organized and operated via the district office. The district director of maintenance and operations and the grounds services manager report directly to the associate vice chancellor of business and operations. Both have regularly scheduled days each week on the Reedley campus and maintenance and grounds staff are assigned to the campus but report directly to the district level managers. Both of these managers are on the Reedley College Facilities Committee.

Reedley College maintains a comprehensive campus in Reedley, and large educational centers in Madera, and the Willow International Center in Clovis, and a smaller site in Oakhurst. These centers are commonly called the North Centers. In addition, Reedley College serves the cities in the southern part of the college's service area (called the South Centers) in Sanger, Selma, Fowler, Dinuba, Parlier, and Kingsburg. College programs and services at the community sites in Sanger, Selma, Fowler, Dinuba, Parlier, and Kingsburg are provided in leased space from local K-12 districts.

The Facilities Committee evaluates and recommends revision of plans and standards and communicates with the respective groups involved. The Reedley College Facilities Committee has representatives from all constituent groups of the college. The Facilities Committee advises both college and district operations, maintenance, and grounds regarding college needs, concerns, and projects pertaining to existing facilities as well as new construction. The Facilities Committee also addresses related issues that impact the entire college community, such as parking, lighting, and security. As the college student population continues to grow, parking continues to be a concern however the team was able to validate that the matter of parking has been and continues to be addressed. For example, students pay \$17.00 per semester to park in the paved parking lots, students also park at no charge in the unpaved parking areas and on the street. Additional free parking is available to students at the church across the street from the college. (III.B.2)

The Facilities and Health and Safety Committees provide a mechanism and vehicle through which requests and issues can be heard, despite limited funds for maintenance staffing and repairs of facilities that sometimes prevent completion of requests in a timely manner. All adaptive resources are available on the Reedley College campus. (III.B.2)

Reedley plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account as evidenced in their strategic direction on infrastructure objectives. (III.B.2.b)

The Educational Master Plan was adopted in 2010 and the program review reports of the various departments drive the review of the physical resources on campus. The college's shared governance structure, budget development process, and program review processes provide a systematic assessment of the effective use of all resources, including physical resource. However, the team observed that the budget development process allocates the status quo and does not take into account changing needs, strategic goals or plans. The planning processes utilized by the college allow faculty and staff to evaluate their programs in an objective manner and to update curriculum, programs, and services as needed, including physical resources. (III.B.2.b)

Conclusions:

While the Strategic Plan Implementation Progress Report by Reedley College's Facilities and Health & Safety Committees identify activities and decisions, the committees are encouraged to continue assessing, implementing, and evaluating its' goals and objectives annually as a part of an integrated planning. The college and the district must jointly engage in continuing and deliberate dialog to assure the continued development and support of Reedley College's physical resources. The College partially meets this Standard.

Recommendations: See: Recommendation 1 and District Recommendation 1.

Standard III.C: Technology Resources

General Observations:

Reedley College and the North Centers receive separate allocations for technology resources, determined by the district Resource Allocation Committee. A single Instructional Technology (IT) manager oversees technology at all sites, i.e., Reedley College and each of the North Centers. However, he is not a district employee but a college employee with a split assignment. Under his supervision, each site updates and maintains local infrastructure, provides front-line support to end users, and makes decisions about resource allocation when it comes to campus-provided hardware and software, primarily used on personal computers.

Findings and Evidence:

The college has the beginning of a Technology Plan, which exists at present only in draft form. This plan articulates an overall technology policy. For specific action items, the Technology Advisory Committee has created a Technology Action Plan. The Technology Plan is intended to be integrated in the future with the Educational Master Plan, Facilities Plan, and Strategic Plan, to identify needs and priorities for technology resources.

To evaluate the effectiveness of technology in meeting end users' needs, the Computer Services department participates in Program Review, and as a part of this analyzes its services and outcomes. In addition, participants in the 2010 Employee Survey largely agreed (78%) that the college had sufficient technology resources available for them to do their jobs.

Technology needs for Distance Education are determined by the faculty DE coordinator. The most recent Computer Services program review did not survey online students as such. (III.C.1)

The college decides on use and distribution of technology resources via the annual Resource Action Plan Proposal process. The primary clearinghouse for technology resource requests is the Technology Advisory Committee. The campus Technology Plan, which is still in draft form, is supposed to be used to guide decisions about acquisition and maintenance of campus technology. The primary process for identifying technology needs for DE is the program review process at the instructional program level. There has been no college-wide assessment of DE needs.

Distance learning services are provided via a district contract with the Blackboard learning management system. Hosting and support are provided off-site as part of this agreement, which also provides for reliability, disaster recovery, privacy and security. A small number of specially equipped classrooms enable students at different locations to interact synchronously. The campus supports video and audio recordings of course material by faculty, as well as screen-capture technology. (III.C.1.a)

IT training is provided to faculty and staff when they request it. In addition, technology training workshops on specific topics are offered. Some training for employees is available online. Basic competence in use of computers is required of students graduating with an Associate's degree from Reedley College. In addition to the basic computer literacy requirement, students acquire technology skills in the course of their instructional programs, as they access library technology, email, and the Blackboard learning management system.

Most employees (71%) express satisfaction with the quality of technology training available to them. In addition, a large majority (85%) of students surveyed said they had made progress in technology competency while at Reedley College.

A faculty distance education coordinator organizes and delivers training to faculty members teaching or preparing to teach DE classes. The DE coordinator assesses the results of that training through surveys at the end of the training sessions. (III.C.1.b)

Technology supporting Internet and telephone access is coordinated at the district level, as are systems for student record-keeping, human resources, and finances. Using district resources, faculty can access attendance and grade reporting systems online, and students can accomplish the typical admission and registration tasks via a web-based system.

Wide-area networking, firewalls, and videoconferencing are also coordinated at the district level. The district has a back-up system in place in case of a power outage. The newer facilities at the Madera and Willow International centers have redundancy systems in case of a power outage. All campus computers have virus protection software and are protected by a centrally managed firewall.

The Reedley College Computer Services Department takes care of end user hardware, software and training needs, and classroom support at all locations. (III.C.1.c)

Keeping technology up to date, in accordance with campus priorities, is the responsibility of the Computer Services department. The campus Technology Plan calls for replacement of personal computers on a 5-year cycle. Competing requests are prioritized using the Resource Allocation Plan Proposals (RAPP) process. (III.C.1.d)

The Technology Advisory Committee has responsibility for tying its resource requests to the college Strategic Plan. Resource Action Plan Proposals flow from this committee to the College Council or the North Centers Executive Committee for prioritization and budgeting. To assess the use of technology resources, the primary tool is a student and staff satisfaction survey, which feeds into the Computer Services program review. It was not clear to the team that the Technology Plan is being developed using assessment data.

As noted above, the college's technology plan is still in draft form. The team did not find that it was integrated with other college or district plans.

Distance education needs are not separately considered when planning for technology needs. (III.C.2)

Conclusions:

It is evident that the college is engaged in technology planning and appears to provide adequate resources to support the institutional mission. However, the team concluded that the college meets Standard III.C.1 but only partially meets Standard III.C.2 since the technology plan itself is still in a development stage and is not integrated into other planning. Linkage of technology planning to other campus planning structures is in the developmental stage.

Recommendation: See College Recommendation 1 and District Recommendation 1.

Standard III.D: Financial Resources

General Observations:

The district allocates funds to Reedley College and to the North Centers separately. The college has no control over the unrestricted funds at the North Centers and little control over the categorical funds. What financial planning there is relates almost entirely to the Resource Allocation Plan Proposals (RAPP) and Action Plan Proposals (APP)- at North Centers. The instructions for the RAPP only identify Lottery and grant funds (VTEA and Instructional Equipment) and indicate that these funds are one-time in nature, although they are used for some ongoing maintenance. In addition, the existing district resource allocation model, like the college model, allocates essentially the status quo and there is no linkage to strategic plans or college-identified needs. A new resource allocation model is in the planning stages with an ambitious goal of having it ready for the next budget cycle.

Findings and Evidence:

Reedley College relies upon its mission and goals as the foundation for strategic planning. All of the strategic planning documents are linked to the college's mission and values. The financial planning documents, however, reference only the RAPP funds, which do not include the entire college budget. The existing resource allocation model essentially allocates the status quo and does not take into account changing needs, strategic goals or plans. (III.D.1)

Reedley College integrates its financial planning with its institutional planning at the college level. The allocation of unrestricted general funds is incremental, and is primarily used to maintain the status quo. The college is increasingly relying on RAPP/APP funds for operational needs. (III.D.1.a, III.D.3)

Reedley College uses a realistic assessment of financial resources and expenditures when developing financial projections. The district and college revenue projections are either based on the state funding formula (the minimum available funding) or the prior year's actual revenues for non-FTES-related funding. The projections are reasonable and err on the side of being conservative. (III.D.1.b)

The district has identified and planned for the payment of liabilities and future obligations. The district is responsible for funding OPEB obligations, and has created and started funding an OPEB trust as well as setting aside funds in a district trust fund. The two funds combined amount to almost 50% of the total liability. However, funding is in abeyance with the state fiscal crisis and the district is urged to continue setting aside funds when the budget permits. The district accrues compensated absences as they are earned. The district borrowed funds from the California Energy Commission which were repaid in June, 2010. Neither the district nor the college have prepared multi-year

financial plans and there is great uncertainty as to the funding that Reedley College might receive in future years after Willow International has become an independent college. The college's planning needs to be integrated with the strategic plans for Willow International and needs to incorporate future years. (III.D.1.c) *See Recommendation #1.*

Reedley College has clearly defined its guidelines for budget development at the college level, but only for the RAPP process. The rest of the college's budget is not overseen by the college budget committee. It is not clear what the North Centers' processes are, however, 64% of the survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they have opportunities to participate in the budget process. Because Reedley College is preparing to separate from the North Centers when Willow International Center becomes Clovis Community College, it has ceded control over the North Centers budgets to the North Center administration, which reports directly to the district administration. The college staff have not participated in the planning processes for the separation of Willow International. (III.D.1.d)

Reedley College is not audited independently from the district. The district's accounting system has appropriate control mechanisms. The district's audits have generally been with few findings; the findings—none material—that have been noted have been corrected. The budgets and the audits accurately reflect the revenues and expenditures of the district and colleges. The college presents a financial status report to the Board monthly. While financial information about the college is readily available in meetings and committees, Datatel is not widely used as a method of tracking financial information. The college staff use "shadow systems" due to the fact that Datatel information is frequently not up to date or not complete. Purchase requisitions may not be encumbered for several weeks and salaries and benefits are not encumbered at all. (III.D.2.a, III.D.2.b)

Both the college and the district maintain healthy reserves and ending balances. The district has been maintaining a reserve in excess of 20%; the Board policy calls for at least 6%. The district has not needed to borrow for cash flow purposes, but recognizes that using a tax revenue anticipation note may be necessary as the state continues to defer payments to colleges. The conservative budgeting practices make for substantial cash balances. Due to the substantial cash balances, the district has not felt the need to prepare cash flow projections. (III.D.2.c)

The district uses the accounting system, along with appropriate policies and procedures to maintain effective internal controls over programs such as financial aid, grants, foundations and auxiliaries. Both the student body and the foundation use the same district accounting system and must follow all district purchasing and accounting procedures, providing appropriate access to internal controls. (III.D.2.d)

The board has designated who in the district needs to sign conflict of interest statements, as has the foundation. The college exercises oversight over certain college auxiliary enterprises and the student body funds. The bookstore is overseen by Fresno City College. Financial aid and grants have a shared oversight with the district. The college

and district have appropriate procedures and policies in place to ensure that contracts are awarded consistent with board policy. (III.D.2.e, III.D.2.f)

While the college financial management processes are regularly evaluated and the annual audit provides an audit of the outcomes, and there are administrative unit program reviews at the college fiscal office, administrative unit program reviews are just starting at the district fiscal office to evaluate the district processes and systems for financial management. (III.D.2.g)

Conclusions:

The college and district need to develop resource allocation models that address the future plans of the institutions and integrate planning and resource allocation needs. The splitting off of Willow International is going to have a dramatic effect on Reedley College's finances and operations and there has been little if any financial planning for this upcoming event.

Recommendations: See Recommendation 1 and District Recommendation 1.

STANDARD IV

Leadership and Governance

General Observations:

Standard IV, Leadership and Governance, is comprehensive and addresses the standards, although absent from the Self Study is any substantive discussion of the impact on Reedley College and the district of the impending creation of a new college. Numerous documents are provided as evidence to support assertions within the Self Study. There are two Planning Agendas for Standard IV, one for each of the two sub-sections; these relate directly to material in the Self Evaluations.

Reedley College has an extensive participatory governance structure and communication processes, formal and informal, that both welcome and promote the involvement of students, classified staff, faculty and administrators. Opportunities for participation are many and varied. A recently-developed Participatory Governance Handbook describes the college's decision-making process and defines the roles of constituent groups. The college provides strong professional development opportunities, especially for leadership development for faculty and staff.

The district has a solid infrastructure of policies and administrative procedures. These were reviewed and updated since the last visit. The chancellor has charged the District Legal Counsel and the Communications Committee with the regular systematic review of policies and procedures.

The Board is aware of its responsibilities and duties. New board members are oriented upon election; the board is provided regular updates by the chancellor and district and college administrators, and an annual board self-evaluation is carried out. Board policy includes a code of ethics for trustees (BP 2715). The seven-member board is elected by region; a process adopted recently. College and district governance structures are established by policy and practice; with representation by appropriate constituent participatory governance groups (faculty, staff, students) on committees which operate on collegial principles. Board policies exist for the selection and evaluation of the SCCCDC chancellor and for the selection of the college president, and Administrative Regulation 7125 provides for the evaluation of all members of the Chancellor's Cabinet including college presidents.

The district's Strategic Plan has been recently updated and approved by the Board of Trustees. The college strategic plans are now aligned with the district's plan and timetable. As part of a three-pronged new district planning structure, the chancellor has created a new strategic planning task force with participation from all units and participatory governance groups; the task force is charged with becoming a formal ongoing district-wide strategic planning committee.

The unique organizational structure of Reedley assigns "presidential" responsibility for the North Centers to a vice-chancellor. In 2008, the Commission approved a substantive change proposal from Reedley College to establish the Willow International Community College Center. At the same time, under the authority of Board Policy 2430 which permits the chancellor to delegate authority, the Vice Chancellor of the North Centers (Willow International, Madera Center and the Oakhurst campus), was given the same level of responsibility and authority as the college presidents, reporting directly to the chancellor. Also in 2008, the president of Reedley College communicated with the Commission to begin the process of eligibility for Willow International College Center.

In May 2009, Reedley College then-president Dr. Barbara Hioco submitted to the Commission an Accreditation Eligibility Application for Willow International Community College Center of Reedley College. While acknowledging that Willow Center is part of the North Centers of Reedley College, the application described how the vice chancellor is the CEO with all the responsibilities of the college president for Willow International Center. In a January 2010 letter, the Reedley president was informed of the Commission's actions to grant Eligibility to Willow International Community College Center to conduct a self study. The letter stated that during this time frame Willow International Center should also make it clear that, for accreditation purposes, it continues to be part of Reedley College.

The Reedley College Self Study outlines the responsibilities of the Reedley president and the North Centers vice chancellor. Cooperation between the two is expected in areas of overlapping jurisdiction, such as curriculum, program review, and shared services. With the pending separate accreditation of Willow International as Clovis Community College, there are significant matters to be resolved such as the administrative supervision of the other North Centers –Madera Center and Oakhurst, budget and staffing

needs, and how currently-shared services will be provided. Members of the college indicate that the responsibility for planning for the many issues associated with this is located at the district. The chancellor has charged the newly-created District Resource Allocation Model (DRAM) Taskforce to develop a budget allocation model that incorporates future plans for resource allocation for Reedley College and Willow International. The Taskforce has only just begun its work and anticipates working through the 2011-12 year. The work of this taskforce will be important in establishing a firm fiscal foundation for Reedley College and the district as Willow becomes a separately accredited college.

Standard IV.A: Decision Making Roles and Processes

Findings and Evidence:

The geography of the area served by Reedley College necessitates a unique administrative structure that includes three distant centers (Madera, Oakhurst, and Willow/International) collectively known as the North Centers) as well as the main campus of Reedley College. In recognition of the needs of the North Centers communities and to prepare for the Willow/International becoming a separately accredited college, a coordinated leadership structure, with a vice-chancellor responsible for most aspects of the North Centers, was established some years ago.

Collaboration between the main campus and the centers occurs on several levels. The Reedley College Academic Senate collaborates with North Centers Faculty Association on governance issues. Similarly, the Classified Senate has developed a parallel model, with a North Center Classified Senate that collaborates with the main campus. Structures and processes such as teleconferencing are in place to facilitate collaboration between the main campus and the North Centers on shared matters such as curriculum, program review, SLOs, and department matters; discussions with faculty and staff members indicated a sincere effort to facilitate good collaboration. While discussions with faculty and staff indicated a strong commitment to collegial collaboration between the main campus and the North Centers, instances were cited where the divided administrative structure appears to impede a clear resolution of differences of opinion. (IV.A.1)

Strong governance structures exist at both the college and the district levels, with faculty and staff voicing satisfaction in their ability to participate and feeling that their voices are valued. There is enthusiasm for, and pride in, the participatory governance structures and processes that the college has created and, as indicated by Planning Agenda 4.1, the college plans further improvement through broader involvement of members of the college community and improved training to serve on committees. However, within this governance structure, some planning processes appear to lack a clear delineation of responsibility for decision-making with multiple groups involved in reviewing and providing recommendations on matters of planning.

To encourage participation and input into decision-making, information is available through a variety of sources such as electronic, print, and face-to-face meetings. The college posts all governance materials such as agendas, meetings, etc. on the Blackboard site. A wide variety of professional development opportunities are available to faculty and staff. The value placed on effective participatory governance is evidenced by Reedley's Participatory Governance Handbook and by the college's Planning Agenda 4.1 regarding communication and establishing a committee orientation process. (IV.A.2.a)

Board policy, SCCC administrative regulations, and the Reedley College Participatory Governance Handbook, approved in 2009, all provide written policies that specify how the various constituencies participate and work together in the shared governance arena. A high 85% of respondents to the Employee Survey agreed or strongly agreed that planning is broad-based and offers opportunities for input by all constituencies. This was confirmed by the team's conversations with members of the Reedley community. Students are represented on the Board of Trustees with one representing Fresno City College and the second one representing Reedley College and the North Centers. (IV.A.2.a)

Reedley College relies on faculty through the local academic senate and appropriate academic administrators in the formulation of student learning programs and service. Curriculum is reviewed by the Curriculum Committee, a committee of the Academic Senate, with representation from the North Centers. Curriculum from the North Centers is approved by the Reedley Curriculum Committee before being submitted to the District Curriculum Committee (ECPC). Where differences of opinion occur, as the team was told, the divided administrative structure does not always lend itself to a clear resolution. (IV.A.2.b)

The Program Review Committee is chaired by a faculty member jointly appointed by the Academic Senate and the college president. The Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Advisory Committee is a subcommittee of the Program Review Committee, of which the majority of members are faculty. A high 84% of respondents to the Employee Survey agreed or strongly agreed that "the college facilitates an ongoing dialogue about improving student learning and institutional processes." (IV.A.2.b, IV.A.3)

Board policies, administrative regulations, and statements of practice and procedure provide evidence that the institution holds high standards of honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. Board responsibilities and ethical conduct are delineated in board policy. There is an administrative code of ethics. Faculty adheres to the 1987 AAUP statement on professional ethics. Financial/fiscal audits, federal and state agency compliance reviews serve as evidence of the college's compliance with this Standard. In addition, Reedley has been awarded a number of federally-funded grants such as: the Upward Bound Program serving six target high schools; a Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math grant; a Title V grant; and three Student Support Services grants. In addition, the North Centers were awarded two additional Student Support Services grants. Reedley's Scholarships for Education and Economic

Development (SEED) program and its funding from the Madera Workforce Investment Board are further evidence of meeting this standard. The college has provided timely responses to ACCJC recommendations and a board policy on accreditation exists. In the Accreditation Eligibility Application for Willow International Community College Center, the college informed the Commission of the separate administrative structure for the North Centers in which the vice chancellor has “presidential” responsibilities. Although Willow International is still in candidacy, the North Centers, of which Willow is a component, appear to operate as an independent entity from Reedley College. (IV.A.4)

The College has reviewed the campus committee structure utilizing the ad hoc Committee on Committees for this task and resulting in the authoring of an excellent Participatory Governance Handbook. The College Council, as the principal participatory governance body of the college, reviews the work of governance committees via annual reports. The college has paid serious attention to assessing governance and decision-making structures and assuring their integrity and effectiveness. In addition, this work has been communicated effectively with 70-73% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing with the three survey questions on this topic. On this basis, the Self Study concludes that there is “a continual need to improve communication structures and to identify new and more effective methods of communication.” The college’s sole Planning Agenda for IV.A is based, in part, on this evaluation. However, the team noted that there is a lack of clarity about where decision-making is located. In some cases, such as with requests for faculty positions, multiple committees or groups each provide their own lists of recommendations. The Academic Senate working with the department chairs is currently reviewing a proposal that will address the recommendation process for faculty hiring. The college partially meets IV.A.5.

Standard IV.B: Board and Administrative Organization

Findings and Evidence:

The role of the Board of Trustees is established in Board Policy 2012. The seven board members, who serve staggered four-year terms, are elected accordance with the California Elections Code and California Education Code. To comply with the California Political Reform Act and to better ensure that the board reflects the interests of the community, in January 2010, the Board approved a map designating geographical trustee areas; a re-districting study is currently underway to assure compliance with legislation. A non-voting student trustee from each college also serves on the board. Periodically, board meetings are held at various campuses in the district to allow the opportunity for the community and campus members to attend and participate.

Over the past seven years, the SCCC has been revising board policies. Administrative regulations are similarly assessed to assure they accurately reflect the implementation of board policy. The chancellor has now charged the district Legal Counsel and the

Communications Committee with the regular review of board policies and administrative regulations. In 2008, a major overhaul of board policies and administrative regulations occurred. At the direction of the new chancellor, the district is now engaging in a regular review process, starting in December 2010 with a review of Administrative Regulation 2410, the process for establishing new administrative regulations or revising or deleting old ones. The district needs to assure that the regular review of the board's policies and procedures continues. (IV.B.1.a, IV.B.1.e)

Board policies, semi-annual board reviews and board presentations demonstrate compliance with IV.B.1.b., IV.B.1.c., and IV.B.1.d.

A number of activities are in place to assure that a program for board development and new member orientation occur. These include a board policy, CCLC orientation for new trustees, a Trustee Handbook, and orientation of new members by the chancellor and the board. Staggered terms of office assure continuity. (IV.B.1.f)

The Board has a self-evaluation process and a code of ethics. Both are provided for in policy [BP 2745 and 2715]. Annual board self-evaluations occur and, recently, the board participated in an ACCT workshop on self-evaluation and goal-setting. An external consultant has also worked with the board in their self evaluation process. The trustees' code of ethics policy is included in the Self Study. Policy and administrative regulation spell out the process for accreditation. (IV.B.1.g, IV.B.1.h, IV.B.1.i)

There is a Board policy for the selection and the evaluation of the Chancellor. Board policies and Administrative Procedures address the process for selecting and evaluating the college President. (IV.B.1.j)

In preparation for the Willow/International achieving independent status, in 2008 the Board of Trustees established a unique administrative structure which has essentially provided Reedley College with co-presidents, although team conversations with members of the college indicate that this structure is of longer standing. The roles and responsibilities of the Reedley College president and the North Centers vice-chancellor are defined in writing in the Self Study. They provide for a high degree of autonomy for each and collaboration where areas of responsibility overlap. The president has primary oversight responsibility over the Reedley campus and a minimal role in the operations of the North Centers; the vice chancellor has primary oversight for the North Centers and no role regarding the Reedley campus. The president and the vice-chancellor report independently to the chancellor and both participate in the Chancellor's Cabinet and provide reports at the Board meetings. (IV.B.2.a)

The college has a number of participatory governance committees, such as the Budget Committee, the Enrollment Management Committee, the Facilities Committee, the Program Review Committee, and the Strategic Planning Committee that feed information to the College Council, whose function is to coordinate all college plans and activities. The College Council is also responsible for making recommendations to the president regarding resource allocation based on program review by means of the Resource Action

plan Proposal (RAPP) process. The institutional research coordinator, who serves both the Reedley main campus and the North Centers, provides quantitative and qualitative information regarding institutional effectiveness. The institutional research is integral to the work of several committees such as the Matriculation Committee, the Program Review Committee, and the Strategic Planning Committee, as well as the RAPP process. Input into the planning and resource allocation process is solicited from all constituent groups, notably during the recent budget reduction processes. (IV.B.2.b)

The Reedley president works closely with the chancellor and the Chancellor's Cabinet to assure the college practices are consistent with the mission of the district and the college, along with board policies and administrative regulations. (IV.B.2.c)

The president has overall responsibility for control of the budget and expenditures for the main campus. Likewise, the vice chancellor has responsibility for the budget and expenditures for the North Centers due to the fact that there is a separate line item for these sites. In spite of the severe economic situation, the college has maintained fiscal stability. The president is directly involved with the development and oversight of the budget, through the Budget Committee and College Council, and is accountable to the chancellor. The North Centers budget has been separated out from the Reedley budget. For certain categorical budget allocations such as matriculation and basic skills, a portion of the college allocation is separated out by the district and assigned to the North Centers who have the sole authority for these expenditures. However, Reedley College is responsible for combining and submitting the year-end budget reports to the state although the college does not have jurisdiction over how these expenditures are made. The college and district budgets are audited annually by an independent audit firm and their reports routinely state no exceptions. Moreover, the college and district exceed the 5 percent reserve recommended by the state. The accreditation survey of employees validated the statement that the college president provides effective leadership in fiscal planning and budget development for the Reedley College main campus. (IV.B.2.d)

The Self Study provides information on a number of community activities in which the president is involved. These include campus events, volunteer activities on community organizations, and communication to high schools. A quarterly college publication, Currents, is distributed to the community. The college's PIO is active in building relationships between the college and the community. (IV.B.2.e)

At the district level, the new chancellor is establishing a culture of transparency and strong participatory governance with all constituent groups represented. There is a renewed focus on planning, and the integration of district and college planning efforts. Under the chancellor's direction, three key district committees or task forces are currently underway. These are the Strategic Planning Task Force; the Budget Committee; and the Communications Council. The first two are new and the third is being revamped to broaden its charge to become a district governance council. Each of these three groups is responsible for a key component of overall district-wide planning; together they represent a systematic, integrated approach to overall planning. (IV.A.3)

The chancellor has also sought advice on administrative structures through a study by the Brain Trust and she has charged appropriate administrators with reviewing the results of the study and making recommendations. Similarly, the district is undergoing its first Administrative Program Review. The outcomes of the Program Review and the Brain Trust recommendations are expected to assist the chancellor in planning for changes in the district administrative organization.

Through district policy, the district's mission statement, organizational charts and a "mapping" of district-college authority and responsibilities, the District delineates and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district and the college. However, missing from the Self Study was a similar delineation for the operational functions of the Reedley College main campus and the North Centers. Facilities plans for the district are also "in the works" and Reedley College is updating its own Facilities Plan. To assist in the review of organizational structure, the district contracted with the College Brain Trust and the board received their report and recommendations in March 2011. It is clear that much thought and effort has gone into addressing and delineating district versus college planning and delineation of responsibilities, but that it is still a work in progress. (IV.B.3.a)

A review of the district office organization structure and centralized services was conducted in fall 2010. The review was intended to increase the effectiveness of services to the colleges/centers. The district is currently assessing how to make improvements and changes to better support the colleges and centers. This work appears to be part of the effort towards continuous quality improvement. (IV.B.3.b)

The SCCCDC uses an allocation methodology for the distribution of resources that up to this point has resulted in a fair distribution according to the Self Study. However, the college and district are facing the same challenges as all community colleges in California and anticipate a possibility in the near future when student demand may surpass what available resources can provide. This situation is exacerbated by plans for Willow/International to become a separate college. The chancellor has established a District Resource Allocation Model (DRAM) Taskforce charged with recommending a comprehensive budget allocation model that incorporates plans for Willow becoming a separate college. Since only Willow International is in the candidacy process, the administrative alignment of the Madera Center and the Oakhurst campus does not appear to have been fully considered. Although ultimately one or both of these may become a part of the new Clovis Community College, there is an interim during which time they must remain under Reedley College's accreditation status and control. While the college meets Standard IV.B.3.c, the work of the DRAM Taskforce is crucial for the future fiscal stability of the college.

The SCCCDC district effectively controls its expenditures. (IV.B.3.d)

Board policy delegates full responsibility and authority to the presidents of the colleges. The district has delineated the specific responsibilities of the Reedley campus president and the North Centers vice chancellor, as described in Board Policy 2430 and printed in

full in the Self Study. Both are held accountable to the chancellor. Given the Candidacy of Willow/International for separate accreditation, this separation of responsibilities is appropriate. (IV.B.3.e)

Several District advisory committees serve to facilitate the effective liaison between the college and the district. These include the Chancellor's Cabinet, the Communications Council, the Education Coordinating and Planning Committee (ECPC), the Strategic Planning Task Force, and the District Resource Allocation Model (DRAM) Taskforce. The Communications Council is an evolving entity. Under the new chancellor's leadership, it is reviewing and evaluating its role. It includes representatives of the various shared governance groups as well as representatives of the certificated and classified bargaining units. The ECPC reviews curriculum from both colleges. The Chancellor's Cabinet includes the Reedley president and the North Centers vice chancellor, as well as other senior level administrators. The Strategic Planning Taskforce is charged with the ongoing review and coordination of the district and college strategic planning processes. The District Resource Allocation Model Taskforce is tasked with developing a budget allocation model that provides a fair allocation to each of the units and provides for the ongoing growth of the colleges and creation of a new college. (IV.B.3.f)

Since the last accreditation visit, a number of activities have occurred or are occurring that serve to evaluate district roles, governance, and decision-making relative to the colleges. These include creation of the district Strategic Plan, the formation of a district Strategic Planning Workgroup in 2010-11, and functional maps of district and college role delineation. Recently, the district contracted with the College Brain Trust to conduct an in-depth evaluation of the services and structures in place at the district to assist the colleges in meeting their educational goals. The district is also preparing for its first administrative program review. The Communications Council is working to research shared governance models and improve the district-wide governance processes. Much is underway to assure the effectiveness of the district and college delineation of roles and structures. The district is in the process of developing procedure to assure governance and decision-making processes are regularly reviewed and evaluated (IV.B.3.g)

The college's sole planning agenda for Standard IV.B is 4.2; it addresses the review and revision of the resource allocation model to ensure that resources are adequately distributed to support the effective operation of the colleges.

Conclusions:

There is evidence throughout the self-study which was confirmed during the team's visit, of the beginnings of continuous quality improvement at both the college and district levels. Under the leadership of the new chancellor, the district has focused renewed attention on strategic planning, governance, and the delineation of responsibilities between the district and colleges. Since these are relatively new initiatives, they are still works in progress. At the college, much energy has been given to improving governance

and planning structures assuring full inclusion of all participatory governance groups. While the college has instituted planning structures including a 5-year strategic plan, an overall integrated planning process is still under development. A number of the planning processes are still very new and have not been tried and assessed.

Within Standard IV, the major concern is how the creation of the new independently accredited Willow International will affect Reedley College itself and the district as a whole. From an accreditation stance, the Madera Center and Oakhurst campus would remain under Reedley College's jurisdiction, at least initially, but currently these units are under the leadership of the Vice Chancellor North Centers. Matters such as resolving shared services, budget and additional personnel to service the new college also need a timely resolution. As Reedley's Planning Agenda 4.2 states, the responsibility for this resolution lies with the district, in consultation with constituent groups. A clear and timely resolution of these matters is critical to Reedley College's future operation.

Recommendations:

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)

District Recommendation 2

In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the District document the process for review of board policies and ensure that district governance and decision-making processes are regularly evaluated. (Standards: IV.B.1.e, IV.B.3.g.)