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Statement of Report Preparation

The Vice President of Academic Affairs, who serves as the institution’s Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) and was the coordinator of the 2012 Self Evaluation, the 2013 Follow-Up Report, and the 2014 Follow-Up Report, was designated as the coordinator for the Midterm Report.

A meeting of the Accreditation Steering Committee was convened in September 2014. The Accreditation Steering Committee is a participatory governance committee and subcommittee of College Council charged with providing ongoing leadership to accreditation recommendations and action plans and providing leadership and direction in the creation of the required interim reports and accreditation self-study to ACCJC.

The committee developed an action plan to address the Recommendations as well as the Self-Identified Issues in the Planning Agenda section of the 2012 self-study. At that time, nine of the ten recommendations had been accepted by ACCJC. By February, the one outstanding recommendation, College Recommendation 2, had also been accepted.

The sections of the document were compiled in late April and early May. For the College Recommendations, the same language was used from the 2013 and 2014 Follow-Up reports combined with statements about continued progress and plans for sustaining improvements. The committee felt the Follow-Up Report language in its original form provided the context necessary to evaluate the improvements going forward. The District Recommendations were drafted by a district-wide committee that presented a modified version of the language from the 2013 Follow-Up Report, interweaving progress from 2012 up to the present time and concluding with statements about sustained improvements. The College’s Self-Identified Issues were drafted by the management responsible for implementing the improvements and developed with input from area faculty and staff. The update on substantive changes was drafted by the Vice President of Academic Affairs based on academic improvements in process.

In May 2015, an executive summary was shared with all employee groups—faculty at Academic Senate, classified staff at Classified Staff Appreciation Day, and management at Administrative Cabinet. The full draft report was posted on the college website in late May, and a notification went out encouraging employees to read the draft and offer any feedback.

A final draft was reviewed by a board of trustees subcommittee in August. Final revisions were made, and the document was submitted to the board and approved at its October 2015 meeting.
College Recommendation 1

To fully meet the Standards, the team recommends the College establish a regular cycle by which to review the mission statement. (I.A, I.A.3, I.A.4)

This recommendation was referenced in Standard I.A. The evaluation team arrived at the tail end of the mission review process. The new mission statement was undergoing its final adjustments prior to being sent to the Kern Community College District Board of Trustees for approval. The team noted that Cerro Coso had not completed a regular or systematic review of its mission since 2007 and that the College appeared to lack any formal procedure for systematically reviewing the mission and for making revisions that would be approved by the board (CR1-1, pgs. 18-19).

Progress Reported in 2013 Follow-Up Report

A regular cycle by which to review the mission statement has been explicitly established. The College had always periodically reviewed its mission statement and other guiding principles—vision, values, and strategic plan—but had never written down the process. In spring 2013, as part of the periodic review and revision of the Participatory Governance Model, a section was added describing the College’s practice. The revised Model was last reviewed by College Council on April 18, 2013, and sent forward for printing (CR1-2; CR1-3).

The College follows a three-year mandatory review and revision cycle (CR1-3, pgs. 29-30). This is done in concert with long-range planning undertaken at the district level. Cerro Coso begins its mission and guiding principles review at the same time KCCD’s mission, vision, values, and strategic plan are undergoing their own review and revision. Once KCCD’s documents are completed, the College finalizes its mission statement, vision, and values. And then, in a second step, it finalizes its strategic goals based on the prior planning documents. This sequence is followed for the purpose of reaffirming the relevance of the mission and service statements to the district and college communities served and of optimizing the dialogue surrounding integration of long-range plans. Moreover, the new section now describes how an off-cycle review might be triggered by unforeseen events of a substantial enough nature. Examples are listed in the Participatory Governance Model. Also described are the steps to be undertaken if either the three-year or triggered review calls for a revision of the mission statement.

The Participatory Governance Model document was edited over the summer, formatted and graphically designed, and then presented to College Council at its September 2013 meeting (CR1-4).
Conclusion Reported from 2013 Follow-Up Report

The College stated it had fully addressed this recommendation. This conclusion was endorsed by the Follow-Up Team in its 2013 Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (CR1-11, pg. 4) and accepted by ACCJC at its January 2014 Commission Meeting (CR1-12).

Sustained Improvements

Since the filing of the 2013 Follow-Up Report, the next review of the mission, vision, values, and strategic goals was undertaken and completed during the 2014-2015 academic year. Minor modifications in wording were made to the mission and vision. More substantial revisions were made to the values in order to align with and better reflect Cerro Coso’s motto to “Educate, Innovate, Inspire, Serve.” The strategic goals were much more substantially revised, and this is explained in detail below under College Recommendation 2. The updated guiding principles were approved by College Council at meetings in January and March 2015 (CR1-5, pg. 2; CR1-6; CR1-7; CR1-8).

Another important change made in this area has been the addition of institution-set standards as a component of the mission review cycle. The College felt that since the standards are a measure of how well it is achieving its mission, a regular review of the standards for relevance, currency, and appropriateness should be carried out at the same time and on the same three-year cycle as that for mission, vision, values, and strategic goals. This gives the institution-set standards not just a locked-down place in the structure of the college's evaluation and planning processes but also a schedule for regular review. In 2014-15, when the College undertook its next mission review, institution-set standards were included, and changes made. Persistence was dropped as an optional measure but Basic Skills Course Success and Online Course Success were added—providing better alignment with those major and explicit items in the mission. The institution-set standards, like the other guiding principles, were approved by College Council. (CR1-9; CR1-10).

List of Evidence

CR1-1  External Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, February 2013
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CR1-4  College Council Minutes, September 5, 2013
CR1-5  Cerro Coso Community College 2015-16 Catalog
CR1-6  Cerro Coso Community College 2015-2018 Strategic Goals
CR1-7  College Council Minutes, January 22, 2015
CR1-8  College Council Minutes, March 5, 2015
CR1-9  ACCJC Annual Report, 2015
CR1-10 College Council Minutes, March 19, 2015
CR1-11 2013 Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report
CR1-12 ACCJC Action Letter, February 7, 2014
College Recommendation 2

Improving Institutional Effectiveness

To fully meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College further improve and integrate all of its planning activities, including the development of a clear linkage of planning to college mission, program review, resource allocation, identified goals, and a means to evaluate planning processes for effectiveness. (I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.2.f, II.B.3, III.A.6, IV.A.5, IV.B.2, IV.B.2.b)

Recommendation 2 was referenced at three places in the External Evaluation Report. In Standard I.B, it was noted that while the College had made significant progress in increasing the effectiveness of its planning, further work was necessary (CR2-1, pgs. 20-21). At the time of the site visit, the College’s annual integrated planning cycle had run one time and was still not fully integrated; different components of planning had independent timelines and triggers that appeared not to line up well. There were also some instances when plans were not completed as called for in the cycle, including the Strategic Plan. Formal evaluation processes remained to be put into place to ensure that the integrated planning efforts are fruitful and continue to be improved.

In Standard III.D, the team concluded that a weak link in the planning process was that assessment/evaluation of the allocation of resources needs to be formalized and improvements from the assessment communicated to all constituent groups (CR2-1, pg. 50). In Standard IV.A, it was stated that a formal process of evaluation must be developed to assess the effectiveness of the governance and decision-making model (CR2-1, pgs. 52, 54-55).

Progress Reported in 2013 Follow-Up Report

Standard I.B

Further improvements have been made in the annual integrated planning cycle to increase the effective incorporation of documents and processes:

- The College completed drafting of its 2012-2015 Strategic Goals, which were approved by the Board of Trustees in February 2013; the new set of goals are more focused and in a much more measurable form than the prior set, each with an identified assessment indicator or set of indicators (CR2-2).
- The College’s Student Success Plan, which had been on an independent track since its creation in 2011 as a result of the dialogue surrounding the Student Success Task Force, has now been combined with the Student Equity Plan and is fully integrated into the annual process. In 2013, Cerro Coso Community College—together with Bakersfield College and Porterville College—joined the Achieving the Dream initiative, and a key element of the planning has been to
establish the Student Success Plan centrally within the cycle as the culmination and focal point of the year’s educational direction-setting (CR2-3).

- The annual unit plan template was revised to identify strategies related to the Student Success Plan (CR2-4).
- The administrative service units of Maintenance and Operations, Information Technology, and Marketing have now been fully integrated as operational units within the planning cycle; in spring 2013, these units wrote administrative unit outcomes (AUO’s); beginning fall 2013, they will write unit plans and be on the program review timeline for periodic evaluation (CR2-5; CR2-6).
- As detailed more fully below in College Recommendation 5, the college human resources office is also being integrated as a full operational unit within the planning cycle, writing AUO’s, an annual unit plan, and a program review.
- As detailed more fully below in College Recommendation 3, the program review template was revised to better align the 6-year process with the annual planning cycle (CR2-7).
- As detailed more fully in College Recommendation 3, the annual unit plan template was revised to more explicitly tighten the connection to program review, including annual updates on every unit’s progress in achieving program review goals (CR2-4).
- Mid-point progress reports for annual unit plans have been instituted to keep better track of goal completion (CR2-3).

In addition, as both the Self Evaluation Report and the External Evaluation Report indicate, one of the College’s self-identified action items to come out of the last Institutional Effectiveness Review was to develop a mechanism for more formally keeping track of institutional progress on strategic goals and objectives as well as enabling follow-up (CR2-8). In spring 2013, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee created a crosswalk of goals to specific measures. Every goal now has an identified assessment indicator or set of indicators, ranging from specific data points already found within our MIS system, to periodic accountability reports, to specially created reports written for and maintained solely at the College. Moreover, a chart showing this crosswalk has been created and posted to the college planning website, including persons responsible and timelines for the data gathering (CR2-9).

*Standard III.D*

At the time of the writing of the Institutional Self Evaluation Report and the visit by the Evaluation Team, the newly adopted planning cycle was in the middle of its second run. Subsequent changes have been made that greatly enhance the tie between planning and resource allocation:

- In the 2012 planning cycle for academic year 2013-14, the annual unit plan template budget worksheet was redesigned so that resource requests were directly linked to second-level resource plans (staffing, professional development, facilities, information technology, and marketing); this made it vastly easier for the developers of these plans to identify and analyze requests.
• In preparation for the 2013 planning cycle for academic year 2014-15, the budget manager provided a spreadsheet for each unit pre-populated with line-item budgets, the current-year adopted budget, and 3-year actuals; this greatly simplified the unit’s ability to plan and the budget committee’s ability to pull together the requests for a first-draft budget (CR2-10).

• The entire list of college budgets was charted out by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and each one incorporated into an annual plan at the unit, section, or division level; this means every org from which money is spent on resources is now integrated at some point in the annual planning cycle (CR2-11, pgs. 31-33).

• The budgeting procedure as it exists in the current integrated planning cycle was formalized in an official Academic Senate-recommended budget process pursuant to AB 1725 (CR2-11, appendix C).

Further revisions are designed for the 2013-14 year. One greatly anticipated change, by faculty chairs and the budget committee alike, is the development of a web form that will simultaneously serve to capture the information in a database and automate the creation of the spreadsheets and budget committee reports. Another very important improvement planned for 2013-14 is the formation of an effective evaluation instrument for the budget process. In fall 2013, the budget committee will dialogue with the Institutional Effectiveness Committee about creating assessment measures, a timeline, and an official report-out mechanism. This instrument will specifically address the Evaluation Team’s concern with formalizing an assessment regarding resource allocation and address the College’s own self-identified action plan from the Self Evaluation Report (CR2-12).

Standard IV.A

Progress has been made on evaluating planning processes for effectiveness. In its Self-Evaluation Report, the College identified two areas where it needed to implement a more formalized evaluation related to its planning and decision-making models. One was College Council (CR2-13). In spring 2013, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee developed a rubric for assessing College Council through its representative function—how well it performs as a conduit of effective dialogue between stakeholder groups and the president for informed decision making (CR2-14). The rubric was distributed to College Council members at the final meeting of 2012-2013, a self-assessment completed, and the results shared at the first College Council meeting of 2013-14 (CR2-15; CR2-16). A similar rubric to be distributed to stakeholders is in development for fall 2013. This is especially important for students since another of the self-identified action items from the last self-evaluation was to develop a formalized evaluation of the effectiveness of student representation on College Council and its sub-committees (CR2-17). Another improvement is that a statement of College Council’s periodic evaluation is now formally embedded in the Participatory Governance Model (CR2-11, pg. 17).

The second area of planning and decision-making that the College determined needed a formalized evaluation is the work of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee itself (CR2-18). In spring 2013, dialogue ensued about evaluating the Institutional Effectiveness Committee that resulted in a series of
proposed changes to existing committees (CR2-19). Since the Institutional Effectiveness Committee’s charge is institutional planning, it was determined that it could and should work together with the SLO Committee and the (long defunct) Program Review Committee. The Program Review Committee is to be resuscitated and broadened to include all college operational units, not just instructional. The SLO Committee, which is currently a sub-committee of Academic Senate, would be similarly broadened. This proposal was introduced to College Council in May 2013 (CR2-16).

In terms of evaluation, these three committees would each provide guidance for improving the College’s performance on the ACCJC institutional effectiveness rubrics: the SLO Committee for student learning outcomes, Program Review Committee for program review, and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee for planning. These rubrics would, in turn, be the measure of their effectiveness—the extent to which the college achieves and maintains Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement. As of the filing of this follow-up report, the proposal has been approved by College Council and is moving forward with implementation (CR2-20).

Progress Reported in 2014 Follow-Up Report

The result of the 2013 follow-up visit was that while the College had made substantive and complete progress in integrating planning activities in a way that linked mission, program review, and resource allocation, it had not fully completed the second half of the recommendation, implementing an effective evaluation instrument for the planning process (CR2-21, pgs. 4-5). The team concluded that the recommendation had been partially addressed, and “the last step needed to meet this recommendation and meet Standards is implementing a formal, systematic evaluation process into its planning cycle.”

In February and March, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) completed the design of a two-part instrument for annually evaluating the College’s planning process, and it implemented the instrument in spring 2014 (CR2-22).

One part is a comprehensive self-evaluation of each of the College’s three major planning areas carried out by the steering groups responsible for each area: the Institutional Effectiveness Committee for planning, the Program Review committee for program review, and the Student Learning Outcome (SLO) committee for SLO’s. This part is designed to be an “insider’s” view: a detailed, frank assessment from groups with a level of special knowledge and institutional history in the areas.

Rubrics were developed by the IEC to guide the self-evaluations (CR2-23). These documents were modeled closely on ACCJC’s own rubrics for evaluating institutional effectiveness—the idea being that the College could and should be judging itself by what constitutes “Proficiency” in these areas. Each steering group was asked to provide a narrative of no more than 300 words for each bulleted item of the rubric (CR2-24). This was also modeled on a Commission assessment: the SLO-readiness survey of 2012. IEC found that survey and the report it yielded (CR2-25) to be highly valuable in identifying the institution’s progress in SLO implementation, so it designed its instrument to yield the same kind of feedback for all three major planning areas.
The IEC scored the responses on a 5-point scale. Each committee member rated the responses separately ahead of the meeting and submitted results to the chair. The group convened to discuss the scores and aggregate an overall rating for each bulleted item (CR2-26).

In terms of making the results available, the self-evaluations and scores were posted to the college website as a much more detailed and comprehensive “College Report Card” than the institution has had in the past (CR2-27). For loop back, the SLO and the Program Review coordinators are both sitting members of IEC, and all three committees used the results of the assessment to directly inform goal-setting for 2014-15 (CR2-28; CR2-29; CR2-30). This is to be an annual process.

The second part of the College’s formal, systematic evaluation of the planning process is a survey of the field. In contrast to the insider’s view of the detailed self-evaluations, the Strategic Planning survey is intended to gauge the college community’s understanding of and satisfaction with planning in the areas of “Mission and Institutional Goals,” “College Planning,” and “Budget and Resource Allocation.”

The survey was designed by IEC in March and administered in April. It provided for comments as well as ratings (CR2-31). The results were gathered and discussed by IEC in May at the same time the self-evaluations were discussed (CR2267). One immediate outcome of giving the survey in 2014 was informing the college president’s address on the subject of college governance to classified staff during classified staff appreciation week and to faculty at fall’s opening flex day. Like the self-evaluations, the yearly results are intended to become a part of the expanded College Report Card (CR2-27).

**Conclusion Reported in 2014 Follow-Up Report**

The College stated it had fully addressed this recommendation. This conclusion was accepted by ACCJC at its January 2015 Commission Meeting (CR2-34).

**Sustained Improvements**

Since the filing of the 2014 Follow-Up Report, an important advancement has been made in the integration, measurability, and target-setting of the College’s strategic goals. In its 2012-2015 Strategic Plan, the College had adopted goals and objectives that ranged from the very narrow (“Increase the percentage of students who successfully complete 12 units within one year using 2011-12 as the baseline year”) to the very general (“Reflect community needs as identified by various scanning data, unit plans, and measured by program review”) and from the specifically measurable (“Increase scores on all benchmarks by 2-3% as measured by the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSEE) 2011 baseline”) to the decidedly unmeasurable (“Implement or improve the following district-wide internal processes and measure their effectiveness annually: 1) tagging similar courses, 2) degree audit, 3) codifications of processes and dissemination of procedural information, and 4) data integrity”) (CR2-2).
For its 2015-2018 goals, the College much more clearly delineated this structure of goals, objectives, measures, and targets. It established a four-level hierarchy of action-planning—goals, objectives, strategies, and actions—with goals, the broadest level of the hierarchy, being directly related to commitments of the college mission. It identified very clear measures tied to just one of these levels—objectives. And it determined specific targets for ‘moving the needle’ on those measures that are the aim of objectives, strategies, and actions. This has simultaneously produced a clearer link to the college mission and a stronger foundation for the annual integrated planning and resource allocation process that flows from the strategic goals (CR2-32).

Additionally, as anticipated in the 2013 Follow-Up Report, the College has now completed the design and implementation of a web form for submitting documents of the annual integrated planning process. Those responsible for completing planning documents fill out and submit the forms online, and the forms simultaneously serve to automate the creation of reports and capture the planning information in a database for future reporting and tracking (CR2-33).
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| CR2-18 | Cerro Coso Community College Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, Standard IV.B.2.b |
| CR2-19 | Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes, March 25, 2013 |
| CR2-21 | ACCJC 2013 Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report |
| CR2-22 | Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes—February 10, March 17, April 21, 2014 |
| CR2-23 | Annual Assessment Self Evaluation Rubrics |
| CR2-24 | Annual Assessment Reports, Spring 2014 |
| CR2-25 | ACCJC’s Feedback Memo on College Status Report on SLO Implementation, October 2013 |
| CR2-26 | Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes—May 12, 2014 |
| CR2-27 | 2014 College Report Card |
| CR2-28 | Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes—September 15, 2014 |
| CR2-29 | Student Learning Outcomes Committee Minutes—September 2, 2014 |
| CR2-30 | Program Review Committee Minutes—September 11, 2014 |
| CR2-31 | College Strategic Planning Survey Results |
| CR2-32 | Cerro Coso Community College 2015-2018 Strategic Goals |
| CR2-33 | College Planning Web-Input Site [screenshots] |
| CR2-34 | ACCJC Action Letter, February 6, 2015 |
College Recommendation 3

Improving Institutional Effectiveness

To fully meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College ensure that all courses and programs are evaluated through an ongoing systematic review and that Student Learning Outcomes, Service Department Outcomes, Program Level Outcomes, and Institutional Learning Outcomes assessment results are integrated into the planning and allocation process. (I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.i, II.C.2, II.B.4, IIIA.1.c)

Recommendation 3 was referenced at two places in the External Evaluation Report. In Standard I.B, it was noted that program review has not been completed for some programs in the expected time (CR3-1, pg. 21). In Standard II.A, the relationship between the program reviews and the integrated planning process was questioned, especially as time lapses between the program review (on a six-year cycle) and the annual unit plan. The site team was concerned that no direct tie-back to program review was present within the annual planning cycle to guide such yearly parts of the process as resource allocation, for instance (CR3-1, pgs. 23, 25-26).

Progress Reported in 2013 Follow-Up Report

Standard I.B

The College is now fully up to date on its program reviews. Within the last year, the College has completed the following program reviews:

- Art (CR3-2)
- Physical Education/Kinesiology (CR3-3)
- Computer Science (CR3-4)
- General Education (CR3-5)

The College is now completely current with its program reviews. Every instructional program listed in the college catalog—degree and certificate—either has been assessed within the last six years or is within its first cycle and too new to be assessed (CR3-6; CR3-7).

In addition, one of the programs completing its assessment this year was the general education pattern. It was an action item from the Institutional Self Evaluation process to complete the College’s first-ever general education program review. A task force composed of faculty and administrators was convened in September 2012. This group met throughout the fall and spring semesters and completed its work in April 2013, submitting the final document to the Academic Senate for approval (CR3-8). The report contained several recommendations for the senate to consider and take action on in fall 2013.
Standard II.A

Program review has now been made a more explicit part of the integrated planning cycle. In spring 2013, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee made revisions to both the annual unit plan and the program review templates to bring them into closer alignment. Based on feedback from the External Evaluation Report as well as from dialogue with the team during its October visit, the annual unit plan template now calls for an explicit tie-back to the last program review and a direct statement of the unit’s progress during the prior year on achieving program review goals (CR3-9). The program review template now aligns directly with the second-level resource analyses of the planning cycle, with the “Currency” section having been reorganized into the subsections of staffing, professional development, facilities, technology, and marketing (CR3-10). Another tighter integration is that specific student learning outcome improvements in both courses and programs are now listed on the program review. These would be the same SLO improvements that are to be captured later in the annual unit plan template as having been accomplished.

The end result is a closer integration between program review and annual unit planning which will be first in evidence in the 2013 planning cycle for 2014-15. Not only are the program review recommendations kept continually in front of those responsible for unit planning but also in front of section, division, and resource leaders who develop subsequent plans based on the unit plans. Since budget is the last step in the planning process, there is now a direct link from program review to resource allocation.

To strengthen that integration, IEC designed and delivered a comprehensive program review training in September 2013. It was the first of its kind for the College and covered such topics as knowing the template, understanding continuous quality improvement, analyzing data, generating productive dialogue, drawing conclusions/setting proper goals, and maintaining consistent tone (CR3-11). Faculty chairs whose programs are undergoing review in 2013-14 were required to attend; all discipline faculty members were also invited. On the unit planning side, faculty chairs are trained yearly in changes in the annual unit plan template. This year’s training—which takes place annually at the first faculty chair meeting of the new academic year—stressed the relation between program review and the annual unit plan. An additional training was provided in early September for all those who are not faculty chairs but responsible for completing an annual unit plan in student services and administrative services areas (CR3-12).

Conclusion Reported in 2013 Follow-Up Report

Cerro Coso has substantially addressed this recommendation. For the first time in a long time, possibly since the beginning of program review accountability, the College is entirely caught up in its reviews. Moreover, the revisions made to the annual unit plan and the program review templates forge a stronger connection between the two planning processes, allowing program reviews to act as long-term planning guides that are, in effect, updated every year with the annual unit plans.
A concern of the evaluation team during its visit was the 6-year cycle. Some members conveyed that they felt it was too long, and although the External Evaluation Report stopped short of recommending a shorter timeframe, these concerns appeared in the report as questions about time lapse and how the 6-year program review can be incorporated into annual resource allocation. The College, however, is wary of having too short a time span for the comprehensive review. With the side-by-side revisions of the unit plan and program review templates in spring 2013, the College believes it has found the right mix of long-term goal-setting guiding short-term decision-making.

One area the College intends to make progress on is the integration of Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO’s) with the rest of the planning process. Although not a requirement in the Accreditation Standards, ILO’s were adopted by the College in September 2009, mapped to the College’s course inventory in August 2010, and assessed by means of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement in spring 2011 (CR3-13). But ILO’s have never become a shaping force in institutional planning, self-reflection, or decision-making. It is one of the goals of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee in 2013-14 to dialogue about ILO’s, their role in the college’s identity, their relation to the college mission, and integration with other parts of the planning cycle.

In its 2013 Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report, the team concluded that Cerro Coso Community College had fully met the expectations of the recommendations and now meets the standard (CR3-21, pg. 5). This conclusion was accepted by ACCJC at its January 2014 Commission Meeting (CR3-22).

**Sustained Improvements**

Since the filing of the 2013 Follow-Up Report, the College has continued to make refinements in its program review and SLO processes. As a result of the implementation of the new College Report Card, both the SLO Committee and the Program Review Committee have annual goals to be accomplished (CR3-14; CR3-15). One goal finished this year was starting and completing an audit of course assessments, reviewing and revising how course assessments map to Program Learning Outcomes, and how this process of assessment provides explicit information for Program Review (CR3-16).

Program reviews for academic, student services, and administrative units have historically occurred on a 6-year cycle, but future cycles will henceforth be on a 5-year schedule. In preparation for program review, a schedule has been developed by each department for each program that shows when course-level student learning outcomes are due (years 1-3) and program-level student learning outcomes are due (year 4) in preparation for writing the program review document in year 5 (CR3-17). Additionally, the recommendation to departments is that all program courses must be reviewed and approved by the Curriculum and Instruction Council within the latter part of each cycle.

At the time of the writing of the 2013 Follow-Up Report, the college was reestablishing its program review committee. One of the first tasks the committee accomplished was revising and enhancing the rubric developed by IEC and establishing a more aggressive timeline. The committee now evaluates and
scores program review documents with a rubric during a first review (CR3-18). Recommendations are provided to the proposers, changes are made, and the committee reviews the document again to ensure recommendations have been implemented (CR3-19). Academic Program Reviews are subsequently reviewed by the Academic Senate. All Program Reviews are presented to College Council for final review and acceptance.

Conversations regarding the College’s Institutional Learning Outcomes and the need for revision have taken place through the Student Learning Outcome Committee, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, the Accreditation Steering Committee, and College Council. In spring 2014, a Task Force was convened to review institution-set standards as well as to recommend a revision of ILO’s at Cerro Coso Community College (CR3-20). The role of this task force was increased unexpectedly when the state Chancellor’s Office announced in February the requirement for colleges to submit Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative targets by June; as a consequence, the task force spent the second half of the semester establishing these targets and had to delay discussions of ILO’s to fall 2015.

List of Evidence

CR3-1  External Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, February 2013
CR3-2  Program Review, Art
CR3-3  Program Review, Physical Education
CR3-4  Program Review, Computer Science
CR3-5  Program Review, General Education
CR3-6  Program Review Main Page
CR3-7  Program Review Schedule
CR3-8  Academic Senate Minutes, May 9, 2013
CR3-9  Annual Unit Plan Template for Planning Year 2014-15
CR3-10 Program Review Template, 2013-14
CR3-11 Program Review Training Materials, September 2013
CR3-12 Annual Unit Plan Training Materials, September 2013
CR3-13 SLO Comprehensive Annual Assessment Report, 2011-12
CR3-14 Student Learning Outcomes Committee Minutes—September 2, 2014
CR3-15 Program Review Committee Minutes—September 11, 2014
CR3-16 PLO Mapping Project Sample Spreadsheets
CR3-17 Sample SLO/PLO/Program Review Timelines for Programs
CR3-18 Program Review Evaluation Rubric and Sample Scores
CR3-19 Program Review Committee Feedback to Proposers
CR3-20 Letter from the President, February 8, 2015
CR3-21 ACCJC 2013 Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report
CR3-22 ACCJC Action Letter, February 7, 2014
College Recommendation 4

To fully meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College develop and implement appropriate policies and procedures that incorporate effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes into the evaluation process that includes Adjunct faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving student learning outcomes. (III.A.1.b, III.A.1.c, III.A.3)

Recommendation 4 was referenced in Standard III.A. It was noted that while the team found evidence of full-time faculty members being evaluated in terms of their participation in SLO efforts via a teaching portfolio, it found no such evidence for any personnel beyond full-time faculty members who are evaluated for their effective contributions to student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes (CR4-1, pg. 37).

Progress Reported in 2013 Follow-Up Report

The faculty collective bargaining agreement already contains within it language that adjunct faculty members are to provide, as part of their evaluation, sample assignments/assessment activities for each learning environment that will be evaluated (CR4-2). However, historically this language had never been taken to mean SLO assessments.

Upon receiving the recommendation in February 2013, dialogue ensued between management and the faculty collective bargaining unit. The result was an agreement that human resources will work with the Colleges to ensure that the evaluation criteria includes a statement indicating that the adjunct faculty member provide assessment information to their faculty chair, and a brief summary of this information (CR4-3).

As a follow-up, the substance of this clarification/agreement was shared with faculty chairs and educational administrators at the first faculty chair meeting of the fall 2013 semester (CR4-4). Expectations were established that all adjunct faculty evaluations starting fall 2013 are to include this evidence of contributions to student progress toward achieving SLO’s.

Conclusion Reported from 2013 Follow-Up Report

The College stated it had fully addressed this recommendation. This conclusion was endorsed by the Follow-Up Team in its 2013 Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report (CR4-7, pg. 6) and accepted by ACCJC at its January 2014 Commission Meeting (CR4-8).

Sustained Improvement
Since the filing of the 2013 Follow-Up Report, the College has required SLO statements from all adjunct faculty members as an ongoing component of the adjunct evaluation process (CR4-5). In addition, a practice has been developed in academic affairs of including a summary statement within the evaluation team summary report of how the adjunct instructor assesses SLO’s (CR4-6).

List of Evidence

| CR4-1 | External Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, February 2013 |
| CR4-2 | Kern Community College District Board Policy, Section 5.7.c.5.b |
| CR4-3 | Human Resources Memorandum Regarding Faculty Contract Article 7C |
| CR4-4 | Faculty Chair Meeting Minutes, August 20, 2013 |
| CR4-5 | Adjunct Evaluation SLO Statement Sample |
| CR4-6 | Recent Adjunct Evaluation Team Summary Samples |
| CR4-7 | ACCJC 2013 Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report |
| CR4-8 | ACCJC Action Letter, February 7, 2014 |
College Recommendation 5

To fully meet the Standards, the team recommends that student and staff equity and diversity plans be fully integrated with the College’s planning processes and include strategies geared toward attracting a diverse pool of qualified applicants able to contribute to the success of the College’s student population. (II.A.1.a, II.A.2.d, II.B.3.d, III.A, III.A.4.b)

Recommendation 5 was referenced in Standard III.A. It was noted that the team was not able to identify any active program in support of, or strategy to support, diversity and equality operating at the College. Moreover, while it was felt that the College is satisfied with its record in equity and diversity for hiring diverse faculty and administrators, a review of classified employees by ethnicity shows the current employee/student body representation ratio to be disparate (CR5-1, pgs. 36, 38-39).

Progress Reported in 2013 Follow-Up Report

In spring 2013, human resources drafted a Kern Community College District EEO/Diversity Plan (CR5-2). This plan adheres closely to the California State Chancellor’s Office “Model Equal Employment Opportunity Plan and Guidelines for California Community Colleges” (2007) for compliance with Title 5 regulations on equal employment hiring and for guidance in improving the equality of opportunity. The draft plan contains a policy statement, a determination of roles and responsibility, guidelines for the establishment of an advisory committee, definitions, and a complaint procedure. The second half of the document discusses data points for analyzing staff diversity—including workforce and applicant pools—as well as methods to address underrepresentation. The district’s own data is analyzed in these areas. The draft is being readied for board approval in November or December 2013.

At the college level, the decision was made in spring 2013 to treat the college human resources office like any other operational unit, requiring it to establish goals and outcomes, assess them yearly, and write an annual unit plan—as well as to complete a periodic program review. This decision was in response to the self-identified action item in the last Institutional Effectiveness Review to develop a formalized evaluation of the effectiveness of college human resources procedures and programs (CR5-3). Although human resources is a centralized district function, the local office has always played a guiding role in providing information to the College about available data, job positions, job classifications, and employee diversity during the institutional planning process. Treating it like any other operational unit will result in more clearly delineated outcomes and goals—especially those related to equity and diversity—that will be much more firmly tied to the institution’s annual integrated planning cycle (CR5-4; CR5-5). Moreover, these goals and outcomes will be assessed annually.
During the spring 2013 semester, Cerro Coso, along with the other colleges within Kern Community College District, applied and was accepted to become an Achieving the Dream school. Participation in Achieving the Dream indicates the commitment of the College to a focus on developing a culture of inquiry, a consistent focus on using data to inform decision making and to identify achievement gaps. The Achieving the Dream process assists the College in reviewing disaggregated and cohort student achievement data with the particular aim of identifying equity gaps in student achievement, groups who are disproportionately unsuccessful in achieving successful student outcomes and, further, identifying barriers that contribute to these equity gaps.

Cerro Coso assembled the faculty leadership team and attended the Achieving the Dream Kick-off Conference in June 2013. During this conference, the team developed the initial work plan for the first year of participation, with the assistance of the Achieving the Dream Leadership and Data Coaches assigned to Cerro Coso (CR5-6). In the context of the broad goal of improving student success, the team chose “Improving the Student Experience” as the theme for the year.

Finally, in support of diversity and equity at the College the Cerro Coso Community College Professional Development Committee has created a professional development plan for all employees that has, as one of its five goals for 2013-14, developing cultural awareness (CR5-7). Activities planned for the year include workshops and diversity and cultural awareness events. At the fall opening Flex Day, the Achieving the Dream leadership team provided a presentation to faculty and administration on the commitment to Achieving the Dream, the broad based participation required by faculty, and the plan for the year (CR5-8). In February, the College is preparing to host Shakti Butler, an educator in the field of racial equity, for an evening lecture open to all staff and the general public as well as a focused discussion with College Council.

**Conclusion Reported in 2013 Follow-Up Report**

The College has partially addressed this recommendation. The College and District have made significant progress in developing a district-wide EEO/diversity plan. Upon approval of the plan, the District will revitalize the District Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity Committee that will provide guidance in helping the college develop strategies for attracting more applicants in underrepresented groups during the recruitment and screening process.

At the college level, what remains to be done is establish diversity as a centrally important component of the annual human resources planning. Now that expectations are clear about how and when HR engages in the planning cycle, the next step to fulfill the recommendation is to make sure diversity is a perpetual focus of those documents—such as a permanent subheading. In this way, consistent data points will be generated and analyzed, and college human resources will have a better, more consistent mechanism for monitoring staffing needs and making suggestions to college administration and department faculty and staff about employee diversity during the institutional planning process.
Achieving the Dream is a major step forward in addressing this recommendation and one that promises to pay dividends for students and staff alike. On October 7 and 8, 2013, Cerro Coso will host the first district wide convergence with leadership at all levels of the Colleges and District and the Achieving the Dream Coaches (CR5-9). Cerro Coso will host a data summit to review with the various segments of campus leadership some initial analysis of the Achieving the Dream disaggregated and cohort data. The second day will be dedicated to a structured dialogue and interaction on student diversity and equity. In preparation, the team is administering the Achieving the Dream Inventory on Diversity and Equity to all administration, faculty and staff, which will inform the development of the day’s activities. This focus is intended to set the context for the work that the College will be doing over the course of the year to review the data, identify achievement gaps with a particular focus on equity, identify possible explanations for gaps, and develop strategies for addressing them.

The Follow-Up Team concluded that Cerro Coso Community College had fully met the expectations of the recommendations and now meets the standard (CR5-19, pg. 6). This conclusion was accepted by ACCJC at its January 2014 Commission Meeting (CR5-20).

**Sustained Improvement**

Since the filing of the 2013 Follow-Up Report, a district-wide Equal Employment Opportunity and Staff Diversity Plan was approved by the Board of Trustees in April 2014 (CR5-10). This plan lists strategies to promote a diverse workforce and provides specific plans and procedures for ensuring equal employment opportunity. Also outlined is the reestablishment of the district-wide Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee (EEOAC), which is to play a proactive role in enhancing and promoting diversity and cultural competence in the district (CR5-11).

At the college level, the completion of the first program review of the human resources department in spring 2015 was a major step in sustaining and enhancing progress on this recommendation (CR5-12). As a component of this first program review, administrative unit outcomes were developed that included diversity planning as a central function and expectation of the department: “80% of staff will report human resources supports the district’s goals of equal opportunity, diversity and cultural competency to foster a diverse workforce.” This data is to be gathered by the distribution of a cultural climate survey during the 2015-2016 academic year (CR5-13).

In addition, HR’s 2015-2016 annual unit plan identified the goal of supporting diversity planning as a central component of district and college decision-making. In 2015-2016, the department intends to review and develop strategies as outlined in the new EEO and Staff Diversity Plan to ensure the College recruits and retains a diverse workforce (CR5-14).

As a consequence of its Achieving the Dream efforts, the College has embarked on institution-wide dialogue about student equity, diversity, and cultural competence. At all-staff meetings in October 2013 and June 2014, student services staff viewed the videos “Students Speak, Are you Listening?” from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement and “Inclusion Insights” by Steve Robbins and
completed exercises associated with the concepts raised (CR5-15). An administrative advance in June 2014 focused on the concept of diversity and white privilege (CR5-16). Faculty inquiry groups were conducted in spring 2014 to gather qualitative input on equity issues in the classroom (CR5-17). And diversity is a major thread of faculty professional development for the 2015-2016 academic year, with at least one external speaker scheduled to give FLEX day presentations to full-time and adjunct faculty alike on the concept of cultural competence in the classroom (CR5-18).

List of Evidence

CR5-1 External Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, February 2013
CR5-2 KCCD Equal Employment Opportunity/Diversity Plan -- *DRAFT*
CR5-3 Cerro Coso Community College Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, Standard III.A.6
CR5-4 Annual Integrated Planning Work Page, 2014-15
CR5-5 Program Review Schedule
CR5-6 Achieving the Dream 2013 Planning Year Work Plan
CR5-7 Resource Request Analysis, Professional Development for 2013-14
CR5-8 Achieving the Dream Flex Day Presentation, August 2013
CR5-9 Achieving the Dream Convergence on Diversity and Equity, Materials
CR5-10 KCCD Board of Trustees Minutes—April 2014
CR5-11 KCCD Equal Employment Opportunity and Staff Diversity Plan
CR5-12 College Council Minutes—April 16, 2015
CR5-13 Human Resources Program Review
CR5-14 Human Resources 2015-2016 Annual Unit Plan
CR5-15 Student Services All-Staff Meeting Agendas and Sign-In Sheets—October 2013 and June 2014
CR5-16 Administrative Advance Agenda—June 2, 2014
CR5-17 Faculty Inquiry Group Fact Sheet
CR5-18 Resource Request Analysis, Professional Development for 2015-16
CR5-19 ACCJC 2013 Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report
CR5-20 ACCJC Action Letter, February 7, 2014
To fully meet the Standards, the team recommends the College develop and implement a process which allows the public, students, and employees to report safety conditions and other issues of disrepair to physical resources. Process should include tracking to ensure all necessary repairs are made promptly and follow-up action is possible to assure that physical resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and services are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security and a healthful learning and working environment. (III.B.1.a, III.B.1.b)

Recommendation 6 was referenced in Standard III.B. It was noted that the current procedure for reporting and tracking incidents of disrepair or safety concerns to physical resources is not well defined or publicized. While the Evaluation Team acknowledged the tracking software “SchoolDude” had been implemented, the system was in the testing phase and not well publicized or commonly used as the primary method of submitting work orders (CR6-1, pg. 42).

Progress Reported in the 2013 Follow-Up Report

After a testing period, the College moved to full implementation of SchoolDude in January 2013. The previous method of sending emails to the Maintenance and Operations listserv was eliminated at that time. To help with the transition, an operations procedure guide sheet was created to assist customers through the process of submitting a work request (CR6-2). The guide lists six action stages, the last of which has eight steps to help the user navigate requests through the system. The guide is available to all students and staff directly on the portal main page (CR6-3).

To publicize and promote the use of the system, an informational forum was held during spring faculty flex day at which the guides were distributed. This was followed up with a mass distribution for all staff through the campus mail.

Since implementation, SchoolDude has become widely used throughout the College to address everything from small custodial issues to safety concerns to event set up and tear down. At the time of the writing of this follow-up report, the system shows 450 work requests of various types having been entered. Out of these requests, 286 were completed in a timely manner, 95 are still in progress at various stages, 13 were voided due to duplication, 2 are pending additional funding, and 27 are awaiting assignment.

SchoolDude provides a variety of reports to ensure that all necessary repairs are made promptly and that follow-up action has been accomplished. It provides needed feedback to the initiator as well as the supervisor assigning the work requests. It outlines where work requests are in the steps of completion.
It shows who the work was assigned to and what the estimated time of completion will be. It shows how many work requests are assigned to each person on the staff. It shows total requests opened and closed and average time of completion (CR6-4).

Conclusion Reported in 2013 Follow-Up Report

The College has mostly addressed this recommendation. SchoolDude has proven to be a comprehensive work-order tracking system to ensure the College is maintaining its physical resources for access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment. The program is available to students and to staff at any time with the click of a button. The College will continue to promote the visibility of the program to both students and staff through announcements, flyers, and reminders. Plans are underway, for example, to place a paragraph about how to report safety conditions and issues of disrepair into the Student Handbook.

One challenge discovered is that some members of the maintenance staff are not as knowledgeable about computer entry as the system requires for proper functionality. Ongoing training is required to improve the staff’s ability to navigate the software and thereby maintain the accuracy of the data being provided to the customer and to the management staff.

While SchoolDude works well for students and staff, where the College can continue to improve in this area is extending the reporting ability to the public. In fall 2013, the facilities committee will examine options for members of the public who are not students or employees and who therefore have no account access to InsideCC—for example, through signage around campus giving a reporting phone number. The goal is to establish and implement a formalized process before the end of the 2013-14 academic year.

It should be noted that in addition to providing communication and tracking, SchoolDude also promotes the College’s ability to assess strategic goal and administrative unit outcomes. Reports from SchoolDude have been identified as measures to aid in assessing Strategic Goal 2.2 (“Improve facilities and maintenance as measured by climate surveys and operational reports compared to 2010-11 baseline”) and Goal 2.3 (“Improve student and employee safety as measured by Clery and OSHA reports through climate surveys as compared to 2011-12 baseline”) (CR6-5). Additionally, they are identified as measures for assessing Maintenance and Operations’ Administrative Unit Outcome 2, Maintenance and Operations responds to work requests in a timely manner (CR6-6).

In its 2013 Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report, the team concluded that Cerro Coso Community College had fully met the expectations of the recommendations and now meets the standard (CR6-9, pg. 7). This conclusion was accepted by ACCJC at its January 2014 Commission Meeting (CR6-10).
Sustained Improvement

Since the filing of the 2013 Follow-Up Report, SchoolDude continues to be widely used throughout the College. It provides instantaneous actionable data. For instance, since July 2014, there have been 259 work requests submitted into the system. To date the system has had 450 work requests of various nature logged into the program—259 alone since July 2014. Of those requests, 286 have been completed in a timely manner, 95 are in various stages of completion, 27 are in the queue for assignment, 13 were voided due to being duplicated, and 2 are awaiting additional funding.

A link was put in place on the college website leading to a form for the public to report safety conditions and other issues of disrepair to physical resources (CR6-7). The form is sent by email to the college maintenance and operations manager, who also serves as the campus safety officer. In addition, safety suggestion boxes have been established at each campus location, including five at the main campus in Ridgecrest. These boxes are monitored by the maintenance and operations manager.

One continued improvement that has been made in this area has been creating a “one-stop” location for all work requests, whether to the Help Desk for technology issues or to SchoolDude for facilities issues. These used to be two separate processes accessed by two separate entry points on the college web site. Combined into one location and prominently housed in one channel on the InsideCC portal, faculty and staff need only to remember the one place. This change was vetted through the administrative team and College Council in February 2015 and went live at the end of February 2015 (CR6-8).

Challenges are still being faced getting maintenance staff to use the system. The challenge yet to be overcome is ensuring that the technician assigned to the work request continues to log into the system at every stage to update the tracking process. Several members of the staff have only a developing awareness of computer literacy at this time; additional training is required for them to be able to navigate through the software to maintain the integrity of the system. That training takes place as part of the department’s weekly meetings.

List of Evidence:

- CR6-1 External Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, February 2013
- CR6-2 SchoolDude Operations Procedure Work Sheet
- CR6-3 SchoolDude Links on InsideCC
- CR6-4 SchoolDude Sample Reports
- CR6-5 Strategic Goals Assessment Matrix
- CR6-6 Maintenance and Operations Assessment Plan
- CR6-7 Facilities and Safety/Security Contact Form
- CR6-8 “Report Technology and Facilities Issues” Channel on InsideCC
- CR6-9 ACCJC 2013 Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report
- CR6-10 ACCJC Action Letter, February 7, 2014
District Recommendation 1

Review and Update Board Policies on a Periodic Basis

In order to comply with the Standards, the team recommends that the Board of Trustees establish a process to ensure the board’s policies and procedures are evaluated on a regular basis and revised as appropriate (IV.B.1.e).

Progress in Addressing Recommendation

Prior to the 2012 accreditation visit, the governing board updated board policies and procedures as needed based on changes to law or regulation; however, there was not a scheduled recurring evaluation of board policies. Therefore, beginning November 2012, the Kern Community College District initiated a formal process to ensure that all of the KCCD Board Policies and Procedures are evaluated periodically and revised as appropriate.

Immediately following the accreditation visit, the Chancellor’s Cabinet implemented the systematic review of the Board Policy Manual to occur every two years (board policy sections 1, 3, 7, 9 and 11 for review in odd-numbered years and board policy sections 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10 for review in even-numbered years) (DR1-1). Additionally, the assistant to the chancellor created a calendar to facilitate the review of board policies (DR1-2).

In July 2013, KCCD’s general counsel recommended removing the collective bargaining agreements from the Board Policy Manual. The bargaining unit contracts are legally binding without being included in board policy. In November of 2014, Board Policy Manual sections 5, 7, and 9 were moved out of board policy and deleted from the Board Policy Manual.

The chancellor, chief financial officer, the Chancellor’s Cabinet, and the Consultation Council agreed on the evaluation of Section 1, Section 3, and Section 11 (odd-numbered sections of the Board Policy Manual) to be completed by the end of 2013. The review of even-numbered sections of the Board Policy Manual (Sections 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10) commenced in January 2014 (DR1.1).

Conclusion

The District has defined a process for the periodic review and appropriate revision of the KCCD Board Policy Manual to ensure an ongoing and systematic review of board policies and revisions where appropriate. This process began in January 2013 to evaluate one-half of the board policies (Section 1, Section 3, and Section 11) in odd calendar years and to evaluate the other half of board policies (Section 2, 4, 6, and 10) in even calendar years.
The Follow-Up Team Report in October 2013 indicated that the colleges have implemented actions that fully address District Recommendation #1. The new review process continues to be evaluated for efficacy and needed modifications to ensure the regular update of board policies and to assure compliance with the requirements of Standard IV.B.1.e.

**Plans for Sustaining Improvement and Institutional Effectiveness**

The process for review of board policies is systematic and evaluated regularly to determine its effectiveness. The District developed an instrument to facilitate the review of board policies. Effective April 2015, the interim vice chancellor of educational services sent a memorandum to the Academic Senate Presidents at each of the three colleges to clarify the vetting process in order to complete additions or revisions to district board policies in a timely manner *(DR1-3)*. For board policies that rely primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate, the intent is for the Academic Senate policy review to take up to eight weeks from initiation to completion *(DR1-3)*. Additionally, to improve the timeliness of reviewing and updating District policies, the District subscribes to the League of California Community College policy service that monitors changes to laws and regulations and clearly formulates and articulates all applicable policy changes.

**List of Evidence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DR1-1</th>
<th>Chancellor’s Administrative Council Minutes – July 2013 to March 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DR1-2</td>
<td>KCCD Board Policy Review Calendar – January 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR1-3</td>
<td>KCCD Academic Senate Letter &amp; Checklist for Board Policies Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
District Recommendation 2

In order to comply with the Standards, the team recommends that the Board of Trustees, in consultation with the Chancellor, develop and implement a development program that meets the needs of the newer board members as well as those board members who have considerable experience as a governing board member. (IV.B.1.f)

Board Development Program

Progress in Addressing Recommendation

The members of the KCCD board of trustees annually participate in a professional development program that is informed, in part, by current state and national community college issues, changing needs of the district, and the results of the board evaluation, which takes place in the fall of each odd-numbered year (DR2-1). In addition, new governing board members participate in an orientation conducted by the district chancellor and chief financial officer, which occurs immediately following their election (DR2-2). Additionally, new governing board members are urged to attend the statewide new trustee orientation workshop conducted by the Community College League of California (CCLC) (DR2-5).

In response to the recommendation, the existing trustee professional development program expanded into a comprehensive Trustee Development Plan (DR2-1). Based on the board self-evaluation results, the Board completed a new plan in October of 2013. In October 2013, the Board revised Board Policy 2F related to board in-service and development (DR2-3).

Following the every-odd-year board evaluation process, board performance areas receiving the lowest ratings on the evaluation are targeted as board development topics (DR2-4). The Trustee Development Plan incorporates topics that are trending community colleges issues and those related to student success, legal and legislative issues, accreditation, facilities planning, budget planning, and accountability and institutional effectiveness.

At the September 2013 board meeting, the board drafted a revision to KCCD board policy (DR2-3). This revision specifies that new trustees will participate in an orientation no later than 90 days following their election. KCCD has had changes in its board membership (in 2013 one new trustee was appointed; in November 2014 two new trustees were elected, and one was appointed in December 2014). Each new trustee participated in an orientation.

When new trustees are elected or appointed to the board, they undergo an orientation prior to assuming office at the December board meeting to acquaint them with KCCD, California community colleges, and the impact of community colleges across the nation. The orientation, conducted by the chancellor, includes topics such as general trustee information, planning and governance structures,
district-wide data, and support mechanisms for board member effectiveness (DR2-5). New trustees learn of the structures that support their governance, including the district-wide annual meeting schedule and subcommittee structures, the KCCD strategic plan, and the annual district budget (DR2-6). Understanding available data is critical to trustees, and the orientation includes a presentation of KCCD’s demographic, enrollment, financial aid, and completion data by college and district wide, as well as student progress and success accountability reports.

Outside support services are also available as part of the new trustee orientation. These include available publications such as the Community College League of California’s Fiscal Responsibility Handbook and a calendar of conferences for trustee orientation such as those sponsored by the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) and the California Community College Trustees and Community College League of California, as well as KCCD workshops related to emergency preparedness and sexual harassment and discrimination (DR2-7). Additionally, new trustees may attend the annual Community College League of California Effective Trustee Workshop conducted each January (DR2-5). For example, one of the three new trustees also attended both the CCLC’s New Trustee Workshop and Effective Trustee Workshop; and the chair of the governing board attended the ACCT Board Leadership Congress in October 2014.

During the annual KCCD board retreat, trustees review the KCCD strategic plan and annual institutional effectiveness outcomes. They also discuss annual reports on the status of each college and the district (DR2-8). The retreat culminates with a delineation of annual priorities, which are incorporated in the board development plan (DR2-9). Every two years at the annual board retreat, the board develops board priorities and goals, which instruct the chancellor’s plan of work. In January 2015, an ACCT consultant conducted a daylong retreat, Building an Effective Team. The agenda included topics such as Best Practices of Effective Boards, Board Self-Assessment, Governing Board Policies and Practices, Codes of Ethics/Standards/Conduct, KCCD Strategic Plan, and Student Success and Outcomes among others.

Conclusion

KCCD has made substantial progress on this recommendation. The Follow-Up Team Report in October 2013 indicated that the colleges have implemented actions that fully address District Recommendation #2. With the adoption of the revised Board Policy 2F and the completion of the Trustee Development Plan (2013-2015), District Recommendation #2 fully meets Standard IV.B.1. KCCD will continue to provide opportunities to understand issues important to board member professional development as appropriate.

Plans for Sustaining Improvement and Institutional Effectiveness

The KCCD Trustee Development Plan, reviewed and updated semi-annually, ensures that trustees learn of new development opportunities. Additionally, KCCD Board work study sessions cover in-depth topics of relevance to the colleges, district, and the district’s service areas (DR2-10).
List of Evidence

DR2-1  KCCD Trustee Development Plan & Calendar 2013-2015
DR2-2  New Trustee Orientation Binder (due to size, the binder is located in the Chancellor’s office)
DR2-3  Revision of Board Policy 2F
DR2-4  Board Self-Evaluation Instrument
DR2-5  CCLC New Trustee Orientation and Effective Trusteeship Program
DR2-6  Strategic Plan 2015-18
DR2-7  Introduction to Fiscal Responsibilities Handbook
DR2-8  Board Retreat Agendas
DR2-9  KCCD Board Priorities / Chancellor Plan of Work & Goals 2012-14 and 2014-16
DR2-10 Board Meeting Agendas- September 2012- June 2013
District Recommendation 3  Evaluate the Board of Trustees Self Evaluation Process

In order to comply with the Standards, the team recommends that the Board of Trustees review the elements of its Self-Evaluation Process and ensure that the Standards' minimum requirements for a Self-Evaluation which: 1) have clearly defined processes in place, 2) have processes implemented and 3) have processes published in the Board's policy manual which are included in the Self-Evaluation Process. The Board's policy 2E2 prescribes additional requirements when conducting the Board's Self Evaluation. (IV.B.1.g)

Progress in Addressing Recommendation

The accreditation visiting team members indicated that board agendas and meeting minutes confirm that the Kern Community College District Board of Trustees performs self-evaluations on schedule every two years (DR3-1; DR3-2; DR3-3). However, the team concluded that the board’s assessment of its evaluation process was insufficient to meet the standard fully. To respond to this recommendation, the following detail and citation are offered.

The secretary of the board provides the board members an agreed-upon evaluation instrument (DR3-4). In the past, when evaluations took place in consecutive years, the trustees compared and analyzed the results of the consecutive evaluation processes. This analysis revealed that differences between one year and the next year were insignificant. The trustees changed the self-evaluation process to take place every odd-numbered year. Additionally, the analysis by the trustees of the evaluation instrument resulted in removal of duplicative evaluation questions to create a more focused evaluation instrument. The Board completed its last self-evaluation in October 2013 (DR3-5).

As indicated in Board Policy 2E, the board evaluation process provides constructive feedback to governing board members about their individual performance, as well as the performance of the board as a whole, including board effectiveness and decision-making (DR3-1). The trustees identify past accomplishments and annual goals, clarify roles, and take actions based on the evaluation summaries to improve effectiveness and efficiency of board meetings.

Once the board members complete the evaluation instrument, they submit their responses to the secretary of the board. A summary of the evaluations is presented to the board in a written communication no later than December of the evaluation year.
Conclusion

A clearly defined trustee self-evaluation process is in place. The Follow-Up Team Report concluded that the Kern Community College District Board of Trustees has a process in place to evaluate the board’s self-evaluation process. The Follow-Up Team Report indicated that District Recommendation #3 had been fully addressed and that the board is in compliance with Standard IV.B.1.g.

Plans for Sustaining Improvement and Institutional Effectiveness

In January 2015, the trustees reviewed its evaluation instrument to determine its effectiveness. Based on the review, the board will discuss and update the board policy related to evaluation. The board will conduct its next self-evaluation in October of 2015 in accordance with the procedure described in this report. To maintain sustainability in the board self-evaluation process, trustees will continue to evaluate the instrument regularly and the self-evaluation process every odd-numbered year.

List of Evidence

| DR3-1 | KCCD Board Policy 2E - Board Self Evaluation |
| DR3-2 | KCCD Board Policy 2F - Standards of Good Practices |
| DR3-3 | KCCD Board Policy 2G- Statement of Ethics |
| DR3-4 | KCCD Governing Board Self Evaluation Instrument |
| DR3-5 | KCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes – October 2013 |
Evaluation of Role Delineation and Decision-Making Process for Effectiveness

In order to comply with the Standards, the team recommends the District conduct an evaluation of the new decision-making process and evaluates the effectiveness of the new processes in decision-making and in communicating the decisions to affected users. (IVB.3.g)

Progress in Addressing Recommendation

Since it was developed in response to the 2006 accreditation recommendations, the Kern Community College District (KCCD) has reviewed and modified its Elements of Decision-Making document several times (DR4-1; DR4-2). This was done annually through 2011 by members of Consultation Council—which consists of the district chancellor, the college presidents, the three college Academic Senate presidents, and leaders from the constituency groups on each college campus and the district office.

In 2012, wider input was sought. At the April 2012 Consultation Council, the chancellor asked the constituent groups to take this document to their respective college groups and return to the next meeting with input, with the purpose of finalizing the new version (DR4-3).

One consequence of this wider input was that, at the May 2012 meeting, members of Council reviewed and discussed the functional roles of all departments at the district office to clarify further district-wide decision-making. The chancellor suggested that an evaluation process regarding participatory governance be made available to district-wide members (DR4-4). As a result, KCCD scheduled a participatory governance workshop offered through the Community College League of California (CCLC) and statewide Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) (DR4-5). In October 2013, faculty, staff, students, and administrators participated in a workshop sponsored by ASCCC in partnership with CCLC. Beth Smith, President of ASCCC, and Scott Lay, Chief Executive Officer of CCLC, conducted the workshop entitled “Participating Effectively in District and College Governance” (DR4-5). Input received from these discussions was used to improve decision-making processes and communication of decisions. These workshops, sponsored by CCLC and the ASCCC, now take place approximately every two years with the intent to familiarize newly seated consultation council members to participatory governance and the decision-making process. A new workshop is planned for fall of 2015.

Furthermore, members of Consultation Council evaluated the decision-making process in September 2013 via a district-wide decision-making survey (DR4-6). The survey was conducted online and was sent to all current members of District Consultation Council and the three colleges’ main participatory governance committees, called College Council at Bakersfield College and Cerro Coso Community
College and College Learning Council at Porterville College, along with those who had been members of those groups in any of the previous four years. The survey assessed the familiarity with and effectiveness of the decision-making process, the role of several groups in that process, and how employees communicate with their constituency groups about decision-making. Sixty people responded to the survey, a small group, but reasonable given the sample size. About one in five respondents (19%) reported being very familiar with the Elements of Decision-Making document, with another 41 percent saying they’d seen it before. Thus, a strong majority had some familiarity with the document.

On the question of the effectiveness of the district-wide decision-making process, responses were split roughly down the middle. A plurality of respondents (42%) answered that decision-making was somewhat effective with an additional 7% who considered it very effective. The other half answered that decision-making was either somewhat (33%) or very (18%) ineffective.

Members of the 2013 Follow-Up Team suggested a modification to the Decision-Making Flowchart to make it less linear. To address this suggestion, the flowchart was revised to identify feedback loops in the decision-making process (DR4-7). Chancellor’s Cabinet, which includes each of the college presidents, reviewed the chart on February 10, 2015 and suggested a graphic adjustment. At the Consultation Council meeting of April 28, 2015, members of Consultation Council reviewed the revised decision-making process flowchart (DR4-9). The chancellor asked members of Consultation Council to share the flowchart with their constituency groups and bring suggestions to the next meeting to ensure there is clarity. To better inform the constituents’ understanding of the decision-making process, the Chancellor sent electronically the document, The Elements of Decision-Making, to members of Consultation Council. The chart was reviewed at the May 2015 Consultation Council. Members of Consultation Council, particularly the Academic Senate leadership, provided input to the decision-making diagram in August 2015. The goal is to adopt a final revised chart at the September or October 2015 Consultation Council meeting.

In an effort to improve constituents’ understanding of the district wide decision-making process, the office of institutional research conducted an anonymous survey to elicit views regarding the lowest rated items in the 2011 and 2013 Climate Surveys: trust between the colleges and the district office. In the context of continual improvement in the decision-making process, the office of institutional research completed a report entitled “Improving Trust at KCCD: A Report on Focus Groups and a Survey Spring 2015” (DR4-8). The report incorporated data from a survey of current and past participants of the KCCD Leadership Academy, a year-long district-wide professional development program, in conjunction with a series of focus group conducted at each college and the district office. The results of the survey and focus group analysis were discussed at the April and May 2015 meetings of the District Consultation Council. The recommendations from the report on the survey and focus groups were formally adopted by Consultation Council in May 2015 (DR4-4).
Conclusion

The Follow-Up Team Report in October 2013 indicated that the colleges have implemented actions that fully address District Recommendation #4. KCCD is committed to providing an easily understood and effective decision-making process and utilizes input from all constituency groups to ensure that the process is continuously evaluated for its effectiveness and resulting data are reviewed consistently.

Plans for Sustaining Improvement and Institutional Effectiveness

The Consultation Council continues to review and evaluate the practices and policies that impact district-wide decision-making. The revised flowchart suggested by the 2013 Follow-Up Team is currently under review and should be finalized by September 2015. To support the sustainability of a transparent and effective decision-making process at Kern Community College District, the Office of Institutional Research will survey constituents in spring 2017. The District Wide Decision Making Survey 2013 provided data that became the catalyst for the District Office and the Colleges to continue meeting and working collaboratively through fall 2015 to enhance and clarify the implementation of the decision-making processes as described in The Elements of Decision-Making 2012 document and the Elements of Decision Making Flowchart 2014-15.

List of Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DR4-1</th>
<th>KCCD Consultation Council Basis for Consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DR4-2</td>
<td>Kern Community College District - The Elements of Decision-Making-2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR4-3</td>
<td>Kern Community College District - The Elements of Decision-Making-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR4-4</td>
<td>Consultation Council Minutes--April 2012 &amp; May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR4-5</td>
<td>Kern Community College District/CCLC - Participatory Governance Workshop -2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR4-6</td>
<td>Kern Community College District - Decision Making Survey -2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR4-7</td>
<td>Kern Community College District - The Elements of Decision Making Flowchart 2014-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR4-8</td>
<td>Kern Community College District- Improving Trust at KCCD Report on Focus Groups and a Survey Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Progress on Self-Identified Issues as Reported in the Planning Agenda Section of the 2012 Self Evaluation

I.B.2

Develop a mechanism for more formally keeping track of institutional progress on Strategic Goals, objectives, and action plans, and develop a process for ensuring follow-up.

Completed. When the initial work toward this actionable improvement plan began, it became apparent that the College’s tools for assessing its goals and objectives, as well as tracking processes for its progress on action plans were not integrated. Additionally, the College did not have a solid organizational structure to keep its focus on defined outcomes. This resulted in a restructuring of College Council to have an Accreditation Committee as an associated committee whose mission is to “act as a standing committee to provide ongoing leadership to accreditation recommendations and action plans and provide leadership and direction in the creation of the required interim reports and accreditation self-study to the Accreditation Commission for Community and Junior Colleges” (SII-1). Through this committee, those responsible for addressing the Actionable Improvement Plans have been held accountable.

College Council is the governance body responsible for recommending the setting of strategic goals that provide the long-term direction of the College, with the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC), an associated committee, charged with providing oversight to the planning and assessment processes to develop and maintain sustainable quality improvement. Therefore, in response to this actionable improvement plan, IEC began developing a matrix of measures (referred to as the “Thoyote”) in order to provide College Council with a more comprehensive measure of progress towards strategic goal attainment. The IEC spent several meetings discussing these measures (SII-2).

Meanwhile, a district-wide strategic planning committee was formed to provide the three year review and revision of the district strategic plan. This committee make-up had representatives from all three colleges and from the district office. Through this process, the committee ended up following a process very similar to what Cerro Coso Community College had previously done: developing a set of very clear ongoing measures for each goal and objective identified. The result of this process was a KCCD Common Measures document that did at the district level what the College had attempted to do with its “Thoyote” at the college level (SII-3).

Supported by this set of common measures, the College then began the three-year review of its own strategic goals, aligning objectives with measures, and developing strategies, actions, and targets to assess progress towards achieving the goals and objectives (SII-4). These strategies and actions were
informed by the College’s annual unit, section, or division plans that had been written in fall 2014 and that drive resource allocation. The intention is to measure the objectives annually against the targets. In this way, the College has succeeded in developing its college level tracking mechanism through the roundabout method of leading change at the district level. This entire process is being institutionalized by tying it to the annual planning process and will undergo its first round of assessment beginning fall 2016.

I.B.4

*Develop a process for comprehensively and formally documenting and collecting planning and resource allocation that has led to improvements in institutional effectiveness.*

Completed. Beginning in academic year 2012, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee was formed as an associated committee of the College Council. Its membership was made up faculty leaders who are championing various committees related to SLOs, curriculum, Program Review, and Academic Senate, along with the CIO, CSSO, CBO and College President. Due to the decision for this committee to report to College Council, additional members representing classified and students were added. Through this committee, the templates for the annual unit, section, and division planning documents were created, along with the establishment of the process of analysis that leads to five resource request analyses (RRA’s): Information Technology, Facilities, Marketing, Professional Development, and Staffing. These planning documents and RRA’s are posted to planning website. These plans also come with allocation requests that are supported by the plans.

The program review process asks departments and units to describe improvements since the previous cycle based on planning (*SII*-5). Similarly, each annual plan reflects on the previous year’s goals to assess progress and effective use of resources provided (*SII*-6). Each unit, section, and division is also required to report mid-year progress towards attaining their annual goals (*SII*-7). This process has become institutionalized for the purpose of driving sustainable quality improvement across the college.

II.A.2.b

*Develop a process, report, and schedule for ongoing statistical analysis of requisites.*

In progress. This action item from Standard II.A.2.b arose from the College’s self-evaluation that it did not have a process in place for analyzing requisites by means of statistical analysis. Although the college has a strong practice of using content review to establish requisites in the first place, it did not, as of the writing of the 2012 Self-Evaluation, have a standard report, process, or timeline for completing ongoing statistical analyses to demonstrate validity. Such a demonstration is not only best practice but also required by Title 5 regulations. It was noted at the time that statistical analysis “is especially important now in light of the fact the College is experimenting with making more out-of-discipline prerequisites for major and general education courses that faculty feel would be more successful if students came in better prepared.” At that time, courses such as BIOL C251 (Anatomy), BIOL C255 (Physiology), and BIOL
C262 (Microbiology) had recently established out-of-discipline prerequisites, “with more interest out there among faculty” (SII-8).

In fall 2014, the college vice presidents contacted the KCCD director of institutional research and reporting to begin collaborating over the design and implementation of a statistical analysis report. Best practices were researched on approaches currently in the field for locally validating prerequisites pre-implementation and post-implementation (Title 5 allows it both ways). In addition, research was carried out on strategies for communicating prerequisite findings, determining impact, and facilitating decision-making based on the results. Dialogue ensued about a way forward, and in spring 2015 two pilot courses were identified for a first round of statistical analysis—BIOL C251 (Anatomy) and PSYC C101 (Introduction to Psychology). As of the writing of this report, the development of a process and the writing of a report are awaiting action in the queue of KCCD instructional research items (SII-9).

II.A.3

Complete the General Education Program Review in 2012-2013.

Completed. This action item from Standard II.A.3 was self-identified because even though the College had met the standard for requiring a component of general education—including a clearly articulated philosophy and a mechanism for placing courses in GE according to their SLO’s—it had not yet ‘closed the loop’ by completing a general education program review (SII-10).

The General Education Program Review was completed in spring 2013 and submitted to Academic Senate and College Council for review and acceptance (SII-11). A copy of the final document, including an analysis of student learning outcomes and the identification of three- and six-year program goals, is posted on the College’s program review webpage.

II.A.3.c

Complete the revision of the mission statement as appropriate, implement programmatic changes as needed, design or adapt a method of assessment.

Completed. Since the evaluation visit of 2012, the College has reviewed the mission statement not once but twice. It did so in fall 2013 preparatory to submitting a substantive change proposal with ACCJC. This proposal for a change in the mission statement was filed in spring 2013 and accepted by the Commission at its June 2013 meeting (SII-12; SII-13).

In addition, on its regular cycle the mission was reviewed again during academic year 2014-2015, as explained in the Participatory Governance Model Handbook (SII-1). This was done together with the vision, values, strategic goals, and institution-set standards. College Council members began this process during the fall 2014 which led to a discussion of the vast geographic service area assigned to the college and the strategies which are used by faculty to serve the 18,500 square miles. Accreditation standards
were reviewed as well as educational requirements mandated by the Department of Education to ensure that the institution’s mission encompassed meeting the educational needs of the citizenry of the region. The outcome of the review resulted in no changes to the mission at this time (except for small revisions for better readability). This process of review is spelled out in the Participatory Governance Model Handbook to ensure the process is institutionalized.

II.B.3.e

*Complete a study of disproportionate impact to ensure that students are not being disadvantaged by test bias.*

Started. The college is gathering data to conduct a disproportionate impact study according to the California Community College Chancellor’s Office “A Guide to Assist with the Design and Implementation of Investigations to Evaluate Tests in consideration of the CCC Assessment Standards.” Because of the small numbers of students in some of the populations, it will take time to accumulate enough data to evaluate for disproportionate impact.

II.C.1.b

*Develop a set of outcomes, a plan for assessment, and a feedback loop for improvement for computer lab aide assistance.*

Started. Even though the College met the Standard of II.C.1.b, it was noted that informal lab aide assistance in the open computer labs was not tracked or assessed in any kind of quantitative or qualitative way: “Although every lab aide is a tutor who has gone through the tutor training program, the College recognizes that ... [as] an avenue of instruction—no matter how spontaneous or informal—it deserves to be evaluated for its effectiveness in supporting student learning” *(SII-14).*

In spring 2015, the vice president of academic affairs met with the lead faculty member of the Learning Assistance Center (LAC) as well as with the LAC office supervisor to discuss the assessment of computer lab aides. It was quickly ascertained that, unlike tutoring, the lab aide program had never developed formal outcomes or assessments. The lab aide service had originally developed out of an internship project connected with a computer information systems program. A manual still exists for this program that is given to lab aides which stresses customer service and general employability skills *(SII-15).* Once the internship project came to end, however, the service was co-opted by the nearby LAC, with which it is co-located. This explains why computer lab aides are also tutors. But while the tutoring center moved forward with a formal identification of outcomes and assessments in this era of accountability, the lab aide service never did.

As of the writing of this report, outcomes have been proposed for the lab aide service *(SII-16)*, with ensuing dialogue waiting for fall 2015 for the onboarding of the College’s new Learning Assistance
Coordinator. At that time, formal assessments will be developed, as well as a tracking mechanism of services provided.

II.C.1.e

*Develop evaluation tools for the performance and adequacy of the Kern County Law Library and the Mammoth Lakes joint-use facility.*

In progress. Cerro Coso Community College Library is in the process of developing evaluation tools for the performance and adequacy of the Kern County Law Library collections housed in the college library. Certain tools are already in place. For example, the library currently collects usage data for the print collection as well as usage data for the electronic databases accessible from the Kern County Law computer located within the main campus library (SII-17). Additionally, data on the currency and scope of the collection is being collected. The College is hiring a full-time Paralegal faculty member in 2015, so the library staff has elected to wait and work with this subject-matter expert to develop evaluation tools that measure the adequacy of the collection as well as the accessibility of the collection. As of now, access to the collection is an issue since only students at the main campus can access both the print and electronic collections.

Similarly, the Cerro Coso Community College librarian is in the process of developing an evaluation plan for the performance and adequacy of the Mammoth Lakes joint-use facility. Presently, the designated “college room” located in the joint-use facility is not being used by the library to support library programming or collections. The college-purchased print reference collection that is integrated into the Mammoth Public library’s collection will be inventoried, weeded, and evaluated in spring 2015. The college librarian and the Mammoth public library interim director are in discussion about future areas of collaboration, outreach, and promotion that would benefit both joint-use entities. Evaluation of such efforts will be built into planning and will likely include usage statistics and satisfaction surveys.

III.A.1.b

*Develop a set of expectations of faculty responsibility for participation in institutional activities.*

Withdrawn. This action item from Standard III.A.1.b arose from a perceived lack of expectations for what constitutes an appropriate level of institutional responsibilities for faculty participation: “Two stated areas of performance for evaluation are ‘individual responsibility’ and ‘participation in institutional activities.’ Currently, the College has no established rubrics, guidelines, or even expectations for judging this.” (SII-18).

This action item is no longer (and perhaps never was) valid. While it is true that the current evaluation instrument does not contain a rubric, set of guidelines, or expectations for assessing faculty participation, the collective bargaining agreement itself identifies areas of institutional participation. In fact, it is #17 of the “Faculty Member Shall’s,” including such areas as college, divisional, or
departmental meetings; committee work; participation in retention, articulation, and research activities; promotional activities; job placement; curriculum development and review (SII-19).

The evaluation process gets at this institutional participation in a variety of ways: through the faculty member’s self-identified goals and accomplishments as listed in the portfolio, through the evaluation team’s assessment of the level of participation as demonstrated by the portfolio, through the “Faculty Service Survey” filled out by committee chairs of committees the evaluands participate on, and by the administrative assessment review that asks directly whether the faculty member participates in department and campus activities. It is true that no rubric, guidelines, or written expectations exist for these assessments. But any such formalized documents would be an enhancement to the faculty contract and thus a matter for collective bargaining—for the district as a whole. More direct movement on this action item is not possible by the College alone.

III.A.4.a

1. Implement professional development opportunities for raising cultural awareness.

Completed. As explained more fully in response to Recommendation 5, over the past three years the College has increased its focus on raising cultural awareness and diversity through professional development opportunities for staff and students. Here is a sample of items:

- At all-staff meetings in October 2013 and June 2014, student services personnel viewed the videos “Students Speak, Are you Listening?” from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement and “Inclusion Insights” by Steve Robbins and completed exercises associated with the concepts raised (SII-20).
- An administrative advance in June 2014 focused on the concept of diversity and white privilege (SII-21).
- Faculty inquiry groups were conducted in spring 2014 to gather qualitative input on equity issues in the classroom (SII-22).
- In February 2014, Ms. Shakti Butler hosted a screening of her film “Cracking the Code: The System of Racial Inequality” and led a college discussion following the showing; later in the evening, a forum was held for the community attendance. Ms. Butler was originally invited fall 2013 but had to reschedule due to inclement weather; the College still held a community viewing of her video and hosted a dialogue with those in attendance. (SII-23).
- Also, in February 2014, the English and Social Sciences Departments developed a series of events around Black History Month, including a swing dance activity and screenings of the movies “The Great Debaters” and “Mississippi Burning” followed by question and answer forums for students. (SII-23).
- A “Lunch and Learn” at Eastern Sierra College Center was presented by the Owens Valley Career Development Center in April 2014 on the subject of cultural awareness and the local Paiute
community: questions, concerns, and strategies (a follow-up conversation was presented in September) (SII-23).

- Similarly, at the Eastern Sierra College Center, a “Lunch and Learn” on the topic of “Understanding our Latino Students” was presented by adjunct instructor and Mono County Superior Court CEO Hector Gonzalez (SII-23).

- Cerro Coso Community College hosted the KCCD Leadership Academy for a day of discussion of race and equity (SII-24).

Also, as explained above in College Recommendation 5, diversity and cultural awareness are major threads of faculty professional development for the 2015-2016 academic year, with at least one external speaker scheduled to give FLEX day presentations to full-time and adjunct faculty alike on the concept of cultural competence in the classroom.

One additional area the college had focused on is holding events over the past three years to shed light on veterans returning from war. A celebration of veterans on Veterans Day has happened honoring both students and staff who have served in the armed forces (SII-25). In addition, a grant from the College Foundation was awarded for the event “Celebrating our Veterans,” which involved the showing of two movies.

These events provide evidence of the College’s commitment to ongoing professional development in this area, therefore the actionable improvement plan has been completed.

2. Identify, implement, and assess specific programs in support of our diverse personnel.

Completed. The College encourages education continuance and professional development for all employees through various staff development programs and implements programs in support of our diverse personnel.

As explained more fully in the response to Recommendation 5, the college human resources office has taken steps to ensure that diversity is integrated within the institutional planning cycle. Completion of HR’s second annual unit plan (SII-26) and first comprehensive program review (SII-27) both identify goals to foster diverse personnel.

The district human resources department continues to provide professional development opportunities and support for diversity programs to staff. In 2014, the Director of Eastern Sierra College Center was supported to attend the Asian Pacific American in Higher Education conference, which served as a professional growth opportunity. Moreover, in addition to the trainings for the administrative advance and leadership academy identified immediately above, district human resources conducted and presented a cultural climate survey and assisted in the diversity and equity discussions.

Other opportunities provided annually by HR include (SII-28):
• Monthly online trainings/webinars for management district-wide are offered by Liebert, Cassidy & Whitmore.
• A Professional Development Manual is developed annually to the College Administrative Team. The 2014-2015 listing offered 20 workshops for staff, several to be conducted throughout the year.
• Human resources attends the California Community Colleges Faculty and Administrators Job Fair to ensure diverse hiring.

At the time the 2012 Institutional Self Evaluation Report was written, changes in Equal Employment Opportunity standards were placed on hold to allow the Department of Finance to address the issue of “mandated costs” to the State of California. Since that time, the College and District have been given the guidance to move forward with the new changes, and in April 2014, the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) and Staff Diversity (SD) Plan was approved by the Board of Trustees (SII-29). This plan lists strategies to promote a diverse workforce and provides specific plans and procedures for ensuring equal employment opportunity. HR developed this document out of the new legal requirements in Title 5, using the Model Equal Employment Opportunity template from the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office. The plan extensively details accountability measures for fulfilling the District’s focus on diversifying its workforce to reflect the students and service area it presently serves.

Looking ahead from the time of the writing of this report, strategies from the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) and Staff Diversity (SD) Plan will be implemented. In spring 2015, a call will go out for the district wide Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee to be re-established. This committee will play a proactive role in working to enhance and promote diversity and cultural competence in the district. Staff development programs will ensure screening committees are in compliance with Title 5 regulations. In addition, a diversity survey will be conducted in spring 2015 to measure the effectiveness of the new Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) and Staff Diversity (SD) Plan.

III.A.5.b

Develop procedures for evaluating professional development activities of different types, identify a repository for housing the results of these evaluations, and develop guidelines and expectations for systematically analyzing them as the basis for improvement.

In progress. The Professional Development committee is an associated committee of College Council that has developed a tab on the college portal, InsideCC, which is easily accessible to all constituencies of the college. Within the tab there is a channel that houses evaluation forms for evaluating the different type of professional development activities (SII-30).
Each faculty flex day, classified appreciation day, and employee in-service day has been evaluated either through paper and pencil or utilizing the web tool survey monkey for the purpose of using the feedback for the basis of improvement. However the results of the feedback have yet to be posted.

III.A.6

*Develop a formalized evaluation of the effectiveness of college human-resources procedures and programs.*

Completed. As referenced in the 2012 Self Evaluation, the college human resources office has historically been passed over for planning and assessment because its operation was centralized at the district office. This gap was identified, and by agreement of the vice chancellor of human resources and the assigned human resources manager at Cerro Coso, a pilot program review process began during the academic year 2015. The program was a pilot from the standpoint that a ‘district’ function was for the first time undergoing a ‘college’ review process. The program review utilized the same template as other administrative departments at Cerro Coso Community College, and the document followed the same procedure, including being vetted through the college’s program review committee and College Council. Through this process, strengths and weaknesses were described, gaps identified, and goals established to address them *(SII-27)*. More to the point of this action item, a key consequence of this first program review process was the creation of a set of administrative unit outcomes (AUO’s). This at once established not just a formalized process and timeline to evaluate the effectiveness of college human resources procedures and programs, but also identified specific instruments for assessments and performance targets.

III.B.1.a

*Develop a mechanism for evaluating facilities and how well they meet the needs of programs and services.*

Completed. This was an action item the College self-identified ahead of its becoming a Recommendation in the 2012 External Evaluation Report. The implementation and follow-up on SchoolDude is thoroughly covered in College Recommendation 6 above. The tool allows for a record of timeliness of response to, accountability for, and completion of work requests and thus provides evidence for various planning documents and mandated state reports.

But another piece is the ability—ongoing—to evaluate facilities, and that’s where the college saw a gap. For faculty and staff, the KCCD Climate Survey provides a place for employees to express satisfaction with facilities and physical resources. One entire component of the survey is dedicated to facilities and physical resources *(SII-31)*. But student feedback had always been lacking. This was addressed in the 2013 development of administrative unit outcomes for Maintenance and Operations that clearly expressed that 80% of staff and students will report that facilities are adequately maintained. Four questions were thereafter developed for the student experience survey that went out in spring 2015
(SII-32). As of the writing of this document, those results are not in yet. But the College has moved to close this gap in evaluating facilities.

III.B.1.b

*Implement an active shooter lockdown procedure.*

In progress. Safety and security remain a high priority at Cerro Coso Community College, and all college personnel actively and regularly participate in activities to bolster preparedness should the unfortunate happen. Since the writing of the Self Evaluation Report in 2012, all classrooms are now equipped with digital telephones over which announcements can be made notifying employees and students in the event of an emergency. Faculty across the college were given a demonstration of the system at Flex Day, spring 2015.

The Kern Community College District Facilities & Construction Department is coordinating the development of a district wide Security Card Access/Hardware Control system that will provide new door hardware with security card access and allow for facility lockdown in the event of an emergency. At the April 2015 KCCD Board of Trustees meeting, an independent consultant agreement was approved with Guidepost Solutions LLC for design of the system (SII-33). Once the design is developed and approved, construction documents, including specifications and standards, will be developed, and the project will go out to bid.

In preparation for project, KCCD requested that SISC provide an analysis of the current risk level at each of the Colleges in order to prioritize the roll-out of the new Security Card Access/Hardware Control system. Based on the large number of people and the size of the campus, Bakersfield College is the biggest risk, according to SISC, followed by Cerro Coso Community College and Porterville College third. As a result, Cerro Coso Community College will be second in the project. There is no current timeline for completion. Once design is complete and hardware has been installed, the college Safety and Security Committee will develop an active shooter lockdown procedure, schedule training, and initiate practice drills.

III.C.1.a

*Reassess IT services that were assessed in the 2007 base line survey*

In progress. In 2007, KCCD hired SunGard to assess the effectiveness of the District and College IT services. As part of the assessment, KCCD employees and students took part in a satisfaction survey developed by SunGard, and this survey formed the baseline for measuring the effectiveness of Cerro Coso Community College’s IT services. The College has elected to redevelop the survey using Survey Monkey as opposed to paying SunGard for this service. The survey is on schedule for completion in August of 2015, and will be distributed to employees and students in October of 2015 and every October thereafter.
III.C.1.b

*Develop evaluation tools for technology training processes and program*

Started. One of the greatest challenges with providing training is assessing if the participants obtained and retained the required information. Of the two methodologies that are particularly effective for measuring technology-related training—tracking the number of support calls and assessing end user proficiency—the college IT Department has built its assessments on the second. For all IT-related training starting fall 2015, the department will send out two surveys, one upon immediate completion of the training and a second three weeks later. This allows participants to implement what they learned and see what was missing, and provide the IT department with data as to the effectiveness and retention of the training. Each assessment will be developed at the time of the training and tailored to the session’s outcomes. The surveys will be administered through survey monkey, and they will be reviewed by the Technology Resource Team, the college’s technology advisory body to College Council and the president.

IV.A.1

*Develop a formalized evaluation of the effectiveness of College Council’s structure and processes.*

Completed. During academic year 2014, College Council developed and implemented its first cycle of review for effectiveness. The process was to have members of College Council make their own independent review of the success of the committee in meeting its mission, and then to have the community of constituencies take a similar assessment reporting how they saw the effectiveness of communication and transparency of College Council. During the first round of assessment, the results were eye-opening and showed big gaps in the work of College Council as perceived by constituencies (*SII-34*). The co-chairs responded, sharing the results with College Council representatives and setting out to fix the perceived gaps in communication between groups (*SII-35*).

As a result of that analysis, the primary governance bodies of Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and Administrative Cabinet all revised agendas to establish a feedback loop from their representatives in order to provide a clearer conduit of reporting out and hearing back.

In terms of ongoing formative assessment, the survey will happen every April for the time being in order to glean feedback from the college constituency, analyze the responses, and identify gaps needing immediate attention prior to the next academic year. Through institutionalizing this process, it provides for sustainable continual quality improvement.
IV.A.2.a

*Develop a formalized evaluation of the effectiveness of student representation in College Council and its sub-committees.*

Completed. This actionable improvement plan was primarily developed to address the gap of students’ non-participation on governance committees, including College Council. To address this issue, chairs of the various committees were asked to establish their meeting schedule early to accommodate those students who have an interest in being the representative to the said committee. A process was also put into place in which meeting dates were to be communicated with the Office of Student Activities and directly to the SGA President so that those assigned representatives can be held accountable for reporting out to SGA at their meetings. By doing this type of planning, committees were not scheduling over the top of SGA meetings and the like. This effort has assisted in an increase in attendance and participation on most committee, particularly College Council (SII-36). However, gaps still exist in student attendance at varying times. This said process has also been codified in the Participatory Governance Model Handbook for ongoing reference (SII-1).

IV.A.2.b

*Develop a formalized evaluation of the effectiveness of Academic Senate governance entities.*

Completed. During spring 2015 a survey was developed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee to be disseminated through Survey Monkey to all senate members during the month of March (SII-37). The results, not available at the time of the writing of this report, will evaluate the effectiveness of Academic Senate committees as well as Senate as a whole, in order to be used as a basis for improvements. This survey is planned to be completed annually during March of each academic year.

IV.A.5

*Add formalized evaluations of the governance and decision-making structures and processes discussed in Standard IV.A and IV.B to the Participatory Governance Model.*

Completed. The Participatory Governance Model Handbook was revised during the 2015 academic year together with the strategic plan, mission, vision, values, and institution-set standards. During this timeframe the formalized evaluations of the governance and decision-making structures and processes were included in the newly revised handbook (SII-1). The Participatory Governance Model Handbook is to be reviewed every three years, with annual addenda when needed.
IV.B.2.b

*Develop a formalized evaluation of the effectiveness of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee.*

Completed. This was a self-identified gap that came back to the College after the 2012 external evaluation as a recommendation. As explained more fully above in College Recommendation 2, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) designed a two-part instrument to assess its effectiveness: reports scored with a rubric and a survey of the college community. The response to Recommendation 2 goes into great detail on this topic, as well as references the evidence.

As of the time of the writing of this report, the evaluation has now run twice—at the end of the 2013-2014 academic year for both the survey and the self-assessment and at the end of the 2014-2015 year for the self-assessment [SII-38; SII-39; SII-40]. IEC believes that, at least initially, the strategic planning survey should go out only once every two years.

**List of Evidence:**

- SII-1  Participatory Governance Model, 2016-2019
- SII-2  Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes—September 30, 2013; October 21, 2013; February 3, 2014; February 10, 2014;
- SII-3  KCCD Strategic Plan Common Measures, 2014 Annual Update
- SII-4  Cerro Coso Community College 2015-2018 Strategic Goals
- SII-5  Program Review Template, 2013-14
- SII-6  Sample Annual Unit Plans 2015-16
- SII-7  Sample Mid-Year Progress Reports 2014-15
- SII-8  Cerro Coso Community College Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, Standard II.A.2.b
- SII-9  Institutional Research Office Update, April 27, 2015
- SII-10 Cerro Coso Community College Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, Standard II.A.3
- SII-11 Program Review, General Education
- SII-12 Substantive Change Proposal—Change in the Mission Statement—April 2013
- SII-14 Cerro Coso Community College Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, Standard II.C1.c
- SII-15 Computer Lab Aide Manual
- SII-16 Proposed Learning Outcomes for Computer Lab Aide Instruction, Spring 2015
- SII-17 Kern County Law Library Usage Statistics
- SII-18 Cerro Coso Community College Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, Standard III.A.1.b
- SII-19 Faculty Contract, pages 17-19
- SII-20 Student Services All-Staff Meeting Agendas and Sign-In Sheets—October 2013 and June 2014
SII-21 Administrative Advance Agenda—June 2, 2014
SII-22 Faculty Inquiry Group Fact Sheet
SII-23 Press Releases and Event Calendar Notices
SII-24 KCCD Leadership Academy Agenda, February 2015
SII-25 Veterans Activities Press Releases—November 4, 2014
SII-26 Human Resources 2015-2016 Annual Unit Plan
SII-27 Human Resources Program Review
SII-28 HR-sponsored Professional Development Opportunities
SII-29 KCCD Equal Employment Opportunity and Staff Diversity Plan
SII-30 Professional Development Forms Channel
SII-31 KCCD Climate Survey Report
SII-32 Student Experience Survey, Feb 2015
SII-33 KCCD Board Meeting Minutes, April 2015
SII-34 College Council Self Evaluation Results and Constituent Survey Results, 2014
SII-35 College Council Minutes—September 4, 2014
SII-36 Committee Minutes Showing Student Attendance: College Council Minutes—April 16, 2015; March 19, 2015; and October 30, 2014—and Academic Senate Minutes
SII-37 Academic Senate Self Evaluation Survey, April 2015
SII-38 2014 College Report Card
SII-39 College Strategic Planning Survey Results
SII-40 2015 College Report Card
Update on Anticipated, Proposed, and In-progress Substantive Change Proposals

At this time, Cerro Coso Community College is looking ahead at submitting substantive change proposals for six new Associate Degrees for Transfer it developed in 2014-2015. These AA-T degrees did not get all the necessary approvals prior to the production of the 2015-2016 catalog. All are new to the college; no prior local degrees were in existence:

- Associate in Arts in Anthropology for Transfer
- Associate in Arts in Art History for Transfer
- Associate in Arts in Economics for Transfer
- Associate in Arts in History for Transfer
- Associate in Arts in Political Science for Transfer
- Associate in Arts in Sociology for Transfer

In addition, a number of other new or substantially revised programs were awaiting action at the board, the regional consortium, or the state at the end of the 2014-2015 year. These include:

- Basic Peace Officer Academy Certificate of Achievement (new)
- Data Analyst I Certificate of Achievement (new)
- Engineering Technology Associate of Science Degree and Certificate of Achievement (new)
- Industrial Technology Associate of Science Degree and Certificate of Achievement (substantially revised)
- Web Fundamentals Certificate of Achievement (new)

During 2015-2016, Cerro Coso Community College additionally anticipates creating the following AS-T degrees. The College currently has a local degree in General Sciences, but the transfer model curricula and development of AS-T degrees will allow the College to offer stand-alone degrees in these areas for the first time:

- Associate in Science in Biology for Transfer
- Associate in Science in Chemistry for Transfer
- Associate in Science in Physics for Transfer

As always, the College will submit Substantive Change Proposals and secure ACCJC approval before offering, advertising, or otherwise promoting any new programs.