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Mission Statement

Columbia College is a dynamic institution of learners and creative thinkers dedicated to high standards of student success. We prepare students to be fully engaged in an evolving world by offering comprehensive and high quality programs and services. Columbia College is committed to a culture of improvement through measuring student learning across the institution. We strive for excellence, foster a spirit of professionalism and embrace diversity.

Approved by the YCCD Board of Trustees on March 14, 2012
Adopted by Columbia College Council on February 3, 2012

Vision Statement

We envision ourselves as an exceptional institution of higher education.

Columbia College will continue to provide comprehensive, exemplary educational programs and services which respond to the individual learning needs of our students and the collective economic and cultural needs of the diverse communities we serve.

Columbia College will be a center for transformational learning promoted through critical and creative thinking that is open to change and personal growth; civic, environmental, and global awareness and engagement; and individual and collective responsibility. We will adopt a holistic approach to promote a culture of support for student learning across the institution.

Columbia College will use effective technologies and showcase facilities to enhance teaching and learning. Our vision will be realized through outstanding employees who adhere to high standards of excellence while working in partnership with those we serve.

We envision ourselves developing a passion and capacity for lifelong learning.

Adopted by Columbia College Council on February 3, 2012

Core Values

Academic Excellence and Success:
We value the commitment to quality and support continuous improvement through student learning outcomes. We are committed to a comprehensive curriculum and services that support and foster a culture of academic wellness for all of our students.

Innovation, Professional Development, and Commonality:
We value creativity, risk-taking, and vision. We value others, ourselves, and our students as unique individuals and embrace the commonalities and the differences that promote the best of who we are.

Transformational Learning:
We value and promote critical and creative thinking. We value learning as a lifelong process of change in the pursuit of knowledge and personal growth.
Vital Community and Access:
We value and believe it is essential to assist the broader community in gaining access to higher education and achieving success in their chosen endeavors. Columbia College values its role in the community and is dedicated to strengthening and enriching the quality of life of all those we serve.

Environmental Sustainability:
We value our living planet. We accept responsibility and adopt practices to protect the environment for future generations and share these values with others.

Civic Awareness:
We value civic and global awareness. We promote the understanding and betterment of our planet by engaging our community.

Shared Decision Making:
We value shared decision making that provides each of us the opportunity to participate in building consensus. We value individual and collective responsibility and accountability.

Positive Environment:
We value the preservation of the unique cultural and aesthetic environment of Columbia College which is welcoming, pleasing, and safe.

Collegiality and Professionalism:
We value kindness and respect in all our interactions. We support, promote and demonstrate understanding, civility, cooperation and mutual respect among all of its employees, students, and community members.

Institutional Wellness:
We value an institutional environment and culture that promotes and supports total health and wellness of staff and students.

Adopted by Columbia College Council on February 3, 2012
Certification of the Midterm Report

Date: October 1, 2014

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges,
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From: Columbia College
11600 Columbia College Drive
Sonora, CA 95370

This 2014 Accreditation Midterm Report is in response to recommendations cited in the February 1, 2012 action letter from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges.

We certify that there was broad participation in the production of the 2014 Accreditation Midterm Report by the college community, that the report accurately reflects actions taken by the college and the district to address the recommendations, and that the report was presented to the board of trustees for review prior to submission.

Signed:

Lynn Martin, Ph.D.
Chair, Board of Trustees, Yosemite Community College District

Joan Smith, Ed.D
Chancellor, Yosemite Community College District

Angela R. Fairchilds, Ph.D.
President/CEO, Columbia College

Leslie Buckalew, Ed.D
Vice President of Student Learning, Accreditation Liaison Officer

Warren Hamilton
Academic Senate President, Columbia College

Elissa Creighton
Classified Senate President, Columbia College

Aiko Gonzalez
President Associated Students of Columbia College
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Statement of Report Preparation

Columbia College respectfully submits this Midterm Report as a summary of the college's institutional progress made in respect to the recommendations of the 2013 accreditation visiting team and follow-up to the fifteen Planning Agendas from our 2011 Self Study Report. This report has been prepared by the Vice President of Student Learning, Columbia College's Accreditation Liaison, with input from the Academic Senate, Classified Senate and Associated Students of Columbia College. In addition, assistance was provided by those administrators, faculty and staff members under specific instructional, student services, learning resources, facilities and technology areas whose responsibility involved addressing specific recommendations and planning agenda items identified in the 2011 institutional self-study. The Midterm Report was sent via email for the entire college community to review and provide comments to the Vice President's Office.

The college has made significant progress in meeting the recommendations set forth in 2012 and in carrying out the planning agendas identified in the preceding self-study. The institution has benefited from a collaborative college-wide approach to addressing the recommendations. The College Council, as well as other standing college committees have played an important role in the process of institutional improvement centered on accreditation. The Midterm Report was approved by the Yosemite Community College District Board of Trustees on October 8, 2014.

Submitted by,

Angela R. Fairchilds, Ph.D.
Columbia College, President
The membership of the accreditation standards work groups is as follows:

### 2011 Institutional Self Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011 Institutional Self Study Steering Committee – Team Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian DeMoss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Gervin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Whitfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Torok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raelene Juarez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryl Landess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Womble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonnie Blansit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Bull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elissa Creighton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Hesse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Etter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Davinagracia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Hillis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austen Thibault</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2011 Institutional Self Study Standards Committee – Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra Campbell</td>
<td>Research and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Schultz</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrienne Seegers</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Bull</td>
<td>Classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley Muniz</td>
<td>Classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Mendenhall</td>
<td>Dean of Vocational Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Torok</td>
<td>Dean of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micha Miller</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Leamy</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia Watterson</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Barton</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Sullivan</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Chesnut</td>
<td>Classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate Rien</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Raby</td>
<td>Dean of Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Greene</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karin Rodts</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Fitzwater</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Medeiros</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Brooks</td>
<td>Classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elissa Creighton</td>
<td>Classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marnie Shively</td>
<td>Director of Student Financial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicol Gaffney</td>
<td>Student, Columbia College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Whitfield</td>
<td>Vice President of College and Administrative Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laureen Campana</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Johnson</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hill</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Martin</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Toner</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheri Glynn</td>
<td>Classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian DeMoss</td>
<td>Director Information Technology &amp; Media Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ida Ponder</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Colon</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Johnston</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Grolle</td>
<td>Classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake Beck</td>
<td>Classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Smith</td>
<td>Chancellor and Chief Executive Officer - YCCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Cavagnero</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Andal</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beccie Michael</td>
<td>Director of Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coni Chavez</td>
<td>Executive Assistant to the President, Columbia College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doralyn Foletti</td>
<td>Classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Womble</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonnie Blansit</td>
<td>Classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Stavrianoudakis</td>
<td>Director of Public Affairs - YCCD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The membership of the accreditation standards work groups is as follows:

### 2012 Accreditation Follow-Up Report

**District Recommendations 1, 2, 3 and 4 - Team Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Gervin</td>
<td>President, Columbia College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrienne Seegers</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Leamy</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raelene Juarez</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Hamilton</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Barton</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Womble</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey Laney</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elissa Creighton</td>
<td>Classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Schultz</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Rivera</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate Rien</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Andal</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Colon</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Jensen</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Ryan</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### College Recommendations 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7 – Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Torok</td>
<td>Dean of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Sullivan</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micha Miller</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Johnston</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Chesnut</td>
<td>Classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Romero</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Whitfield</td>
<td>Vice President of College and Administrative Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Buckalew</td>
<td>Vice President of Student Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate Rien</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Toner</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Griffiths Bender</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley Muniz</td>
<td>Classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tori Palmberg</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Kelly</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Raby</td>
<td>Dean of Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alicia Kolstad</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Medeiros</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia Watterson</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan McGee</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Colon</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian DeMoss</td>
<td>Director Information Technology &amp; Media Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ida Ponder</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*continued*
continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Recommendations 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7 – Team Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Randy Barton  Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Gervin    President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raelene Juarez  Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karin Rodts     Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anneka Rogers   TRiO Project Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Trolier    Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Vitelli   Dean of Career and Technical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahna Von Epps  Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Cavagnaro  Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Vidaurri Classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Naegle     Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Recommendations 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7 – Team Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Colon    Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian DeMoss    Director Information Technology &amp; Media Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ida Ponder      Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Barton    Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Gervin   President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raelene Juarez  Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karin Rodts     Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anneka Rogers   TRiO Project Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Trolier    Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Vitelli   Dean of Career and Technical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahna Von Epps  Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Cavagnaro  Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Vidaurri Classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Naegle     Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The membership of the accreditation standards work groups is as follows:

### 2013 Accreditation Follow-Up Report

#### District Recommendations 2 and 3 - Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jill Stearns</td>
<td>President, Modesto Junior College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Buckalew</td>
<td>Interim President, Columbia College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Whitfield</td>
<td>Vice President of Administration, Columbia College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Leamy</td>
<td>Academic Senate President, Columbia College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Stavrianoudakis</td>
<td>District Public Affairs Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coni Chavez</td>
<td>Executive Assistant to the President, Columbia College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### College Recommendations 1 and 2 - Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris Vitelli</td>
<td>Acting Vice President of Student Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Sullivan</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micha Miller</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Johnston</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Chesnut</td>
<td>Classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Christman</td>
<td>Student, ASCC President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Whitfield</td>
<td>Vice President of College and Administrative Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raelene Juarez</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Griffiths-Bender</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Johnson</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Bull</td>
<td>Classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiko Gonzalez</td>
<td>Student, ASCC Director of Publicity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The membership of the accreditation standards work groups is as follows:

2014 Midterm Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Recommendations 1, 2, 3 and 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angela Fairchilds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Recommendations 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7-Team Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Torok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Buckalew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Raby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Whitfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Vitelli</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Agendas 1-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raelene Juarez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Buckalew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Vitelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Barton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luisa Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Torok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Naegle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Johnston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Leamy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laureen Campana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Raby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Sunday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margo Guzman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Whitfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Fairchilds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Womble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Sullivan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence for the Statement of Report Preparation

1.01 Columbia College 2011 Institutional Self Study
1.02 Letter from ACCJC February 11, 2013
1.03 ACCJC Follow Up Visit, November 19, 2012
1.04 Letter from ACCJC February 7, 2014
1.05 Minutes from College Council, February 2014
1.06 Minutes from College Council, March 2014
1.07 Minutes from College Council, April 2014
1.08 Minutes from College Council, May 2014
1.09 Minutes from College Council June 2014
1.10 Minutes from College Council July 2014
1.11 Minutes from College Council August 2014
1.12 Agenda for the YCCD Board of Trustees Meeting, October 2014
   http://www.boarddocs.com/ca/yosemite/Board.nsf/vpublic?open
Response to District Recommendation 1

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.)

VISITING TEAM’S REMARKS:
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 RESPONSE/UPDATE:
Columbia College Planning Agenda #11 from 2011 Institutional Self Study
The college needs to develop a systematic and reliable mechanism to track evaluation progress for faculty, administrators, and staff. Responsible parties need to be identified for staff, faculty, and administrators. (Standard III.A.1.b)

Columbia College Planning Agenda from 2012 Accreditation Follow-Up Report as listed in District Recommendation #1 Response
Both college presidents will continue to work with the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources and Information Technology to insure the evaluation tracking process supports the District and both colleges’ efforts to complete evaluations in a timely manner. The District Human Resources Office will provide the necessary oversight to insure that current evaluations are maintained in the employee’s personnel files.

In response to the ACCJC recommendation and the fulfillment of the planning agendas described above, the District and the college have implemented the following evaluation processes for the respective employee groups:

Classified Staff Evaluations
Per the California Schools Employees Association (CSEA) Chapter 420 contract, permanent classified members are evaluated once every two years, with subsequent evaluations based on the date of the previous regularly scheduled evaluation. In the event an evaluation is not completed within thirty (30) days of the due date, the classified member’s performance shall be deemed competent for that
period and the next evaluation, due in two years, must be completed. An exception to the thirty (30) day provision is provided for in the case of a classified member’s extended absence. Probationary classified members are evaluated during the third (3rd), sixth (6th) and eleventh (11th) month of the probationary period. [D1.01]

In the last round of negotiations, which culminated in the 2013-2016 contract between CSEA and YCCD, employee evaluation language and process was reviewed and revised. Specifically, changes were made to the number and timing of probationary evaluations and a performance improvement plan (PIP) process for permanent employees was added.

Management Staff Evaluations
Per the Leadership Team Handbook, Leadership Team members (managers and administrators) are evaluated each year with a one-on-one evaluation performed by their direct supervisor. Every third year the evaluation includes a confidential evaluation survey sent to not less than 20 subordinate staff, members from the constituent groups, and colleagues with whom the employee has regular interaction. Team members are evaluated twice during the first year they hold their position. [D1.02]

The 2013 Leadership Team Handbook lists the section regarding evaluation as “under review.” The Leadership Team Advisory Council (LTAC) is working with its constituency to assess and improve the relevance of evaluation forms as a means to increase the effectiveness of the process. Resulting recommendations will be made to the Interim Vice Chancellor of Human Resources in spring 2014 with implementation anticipated by the end of fall 2014.

District-level Tracking Process for Classified and Management Staff
YCCD Human Resources documents completed evaluations in Datatel, the District’s management information system, and files them in the employee’s personnel file. Timely evaluations are ensured by way of the tracking process described below.

1. YCCD Human Resources has developed a staff evaluation report in Datatel, the District’s management information system. The information contained in this report is input by Human Resources staff when a completed evaluation is received and indicates the employee’s name, the date of the last evaluation, the date of the next evaluation, the type of evaluation to be performed during the next evaluation, and the position title.

2. YCCD Human Resources has made this report available to managers within the district to be able to view employee information in their area for purposes of monitoring timelines and planning for upcoming evaluations. A reminder to complete evaluations is sent to all YCCD managers from Human Resources each quarter with step-by-step instructions to access the report, in addition to other essential information regarding requirements detailed in the CSEA contract and Leadership Team handbook to complete evaluations. [D1.03]

College-level Tracking Process for Classified and Management Staff
3. The Columbia College President’s Office separately maintains a tracking spreadsheet for Classified Staff evaluations. All completed employee evaluations are provided to the College President’s Office from area managers and/or vice presidents and are recorded on the tracking spreadsheet, then forwarded to YCCD Human Resources for input into Datatel and the employee’s personnel file. The information contained in the staff evaluation report from Datatel is pulled in January and August by the College President’s Office and is validated against the College’s tracking spreadsheet. Any information that is not in alignment is identified and corrected through coordination.
between the College President’s Office and the Human Resources Operations Office. The tracking spreadsheet is open to view by the Office of the Vice President of Student Learning and the Office of the Vice President of College and Administrative Services for use in working with deans and department managers to adhere to evaluation timelines.

Faculty Evaluations
Per the Yosemite Faculty Association (YFA) contract, tenured faculty members are evaluated once every three academic years in the spring semester and contract (probationary) faculty members are evaluated once each academic year during the fall semester. [D1.04]

District-level Tracking Process for Full-time Faculty
YCCD Human Resources documents completed evaluations in Datatel, the District’s management information system, and files them in the employee’s personnel file. Timely evaluations are ensured by way of the tracking process described below.

1. YCCD Human Resources provides the College President’s Office and Office of the Vice President of Student Learning a staff evaluation report listing faculty evaluations on January 31 and August 1 each year. This report is pulled from the information input into the Human Resources module of Datatel, the District’s management information system. The timing of the report is intended to capture fall and spring evaluations completed and submitted at the end of each semester to Human Resources. The evaluation report indicates the faculty member’s name, the date of the last evaluation, the due date of the next evaluation, the type of evaluation to be performed during the next evaluation, and the position title.

College-level Tracking Process for Faculty
The evaluation tracking process instituted and described in the 2012 follow-up report was assessed in December 2013 and revised as described below. The first cycle of this revised tracking process culminated in January 2014 and allows for a successful systematic mechanism to track evaluation progress.

2. The Columbia College President’s Office separately maintains a tracking spreadsheet. All completed employee evaluations are provided to the College President’s Office and are recorded on the tracking spreadsheet, then forwarded to YCCD Human Resources for input into Datatel and the employee’s personnel file. The information provided to the President’s Office in January and August, through the staff evaluation report from Human Resources (described above in District-level Tracking Process for Full-time Faculty 1.), is validated against the College’s tracking spreadsheet. Any information that is not in alignment is identified and corrected through coordination between the College President’s Office and the Office of the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources. The tracking spreadsheet is open to view by the Office of the Vice President of Student Learning for use in working with division deans to adhere to evaluation timelines.

3. The Office of the Vice President of Student Learning uses the college’s tracking spreadsheet to inform area deans to plan for and complete evaluations using the next evaluation dates provided, which are also listed in the staff evaluation report from Human Resources sent to the College President’s Office and copied to the Office of the Vice President of Student Learning. Progress updates from area deans regarding faculty evaluations scheduled in a given semester are routinely discussed in regularly scheduled group meetings with the Vice President of Student Learning (“Deans’ Meetings”).
4. A faculty member is notified that their evaluation has been received in Human Resources based upon the last evaluation date contained in the staff evaluation report provided by Human Resources (described in 1. above). The College President’s Office sends a template email to each faculty whose evaluation was completed (per the report) to inform them that Human Resources received the evaluation, their next evaluation date has been reset in Datatel, and the evaluation has been processed for placement in their personnel file [D1.05]. This template email is also copied to the faculty member’s dean. **NOTE:** If an employee would like to further confirm placement of the evaluation in his/her file, they can schedule an appointment with YCCD Human Resources to view their file.

**EVALUATION**

Since the 2011 external evaluation team offered District Recommendation #1, Columbia College and the District Office have established a systematic process to track employee evaluations. Additionally, processes have been assessed and improvements have been made. The 2012 external team evaluation report states that the “District has met the expectations of the recommendation” and refers to an electronic database and report system that had yet to be completed. That database and report system is now in place using Datatel, the District’s management information system. YCCD Human Resources provides the necessary oversight to ensure current evaluations are maintained in employee personnel files. The College has instituted a mechanism to monitor progress and validate evaluations are received in Human Resources and information is in alignment. All parties have a clear understanding of the process, scheduled timelines, and their role in adhering to employee evaluation requirements.
Evidence for District Recommendation 1

D1.01 California Schools Employees Association Chapter 420 (CSEA) Contract
http://www.yosemite.edu/hr/2013%202016%20Classified%20Contract.pdf

D1.02 Leadership Team Handbook
http://www.yosemite.edu/hr/documents_publications/LT%20HANDBOOK%202013%20updated.pdf

D1.03 Shelley Akiona email on 4/8/13 re: reminder to perform classified and leadership team evaluations

D1.04 Yosemite Faculty Association (YFA) Contract
http://www.yosemite.edu/hr/YFA%20Agreement%202012%202014_FINAL2.pdf

D1.05 Chris Vitelli email dated 12/20/13 re: revised faculty evaluation tracking process
Response to District Recommendation 2

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.)

VISITING TEAM’S REMARKS:
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 measurable 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 RESPONSE/UPDATE:**
ACCJC’s 2013 follow-up team report validated the “events and processes that took place in 2013, regarding the revisions and realignment of the three mission statements,” served to address the recommendation and meet the standards and eligibility requirement referenced with the recommendation.

Since that time, the Chancellor has initiated the development of a new District Vision Statement. The concept was discussed at the District Council meeting on March 26, 2014 [D2.01], and a district-wide Visioning Meeting was conducted April 23, 2014. [D2.02] The intent was to draft a Vision Statement that will guide the District toward the future and serve as an overarching theme to guide the colleges in clarifying their missions and developing strategic priorities. Eleven draft vision statements were developed and sent out districtwide so that all employees could vote on their preferred choice. Two favorites emerged and the Chancellor introduced a final voting process at the In-Service (Columbia) and Institute Day (MJC) in August, 2014.

At the college level, the College Council has developed a Strategic Planning timeline commencing with a Planning Retreat in June 12, 2014. The retreat laid the foundation for a five-year Strategic Plan that will be developed during the 2014-2015 academic year. The Columbia College Mission Statement will be reviewed and revised, as necessary, to align with priorities established through this planning process. The array of course offerings will also continue to reflect the priorities while remaining within the context of current budgets [D2.03].
Evidence for District Recommendation 2

D2.01 District Council Meeting Minutes, March 26, 2014

D2.02 District Council Visioning Meeting, April 23, 2014

D2.03 Columbia College Council Record of Meeting, June 12, 2014
Response to District Recommendation 3

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.)

VISITING TEAM’S REMARKS:
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 RESPONSE/UPDATE:
In response to recommendation #3, YCCD procedures and job descriptions were updated to clearly define the delegation of authority from the Board of Trustees to the College Presidents via the Chancellor. YCCD Board Policy 2430.1: Delegation of Authority to the Presidents was developed and adopted by the Board of Trustees on September 12, 2012 [D3.01]. The Chancellor holds the College President accountable for the operation of the college in a manner consistent with Board Policies, Administrative Procedures and established goals.
Evidence for District Recommendation 3

D3.01 YCCD Board Policy 2430.1: Delegation of Authority to the Presidents
http://www.yosemite.edu/Trustees/newpolicyandprocedures/2430.1%20Delegation%20of%20Authority%20to%20the%20Presidents.pdf
Response to District Recommendation 4

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.)

VISITING TEAM REMARKS:
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.

DISTRICT RESPONSE/UPDATE:
The YCCD Board Policy 2431 establishes a process for the hiring of the College President(s) [D4.01, D4.02, D4.03]. The District used this process during fall 2013 to conduct the search and hiring process for the current President of Columbia College who began her duties in February, 2014. There is an established process for evaluation of the college presidents. Additionally, the Chancellor is accountable for the supervision and evaluation of the college presidents and this responsibility is clearly stated in the Chancellor's job description.

In the first year, a new president is evaluated after six months of service and then again at the one year anniversary. In subsequent years, evaluations are conducted annually. The presidential evaluation process is a 360 review comprised of: a) a survey to the college community; b) a self-evaluation document and draft goals submitted to the Chancellor; and c) a one-on-one evaluation meeting between the Chancellor and the president to discuss the results [D4.04].

EVALUATION
The District has implemented these processes and is following them.
Evidence for District Recommendation 4

D4.01 Minutes of the Board of Trustee Meeting, February 8, 2012
http://www.yosemite.edu/Trustees/02.12%20FEBRUARY%20MINUTES.pdf

D4.02 YCCD Board Policy 2200
http://www.yosemite.edu/Trustees/newpolicyandprocedures/2200%20Board%20Responsibilities.pdf

D4.03 YCCD Board Policy 2431

D4.04 Presidential Evaluation Timeline
Response to College Recommendation 1

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).

VISITING TEAM’S REMARKS:
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.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE RESPONSE/UPDATE:
The College continues to prioritize comprehensive student learning outcomes to provide the highest quality education for our students, to stimulate improvements as needed, strengthen our culture of evidence, and use results for overall institutional effectiveness.

Since the ACCJC follow-up visit, the College has worked to “close the loop” on development, assessment, and analysis of all administrative area student learning outcomes—using assessment results to initiate program improvement [1.08].

For all areas, the College’s cycle of improvement for student learning outcomes continues to meet the rubric for continuous quality improvement. As such, the College continues to: 1.) Improve comprehensive reporting and support, 2.) Build stronger relationships between program review and SLOs, and 3.) Identify and share improvements to student learning through ongoing cycles of assessment [1.01, 1.02, 1.03, 1.05, 1.08, 1.09].

The College continues to provide ongoing support for all areas with particular focus and attention to those administrative areas “closing the loop” and has completed a full cycle of assessment [1.01, 1.08, 1.13]. SLO Mentors are an integral part of this process for all areas at the College. The SLO Mentors provide weekly scheduled office hours, online tools and resources, regular workshops, “just-in-time” one-on-one support, online support resources, monthly columns in the Academic Senate Newsletter, and open dialogue and communication with the campus community [1.01, 1.04, 1.06, 1.07, 1.08, 1.10]. Additionally, the SLO Workgroup meets regularly to discuss progress, share improvements, and to guide the overall cycle of review for all areas of SLOs at the College.

Completion of the Development & Assessment of SLOs for Courses and Programs
Of the 511 courses (excluding cross-listings), 100% are currently associated with at least one or more student learning outcomes and an associated assessment and analysis (excluding new courses from the 2012-13 academic year). To date, analysis of SLOs has led to either the review and/or identification of improvements for all active (excluding new courses) courses at the College. Moving forward, the College has particularly focused on the analyses of these SLOs and the improvement ensued as part of that cycle [1.08, 1.13].

Of the 96 programs, 100% are currently associated with at least one or more student learning outcomes and an associated assessment and analysis. To date, analysis of SLOs has led to either the review and/or identification of improvements for all active programs at the College [1.08, 1.13].

Development and Assessment of Learning Outcomes for Administrative Services, Student Support Services, and Library and Learning Support Services
The development and assessment of learning outcomes for Administrative Services, Student Support Services, and Library and Learning Support Services has been a continuous primary goal.
Administrative Services
Of the 9 programs in Administrative Services, 100% currently are associated with at least one learning outcome and associated assessment. To date, analysis of SLOs has led to either the review and/or identification of assessment results for the improvement of all the programs in Administrative Services [1.08, 1.13].

Student Support Services
Of the 15 programs in Student Support Services, 100% currently are associated with at least one learning outcome and associated assessment. To date, analysis of SLOs has led to either the review and/or identification of assessment results for the improvement of all the programs in Student Support Services [1.08, 1.13].

Library and Learning Support Services
Library and Learning Support Services has 100% currently associated with at least one learning outcome and associated assessment. To date, analysis of SLOs has led to either the review and/or identification of assessment results for the improvement of all the programs in Library and Learning Support Services [1.08, 1.13].

Results Demonstrating Improvement and Closing the Loop
The College continues to utilize comprehensive assessment reports via the SLO Tool—helping inform the College of the progress with ongoing cycles of evaluation. [1.08, 1.13] The SLO Tool, integrated with Program Review [1.09] and resource allocation, provides comprehensive results demonstrating improvement for courses and programs—particularly in “closing the loop” on one full cycle of learning outcomes for several administrative areas. [1.03, 1.04, 1.05, 1.06, 1.07, 1.08, 1.12, 1.13]

As a part of the current cycle, the SLO Mentors have developed a Program SLO Report Card [1.14] for all program-related student learning outcomes. The goal is for all programs to evaluate Program SLOs and demonstrate improvement as a result of this planning cycle. Additionally, each program is connecting their respective learning outcomes to one or more of the college/institutional learning outcomes—a new addition to the SLO Tool [1.06, 1.08].

By September 2013, all college programs, including administrative areas, completed the Program SLO Report Card demonstrating the completion of one full cycle for all programs with results for improvement of student learning and institutional effectiveness [1.14]. Using the results of the Program SLO Report Card, the SLO Mentors will identify common areas needed for continuous improvement and address these areas through a series of one-on-one consultations, electronic dialogue, and workshops.

As a part of our continuous cycle of improvement, the SLO Report Card will be forwarded to College Council for inclusion in the annual evaluation.

Examples of Improvement:

Courses
The NARTC 181-California Wildlife course instructor developed an assessment tool aligned with each of the course SLOs to gain student perspective on each outcome. The student assessments and comments led to the improvement of course technology and upgrades with the purchase of new wildlife cameras for the course [1.08, 1.15].
Programs
The Biological and Physical Sciences Program created an assessment to measure the SLO to “develop social and professional skills needed to be successful in the modern workplace.” The results of the 4-question student assessment given in all science-related programs led to increased classroom instruction and contextualized activities related to the types of workplace skills needed as they relate to biological and physical sciences related careers [1.08, 1.15].

Administrative Services
The Child Development Center’s SLO to “provide ‘hands on’ opportunities and experiences for students to explore and practice what has been learned while enrolled in Child Development or closely related courses” was linked to the following two assessment tools: the Infant Toddler Environmental Rating Scale (ITERS) and the Early Childhood Education Rating Scale (ECERS). The analyses of these tools led to increased activities and hands-on opportunities for student employees aligned with the ITERS and ECERS assessments [1.08, 1.15].

Student Services
The EOPS program’s SLO for “80% of new EOPS students to demonstrate knowledge of program requirements and services as a result of attending an EOPS orientation” was assessed with a quiz after each session. As a result of the orientation quiz, it was determined that students were often unable to identify the required action steps and counseling sessions for the program. This resulted in an increased emphasis on this component of the orientation, which included more clearly defined action steps and required counseling sessions [1.08, 1.15].

Library Support Services
The Library’s SLO to “foster positive growth in students”—integrated with college-wide SLOs—was assessed via several student surveys in a four-year period. The results led to several improvements including the increased depth and breadth of textbook availability in the reserve collection leading to a 50%-plus increase in usage, an increase in face-to-face orientations, and the development of Finals Cram Nights [1.08, 1.15].

Outline of Overall SLO Cycle Review for Columbia College
In an effort to codify comprehensive review cycles, the College has discussed a plan and the SLO Workgroup made the recommendation to College Council to adopt the following review comprehensive cycle for all learning outcomes [1.06, 1.11]:
Comprehensive Review Cycle for SLOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>3-Year Cycle</th>
<th>5-Year Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional SLOs</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Support Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The review cycle was adopted by College Council on May 16, 2013 [1.11]. The College is working to develop a more detailed cycle calendar with specific dates for each of the areas. The goal is to stagger the dates appropriately to allow for a portion of each area to conduct comprehensive reviews each year.

**Evaluation Summary**

The College has made significant progress in completing the cycle and “closing the loop” for learning outcomes in all areas—including administrative areas—and is using the outcomes to improve and enhance student success and institutional effectiveness.

To date, all instructional courses and programs as well as Administrative Services, Student Services, and Library Support Services have identified SLOs assessing outcomes and are actively using the results for improvement and institutional effectiveness [1.08]. SLOs are also now included as an integrated component of Program Review [1.09] and ongoing support is provided for all areas. Furthermore, a comprehensive review cycle has been identified and will ensure continuous quality improvement and assessment of SLOs [1.11].

In summary, Columbia College is committed to student learning outcomes for all areas to use the results for improvement of student learning and institutional effectiveness. The College has strived to meet the sustainable quality improvement level for all student learning outcomes and has “closed the loop” on the development, assessment, and analysis of all administrative area student learning outcomes—using the results to initiate program improvement.
Evidence for College Recommendation 1

1.01 Student Learning Outcomes
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/default.php

1.02 SLO Statement of Purpose
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/statement.php

1.03 Assessment Cycle
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/cyclegraphic.php

1.04 Assessment Tools and Resources
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/tools.php

1.05 Implementation Models
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/implementation.php

1.06 SLO Workgroup Minutes
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/slo_minutes/default.php

1.07 SLO Workgroup
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/workgroup.php

1.08 SLO Tool
   https://apps.gocolumbia.edu/slo_tool/login.aspx

1.09 Columbia College Planning, Instructional Program Review

1.10 Accreditation Forum Presentation 3-15-13

1.11 College Council Minutes, May 16, 2013
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/governance/documents/collegecouncil/2013/
   CollegeCouncilMinutes05162013.pdf

1.12 ACCJC College Recommendation 1 Response Team Meeting Minutes for 3-28-14

1.13 SLO Summary Report

1.14 Program SLO Report Card

1.15 SLO Examples of Improvement
SLO Examples of Improvement by Course
SLO Examples of Improvement by Program
SLO Examples of Improvement - Administrative Services
SLO Examples of Improvement - Students Services
SLO Examples of Improvement - Library Support Services
Response to College Recommendation 2

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).

VISITING TEAM’S REMARKS:

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: 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.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE RESPONSE/UPDATE:

Measurable Goals and Objectives: Columbia College has continued to evaluate and strengthen its integrated planning structure. The College Council serves as the recommending body for integrated planning and holds an annual planning retreat in spring to evaluate the following areas: 1) The effectiveness of the Columbia College Strategic Planning and Cycle, 2) Progress toward the achievement of the College Mission through measurable goals, 3) Evaluation of program review and its effectiveness in guiding resource allocation, and 4) Employee Evaluation. Institutional information and data analysis for the retreats is provided through the Office of Institutional Research. Evaluative information from the Annual Planning Retreat is consolidated into an Annual Assessment Report that provides feedback, analysis and suggestions for improvement to the institution [2.01].

As the College Council initially approached the assessment of the college goals by development of a qualitative rubric, the dialog shifted away from using a rubric to focus on the development of measurable objectives for each of the college goals. Subsequent efforts to develop measurable objectives led the Council to recommend that the existing college goals be revised and focused in a way that would allow them to be more effectively measured.
The original goals were consolidated from ten into five with each goal having measurable objectives, which was approved by College Council on October 5, 2012 [2.03, 2.10].

**Integrated Planning Cycle:**
Columbia College has an integrated planning process that has evolved over the years and developed a cycle of evaluation that is based on evidence and data to improve student learning and to analyze progress towards fulfilling its Mission and making improvements to the goals of the college [2.08].

Each goal has objectives that will be evaluated with data and surveys each year. An Institutional Effectiveness Report and analysis from the College Researcher will be prepared by the end of each spring semester. The report was reviewed and discussed by College Council, at a year-end retreat, looking at trends and other data to ensure a continuous quality improvement.

The College Council has reviewed the planning process mechanisms in place at the College, including but not limited to Program Review, Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), and Resource Allocation for ease of use and effectiveness. The discussion evolved from staff surveys regarding the Integrated Planning Process used to achieve improved student achievement and learning. College Council will also review an Executive Summary [2.02] from each division area; Instruction, Student Services and Administrative Services. The Executive Summary highlights areas of improvement, allocated resources, and areas of needed improvements.

Documentation related to Integrated Planning:

- [http://www.gocolumbia.edu/institutional_research/cc_planning/2013ProgressTowardGoals.pdf](http://www.gocolumbia.edu/institutional_research/cc_planning/2013ProgressTowardGoals.pdf)


**Strengthening Research:** The College has experienced greater stability with research and planning since the hiring of a full-time Director of Research and Planning in May of 2012. The most significant project undertaken by Columbia’s new Director was the creation of a data portal that allows administrators, faculty and staff easy access and better evaluation of critical data used in the planning cycles [2.05, 2.07].

[https://sp-portal.yosemite.edu/data/cc-research/SitePages/Data%20Portal.aspx](https://sp-portal.yosemite.edu/data/cc-research/SitePages/Data%20Portal.aspx)

**Program Review:** Program Reviews are updated every fall by all divisions; Instruction, Student and Administrative Services. In addition, a comprehensive Program Review is completed every three years for each division. The update is date stamped with an analysis of improvements, areas of concern and resources allocated to improve student learning. The comprehensive Program Review is a complete analysis of the previous three years and review of the program or service going forward. The Vice Presidents will provide an Executive Summary after the third year at the College Council Retreat [2.04].

To maintain continuous quality improvement for student success, the Program Review process uses data and other evaluation tools such as surveys to analyze the effectiveness of the program or service.
Identified improvements result in the program or service creating appropriate Student Learning Outcomes – (SLOs), so the continuous process of improvement can be monitored. The Program Review process also identifies resources necessary to accomplish the needed improvements.

**Student Learning Outcomes:** SLOs are identified from Program Review and documented in the SLO Tool developed by the college on the intranet. Annual reviews take place each spring semester. A Comprehensive Review will be done every three to five years. The purpose of SLOs is to track the improvement in student success for students attending Columbia College. Instructional Programs, Administrative Services, and Student Support Services/Library Support Services will complete a comprehensive review every three years and courses will be done every five years [2.06].

**Resource Allocation:** Resource Allocation for categorical funds begins in the fall, after Program Reviews are updated or the Comprehensive Review is completed, and continues into the spring semester for all three divisions. At division meetings, the identified resource needs in Program Review are prioritized. The Dean or Administrator creates a prioritized list of the needs to submit to the Vice Presidents. The lists are reviewed by the Vice Presidents and brought forward to the Administrative Council meeting in February for consideration. Actual resource allocation takes place when the budget is developed in late spring.

At the February Administrative Council meeting, the lists of resource needs are reviewed and discussed. In March, the Administrative Council will finalize the items for funding, based on available resources, and make a recommendation to the President for consideration.

The President will approve the items deemed appropriate to fund and will present the list to College Council for review at the April meeting. After consultation with College Council, the list of approved items for funding will be included in the college budget [2.09, 2.11].
Evidence for College Recommendation 2

2.01  2013 Progress Toward Goals

2.02  2012-13 Columbia College Administrative Services

2.03  Columbia College Council Minutes 5-16-2013
     http://www.gocolumbia.edu/governance/collegecouncil.php

2.04  Home – Program Review

2.05  2013 Institutional Effectiveness Report
     http://www.gocolumbia.edu/institutional_research/InstitutionalEffectivenessReport.pdf

2.06  SLO Tool Login.aspx.htm
     https://apps.gocolumbia.edu/slo_tool/login.aspx

2.07  SSPR Report Spring 2013

2.08  Integrated Planning Process Cycle Chart

2.09  Columbia College Council Minutes 7-11-2013
     http://www.gocolumbia.edu/governance/collegecouncil.php

2.10  Integrated Planning Process Cycle Narrative

2.11  Columbia College Council Minutes 4-4-2014
Response to College Recommendation 4

**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).

**VISITING TEAM’S REMARKS:**

**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.

**COLUMBIA COLLEGE RESPONSE/UPDATE:**

Columbia College is committed to meeting the needs of distance learning students. Since the 2011 comprehensive accreditation evaluation, the college has made significant progress toward developing counseling and advising opportunities for online students [4.01, 4.02].

Expansion of the college’s distance education program is a key component of Columbia’s $2 million Title III grant. As the grant sunsets this year, more than 30 online services will have been developed to support distance learning students [4.02, 4.05].

In coordination with the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP), enhancements have been made in the areas of registration, orientation, access to advising, and educational planning [4.03]. Distance learning students can now complete the matriculation process in order to get started taking online class at Columbia College, without having to step foot on campus. In spring 2013, Columbia switched to the statewide application (CCCApply), which created a more streamlined process and better statewide consistency. Conversion to CCCApply allowed for the implementation of the online state-wide Board of Governors Fee Waiver process. Additionally, we have improved the online registration process; contact information, address, educational goals and program of study (major) is now verified during the online registration process.

Much progress has been made that specifically addresses the counseling and academic advising needs for students enrolled in distance learning courses. The counseling website [http://www.gocolumbia.edu/counseling/default.php](http://www.gocolumbia.edu/counseling/default.php) has been revised to better serve and provide resources to all students, and especially to the distance learners. The goal for the development of the website was to enable students to obtain accurate and up-to-date information, to self-serve where appropriate, to understand the
benefit of meeting with a counselor, and to be better prepared when they do meet with a counselor. Counselors have collaborated and provided a variety of material that is valuable to students [4.04].

During the spring 2012 semester, the counseling department developed a Facebook page (www.facebook.com/cccounseling). The goal in using Facebook is to give students quick information in a format they are familiar with, to provide links and access to counselors for quick and/or general questions, and to enable the counselors to ‘be where students are’ with the information that is needed. There is a designated counselor assigned to post information and answer questions, but all counselors have access to do this as well. There is a direct link to the Facebook page on the Columbia College Counseling webpage. Reference to Facebook is also listed in the schedule and catalog.

Alternative formats for counseling services are currently in place. When a student cannot physically attend an on campus appointment, they can schedule a phone appointment. Additionally, counselors will correspond with students via email, which is now publicized on the updated counseling website. The counselors explored several e-advising platforms such as Skype, Blackboard, CCCConfer, and others. In order to efficiently run a successful counseling appointment with a student, the counselor needs a visual component (i.e. desktop sharing) with the student to enable detailed explanations of complex course planning. Google Hangout web conferencing technology was selected as the platform for online counseling. Desktops and documents can be shared and can be accessed on computers, Android and Apple devices. In addition to individual scheduled online appointments, students can ask quick general counseling related questions in a live chat/drop-in style forum. The online counseling and Google hangout forums went live spring 2014. http://www.gocolumbia.edu/counseling/online_counseling_services/default.php

College Orientation has also been revised to provide more of an in-depth overview of college policies, procedures and resources, so that Counselors can focus more on educational planning during the face-to-face advising sessions. Online workshops are currently in development to mirror the face-to-face advising sessions so distance learners will also have access. Additionally, the guidance course, “Orientation to College”, had been developed in an online format. The course is designed to prepare the student to meet the demands of college rigor and expands upon the concepts introduced in the online version of orientation [4.05].

Columbia College is currently implementing a degree audit system that will help counselors to electronically facilitate educational plans with students. The purpose of Degree Audit is to inform the counselor and the student of the courses required for the degree program, and their progress toward that goal. Counselors can access Degree Audit through Datatel and students can access Degree Audit through Web Advisor (connectColumbia), via the e-advising module (Student Planning) that accompanies Degree Audit. The Student Planning module will also allow students to access “what-if” scenarios on their chosen program of study.

Columbia College uses Blackboard, a web-based course management system and tool that allows our instructors to develop and support online education. On the main page of Blackboard, is a student resource link directing students to the online services such as counseling. Additionally, students can access the resource; “Getting started with online learning” that includes a tutorial for navigating Blackboard components and an online student success orientation. Information on how to be an online student is also incorporated into the main new student online orientation [4.06].
Evidence for College Recommendation 4

4.01  CCCApply.htm

4.02  Columbia College Counseling Facebook
       https://www.facebook.com/cccounseling

4.03  Resources for Students
       http://www.gocolumbia.edu/online_learning/students.php

4.04  Columbia College Counseling
       http://www.gocolumbia.edu/counseling/default.php

4.05  Columbia College Online Counseling Services
       http://www.gocolumbia.edu/counseling/online_counseling_services/default.php

4.06  Title III Online Services Fall 2013
Response to College Recommendation 5

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).

VISITING TEAM’S REMARKS:

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 meeting 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.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE RESPONSE/UPDATE:

Administrative Services program review process was implemented in August 2012 with a comprehensive review and was updated in 2013 and 2014, as scheduled through the college integrated planning and evaluation process [5.01]. The priority needs identified through the program review process for Administrative Services were addressed in the allocation of resources [5.02].
Administrative Services program review process has now completed the three year cycle with a comprehensive review with two updates. An Executive Summary for Administrative Services was presented at the September College Council meeting [5.03]. Administrative Services will now start a new cycle with a comprehensive program review in fall 2014.
Evidence for College Recommendation 5

5.01 Integrated Planning and Evaluation Chart
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/institutional_research/cc_planning/

5.02 College Council July 11, 2013 meeting minutes

5.03 College Council September 5, 2014 Agenda
Response to College Recommendation 6

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).

VISITING TEAM’S REMARKS:
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.

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.
COLUMBIA COLLEGE RESPONSE/UPDATE:
Columbia College has adopted and updated the Integrated Planning Process and Cycle of Evaluation on July 10, 2014, has completed two annual review cycles of the College goals (from data presented in the 2013 and 2014 Institutional Effectiveness Reports), one retreat to review the Planning and Evaluation process and recently started the Strategic Planning discussions [6.01, 6.02, 6.03, 6.04]. The first College Council retreat using the adopted integrated plan occurred on May 16, 2013 and College Council held a Strategic Planning Session on June 12, 2014 with additional sessions scheduled for the entire College at In-Service and another College Council session on November 7, 2014. The planning process includes the allocation of resources and enables instruction, student services and administrative services to bring forward identified needs for technology, staffing and other resources identified in program review [6.05, 6.06].

Overview
Columbia College has an integrated planning process that has evolved over the years, and developed a cycle of evaluation that will be based on evidence and data to improve student learning and to analyze progress towards its Mission and improvements to the Goals of the college.

Currently, the college has a planning calendar that reviews the Mission and Goals on a yearly cycle. Two yearly reviews have occurred and the College has started the Strategic Planning Process to assess the environment we serve, strategize our future direction, ensure our goals match the needs of our customers and that our resource allocation decisions are made to support the direction of the College.
Evidence for College Recommendation 6

6.01  College Council July 10, 2014 meeting minutes

6.02  College Council May 16, 2013 retreat meeting minutes
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/governance/documents/collegecouncil/2013/
CollegeCouncilMinutes05162013.pdf

6.03  2014 Institutional Effectiveness Report
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/institutional_research/ier2014.pdf

6.04  College Council June 12, 2014 Strategic Planning Process meeting minutes

6.05  College Council July 11, 2013 meeting minutes – Allocation of Resources

6.06  College Council May 8, 2014 meeting minutes – Allocation of Resources
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/governance/2014maycollegecouncil.pdf
Response to College Recommendation 7

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).

VISITING TEAM’S REMARKS:
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.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE RESPONSE/UPDATE:
The College continues to make significant progress in supporting staff development efforts and initiatives. The College developed a comprehensive staff development plan designed to meet the needs of its personnel and developed a systematic evaluation process [7.01, 7.02].

The Columbia College Three-Year Staff Development Plan was reviewed by College Council at the October 5, 2012 meeting [7.03]. The administrator overseeing the Staff Development Plan reviewed the plan with the Council and it was agreed that an agenda item would be added to the November College Council meeting to consider approval of the plan. The 3-year plan was formally adopted at the November 2, 2012 College Council meeting [7.04].

To formally launch and introduce the staff development plan, representatives from each constituency group presented at the January 10, 2013 campus wide In-Service [7.05]. The presentation introduced
the staff development plan’s new website, statement of purpose, goals, committee structure, committee representatives, assessment components, and highlights from each of the represented constituencies.

The “Columbia College Staff Development—An Initiative for Professional Engagement” website was created [7.01]. The website includes a copy of the 3-year plan, policies and processes to request staff development funds, and timelines to submit funding requests. Additionally, the Activity Proposal Form and Activity Proposal Rubric are posted on the website.

The Staff Development Committee meets twice a semester to review the staff development plan, report out from each constituent group, discuss and review policies and procedures as needed, and to allocate funds for staff development [7.06].

In August 2014, the Staff Development Committee conducted a college-wide survey to assess professional development needs. The needs assessment results will be reviewed and a plan to implement the results will be developed in the fall 2014 term [7.07].

As noted in the Staff Development Plan, the committee conducted a mid-term self-evaluation and assessment report based on the evidence and outcomes of the plan in April 2014 [7.08]. The results of the mid-term report were submitted to College Council at the September 5, 2014 meeting [7.09].

Moving forward, the College has identified a classified staff member in the Office of the Vice President of Student Learning to track all staff development activities, including the assessment of all funded staff development activities. In addition, beginning in the fall 2014, this staff member will be responsible for coordinating and organizing a master calendar and “hub” for staff development activities to increase visibility of professional development opportunities for all contingencies at the College.

In summary, the College continues to make significant progress in fully implementing the 3-year Staff Development Plan as well as involving all constituency groups in the process to ensure the needs of the entire institution are considered and reviewed, along with an evaluation tool and a schedule for outcome assessment.
Evidence for College Recommendation 7

7.01 Staff Development Website and Resources
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/staff_development/default.php

7.02 Three-Year Staff Development Plan
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/staff_development/StaffDevelopmentPlanOutline.pdf

7.03 Minutes from College Council Committee, October 5, 2012

7.04 Minutes from College Council Committee, November 2, 2012

7.05 Columbia College In-Service Staff Development Plan PPT Presentation
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/staff_development/staffdevelopmentin-servicepptjan13.pdf

7.06 Staff Development Committee Meeting Agendas and Minutes
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/staff_development/staffdevelopmentagendasandminutes-1.php

7.07 Staff Development College-wide Needs Assessment Survey
https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/MNJ3CR7

7.08 Staff Development Mid-Term Self-Evaluation and Assessment Report
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/staff_development/
StaffDevelopmentPlanMidTermSelfAssessmentReport2014.pdf

7.09 Minutes from College Council Committee, September 5, 2014
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/governance/collegecouncil.php
Response to Self-Identified Issues/Planning Agendas

Columbia College has made significant progress on the completion of its improvement plans. Based on our Institutional Self Study in 2011, we identified fifteen planning agendas (now called improvement plans). The timeline for the improvement plans are listed below and show the responsible parties and dates of completion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Planning Agenda</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I.B.4 II.A.2.f</td>
<td>The college will find mechanisms to better involve part-time faculty and staff in planning.</td>
<td>College Council</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I.B.6 IV.A IV.A.1 IV.A.5</td>
<td>College Council will continue to improve the evaluation tools for college goals and planning processes.</td>
<td>College Council</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>II.A.1.c II.A.3.b II.A.3.c</td>
<td>The college needs to continue efforts to improve authentic assessment of student learning outcomes for course, program and institutional levels. This will include evidence of cycles of ongoing assessment. The institution will offer college-wide workshops in fall 2011 and spring 2012 to accomplish this.</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes (SLO ) Workgroup</td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>II.A.1.c II.A.2.i</td>
<td>The college needs to more fully implement programmatic student learning outcomes, in particular, mechanisms to assess progress toward achieving these outcomes.</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes (SLO ) Workgroup</td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>II.A.1.c</td>
<td>The college needs to more fully implement institutional student learning outcomes, in particular, mechanisms to assess progress toward achieving these outcomes.</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes (SLO ) Workgroup</td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>II.A.2.a</td>
<td>The college needs to more fully implement course level student learning outcomes, in particular, mechanisms to assess progress toward achieving these outcomes.</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes (SLO ) Workgroup</td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>II.A.2.i</td>
<td>Measurable programmatic outcomes for programs will appear in the 2011-2012 College Catalog.</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes (SLO ) Workgroup</td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>II.B.3 II.B.4</td>
<td>Student Services will establish a new mechanism to manage program review data.</td>
<td>Student Services/ Technology and Media Services</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>II.B.3.e</td>
<td>Institutional Research Office will work with the Math Department to complete the math assessment validity study.</td>
<td>Institutional Research Office</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>III.A.1.a III.A.2</td>
<td>Continue to develop Staffing Plan.</td>
<td>College Council</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>III.A.1.b</td>
<td>The college needs to develop a systematic and reliable mechanism to track evaluation progress for faculty, administrators, and staff. Responsible parties need to be identified for staff, faculty, and administrators.</td>
<td>President’s Office</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>III.A.1.c</td>
<td>Continue to discuss the associations between student learning outcomes and the self-evaluation component of the faculty evaluation.</td>
<td>Academic Senate/ Student Learning Outcomes (SLO ) Workgroup</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>III.A.5 III.A.5.a III.A.5.b</td>
<td>Re-establish the Staff Development Committee to develop a comprehensive Staff Development Plan and processes for the college.</td>
<td>Vice President of Student Learning</td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>IV.A.5</td>
<td>The college will continue to develop and strengthen unit planning processes at the unit/division level.</td>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>IV.B.2.b</td>
<td>The president will direct college resources to evaluate and implement identified research needs.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning Agenda 1 (1.B.4., 11.A.2.F)

The college will find mechanisms to better involve part-time faculty and staff in planning.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE RESPONSE/UPDATE:
Columbia College continues to improve its broad-based planning processes. Changes over the last year have codified and strengthen the integrated planning process and the evaluation mechanisms. College Council, the recommending body for the college, oversees the planning documents and processes. To help better involve part-time faculty and staff and to also understand Annual Planning, a chart was created to provide a timeline of the integrated planning process components and the evaluation mechanisms involved.

The Integrated Planning Process and Cycle of Evaluation
The implementation of timeframes for the Annual Planning processes codifies the ongoing systematic review and improves the college’s culture of evidence. At the College Council April 5, 2013 meeting, discussion took place about the need for a timeline with defined dates for SLOs and other annual planning processes such as program review and resource allocation. At the May 16, 2013 meeting [1.03], College Council reviewed a one-page chart outlining the timeframes for integrated planning process components and made recommendations to be brought back to the next meeting. A chart was created to provide a quick overview of the timeframes. In addition, a narrative of the integrated planning components and evaluation mechanisms was approved at the July 11, 2013 College Council meeting. Here is the overview:

Columbia College Integrated Planning Process and Cycle of Evaluation

Overview
Columbia College has an integrated planning process that has evolved over the years and developed a cycle of evaluation that will be based on evidence and data to improve student learning and to analyze progress towards its Mission and improvements to the goals of the college.

Currently, the college has a planning calendar that reviews the Mission, which includes the Goals, on a two year cycle. The goals are:

Goal 1 – Student Success
Goal 2 – High Quality Programs and Services
Goal 3 – Institutional Effectiveness
Goal 4 – Campus Climate
Goal 5 – Community Connections

http://www.gocolumbia.edu/about/goals.pdf

Each Goal has objectives specific to that goal that will be evaluated with data and surveys each year. An Institutional Effectiveness Report and analysis from the College Researcher will be prepared by the end of each spring semester. The report will be reviewed and discussed by College Council, at a year-end retreat, looking at trends and other data to ensure a continuous quality improvement.
The College Council will also review the planning process mechanisms in place at the College, including but not limited to Program Review, Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), and allocation of resources for ease of use and effectiveness. The discussion will evolve from staff surveys regarding the integrated planning process used to achieve improved student achievement and learning. College Council will also review an Executive Summary from each division area; instruction, student services and administrative services. The Executive Summary will highlight areas of improvement, allocated resources, and areas of needed improvements [1.03].

The Integrated Planning Process and Cycle of Evaluation:

Program Review - annually updated in the fall semester with a comprehensive review every three years

Program Reviews are updated each fall by all divisions; instruction, student and administrative services and a complete comprehensive Program Review is completed every three years for all divisions. The update will be date stamped with an analysis of improvements, areas of concern and resources allocated to improve student learning. The comprehensive Program Review is a complete analysis of the previous three years and review of the program or service going forward. The Vice Presidents will provide an Executive Summary after the third year at the College Council Retreat.

To maintain continuous quality improvement for student success, the Program Review process uses data and other evaluation tools such as surveys to analyze the effectiveness of the program or service. Improvements identified result in the program or service creating appropriate Student Learning Outcomes, SLOs, so the continuous process of improvement can be monitored. The Program Review process also identifies resources necessary to accomplish the needed improvements [1.04].

Student Learning Outcomes - annually updated in the spring semester with a comprehensive review every three to five years

SLOs are identified from Program Review and documented in the software developed by the college on the intranet. Annual reviews take place each spring semester. A comprehensive review will be done every three to five years (see below). The purpose of SLOs is to track the improvement in student success for both the instructional, student and administrative services for the students attending Columbia College.

Instructional Programs, Administrative Services, and Student Support Services/Library Support Services will complete a comprehensive review every three years and courses will be done every five years.

Allocation of Resources – the needs identified in Program Review are prioritized and funded by the College in the spring semester

The allocation of resources starts in late fall, after Program Reviews are updated or the comprehensive is completed, and continues into the spring semester for all three divisions. At division meetings, the identified resource needs in Program Review are prioritized. The Dean or Administrator creates a prioritized list of the needs to submit to the Vice Presidents. The lists are reviewed by the Vice Presidents and bought forward to the Administrative Council meeting in February for consideration.

At the Administrative Council in February, the lists of resource needs are reviewed and discussed.
In March, the Administrative Council will finalize the approved items for funding, based on available resources, and make a recommendation to the President for his/her approval.

The President will approve the items deemed appropriate to fund and will present the list to College Council for review at the April meeting. After consultation with College Council, the list of approved items for funding will be included in the college budget.

**Annual College Council Retreat for Evaluation of all Mechanisms for Continuous Quality Improvement**

In March of each year, the College Council will meet to review the Institutional Effectiveness Report (IER), surveys completed, an Executive Summary and analysis from the College Researcher. The IER report will be a trend analysis of the College’s goals and objectives that are supported with data from various sources. The College Council will discuss and make recommendations for improvement of learning outcomes and recommend to the President for direction going forward to the new academic year [1.02].

The College Council will also review, discuss, and make recommendations for improvements to the integrated planning process from surveys and other input for Program Review, SLOs, and the allocation of resources to the college President. The college President will take those recommendations to the Administrative Council for discussion and implementation.

**Strategic Planning – Mission, Vision, Core Values and Goals review every two years**

Columbia College has a timeline for reviewing and updating the Mission, Vision, Core Values and Goals every two years. The recommendations for improving the integrating planning process will assist in the development of evaluation mechanisms that lead to continuous quality improvement.

**Building a Culture of Evidence**

Since the hiring of a full-time Director of Research in May 2012, significant strides have been made in order to build a culture of evidence. A data portal has been created on the college web site that allows all administrators, faculty and staff, whether part-time or full-time, access to data in all areas of the college. The collection of data provides users with a collection of data for internal use and evaluation. https://sp-portal.yosemite.edu/data/cc-research/SitePages/Data%20Portal.aspx

In addition, the researcher has been able to work with administrators, faculty and staff with creating mechanisms to effectively captivate data in a meaningful manner. For example, a Staff and Faculty Survey and a Student Feedback Survey have been conducted the last two years. This data provides the Summary of Institutional Progress Toward Goals which is reviewed and discussed by College Council to see if there are trends or other data to ensure continuous quality improvement.

The researcher was also able to help create a new program review format for the Arts and Science and Career Technical Education divisions. Within the new form, SLO data is readily available as well as all courses and programs approved through the curriculum committee. Documents can simply be attached to provide additional information or external data. Plus, if projects and/or improvements require funding, each request can be connected within the form to the college goals and measurable objectives, institutional SLOs, program SLOs, and course SLOs.
Next Steps
The Annual Planning Cycle at Columbia College is an ongoing systematic process. Feedback from faculty indicated that the process keeps changing and that timeframes need to be codified. Now that the Integrated Planning and Evaluation Process chart and narrative are in place and no significant changes have been made, it is time to better involve part-time faculty and staff. For example, at the Adjunct In-Service (August 2014) a session on the annual planning process and the integrated planning process was conducted. A concerted effort will also be made to communicate what broad-based planning looks like at Columbia College. Representatives from the Classified Senate and Academic Senates will continue to update and inform their constituents just as Divisions Deans will reiterate the timeframes.

The institution continues to improve and strengthen its planning processes. Columbia College has an integrated planning process that has evolved over the years and has developed a cycle of evaluation that is based on evidence and data to improve student learning and strives to make this data available to appropriate constituencies.
Evidence - Planning Agenda 1

1.01 Faculty and Student
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/institutional_research/cc_planning/IER-FacultyStaff.pdf

1.02 IER

1.03 College Council Minutes – April 5, 2013, May 16, 2013, July 11, 2013
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/governance/collegecouncil2013.php

1.04 Integrated Planning and Evaluation Process Chart - July 2014
Planning Agenda 2 (I.B.6, IV.A, IV.A.1, IV.A.5)

College Council will continue to improve the evaluation tools for college goals and planning processes.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE RESPONSE/UPDATE:
Columbia College continues to strengthen its culture of institutional assessment. Since the time of the last visit, the College finalized the institution’s goals, measurable objectives, and developed sustainable evaluations mechanisms that lead to continuous quality improvement at all levels.

In December 2010, College Council initiated the evaluation of college goals and continued the effort through the spring and summer of 2011 [2.01]. After several reiterations of trying to develop a qualitative rubric, it was decided at the September 30, 2011 College Council retreat to instead create measurable objectives for each of the college goals [2.02].

Efforts toward the revision and measurement of college goals continued; however, it was not until the formation of the College Goals Revision Subcommittee at the April 6, 2012 College Council meeting that considerable progress was made [2.03]. The goals were consolidated from ten into five with each goal having measurable objectives. A full-time Director of Research and Planning was also hired in May 2012 to help to stabilize the institutional research needs of the College [2.04]. Now, almost two years after hiring the full-time Director of Research and Planning the College has completed evaluations of our Program Review Process, Student Learning Outcomes and Resource Allocation Process. Pending and expected in June 2014 is evaluation of our College Mission and Goals. This will be completed before the Midterm reported is submitted in October 2014.

The College Council approved the following five college goals with measurable objectives at an October 5, 2012 meeting, [2.05, 2.06]: 
## GOALS
### GOAL 1 – STUDENT SUCCESS:
Students at Columbia College shall develop and reach informed self-identified goals in a timely manner. Our students shall master relevant theory and practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOALS</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>SUPPORTING DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 The college shall increase the percentage of students that have Student Educational Plans</td>
<td>1.1.1 Percentage students with Student Education Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 The college shall increase the percentage of students that have reviewed or updated their Educational Goals each semester</td>
<td>1.2.1 Percentage students that have reviewed SEPs each semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 The college shall monitor and plan for an optimal number of annual program completions</td>
<td>1.3.1 (‘optimal’ would be determined over time through program review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Student completion data shall be used to determine existing time-to-completion velocities for college programs. Data shall be used to improve time-to-completion velocities</td>
<td>1.4.1 Time to completion velocities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Students shall demonstrate in-depth, critical knowledge of theory, research and practice relevant to their chosen professional roles and focus areas, including skill development in Organization, Computation, Communication, and Research. (Institutional SLO #4)</td>
<td>1.5.1 Measures for Institutional SLO #4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.4.1.1 Measures for Institutional SLO #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### GOAL 2 – HIGH QUALITY PROGRAMS AND SERVICES:
Columbia College shall develop and maintain high quality programs and services that support the College Mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOALS</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>SUPPORTING DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 All college programs shall regularly evaluate and improve program quality through ongoing and systematic cycles of program review</td>
<td>2.1.1 Evidence of ongoing cycles of effective program review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 All college programs shall regularly evaluate and identify resource needs through ongoing and systematic cycles of program review</td>
<td>2.2.1 Evidence of ongoing cycles of needs assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 All programs shall document their appropriate support for the college mission</td>
<td>2.3.1 Evidence of ongoing cycles of needs assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Instructional programs undergo effective systematic cycles of curriculum review</td>
<td>2.4.1 Evidence of high-quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning characterize all programs. (Standard II.A.2.c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2.2.1.1 Evidence of quality data-informed resource requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.1.1 Evidence of appropriately prioritized resource allocations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response to Self-Identified Issues/Planning Agendas
### GOAL 3 – INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS:
Columbia College shall demonstrate institutional effectiveness through ongoing and systematic cycles of improvement that lead to the accomplishment of the College Mission and guide the allocation of its resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOALS</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>SUPPORTING DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 The College Council shall annually evaluate progress toward Mission-based College Goals.</td>
<td>3.1.1 Annual analysis and reporting on measurable objectives for College Goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 The institution shall demonstrate the consistent execution of regularly scheduled institutional plans as prescribed by the Master Planning Calendar</td>
<td>3.2.1 Regular review of Master Planning Calendar, and assessment of its effectiveness at Annual Planning Assessment Retreats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust and pervasive. Data and analyses are widely distributed and used throughout the institution. (ACCJC Rubric: Planning)</td>
<td>3.3.1 Document and assess frequency, breadth, visibility and effectiveness of dialogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 The institution shall maintain and improve mechanisms to evaluate the Strategic Planning Cycle</td>
<td>3.4.1 Identify and expand the connections between the Master Planning Calendar and Strategic Planning Cycle. Suggested improvements from Annual Planning Assessment Retreats. Document and track increasing number of improvements to SPC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 The institution shall increase and improve connections between evaluation and resource allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOAL 4 – CAMPUS CLIMATE:
Interactions among all constituencies at Columbia College shall be characterized by respect for all individuals and ideas. Campus policies and procedures shall be inclusive and encourage participation by all in the college community. Both the physical and intellectual environment of the campus shall encourage personal reflection and inquiry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOALS</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>SUPPORTING DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 The college shall strive to increase broad participation in college committees by students, faculty, staff, and management</td>
<td>4.1.1 Track the number of college committees on the Columbia College Committee Map that have regular participation by students, faculty, staff, and management. Survey students and all employees as to their level of participation on college committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 The college shall strive to increase broad participation in college activities by faculty, staff, and students</td>
<td>4.2.1 Track the number of college activities on the events calendar that have regular participation by students, faculty, staff, and management. Survey students and all employees as to their level of participation in college activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Faculty, staff, management and students shall encourage diverse viewpoints and critical thinking</td>
<td>4.3.1 Survey students and all employees regarding the level of impact the physical surroundings (buildings and grounds) on their level of reflection and inquiry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 The college shall strive to increase the percent of students, faculty, staff and management who find the physical environment of the campus supportive of reflection, inquiry and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL 5 – COMMUNITY CONNECTIONS:
Columbia College shall foster mission focused partnerships and the economic development of its surrounding communities. The college shall promote social and civic responsibility through activities and programs for its students.

5.1 The college shall increase formal connections with city and county economic development and workforce training
5.2 The college shall increase efforts to support occupational pathways that are documented as new or viable areas of employment
5.3 The college shall strengthen community partnerships that support the College Mission
5.4 Students shall develop values, opinions, attitudes, and behaviors that underlie and support active citizenship through, Civic engagement, Leadership development, Advocacy, Collaboration, Team-building and Mentoring. (Institutional SLO 2)

5.1.1 • Track the number of formal connections with Workforce Investment Boards, Economic Development Programs and Industry Leaders.
• Document formal partnerships, consortia and initiatives the college is engaged with in support of the communities served

5.2.1 • Document sectors of employment to focus on through Department of Labor Statistics, CCCCO Data, and Perkins IV Data.
• Documentation of initiatives and support for programs in above-mentioned area
• Employment data and number of students in programs documented as emerging or viable

5.3.1 • Track the number of partnerships in support the College Mission. This could be number of partnerships, number of members, number of organizations, institutions or counties involved

5.4.1 • Student Survey
• Measures for Institutional SLO #2

Closing the Loop
The College continues to review and improve upon sustainable evaluation mechanisms that had been developed leading to continuous quality improvements at all levels. College Council had a Planning Assessment Retreat on November 6, 2012 that focused on developing effective evaluation mechanisms for strategic planning, resource allocation, and program review [2.07]. The next College Council Retreat is scheduled for June 2014 to review the College Mission and Goals.

Topics of discussion included, but were not limited to, identifying mechanisms and a process to evaluate and improve college goals [2.08]. The College now has a prioritization process for resource allocation and a simplified identification of resource needs included in the new Program Review Tool.

Program Review
The Columbia College Program Review format and process for Student Services and Administrative Services has proven to be effective [2.09]. As a part of continuous quality improvement, the Program Review Tool was evaluated, feedback was solicited (CTE Division Meeting, January 2013), and the following changes were made: 1.) Increase ease of navigation and the elimination of multiple screens, 2.) New comprehensive view of final document, 3.) Integrated planning tools, 4.) Integrated and embedded data, and 5.) Integrated resource allocation and alignment with College Goals [2.10]. Underway now, is the continued technical integration of the Program Review tool linked with other key databases such as SLO tool, Curriculum and Resource Allocation databases. This enhanced integration will be available to faculty, staff and administration in Fall 2014.
Within the new form, SLO data is readily available as well as all courses and programs approved through the curriculum committee. Documents are easily attached to provide additional information and/or external data. With resource requests integrated within the new Program Review form, there is no longer a need for the Unit Planning tool. If projects and/or improvements require funding, each resource request is associated with a College goal and measurable outcomes [2.13, 2.14, 2.15].

On March 26, 2013, the Arts and Science and Career Technical Education division deans presented the new format and discussed the components with faculty [2.11]. An aggressive timeline was presented with the goal to complete Program Review within the new form—by the beginning of the fall 2013 this goal was achieved [2.12].

The Integrated Planning Process and Cycle of Evaluation
The Columbia College Annual Planning Cycle is an ongoing systematic review leading to continuous quality improvement for the institution. The implementation of timeframes for the Annual Planning Cycle codifies the ongoing systematic review and improves the College’s culture of evidence. At the College Council April 5, 2013 meeting, it was shared that a timeline with defined dates should be created for SLOs and other annual planning processes such as program review and resource allocation [2.16]. College Council was open to documenting these dates. At the May 16, 2013 meeting, College Council reviewed a one-page chart outlining the timeframes for integrated planning process components and made recommendations to be brought back to the next meeting [2.17]. The chart was created to provide a quick overview of the timeframes and includes the components outlined below. At the July 11, 2013 meeting, the timeline was approved by College Council. The timeline was revisited at the April 4, 2014 College Council meeting and approved with revised dates to include annual, three and five year reviews.

Mission & Goals and other strategic planning documents
The Institutional Effectiveness Report (IER) and analysis prepared by the college researcher, including evaluation of college goals and objectives, is reviewed annually by College Council at the March retreat [2.18]. Columbia College has a designated timeline in the Master Planning Calendar for reviewing and updating the Mission, Vision, Core Values and Goals every two years. Recommendations for improving the integrated planning process assist in the development of evaluation mechanisms that lead to continuous quality improvement.

Program Review
Program Reviews are updated each fall by all areas: instruction, student and administrative services with a comprehensive Program Review completed every three years for all divisions. The comprehensive Program Review is a complete analysis of the previous three years and review of the program or service going forward. The Vice Presidents provide an Executive Summary after the third year to College Council at the March retreat.

To maintain continuous quality improvement for student success, the Program Review process uses data and other evaluation tools such as surveys to analyze the effectiveness of the program or service. Identified improvements result in the program or service creating appropriate Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) to monitor the continuous process of improvement. The Program Review process also identifies resources necessary to accomplish needed improvements.
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2.01 December 3, 2010 College Council meeting minutes  

2.02 September 30, 2011 College Council meeting minutes  

2.03 April 6, 2012 College Council meeting minutes  
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/governance/documents/collegecouncil/2012/cc4-6-12.pdf

2.04 May 2012 YCCD Board meeting minutes (hire of full-time researcher)

2.05 October 5, 2012 College Council meeting minutes  

2.06 College Goals and Objectives

2.07 November 6, 2012 College Council Planning Assessment Retreat minutes  
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/governance/documents/collegecouncil/2012/cc11-6-12.pdf

2.08 Integrated Planning System (Program Review Tool / Unit Planning Tool / SLO Tool)

2.09 Program Review for Student Services  
Program Review for Administrative Services

2.10 CTE Program Discussion feedback

2.11 March 26, 2013 launch of new program review form (email from CTE and A&S Deans)

2.12 New Program Review form for instructional programs

2.13 SLO Tool  
https://apps.gocolumbia.edu/slo_tool/login.aspx

2.14 SLO Report Card

2.15 March 25, 2013 SLO Workgroup meeting minutes  

2.16 April 5, 2013 College Council meeting minutes  

2.17 May 16, 2013 College Council meeting minutes  

2.18 Institutional Effectiveness Report
Planning Agenda 3 (II.A.1.c, II.A.3.b, II.A.3.c)

The college needs to continue efforts to improve authentic assessment of student learning outcomes for course, program and institutional levels. This will include evidence of cycles of ongoing assessment. The institution will offer college-wide workshops in fall 2011 and spring 2012 to accomplish this.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE RESPONSE/UPDATE:

College-wide workshops on student learning outcomes with an emphasis on authentic assessment were offered both in fall 2011 and spring 2012 [3.01, 3.02]. For all areas, the College's cycle of improvement for student learning outcomes continues to meet the rubric for continuous quality improvement. As such, the College continues to: 1.) Improve comprehensive reporting and support, 2.) Build stronger relationships between program review and SLOs, and 3.) Identify and share improvements to student learning through ongoing cycles of assessment [3.03, 3.04, 3.07, 3.08, 3.09, 3.10].

The College has also worked hard to “close the loop” on development, assessment, and analysis of all administrative area student learning outcomes—using assessment results to initiate program improvement [3.04].

The College goals were consolidated from ten to five with each goal having measurable objectives. The College Council approved these goals and measurable objectives at the October 5, 2012, meeting [3.11].

The College also hired a full-time Director of Research and Planning in May 2012 to help stabilize the institutional research needs [3.12]. The College Researcher has also been invaluable providing support for authentic assessment of student learning outcomes at all levels. The College Researcher also serves as a resource on the SLO Workgroup.

The College continues to utilize comprehensive assessment reports via the SLO Tool—helping inform the College of the progress with ongoing cycles of evaluation. [3.04, 3.13] The SLO Tool, integrated with Program Review [3.09, 3.10] and resource allocation, provides comprehensive results demonstrating improvement for courses and programs—particularly in “closing the loop” on one full cycle of learning outcomes for several administrative areas. [3.04, 3.05, 3.08, 3.13, 3.15, 3.16, 3.17]

SLO Mentors are an integral part of the process for all areas at the College. The SLO Mentors provide weekly scheduled office hours, online tools and resources, regular workshops, “just-in-time” one-on-one support, online support resources, monthly columns in the Academic Senate Newsletter, and open dialogue and communication with the campus community [3.04, 3.05, 3.07, 3.15, 3.16, 3.19, 3.20]. Additionally, the SLO Workgroup meets regularly to discuss progress, share improvements, and to guide the overall cycle of review for all areas of SLOs at the College.

As a part of the current cycle, the SLO Mentors have developed a Program SLO Report Card [3.18] for all program-related student learning outcomes. The goal is for all programs to evaluate Program SLOs and demonstrate improvement as a result of this planning cycle. Additionally, each program is connecting their respective learning outcomes to one or more of the college/institutional learning outcomes—a new addition to the SLO Tool [3.04; 3.05].
By September 2013, all college programs (including administrative areas) completed the Program SLO Report Card demonstrating the completion of one full cycle for all programs with results for improvement of student learning and institutional effectiveness [3.18]. Using the results of the Program SLO Report Card, the SLO Mentors identified common areas needed for continuous improvement and addressed these areas through a series of one-on-one consultations, electronic dialogue, and workshops. As a part of our continuous cycle of improvement, the SLO Report Card will be forwarded to College Council for inclusion in the annual evaluation.

To date, all instructional courses and programs as well as Administrative Services, Student Services, and Library Support Services have identified SLOs and are actively using the results for improvement and institutional effectiveness. SLOs are also now included as an integrated component of Program Review and ongoing support is provided for all areas. Furthermore, a comprehensive review cycle has been identified and will ensure continuous quality improvement and assessment of SLOs.

In an effort to codify comprehensive review cycles, the College has discussed a plan and the SLO Workgroup made the recommendation to College Council to adopt the following review comprehensive cycle for all learning outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>3-Year Cycle</th>
<th>5-Year Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional SLOs</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Support Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The review cycle was adopted by College Council on May 16, 2013 [3.20] for each of the areas. The goal is to stagger the dates appropriately to allow for a portion of each area to conduct comprehensive reviews each year.
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3.01 Flex Day Agenda, Fall 2011

3.02 Flex-Day Agenda, Spring 2012
   Flex Day Agenda, Fall 2011

3.03 SLO Cycle of Evaluation
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/cyclegraphic.php

3.04 SLO Tool
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/tools.php

3.05 SLO Workgroup Minutes
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/slo_minutes/default.php

3.06 SLO Website
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/default.php

3.07 Student Learning Outcomes
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/default.php

3.08 Implementation Models
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/implementation.php

3.09 Columbia College Planning
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/institutional_research/cc_planning/default.php

3.10 Instructional Program Review

3.11 College Council Minutes, October 5, 2012, College Goals and Objectives

3.12 YCCD Board Meeting Minutes (Hire of Full-Time Researcher), May 9, 2012
   http://www.yosemite.edu/Trustees/05.12%20MAY%20MINUTES.pdf

3.13 SLO Report Summary

3.14 Assessment Tools and Resources
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/tools.php

3.15 SLO Workgroup
   http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/workgroup.php

3.16 ACCJC College Recommendation 1 Response Team Meeting Minutes 3-28-14
    ACCJC College Recommendation 1 Response Team Meeting Minutes 4-4-13
3.17 Program SLO Report Card

3.18 Accreditation Forum Presentation 3-15-2013
Accreditation Forum Presentation 3-15-2014

3.19 Academic Senate Newsletters
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/academic_senate/January2013.pdf
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/academic_senate/March%202013.pdf
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/academic_senate/April%202013.pdf

3.20 College Council Minutes, May 16, 2013
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/governance/documents/collegecouncil/2013/
CollegeCouncilMinutes05162013.pdf
Planning Agenda 4 (II.A.1.c, II.A.2.i)

The college needs to more fully implement programmatic student learning outcomes, in particular, mechanisms to assess progress toward achieving these outcomes.

**COLUMBIA COLLEGE RESPONSE/UPDATE:**

The improved Program Review [4.02, 4.03] process includes analysis of programmatic student learning outcomes by integrating with the SLO Tool, particularly in relation to achievement of stated goals and allocation of resources necessary to achieve those goals.

As a part of the current cycle, the SLO Mentors have developed a Program SLO Report Card [4.04] for all program-related student learning outcomes. The goal is for all programs to evaluate Program SLOs and demonstrate improvement as a result of this planning cycle [4.01]. Additionally, each program is connecting their respective learning outcomes to one or more of the college/institutional learning outcomes—a new addition to the SLO Tool [4.05, 4.06].

By September 2013, all college programs (including administrative areas) completed the Program SLO Report Card demonstrating the completion of one full cycle for all programs with results for improvement of student learning and institutional effectiveness [4.04]. Using the results of the Program SLO Report Card, the SLO Mentors identified common areas needed for continuous improvement and addressed these areas through a series of one-on-one consultations, electronic dialogue, and workshops. As a part of our continuous cycle of improvement, the SLO Report Card will be forwarded to College Council for inclusion in the annual evaluation.
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4.01 SLO Cycle of Evaluation
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/cyclegraphic.php

4.02 Columbia College Planning
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/institutional_research/cc_planning/default.php

4.03 Instructional Program Review

4.04 Program SLO Report Card

4.05 SLO Workgroup Minutes
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/slo_minutes/default.php

4.06 SLO Tool
https://apps.gocolumbia.edu/slo_tool/login.aspx
Planning Agenda 5 (II.A.1.c)

The college needs to more fully implement institutional student learning outcomes, in particular, mechanisms to assess progress toward achieving these outcomes.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE RESPONSE/UPDATE:

The College goals were consolidated from ten to five with each goal having measurable objectives. The College Council approved these goals and measurable objectives at their October 5, 2012, meeting [5.01]. In addition, requests for resources to support the college mission must be tied to one or more institutional goals. Therefore, resource allocation at the institutional level is now tied directly to data from college goals.

The College also hired a full-time Director of Research and Planning in May 2012 to help stabilize the institutional research needs [5.02]. The College Researcher has also been invaluable providing support for authentic assessment of student learning outcomes at all levels. The College Researcher also serves as a resource on the SLO Workgroup.
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5.01 College Council Meeting Minutes, October 5, 2012

5.02 YCCD Board Meeting Minutes (Hire of Full-Time Researcher), May 9, 2012
   http://www.yosemite.edu/Trustees/05.12%20MAY%20MINUTES.pdf
Planning Agenda 6 (II.A.2.a)

The college needs to more fully implement course level student learning outcomes, in particular, mechanisms to assess progress toward achieving these outcomes.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE RESPONSE/UPDATE:

Of the 511 courses (excluding cross-listings), 100% are currently associated with at least one or more student learning outcomes and an associated assessment and analysis (excluding new courses from the 2012-13 academic year). To date, analysis of SLOs has led to either the review and/or identification of improvements for all active (excluding new courses) courses at the College. Moving forward, the College has particularly focused on the analyses of these SLOs and the improvement ensued as part of that cycle [6.01, 6.02].

Of the 96 programs, 100% are currently associated with at least one or more student learning outcomes and an associated assessment and analysis. To date, analysis of SLOs has led to either the review and/or identification of improvements for all active programs at the College [6.01, 6.02].

SLO Mentors are an integral part of the process for all areas at the College. The SLO Mentors provide weekly scheduled office hours, online tools and resources, regular workshops, “just-in-time” one-on-one support, online support resources, monthly columns in the Academic Senate Newsletter, and open dialogue and communication with the campus community [6.01, 6.03, 6.04, 6.05, 6.06, 6.07, 6.08]. Additionally, the SLO Workgroup meets regularly to discuss progress, share improvements, and to guide the overall cycle of review for all areas of SLOs at the College.
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6.01 SLO Tool
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/tools.php

6.02 SLO Report Summary

6.03 Student Learning Outcomes
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/default.php

6.04 Assessment Tools and Resources
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/tools.php

6.05 SLO Workgroup Minutes
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/slo_minutes/default.php

6.06 SLO Workgroup
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/workgroup.php

6.07 Accreditation Forum Presentation 3-15-2014

6.08 Academic Senate Newsletters
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/academic_senate/January2013.pdf
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/academic_senate/March%202013.pdf
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/academic_senate/April%202013.pdf
Planning Agenda 7 (II.A.2.i)

Measurable programmatic outcomes for programs will appear in the 2011-2012 College Catalog.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE RESPONSE/UPDATE:
Measurable programmatic outcomes were added to the 2011-2012 College catalog as well as subsequent catalogs [7.01]. Beginning with the 2014-2015 college catalog, we have also included assessments for those programmatic outcomes [7.02]. These measurable programmatic outcomes and assessment are also listed on the college SLO Website [7.03].
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#### 7.01 Excerpts from 2011-2012 College Catalogs
- Excerpts from 2012-2013 College Catalogs
- Excerpts from 2013-2014 College Catalogs

#### 7.02 Excerpts from 2014-2015 College Catalogs

#### 7.03 SLO Website
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/default.php
Planning Agenda 8 (II.B.3, II.B.4)

Student Services will establish a new mechanism to manage program review data.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE RESPONSE/UPDATE:
Since the last accreditation team visit, the program review process for Student and Administrative Services has continued to evolve. Unlike instructional programs that have set data elements, there are very different data needs among the different Student and Administrative programs. In order to establish consistency, broad concepts were created with enough flexibility to allow departments to identify the data points that make sense for each of the programs. These include following:

- Number Served
- Program Success
- Student Satisfaction
- Strengths
- Challenges
- Goals

Additionally, Student Learning Outcomes and Resource allocation needs have been incorporated into the program review process. Each program analyzes the data points that fall under these broad categories. For example, a program may review trends for headcount of number of students in the program and track how those students persisted and completed their goals over time.

The College piloted and implemented a comprehensive program review/SLO/planning collection system for Instructional areas in Spring 2012 after receiving comprehensive feedback from the users. The revised system replaced the former tools that were housed in separate modules of SLO, Program Review and resource planning into one collection device for all facets of program evaluation and strategic planning [8.01]. The Student Services and Administration units will be converting their program review, planning, and resource allocation request process to the new format in 2014-15 planning cycle [8.02].
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8.01  2012-13 Students Services Program Review Report

8.02  Columbia College Administrative Services Program Review 10-29-2013
Planning Agenda 9 (II.B.3.e)

Institutional Research Office will work with the Math Department to complete the math assessment validity study.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE RESPONSE/UPDATE:
As of Spring 2014, Columbia College has completed the math assessment validity study as identified in our 2011 Institutional Self Study.

Background
Columbia College requires new students, or students who have been on an extended hiatus from college coursework to complete a placement exam in order to assess skill levels in mathematics. Done prior to registering in computational and language related courses, the results prevent the student from reenrolling in coursework above their assigned skill level unless they are evaluated as having a higher placement through the advisement process.

For placement into math courses, Columbia College uses the College Board’s online and adaptive “Accuplacer” test battery that consists of basic mathematics, elementary algebra, and college-level or transfer level math. The Accuplacer testing process branches across the separate test modules, Arithmetic, Elementary Algebra and College Level Math as the student answers questions correctly or incorrectly, and then produces score reports from each of the modules completed. Separate score reports are thus generated and can result in up to three separate placement results per student tested. These are then made available to counseling and advisement staff at the time of advisement where students are assisted in selecting the appropriate coursework given their backgrounds and skill level [9.01].

Math Placement
There are several reasons why math placements have been problematic for Columbia. First, when the college switched from using the ACT exam to the College Board Accuplacer, the cut scores were put in place given guidelines provided by the test publisher, and what information could gathered from other colleges, as the test and the process of Accuplacer adaptive testing was still fairly new. The college’s size also meant Columbia had to collect data from multiple semesters in order to accumulate sufficient numbers of records to produce a valid statistical sample for analysis. Another complicating factor is of determining placement from up to three separate math placement results from three test modules. This means the burden of determining math placement falls on the shoulders of the counseling and advisement staff who must manually weight the student’s placement scores, background information, and a personal interview (multiple measures). Finally, the Datatel IS database system cannot accommodate weighting, algorithms, or decision rules in determining a single placement from multiple test scores.

The Math Faculty, not surprisingly, has seen less than expected student performance in their math courses. Whether the outcome may be a result of students being placed improperly, or from a combination of other factors, will be explored and hopefully provide some concrete information and direction for further exploration.

In Fall of 2011 the Columbia College Research Office produced the initial draft data summary for Math Assessment/Placement and Update. These results were reviewed by faculty (both math and English)
during the Fall semester. Based on this review of the data the Math faculty opted for a revision of cut scores to be implemented in Spring 2012.

During Spring of 2012, the Columbia College Director of Research and Vice President of Student Learning met with faculty and counselors to discuss issues surrounding the cut score change, specifically of Math 601 and Math 602 placements [9.02].

Additional meetings with the Math Department occurred in the Fall 2012 to discuss ongoing concerns about Math 602 and Math 101 placements. These conversations included a review of the preliminary data regarding the cut scores and a discussion about an additional Multiple Measures validation study.

Subsequent data analysis updates were run in Fall 2013 and again in Spring 2014, but the numbers of students included in the cohorts following the cut score change are still too small to provide valid least squares and regression analyses. These data were not produced in a formal report, but have been shared with the math faculty.
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9.01 Math Assessment/Validation Study

9.02 Math and English Assessment Summary
Planning Agenda 10 (III.A.1.a, III.A.2)

Continue to develop Staffing Plan.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE RESPONSE/UPDATE:

Columbia College's integrated planning process [10.04] has evolved into a process of inclusiveness that includes all segments of the College. Since August 2012, the Administrative Services Division has completed a comprehensive program review and has made yearly updates that include needed staffing resources. The other divisions of the College have also refined the program review [10.01] process and now all the divisions include staffing needs in program review. This change has enabled the College to gather needed staffing information more efficiently than in prior years when requested resources were stored in the Unit Planning Tool.

The College has also implemented a yearly College Council Retreat, with the first occurring on May 16, 2013, [10.02] that reviewed external data presented in the Institute Effectiveness Report [10.03] and the goals of the College mission. The College Council also approved an Institutional Planning and Evaluation Cycle that will assist in the Staffing Plan since staffing resources are clearly identified in all program reviews. The College held the second College Council Retreat on June 12, 2014 [10.05] with an outside facilitator to assist in the College's Strategic Planning process that should help define our staffing plan for future years.
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10.1 Program Review

10.02 May 16, 2013 College Council Retreat Minutes

10.03 Institute Effectiveness Report
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/institutional_research/ier2014.pdf

10.04 Integrated Planning and Evaluation Process Chart

10.05 June 12, 2014 College Council Retreat Minutes
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/governance/collegecouncil.php
Planning Agenda 11 (III.A.1.b)

The college needs to develop a systematic and reliable mechanism to track evaluation progress for faculty, administrators, and staff. Responsible parties need to be identified for staff, faculty, and administrators.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE RESPONSE/UPDATE:
Both college presidents will continue to work with the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources and Information Technology to insure the evaluation tracking process supports the District and both colleges’ efforts to complete evaluations in a timely manner. The District Human Resources Office will provide the necessary oversight to insure that current evaluations are maintained in the employee’s personnel files.

In response to the ACCJC recommendation and the fulfillment of the planning agendas described above, the District and the college have implemented the following evaluation processes for the respective employee groups:

Classified Staff Evaluations
Per the California Schools Employees Association (CSEA) Chapter 420 contract [11.01], permanent classified members are evaluated once every two years, with subsequent evaluations based on the date of the previous regularly scheduled evaluation. In the event an evaluation is not completed within thirty (30) days of the due date, the classified member’s performance shall be deemed competent for that period and the next evaluation, due in two years, must be completed. An exception to the thirty (30) day provision is provided for in the case of a classified member’s extended absence. Probationary classified members are evaluated during the third (3rd), sixth (6th) and eleventh (11th) month of the probationary period.

In the last round of negotiations, which culminated in the 2013-2016 contract between CSEA and YCCD, employee evaluation language and process was reviewed and revised. Specifically, changes were made to the number and timing of probationary evaluations and a performance improvement plan (PIP) process for permanent employees was added.

Management Staff Evaluations
Per the Leadership Team Handbook [11.02], Leadership Team members (managers and administrators) are evaluated each year with a one-on-one evaluation performed by their direct supervisor. Every third year the evaluation includes a confidential evaluation survey sent to not less than 20 subordinate staff, members from the constituent groups, and colleagues with whom the employee has regular interaction. Team members are evaluated twice during the first year they hold their position.

The 2013 Leadership Team Handbook lists the section regarding evaluation as “under review.” The Leadership Team Advisory Council (LTAC) is working with its constituency to assess and improve the relevance of evaluation forms as a means to increase the effectiveness of the process. Resulting recommendations will be made to the Interim Vice Chancellor of Human Resources in spring 2014 with implementation anticipated by the end of fall 2014.
Classified and Management Staff Evaluation Tracking Process

YCCD Human Resources documents completed evaluations in Datatel, the District's information management system, and files them in the employee's personnel file. Timely evaluations are ensured by way of the tracking process described below [11.03].

YCCD Human Resources has developed a staff evaluation report in Datatel, the District's information management system. The information contained in this report is input by Human Resources staff when a completed evaluation is received and indicates the employee's name, the date of the last evaluation, the date of the next evaluation, the type of evaluation to be performed during the next evaluation, and the position title.

YCCD Human Resources has made this report available to managers within the district to be able to view employee information in their area for purposes of monitoring timelines and planning for upcoming evaluations. A reminder to complete evaluations is sent to all YCCD managers from Human Resources each quarter with step-by-step instructions to access the report, in addition to other essential information regarding requirements detailed in the CSEA contract and Leadership Team handbook to complete evaluations.

Faculty Evaluations

Per the Yosemite Faculty Association (YFA) contract [11.04], tenured faculty members are evaluated once every three academic years in the spring semester and contract (probationary) faculty members are evaluated once each academic year during the fall semester.

The evaluation tracking process instituted and described in the 2012 follow-up report was assessed in December 2013 and revised as described below. The first cycle of this revised tracking process culminated in January 2014 and allows for a successful systematic mechanism to track evaluation progress.

District-level Tracking Process for Full-time Faculty

YCCD Human Resources documents completed evaluations in Datatel, the District's information management system, and files them in the employee's personnel file. Timely evaluations are ensured by way of the tracking process described below.

YCCD Human Resources provides Columbia College President's Office and Office of the Vice President of Student Learning a staff evaluation report listing faculty evaluations on January 31 and August 1 each year. This report is pulled from the information input into the Human Resources module of Datatel, the District's information management system. The timing of the report is intended to capture fall and spring evaluations completed and submitted at the end of each semester to Human Resources. The evaluation report indicates the faculty member's name, the date of the last evaluation, the date of the next evaluation, the type of evaluation to be performed during the next evaluation, and the position title.

A faculty member is notified that their evaluation has been received in Human Resources based upon the last evaluation date reflected in the staff evaluation report provided by Human Resources (described in 1. above). The College President's Office sends a template email to each faculty whose evaluation was completed (per the report) to inform them that Human Resources received the evaluation, their next evaluation date has been reset in Datatel, and the evaluation
has been processed for placement in their personnel file. **NOTE: If an employee would like to further confirm placement of the evaluation in his/her file, they can schedule an appointment with YCCD Human Resources to view their file [11.05].**

**College-level Tracking Process for Classified and Management Staff**

The Columbia College President's Office separately maintains a tracking spreadsheet for Classified Staff evaluations. All completed employee evaluations are provided to the College President's Office from area managers and/or vice presidents and are recorded on the tracking spreadsheet, then forwarded to YCCD Human Resources for input into Datatel and the employee's personnel file. The information contained in the staff evaluation report from Datatel is pulled in January and August by the College President's Office and is validated against the College's tracking spreadsheet. Any information that is not in alignment is identified and corrected through coordination between the College President's Office and the Human Resources Operations Office. The tracking spreadsheet is open to view by the Office of the Vice President of Student Learning and the Office of the Vice President of College and Administrative Services for use in working with deans and department managers to adhere to evaluation timelines.

The Office of the Vice President of Student Learning uses the college’s tracking spreadsheet to inform area deans to plan for and complete evaluations using the next evaluation dates provided, which are also listed in the staff evaluation report from Human Resources sent to the College President's Office and copied to the Office of the Vice President of Student Learning. Progress updates from area deans regarding faculty evaluations scheduled in a given semester are routinely discussed in regularly scheduled group meetings with the Vice President of Student Learning (“Deans’ Meetings”).

**EVALUATION**

Since the 2011 external evaluation team offered District Recommendation #1, Columbia College and the District Office have established a systematic process to track employee evaluations. Additionally, processes have been assessed and improvements have been made. The 2012 external team evaluation report states that the “District has met the expectations of the recommendation” and refers to an electronic database and report system that had yet to be completed. That database and report system is now in place using Datatel, the District’s information management system. YCCD Human Resources provides the necessary oversight to ensure current evaluations are maintained in employee personnel files and the College has instituted a mechanism to monitor progress and validate evaluations are received in Human Resources and information is in alignment. All parties have a clear understanding of the process, scheduled timelines, and their role in adhering to employee evaluation requirements.
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11.01 California Schools Employees Association Chapter 420 (CSEA) Contract
http://www.yosemite.edu/hr/2013%202016%20Classified%20Contract.pdf

11.02 Leadership Team Handbook
http://www.yosemite.edu/hr/documents_publications/LT%20HANDBOOK%202013%20updated.pdf

11.03 Shelley Akiona email on 4/8/13 re: reminder to perform classified and leadership team evaluations

11.04 Yosemite Faculty Association (YFA) Contract
http://www.yosemite.edu/hr/YFA%20Agreement%202012%202014_FINAL2.pdf

11.05 Chris Vitelli email dated 12/20/13 re: revised faculty evaluation tracking process
Planning Agenda 12 (III.A.1.c)

Continue to discuss the associations between student learning outcomes and the self-evaluation component of the faculty evaluation.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE RESPONSE/UPDATE:

The use of student learning outcomes [12.01] in the faculty evaluation process continues to be discussed at the Academic Senate level [12.02]. At the referenced Senate meeting, faculty supported continuing the current policy as stated in the following excerpt from the current YCCD – YFA Faculty Contract.

6.3.4 Components of the evaluation will include, at a minimum, student evaluations, peer and administrative classroom observations, and a self-evaluation. (See Appendix C3a and C3b for Evaluation Timeline)

1.3.4.1 Student evaluation forms will be administered between the eighth and twelfth weeks of the semester of the evaluation.
(Use forms in Appendix C-5)

6.3.4.2 Peer and administrative classroom observations will be conducted during weeks six through twelve. For faculty teaching both Distance Education and non-Distance Education classes, observations shall occur in both modalities. Peers may also review syllabi, graded papers, tests and quizzes, texts, and handouts used by the faculty member being evaluated.

6.3.4.3 A self-evaluation shall be written by the faculty member being evaluated. This evaluation should include goals and objectives for the next evaluation period; an analysis of previous objectives met or unmet; professional improvement activities; new curriculum created, especially in distance education; and could also include items such as scholarly publications or presentations; college and community participation. Faculty may include results of Student Learning Objectives measured in their courses if they so choose.
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12.01  SLO Tool
       https://apps.gocolumbia.edu/slo_tool/login.aspx

12.02  Academic Senate Agenda and Minutes 3/28/2014
       Academic Senate Agenda 3/28/2014
       Academic Senate Minutes 3/28/2014
Planning Agenda 13 (III.A.5, III.A.5.a, III.A.5.b)

Re-establish the Staff Development Committee to develop a comprehensive Staff Development Plan and processes for the college.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE RESPONSE/UPDATE:
Since the last accreditation team visit, Columbia College has fully re-established the Staff Development Committee and developed a comprehensive Staff Development Plan with accompanying processes for the College [13.01, 13.02].

The Columbia College Three-Year Staff Development Plan was formally approved and adopted at the November 2, 2012 College Council meeting [13.03]. To launch and introduce the staff development plan, representatives from each constituency group, presented at the January 10, 2013 campus wide In-Service [13.04]. The presentation introduced the staff development plan’s new website, statement of purpose, goals, committee structure, committee representatives, assessment components, and highlights from each of the represented constituencies.

The Dean of CTE provides administrative oversight of the Staff Development Plan. The Dean works directly with the Columbia College Staff Development Committee to facilitate and assist with implementing the Three-Year Staff Development Plan.

The Staff Development Committee, as an initiative for professional engagement, established the following as goals for the plan:

1. Foster innovation and exploration of new ideas and strategies for institutional growth and enrichment of education.
2. Develop tools and processes to effectively assess professional development activities integrated with college resource planning.
3. Support and develop innovations in instructional and administrative techniques and program effectiveness.
4. Promote and provide increased visibility for professional engagement opportunities and activities for the purposes of professional enrichment.

The “Columbia College Staff Development—An Initiative for Professional Engagement” website was created. The website includes a copy of the 3-year plan, policies and processes to request staff development funds, and timelines to submit funding requests [13.01]. Additionally, the Activity Proposal Form and Activity Proposal Rubric were posted on the website [13.05, 13.06].

The Staff Development Committee meets twice a semester to review the staff development plan, report out from each constituent group, discuss and review policies and procedures as needed, and to allocate funds for staff development [13.07].

Moving forward, the College has identified a classified staff member in the Office of the Vice President of Student Learning to track all staff development activities, including the assessment of all funded staff development activities via the Professional Development Activity/Evaluation form [13.08]. In addition, beginning in the fall 2014, this staff member will be responsible for coordinating and organizing a master calendar and “hub” for staff development activities to increase visibility of professional
development opportunities for all constituencies.

In summary, Columbia College is committed to the comprehensive Staff Development Plan designed to meet the needs of its personnel.
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13.01 Staff Development Website and Resources
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/staff_development/default.php

13.02 Three-Year Staff Development Plan
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/staff_development/StaffDevelopmentPlanOutline.pdf

13.03 Minutes from College Council Committee, November 2, 2012

13.04 Columbia College In-Service Staff Development Plan PPT Presentation
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/staff_development/staffdevelopmentin-servicepptjan13.pdf

13.05 Staff Development Activity Proposal Form
Activity Proposal Form

13.06 Staff Development Activity Proposal Rubric
Activity Proposal Rubric

13.07 Staff Development Committee Meeting Agendas and Minutes
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/staff_development/staffdevelopmentagendasandminutes-1.php

13.08 Professional Development Activity/Evaluation Form
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/staff_development/ActivityEvaluationForm.pdf
Planning Agenda 14 (IV.A.5)

The college will continue to develop and strengthen unit planning processes at the unit/division level.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE RESPONSE/UPDATE:
Since the last accreditation team visit, Columbia College has significantly improved and strengthened unit planning processes at the unit/division level—ultimately revamping unit planning processes and combining planning tools into one Program Review Tool [14.01].

The Columbia College Program Review is now integrated with institutional planning processes and cycles in all areas. While Program Review in the Administrative and Student Services areas were working quite well, the Program Review for instructional areas needed to be revamped [14.02, 14.03]. At the end of the fall 2012 semester, the College launched a Program Review Tool integrating with the Unit Planning Tool and SLO Tool. The implementation of the Program Review Tool was the last piece of the Columbia College Integrated Planning System.

The new Program Review Tool is a comprehensive and integrated tool for instructional program review at the unit/division level. Within the new form, SLO data is readily available as well as all courses and programs approved through the curriculum committee. Documents are easily attached to provide additional information and/or external data. With resource allocation requests integrated within the new Program Review form, there is no longer a need for the Unit Planning Tool. If projects and/or improvements require funding, each resource request is associated with a College goal and measurable outcomes—connecting unit planning at the unit/division level to the overall College goals and objectives [14.04].

The Integrated Planning Process at Unit/Division Level
The Columbia College Annual Planning Cycle is an ongoing systematic review leading to continuous quality improvement for the institution—beginning at the unit/division level.

Program Review
Program Reviews are updated each fall at the unit/division level for all areas: instruction, student and administrative services with a comprehensive Program Review completed every three years for all divisions. The comprehensive Program Review is a complete analysis of the previous three years and review of the program or service going forward. The Vice Presidents provide an Executive Summary after the third year to College Council at the March retreat.

To maintain continuous quality improvement for student success, the Program Review process uses data and other evaluation tools such as surveys to analyze the effectiveness of the program or service at the unit/division level [14.05]. Identified improvements result in the program or service creating appropriate Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) to monitor the continuous process of improvement. The Program Review process also identifies resources necessary to accomplish needed improvements.

Student Learning Outcomes
SLOs are identified from Program Review and documented in the software developed by the College [14.06, 14.07]. Annual reviews and updates take place each spring semester.
comprehensive review is completed every three years for programs and support services. Courses are comprehensively reviewed every five years. In spring 2013, the SLO Report Card was implemented to assess the quality of Program SLOs and a button was added in the SLO Tool to connect program SLOs at the unit/division level to college SLOs [14.08].

Resource Allocation
The resource allocation process starts in late fall, after Program Reviews are updated or the comprehensive Program Review is completed at the unit/division level, and continues into the spring semester for all areas. The identified resource needs in Program Review are prioritized at division meetings. The Dean or Administrator creates a prioritized list of the needs to submit to the Vice Presidents. The lists are reviewed by the Vice Presidents and brought forward to the Administrative Council meeting in February for consideration [14.09].

At the Administrative Council meeting in February, the lists of resource needs are reviewed and discussed. In March, the Administrative Council will finalize the approved items for funding, based on available resources, and make recommendations to the President for approval.

The President approves the items deemed appropriate to fund and presents the list to College Council for review at the April meeting. After consultation with College Council, the list of approved items for funding are included in the college budget.

College Council reviews an Executive Summary of all Program Reviews completed at the unit/division level from instruction, student services and administrative services. The Executive Summary highlights areas of improvement, allocated resources, and areas of needed improvements.

In summary, the unit planning process at the unit/divisions levels are connected to the overall cycle of evaluation and assessment for the College [14.10]. Since the last accreditation team visit, the College has codified and developed strong unit planning processes at the unit/division level leading to continuous quality improvement for the institution.
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14.01 Columbia College Program Review Tool

14.02 Program Review Administrative Services

14.03 Program Review Student Services

14.04 College Goals and Measureable Outcomes
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/about/goals.php

14.05 Institutional Research and Planning Website
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/institutional_research/default.php

14.06 Student Learning Outcomes Website
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/default.php

14.07 Student Learning Outcomes Tool
https://apps.gocolumbia.edu/slo_tool/login.aspx

14.08 Program SLO Report Card
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/SLO/SLORubricandSelfAssessment.pdf

http://www.gocolumbia.edu/institutional_research/cc_planning/
IntegratedPlanningProcessCycleNarrative.pdf

14.10 Cycles of Evaluation and Assessment
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/institutional_research/cc_planning/
Planning Agenda 15 (IV.B.2.b)

The president will direct college resources to evaluate and implement identified research needs.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE RESPONSE/UPDATE:
The President has consistently and purposefully allocated resources to enhance research capacity, expertise and support. The preponderance of workload for the Director of Research & Planning (who reports directly to the President) has been focused on priorities to support data collection, access, and analysis. In addition, she has been charged with investigating new tools, best practices and other resources to maximize effectiveness.

By way of further resource needs, the President has authorized Information Technology (IT) to provide high level user access to the Director of Research & Planning to some highly restricted District IT systems.

Additionally, in order to address the accountability mandates and Student Success Initiatives implemented in California in recent years, resources have been allocated for the Director to attend training and conferences for professional development and to build a peer network across the state. Some examples are the RP Group workshops (statewide research and planning group) and Annual Conference, the California Association for Institutional Research (CAIR) conference, and the WICHE Consortium for Educational Technologies.

Further investment has been made in subscriptions to databases and data collection tools such as EMSI (an economic regional data service) and Survey Monkey, as well as purchasing Rapid Insight software for more sophisticated and complex analytic support.

EVALUATION
From the participation in two statewide conferences, the Director brought back several strategies in managing college enrollment, program review, and assessment and accreditation best practices. The information was utilized in the redesign of the program review forms that then contributed to the college's accreditation reaffirmation.

Increased access to the district's IT system and reports significantly improved the Research Office's availability to provide data for numerous mandated reports as well as ad hoc, Instructional, CTE, and management inquiries. Subsequently, the research office was also given access to an IT programmer's time which led to the upgrade of a sorely needed student demographic data download that has since been used on an almost daily basis.

Subscriptions to online services, e.g., EMSI and Survey Monkey, have made it possible to provide previously unavailable external data, such as local job market and labor statistics, to college programs and to collect data for at least two major surveys—the Institutional Effectiveness Feedback surveys for staff and students. These surveys have provided vital information to the College Council as to the progress made toward the College Goals.

Additionally, the purchase of a sophisticated software package has made it possible to aggregate and prepare numerous data files from various sources and formats into single, normalized files. This has significantly reduced the time needed to prepare complex data sets for analysis.
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15.01  2013 and 2014 Institutional Effectiveness Reports
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/institutional_research/InstitutionalEffectivenessReport.pdf
http://www.gocolumbia.edu/institutional_research/ier2014.pdf
Updates on Substantive Change

Columbia College 2014 Substantive Change Proposal: Distance Education
Addition of Courses that Constitute 50 Percent or More of the Units in a Program Offered through a Mode of Distance Education

OVERVIEW
Columbia College is a small, rural community college located in Sonora, California, in the foothills of the Sierra Nevada. It is situated on 280 acres of forestland in the historic Mother Lode gold country. The college was established in 1968 and is part of the Yosemite Community College District (YCCD).

Columbia College’s service area is geographically vast with numerous scattered, isolated communities. The college serves Tuolumne and portions of Calaveras and Stanislaus Counties, including Oakdale, Riverbank, Knight’s Ferry, Valley Home, and Waterford. Drive times from the far reaches of the service area to the college campus are at least two hours round trip, longer in inclement weather. The foothill terrain ranges from rolling hills to steep canyons with many narrow, winding, two-lane roads. Public transportation is very limited. In addition, a relatively high percentage of students are employed either full- or part-time. These conditions pose multiple barriers to student success due to inadequate transportation, child care, income, and/or time to commute to the Sonora campus. Thus, to maximize student success it is imperative that the college continue to expand its distance education offerings.

To this end, Columbia College is preparing its second Substantive Change Proposal for Distance Education, to be submitted to the ACCJC for approval at its November 6, 2014 meeting. The college’s first such proposal, approved by the ACCJC on July 1, 2011, identified 12 associate degrees and three certificates of achievement that were offered 50 percent or more through distance education, as well as 11 programs that were close to the 50 percent threshold at that time. The new proposal will identify a total of 42 programs (listed below) that have reached or exceeded the 50 percent threshold: 37 associate degrees, two certificates of achievement, and three skills attainment certificates, plus at least 11 programs that are approaching the fifty percent threshold.

Associate in Arts for Transfer (AA-T)
Anthropology
Communication Studies
English
Kinesiology
Psychology

Associate in Science for Transfer (AS-T)
Early Childhood Education

Associate in Arts (AA) Degrees
Fine Arts: Emphasis in Art
Fine Arts: Emphasis in Photography
Health and Human Performance: Sport Science
Language Arts: Emphasis in Communication
Language Arts: Emphasis in English
Liberal Arts: Emphasis in Arts and Humanities
Liberal Arts: Emphasis in Behavioral and Social Sciences
Liberal Arts: Emphasis in Science
Liberal Studies: Emphasis in Elementary Teaching Preparation

**Associate in Science (AS) Degrees**
Allied Health
Child Development
Computer Science: Multimedia Technology
Emergency Medical Services
Fire Technology
Hospitality Management: Emphasis in Hotel Management
Post-Secondary Studies: Emphasis in Biological Sciences
Post-Secondary Studies: Emphasis in Computer Science
Post-Secondary Studies: Emphasis in Environmental Sciences
Post-Secondary Studies: Emphasis in Physical Sciences
Post-Secondary Studies: Emphasis in Pre-Engineering
Science: Emphasis in Biology
Science: Emphasis in Earth Science
Science: Emphasis in Environmental Science
Science: Emphasis in General Science
Science: Emphasis in Physical Science

**Associate in Science Occupational Education (ASOE) Degrees**
Fire Technology
Hospitality Management: Dinner Line Cook
Hospitality Management: Hotel Management
Human Services
Office Technology: Administrative Office Professional
Office Technology: Medical Office Specialist

**Certificates of Achievement (COA)**
Computer Science: Multimedia Technician – Web Development
Emergency Medical Services

**Skills Attainment Certificates (SAC)**
Emergency Medical Technician Training
Safety and Sanitation
Medical Coding

**Programs Nearing the 50 Percent Threshold**
Computer Science ASOE - 46.67%
Computer Science: Multimedia Web Design COA - 45.00%
Computer Science: Website Development for Entrepreneurs SAC - 47.06%
Entrepreneurship AS - 45.00%
Forestry and Natural Resources: Natural Resources AS - 42.50%
Forestry and Natural Resources: Water Resources Management ASOE - 46.67%
Hospitality Management: Chef ASOE - 43.33%
Hospitality Management: Pantry and Dessert Chef - 48.33%
Hospitality Management: Restaurant Management ASOE - 46.67%
Office Technology: Office Technician SAC - 41.18%