

EVALUATION REPORT

FINAL

REEDLEY COLLEGE

**995 North Reed Avenue
Reedley, CA 93654
www.reedleycollege.edu**

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 25 through 27, 2005

Jackie L. Fisher, Sr., Chair

**Reedley College
Comprehensive Evaluation Team**

Dr. Jackie Fisher, Sr. (**CHAIR**)
Superintendent/President
Antelope Valley College

Dr. Willard Lewallen
Vice President, Student Services
Victor Valley College

Dr. Frank Baratta
Director District Research (Retired)
Contra Costa Community College District

Ms. Lisa Marchand
Professor, ESL
Cosumnes River College

Dr. Tania Beliz
Professor of Biology
College of San Mateo

Mr. James Matthews
Faculty Library Coordinator/Collection
Developer
Chabot College

Ms. Peggy Cha
Chancellor
Kauai Community College

Ms. Paula Norsell (Assistant)
Executive Assistant to the President
Antelope Valley College

Mr. Robert Dees
President
Orange Coast College

Mr. John Wagstaff
Director of Information Technology
Services
El Camino College

Mr. W. Andrew Dunn
Vice President of Business Services
San Joaquin Delta College

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION REPORT

INSTITUTION: Reedley College

DATE OF VISIT: October 25 through 27, 2005

TEAM CHAIR: Jackie L. Fisher, Sr., Ed. D.
Superintendent/President
Antelope Valley College

An eleven-member accreditation team visited Reedley College from October 25 through 27, 2005, for the purposes of determining whether the institution continues to meet accreditation standards. Prior to and during the visit, the team assessed how well the college is achieving its stated purposes, analyzed how well the college is meeting the commission's four standards, provided recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitted recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the accredited status of the college.

In preparation for the visit, the team chair and team members attended an all day team training session in the City of Oakland, California, on September 23, 2005. ACCJC's vice presidents Dr. Deborah Blue and Jack Pond conducted the all day training session. During this training session, team members were taught how to conduct an institutional evaluation in accordance with ACCJC standards.

The team prepared for its visit by thoroughly reviewing Reedley College's self study, evaluating responses to the previous team's recommendations, assessing online courses, and examining numerous documents provided by the college. During the three-day visit, the team held meetings with individuals and small groups; held four open forums, two at the Reedley College campus and one each at the Madera and Clovis centers; and visited numerous classrooms.

A month prior to the team's visit, members were required to fulfill two written assignments in reaction to Reedley College's self study. Team members were asked to evaluate the self study report and respond to the previous team reports (spring 2000). Team members were asked to submit requests for individual and group appointments to be scheduled by the team assistant. On October 24, 2005, the team met for approximately 2 ½ hours to review the self study report and confirm appointments and issues to be addressed during the visit.

Reedley College was well prepared for the visit and the staff greeted the team in a professional manner. The team was provided open access to all documents needed to gather evidence related to the accreditation standards. The staff provided additional evidence when requested by team members via the team assistant. Administrators, faculty, staff, and students were very generous with their time and assistance.

The team was able to confirm the self study's portrayal of the college and its appraisal of how well the college and centers were meeting the four accreditation standards. With the exception of the lack of planning agendas, the team was impressed by the thoroughness of the self study report and by the overall condition of the college and centers. However, the team was unable to visit the Oakhurst Center. The Oakhurst Center is approximately 75 miles northeast of Reedley campus, and it would have taken one full day to conduct an honest and thorough assessment of programs and services by team members.

The team believes that if administrators, faculty, and staff can expand the atmosphere of trust and cooperation, Reedley College will continue to make progress toward recommendations prepared by the team.

Introduction

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. One of two community colleges that 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. 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 20,000 people. Student enrollment for the 2004 fall semester was 5,705. Hispanics make up 61 percent of the student enrollment with Whites the next largest group at 23 percent. In the fall semester of 2004, enrollments of freshman without a high school diploma were three times higher than students with a high school diploma. Reedley College, therefore, plays a critical role in efforts to improve the educational and economic status of the communities it serves. 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 6,700. The largest student enrollment is at the Clovis Center, which is located in a suburb of Fresno. Approximately 80,000 people live in Clovis, and it is the fastest growing population in the Fresno area. Student enrollment during the fall 2004 semester at the North Centers were reported as follows: Oakhurst Center - 407, Madera Center - 2,101, and Clovis Center - 4,131. Having achieved a steady growth over the past five years, the Clovis Center is now the largest of the North Centers, generating almost 954 credits FTES in 2004.

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 overall morale of administrators, faculty, and staff is very positive, as evidenced by the self study and through interviews by the visiting team.

An eleven-member team visited Reedley College and its educational centers from October 25 – October 27, 2005. On October 24, 2005, three members of the team, along

with three members of the team visiting Fresno City College, visited the district office to meet with the Chancellor and his staff as well as four members of the Board of Trustees.

Recommendations:

After carefully reading the self study, examining documentary, observational and interview evidence, and conducting extensive discussion in light of the four accreditation standards, the team offers the following recommendations to the college and the district:

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)

Recommendation 2: Institutional Planning

The team recommends that the college develop, implement, and evaluate a collegewide strategic plan that incorporates the individual planning efforts of the college and centers. The collegewide 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)

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)

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)

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)

Recommendation 6: College Strategic Planning Connection with District Strategic Planning

The team recommends that the college develop, implement, and evaluate a collegewide 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) (See Fresno City College's Evaluation Team Report.)

Commendations:

Among the many programs, services, and initiatives that the team was impressed by, the following seemed particularly noteworthy:

1. The team wants to commend the college's healthy and stable budget reserves. The new practice of allowing the college to retain all carryover funds encourages better budgeting practices and aligns the interests of the college and the district.
2. The team wants to commend the college for the design of its new Writing Centers at the Clovis and Madera sites, which enhance both academic success and social relationships.
3. The team wants to commend the faculty and staff for maintaining a student-centered environment both inside and outside the classroom. The physical environment is attractive and well maintained and students find staff and faculty to be helpful and supportive.
4. The team wants to commend the college for the inclusiveness of its new Facilities Committee. The team encourages the college to consider this committee as a model for other college committees.

5. The team wants to commend the Classified Senate for its staff development and leadership program.
6. The team wants to commend the college for its innovative Registration-to-Go and laptop computer loan programs, which improve access and meet the needs of the area's unique population. The team encourages the college to consider expansion of the Registration-to-Go program to reach additional demographic groups.

Team's Evaluation of Institutional Responses to 2000 Recommendations

In 2000, the accreditation visiting team submitted ten recommendations for Reedley College to address before the next comprehensive visit. The self study report, which was prepared for the team's visit in October 2005, detailed the consideration given to each of the ten recommendations. The 2005 visiting team reviewed recommendations from the previous team prior to the visit in October 25, 2005, and was pleased with the college's progress in addressing the recommendations.

The 2005 team's assessment regarding Reedley College's progress reported on prior recommendations included the following:

2000 Recommendation 1: *The previous team recommended that the college should intensify its efforts to infuse cultural diversity perspectives in the curriculum as appropriate.*

The self study reported that college has followed a model whereby diversity is blended into the curriculum in a broad scope manner. It was suggested by the previous team that a more focused approach involving specific courses dedicated to diversity issues would have significantly less reach. The 2005 team confirmed that the college appears to have heeded this observation.

2000 Recommendation 2: *The previous team recommended that both instruction and student services should consider when and how to coordinate multicultural activities to improve campus wide participation.*

The self study reported that the college has many multicultural activities sponsored by both the instructional and student services units, although evidence that the two units actually plan and coordinate together is not apparent. The Reedley College Strategic Plan includes as one of its overarching goals promoting and celebrating diversity. Progress reports associated with the implementation of the strategic plan tally the number of multicultural activities as well as the means of outreach and promotion.

However, the college should continue to make improvements in this area. The self – study reported that the Associated Student Body supports diversity themes for celebration throughout campus, but wide participation in such events is not documented. The college should seek ways to encourage more faculty and students to become involved in multicultural activities.

2000 Recommendation 3: *The previous accreditation team recommended that the college should update its affirmative action plan.*

Although a comprehensive Affirmative Action Plan was prepared by the district during the 2000-2001 year, since the passage of Proposition 209, the legal landscape surrounding the status of affirmative action has remained somewhat unclear. The California Community College Chancellor's Office indicated that a plan for promoting

diversity would be released, but that has not yet come to pass. Until further clarity is provided in this area, the district and college should continue to follow Equal Employment Opportunity Commission guidelines and offer related training to those involved in the hiring process.

2000 Recommendation 4: *The previous team recommended that the Board of Trustees develop a process by which its own performance can be assessed regularly.*

The self study reported that in the summer 2000 the Board began discussions regarding a process of self-evaluation. That process evolved to 2004 when a more formalized approach was undertaken involving a specific questionnaire sent to each Board member. The Chancellor and Board President review these completed questionnaires. A supporting Board policy has been drafted. It awaits a companion set of administrative regulations for adoption. The team suggests that the Board of Trustees continue its self-evaluation process.

2000 Recommendation 5: *The team recommends that the colleges develop and implement a college-wide process to assess how well and in what ways it is achieving its purposes as an institution and communicates evidence of quality to the public. The college must specify its intended institutional outcomes and clearly document those achievements.*

The self study reported that the college has made progress in hiring a full-time institutional researcher; created and published the Reedley College Strategic Plan 2002-2005; published the Reedley College 2003-2004 Annual Report; and the State Center Community College District Fact Book 2005-06. There was no discussion of the role of the Public Information Officer or of any planning or actions for the dissemination of this information to the community outside of placement of the documents on the Internet.

The team found that Reedley College has substantially responded to the previous team's recommendation by hiring an Institutional Researcher to address developing quantifiable data for program reviews. The college has developed a strategic plan and related accountability network for developing and monitoring its institutional outcomes.

2000 Recommendation 6: *The team recommends that the college develop and implement an integrated strategic planning process, which incorporates information from consultation with the various segments of the community in order to identify the most appropriate ways for the college to meet community needs. Special attention should be paid to developing a student services facilities plan for the campus.*

The self study reported evidence of progress in the development of a Reedley College Strategic Plan 2002-2005. In the self study report, there is discussion of evaluating the progress on that three-year plan and the creation of a new plan.

The integrated strategic master plan released in 2002 is addressed elsewhere in this summary. However, the focus of a student services facilities plan warrants additional

attention. The district's major tool for implementation of this plan is their local general obligation bond measure approved by the voters in 2002. A Facilities Committee was established in 2004 to help coordinate the delivery of projects within the program. Though the college has made progress in addressing the previous team's recommendation, the 2005 team believes that the college should continue its progress by ensuring that the strategic plan include an assessment of student and community needs, identifies and defines resources for existing and future centers, and incorporates the individual planning efforts of the college and centers and fits into the strategic direction of the State Center Community College District. (See 2005 Recommendations 2 and 6.)

2000 Recommendation 7: *The team recommends that the college develop intended student learning outcomes for courses and programs and promote teaching and learning strategies that improve the successful accomplishment of them.*

The self study reported that the college is making progress on establishing, implementing, and evaluating student learning outcomes at the institutional, program, and course level. The self study also states that there has been extensive discussion about course level student learning outcomes and that student learning outcomes are been identified in course syllabi.

The evaluation following the completion of the first cycle of program review identifies student learning outcomes as one of its core purposes. Teaching and learning strategies are among the stated directions of the Reedley College Strategic Plan. Basic organizational structure is also said to provide focus and dialogue in matters pertaining to student learning outcomes.

However, the team found that quite a few faculty members and staff could not define student learning outcomes and student learning outcomes were often confused with course objectives. Additionally, measurement of student learning outcomes has not been integrated into the program review process. The team, therefore, does not believe that the college has met this recommendation. (See 2005 Recommendation 1.)

2000 Recommendation 8: *The team recommends that Reedley College and the Centers initiate and execute a plan to address and systematically evaluate the adequacy of and access to library and learning resource collections in all relevant formats, including sufficient print and non-print materials, and to further ensure that professionally qualified library and learning resource staff provide support at all locations where these services are offered.*

The self study reported that the college has evidence of progress: the 2004 program review of the library; creation of a library advisory committee for the North Centers, the creation of a districtwide online public access catalog, funding increase for materials and the hiring of two classified library instructional aides for the North Centers. The funding of a professional librarian position for the North Centers was reported to be, "dependent upon available budget and faculty position prioritizations in the near future," however, in faculty prioritization memos, the library position was not listed for consideration.

The team found that Reedley College and the North Centers need to address professional librarian staffing needs, as this was a recommendation from the previous accreditation visit. Student library instruction and reference services need to be locally based in the North Centers. The college should engage in dialogue about the need for the development of information competency into the curriculum of the college. (See 2005 Recommendation 5.)

2000 Recommendation 9: *The team recommends that the college recognize and address the need for an institutional commitment focused on students with disabilities. The commitment should permeate all aspects of the campus, including web site delivery of programs and services.*

The self study reported that the college has made progress in increasing its commitment to provide more leadership to clubs, and to advisory committees. The college has added new support programs through a Student Support Services (TRIO) grant and Reedley College's Access to Vocational Education (RAVE) Program. The college has utilized matching funds from the State architectural barrier removal grant program. The web pages, when redesigned, will provide disabled student access. The team did not find evidence, however, of closed captioning or the funding for it.

The team found evidence, through interviews with faculty and staff, that the college has embraced a multi-faceted approach in improving service delivery to the disabled student population. The college has increased the awareness to and exposure of students with disabilities through additional leadership positions in the college governance structure. Financial resources have been enhanced through successful grant applications. These grant-based resources have facilitated the delivery of additional services as well as the acquisition of furnishings and equipment. Physical plant improvements that facilitate access compliance have been sought. Access for the disabled has also received a long-term commitment through the college's strategic plan. The college has met the recommendation.

2000 Recommendation 10: *The team recommends that the college take immediate action to ensure that evaluations for part-time faculty are implemented on a regular and systematic basis.*

The self study reported that the college has made significant progress toward completing a faculty collective bargaining agreement and part-time faculty evaluation tracking mechanisms as progress on this recommendation.

The team found that the State Center Community College District has implemented an exclusive collective bargaining relationship with its part-time faculty. The team found that the collective bargaining agreement delineates a provision for timely evaluations. The college has developed a tracking process to ensure compliance with this provision of the contract. The college has addressed the previous team's recommendation.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

1. AUTHORITY

Reedley College currently operates under the California approvals and accreditation associated with State Center Community College District. The Clovis Center, Madera Center, and Oakhurst Center currently conduct educational programs and services under the jurisdiction of Reedley College. Reedley College was founded in 1926 and approved as an official California community college in 1963.

2. MISSION

The team confirmed that the college developed its mission statement, which was approved by the State Center Community College District Board of Trustees in June 1999. The statement was reviewed during annual leadership retreats in 2001, 2002, and 2003 and will be reviewed and updated after the college receives the accreditation final report in January 2006.

3. GOVERNING BOARD

The State Center Community College District Board of Trustees is a seven-member body elected for staggered four-year terms from areas within the district. A non-voting student member is selected by students to serve on an annual basis. The team confirmed that the Board makes policy for the district and exercises oversight of its operations. Board members have no employment, family, or personal financial interest in the district and file a conflict of interest statement annually to this effect.

4. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

The team confirmed that the Board of Trustees selects and appoints the president, who has primary authority and responsibility for leadership and management of all programs and services provided by the college.

5. ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY

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

6. OPERATING STATUS

The team certifies with no reservation that Reedley College is fully operational with students actively pursuing its degree programs.

7. DEGREES

The team found that a majority of students enter Reedley College with the intent of taking a degree, certificate, license, or preparing for transfer to a four-year institution. Additional information confirmed that degrees and certificated programs were defined clearly so that students may complete their educational goals in a timely manner.

8. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The team certifies that Reedley College offers a range of degree and certificate programs and that the programs are consistent with the college mission and provided in a manner conventional to community colleges and consistent with Eligibility Requirements.

9. ACADEMIC CREDIT

The team found that Reedley College awards academic credit in a manner conventional for community colleges and consistent with generally accepted good practices.

10. STUDENT LEARNING AND ACHIEVEMENT

The team examined course outlines, syllabi, and the draft catalog and found evidence that programs have program purpose statements that are available to the public.

11. GENERAL EDUCATION

The team certifies that Reedley College has a clear general education component in its degree programs and that writing and computational skills are reflected in these requirements. Students are introduced to several areas of knowledge, consistent with the practices of California community colleges. Accepted general education courses are appropriate for higher education.

12. ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The team found no evidence that faculty and staff were restricted or denied opportunities to think, speak, or write regarding issues involving academic values.

13. FACULTY

At the time of the accreditation visit, the college had a compliment of 152 full-time faculty members, with an array of expertise aligned with college offerings. Faculty responsibilities are defined in State Center Community College District Board Policy and outlined in the collective bargaining agreement.

14. STUDENT SERVICES

The team reviewed student services provided by Reedley College and found them to be consistent with the needs of the student body and the college mission statement.

15. ADMISSIONS

The team found Reedley College admission policies in the draft catalog and other publicly available documents. These policies are consistent with those required of California community colleges.

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 is needed to accommodate existing services. However, the team recommends that a staffing plan be developed to address extension of these services as additional centers are formed.

17. FINANCIAL RESOURCES

The team found that Reedley College has an enviable record for fiscal prudence. Even during previous years of statewide budget difficulties, Reedley College retained an adequate financial base to support its programs. Continuing to do this will not be a major challenge for the district.

18. FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The team examined the latest external audit available for the district (2004-2005) and was informed by appropriate district officials that the draft 2005-2006 audit contains no exceptions.

19. INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING AND EVALUATION

The team found ample evidence of planning for all-important aspects of college operations. However, the team found that additional work remains to refine and coordinate this planning and make good use of evaluation results, both the district and the college have invested significantly in these efforts.

20. PUBLIC INFORMATION

Reedley College develops and publishes (via hard copy and web) a catalog every two years, in which all of the requisite information is contained. In addition, the college publishes a Faculty Handbook and other documents that contain important information regarding college operations. These documents are readily available both on campus and online.

21. RELATIONS WITH THE ACCREDITING COMMISSION

The self study included a statement, signed by the President of the Board of Trustees and the college President, which assures that the institution adheres to the Eligibility Requirements, Standards and Policies of the Accrediting Commission.

ACCREDITATION THEMES

Dialogue

The college has been actively involved in attempts to keep all employees informed regarding matters of institutional quality and improvement. The college hosts several collegewide meetings throughout the academic year to encourage dialogue from employees about planning and implementation of policies, shared governance issues, campus climate, budget, research, student achievement, student learning outcomes, and technology. The self study stated that the Vice Chancellor schedules monthly meetings with employees at the North and South Centers via synchronized television. Monthly electronic newsletters are posted on the website so that employees can access and review at their convenience.

The team confirmed that there are numerous opportunities at the Reedley College campus and the North Centers for employees to engage in meaningful dialogue. However, the team found that a number of employees are not taking advantage of these attempts to increase meaningful dialogue regarding important issues, resulting in misinformation regarding decisions on planning and allocation of resources. The tripartite leadership involving the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and administration should take appropriate steps to make sure that respective constituents take advantage of all opportunities for both informal and formal dialogue. They should make sure that every dialogue sessions guides ongoing self-reflection and continuous improvement.

Institutional Integrity

The team was provided sufficient evidence, documentation, and support prior to and during the visit. The evidentiary materials demonstrated to visiting team members that the college represents itself honestly and truthfully to all stakeholders. The team found no evidence that board policies have been breached regarding academic freedom or working conditions.

The team found that the catalog was reviewed and updated every two years by all constituents groups. The catalog contains relevant information regarding the status of programs and services offered at the college. The team confirmed that current and prospective students are welcomed and treated with respect and honesty. Students are advised clearly what will be expected of them in order to be successful. The team found that students are given the support to make this success a reality, encouraged to seek opportunities that fit their unique learning abilities, and allowed to succeed or fail on the merit of their work.

Student Learning Outcomes

The college has taken steps to initiate the process of developing and implementing student learning outcomes at the institutional level. In 2000, the college's curriculum committee incorporated requirements for student learning outcomes by requiring that "all

new and changes to academic courses and programs must include an outcomes statement for each program as well as student learning outcomes for each course.” This activity to list student learning outcomes was in response to the initial cycle of program review.

The team found, however, that a number of faculty members and staff did not know how to develop, implement, and evaluate student learning outcomes. They indicated that workshops held at Reedley College campus to develop, implement, and evaluate student learning outcomes were unsuccessful. The team recommends that administrators, faculty, and staff attend professional development workshops, presented by colleagues from community colleges that have implemented relevant student learning outcomes. In addition, the college should consider developing a written plan that outlines the steps to be taken to assess outcomes, analyze assessment results, and use the results of the analysis for institutional improvement.

Evaluation, Planning, and Improvement

The self study indicates that the college “is committed to utilizing a comprehensive planning model which encompasses short and long-range planning in a committee structure that embraces shared governance. The planning cycle is comprised of evaluation, goal setting, resource distribution, implementation and assessment.” The college has published the Reedley College Strategic Plan 2002-2005, which delineates seven strategic directions containing four to nine specific objectives. There is a districtwide strategic plan document that serves as a guide to the college strategic plan. In other words, the districtwide and college strategic plan are intended to be interdependent planning documents.

The team found that an assessment of student needs as applies to the decision making process and its relationship to providing relevant college programs, support services, and student learning outcomes was not collected. The evaluation process did not include planning for the eventuality of the North Centers becoming a separate educational campus. The team found little evidence that quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed to support the systematic cycle of evaluation, planning, and improvement that leads to appropriate resource allocation. Members of the Strategic Planning Council and Strategic Plan Direction should continue to learn how to analyze and use data to help set priorities and allocate resources to meet goals established for the college and district.

Organization

The team found that Reedley College campus and its centers continue to define student learning and to provide transitional programs (e.g., basic skills and tutoring services) that support learning. The college has enhanced its capabilities to evaluate student learning and institutional achievement through a researcher on campus charged with collecting and providing data to decision makers.

The Reedley College campus has implemented a one-stop service function within the Student Services area. The one-stop service provides admission, registration, financial

aid, and accounting services as a convenience for students who wish to register for classes on campus.

Reedley College does not provide appropriate professional staff (i.e. Reference Librarian) to support learning during all operational hours or at all locations.

Institutional Commitments

The State Center Community College District Board of Trustees approved Reedley College's mission statement in 1999. The college will review and revise, if necessary, the mission statement along with a statement of philosophy, and vision during spring of 2006. The team found that the college and centers provide evidence of commitment to provide high quality education to a diverse population. This commitment was clear from students interviewed at the Reedley College campus and North Centers during the team's visit.

Reports of the four standards and related findings, conclusions, and recommendations are as follows:

Standard I Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

I.A. Mission

General Comments

Reedley College demonstrates overall success in meeting the educational needs of its students in accordance with the college mission statement. In keeping with the mission statement, the college has instituted common policies and practices among its widespread centers in an effort to provide consistent and effective instructional programs and services to students at each location. The college has also begun to make progress in giving more attention to, dialoguing, and working to develop student learning outcomes in all areas. Although only a few instructional departments have as yet developed student learning outcomes for their courses, the college has initiated a new course outline form and campus-wide Program Review process intended to ensure the development and use of learning outcomes across the campus.

The college mission statement has been approved by the Board of Trustees and is published in the college catalog, on the college web site, and in other appropriate publications. As of 2004-2005, the Strategic Planning Council is charged with reviewing the college mission statement annually.

The college's strategic plan grew directly out of the mission statement. The plan is used to guide the college in all aspects of its operation, including the college's budget development and allocation of funds. The college reviewed its governance structure in spring 2005 to ensure that its decision-making processes were aligned with the mission statement and strategic plan goals. Staff interviewed by the visiting accreditation team was aware of the mission statement and felt it was followed in carrying out the business of the college.

Findings and Evidence

Although the college has a number of planning mechanisms related to its own operations or those of the North Centers in place, faculty and staff expressed concerns about a clear lack of campus dialogue about distance education courses. It is also unclear how integrated the college's processes and their results are with the planning done by the district. Faculty and staff who discussed this issue with the team felt there was little integration of the college's planning with many of the issues planned or decided at the district level. The college should review the relationship of its own planning to that done at the district level to ensure compatibility of planning and clear communication among all constituencies (Standards I.A.1, I.A.3).

Team members met with the college President and Deans of Instruction and Student Services several times during the visit, as well as with other key administrators, faculty,

students, and classified staff. The team members reviewed documents, met on several occasions with faculty and staff groups, and also talked with a variety of such persons on an individual basis. In meeting with students at Reedley College and the North Centers, the team was particularly impressed by the students' appreciation of the staff and quality of instruction and services they received at each location. Such testimony, the self study report, catalog, class schedule, course outlines, and other evidence provided demonstrate that the college is providing instructional programs and student support services in keeping with its mission statement (Standards I.A.I, I.A.4).

Conclusions

The college satisfies the requirements of Standard I.A. However the college should continue to take steps to improve dialogue with faculty and staff, which will lead to better institutional planning.

The team commends the faculty and staff for maintaining a student-centered environment both inside and outside the classroom. The physical environment is attractive and well maintained and students find staff and faculty to be helpful and supportive.

I.B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Comments

The college regularly practices ongoing dialogue about improving student learning and institutional processes, but the self study indicates that the distance separating the college from its North Centers sometimes negatively affects communication, so that processes may be delayed or necessarily repeated. This impression was reiterated by faculty and staff interviewed by the accrediting team. This is most evident in the numerous campus committees, Senates, and other bodies that discuss these topics and the progress made in establishing the new writing centers at the Madera and Clovis Centers.

At the recommendation of the Academic Senate and now as part of faculty evaluations, many faculty have adopted the practice of including learning outcomes (in most cases actually objectives) on the course syllabus they provide to students. The recent shift in the ESL curriculum to better address student learning needs, as well as the composition department's development of grading guidelines and a rubric are further evidence that the college maintains on-going, collegial interaction aimed at improving student learning. The team also was told of several conferences and workshops that faculty and staff have attended since the last accreditation visit in order to learn more about developing student learning outcomes for their departments and programs.

The college appears in general to meet the Standard in establishing goals, measuring them, and widely discussing their outcomes. The college uses the strategic plan, the Strategic Plan Direction Co-Chairs Committee, and Direction teams to achieve the Standard requirements. The English Department's use of data in the development of a cooperative Title 5 grant is evidence of such use, although other examples were not offered in the self study report.

In response to the Standard requirement that the college evaluate its effectiveness both quantitatively and qualitatively, the campus has instituted a strategic plan and Strategic Planning Council, as well as a revised program review process. The Council oversees the college's progress in meeting its goals on an ongoing basis, and program review is completed every five or six years by each program. The program review form asks explicitly for respondents to evaluate their program qualitatively and quantitatively. The Budget Committee sets the budget and allocates resources according to data provided by the campus researcher. Budget considerations and student needs have led to implementing large group instruction in some areas, but have also left the North Centers faculty concerned with how to implement critical thinking in such a learning environment. The Planning Agenda for this Standard does not include a plan to address this problem.

The college appears to have a broad-based, participatory system of resource allocation. Various committees are responsible for planning at their level, and the Strategic Planning Council and Committee on Committees oversee the broad involvement of campus staff and students in decision-making. Innovations such as "decision packages" encourage participation and creative projects in support of the college's goals. Although a low percentage of faculty and staff agreed when surveyed that a review of programs and services is integrated into college planning processes, the Planning Agenda for this Standard lists no plan to address this perception. (Standard I.B.1)

Findings and Evidence

The self study's descriptions and evaluations of the college's processes for improving institutional effectiveness are sufficient overall, though it is clear that the campus needs to improve its understanding and use of measured student learning outcomes. Course syllabi containing learning outcomes, evidence of staff attendance at professional conferences and workshops, and other materials provided show the college's efforts to improve its understanding and use of student learning outcomes.

The college's program review process is central to achieving ongoing improvement of institutional effectiveness and such effectiveness pertains most essentially to the issue of whether or not and how well students are actually learning at the college. Measurement of student learning outcomes or their equivalent is listed in the purpose statement for the current Program Review Handbook, but nowhere else in the handbook or the program review process. The same statement concerning measurement of student learning outcomes was included in the earlier cycle of Program Review Handbook purpose statements, but reviews done under the previous phase (History 11, 12, Poly Sci 2, CASS, Composition, ESL, and so on) were completed without referencing any program learning outcomes. Such outcomes should have been the basis, the very core of nearly all else that was discussed in the program reviews. Data pertaining to institutional effectiveness (enrollment trends, faculty expertise, technology, facilities, etc.) needs to be evaluated, but most primarily in the light of student learning outcomes data. The college should ensure that all program reviews include explicit evaluation, analysis, and application of measured student learning outcomes in considering all the data pertaining to a program. It is not likely that such evaluation, analysis, and application of learning outcomes at the

program level will result from the processes directed by the current Program Review Handbook. (Standards I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4)

It is also evident that the college's faculty and staff are not in agreement about what constitutes measurable student learning outcomes. Faculty and staff who met with team members said they were unclear about what learning outcomes were and how they should be defined or how they differed from course objectives. The college's recently revised course outlines, in fact, list outcomes and objectives in a variety of ways, sometimes separating them, sometimes listing Outcomes but not Objectives or vice versa, and sometimes combining the two as Outcomes/Objectives. Further, the sample course syllabi submitted to the team listed objectives, rather than actual outcomes. More discussion needs to take place among faculty and staff about how knowledge or skills used to measure student learning differ from those used to assign a course grade. (Standards I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6)

Conclusions

The college satisfies the requirements of Standard I.B, though it should continue to identify and assess its institutional, program, and course student learning outcomes. Assessment of those outcomes should include psychometrically correct methods that are valid and appropriate for the area under review. The instructional assessment process should ensure the proper alignment between credit course outlines, the domains of knowledge and skills imparted, relevant professional frameworks, and actual classroom instruction. The team encourages the college to implement results for planning and to improve institutional effectiveness.

The college is to be commended for designing the Madera and Clovis writing centers to enhance both academic success and social relationships.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: 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)

Recommendation 2: The team recommends that the college develop, implement, and evaluate a collegewide strategic plan that incorporates the individual planning efforts of the college and centers. The collegewide 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)

Recommendation 3: 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)

STANDARD II

Student Learning Programs and Services

II.A. Instructional Programs

General Comments

It is clear that instructional programs meet the mission and purposes of the institution. Through a revised program review process, vocational advisory committees, and curriculum approval process, the institution ensures that programs and courses are current and relevant. The college seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through comprehensive instructional programs that lead to skill enhancement, degrees, certificates, employment, life-long learning, and transfer to other institutions.

The college has begun the development and implementation of student learning outcomes. The focus so far has been at the institutional level and the development of program, degree, and course level student learning outcomes will follow. The team found no evidence of a written plan for the development, implementation, and assessment of student learning outcomes.

The college has revised its program review process and the next cycle of program review has commenced. The revised process includes a focus on student learning outcomes and institutional effectiveness.

Findings and Evidence

The college has moved toward creating a culture of evidence and is becoming a data-driven institution. It has articulated this commitment in its strategic plan by stating, “systematically gathered and analyzed information is an important tool for improvement of the college over time.” The cornerstone of this data-driven commitment is the college’s revised program review process. The purposes of the program review process are outlined in the Program Review Handbook. One of the purposes of program review is to, “inform integrated planning, resource allocation, and decision-making processes.” Presently, the team could find little evidence that results of current assessments and evaluations are used for planning, decision-making, and resource allocation. The team encourages the college to use the results of this next cycle of program review as a basis for making institutional improvements. (Standard II.A.1a)

The college utilizes a variety of instructional delivery systems and teaching methodologies to meet the diverse learning needs of students. Courses are offered in traditional instructional format as well as distance education (e.g., web-based, interactive voice and video). Learning community models are used and some courses have a service-learning component. The curriculum approval and revision processes provide a means to assess whether the systems and methodologies are consistent with the objectives of instruction. However, the college does not provide evidence that these systems and methodologies meet the learning needs of students. The team could not find evidence that the college has systematically assessed the learning styles and needs of its students. (Standard II.A.1b, II.A.2d)

Reedley College is offering distance education courses (web-based, online) through the Blackboard software platform. For the active courses, the team found that the course information is organized in a very accessible format. The discussion boards for each of the courses showed active student participation. However, the team found that there has been a lack of dialogue between and among faculty and administrators surrounding the development and implementation of online distance education. Additionally, the team could find no evidence of any efforts to evaluate online courses, other than a few examples of student evaluations of their experiences. (Standards II.A.1b, II.A.2d, II.A.2e)

The Reedley College Curriculum Handbook clearly outlines the curriculum development and approval process. The Curriculum Committee reviews the course in one hearing and decides upon it in the second hearing. Once the Curriculum Committee approves the course/program, the campus curriculum committee forwards the course/program to the District Education Coordinating and Planning Council (ECPC). ECPC monitors all curricula at district campuses and forwards a recommendation to the State Center Community College Board of Trustees who grants ultimate approval. Programs that offer Certificates of Achievement and vocational degrees are forwarded to the Central Region Consortium for review. Reviewed programs are sent to the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office for state approval. (Standards II.A.2a, II.A.2b, II.B.2c)

The college has begun the process of developing and implementing student learning outcomes. Some progress has been made toward including student learning outcomes at the course level. However, there appears to be varying levels of understanding among faculty, managers, and committees when it comes to developing and implementing student learning outcomes. There has been little or no progress in developing student learning outcomes for programs and degrees with the exception of some vocational programs, with long standing outcomes as a result of external regulatory requirements and professional standards. In many cases, external evaluations (program reviews) are necessary in order to offer and deliver the program. Where there is examples of course student learning outcomes, there is no evidence that the college regularly assesses student progress towards achievement of outcomes. Most importantly, other than anecdotal and informal reports, there is no documented evidence that assessment results have led to improvements in courses. In general, there is considerable initial development still needed in the area of student learning outcomes for courses, programs, degrees, and certificates. (Standards II.A.1a, II.A.1c, II.A.2a, II.A.2a, II.A.2b, II.A.2e, II.A.2f, II.A.2i, II.A.5)

The college stated in several subsections within Standard II that student needs and community needs are a basis for determining whether to offer instructional programs and that the college will assess these needs. The team could find no evidence of an assessment of student and community needs, nor could the team find any plan for assessing student and community needs. The team encourages the college to systematically assess the learning needs of its students and to assess the needs of the community in designing, developing, and implementing instructional programs. (Standards II.A.1a, II.A.1c)

The college used the results of a student satisfaction/student outcomes survey as evidence in support of various standards under student learning programs. The calculation of response percentages from the survey is very misleading. Neutral responses appear to have been counted as being satisfied. For example, the college reports a 92 percent satisfaction rating for quality of instruction. However, the “very satisfied” and “satisfied” responses only total 75 percent. By adding the “neutral” responses, the total reaches 92 percent. Satisfaction rates are low for many items. For example, variety of courses offered received only a 48 percent satisfaction rating. The survey also reported average ratings for the various survey items and included comparative data from other institutions, but no analysis was provided for these results. Although the results of several survey items indicate a need for improvement, the college offers no plans for addressing the items where improvement is indicated. (Standards II.A.2e, II.A.2f)

Conclusions

The college states that there has been extensive dialogue about student learning outcomes, but the evidence in support of this dialogue revealed only a few workshops, some as long ago as 2001. There appears to be a lack of understanding of student learning outcomes, which indicates a need for a clearer and commonly shared understanding of course objectives and measurable student learning outcomes among those responsible for curriculum development and revision. Faculty, staff, and administrator training in student learning outcomes for courses, programs, and degrees is needed in order to make progress toward standards II.A.1c and II.A.2b. (Standards II.A.1c, II.A.2b)

The college needs to develop processes for assessing student learning outcomes, particularly as they are related to instructional delivery systems and methods. Additionally, the results of program review and the results of other assessments/evaluations (e.g. surveys) must be used for planning, decision-making, and resource allocation. Ultimately, the results of assessment and evaluation should lead to institutional improvements that benefit students, staff, and the college. (Standards II.A.1c, II.A.2b)

If the college intends to grow and expand distance education, it needs to plan more effectively for the infusion and expansion of distance education opportunities. This plan should address technical support issues, faculty training, and an assessment of distance education effectiveness. Additionally, the Curriculum Committee must take a central role in determining appropriateness of distance learning opportunities. (Standards II.A.1b, II.A.2a, II.A.2d, II.A.2e)

The college needs to reexamine the results of the student satisfaction/student outcomes survey and provide a more thorough and accurate interpretation of the results. Where appropriate, the results of some of the survey items should be used as a basis for further investigation and/or institutional improvement.

II.B. Student Support Services

General Comments

The college provides diverse and comprehensive student services that are responsive to the multi-faceted learning and support needs of its student body. There are a variety of programs and services in place to provide support to students as they pursue their educational goals. Several programs are specifically designed to attract, retain, and transfer students, particularly students from targeted, underrepresented populations as well as students with special needs. A sampling of the college's array of programs and services follows and demonstrates the institution's commitment to both challenge students and support them as they strive to attain their education and career objectives:

Title 5 Grant Initiatives – Summer Bridge Program, First Year Experience
CalWORKs
S.A.R.P. – Student-Athlete Retention Program
High Tech Center – lab supporting students with disabilities
Sequoia Residence Halls
Tutorial Center
Upward Bound

Of particular note is the college's Registration-To-Go Program, a year round enrollment process that culminates with an on-site registration program at each high school in the service area. Registration-To-Go provides each student in each high school in the service area the opportunity to apply, test, and register for classes at Reedley College without having to leave their own high school campus and before graduation from high school. Applications are collected at the high schools from September through March. Course placement tests, financial aid workshops, and orientation are provided for feeder high schools during March, April, and May. All eligible students are invited to the on-site registration at their own high school, which includes counseling and advising on course selection. The district communication staff ensures that dedicated telephone lines and wireless access to the Internet are available during the process. (Standard II.B.3a)

Findings and Evidence

To ensure that student support services are viable and of high quality, the various programs that comprise student services are evaluated through the college's program review process. Additionally, the program review process is augmented by annual evaluations in many of the student services program areas through state-mandated and/or federal review. As is the case with student learning programs, student support services has begun the next cycle of program review under the revised program review process. The team found little evidence that the results of previous program reviews were used for planning, decision-making, resource allocation, and institutional improvement. (Standard II.B.1)

On the basis of interviews with faculty and staff and the review of evidence provided, the team determined that the integration of technology into student support services has been a focus for some time as a means to provide appropriate services for students who are

prepared to take advantage of technology-based services. The college has implemented several web-based services for students including the admission application, online forms for key processes, and several registration functions through Web Advisor (Datatel Colleague's web-based enrollment solution). The college is encouraged to move with all deliberate speed in implementing additional web-based services such as fee payment, access to financial aid eligibility information, student education plans, and access to grade history. The Title 5 grant provides the opportunity to develop web-based counseling and advising services and the development of this innovative service delivery is underway. Implementation of a full complement of web-based services will help to mediate the effects of serving increasing numbers of students in a time of fiscal constraint and limited resources. The team uncovered during an open forum meeting held on campus that the college has developed a pilot program designed to address the needs of its lower income student population by having laptop computers available for loan. The college intends to expand the program using grant funding. (Standard II.B.3a)

The primary documents and sources of student services information are the college catalog, schedule of classes, college website, and a variety of other printed materials (brochures, etc.). General college information, requirements, procedures, policies, and references to other related information and documents could be found in these materials. These primary college materials are comprehensive and useful as a reference tool and guide for students as they plan educational experiences. Additionally, these materials are useful to college staff as they serve and guide students during their educational experiences. (Standard II.B.2)

Student services staff has demonstrated a strong commitment to provide access to services. Despite facility limitations and constraints, related services are logically located and efforts have been made to utilize space in the most effective manner possible. Access to services will be enhanced by the continued development and implementation of web-based services. There is some concern that the limited number of computer workstations in the Reedley College Assessment Center hinders the college's ability to efficiently handle student assessment and placement needs during peak registration activity periods. Additionally, it was noted that there is a need for more fully developed job placement services for students.

The college provides a variety of experiences to encourage students to participate in the governance process and other activities on campus. Of particular note is the Dean's Student Advisory Council (D-SAC), which provides students from various clubs and student organizations the opportunity to share opinions and ideas for improving the college. Experiences are available that encourage personal and civic responsibility along with promoting intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all students. The Associated Student Body is very active in stimulating student involvement and school spirit at Reedley College and the North Centers. (Standard II.B.3b)

Counseling and advising services are comprehensive and counselors and support staff deliver services across multiple programs and functional areas. Counselors have been responsible for creating a strong support system for a wide array of student needs including support in the areas of education planning, orientation, assessment, retention,

persistence, student success, probation, and transfer. The college used the results of a student satisfaction/student outcomes survey as evidence in support of various standards under student support services, including counseling and advisement. The calculation of response percentages from the survey is very misleading. Neutral responses appear to have been counted as being satisfied. For example, the college reports a 78 percent satisfaction rating for quality of academic advising. When neutral responses are not counted satisfaction is only 58 percent. This item also had the highest percentage of “very dissatisfied” and “dissatisfied” responses (17 percent), followed closely by career planning services (13 percent) and job placement services (13 percent). The survey also reported average ratings for the various survey items and included comparative data from other institutions, but no analysis was provided for these results. Although the results of several survey items indicate a need for improvement, the college offers no plans for addressing the items where improvement is indicated. Additionally, students from Reedley as well as the North Centers participated in the survey, but the responses are reported in the aggregate. In their present form, the results cannot be used for planning, decision-making, and institutional improvement. (Standards II.B.1, II.B.1c, II.B.3c)

The college’s diverse student body serves in and of itself to promote student understanding and appreciation for diversity. Further, the many student activities, programs, clubs, and events foster a climate of awareness, understanding, and acceptance. Results from the student outcomes/satisfaction survey provide some evidence that efforts are effective, but again the calculation and interpretation of these results needs some reexamination. (Standard II.B.3d)

The college conducted a content validity analysis of course placement instruments in 2002. However, the remaining elements necessary to validate that placement instruments are appropriate and effective have not been completed (cut score determination, disproportionate impact analysis, analysis of bias, etc.). (Standard II.B.3e)

The college maintains and secures student records in accordance with good practice and appropriate state and federal regulatory provisions. The college publishes and follows established policies and procedures for release of student records in accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and state regulatory provision. (Standard II.B.3f)

Student support services are evaluated through the college’s program review process, which is designed to assure that services are meeting student needs. The revised program review process provides for the establishment of student learning outcomes. However, there is no evidence that the evaluation of services contributes to the achievement of student learning outcomes. Additionally, there is no evidence that the results of program review are used to make improvements in student support services. (Standard II.B.4)

Conclusions

The college meets and in many areas exceeds the standards regarding student support services. The team was impressed by the comprehensive array of high quality and innovative student support services to meet the needs of its diverse student body. The

team found student support services to be student-centered and focused on helping students to achieve their education and career goals. Interviews with individual students and groups of students revealed a high level of satisfaction with student support services and programs. The college should take great pride in the efforts and accomplishments of the faculty, staff, and administrators involved with student support services.

The college needs to reexamine the results of the student satisfaction/student outcomes survey and provide a more thorough and accurate interpretation of the results. Particularly for student support services, there were many survey items where students indicated that a service was “very important,” but student satisfaction was low in terms of how the college was delivering on the service. The college provided no analysis of these gaps between importance and satisfaction. The college needs to analyze these findings and use the results of this analysis as a basis for making improvements in student support services.

The team found little or no documented evidence that the college engages in a systematic evaluation of student support services to assure that services are meeting identified student needs. The college needs to fully embrace the program review process for student support services with a focus on using the results of assessment and evaluation to make improvements in student support services. As with other areas of the college, the establishment of a cycle of planning, implementation, evaluation, improvement, and reevaluation will result in improved services to students. (Standards II.B.3, II.B.4)

Historically, student support services have had difficulty documenting and measuring their value and impact on student learning due to a lack of data and evaluation models. They have primarily relied on anecdotal information and sporadic measurements. The college must provide evidence that the utilization of student support services contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. It is understood that this is a new and complex undertaking for most colleges. However, the college must begin working to understand and define the relationship between support services and student learning outcomes in order to improve the effectiveness of these services.

II.C. Library and Learning Resources

General Comments

The Reedley College library offers a range of services including print and non-print materials, tutoring, reference desk, computer laboratories and instruction. There is a large open access computer laboratory in the building adjacent to the tutoring facility and a smaller, open access computer “information commons” in the reference room.

The North Centers Libraries provide some of the same services as the main campus, although in smaller locations. The Reedley College librarians provide professional guidance to the North Centers classified staff, particularly in the areas of collection development and reference service.

The library catalog has been migrated to the Dynix Horizon library automation database and merged with all the other State Center Community College District library holdings into a master union catalog. Students are now able to use any library for their research needs as well as access library databases from off campus.

Findings and Evidence

Staffing remains an issue for Reedley College and the North Centers. The previous team recommended that the college take steps to ensure that professionally trained librarians were available at all library and learning resource sites in the district. This has not happened. There are two professionally trained librarians at Reedley College and none at the North Centers. Two librarians at Reedley College and adjunct librarians provide all the professional services for all locations. Consequently, when the librarians are teaching, working with faculty, or performing circulation or technical services, there may not be reference desk service available to students. The move to larger, more dispersed service areas at the Reedley College Library will compound this problem because the librarians and the classified staff can not always see students waiting for service. (Standards II.C.1a, II.C.1b)

Professional services to students (reference and bibliographic instruction) are not being provided at either of the North Centers libraries. The Reedley College librarians give some guidance to the library classified staff in the area of collection development for books, periodicals and audiovisual materials. The library classified staff have developed some web-based helping guides for students under the direction of the librarians at Reedley College to compensate for the lack of in-house professional help.

The Reedley College Library and Learning Resources do not currently have a formal information competency program. Although an ad hoc information competency committee has been formed, no visible progress had been made. Basic library instruction takes place in some classes, particularly in English. The librarians work with faculty to schedule subject specific orientation workshops for classes. No instruction or service level student learning outcomes have been identified or implemented. (Standards II.A.3b, III.C.1)

Conclusions

Reedley College and the North Centers need to address professional librarian staffing needs, as this was a recommendation from the previous accreditation visit. Student library instruction and reference services need to be locally based in the North Centers. The College should engage in dialogue about the need for the development of information competency into the curriculum of the college.

Recommendations

See Recommendation 1 for Standard I.

Recommendation 4: 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)

Recommendation 5: 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)

Standard III Resources

III.A. Human Resources

General Comments

Human Resources are a shared responsibility between the college and the district. The district allocates positions, oversees hiring and maintains classified personnel records. The college and the North Centers determine faculty disciplines for hiring for both full time and adjunct and maintain faculty personnel records.

The district is rather unique in being a “Merit System” district whereby a separate quasi-governing body oversees the recruitment and hiring process for the classified service. Classified staffing requests involve a process that culminates with approval by three administrators including the president and include a rationale that identifies a relationship to the strategic plan as well as program review mandates and require justification of the relation to college or institutional needs. The self study outlines a challenge the district is grappling with as it attempts to transition a body of “extra-help” employees to permanent status. Budget constraints have apparently delayed a three-year implementation window.

Findings and Evidence

Standard III of the self study identifies resource issues but mentions few planning agendas for solutions.

Staffing levels, when contrasted with comparable colleges or on a statewide basis, seem to be at reasonable levels. Although the self study asserts these numbers are sufficient to meet institutional needs, employee survey feedback suggests otherwise. In response to the adequacy of student support services, only 30 percent felt staffing levels were sufficient. Only 18 percent of respondents felt that technical staffing levels were sufficient and only 17 percent of respondents felt that the full-time to part-time faculty ratios were appropriate. (Standard III.A.2)

The college uses the “Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges” document as the basis to govern the hiring of faculty. There is also an alternative petition for equivalency criteria process. Allocation of faculty positions comes from the district using a process that is not documented. Evaluation of faculty is governed by the faculty agreement. Student learning outcomes are addressed within the context of the contract wording, “responsive to the educational needs of students by exhibiting sensitivity to student goals and aspirations.” These criteria do not include student learning outcome measures. (Standard III.A.1)

Staff Development is embraced for all employees. Portions of lottery funds are dedicated to this purpose. The Faculty bargaining unit reflects increased release time for staff development activities. The Classified unit has also embraced this notion and the district promotes a formal six-month program for classified career advancement. The district also underwrites an annual Classified Mega Conference designed to build communication

and team spirit. A very significant 84 percent of survey respondents felt the College did embrace the concept of staff development. (Standards III.A.5a, III.A.5b)

The team determined that the college has not developed an institutional code of ethics and strongly encourages the development of such through a collaborative process. (Standard III.A.1d)

Diversity is overtly recognized in the State Center Community College District strategic plan. The Reedley College Mission Statement also recognizes the institution as being committed to a student focused, diverse learning environment. The college's philosophy reflects an institution that recognizes and supports a diverse learning community. This commitment is evidenced through a group of committees, reports, and programs. (Standard III.A.4)

Conclusions

A comprehensive Affirmative Action Plan was prepared by the District during the 2000-2001 year. Since the passage of California Proposition 209, the legal landscape surrounding the status of affirmative action has remained somewhat unclear. The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office indicated that a plan for promoting diversity would be released in January 2006. Until further clarity is provided in this area, the district is continuing to follow Equal Employment Opportunity Commission guidelines and offering related training to those involved in the hiring process.

The college should continue to develop and implement in its faculty evaluation process a component that measures their ability to achieve student learning outcomes. (Standard III.A.1c)

The Classified Senate is to be commended for its staff development and leadership program.

III.B. Physical Resources

General Comments

This district is challenged with its rapidly growing population and large service area. The district has recognized the shortcomings of relying solely on state resources to fund facility modernization and new construction. The district was successful with a local bond measure recently and appears to be maximizing resources in this area by leveraging additional state resources with local bond proceeds. The district has further sought out joint use partnerships with a local school district and funding opportunities available through legislation designed specifically for such joint use functions.

Findings and Evidence

Reedley College has three affiliated educational centers in the communities of Clovis, Madera and Oakhurst. The Clovis and Madera centers have achieved the necessary enrollment thresholds and are recognized by the California Post-Secondary Education Commission (CPEC). The education center in Oakhurst was established under

Legislative Mandate, SB 1607, in 1995. The provisions of that bill became inoperative in 2000. Enrollments at the Oakhurst facility are not sufficient to otherwise sustain official status as an education center. Interviews with staff indicate a strategic direction that will eventually grow the Madera and Clovis centers into colleges. (Standard III.B.1)

The district has a planning process in place for equipping facilities. Local general fund and decision package funds as well as state and federal resources are mentioned as funding opportunities. There is also some reliance on local bond proceeds to help equip new facilities. Many districts are faced with the conundrum of using long-term debt (general obligation bonds) to acquire relatively short-lived furnishings and equipment for new and modernized facilities. While for many institutions this is not entirely avoidable, the use of long-term debt for such activities should be scrutinized. (Standards III.B.1a, III.B.1b, III.B.2a, III.B.2b)

Conclusion

Total cost of ownership is mentioned in relation to compliance with this standard. Reference is made to cost of equipment and related operational and maintenance of equipment. As noted elsewhere in this report, true total cost of ownership would also look at increased utility cost as well as operational and maintenance staffing issues that are discussed elsewhere in this report. The college should consider more closely examining the total cost of ownership of new facilities.

III.C. Technology Resources

General Comments

Technology planning and assessment occurs in a hierarchical structure of district and college committees. It is not evident that this structure can facilitate improving student learning outcomes or creating measures of success.

Findings and Evidence

Survey results reported in the self study indicated mixed feelings about the adequacy of technology software and hardware. The team found through interviews that there was general unease about the college's commitment to review and update its technology infrastructure. Stronger feelings were voiced about a lack of sufficient technology support staff. The college, in recognition of this input, has hired an Information Technology Director. (Standards III.C.1, III.C.1a, III.C.1c, III.C.1d)

The team found that training opportunities are met both through a general staff development and specific technology training seminars. One of largest impediments to a more comprehensive approach is the lack of a complete technology plan. (Standards III.C.1b, III.C.2)

There is a willingness to use qualitative and quantitative data to measure progress toward student learning outcomes. However, users are frustrated by lack of access to Datatel Colleague data. (Standard III.C.2)

Network reliability could be hampered by the lack of a disaster recovery plan and privacy and security policies.

Conclusions

The college meets this standard, however, the team suggests that the college investigate providing user level access to Datatel Colleague data resources, complete the network upgrade, and integrate a local disaster recovery plan and privacy and security policies with district plans and policies. The college should consider using an appropriate model, such as total cost of ownership, to anticipate budget requirements to keep the technology infrastructure current.

III.D. Financial Resources

General Comments

The budget development process outlines the collaborative nature of the district budget building cycle. Financial resource planning is integrated with institutional planning and it is done so through several major governance committees including the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC), Strategic Planning Council (SPC) and President's Cabinets (President's Cabinet and President's Augmented Cabinet). The budget development calendar reflects interaction between college and district personnel. The Reedley College Strategic Plan serves as a guideline for annual college budget development. Priorities are established by the President, but with input from governance committees.

Findings and Evidence

The voters in the State Center Community College District approved a \$161 million General Obligation Bond Measure under the rules established by Proposition 39. As such, the district must comply with certain requirements, including the establishment of a Citizens' Oversight Committee and the commissioning of annual performance and financial audits. Information on the district web site indicates such compliance activities have been addressed. One issuance of \$20 million has been made since the most recent audit. As noted elsewhere in this report, as a long-term strategy toward maintaining these newly developed facilities, the district should systematically examine the total cost of ownership. (Standard III.D.2)

A review of recent collective bargaining agreements indicates a practice of linking a portion of pay raises to performance objectives. Interviews with staff indicate this has been a longstanding practice. Conditioning a portion of salary enhancement to the securing of growth funding aligns the interests of the bargaining unit and the district and fairly allocates risk and reward to both parties. (Standards III.D.2c, III.D.2d, III.D.2f)

The district's reserve level is well in excess of the minimum prudent level of five percent. For the 2003-04 fiscal year, the Annual Fiscal Report indicates an operating surplus for the college in excess of \$2.7 million. The unrestricted reserve for that same period is 14.7 percent. Reports indicate the district as a whole has a similarly robust reserve level. The college is to be commended for maintaining such a healthy reserve level. Staff reported it was the magnitude of the reserves that allowed the district to weather the

budget crisis of fiscal year 2002-03 without significant attrition. (Standards III.D.2d, III.D.2e, III.D.2f)

In addition to legally mandated annual external audits, the district's financial management practices are also scrutinized through program review and evaluation. Monthly meetings are held with district and college business and finance staff. The organizational structure is such that information can flow either centrally from the district office to the college or from college personnel to the district office. Within the last few years, an important change in the district's financial management practices has taken place. The colleges are now allowed to keep all reserves, whereas in the recent past only non-salary balances remained with the colleges. This step has not only prompted more rational budgeting, it has, more fundamentally, aligned the interests and motivations of the colleges with the district office. (Standards III.D.2e, III.D.2g)

There is an Intra-district allocation of funding, but the criteria are not published nor is it understood how it works. The budget allocation of the North Centers is separate to Reedley College. Knowledge of the budget process is low according to the employee survey. Although no dissatisfaction was noted with the funding allocation practice used to distribute funds to the college and center sites, the college may wish to consider developing a written policy addressing fund allocation. (Standard III.D.2b)

Conclusions

Although no dissatisfaction was noted with the funding allocation practice used to distribute funds to the college and center sites, the team encourages the college to consider developing a written policy addressing fund allocation. In addition, the team suggests that the district systematically examine the total cost of ownership as a long-term strategy toward maintaining these newly developed facilities.

The college is to be commended for its healthy and stable budget reserves. The new practice of allowing the college to retain all carryover funds encourages better budgeting practices and aligns the interests of the college and the district.

Recommendations

See recommendations for Standards I and II.

Standard IV Leadership and Governance

General Comments

The self study report appears to adequately address the elements of Standard IV. Reedley College uses a large number of standing and ad hoc committees with representation from all constituencies to establish a participative planning and governance procedure. Governance structures and policies support the participation of faculty, classified staff, students and administrators in planning and decision-making processes. A strategic planning process, begun in 2000 in response to a recommendation from the previous accreditation team, involved large numbers of community members, faculty, staff, students and administrators in a series of meetings to review the mission, core values, and seven draft strategic directions for the college. The program review process, which was recently evaluated and modified to more explicitly address the identification and assessment of student learning outcomes, also systematically and regularly involves faculty and staff in planning and decision-making.

Despite these structures, some significant concerns were voiced about a lack of productive, free-flowing dialogue among administrators and faculty and staff (Standard IV.A.1). There were also some concerns voiced about the increasing separation between the North Centers and Reedley College and a definite split in the perceptions around the eventual establishment of at least one Center as a separate college. North Centers' faculty, staff and administrators are purposefully planning for this separation with the support of the Board of Trustees. Other perceptions on the Reedley campus questioned the necessity for and wisdom of a separate strategic plan.

Findings and Evidence

The Board of Trustees has recently undertaken a review and revision of its policies and administrative regulations to better reflect accreditation standards, following the Community College League of California models. While much of the policy has been reviewed and revised, none has yet been fully implemented as the district has decided to complete all changes and replace all policies at one time. This situation has left the college in a somewhat ambiguous situation because many of the new policies have been officially adopted, but are awaiting the completion of the administrative regulations before being implemented. (Standards IV.A.1, IV.A.2a)

IV.A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Comments

Reedley College has a congenial atmosphere, and team interaction with faculty, staff and administrators confirmed the deep sense of pride in their college. The large number of committees and the membership lists and agenda of such committees as the President's Augmented Cabinet, Program Review Committee, Facilities Committee and Strategic Planning Council, demonstrate that the college provides many opportunities for involvement of administration, faculty, staff and students. Importantly, given the plans for the eventual separate institutional status of the North Centers, specific committees

have been formed to allow the faculty, staff and students of these centers to develop their forums, as well. Communication is reported to have improved between the North Centers and Reedley College because of the upgrade to the audio and video technology connection, which the team's experience confirmed. However, access to the technology is limited and not all intercampus meetings allow the use of the technology. For example, Curriculum Committee meetings must be conducted in person. This exception may put a particular burden upon the North Centers faculty to continue the kind of active and engaged dialogue critically needed to develop student learning outcomes throughout the curriculum. (Standards IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.3)

Moreover, the self study report indicated the continuing need to publicize and support these channels of communication. More critically, there was some sense that, on the Reedley campus, dialogue among all constituency groups is not taking place as well as is desired. Despite the collegial structures, there is a perception among a number of faculty and staff that planning is top down. The relationships among new administrators and faculty are still emerging and there were concerns voiced about leadership style. Further, there is a perception that institutional leaders are not currently meeting the challenge to create an environment that promotes empowerment of faculty and staff. (Standards IV.A.1, IV.A.2)

Findings and Evidence

A Committee on Committees was established to review the plethora of groups established over the years with sometimes overlapping charges and responsibilities. These groups included the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Program Review Committee, Facilities Committee, and Strategic Planning Council—over thirty in all when the North Centers committees are included. The Committee on Committees produced an inventory of committees with a standard format description and made a set of recommendations aimed at creating a participatory and inclusive approach and a written College Planning and Governance Plan. It is important for the college to implement these recommendations. The disconnect among these committees could adversely affect the strategic planning process, which is just beginning. An integrated planning process will not be achieved and the input from all the constituencies represented on these committees might be lost if the connection is not made. (Standards IV.A.1, IV.A.2, IV.A.3, IV.A.5)

Data underlying planning, as well as planning documents themselves, are available through the college's website and intranet. Such events as the "duty day" forums at the beginning of each semester and the monthly President's Forum keep the various campuses informed of major activities. The survey results listed in the self study further validate that the majority of the employees perceive the environment of the college as encouraging of widespread commitment to institutional improvement. Faculty leadership is demonstrated in academic decision-making through such standard avenues as the Curriculum Committee. In addition, the faculty and staff of the programs drive the program review process, which has just completed its first full cycle. Various written policies including district Board policies, the union contract, and the Academic Senate bylaws also clearly outline the involvement of appropriate constituents. (Standards IV.A.2, IV.A.2b, IV.A.3, IV.A.5)

Conclusion

Reedley College responded appropriately to the recommendations of the previous accreditation team and has shared its self study and reports with both internal and external constituents. Board policies have been completely reviewed and extensively revised to ensure compliance with ACCJC standards. Progress on the strategic plan is reviewed annually and reported to the Board and shared with the college community and the public. (Standard IV.A.4)

The team wants to commend the college for the inclusiveness of its new Facilities Committee. The team encourages the college to consider this committee as a model for other college committees.

IV.B. Board and Administrative Organization

Findings and Evidence

Board policies clearly state duties and responsibilities with respect to ensuring educational quality and appropriate concerns of a governing board in accordance with Commission standards. The extensive work that has gone into the review and revision of Board policies to reflect ACCJC language is evidence of the commitment of the Board to its responsibilities. The district website gives access to some of these newly revised policies, specifically chapters 1-5. Appropriate processes ensure that the Board is the final approval body for educational programs, strategic planning, budgeting and other fiscal matters. (Standard IV.B.1)

However, sections on Human Resources and Business and Fiscal Affairs are not yet accessible on the website. As noted in the self study report, the accompanying Administrative Regulations are still under development and none are on the website. As the Board policies themselves are, appropriately, quite brief and unspecific as to implementation, the completion of administrative regulations is an important step. Among these new policies, for which Administrative Regulations have not yet been adopted are those addressing the selection and evaluation of the Chancellor, the Board's own code of ethics, and Board self-evaluation (Standards IV.A, IV.B.1)

The college is working toward establishing iterative processes of assessment, evaluation, and improvement through such mechanisms as program review. On a governance level, that commitment is seen in the new Committee on Committees and the review and evaluation of the effectiveness of the program review process itself. As noted above, on the district level there is also progress toward regular evaluation and improvement of Board of Trustee policies and practices. The district provides leadership through such mechanisms as the District Strategic Plan and District wide committees. The Chancellor has regular meetings with the leadership team, including administrators, faculty, staff, and students.

There are clear lines of responsibility from the Board to the Chancellor and thence to the college president and vice chancellor. The president of Reedley College and the North

Centers vice chancellor further delegates day-to-day operations to appropriate deans or other administrators. Faculty, classified staff and students also have their recognized governance organizations such as the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and Associated Student Body as well as the large number of committees. (Standards IV.B.2a, IV.B.2b)

The unique circumstances of the relationship between the Reedley College main campus and the North Centers seems to be effectively addressed under the current structure. The data listed in the self study report indicates that the combined enrollment of the North Centers is actually greater than that of the main campus, and that the distance of the North Centers from the main campus is a continual challenge to coordination and dialogue. The establishment of a chief executive officer for the North Centers reporting directly to the system chancellor is part of the recently completed North Centers strategic plan, which is serving as a transition plan for the eventual establishment of a Center as a separate entity, the third college of the district. The North Centers constitute a separate line item in the State Center Community College District budget and thus the two CEOs can have control, responsibility and be held accountable for their own budgets. There are still overlapping areas of service, and continual communication among the Reedley president, North Centers Vice Chancellor and the Chancellor and the faculty and staff is essential. (Standards IV.B.2d, IV.B.3, IV.B.3a, IV.B.3e)

The North Centers have recently formed an Institutional Oversight and Budget Committee. The committee's operating procedures and policies indicate that the group was created, "to assess and improve upon the existing process of evaluation, planning, and improvement for the North Centers, with an emphasis on the North Centers' strategic planning and implementation processes. (Standard IV.B.3g)

Conclusions

The college meets this Standard. The revisions underway in Board of Trustees policies are clearly in response to ACCJC Standards. However, the implementation of Administrative Regulations has not been completed, and while the process for the development of the regulations is clear, there is no timeline. The Board of Trustees needs to revisit the self-evaluation process to ensure that ACCJC standards are met. (Standard IV.B.1j)

Participative governance in the college would benefit from increased open and honest dialogue, which is informed by both qualitative and quantitative data about student and community needs, student achievement and student learning outcomes. Communication among and between faculty, classified staff, administrators and students would better accommodate student learning if the roles of each constituency were uniformly recognized and appreciated.

Recommendations

See recommendations for Standards I and II.