Follow Up Visit

Columbia College
11600 Columbia College Drive
Sonora, CA 95370

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

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
Columbia College on October 31, 2012

Ms. Jill Board   President, Cerro Coso Community College

Mr. Tim Flood   Vice President Administrative Services, Grossmont College

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

Date: November 19, 2012

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

From: Jill Board, Team Chair

Subject: Report of Follow-Up Visit
                   Columbia College, October 31-November 1, 2012

Introduction:
In October 2011 Columbia College, Yosemite Community College District (YCCD), was visited by an Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) External Evaluation Team. At the ACCJC January 10 -12, 2012 meeting the institutional Self Study Report was reviewed and the report of the evaluation team. The Commission acted to issue Warning and require Columbia College to submit a Follow-Up Report followed by a visit. The visiting team, Ms. Jill Board, Mr. Tim Flood, and Mr. Mohamed Eisa, conducted the site visit to Columbia College on October 31 – November 1, 2012. The purpose of the team visit was to verify that the Follow-Up Report prepared by the College was accurate through examination of evidence, to determine if sustained, continuous, and positive improvements had been made at the institution, and that the institution has addressed the recommendations made by the External Evaluation Team, resolved the deficiencies noted in those recommendations, and meets the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards and Commission policies.

The team found that the college had prepared well for the visit by arranging for meetings with the individuals agreed upon with the Team Chair and by providing appropriate documents, IT access and assistance when needed in the meeting used by the team. Over the course of our visit additional documents were provided upon request in a timely manner. The team met with the President of the College, the Vice President of Student Learning, the Vice President of College and Administrative Services, the Dean of Career and Technical Education (CTE), the Dean of Student Services, the Director of Library and Academic Achievement Center, the Director of Research, the Academic Senate President, the Coordinator of the Integrated Planning System, and faculty and staff who had participated in various workgroups and College Council, i.e. Student Learning Outcomes Workgroup and Mentors, the College Goals Committee, and Staff Development Exploratory Committee.

The Follow-Up Report and visit were expected to document improvement in the following areas:

<u>District Recommendations</u>

Recommendation 1: In order to fully meet the standard and improve the effectiveness of its human resources, the team recommends the systematic evaluation of all personnel at stated intervals with appropriate documentation. (Standards III.A, III.A.1.a.)

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. (Standards III.D, III.D.1, ER 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.)

District Recommendation 4: The team recommends the District develop policies that clearly define, and follow, the process for hiring and evaluating the college president. (Columbia College 2011 Evaluation Report References Standards IV.B.1; IV.B.1.j and Modesto Junior College 2011 Evaluation Report References Standards III.A, III.A.1, III.A.3; ER3, ER5.)

<u>**College Recommendations**</u>

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).

College Recommendation 2: In order to fully meet the standard, the team recommends 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).

College Recommendation 4: In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the institution develop implement and evaluate counseling and academic advising that takes into account the needs of students enrolled in Distance Learning courses (Standards II.A.1.b.; II.A.2.d; II.B.3.a; II.C.1.c).

College Recommendation 5: In order to fully meet the standard, the team recommends that the institution implement planning and program review processes in administrative services, and use the results to inform technology decisions, physical resource needs and resource allocation (Standards III.A., III.B.2, III.C.1, III.C.2).

College Recommendation 6: In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the institution systematically assess the effective use of financial resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for institutional improvement (Standards III.D, III.D.3).

College Recommendation 7: In order to fully meet the standard, the team recommends that the institution develop a comprehensive staff development plan designed to meet the needs of its personnel and develop a systematic evaluation process (Standards III.A, III.C.b).

District Responses to the 2011 External Evaluation Team Recommendations:

District Recommendation 1: In order to fully meet the standard and improve the effectiveness of its human resources, the team recommends the systematic evaluation of all personnel at stated intervals with appropriate documentation. (Standards III.A, III.A.1.a.)

Findings and Evidence: The District Office of Human Resources has improved their evaluation tracking process to now include full time faculty evaluations. The District vice chancellors and the college executive staff have worked to implement the new process. The evaluation process and associated scheduled timelines are well understood throughout the District.

Although the District asserts that the college "presidents coordinate with the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources and Information Technology to ensure the evaluation tracking process supports the District and both colleges' efforts to complete evaluations in a timely manner," a fully operational automated or technology supported tracking system is under construction. None the less, evaluation data is currently being input into Datatel software where evaluation tracking reports can be produced for an increasing number of employee groups. The District Human Resources maintains appropriate documentation in the employee's personnel files.

Conclusion: The District has established a systematic evaluation process for all District and College Personnel.   Even though the electronic database and report system is just short of complete, the team believes that the District has met the expectations of the recommendation.

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. (Standards III.D, III.D.1, ER 17.)**

Findings and Evidence: In response to District Recommendation 2, the YCCD Mission review process was initiated at the March 28, 2012 YCCD District Council meeting. At that meeting the council reviewed the YCCD Mission, and as part of the review process the YCCD Chancellor directed the District Council members to work with their local constituencies and college councils to discuss the relationship between the missions of the respective colleges and that of the YCCD. On April 25, 2012 the District Council again met and neither college reported any suggested modifications of the YCCD Mission Statement. Furthermore, both colleges agreed that their respective missions were in alignment with that of the YCCD. Later, Modesto Junior College incorporated the YCCD mission statement as a guiding document during the May 15 and August 23, 2012 workshops which then led to the revision of the MJC mission statement. The MJC mission statement was adopted by MJC's College Council on October 1, 2012, and was approved by the YCCD Board of Trustees on October 10, 2012. The YCCD mission statement was Board approved on September 12, 2012. Staff indicated that the long delay in reviewing the Mission Statement was due to having an interim president.

The MJC Accreditation Follow-Up Report states: "The Columbia College Mission Statement and YCCD Mission Statement are not aligned, according to the Council by being generic in terms of measureable student learning outcomes. " It then later states, "Overall, the Columbia College Council agreed that the Columbia College Mission Statement and the YCCD Mission

Statement are in "harmony" and not at cross purposes with each other." According to staff, this confusion was caused by an interim president at Columbia College and differing faculty opinion.

This section of the MJC Follow-Up Report was very confusing and hard to follow. The Team concluded that, although the recommended review of District and College Mission Statement were conducted, it is not clear that the effort to align the Statements was achieved.

College Course and Program Planning

The colleges have independent committees/groups that are continuously meeting to review their budgets. The colleges assert that they have directed their focus on offering courses for transfer, Career Technical Education (CTE), and basic skills.

At Columbia College, the "Big Picture Budget Discussion Group" (BPBDG) reports to the College Council and is led by the college president. This group discusses cuts in VTEA funding, college fiscal shortfalls, and programmatic impacts.

MJC's Resource Allocation Council is now responsible for developing a budgetary master plan, which will guide resource allocation recommendations in periods of growth and reduction. The Resource Allocation Council is responsible for making a college budget recommendation to College Council each spring as part of the annual budget development process. Although the governance and planning structure has been changed and significant progress has been made, there is no evidence that there is a clear articulation of data driven decision-making among the various councils/groups. These processes are very new and not fully institutionalized at this point. The team concluded that most of the decision-making in regard to course reductions is being accomplished at the program level.

Conclusion: The team found significant confusion in the interaction of the District and the Colleges during the process of reviewing their respective Mission Statements. In addition, it is not clear that, at the time of the follow-up visit, the college has an open and participatory process to address workload reduction at the institutional level. The team finds that this recommendation has been partially met.

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.)**

Findings and Evidence: In response to Recommendation 3, the District strengthened Board Policy 7430, Delegation of Authority to the Chancellor, to include references to the college president. Specifics regarding the authority and role of the president were left to the president's job description, which does not have the strength or purpose of Board Policy.

The college/district asserts that the Accreditation Follow-Up Report and Yosemite Community College District's Board Policy 7430 is in alignment with Education Code Sections 70902(d), 72400 and Accreditation Standard IVB.3.e. In addition, they assert "As long as the Chancellor is responsible to the Board of Trustees for the evaluation of the college presidents, this delineation

of authority is correct and proper."

The October, 2011, visiting team recommended that a singular Board Policy be developed that outlines the role of the college president. The team finds that the current revised Policy 7430, that relies on the interpretation of "CEO" as a means to define the role of the president, falls short of the intent of the recommendation.

Conclusion: The recommendation calls for delineating the delegated roles and responsibilities to the college president by developing a Board Policy specific to the college president. The team finds that this recommendation has not been met.

District Recommendation 4: **The team recommends the District develop policies that clearly define, and follow, the process for hiring and evaluating the college president. (Columbia College 2011 Evaluation Report References Standards IV.B.1; IV.B.1.j and Modesto Junior College 2011 Evaluation Report References Standards III.A, III.A.1, III.A.3; ER3, ER5.)**

Findings and Evidence: The Yosemite Community College District has developed Policies and has Procedures in place that clearly define and follow the process for hiring and evaluating the college presidents. The Board of Trustees, working with the Chancellor recently hired a new president for MJC and she began her duties on July 1, 2012. Further, the Columbia College President, hired on July 1, 2011, has been evaluated both at six-month and one-year intervals, according to the processes and timelines.

Conclusion: New policies and timelines are in place and functioning. The team concludes that this recommendation has been fully met.

College Responses to the 2011 External Evaluation Team 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).**

Findings and Evidence: Columbia College's Accreditation Follow-Up Report indicates significant progress has been made in development and assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in Instruction, Student Support Services, Library and College and Administrative Services areas. Through the examination of documents such as minutes of meetings of different committees and councils, Governing Board minutes, calendars, and other relevant documents, the team was able to verify that SLO development and assessment is continuing to be implemented and improved, and that the results are being used to identify areas for improvement. A college work group was formed to assist the college in meeting the SLO requirements, and meeting minutes are posted. The college has also committed additional resources through release time and stipends for SLO Mentors. The college SLO Tool includes an assessment report that allows the college and departments to track their progress. The team

examined the electronic information provided through the SLO Tool and the Integrated Planning System and interviewed over 25 people that included faculty, staff, and administration.

The areas examined show evidence of the existence of goals/objectives, assessment of student learning, where applicable, and use of results for improvements. However, in some administrative areas, the use of assessment results or "closing of the loop" may not have taken place since a full cycle of one year has not passed since assessment began.

The team requested and received reports submitted (February 22, 2012 and April 13, 2012) or to be submitted (October 29, 2012) to the Governing Board for major changes made in courses and awards in 2012. During this period, the College reported a total of 158 changes that included 62 course discontinuations, 46 course modifications, 34 course additions, 8 program discontinuations, 8 program modifications, and no program additions.

On the administrative side, a full-time director of research and planning was hired in May 2012; the facilities master plan was completed and approved by the Governing Board in June 2012, and there is documented evidence of increased use of Smart Boards and interactive projectors in classroom instruction.

The follow-up meetings focused on the validation of the evidence submitted by the college and obtaining assurance of the level of institutional dialog regarding assessment results.

Conclusion: 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 will continue to serve the institution and its students well in the future. The documented evidence was sufficient, relevant, and verifiable. The personnel interviewed were found to be 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 tone of commitment witnessed from the institutional leadership and other members of the college community is very encouraging and should stimulate further inquiry about institutional quality. The institution is encouraged to continue its hard work toward sustainable quality improvement at all levels, including the newly added area of administrative services. The team finds the college partially meets the recommendation.

College Recommendation 2: **In order to fully meet the standard, the team recommends 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).**

Findings and Evidence: The college provided detailed information regarding the processes used to revamp and identify college goals and associated measurable outcomes. The College Council recommended moving away from its original goals identified after consultation with the Bridging Research, Information, and Culture Technical Assistance Program. The college supplied College Council Meeting minutes which include evidence that the college, through a participatory governance process, evaluated and approved changes to the college goals that will

provide better linkages to assessment and measurable outcomes. The new college goals were adopted on 10/5/12. The college has made great strides in improving evaluation mechanisms since the last visit. The college has hired a full-time Director of Research and Planning, instituted program reviews in all areas of the college, and is currently working on completing an Integrated Planning System that will link unit plans, SLO management and program review.

The weaknesses in the employee evaluation process have been addressed through the development of the Columbia College Employee Evaluation Process which defines responsibilities within the YCCD and college departments. An Annual Planning Assessment retreat to evaluate goals and review assessment data has been established with the first one scheduled for November 6, 2012. The team met with more than 25 college lead people to validate the provided evidence.

Conclusion: The Columbia College has made significant progress in creating and revising evaluation mechanisms to improve their effectiveness in measuring and obtaining institutional improvement. With the establishment and approval of new college goals and supporting data the college will be able to more effectively align department and unit activities and evaluate their effectiveness in improving programs and services.

The team found that the documents on file and the discussions held with college personnel support the college's claim regarding improving the effectiveness of evaluative processes. There is evidence that changes have been made to improve the instructional programs, student support services, and administrative services. The changes made by the institution to improve the research, planning, and goal assessment reflect serious and sustainable commitment beyond the current visit by the Follow-up Team. The personnel interviewed cited several examples of improvements in their respective areas: course and program realignment and improved student and administrative services. Members interviewed were anxious to continue the process of improvement at all levels and have expressed enthusiasm for the upcoming planning assessment retreat to be held at the beginning of November, 2012. Furthermore, persons interviewed expressed enthusiasm for the improved level of transparency and existence of a more meaningful dialogue about the budget allocation process. It is clear that a sufficient amount of dialogue and reflection has taken place among members of the college community. The level of commitment witnessed from the institutional leadership and other members of the college community is very encouraging and should stimulate further inquiry about institutional quality.

It should be noted that at the time of the Follow-up Team's visit, the college had not yet finalized the revision of its goals and the development of the measurable objectives. Minutes of meetings of the College Council between February and October, 2012 show significant progress by the office of the president, the director of research, and members of the college council to collapse the ten college goals, develop measurable objectives, and create the research infrastructure to provide the data that supports these efforts. It is expected that the finalization of this work will take place November 6, 2012. Minutes of meetings of the college council dated October 5, 2012 provide a glimpse into the agenda for this annual planning assessment retreat. Agenda items focus on developing effective evaluative mechanisms for strategic planning, resource allocation, and program review. In summary, the institution made significant concerted efforts to address this recommendation; however, as mentioned additional work is needed to develop sustainable

evaluation mechanisms that lead to continuous quality improvement at all levels. The team finds the college has partially met this recommendation.

College Recommendation 4: **In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the institution develop implement and evaluate counseling and academic advising that takes into account the needs of students enrolled in Distance Learning courses (Standards II.A.1.b.; II.A.2.d; II.B.3.a; II.C.1.c).**

Findings and Evidence: The college has improved and expanded its counseling and academic advising taking into account the needs of distance learning courses. The team was able to confirm these changes through reviewing Columbia College's Distance Education Plan, the Columbia College Counseling Website, and the Distance Education Resources for Students website. Services include online advising, e-counseling and telephone services, social media forums, and online orientation. The College is also in the process of implementing a degree audit system. Columbia College's Follow-Up Report also included ACCJC's approval of the college's Substantive Change Report, which included detailed information and evidence regarding the student support services offered to distance learners and a sustainability plan to fund these services in the future.

Conclusion: The counseling and academic advising has been expanded to meet the counseling and academic advising needs of students enrolled in distance learning. The college has developed a plan and dedicated resources to evaluate and support these services in an ongoing manner. The team finds that the college meets the recommendation.

College Recommendation 5: **In order to fully meet the standard, the team recommends that the institution implement planning and program review processes in administrative services, and use the results to inform technology decisions, physical resource needs and resource allocation (Standards III.A., III.B.2, III.C.1, III.C.2).**

Findings and Evidence: The college has reinstituted planning and program review within the College Administrative Services areas. Administrative Services Program Review was completed on August 11, 2012 with all of the Administrative Services departments having completed the first cycle of the process. The Faculty Senate assisted in process development and has approved the process being used. The visiting team was able to verify the completion of the first cycle through reviewing the completed program review documents and meeting minutes from the Columbia College Administrative Services Division Managers' meeting minutes. The newly instituted program review process includes programmatic descriptions and functions, program successes, an analysis of key data points and trends, strengths, challenges and goals, and an evaluation of resources needed to inform the college during the resource allocation process. Resources identified within the program review document are then added into the unit planning activities. The team was able to review program improvements that were implemented based on the program review recommendations. The College and Administrative Services also established their Student Learning Outcomes and assessments in all departments and areas.

The college is continuing to make improvements to the program review process and is working to move to an online format, creating similar review formatting between Instruction, Student

Services and Administrative Services. A program review data portal is also being completed to give college programs access to course level indicators of success and data trends. The program review cycles are identified in the College Master Planning Calendar to ensure timelines are communicated and understood. The college is also working on an Integrated Planning System that will link unit plans, SLO management, and program review.

Conclusion: The newly implemented Administrative Services Program Review Process provides an excellent evaluation model and provides the mechanism for College and Administrative Services departments to inform the college about their resource needs and linking the results to the planning and resource allocation process. The program review process has been established and included in the annual planning cycle, establishing the requirement that all areas are reviewed in a systematic way. Program review recommendations have been implemented that have advanced the effectiveness of the college in meetings its mission. The college is expanding and updating the program review process to create a simplified system to be used in all areas and will more readily identify the connections between program review, SLOs and resource allocation at the college. Based on the evidence provided to the team and the discussions with College and Administrative Services and Faculty Senate representatives, the team believes that the college has fully met the recommendation.

College Recommendation 6: **In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the institution systematically assess the effective use of financial resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for institutional improvement (Standards III.D, IIID.3).**

Findings and Evidence: The college has provided evidence that it has engaged in college wide discussions regarding planning goals and effective evaluations methods. The college provided the team with evidence including the strategic planning cycle, the integrated planning model, unit plans, and college goal progress report. This data provides clear evidence that Columbia College continues to effectively integrate planning throughout the college, and that all constituency groups are involved in the process. With the college wide incorporation of program review and the completion of SLOs in all areas, the college has completely implemented the integrated planning model that it had established and approved through their College Council. This integrated planning provides the college with the information and data necessary to make informed resource allocation decisions. The college provided the team with new college wide goals and measurement points that will allow it to effectively set benchmarks and then gauge progress towards achieving college goals. The College Goals and key measurement points were approved and adopted by the College Council on October 5, 2012, as evidenced by College Council meeting minutes. The team was able to review the Integrated Planning System, which is in the final stages of completion. The Integrated Planning System provides clear linkages between program review, unit planning activities, and college goals. The college submitted response did not include evidence that the college has implemented the process of evaluating resource allocation and its effectiveness in meeting college goals and achieving institutional improvement. The response stated the "Annual Planning Assessment Retreats will provide the needed institutional structure to discuss and evaluate overall planning for the college. This has tremendous impact when it comes to the effective allocation of resources as it moves away from processes that have not been formalized across the institution." Since the Annual Planning Retreat was delayed, the college did not provide clear evidence that it had used an evaluative tool

to assess effectiveness of resource allocation in bringing about institutional improvements as required by College Recommendation 6.

Although the college did not provide clear evidence of how the systematic assessment of financial resources use outcomes were used as the basis for institutional improvement, the visiting team was able to identify evidence that the college had met this portion of the recommendation. The team reviewed evidence and had discussions with faculty and administrators who served on District Recommendation 2 and College Recommendation 2. The Big Picture Budget Discussion Group (BPBDG) provided the mechanism for the entire college to review and evaluate college resource allocations. The college used the evaluation to recommend changes and reductions. The team reviewed meeting minutes, college budget allocations by type and college reallocation recommendations that brought the 2012-13 budget in balance and began the process of preparing for 2013-14. The budget reduction and reallocation recommendation from BPBDG based on the analysis of budget data was forwarded to the College Council. The College Council approved the recommendations that allowed the college to continue to meet programmatic and college goals within the limited resources available. Course offerings were reviewed and course sections and certificates were removed based on a department and college evaluative process. The team was able to review Columbia College's Curriculum Course and Awards Report which included course and award discontinuance listings providing evidence that the college had systematically evaluated course offerings and used the results of the evaluation for institutional improvement. Through the review of the Big Picture Budget Discussion Group meeting minutes and discussions with BPBDG members there is clear evidence that the college engaged all constituent groups and all those who wished to participate in a systematic evaluation of college resource allocation, and the analysis was used as the basis for institutional changes and improvements.

Conclusion: The college has made great strides in improving the linkages between the various planning processes and has incorporated program review in all areas of the campus. The college has linked program review to unit planning activities and college goals utilizing an improved Integrated Planning System. The evidence supports that the results of the evaluative processes were used as the basis for institutional improvement within the college written response, and the team was able find evidence that this process occurred and is ongoing. With the completion of the college's first Annual Planning Assessment Retreat, and the inclusion of the Planning Retreat into the annual planning cycle, the college will have formalized a complete planning and evaluative process by which resource allocation can be assessed and the results used to improve the institution. The team recommends that the college continue to implement and improve the planning and evaluative processes it has begun. The team also recommends that the college include the Annual Planning Retreat in the planning cycle to ensure this important evaluative component is formally incorporated into the annual planning and evaluation process. Based on the evidence provided, the team believes that the college has met the expectations of the recommendation.

College Recommendation 7: **In order to fully meet the standard, the team recommends that the institution develop a comprehensive staff development plan designed to meet the needs of its personnel and develop a systematic evaluation process (Standards III.A, III.C.b).**

Findings and Evidence: The College has provided evidence that it has made an institutional commitment to developing a comprehensive staff development plan and evaluation process. The

process for developing the plan began in the spring of 2012. Through a collaborative process, the Dean of Career and Technical Education and Economic Development was charged with leading the college through the planning process. The college provided evidence that a task force was formed, referred to as the Staff Development Exploratory Committee. Its initial mission was to redefine the mission or purpose of staff development, who staff development serves, what this committee would be called permanently, and what would be the authorized use of staff development funding. The group further redefined the Staff Development Committee's goals and objectives, its recommended committee structure and its evaluation and assessment processes to assess the effectiveness of professional development activities.

The outcome was a draft Three Year Staff Development Plan, which includes six stated goals for the college's professional development activities. The plan is comprehensive and links to the college mission and vision, with future linkages to their Institutional Learning Outcomes. The committee structure of the Staff Development Committee includes the participation of all constituent groups.   The plan includes an evaluation component utilizing a "Professional Development Activity/Evaluation Form" currently used by the college for Flex week activities, and will now be used after each staff development activity; an outcome assessment will be completed at the 1.5 year mark and at the three year mark. The draft plan is expected to be approved by the College Council on November 2, 2012 which will trigger permanent members being identified and launching the new Staff Development Committee.

Conclusion: The college has made substantial progress in developing a draft Three Year Staff Development Plan that clearly supports the institution's mission and vision. The plan involves all constituency groups so that the needs of the entire institution are considered and reviewed, along with an evaluation tool and a schedule for outcome assessment. The team concludes that the college has met the recommendation.