

RECEIVED

DEC 18 2013

*Accrediting Commission for
Community and Junior Colleges*

FOLLOW-UP VISIT REPORT

Yosemite Community College District
2201 Blue Gum Avenue
Modesto, CA 95358

Columbia College
11600 Columbia College Drive
Sonora, CA 95370

RECEIVED

JAN 06 2014

**Columbia College
RESIDENTS OFFICE**

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
Yosemite Community College District and Columbia College November 14, 2013.

Cynthia E. Azari, Ed.D.
Chair

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

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
Yosemite Community College District and Columbia College on November 14, 2013

Dr. Cynthia Azari Interim Chancellor, Riverside Community College District

Mr. Mohamed Eisa Dean, Research, and Student Outcomes, Diablo Valley College

Yosemite Community College District and Columbia College Follow-Up Visit, November 14, 2013

District Recommendations

District Recommendation 2: In order to fully meet the standard, the teams recommend that the District and the colleges review institutional missions and their array of course offerings and programs in light of their current budgets (Standard III.D, III.D 1, ER 17).

Institutional Response: In the Follow-Up report dated October 10, 2013, the district indicated that districtwide discussions brought forth a recommendation that Modesto Junior College shorten the mission statement adopted by the Board of Trustees on October 12, 2012 to ensure clarity and strengthen the linkage between the three institutional mission statements within the district.

It was further stated that on March 29, 2013, the District Council (districtwide governance committee) recommended realignment of the three mission statements. On April 5, 2013, Columbia College Council supported the District Council's recommendation for alignment and accordingly made a minor revision to the college's mission statement.

For Modesto Junior College, a major revision of the mission statement was undertaken by Modesto College Council on August 13, 2013. This revision resulted in shortening the length of mission statement and aligning it with that of the district. Approval of the new mission statement by Yosemite Community College District (YCCD) Board of Trustees took place on September 11, 2013.

The Accreditation Follow-Up Report also stated that course and program offerings at Columbia College and Modesto Junior College are aligned with the missions of the respective colleges through the curriculum approval processes. Furthermore, each college implemented resource allocation processes that tie allocation to their respective missions.

Evidence Reviewed: The following documents were examined by the Follow-Up Team:

- District Planning Session, March 29, 2013
- Program Review and Unit Planning meeting (Columbia), March 26, 2013
- Student Learning Outcome Work Group Meeting (Columbia), March 25, 2013
- Columbia College Council Record of Meeting, April 5, 2013
- Columbia College Council Record of Meeting, May 16, 2013

Follow-Up Team Findings: The follow-up team review of the updated mission statements of YCCD, Modesto Junior College, and Columbia College reaffirms the claims made in the aforementioned Accreditation Follow-Up Report. Furthermore, meeting of the team with the Chancellor of the YCCD and the Interim President of Columbia College on November 14, 2013, confirmed and validated the sequence of events and processes that took place in 2013, regarding the revisions and realignment of the three mission statements. Meetings with members of the administration, faculty, and staff of Columbia College further re-affirmed the claims stated in the

report. The district has addressed the recommendation and meets Standards III.D, III.D.1 and Eligibility Requirement 17.

District Recommendation 3: The team recommends the District and Board of Trustees develop policies on the delegation of authority to the college president (Standard IV.A.2.a, IV.B.3.e.)

Institutional Response: In the Follow-Up report dated October 10, 2013, the district indicated that YCCD Board of Trustees adopted a policy (#2430) on September 12, 2012, delegating authority to the chancellor and college presidents. In response to the Commission's 2012 follow-up team recommendation, a district policy committee created two separate policies, one for the chancellor (# 2430), and one for the college presidents (# 2430.1). Furthermore, the Accreditation Follow-up Report stated that the job descriptions for the chancellor and presidents were updated to reflect the delegation of authority from the Board of Trustees.

Evidence Reviewed: The following documents were examined by the Follow-Up Team:

Policy 2430: Delegation of Authority to Chancellor and Presidents.

Policy 2430.1: Delegation of Authority to College Presidents

Job descriptions for the chancellor and presidents

Follow-Up Team Findings: The follow-up team review of the updated policies clearly reaffirms the institutional response. Furthermore, meetings with the Chancellor of the YCCD and the Interim President of Columbia College on November 14, 2013, confirmed the existence and implementation of the revised policies regarding the delegation of authority to the chancellor and presidents. The district has addressed the recommendation and meets Standards IV.A.2.a and IV.B.3,e.

College Recommendations

College Recommendation 1: In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the institution complete the development and assessment of student learning outcomes for all courses and programs and develop and assess learning outcomes in administrative services, student services, as well as the Library and Learning Support Services and use the results for improvement of student learning and institutional effectiveness (Standards I.B.3, I.B.7).

Institutional Response: In the Follow-Up report dated October 10, 2013, Columbia College stated that assessment of student learning outcomes and use of results for improvement is in place for all five major areas of assessment, including: courses (511), instructional programs (96), administrative services (9), student support services (15), and library and learning support services. Furthermore, the institution provided examples of the improvements taking place as a result of assessment in all five areas. It appears from the Follow-Up report that an ongoing dialog is taking place regarding improvements at all levels of the institution.

Evidence Reviewed: The follow-up team reviewed several pieces of evidence before and during its visit to the campus of Columbia College on November 14, 2013. First, the team examined the electronic documentation related to plans, assessment, minutes of meetings of

different committees and councils, calendars, and other relevant documents. Furthermore, the team met with 14 persons, including members of the administration, faculty, staff, and students. Some of the meetings were in groups and others were focused on one or two persons.

The team examined samples of evidence that included the following:

- Courses in general education and career technical education.
- Instructional programs in biological and physical sciences, fire technology, and business.
- Administrative services related to business services, bookstore, and child development center.
- Student services related to counseling, transfer center, and financial aid.
- Library and learning support services.

During the follow-up visit on October 14, 2013, the team met with the following 14 persons:

- Interim College President
- Interim Vice President of Student Learning
- Vice President of College and Administrative Services
- Director of College Research and Planning
- Academic Senate President
- Chairperson of the Curriculum Committee & Computer Science faculty
- Three Faculty members from English, Child Development, and H-HP
- Program specialist Cal Works
- Librarian
- Accounting technician
- Two ASCC student leaders

The follow-up meetings focused on validation of the evidence submitted by the college and on obtaining assurance of sustainability of efforts and institutional commitment for continuous quality improvement.

Follow-Up Team Findings: The team found that the documents on file support the college's claim regarding assessment of SLOs at various levels. The changes made by the institution regarding courses, programs and future plans reflect a robust assessment and evaluation processes that should continue to serve the institution and its students well into the future. The documented evidence was sufficient, relevant, and verifiable. The personnel interviewed were highly committed to the implementation of a sustainable program of continuous improvement in student learning and institutional effectiveness at all levels. Apparently, there has been sufficient amount of dialogue, analysis, and reflection among members of the college community. The commitment we witnessed from the institutional leadership and other members of the college community is very encouraging and should stimulate further inquiry about institutional quality.

All areas examined show evidence of a well established assessment process and effective use of results for improvements. It is important to note that the concerns raised by the previous follow-up team in 2012, regarding the administrative services, have been addressed. Of particular

importance, the team witnessed a mature and developed institution that has learned well from the experiences of the past two years. Undoubtedly, there are significant improvement and a change of tone, not only at the top, but also among members of the faculty, staff, and students. Absent are the words that had negative connotations and defensive postures. The director of research and planning has done a commendable job in establishing, maintaining, and communicating information for planning, program review, assessment of learning, and use of results for improvement. The college has addressed the recommendation and meets Standards I.B.3 and I.B.7.

College Recommendation 2: In order to fully meet the standard, the team recommends that the institution continue to assess the evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, the library and other learning support services (Standards I.B.6; IV.A.5).

Institutional Response: In the Follow-Up report dated October 10, 2013, Columbia College provided a detailed response that addressed the assessment of evaluation mechanisms on a continuous and systematic basis. The College's response outlined several mechanisms that included the following:

- Evaluation of mission, goals and strategic planning documents.
- Evaluation of the integrated planning process.
- Evaluation of the program review tools.
- Evaluation of student learning outcomes processes.
- Evaluation of the resource allocation process.
- Evaluation of the annual institutional effectiveness report.
- Overall evaluation of the mechanisms for assessing continuous quality improvement.

In addition, the college's response provided a revised and improved set of five (in place of ten) college goals, together with the related measurable objectives, and the key performance indicators (KPI)/supporting data.

Evidence Reviewed: The follow-up team reviewed several pieces of evidence including the following items:

- The college council meeting minutes of October 5, 2012; November 6, 2012; April 5, 2013; and May 16, 2013.
- The integrated planning system including the SLO tool, the unit planning tool, and the program review tool.
- The program review form for instructional programs, student services, and administrative services.
- The student survey of 2013.
- The institutional effectiveness report.
- The planning calendar.

Furthermore, the team met (as indicated earlier under College Recommendation #1) with 14 persons, representing a cross section of administrators, faculty members, staff persons, and

students. Once again, the discussion focused on issues related to validation of evidence, effectiveness of the processes, and assurance of sustainable efforts and commitment for continuous quality improvement.

Follow-Up Team Findings: The team found that the documents on file support the college's claim regarding the review of the evaluation mechanisms and their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student services, administrative services, and library and learning support services. The college was able to consolidate its earlier ten goals into a more manageable set of five goals. More importantly, the college developed a reasonable number of measurable objectives, and key performance indicators (KPI) or supporting data. The consolidation of goals and measurement of KPIs will focus the energies of the college and will provide documented evidence regarding the accomplishment of goals. This is a step in right direction that, if followed by corrective actions, should lead to continuous improvement across the board. In addition, the college made serious and commendable efforts toward evaluation of exiting assessment tools and using the results of the evaluation for improvement. Notably, the college developed an ambitious calendar of evaluation and review of the assessment tools. The college has addressed the recommendation and meets Standards I.B.6 and IV.A.5.