EVALUATION REPORT APRIL 2013

Barstow Community College
2700 Barstow Road, Barstow, CA 92311

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 Follow-Up team that visited
Barstow Community College on April 15-16, 2013

Dr. Roger Schultz – Mt. San Jacinto College
Dr. Katherine McLain – Cosumnes River College
Ms. Beth Gomez – Mt. San Jacinto College
Mr. Steven Reynolds – College of the Siskiyous

Date: May 10, 2013

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

From: Dr. Roger Schultz, Team Chair

Subject: Evaluation Report of Follow-Up Visit Team to Barstow
                Community College, April 15-16, 2013

Introduction

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) placed Barstow College on Warning at its June 2012 meeting for a number of deficiencies in relation to the standards, which are outlined in the visiting team report from March 2012. The 2012 visiting team identified 13 recommendations to address in order for the college to meet the accreditation standards. In its June 2012 action, the ACCJC requested a follow-up report focused on 11 of the 13 original recommendations, along with a site visit. A follow-up site visit was conducted by four members of the 2012 team on April 15 and 16, 2013. The visiting team included: Dr. Roger Schultz, team chair, Dr. Katherine McLain, Mrs. Beth Gomez and Mr. Steven Reynolds. The purpose of the visit was to assess and validate the college's follow-up report and progress in addressing the deficiencies and meeting the standards of the focused recommendations.

The follow up report and visit focused on the following 11 recommendations:

Recommendation 1: …the College further define and clarify in sufficient operational detail the conceptual planning models to include responsible positions and parties, timelines, linkages and the ongoing and systematic evaluation of its planning processes (I.A.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, I.B.7).

Recommendation 2: …the College move towards a fully interactive distance education platform that includes regular and effective instructor contact, and documentation of that contact. (II.A.l.b, II.A.2.d)

Recommendation 3: …the College must act immediately to:
- Complete and document all student learning outcomes (SLOs) for all courses and programs (II.A.l.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.e, II.B .4)
- Distribute the student learning outcomes (SLOs) to students (II.A.6)

- Distribute the student learning outcomes (SLOs) to adjunct faculty (I.B.5)
- Document assessment at all levels of outcomes, including course, program, core competencies (I.B.7, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.e, II.B.4)
- Document improvement in student learning (II.A.l.c, II.B.4)
- Link evidence of student learning outcome (SLO) assessment to planning and resource allocation
  (I.B, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, III.D.3).

Recommendation 4: …the institution develop appropriate planning documents to integrate institutional planning efforts: a) Strategic Plan; b) Human Resources Staffing Plan; c) Facilities Master Plan; Professional Development Plan (I.B.3, III.A.5.a, III.A.5.b, III.A.6, III.B).

Recommendation 5: …the College establish a systematic evaluation process to generate data that will inform opportunities for improvement in all governance structures, institutional processes, and practices (I.B.7, IV.A.5).

Recommendation 7: …the College refine and fully implement the process which clearly links resource allocation with integrated institutional planning. The team also recommends that the resource allocation and planning process include setting priorities for funding institutional improvements (III.D, III.D.l, III.D.l.a, III.D.l.d).

Recommendation 8: …the College establish funding priorities that clearly links to the institutional goals, strategic priorities and mission statement. The team also recommends that items which impact student learning are given funding priority. (I.B, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, III.D.3, III.D.l, III.D.l.a, III.D.l.b).

Recommendation 10: …the College clarify institutional priorities and streamline the budget process to insure that the result of program reviews are closely aligned with all institutional goals (I.B, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, III.D.3).

Recommendation 11: … the College develop a method that provides a direct linkage in the planning process to the resource allocation process for technology and distance education, and secure an identifiable, stable and ongoing budget for those activities (III.C .l.a, III.C.l.d).

Recommendation 12: …all College units develop systems to completely implement and sustain program review across the institution resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning (I.B.3, I.B.7, II.A.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.2, III.D.3, IV.A.1, IV.A.5, IV.B.2.b).

Recommendation 13: …the College strengthen its ability to implement, document and evaluate its plans to support ongoing and systematic dialog about institutional effectiveness (I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5).

In preparation of the visit the team members reviewed the 2012 team report and the college's 2013 Follow-Up report. The team also reviewed the evidence provided by the college as part of that report. Prior to the actual visit the team requested to meet with key Barstow College personnel during the visit along with viewing additional evidence. The visit commenced on the morning of April 15th and ended mid-day on April 16th. During that time the team met with the personnel identified in advance, as well as people requested during the visit. The college was very cooperative and efficient in setting the needed meetings and in providing the requested additional evidence in a timely manner. The team visited with the Interim Superintendent President, the Academic Senate President, the members of the President's Cabinet (this includes all of the VP's), the dean of research, planning and development (also the accreditation liaison officer), the web coordinator, the distance education coordinator, key faculty and staff from the relevant committees such as the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and Strategic Planning Committee, as well as distance education faculty.

Review of the follow-up report and the evidence, along with the numerous interviews, validated for the visiting team that Barstow College has made great strides in a very short period of time in an effort to address the recommendations and meet the standards. The team was impressed with the campus-wide commitment to meeting the standards and how much progress was made on so many aspects of the 11 recommendations. It was also not just the progress made that impressed the team, but how fundamentally their actions were rooted and becoming embedded in their campus culture. The college has made significant progress and meets the standards now. Overall, the college should be commended for the quality of its efforts and the resulting outcomes.

The following pages contain a more detailed listing of each recommendation, the findings and evidence related to that recommendation, and the resulting assessment and conclusion.

Discussion of the College Responses to the Team Recommendations

Recommendation 1: In order to fully meet the standards, the team recommends that the College further define and clarify in sufficient operational detail the conceptual planning models to include responsible positions and parties, timelines, linkages and the ongoing and systematic evaluation of its planning processes (I.A.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, I.B.7).

Findings and Evidence:

1. Include responsible parties and timelines:

The College has further defined and clarified its conceptual planning model by annotating its Planning and Program Review Cycle diagram to specify responsible parties and timelines. This diagram is posted at prominent spots across the campus. The College has also created an Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) Task Timetable and a Budget Timeline to provide additional details about the Planning and Program Review Cycle.

The College has edited its Program Review Templates and Budget Proposals and Budget to support its new Program Review and Planning Cycle and is in the process of developing a Program Review Handbook. The charge of the IEC has been edited to explicitly identify its responsibilities with respect to the ongoing implementation, assessment and modification (as needed) of the College's Program Review and Planning Cycle. The College has created the Program Review Committee, a sub-committee of the IEC, to assist them with this task.

2. Further define and clarify its planning model to include linkages:

The linkages between various aspects of the College's planning processes have been clarified through the development of a Mission/Goals crosswalk. This crosswalk identifies linkages between the College's Mission, the College's Strategic Priorities, the Board Goals, the President's Goals and the Educational Master Plan.

In addition, the College created an ad hoc cross-constituency group to complete its three–year Strategic Plan. This plan is linked explicitly to the Program Review and Resource Allocation process and indirectly to the Mission and the Educational Master Plan through the Mission/Goals crosswalk.

The College's efforts in this area could be strengthened if they disseminated the diagrams in its Educational Master Plan and previous Self-Study that show the relationships between its college-wide plans to the College community.

3. *Further define and clarify its planning model to include ongoing assessment and modification:*

The College has incorporated multiple feedback loops and an annual summative assessment in its Program Review and Planning Cycle. The College had just implemented this cycle for the first time when the team visited. The team found evidence that the newly implemented process had been formally and informally evaluated and that the individuals and groups involved with the process had already identified changes that should be made to enhance its effectiveness. There may be a need to formalize these feedback loops to ensure the feedback is recorded and discussed within the IEC committee meetings. This could be accomplished if the Vice Presidents attended the IEC meetings on a more regular basis.

The Progress Report indicated that the Office of Institutional Effectiveness along with the IEC will monitor the College's progress toward achieving the goals and objectives outlined in the Strategic Plan. Interviews indicated that the College community was not aware of how the Strategic Plan would be institutionalized and/or replicated in the future. The College may need to provide more operational detail about how it will implement, assess and generate its next Strategic Plan.

Conclusion: The team believes that the College has addressed this Recommendation and now meets the standards. One cycle of the Program Review and Planning Cycle has already been completed and has been well received by the College community. The College is clearly engaged in evaluating and enhancing this process. These facts, combined with the Board's stated commitment to an integrated system of planning, ensure that the College's efforts in this area will continue.

Recommendation 2: In order to fully meet the standards and address the previous recommendation, and to meet U.S.D.E. regulatory requirements for distance education, the team recommends that the College move towards a fully interactive distance education platform that includes regular and

effective instructor contact, and documentation of that contact. (II.A.l.b, II.A.2.d)

Findings and Evidence:

1. Movement toward a fully interactive distance education platform:

The team found that the college is still using its homegrown learning management system (LMS). The college reported in its follow-up report that it was working on developing a new portal system and LMS. The college had contracted with a third-party vendor to develop the portal and to adapt the Moodle LMS platform to the college's needs. Since the writing of the Follow-Up Report, the college had run into difficulty working with the third-party vendor. The vendor was unresponsive to the college's inquiries and did not help the college fix problems that surfaced in the system. During the spring 2013 semester, the Distance Education Committee decided to cease working with this third-party vendor and instead develop the college's Moodle platform without external assistance.

The team interviewed faculty who teach online, the Webmaster, and the Distance Education Coordinator. The Webmaster and her staff have been working on developing the Moodle platform on their own without assistance from the vendor. They report that their efforts have been successful. They will inaugurate Moodle in Summer 2013 by piloting 16 online classes. If all goes well, 50% of the of the college's online courses will be taught using Moodle in Fall 2013, and they expect 100% of Barstow's online courses to be using Moodle in spring 2014.

The team was concerned about faculty orientation and training on the new Moodle LMS. The Webmaster and Distance Education Coordinator explained that all instructors who teach online are required to complete training in online course design and management. The College has created a number of self-guided tutorials that online instructors must complete. The team reviewed these homegrown tutorials, which train the instructors how to operate the homegrown LMS. After instructors have completed all of the modules in this online instructor training, they receive a certificate in online instruction from Barstow College. In addition, the college pays for instructors to complete Moodle training through @One to receive certification in the Moodle LMS.

The Distance Education Coordinator reported that 20% of the online faculty have completed Level 1 training. Level 1 training includes effective course management and online teaching strategies. The Level 2 training for faculty includes more nuts & bolts of operating the LMS. He also reported that Moodle has been installed on the distance education servers. Moodle training for students is under construction. The Webmaster reported that the student training will be moderated but it will also be optional. Students who enrolled in classes that use Moodle will be directed to an assessment to determine their skill level. Depending on their assessment results, students will be directed to the Moodle training.

2. Regular and effective instructor contact and documentation of that contact:

The webmaster claimed that the Instructional Technology Center staff review online courses for practices of regular and effective contact between instructor and students and between students and students. The staff uses a rubric to assess the regular and effective contact in online classes. The staff has access to all the online classes, and they make periodic visits. They visit, and will continue to visit, the instructors' classes every semester for courses that fall below the college's standards for retention and success or for courses that receive student complaints. If the instructor is found to have insufficient contact with students, the webmaster refers the instructor to additional training. The findings of insufficient contact are not used in the instructor's formal evaluation.

The team was given access to online courses. The courses that the team reviewed showed that there was indeed regular contact between students and instructors, even using the homegrown system. A review of the instructor training tutorials showed that in the training for discussion forums, instructors were encouraged to participate regularly in their class discussions, providing feedback to students.

Conclusion: Because of problems with the third party vendor, the college was unable to move to the Moodle platform in fall 2012 as originally planned. The college is just now piloting a very small number of courses using the new Moodle platform, and they will increase the number of classes using Moodle in summer 2013. Their goal is to have 100% of online classes consistently using Moodle in spring 2014. Even with these setbacks, the

college has been able to work with its homegrown LMS to provide plenty of interactivity for students and instructors. The team reviewed a number of courses and found ongoing discussions between students and instructors. The college's system for assessing regular and effective contact in online courses has had a positive impact on the quality of online instruction. The College has made significant progress toward addressing concerns related to student contact. However, the implementation of a fully interactive distance education platform has not yet been completed and the college only partially meets the Standards.

Recommendation 3: In order to meet the standard and achieve the commission's requirements for implementation of learning outcomes assessment for 2012, the team recommends that the College must act immediately to:

- Complete and document all student learning outcomes (SLOs) for all courses and programs (II.A.l.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.e, II.B .4)

- Distribute the student learning outcomes (SLOs) to students (II.A.6)

- Distribute the student learning outcomes (SLOs) to adjunct faculty (I.B.5)

- Document assessment at all levels of outcomes, including course, program, core competencies (I.B.7, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.e, II.B.4)

- Document improvement in student learning (II.A.l.c, II.B.4)

- Link evidence of student learning outcome (SLO) assessment to planning and resource allocation
(I.B, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, III.D.3).

Findings and Evidence:

1. Complete and document all student learning outcomes (SLOs) for all courses and programs:

The college has used its curriculum development process to update all course outlines to include student learning outcomes. Every course and program that is taught at the college has documented SLOs. Those courses

which currently do not have SLOs identified are scheduled to be archived before the end of the academic year and will no longer be taught.

2. Distribute the student learning outcomes (SLOs) to students:

All instructors, full-time and part-time, are required to include student learning outcomes and course objectives on their syllabi. The Faculty Handbook states that student learning outcomes must be included in the syllabi. Faculty comply with this requirement. The team reviewed a number of syllabi, including syllabi for online courses, and found evidence that SLOs are indeed distributed to students. The Office of Academic Affairs collects syllabi for all courses from faculty at the beginning of each term, both distance education courses and traditional courses. The Office of Academic Affairs reviews the syllabi for compliance and makes recommendations to faculty to fix deficient syllabi within the first week of class.

3. Distribute the student learning outcomes (SLOs) to adjunct faculty:

SLOs and course learning objectives are included on the official course outlines. Adjunct faculty receive copies of the course outlines prior to teaching their assigned classes. As stated in the Faculty Handbook, all faculty are required to teach their courses according to the information contained in the official course outlines. The Vice President of Academic Affairs ensures that adjunct instructors receive copies of the official course outlines when they are given a teaching assignment.

4. Document assessment at all levels of outcomes, including course, program, core competencies:

The college has made significant progress on this part of Recommendation 3. The college has created a template for a form that faculty complete at the end of every term, a for in which they report assessment results and plans for improvement. SLOs are assessed at all levels: course level, program level, and institutional core competencies. The institutional core competencies are mapped to the course level SLOs. This mapping is included on the assessment reporting form. In addition, the college has created a website where these assessment forms are published. These assessment reports include class identification data, the text of the SLO being assessed, information about the SLO's link to core competencies, the assessment

method used, other information about the assessment method such as sampling information if relevant, a brief analysis and summary of the data collected, and descriptions of improvement plans that are based on the assessment results. This information is collected on nearly every course during a semester. In one academic year, every course is expected to be reported. Summary assessment data may be reported in program reviews, where they are analyzed and used to determine the necessary improvements for courses and programs.

5. Document improvement in student learning:

Assessment results for course level SLOs are contained in the online assessment reports. In these online reports, faculty discuss the assessment data and create plans for improvement. The team reviewed a number of these online assessment reports and found that the college is tracking assessment results semester after semester. Currently, the college has published three semesters of assessment data from fall 2011 to fall 2012, including data for courses that have been taught every semester. The college has the capability to track whether course improvements have led to increased student learning of the SLOs. After several more semesters of data collection, the college will be able to conduct trend analysis to document how changes to courses and programs have affected students achievement of the SLOs.

6. Link evidence of student learning outcome (SLO) assessment to planning and resource allocation:

The college's program review document attempts to link SLO assessment data to planning and resource allocation. The document includes a section where faculty can discuss assessment results as they pertain to their programs and disciplines. The team reviewed the program review template and found that there is a section where faculty are to respond to the question: "Summarize the progress your program has made on program and/or course level SLO measures you have applied since your last program review." They also respond to a follow-up question describing program or course improvements made as a result of assessment data and a second follow-up question in which they articulate a plan for completing the assessment cycle. In the section that follows, they are to provide more detailed analysis of "Supporting Assessment Data," but this is not

necessarily for SLO assessment data. Faculty may use other data to assess the strength of their programs, including completion and transfer data. Based on that data analysis, the next section of the program review document asks for new program goals, linking program goals to the institutional goals as expressed in the strategic plan; and then faculty identify resource requests needed to accomplish those goals.

In the program review document the link between resource requests and SLOs may be direct or indirect, depending on the resource that is being requested. For example, an equipment request for software upgrade may directly impact student achievement of an SLO; however, a human resource request for an additional faculty member will not necessarily improve student achievement of SLOs, but the additional instructor will make it possible for a new class to be offered or for more sections of a class to be offered, thus increasing the number of students who can participate in the SLOs and assessments.

Conclusion: Barstow College continues to make progress and improvements on its cyclical implementation of SLOs and assessments. It has increased the number of faculty both full-time and part-time who participate in SLOs and assessment. It has moved toward full compliance in having all courses and programs identify student learning outcomes. All faculty are required to teach their courses following the SLOs, objectives, and assessment methods as identified in the official course outlines. SLOs are published in syllabi so that students know what is expected in each course and program. The college has integrated SLOs and assessment into its program and institutional planning and evaluation processes and into its resource allocation processes by including SLO assessment and other assessment measures in program reviews. The college is accountable to its students and to the public in publishing its assessment results online. The college has made substantial progress and has partially addressed this recommendation.

Recommendation 4: In order to fully meet the standards, the team recommends that the institution develop appropriate planning documents to integrate institutional planning efforts: a) Strategic Plan; b) Human Resources Staffing Plan; c) Facilities Master Plan; Professional Development Plan (I.B.3, III.A.5.a, III.A.5.b, III.A.6, III.B).

Findings and Evidence:

1. Strategic Plan:

The College completed its Strategic Plan, which is linked explicitly to the Program Review and Resource Allocation processes and linked implicitly to the Mission and the Educational Master Plan through the Mission/Goals crosswalk. The Strategic Plan provides the framework for the College's Program Review and Resource Allocation processes.

2. Facilities Master Plan:

The College updated its Facilities Master Plan based on a) an audit of the facilities needs and projections for future growth outlined in the Educational Master Plan, b) the College's Strategic Plan, c) information from end users and d) environmental changes that have occurred since the generation of these two documents. The implementation of this plan will be assessed annually by the Facilities Committee. Although the Facilities Master Plan provides a framework for future facilities development, there is currently no process at the college to identify and reallocate existing space to meet the needs identified through the program review process.

3. Professional Development (PD) Plan:

The College has conducted a survey and engaged in conversations about PD needs with various campus groups including the President's Advisory Council, the President's Cabinet, and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. At the time of the visit the College had used this information to generate a training plan for the remainder of the 2013 calendar year. The anticipated completion date for the Professional Development Plan (as stated in the Strategic Plan and confirmed by interviews) is the end of the 2014-15 academic year. There are currently no plans to develop an interim Professional Development schedule prior to the completion of this plan. Although the development of the PD Plan has been assigned to an individual, the process and group responsible for developing this plan were not clearly identified at the time of the visit. The progress report indicated that information from Program Review was going to be incorporated into the Professional Development Planning process. However, interviews with College personnel indicated this was a future goal.

4. Human Resources Staffing Plan:

The Human Resources Plan is currently in its initial stages and the anticipated completion date (as stated in the Strategic Plan and confirmed by interviews) is the end of the 2014-15 academic year. During the visit, the team was only able to glean that very general information about the process that will be used to generate this plan. Steps included evaluating current effectiveness, reviewing best practices, and using Program Review data through the Institutional Effectiveness Committee.

5. Integrate institutional planning efforts:

Documentation and interviews with staff clearly demonstrated the integration between the Strategic Plan and other College planning processes and plans. Although interviews demonstrated that the new Facilities Plan was integrated with other college planning processes and plans, this integration is not readily apparent in a review of the documentation provided to the visiting team. The team found one diagram showing the relationships between the broader institutional plans in the Educational Master Plan and another diagram showing the integration in the previous Self-Study. The College community did not seem to be aware of these diagrams. For this reason, it is recommended that these diagrams be updated to show the anticipated completion dates for the plans under development then disseminated to the broader college community.

Conclusion: The team believes that the College has partially addressed this Recommendation and now partially meets the standards. This reflects the fact that: a) two of the plans (Professional Development and Human Resources Staffing) have not yet been completed, b) there has been little progress to date, c) there is no group that is formally assigned to facilitate and implement the plans, and d) the anticipated timeline for the completion of these plans is quite long. As a result of these factors, the team was not confident in the College's ability to complete these plans in a timely manner. In addition, there is still a need to communicate the relationships between the broader college-wide plans to complement the Program Review and Planning diagram and the Mission/Goals Mapping documentation.

Recommendation 5: In order to fully meet the standards, the team recommends that the College establish a systematic evaluation process to

generate data that will inform opportunities for improvement in all governance structures, institutional processes, and practices (I.B.7, IV.A.5).

Findings and Evidence:

1. *Improvement in all governance structures:*

The President's Advisory Council conducted a comprehensive assessment of its governance structures during the Spring and Summer of 2011. These changes were reflected in the College's December 2011 Shared Governance Process and Structure Manual. BP 2510 was revised in January of 2013 to require that this review process be undertaken at least every three years.

2. *Improvement in all institutional processes and practices:*

The College has developed and implemented a Program Review Template for Non-Instructional Programs and modified its template for Instructional Program Review. A three-year cycle has been established for all college programs and the new Program Review process has been linked to the College's budget allocation processes. The new non-instructional Program Review process has been assessed via a survey.

Almost all non-instructional programs have completed a program review and the Instructional Program Reviews are up-to date. A review of completed program reviews indicated that programs engaged this process with integrity with the goal of enhancing student success and program effectiveness.

The IEC has the responsibility for monitoring the quality of and continued engagement in the Program Review process. The IEC has developed and implemented a system whereby all Program Reviews are evaluated and feedback is provided to the programs.

Conclusion: The College has a Program Review Process and cycle for all college programs and has devised and implemented a review process and cycle for its shared governance processes and structures. The team believes that the College has addressed this Recommendation and now meets the standards.

Recommendation 7: In order to fully meet the standards, the team recommends that the College refine and fully implement the process which

clearly links resource allocation with integrated institutional planning. The team also recommends that the resource allocation and planning process include setting priorities for funding institutional improvements (III.D, III.D.l, III.D.l.a, III.D.l.d).

Findings and Evidence

1. Refine and fully implement the process which clearly links resource allocation with integrated institutional planning:

The Team found that the College completed its Strategic Plan, which is linked explicitly to the Program Review and Resource Allocation processes and indirectly to the Mission and the Educational Master Plan through the Mission/Goals crosswalk. The Strategic Plan provides the framework for the College's Program Review and Resource Allocation processes. The College drafted this crosswalk document through the collaborative efforts of management and faculty through the creation of a Strategic Priorities Committee. This committee drafted the college's strategic priorities and as a result, refined their resource allocation rubric to include the strategic priorities.

Throughout the past year, the College developed and implemented a timeline and refined the cycle for budget allocation proposals (BAP's) submitted for consideration for funding in the next budget cycle (2013-2014). Following refinement of the resource allocation process, college constituents were educated on the budget process at all college meetings. A total of 23 BAPs were submitted by management, faculty and staff to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee for funding consideration. These were scored, ranked and prioritized with recommendations forwarded to the President's Advisory Council (PAC). Once approved through the PAC they will be sent to the Executive Cabinet for approval and will be included for funding through the budget process.

2. That the resource allocation and planning process include setting priorities for funding institutional improvements

The College's budget allocation proposal scoring rubric, which validates that budget proposals are linked to planning, was refined and updated to reflect clear links between the College's program review, institutional plans, goals and outcomes. The college's strategic priorities support student learning in

Basic Skills, CTE, transfer courses, technology and distance education. The current resource allocation rubric includes the strategic priorities. The proposals for resource allocation submitted by various constituents were given point values in relation to how well the proposal met the stated plans, goals and outcomes as outlined in the rubric. The scored proposals were ranked in a tiered approach by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (a shared governance committee). Funding consideration is given by the amount of available resources, taking into consideration the ranking and viability of the proposal as outlined in the Planning and Program Review cycle flowchart.

Conclusion: The team believes that the College has addressed this Recommendation and now meets the standards. The College has identified their strategic priorities which link resource allocation to integrated planning. The College is on the verge of the first complete annual cycle using the refined and updated scoring rubric that links planning to resource allocation. It is clear that the College is committed to evaluating and refining this process as the cycle is completed and assessed. The College's commitments to an integrated system of planning guarantee that the College's efforts in this area will continue.

Recommendation 8: In order to fully meet the standards, the team recommends that the College establish funding priorities that clearly links to the institutional goals, strategic priorities and mission statement. The team also recommends that items which impact student learning are given funding priority. (I.B, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, III.D.3, III.D.l, III.D.l.a, III.D.l.b).

1. *The College establish funding priorities that clearly links to the institutional goals, strategic priorities and mission statement:*

The Team found that the College completed its Strategic Plan, which is linked explicitly to the Program Review and Resource Allocation processes and indirectly to the Mission and the Educational Master Plan through the Mission/Goals crosswalk. The Strategic Plan provides the framework for the College's Program Review and Resource Allocation processes. The College drafted this crosswalk document through the collaborative efforts of management and faculty through the creation of a Strategic Priorities Committee. This committee drafted the college's strategic priorities and as a result, refined their resource allocation rubric to include the strategic

priorities. The scoring rubric ranks each proposal based on the proposal meeting the College's plans, strategic priorities, mission statement and outcomes.

2. Items which impact student learning are given funding priority:

The College has made significant progress toward clearly linking resource allocation to planning by refining and explicitly linking to their mission and College plans. The college's strategic priorities support student learning in Basic Skills, CTE, transfer courses, technology and distance education. The current resource allocation rubric includes the strategic priorities thus giving funding priority to proposals that impact student learning. The proposals for resource allocation submitted by various constituents were given point values in relation to how well the proposal met the stated plans, goals and outcomes as outlined in the rubric which would lead to increased funding priority for items which impact student learning.

Conclusion: The team believes that the College has addressed this Recommendation and as a result meets the standards. The College has established funding priorities that clearly links to the institutional goals, strategic priorities and mission statement. The College identifies and gives higher value to those items which impact student learning via the strategic goals which are given funding priority in their resource allocation process. The College has a willingness to continue to refine and assess their process of linking resource allocation to planning and identify items which impact student learning are given priority. It is clear that the College has made tremendous progress in this area and that this process will continue to be enhanced and improved.

Recommendation 10: In order to fully meet the standards, the team recommends that the College clarify institutional priorities and streamline the budget process to insure that the result of program reviews are closely aligned with all institutional goals (I.B, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, III.D.3).

Findings and Evidence

1. *The College clarify institutional priorities:*

The College completed its Strategic Plan, which is linked explicitly to the

Program Review and Resource Allocation processes and is linked implicitly to the Mission and the Educational Master Plan through the Mission/Goals crosswalk. The Strategic Plan provides the framework for the College's Program Review and Resource Allocation processes. It incorporates strategic priorities with outcomes that are quantified and measurable. The six strategic priorities support all the elements of the College's Mission.

2. *Streamline the budget process to insure that the result of program reviews are closely aligned with all institutional goals:*

The College has edited its Program Review Templates and Budget Proposals and Budget to support its new Program Review and Planning Cycle and is in the process of developing a Program Review Handbook. The charge of the IEC has been edited to explicitly identify its responsibilities with respect to the ongoing implementation, assessment and modification (as needed) of the College's Program Review and Planning Cycle. The College has created the Program Review Committee, a sub-committee of the IEC, to assist them with this task.

The College's budget allocation proposal scoring rubric was refined to validate that budget proposals are linked to planning. The rubric was updated to illustrate clear links between the College's program review, institutional plans, goals and outcomes. Program and service area BAPs are scored on how closely the request is linked to the strategic goals and how the action plan will achieve the intended outcomes. The proposals for resource allocation submitted by various college constituents are given point values in relation to how well the proposal met the stated plans, goals and outcomes. The scored proposals were ranked by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, a shared governance committee. Funding consideration will be given by the amount of available resources, taking into consideration the ranking and viability of each proposal, as outlined in the Planning and Program Review cycle flowchart. All proposals that are funded in the planning process and program review cycle will be included in the subsequent budget cycle.

Conclusion: The team believes that the College has addressed this Recommendation and now meets the standards. The College has clarified its institutional priorities in their strategic plan. The College's Planning and Program Review Cycle insures that the program reviews are aligned with the

strategic plan is which in turn links planning to resource allocation incorporated into the annual budget cycle. The College is committed to evaluating and refining this process as the cycle is completed and assessed. The College's commitments to an integrated system of planning guarantee that the College's efforts in this area will continue.

Recommendation 11: In order to meet the standards and address the previous recommendation, the team recommends that the College develop a method that provides a direct linkage in the planning process to the resource allocation process for technology and distance education, and secure an identifiable, stable and ongoing budget for those activities (III.C .l.a, III.C.l.d).

Findings and Evidence

1. *Develop a method that provides a direct linkage in the planning process to the resource allocation process for technology and distance education:*

The Strategic Plan provides the framework for the College's Program Review and Resource Allocation processes. Since over 50% of the class offerings at the College are offered via a distance education platform, the college has identified funding in the information technology budget to support the technology infrastructure for distance education. Two years ago, the college dedicated budget to improve and replace technology for institutional support. They established an individual line item in the overall budget solely for distance education. Any BAP's are submitted in regards to technology are first reviewed to see if they would qualify for funding from this set aside reserve.

2. *Secure an identifiable, stable and ongoing budget for those activities:*

Since over 50% of the class offerings at the College are offered via a distance education platform, the college has identified funding in the information technology budget to support the technology infrastructure for distance education. Two years ago, the college dedicated budget to improve and replace technology for institutional support. They established an individual line item in the overall budget solely for distance education.

Conclusion: The team believes that the College has addressed this Recommendation and now meets the standards. The college has focused on their need for a systematic process for upgrades and replacement of their technology infrastructure. The College has identified an annual set aside amount for technology and distance education. The College recognizes that a majority of their class offerings are online and has dedicated support for that infrastructure. They have made a great deal of movement towards a systematic schedule to replace outdated technological equipment.

Recommendation 12: In order to fully meet the standards, the team recommends that all College units develop systems to completely implement and sustain program review across the institution resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning (I.B.3, I.B.7, II.A.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.2, III.D.3, IV.A.1, IV.A.5, IV.B.2.b).

Findings and Evidence:

The College has developed and implemented a Program Review Template for Non-Instructional Programs and modified its template for Instructional Program Review. A three-year cycle has been established for all college programs and the new Program Review process has been linked to the budget allocation processes.

Almost all non-instructional programs have completed a program review and the Instructional Program Reviews are up-to date. A review of completed program reviews indicated that programs engaged this process with integrity and thoughtfully reflected on ways they could strengthen their programs to enhance student success and program effectiveness. The new non-instructional Program Review process has been assessed via a survey.

The IEC has the responsibility for monitoring the quality of and continued engagement in the Program Review process. The IEC has developed and implemented a system whereby all Program Reviews are evaluated and feedback is provided to the programs.

Conclusion: The team believes the College has addressed this recommendation and now meets the standards. There is a Program Review Template for all College Programs, almost all College Programs have an up-

to-date Program Review, and there is a mechanism in place for ensuring that the College's work in this area will continue.

Recommendation 13: In order to fully meet the standards, the team recommends that the College strengthen its ability to implement, document and evaluate its plans to support ongoing and systematic dialog about institutional effectiveness (I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5).

Findings and Evidence:

1. Implement, document and evaluate its plans:

The IEC has taken on the responsibility for implementing, documenting and evaluating all aspects of the College Planning and Program Review Cycle. They are in the process of strengthening their ability to carry out this responsibility through the creation of a Program Review Manual. The Facilities Committee has undertaken the responsibility for implementing, documenting and evaluating the Facilities Master Plan. The Technology Committee is responsible for the implementing, documenting and evaluating the Technology Plan. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness is responsible for providing data to inform the assessment and evaluation of all college plans. However, because the Strategic Plan was developed by an ad hoc group, the College needs to more clearly define the mechanisms and cycle for evaluating and reporting on the implementation of its Strategic Plan. In addition, although there is a Staff Development and Excellence Recognition Committee, they have not met regularly over the past two years and interviews indicated that they were not primarily responsible for the development or evaluation of the Professional Development plan once it is developed. No documentation was provided regarding the implementation, documentation and evaluation of the College's other plans.

2. Ongoing and Systematic Dialog:

The College has developed and/or modified structures (including All College Meetings, Best Practices and All Division Meetings, and Student Services Meetings) to enhance dialog about institutional effectiveness. A review of the agendas and minutes indicates that these meetings do provide systematic opportunities for dialog about institutional effectiveness. There is also some evidence that these meetings have contributed to enhanced institutional

effectiveness. Dialogues about institutional effectiveness also occur at the President's Advisory Council, the President's Cabinet and the Board of Trustees meetings.

Plans are underway to strengthen communication about the College's institutional effectiveness efforts and to enhance opportunities for dialog about institutional effectiveness using social media. The College has established a goal in the Strategic Plan to ensure work in this area continues. Interviews and the review of evidence indicate the College is making progress on the implementation of this goal.

Conclusion: The team believes the College has partially addressed this recommendation and now partially meets the standards. The College has increased the opportunities for and enhanced its ability to document dialog about institutional effectiveness and expressed their commitment to continuing these efforts in their Strategic Plan. Although there are clearly defined mechanisms in place to ensure that the College will implement, document and evaluate many of its plans, this clarity does not exist for all of its planning processes. Now that the infrastructure of its planning processes has been established, the College may wish to create a matrix to represent the timelines, responsible parties and the communication strategy for the evaluation of its plans to the College and greater community.