FOLLOW-UP REPORT

College of the Siskiyous
800 College Avenue, Weed, CA 96094

A confidential report prepared for
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the Follow-Up team that
Visited College of the Siskiyous on April 12th 2011

William Duncan IV, Superintendent/President, Taft College
Eric Bérubé, Ph.D., Coordinator of Institutional Research, Taft College

Date: April 12, 2011

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

From: William Duncan IV, Team Chair

Subject: Report of Follow-Up Visit Team to College of the Siskiyous,
             April 12, 2011

Introduction

At its meeting on June 9 - 11, 2010, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) acted to place College of the Siskiyous on warning for four recommendations and to require a follow-up report by March 15, 2011 and a visit. Two members of the visiting team that undertook the comprehensive review, Chair William Duncan and Dr. Eric Bérubé, conducted that follow-up visit on April 12th, 2011, to assess whether the College has resolved four of the nine recommendations made by the visiting team for the comprehensive review.

The two team members spent the day examining evidence and met with the Director of Planning, Assessment and Research, and the Academic Senate President in order to validate the assertions made in the College's follow-up report. The team examined numerous documents provided in both hardcopy and electronic format.

In general, the team found that the College had done considerable work since the 2010 visit. The College follow-up report contained extensive information about this progress. It immediately became clear to the visiting team that the campus has been engaging in an institution-wide discussion regarding institutional effectiveness processes and structures, including research, program review, evaluation, and planning.

Overall, the College and its staff were very accommodating during the follow-up visit.

The Follow-Up Report and visit were expected to document resolution of the following four recommendations:

Recommendation 1: Research Capacity;
Recommendation 2: Program Review;
Recommendation 3: Evaluation; and
Recommendation 7: Strategic Plan.

Discussion of the College Responses to the Team Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Research Capacity

In order to fully comply with the standards, the team recommends the college increase the research capacity of the institution to conduct the college's research agenda, to assist college staff with the use of research-based information in decision-making, and to ensure that the college's planning and resource-allocation processes are infused with relevant and timely information on the effectiveness of the institutional practices and student learning (IB.2, IB.3, IB.6, IIA.1.C, IIB.4, IIIA, IIIB, IIIC, IIID.3, IVB.2.B).

Findings and Evidence

Since the previous comprehensive site visit in March of 2010, College of the Siskiyous has created and filled a position of Director of Planning, Assessment and Research (DPAR). That position is charged with planning and managing activities and involved in assessing institutional effectiveness, decision-making in regards to policies and procedures related to program review and planning, program review implementation, and ensuring that student learning outcomes are integrated into the program review and planning processes. The team found evidence of these activities in the establishment of several planning processes related to data collection and reporting. One such process is the creation of the institutional research and data request process, a standardized process for requesting data that is available on a new research website. Additionally, the DPAR was instrumental in the creation of "data custodians" across campus who are responsible for maintaining the data in their functional area. These data custodians meet on a regular basis to discuss data-related issues including access to data and reporting needs. The data custodians and the types of data they are responsible for are as follows:

Name	Department	Type of Data/Information
Kristy Anderson	Planning, Assessment & Research	Research Methods & Design
Li Collier	Student Learning	Course & Program Data
Kent Gross	Administrative Services	Fiscal and Payroll
Eric Houck	Information Technology	State Reporting & Data Extraction
John Jaffry	Enrollment Services	Student and Financial Aid
Nancy Miller	Human Resources	Personnel

Research capacity is further increased by the recent purchase of Argos, a report writing and analysis tool which will be used to build standardized

reports used by the campus community. The reports will be used among other ways within the program review process to request resources, thus linking the program review and planning processes to resource allocation.

Conclusion

The institution has fully addressed this recommendation and is in compliance with the Commission Standards.

Recommendation 2: Program Review

In order to fully comply with the standards, the team recommends that all college departments and programs complete the annual program review and strengthen its linkages to the college's planning and resource allocation processes. The team further recommends that the college make its mission statement and detailed student achievement and student learning data central in the dialogue and reflection that inform the program review, institutional planning, and all college decision-making processes (IB.1 – 7, IIA.2, IIB.3, IIB.4, IIC.2).

Findings and Evidence

After much deliberation and evaluation of the existing program review process, College of the Siskiyous determined that the process was not effectively utilized for strategic planning. In an attempt to focus the campus' efforts on the creation of a new "Planning by Design" system, College of the Siskiyous decided to purposely suspend the ongoing program reviews. These efforts will include the development of new program review procedures that will not only meet Accreditation Standards, but will support the College's endeavors in producing desired student outcomes. The "Planning by Design" system is built on a foundation of program reviews, unit and area plans, and classroom and community assessments that are all driven by and feed into a comprehensive "Student Learning Plan," thus making student learning central to the overall strategic planning efforts.

During this development phase, much work has been completed on creating the framework for conducting program reviews in the instructional, student services, and administrative services areas. The school has focused on answering such basic questions as:

- What is a program?
- What is program review?
- What are the key components of program review?

- What are the results of program review?
- What is the timeline for program review?

Subsequent discussion has focused on developing the actual mechanism of program review within the various campus areas and how those program reviews will be linked to resource allocation. As these questions are being answered, it is planned to resume annual program review in fall 2011. Part of the new processes and structures being developed include the dissolution of the President's Advisory Council and the creation of several new committees such as a Program Review Committee and a related Academic Senate subcommittee that both focus on instructional program review issues. These committees will be charged with, among other things, determining the appropriate content of material to be reviewed for their specific areas. Other new committees, which are discussed under Recommendation 7, include the College Council (which is charged with issues of Participatory Governance), the Budget Committee (which is charged with issues related to budget and resource allocation), and the College Council (which is charged with issues related to strategic planning).

Conclusion

The College has made significant progress in laying the foundation to meet this recommendation. However, since the actual program review procedures have not yet been implemented and at least one cycle has still to be completed, the College has yet to meet this recommendation. To meet the Standards (IB.1 – 7, IIA.2, IIB.3, IIB.4, IIC.2) and to improve, the team recommends that the College continue building its program review procedures upon the excellent, methodical foundation that has been built so far and complete one cycle of program review by fall 2012.

Recommendation 3: Evaluation

In order to fully comply with the standards, the team recommends the college conduct regular, rigorous and inclusive evaluation(s) of its participatory governance, program review, and planning processes. The results of the evaluation(s) should be broadly communicated to the campus community and the Board of Trustees, and the evaluation results should be central to process improvement (IB.1, IB.3, IB.6, IIC.2, IVA.5).

Findings and Evidence

The team found evidence that rigorous and inclusive evaluation of the College participatory governance, program review, and planning processes

had been conducted starting immediately after the initial site visit in Spring 2010 and the results were shared with the college community in January 2011. Since this was the first such evaluation of these processes since the comprehensive site evaluation in March 2010, the evaluation cannot be said to be "regular" although a comprehensive draft timeline for regular evaluations has been developed. This timeline also include suggested criteria for future evaluations. The results were made available to the campus community and the Board of Trustees via committee meetings and through the use of a password protected intranet. The team found evidence in the form of committee meeting minutes, and confirmed through interviews, that these evaluations were used for process improvement and that future iterations of these evaluations will continue to be used for process improvement. The evaluation results are being used as the foundation for the changes being implemented in the College's planning and governance processes. For example, one major change that has resulted from the evaluations has been the complete restructuring of the participatory governance process whereby, prior to the change, all recommendations were funneled through the President's Advisory Council (PAC). Recommendations are now categorized into one of several categories so that recommendations may now go from the recommending body directly to the President or Board of Trustees as appropriate.

Conclusion

The institution has made considerable progress on this recommendation and needs to continue implementing the evaluation process as described in the draft timelines described in the "Planning by Design" document.

Recommendation 7: Strategic Plan

In order to fully comply with the standards, the team recommends the college's new strategic plan fully integrate human resources, facilities, technology, and financial resources to support the college's short- and long-range needs (IIIA.6, IIIB.2, IIIC.1.c, IIID.1.a).

Findings and Evidence

College of the Siskiyous has begun to implement a process for developing a comprehensive Educational Master Plan, which will serve in lieu of a Strategic Plan, and has produced the first draft of the Educational Master Plan. The center of the Educational Master Plan is the Student Education Plan which is supported by the other unit plans such as Facilities, Institutional Advancement, Technology, Business Services, and Human Resources. This

approach also includes a means of linking budgeting to resource allocation through the use of "proposal forms," formerly referred to as "action plans." A newly developed committee (referred to under Recommendation 2: Program Review), is the College Council, which is the umbrella committee overseeing recommendations made to the president. Committees feeding into the work of College Council include the Planning Council, the Budget Committee, and the Facilities Committee. The groups conducting program review feed recommendations and information to all of these committees. The processes by which these committees and overall plans were developed were inclusive and collaborative. Integration of these plans exists through several mechanisms, including the creation of a new Vice President of Student Learning position that eliminates the former silos caused by having two vice presidents, one each for Instruction and Student Services.

Conclusion

The institution has made substantial progress in addressing this recommendation and, in order to fully comply with this recommendation, needs to continue to implement the processes laid out in its timeline described in the "Planning by Design" document and in the Follow-Up Report.

Colleges with Distance Education Programs
May 2011

	College	Date(s) Approved	GE/LA	100% of a Program
1.	Allan Hancock College	2008 April, 2008 November	✓	
2.	American River College	2008 April	No	
3.	Barstow College	2010 June	✓	
4.	Berkeley City College	2009 May	✓	
5.	Butte College	2009 May		
6.	Cabrillo College	2008 April	✓	
7.	Carrington College California	2004 September, 2009 May, 2010 June	✓	100% of a Program
8.	Cerritos College	2009 September	✓	
9.	Cerro Coso College	1998 June	✓	
10.	Chabot College	2009 May	✓	
11.	Citrus College	2007 May, 2008 September, 2009 September, 2011 March	✓	
12.	City College of SF	2009 February	✓	
13.	College of San Mateo	2010 February	✓	
14.	College of the Canyon	2008 September	✓	
15.	College of the Siskiyous	2009 March	✓	
16.	Columbia College	Currently Pending	✓	
17.	Cosumnes College	2005 February, 2008 September	No	
18.	Cuesta College	2002 January	✓	
19.	Cypress College	2009 September, Currently Pending	✓	
20.	East L.A College	2010 November	✓	
21.	El Camino College	2011 March	✓	
22.	Folsom Lake College	2010 June	✓	
23.	Foothill College	2010 November`	✓	
24.	Fullerton College	2010 June	✓	
25.	Hartnell College	2010 June	No	
26.	Hawaii CC	2008 June, 2008 April	✓	
27.	Heald College	2005 September, 2009 May	✓	
28.	Honolulu CC	2008 October, 2009 April	✓	
29.	Irvine Valley College	2010 June	✓	
30.	Lake Tahoe College	2010 November	✓	
31.	Las Positas College	2007 March, 2010 June	✓	
32.	Lassen College	2010 November	✓	

	College	Date(s) Approved	GE/LA	100% of a Program
33.	Leeward CC	2009 April	✓	
34.	L.A. Harbor College	2009 September	✓	
35.	L.A. Mission College	2009 May	No	
36.	L.A. Trade-Technical	2009 April		
37.	L.A. Valley College	2010 February		
38.	Mendocino College	2010 June		
39.	Merced College	2008 March, 2009 February, 2010 November		
40.	MiraCosta College	2009 June		
41.	Mission College	2006 December		
42.	Modesto Junior College	2010 November		
43.	Monterey Peninsula College	2009 November		
44.	Moorpark College	2009 September		
45.	Mt. San Antonio College	2009 May		
46.	Mt. San Jacinto College	2004 June, 2011 March		
47.	MTI College	2005 May		
48.	Napa Valley College	2008 October		
49.	Norco College	2010 November		
50.	Ohlone College	Currently Pending		
51.	Oxnard College	2010 June		
52.	Porterville College	2011 March		
53.	Reedley College	2011 March		
54.	Rio Hondo College	2010 February		
55.	Sacramento City College	2009 February		
56.	San Diego City College	2010 March		
57.	San Diego Mesa College	2008 February, 2010 November		
58.	San Diego Miramar College	2009 February		100% of Program
59.	San Joaquin Delta College	2010 June		
60.	San Joaquin Valley College	2001 January, 2004 November, 2005 April, 2005 November		
61.	Santa Ana College	2008 April		
62.	Santa Barbara College	2009 May		100% of Program
63.	Santa Monica College	2009 September		
64.	Santa Rosa Junior College	2007 November, 2010 June		100% of Program
65.	Santiago Canyon College	2008 June		

	College	Date(s) Approved	GE/LA	100% of a Program
66.	Shasta College	2010 February		
67.	Sierra College	2010 November		
68.	Skyline College	2009 September		
69.	Solano College	2006 March		
70.	Southwestern College	2010 June		
71.	Ventura College	2009 September		
72.	West Hills College Coalinga	2010 November		
73.	West Hills College Lemoore	2010 November		
74.	West L.A. College	2008 March		
75.	West Valley College	2002 June, 2009 May		
76.	Windward Community College	2011 March		
77.	Yuba College	2008 November		