



College of the Siskiyous

800 College Avenue

Weed, CA 96094

Focused Midterm Report

Submitted March 9, 2007

To Accrediting Commission of
Community and Junior Colleges

Table of Contents

Report Preparation	1
Responses to Team Recommendations	2
Recommendation 1	2
Recommendation 2	3
Recommendation 3	5
Recommendation 4	11
Recommendation 5	12
Responses to Self-Identified Issues	13
Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness	13
Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services	15
Standard III: Resources	29
Standard IV: Leadership and Governance	36

Report Preparation

Ever since the College received the visiting team's recommendations in March 2004, the College has been actively working on tasks and projects inspired by the visiting team's recommendations. This Midterm Reports presents the College's progress toward addressing those recommendations and its progress toward the plans for self-improvement that were identified in the March 2004 Self Study Report.

In September 2006, the Steering Committee that produced the 2004 Self Study reconvened to discuss how to proceed with the writing of the Focused Midterm Report. To help provide input to the progress on the recommendations and the plans for self-improvement, College administrators were invited to participate. The final membership of the Focused Midterm Report committee comprised individuals from the various constituent groups on campus: four faculty (including the Accreditation Liaison Officer), four administrators (President/Superintendent, Vice President of Instruction, Vice President of Student Services, and Vice President of Administrative and Technology Services), three members of Administrative Support Management, and one classified person.

The committee set off to work, gathering information on the College's progress. The original date for reporting back to the committee with findings was November 2006, but this deadline was pushed back to January 2007. Descriptions of the progress were gathered and a first draft of the Focused Midterm Report was created in February 2007. The draft was presented to the campus for feedback. Using the feedback, the report was revised and presented to the Board of Trustees. The report was approved by the Board at their March 2007 meeting and forwarded to ACCJC.

W. David Pelham, EdD.
Superintendent/President

Responses to Team Recommendations

Recommendation 1

The College promptly review and revise its mission statement, so that the accreditation focus on student learning is incorporated into the statement. Once revised, COS should establish a regular review cycle for its mission statement that provides for updates to the mission as needed. The College also needs to develop a systematic and regular way to assess the achievement of its mission, and then communicate its progress to all of its constituents. (IA, IA.3)

Upon receiving the recommendations of the Accreditation Team the District began a process to review and revise its mission statement to reflect the new focus on student learning outcomes and to reflect its applicability to the District and its future plans. The first conversations about the mission began at the President's Advisory Council (PAC) Retreat, November 2004. Soon after this meeting, input on the College's mission and on the direction the College should take for the next five to ten years was solicited from the entire campus community at the annual Planning Day, November 2004. The Strategic Master Plan Steering Committee tallied and compiled the people's ideas and comments into a mission statement, including statements of values, vision, and function. The values serve as the themes around which the goals of the Strategic Master Plan are organized. The vision statements elaborate those values and essentially restate the Mission in more specific terms. The function statement identifies concisely the primary means by which the District accomplishes its mission. These College values, vision, and function statements help make the mission operational.

The first draft of this comprehensive mission statement was presented to the campus for review in February 2005. Feedback was compiled and reported to the Strategic Master Plan Steering Committee, who put the mission statement in its final form. The mission statement was approved by the PAC and ultimately approved by the Board of Trustees in March 2005. Once the mission statement was Board approved, the campus community met in forums (March 2005) to discuss details of the Strategic Master Plan. The Steering Committee consolidated the feedback (April 2005) and finalized the details of the complete Strategic Master Plan, which was approved by the Board of Trustees in May 2005.

The revised mission, values, vision, and function statements include language about student learning. The mission is published in its new form in the following documents: The Strategic Master Plan, April 2005; the 2005-07 College Catalog, and future catalogs; editions of the College's Schedule of Classes, beginning Fall 2005; the 2006-07 Student Handbook; and on the College's official website (easily found in the Site Index). However, among the Board Policies, which are published online and available for public viewing, Board Policy No. 1.0 still shows the mission from 1998 and needs to be updated to reflect the most recent changes to the College's mission and vision.

In January 2006, the plan for the annual review of the College's mission and the Strategic Master Plan was revised and put into place. The first cycle of review occurred February 2006, and will occur every spring semester for the next four years. However, there is as yet no official Board policy governing the regular review of the mission or the Strategic Master Plan. According to the Superintendent/President, the College has not yet adopted a policy overseeing the review of the mission because the institution wants to go through the process a number of times before committing to rules governing it.

The current annual review process, which has been put into place, involves having college personnel review the mission and planning documents and then provide feedback to the PAC through campus forums open to all staff and students. The primary purpose of this inclusive review process is to obtain input on revisions to the mission, vision, values, and goals as well as to develop plans for projects to be carried out on campus and to ensure that such projects are aligned with the mission and the Strategic Master Plan. This institutional review process is designed in such a way as to encourage college personnel to use assessment results and data to evaluate the College's achievement of its mission; however, more discussions and training need to take place regarding concrete methods for accomplishing this institutional assessment task.

Recommendation 2

The College develop a new broad-based strategic planning process that clearly incorporates the revised college mission into the plan. The process should provide the College with measurable, long-term goals and include a systematic cycle of evaluation, implementation, and reevaluation leading to improvement. (IA.4, IB.2, IB.4, IB.6)

Dialogue about creating a new strategic master plan for the College began at the President's Advisory Council (PAC) Retreat, November 2004. Soon after this meeting, all college personnel were gathered for a one-day working session at the annual Planning Day, November 2004, to determine the directions of the College for the next five to ten years. The Strategic Master Plan Steering Committee compiled the people's ideas and comments first into a mission statement—including statements of values, vision, and function—and also into a rough first draft of a Strategic Master Plan. After the Board of Trustees approved the mission and vision statements in March 2005, the Strategic Master Plan Steering Committee drafted a comprehensive plan based on the approved mission and vision statements. This draft Strategic Master Plan identified goals, objectives, activities, timelines, and responsible parties. The draft was presented to college personnel at several open forums in late March 2005. About 60 personnel all together attended these forums. In April 2005, the Steering Committee used the campus comments and feedback to revise and finalize the Strategic Master Plan, which was approved by the Board of Trustees in May 2005.

In January 2006, an annual review process for the Strategic Master Plan was developed by the Vice President of Student Services, who oversees the annual review process. The

annual review allows the College to assess the achievements of the Mission and of the various elements within the Strategic Master Plan, and ultimately to fine tune any changes to the plan. The Annual Review serves as a short-term view of the College's efforts while the Strategic Master Plan gives a long-term, more global or all-encompassing perspective of current and future endeavors. The Strategic Master Plan is a comprehensive five-year plan that provides clear direction on the priorities of the College. The annual and the five year plans are linked as parallel projections that support each other, the Strategic Master Plan providing guidelines and benchmarks for the annual plans.

The College has created a systematic and cyclical process by which it evaluates its mission and plans on an annual basis. The process begins in January when individual divisions and departments are asked to review their program plans from the previous year and from the most recent results of their six-year review cycle. This stage of the Strategic Master Plan review asks divisions and departments to interpret their assessment results from the past year and to report those results to determine appropriate program improvements. From this annual report, divisions and departments develop Action Plans for projects to be implemented in the coming year.

The review of assessment results and the creation of Action Plans are tied to division and departmental review of the College's mission and the Strategic Master Plan. Action Plans are prioritized in February and used to develop budgets for the coming year. In March all annual reports and Action Plans are presented to the President's Advisory Council, which reviews the College's progress towards meeting the College's strategic planning goals. In late March, after the various segments of the campus have reviewed their individual goals and plans, campus forums are held to review the College's mission, goals and objectives to determine if changes to the institutional Strategic Master Plan need to be made. In the ensuing academic year, the Action Plans are implemented, assessment results are then gathered and analyzed, and the review cycle begins again in the following January.

In 2006, the first year this systematic review cycle was used, these campus forums were held on March 23 and 24 with over fifty individuals attending. An "Annual Report on the Strategic Master Plan" was then presented to the Board of Trustees at their June 6, 2006 meeting. The next review of the College's mission and Strategic Master Plan will occur in late March, 2007.

On the other hand, the District is working on its assessment practices. Though institutional review processes have begun and are scheduled to occur each spring, and though the Vice President of Student Services has been given the responsibility of overseeing the process, the institution has only informally designated PAC as the campus-wide group that will guide these processes. The College needs to engage in meaningful assessment processes and has begun to move toward that goal by hiring a researcher who will provide more direction for institutional assessment processes. It is also felt that the campus is currently wrestling with how to differentiate between goals and SLOs. A viewpoint from the 2004 visiting team's Evaluation Report states: "To fully implement the accreditation standards,

the College will need to maximize its current research capabilities. This will require a review of the current research capacity and the development of strategies to address the expected increase in research demands.” The College has been without a researcher since March 2004. When the last researcher resigned, research responsibilities were transferred to the grant writer, who resigned in May 2005. In essence, the College has struggled without a researcher or research office since May 2005. The College has worked diligently yet unsuccessfully to fill the researcher position. Fortunately the College has finally been able to fill the position; the new researcher will begin work on March 31, 2007. This will support the College’s interest in being data driven, and it is expected that this person will assist the College in creating a comprehensive picture with which to plan future changes.

Recommendation 3

The College develop an institution-wide process, with timelines and responsible parties, for the establishment of specific student learning outcomes and criteria for measurement and review. The plan should include the identification of student learning outcomes for courses, programs, general education, certificates and degrees, and for student services and learning support services; the assessment of student and employee achievement of those outcomes; and the utilization of the assessment results in a systematic way to make improvements. (IIA.1.c, IIA.2, IIA.3, IIB.1, IIB.4, IIC.1, IIC.2)

College of the Siskiyou is steadily moving forward in its efforts to establish student learning outcomes in all courses, programs, general education, certificates and degrees, student services, and learning support services. It is also moving steadily forward in creating a culture of assessment to measure student achievement of those outcomes and use assessment results to make course, program, and institutional improvements.

During 2004-2005, the College was involved in a large-scale strategic planning process. Though processes for student learning outcomes and assessment have not yet been *fully* developed across all areas of the campus, their inclusion in the College’s planning process is evident. Of the twelve institutional goals established in the Strategic Master Plan, published April 2005, the first two goals center on student learning.

Goal #1: To have at least 75% of the students in each course meet each learning outcome in the course.

Goal #2: To achieve at least a 75% success rate for all courses at COS.

These goals imply that the College will be heavily involved in assessing student learning outcomes course by course and program by program. Thus, instructor by instructor and department by department, assessment results will be used to improve instruction so as to assist more students in achieving the learning outcomes established for each course, for each program, and for the institution as a whole.

Training

To help keep the institution moving forward and illustrate its commitment to student learning outcomes and assessment, the College has provided and continues to provide ongoing training for staff and faculty, especially for faculty, on issues related to SLOs and assessment. The College has also invested in sending members of the staff and faculty to off-campus training opportunities.

In February 2005, a small team from College of the Siskiyous attended the VTEA Accreditation/Learning Outcomes Planning Workshop. This team comprised one faculty member, one counselor, and three managers. As part of this training, the participants developed an SLO Implementation Plan. They took this implementation plan back to the College where it was discussed and fine-tuned by an ad hoc SLO and Assessment Committee of the Faculty Senate. The implementation plan was approved by the Senate in Spring 2005 and was one of the considerations during discussions of the hiring of a new VP of Instruction and during discussions of restructuring the instruction area of the College.

In August 2005, three members of the full-time faculty attended intensive, five-day Assessment Worth Doing Institute, sponsored by the RP Group of the California Community Colleges. The faculty gained more information regarding SLOs and assessment at the course level, program level, and institutional level. They also gained more insights into the directions in which COS should be moving. They used their newly gained information as group facilitators in Faculty/Staff Learning Communities.

In Fall 2005, the new VP of Instruction had all full-time faculty members participate in small group dialogue on SLOs and assessment, studying through the book *The Outcomes Primer*, by Ruth Stiehl. Staff members from the campus, especially select members of the Student Services staff, also participated in these discussion groups. The study of this book culminated in a one-day workshop in November 2005 facilitated by the author and attended by 100% of the college staff (administrators and managers, certificated faculty, and classified staff). The purpose of this project was to move the campus towards designing institutional and programmatic outcomes and then toward building strong course SLOs that directly impact the more global outcomes. In January 2006 as a follow-up to the one-day workshop, faculty engaged in a work session to develop program-level student learning outcomes. Where appropriate, advisory committees, community leaders, and other campus personnel participated with the faculty in this one-day workshop. By the end of March 2006, all instructional programs had identified program-level learning outcomes.

Institutional Processes

Several processes have been put into place to ensure the College develop, measure, and review student learning outcomes.

1. Course Review

The most prominent process is the review of Official Course Outlines as new courses are proposed and as old courses are updated. From January 2004 through January 2005, seventy-four course outlines were reviewed by the Curriculum Committee as new courses were proposed and as old courses were updated; many outlines were “caught” and returned to the originators for revisions to ensure the inclusion of SLOs. Members of the Curriculum Committee served to help faculty create SLOs if they were having trouble doing so.

As Curriculum Committee members implemented this increased rigor in their monitoring of official course outlines, they engaged in much dialogue regarding the nature of SLOs, criteria for evaluating SLOs, and criteria for evaluating the assessment examples listed on the course outlines. Committee members came to consensus on what exactly they would look for in the course outlines.

These conversations led to a revision of the Curriculum Development Handbook, especially to a revision of all forms required in the curriculum approval process and a more detailed revision of the instructions for developing a course outline, including extensive explanations of how to write SLOs and how to document in the outline the assessment practices that will be used to evaluate student achievement of the SLOs. The committee worked on these revised forms and processes during the 2005-06 academic year. Beginning September 1, 2006, all proposed new courses and all old courses needing to be updated must now undergo this more rigorous review process. One purpose of the increased rigor and the increased number of forms is to provide evidence that courses have been officially reviewed for the following:

- Units and hours are appropriately calculated.
- Student Learning Outcomes are clearly identified.
- Instructional methodologies are identified and are appropriate for the SLOs.
- Assessment methods are identified and are appropriate for the SLOs.
- Course content is detailed and specific.
- Course SLOs satisfy the College’s general education SLOs if the course is approved or proposed for general education.
- Prerequisites are justified and valid.
- Courses offered via distance learning maintain the integrity of the SLOs, the instructional methods, the assessment strategies, and the course content.

In order to streamline curriculum development and revision processes, programmers in Technology Services are creating online forms that will automate the forms and reports. It is expected that these online automated forms should be available to faculty in Spring 2007.

Faculty, both full-time and adjunct, are responsible for proposing and for updating courses and programs within established procedures. The Curriculum Committee, which is composed of members from the Academic Senate and also includes the Vice President of

Instruction, is responsible for creating and monitoring curriculum approval processes and for reviewing and approving courses and programs.

2. Instructional Program Review

During Summer 2004, work began on revising the Program Review reporting process so that it would inform faculty better what changes need to be made in their programs to improve student success and to improve student achievement of SLOs. The purpose of revising the Program Review process was also to make sure that Program Review reports provide data and analysis that are meaningful and useful for program improvements. During the 2004-05 academic year, no programs were scheduled to undergo Program Review. This allowed an ad hoc committee of the Faculty Senate to work on revising the Program Review process and the Program Review Report form to ensure that Program Reviews contained reporting, analysis, and evaluation of student achievement of learning outcomes. As part of this revision, attention was paid to how faculty can report student achievement of SLOs. The changes were brought to and approved by the Senate as a whole at their March 17, 2005, meeting. Instruction Council next approved the revisions to the process at their April 4, 2005, meeting. The revised process and forms went to the President's Advisory Council and to the Board as information items.

The revised process and forms went into effect beginning with all programs that needed to be reviewed during the 2005-06 academic year. But until then, the only SLOs to be considered had been course-level SLOs.

Creation of program-level student learning outcomes began on Planning Day, November 2005. Ruth Stiehl was hired to conduct a workshop for staff and faculty on how to develop student learning outcomes for programs. In January 2006, faculty completed the task of identifying SLOs for their programs.

During the 2005-06 academic year, the following programs were reviewed using the new process, which includes analysis and evaluation of SLOs, student achievement of those SLOs, assessment practices, and using assessment results for program improvements: Theater, Business/Economics, Computer Science, Nursing (LVN), Early Childhood Education/Family Consumer Science, Welding, Varsity Athletics/Recreation/Physical Education, and Engineering/Physics/Physical Science.

The new Program Review process requires a comprehensive review to occur once every six years. During interim years, each program must complete an annual mini-review. Even though each program has established its program-level SLOs, it has not yet been determined how much detail these annual mini-reviews will report regarding student achievement of SLOs. The 2005-06 academic year was the first year that these annual mini-reviews were required, but few programs caught on as to how to report student achievement of either course-level or program-level SLOs. Faculty need some training on how to accomplish this task.

Full-time faculty are responsible for completing program review within established deadlines. Division deans and the Vice President of Instruction are responsible for overseeing the Program Review process and ensuring that Program Reviews are reported on schedule.

3. Student Services Program Review

The Student Services area has been working on student learning outcomes for the past five years. Working with SLOs in Student Services has been a process of discovery as individuals become more aware of what “works” for the College. In the initial stages, the various departments began by listing five to ten SLOs for each of their areas, with few or no assessment measures attached. Then, in December 2005, all of the Student Services staff members met and developed three key student learning outcomes themes: Life Goals, Responsibility, and Values. Each department was then charged with developing one or two SLOs specific to the services it provides to students and specific to the knowledge and skills students should have as a result of receiving services from those departments.

The focus for the next few years for student services will be the theme of “Responsibility.” For the 2007-08 Planning Year, the Student Services area has revised the process by which program review, planning, and assessment of SLOs will be completed. Each department within Student Services will prepare an annual document that includes 1) a review of key program data and an evaluation of the program (akin to a mini Program Review), 2) analysis of assessment results of one or two SLOs that address the area of “Responsibility,” and 3) a plan for improving their services (action plans and budget). These documents were completed in January 2007 and reviewed by the Student Services Council in February 2007. Annually, each area will conduct an evaluation of how well it did on the SLO and prepare a summary report for distribution to campus.

4. Library Services

Regarding student learning outcomes for Library Services, library staff set to work to develop student learning outcomes for library services as a result of campus wide training in SLO development in October 2005. Outcomes for focused workshops provided by library staff were developed first, along with assessment tools to measure student achievement of those workshop outcomes. In spring 2006, library staff engaged in much dialogue on the more complex issue of how to identify and assess appropriate student learning outcomes for typical library services. In November 2006 they finalized three outcomes and developed appropriate assessment tools to help them determine students’ achievement of those outcomes. The first implementation of the library assessment tool will occur in March 2007. The library has created two assessment questionnaires to measure the outcomes: one a student satisfaction survey to be distributed every March, and the other a research skills survey to be distributed in the 16th week of every semester.

5. Institutional Review

Review of institutional outcomes is built into the review processes for the Strategic Master Plan and the College Mission.

Review of institutional learning outcomes can also be found in review processes for general education since general education is an institutional goal that occurs within instructional courses and programs. SLOs for the General Education Program were established at the beginning of the 2004-2005 academic year. Officially approved by the Faculty Senate on September 9, 2004, the general Education Philosophy and General Education SLOs are used as benchmarks for whether College of the Siskiyous courses developed as part of other programs are accepted into the General Education program. The General Education philosophy expresses the overarching goals of the College through its General Education Program. This philosophy is now published in the new 2005-2007 College Catalog.

During August and September 2005, the Curriculum Committee redesigned the forms and processes that faculty members use when they submit courses for review. One such form pertains to the General Education approval. Faculty must ensure that the SLOs of individual courses align with the institutional general education SLOs if they are submitting a course to be included in the GE list. All new courses that are submitted for GE approval must be scrutinized and approved by a sub-committee of faculty members from disciplines within the specific general education area. Also, to provide evidence that all courses on the GE list have been officially reviewed and approved for general education, all courses that are already on the GE list and that are due for three-year curriculum review must also be reviewed for alignment with the GE SLOs. It is expected that all courses currently accepted on the GE list will have been reviewed and approved by the end of Spring semester 2009. (The three-year curriculum review process was established to ensure that all courses and course outlines are reviewed and updated regularly for currency. To accomplish this task, the College's courses were divided into three groups so that each year one-third of all courses will be reviewed and updated by faculty.) If the general education SLOs for any one GE area change, then all courses on the GE list for that area will be required to be re-reviewed for GE alignment the next time the courses come forward for three-year curriculum review.

Institutional assessment processes for general education outside of what occurs in individual courses have not yet been developed or discussed. It is assumed that if a student passes a course in a particular GE area, then that student has achieved the required general education SLOs for that area. The general education SLOs would have been assessed as part of the regular assessments within that particular course.

Who is responsible? In November 2004, the SLO Steering Committee was formed as an ad hoc committee of the Faculty Senate. The function of this committee was threefold:

- 1) Formulate a campus-wide plan for implementation, criteria for measurement and review of Student Learning Outcomes in the instructional programs, student services and learning support services.
- 2) Make recommendations about timeline and structure.
- 3) Address preparation and training.

The committee worked on their charge during the Spring 2005 semester, creating an implementation plan that was approved by the Faculty Senate March 17, 2005. After their initial work was completed, the SLO Steering Committee did not meet on a regular basis to discuss or to push forward the SLO and assessment agenda for the College. Currently, it is unclear who should be responsible for evaluating the progress that the College has made in establishing and assessing SLOs in courses, programs, and services; for monitoring and reporting the College's SLO and assessment development efforts; and for ensuring that a culture of assessment is cultivated and maintained at College of the Siskiyous.

Assessment of Student and Employee Achievement

In September 2003, an ad hoc committee of the faculty Senate began working on a revision of the tenure evaluation process. Part of this revision was influenced by the statement in the new Accreditation Standard III.A that "Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes." The revised process created by the ad hoc committee, however, did little to include SLOs and assessment in a meaningful way as part of faculty evaluations. Nevertheless, the Faculty Senate approved the changes at its October 14, 2004, meeting and forwarded the changes to the faculty bargaining unit for approval. The Faculty Association (CCA/CTA) approved the changes in the evaluation process at their April 28, 2005, meeting.

Although the revised faculty evaluation process looks at faculty members' success with SLOs and assessment very minimally, it is hoped that individual faculty members will take it upon themselves to include more discussion of SLOs and assessment in their dialogues with their peers and in their self-evaluations, even though they are only minimally required to do so.

Recommendation 4

The College review its values, policies, procedures, and practices with regard to issues of diversity to enhance the learning environment and create a climate of mutual respect and appreciation. (ACCJC Policy Statement on Diversity, IIA.3.c, IIB.3.d, IIIA.4)

The College has reviewed its policies and procedures in regards to issues of diversity. This review began as a goal of the Academic Senate in August 2004. In September 2004 an ad hoc committee of the Academic Senate began creating a diversity requirement for COS students. After much debate among faculty members about how to incorporate diversity into instructional programs, the Senate decided in February 2005 that the diversity requirement should be included as part of the general education program. After more debates, in April 2005 the Senate added a new Diversity area to the General Education program to go into effect beginning Fall 2005, including student learning outcomes that such Diversity courses should address.

Immediately following the passage of this Senate resolution, the Curriculum Committee formed procedures for courses to obtain approval as Diversity courses. And Faculty members began submitting appropriate courses for approval, revising course SLOs to align more closely with the new Diversity SLOs. As of Spring 2007, six courses have been accepted as satisfying the Diversity SLOs.

Besides this inclusion of Diversity as an important area of instruction, celebrations of diversity have also been addressed by the College's Diversity Council. The Diversity Council has been responsible for organizing special cultural events at the College, including but not limited to African American History Month, Women's History Month, Gay and Lesbian Awareness, and International Day. They have been instrumental in supporting local efforts to have the Tulelake Internment Center registered as an historical landmark. They also bring guest speakers to campus to speak to students and staff on issues of diversity.

During the 2005-2006 year, the campus addressed diversity across the campus by including activities in the Flex Calendar of the District. Published in the Flex Handbook, each month was assigned an area of emphasis, and faculty members selected which months they wanted to participate. Flex credit was provided to faculty who developed, organized, and then carried out a diversity activity within their selected month. This activity was successful for the most part and created a sense of awareness across the campus, but continued participation in the subsequent year did not develop.

In the Human Resource Office, diversity and equity are issues that are taken seriously. Every hiring committee includes an Equal Employment Opportunity Officer who is trained to ensure all hiring practices are equitable and who works with the hiring committee to ensure they understand expectations and requirements for equity and non-discrimination. New rules for diversity and equity will be published Spring 2007. When those new policies are released, the Human Resource Office will train all Equal Employment Opportunity Officers on the updates.

Recommendation 5

The College establish a process, including timelines and responsible parties, to systematically review its board policies and procedures on a regular basis to ensure their currency. (IVB.1.e)

The Board of Trustees approved Board Policy 1.7.3 and Board Procedure 1.7.1 at its January 2007 meeting. This policy establishes that the President/Superintendent oversees the process for reviewing board policies on a regular basis and for ensuring they are updated as needed. This policy also establishes that at least one section of Board Policies will be reviewed each year. The procedure that was approved supplies more detail of how this review process will take place, and it identifies the parties responsible for the different steps in the process.

Responses to Self-Identified Issues

The following chapter briefly describes progress the College has made accomplishing the goals and tasks it set for itself in the Planning Agenda of the 2004 Self Study Report. The numbers of the plans below correspond to the numbers of the plans as they are listed in the Planning Summary section of the College of the Siskiyous 2004 Accreditation Self Study.

Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

Standard IA. Mission

1. *Include wording on New Course Proposal Form that reflects the importance of aligning courses with the mission, the character, and the needs of the students and community we serve (Standard I.A.1.).*

This information has not been included in the wording of the New Course Proposal Form. However, the instructions for completing the form do require that instructors align their courses with the needs of the students and the community the College serves. These instructions were created in Spring 2006 and published in August 2006, available for all new courses proposed since August 2006.

2. *Provide training to new and existing Curriculum Committee members regarding the importance of monitoring the New Course Proposal Form to ensure that it is used consistently in the development of new curriculum (Standard I.A.1.).*

In Spring 2006, the Curriculum Committee itself revised all the forms used for proposing new courses and for submitting course updates. Members of the Curriculum Committee provided training for the rest of the faculty in August 2006. They trained the faculty extensively on the use of the new curriculum development forms.

3. *Clearly delineate the supporting elements or guiding principles from the mission statement itself when including it in publications (Standard I.A.2.).*

Since Fall 2005, whenever the Mission is published in College documents, such as the College Catalog or the Faculty Handbook, the complete mission is usually published, including the values, vision, and function statements. Each section of the Mission is labeled clearly with subheadings. The Function statement is missing from the most recent edition of the Student Handbook, but the mission, values, and vision are presented clearly.

4. *Expand employee exposure to the mission statement by (1) including it in the Employee Handbook and the full-time and adjunct Faculty Handbook, (2) including specific reference to the mission statement in trainings and orientations for new employees, and (3) formally including it in orientation of full- and part-time faculty by Spring 2004 (Standard I.A.2.).*

The Mission is published in the most recent version of the Faculty Handbook, last updated August 2005. It will be contained in the Employee Handbook, which is

under construction. The Mission is not currently presented in new faculty or new staff orientations.

5. *The Level Three Committee (President's Advisory Council) and the Board will develop an official policy outlining how often and by what process the institution will review and revise as necessary its mission statement by Fall 2004 (Standard I.A.3.).*

The College revisits its mission every year when it revisits the Strategic Master Plan.

Standard IB. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

1. *Ensure that information is accessible to all constituency groups through the distribution of committee agendas and minutes and through the posting of all important committee and planning documents on the COS website (Standard I.B.1.).*

Communication across the campus is improving. Information is available to all constituent groups as the minutes from the following groups and committees are available on the College's website and through the employee intranet:

- Academic Senate (02/08/07)
- Administrative Services Level 2 (last update 10/25/05)
- Budget Oversight Committee (last update 12/01/05)
- Curriculum Committee (last update 11/28/06)
- Facilities and Grounds (last update 10/03/05)
- Instruction Council (last update 11/27/06)
- President's Advisory Council (PAC) (last update 01/09/07)
- Safety Committee (last update 11/15/06)
- Student Services Council (last update 12/07/06)
- Technology Council (last update 12/01/05)
- Career & Technical Education Advisory Committees (last update 11/09/06)

Some groups are better than others at keeping the online minutes updated.

Planning forms are available on the College's Website. The Planning Documents page of the COS website contains electronic copies of the following documents and makes them available for public viewing:

- 2005 Strategic Master Plan
- 2006 Revisions to the Strategic Master Plan
- Annual Mission/Strategic Master Plan Review Process
- 2005 Enrollment and Retention Report
- Annual Planning Forms
- Other documents elaborating details gathered from 2004 and 2005 Planning Day activities

2. *The Level Three Committee (President's Advisory Council) will develop an assessment tool or strategy that will be used on a regular basis to evaluate the effectiveness of the Institutional Planning Process and its use for allocation of resources by the end of Fall 2003 (Standard I.B.6.).*

This assessment process has been created. The document that outlines the process is housed on the College's website. This document describes all the activities and responsible parties and their roles in reviewing the Strategic Master Plan and the Mission on an annual basis.

3. *The Level Three Committee (President's Advisory Council) will develop an assessment tool or strategy that will be used on a regular basis to evaluate the effectiveness of all current review processes (Standard I.B.7.).*

The Strategic Master Plan has been in effect since it was approved by the Board of Trustees in May 2005. In January 2006, the College adopted a process for the annual review of the Strategic Master Plan. The first cycle of review occurred February 2006, and should occur every February for the next four years. The College has not yet adopted an assessment tool or strategy to evaluate the effectiveness of this annual review process. The President's Advisory Council wants first to use the process a number of times before determining what sort of instrument or strategy will best assess the effectiveness of the review process.

4. *Instruction Council will create a survey instrument that can be used at the mid cycle to determine progress toward the recommendations highlighted within the program reviews (Standard I.B.7.).*

This plan has been scrapped in favor of a process that looks more frequently at the progress instructional programs have made toward the recommendations highlighted in their program reviews. Instead of a mid-cycle review (i.e. three-year review), each program undergoes an annual review. These annual program reviews are part of the annual Strategic Master Planning process. These annual reviews are also known as the "Level 1" plans.

Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services

Standard IIA. Instructional Programs

1. *Provide staff development activities beginning in 2003-04 to encourage more faculty-driven classroom assessments including pre and posttests, portfolios, and student self-assessments to measure student outcomes (Standard II.A.1.a.).*
13. *In 2003-04, as part of their discussions about student learning outcomes, the Academic Senate will present workshops on assessment issues, such as the relationship between assessing student learning outcomes and assigning grades (Standard II.A.2.h.).*

In response to the above two plans, the College has provided Flex and staff development opportunities since January 2004, focusing on developing student outcomes and creating practical assessments to measure student achievement of those outcomes. The College has offered Flex workshops on campus every August and January as part of the Flex Week activities that precede each semester. The College has also sent faculty and staff members to conferences and seminars that focus on assessment. Some of these have included Assessment Worth Doing Institute,

Summer 2005; Conference on the First Year Experience, Spring 2005; and Conference on Student Success, Fall 2006.

2. *In order to share information and improve effectiveness, develop an assessment matrix, beginning in Fall 2004, that documents all assessment efforts currently in place on campus (Standard II.A.1.a.).*

This project has not started. Since Spring 2004, the College has employed three VPs of Instruction, each with different agenda and plans for the instructional areas. During this period, there have been many changes in instructional areas, including other changes in leadership, such as the resignations of an Area Director and Director of Instructional Services, and the creation of a Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences position. These organizational changes are not yet complete. Once departments are created and department chairs established, then more organizational strategies for overseeing course and program assessments will be implemented.

3. *Increase the number of online and videoconference classes where appropriate and within budgetary constraints (Standard II.A.1.b.).*

The number of classes taught via distance learning has increased steadily each year. In 2003-04 the College taught 3 hybrid classes, 46 internet classes, and 21 two-way interactive video classes. In 2004-05 the College taught 10 hybrid classes, 49 internet classes, and 26 two-way interactive video classes. In 2005-06 the College taught 10 hybrid classes, 58 internet classes, and 26 two-way interactive video classes.

4. *The Instruction Office, in conjunction with the Curriculum Committee, will develop a new evaluation of alternative delivery modes during the 2003-04 academic year (Standard II.A.1.b.).*

Courses are evaluated as part of the faculty evaluation process. The standard student survey instrument used in this evaluation process has been adapted for online courses. The online version addresses issues pique to interactive online courses. For two-way interactive video courses, the standard student survey for traditional face-to-face classes is used. Though no special survey instrument has been created for video-conferenced courses, in the open-ended comments sections, students provide feedback about how the alternative delivery mode has affected their learning.

5. *Expand staff development efforts to embrace different learning modalities and the new student learning outcomes (Standard II.A.1.b.).*

At the beginning of each fall and spring semester, staff development opportunities are presented to staff and faculty during Flex week. Since Fall 2004, training has covered many topics including but not limited to the following:

- developing student learning outcomes
- creating appropriate assessments for student learning outcomes
- different learning styles of students
- various learning modalities and course delivery methods

- software applications to enhance learning modalities
- accessibility issues related to distance learning.

6. *Review and, where appropriate, develop specific student learning outcomes for all programs (Standard II.A.2.a.).*

Creation of program-level student learning outcomes began on Planning Day, November 2005. In January 2006 during the course of a follow-up Flex activity, faculty continued the task of identifying SLOs for their programs. By the end of March 2006, all instructional programs had identified program-level learning outcomes.

7. *In 2003-04, the Faculty Senate will discuss and develop additional methods for assessing students' achievement of learning outcomes and for providing evidence that students have achieved those outcomes. The Senate will also assist faculty in implementing these methods (Standard II.A.2.b.).*

In November 2004, an ad hoc SLO and Assessment Committee was created by the Faculty Senate. The Committee met frequently at first to draft a resolution on outcomes and assessment, but since Fall 2005, the committee has met infrequently. Though several individual faculty members are working on assessment practices in their own classrooms, overall the Senate has not discussed assessment nor the need to provide evidence that students have achieved learning outcomes, and they have not assisted faculty in implementing assessment practices. More work is needed in this area.

8. *The Director of Business and Technology will create workshops for the occupational advisory committees on the process of creating student learning outcomes for each area's certificate and degree programs (Standard II.A.2.b.).*

9. *In 2003-04, one or two additional occupational programs will be identified for the development of student learning outcomes related to certificates and degrees (Standard II.A.2.b.).*

18. *Review the occupational programs to ensure that the learning outcomes are current. If not, they will be revised (Standard II.A.3.).*

The College responded to the above three plans with the following activities:

In Fall 2005, the established occupational advisory committees participated in the day-long training presented by Ruth Stiehl. At this training, all participants learned how to create program-level student learning outcomes. These advisory committees met again at the January 2006 follow-up training session during which program-level SLOs were created for each instructional program at the College. The occupational advisory committees worked side-by-side with discipline faculty to create SLOs for their occupational programs.

10. *The Academic Senate, working with the Curriculum Committee, will reexamine the General Education philosophy. Once that reexamination is complete, the Curriculum*

- Committee will review all COS General Education requirements to reflect the philosophy. This should be completed by Fall 2004 (Standard II.A.2.e.).*
14. *The Academic Senate and the Vice President of Instruction will work together to develop learning outcomes for General Education courses and programs (Standard II.A.2.i.).*
 17. *Review the General Education philosophy and match the courses to the philosophy (Standard II.A.3.).*
 19. *The Academic Senate and the Vice President of Instruction will put together an ad hoc committee to review the General Education philosophy and revise it as needed. After establishing the philosophy, they will create some related student learning outcomes for the General Education program (Standards II.A.3.a., II.A.3.b., II.A.3.c.).*
 20. *The ad hoc committee will share these General Education student learning outcomes with faculty in the various disciplines so that these General Education outcomes can be integrated into specific course outcomes (Standards II.A.3.a., II.A.3.b., II.A.3.c.).*
 21. *The Academic Senate will discuss assessment strategies to determine students' achievement of the learning outcomes for the General Education program (Standards II.A.3.a., II.A.3.b., II.A.3.c.).*
 22. *The Curriculum Committee will review the graduation requirements for the Associate degree to ensure that all of the recommended General Education areas are covered (Standards II.A.3.a., II.A.3.b., II.A.3.c.).*

The College responded to the above seven plans with the following activities:

SLOs for the General Education Program were established at the beginning of the 2004-05 academic year. Officially approved by the Faculty Senate on September 9, 2004, the general Education Philosophy and General Education SLOs are used as benchmarks for whether College of the Siskiyous courses developed as part of other programs are accepted into the General Education program. The General Education philosophy expresses the overarching goals of the College through its General Education Program. This philosophy is now published in the new 2005-07 College Catalog.

As of Fall 2005, faculty must ensure that the SLOs of individual courses align with the institutional general education SLOs if they are submitting a course to be included in the GE list. However, during Spring 2006 the Curriculum Committee formalized the process by which courses are approved for GE. As of August 2006, all new courses that are submitted for GE approval must be scrutinized and approved by a sub-committee of faculty members from disciplines within the specific general education area. Also, to provide evidence that all courses on the GE list have been officially reviewed and approved for general education, all courses that are already on the GE list and that are due for three-year curriculum review must also be reviewed for alignment with the GE SLOs. It is expected that all courses currently accepted on the GE list will have been reviewed and approved by the end of Spring semester 2009. (The three-year curriculum review process was established to ensure that all courses and course outlines are reviewed and updated regularly for currency. To accomplish this task, the College's courses were divided into three groups so that

each year one-third of all courses will be reviewed and updated by faculty.) If the general education SLOs for any one GE area change, then all courses on the GE list for that area will be required to be re-reviewed for GE alignment the next time the courses come forward for three-year curriculum review.

Institutional assessment processes for general education outside of what occurs in individual courses have not yet been developed or discussed. It is assumed that if a student passes a course in a particular GE area, then that student has achieved the required general education SLOs for that area. The general education SLOs would have been assessed as part of the regular assessments within that particular course.

11. *During 2003-04, the Academic Senate, in conjunction with the faculty bargaining unit, will determine how assessment of student learning outcomes will be incorporated into the evaluation process for full-time and adjunct faculty. (Standards II.A.2.e., III.A.1.c.)*

In September 2003, an ad hoc committee of the faculty Senate began working on a revision of the tenure evaluation process. The revised process did little to include a meaningful reflection on student achievement of SLOs as part of faculty evaluations. Nevertheless, the Faculty Senate approved the changes at its October 2004 meeting and forwarded the changes to the faculty bargaining unit for approval. The Faculty Association (CCA/CTA) approved the changes in the evaluation process at their April 2005 meeting.

Although the revised faculty evaluation process looks at faculty members' success with SLOs and assessment very minimally, it is hoped that individual faculty members will take it upon themselves to include more discussion of SLOs and assessment in their dialogues with their peers and in their self-evaluations, even though such dialogue and self-reflection are only minimally required.

12. *All first day handouts will include measurable student learning outcomes by Spring 2005 (Standard II.A.2.f.).*

All full-time and adjunct faculty members include student learning outcomes on first-day handouts for all courses. These outcomes are duplicated from the outcomes listed on the Official Course Outlines for the courses. New and returning adjunct faculty are reminded to do so at the orientation meeting before each fall semester.

15. *Discipline faculty will develop student learning outcomes in each major and these will be widely distributed to students (Standards II.A.2.i., II.A.3.).*

Faculty finalized program-level SLOs by March 2006. These Program-level SLOs have not yet been published or distributed to students.

23. *The Curriculum Committee and the academic areas will review the issue of diversity in courses and, if appropriate, recommend to the Academic Senate that a diversity component be added to the graduation requirements (Standard II.A.3.c.).*

In September 2004 an ad hoc committee of the Academic Senate began creating a diversity requirement for COS students. After much debate among faculty members about how to incorporate diversity into instructional programs, the Senate

decided in February 2005 that the diversity requirement should be included as a separate area within the general education program. After more debates, in April 2005 the Senate added this new Diversity area to the General Education program to go into effect beginning Fall 2005, including student learning outcomes that such Diversity courses should address.

Immediately following the passage of this Senate resolution, the Curriculum Committee formed procedures for courses to obtain approval as Diversity courses. And Faculty members began submitting appropriate courses for approval, revising course SLOs to align more closely with the new Diversity SLOs. As of Spring 2007, six courses have been accepted as satisfying the Diversity SLOs.

24. *Create a plan for majors in all appropriate subject areas and obtain approval from the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office as necessary (Standard II.A.4.).*

All majors, degree, and certificate programs have been reviewed and are included on the Chancellor's Office list of approved programs for College of the Siskiyous.

25. *Revise the Faculty Handbook so that information regarding first day handouts and course objectives is consistent with the information included in the Curriculum Development Handbook (Standard II.A.6.).*

Both the Curriculum Development Handbook and the Faculty Handbook need to be reviewed for consistency in regards to curriculum matters, including first-day handouts and student learning outcomes.

26. *In Fall 2003, the Curriculum Committee will consider accepting the college credit recommendations for training programs published by the American Council on Education (Standard II.A.6.a.).*

This project took low priority as the District worked on many other tasks related to SLOs and assessment. The District continues to use its Equivalency procedures for determine the eligibility of faculty applicants who do not meet minimum qualifications.

27. *Develop a staff handbook, which includes Board adopted codes of conduct. The handbook should be given to all new employees (Standard II.A.7.c.).*

The Faculty Handbook does not contain a Code of Conduct. Instead it contains an Ethics Statement that was adopted by the Academic Senate in April 2004. The code of ethics for staff will be discussed at the Policy and Procedure day in March 2007 and a plan for forming an Ad Hoc Committee will be finalized. The timeline for completion of this process is January 2008.

Standard IIB. Student Support Services

1. *Analyze the findings of recent Program Reviews. Develop strategies to address the results and recommendations of the Program Review (Standard II.B.1.).*

The process for Program Reviews in Student Services has been revised. The new process was implemented in the 2006-07 academic year. The results of these program reviews will be discussed in February or March when the Student Services Council convenes to discuss program plans for the 2007-08 academic year. Results from the program reviews will be used to generate program plans for the coming year.

2. *Increase the number of degrees and certificates by 5%. Suggested activities include:*
- *Automate awarding of certificates*
 - *Continue to send letter regarding eligibility to receive degree and provide copies to counselors and advisors*
 - *Provide information on degrees to instructors and advisors and ask their assistance in promoting them*
 - *Provide information on options available to complete the wellness component of the associate degree and promote a “wellness program” college-wide (staff and students)*
 - *Study the barriers faced by students in obtaining a degree or a certificate (Standard II.B.1.)*

Automated awarding of certificates has not yet occurred. This task involves an upgrade to district software that has not yet occurred. Letters notifying students of graduation eligibility continue to be sent. Information on degrees is regularly provide to instructors and advisors. A list of wellness options has been completed and is provided to students. The College did begin a Wellness Program. Through the Wellness Program, the College provides all employees with fitness, health, and nutrition information and encourages staff and faculty to get involved in fitness or activity classes. A study of barriers faced by students in obtaining degrees or certificates has not been conducted.

3. *Increase the number of UC Transfers from 7 to 12 per year. Suggested activities include:*
- *Promote TAA’s for UC Davis & UC Santa Cruz around campus and to the high schools*
 - *Conduct college visits to northern California UC campuses*
 - *Place posters around campus promoting UC transfer*
 - *Work to change the campus culture regarding UC transfer*
 - *Invite UC representatives each semester to meet with prospective transfer students (Standard II.B.1.)*

TAA’s for UC Davis and UC Santa Cruz have been promoted on campus and at the high schools. The Student Support Services (SSS) program regularly conducts tours to northern UC campuses and even opens the invitation to the general student population. Posters have been placed in the student Center and in other locations around campus to promote UC transfer. And UC representatives are regularly invited to campus to promote transfer.

4. *Analyze “student drops.” Suggested Activities:*

- *Conduct exit interviews of students who leave to determine the reasons why students leave*
- *Explore the possibility of adjusting the drop date*
- *Determine if any academic contacts have been made for students who are here for 60% of the semester (Standard II.B.1.)*

Exit interviews were conducted in Fall 2005 and Spring 2006 to determine why students leave COS. Drop dates have been studied; the drop dates for Fall 2006 and Spring 2007 were moved to later dates in the semester. No contacts have been made for students who attended at least 60% of a semester.

5. *Improve the “life skills” of our students. Suggested Activities:*

- *Determine essential “life skills” for our students*
- *Develop training programs for all staff on how to assist students in developing their life skills*
- *Obtain information about the Critical Incident Stress Management program*
- *Incorporate information into GUID 5*
- *Develop a list of classes that help teach life skills*
- *Develop a list of resources for referral*
- *Incorporate means of addressing “complaints” into the first day handout (Standard II.B.1.)*

Essential life skills were determined and included in the College Success Skills course, GUID 5. However, a training program for all staff to help students with life skills has not been developed, though the idea of such training has been discussed with counselors. Counselors discussed the Critical Incident Stress Management program in 2005-06. Information from that program was incorporated into the GUID 5 course. The Student Services division has not made a list of courses that help teach life skills to students, but a list of resources for referral was created and has been included in the 2006-07 Student Handbook. Regarding the inclusion of policies or procedures for addressing student complaints, faculty have not been required to include this information in their syllabi or first-day handouts.

6. *Explore the possibility of providing catalog updates online, while still maintaining a two-year cycle for publication (Standard II.B.2.).*

The College Catalog is published in print form on a two-year cycle; the online version of the catalog is updated annually or sooner when significant changes to programs, policies, or procedures occur.

7. *Establish formal procedures to ensure that relevant Program Review findings are automatically forwarded to the Instructional Services Office for inclusion in subsequent catalogs (Standard II.B.2.).*

A specific timeline of deadlines and responsible parties is created as part of the process of preparing a catalog for publication. The timeline includes tasks that are specific to Student Services. All additions, deletions, and changes in information

coming from the Student Services division are forwarded to the Instructional Services Office for inclusion in the catalog according to the established deadlines.

8. *Formalize procedures for faculty and staff to review catalog contents prior to publication (Standard II.B.2.).*

The specific timeline of deadlines and responsible parties includes participation from faculty and staff to review the catalog's contents prior to publication.
9. *Monitor usage and effectiveness of online registration system (Standard II.B.3.a.).*

The Registrar monitors the usage and effectiveness of the online registration system each semester. The Registrar reports the findings in the Annual Plan for the Admissions and Records Department.
10. *Identify appropriate staff member(s) to visit the Yreka campus monthly to meet identified students' needs (Standard II.B.3.a.).*

The Counseling Office sends a counselor to the Yreka campus once per week and more frequently during peak periods, such as the first two weeks of each semester and the opening week of registration for the following semester (around the twelfth week of the semester).
11. *Implement suggestions by the Student Services Council (proposed in response to the needs assessment survey) (Ref. 2.34) to increase accessibility for all students (Standard II.B.3.a.).*

Until his retirement, the director of the Technology Learning Center (TLC) trained faculty and staff on how to ensure that their web pages were accessible. Such training has not occurred since he retired (Summer 2005). The coordinator of Disabled Student Services makes sure that the campus complies with ADA accessibility requirements. Two such projects include live captioning of all video-conferenced classes and closed captioning of all DVD and VHS materials used for instructional purposes. The coordinator of video-conferencing ensures that courses are live-captioned. Library staff oversee closed captioning of all A/V materials that do not already contain closed captioning.
12. *Prepare a distance-learning packet outlining services for students, and provide the same materials in Spanish (Standard II.B.3.a.).*

The Counseling Office has created an information packet for distance learning students. It has not yet been translated into Spanish.
13. *In order to encourage greater participation, ASB will solicit additional student input to identify appropriate activities and timing of events (Standard II.B.3.b.).*

In Fall 2006, the College hired a new coordinator of student activities and the Associated Student Board. This coordinator meets regularly with students, trains student leaders to be leaders, and provides the College with weekly updates of student activities.

14. *Encourage individual clubs to explore alternative, more productive, means of publicizing campus happenings (Standard II.B.3.b.).*

Student organizations and clubs are encouraged to keep the student activities coordinator informed of their activities so that the activities will be published in the weekly activity updates.

15. *As a campus community, work to maximize the opportunities presented by the natural setting of COS. Explore the development of environmental stewardships or partnerships (Standard II.B.3.b.).*

“Environment” is included as one of the values in the 2005 update of the College Mission. The values provide the framework for the 2005 Strategic Master Plan. Under the value of “Environment,” three goals were established in the Strategic Master Plan. One of those goals (Goal 6) is to integrate the College’s surrounding environment into programs and courses. Three of the four objectives listed within this goal are being worked on by the Office of Instruction. The Deans and Directors and the Instruction Council are discussing ways to integrate current programs with the surrounding environment and they are discussing new courses and programs that could be created that will integrate the surrounding environment with student learning.

In conjunction with Bond Measure A that passed in 2005, plans for new construction are being developed along with a long-range Facilities Master Plan. Recent meetings for the design of the Facilities Master Plan incorporate the College’s value of environment and seek to capitalize on the uniqueness and beauty of the College’s surroundings.

16. *Maintain and expand upon the existing student-driven musical, art, and theatrical offerings (Standard II.B.3.b.).*

Musical, artistic, and theatrical offerings have increased since the writing of the 2004 Self Study. In 2005-06, the Art Department created a space to show student art work, including student video productions. In Fall 2005, COS created an MOU with local cable access television MCTV 15. The joint venture provides COS students with production experience in a TV studio. In Fall 2006, a second music instructor was hired to oversee instruction in instrumental performance. In Fall 2006, this new instructor created a second concert band, which meets and practices in Yreka, and in Spring 2007 he added a daytime band class for daytime students (prior to this, band offerings occurred only at night). In Fall 2006, the College hired a new Theatre instructor, who has added a third main-stage production to the COS production schedule. In Spring 2007, the student-directed One-Act Festival will have the largest number of student directors to date. In Fall 2006, the College moved its college hour to the middle of the instructional day, Tuesdays and Thursdays. This change in the weekly schedule has allowed student performing groups to perform for other students in the student center and in the quad—vocal jazz ensemble, chamber choir, and student actors involved in improvisations and fight choreography.

17. *Research and identify the learning support needs of the student population in the area of counseling and academic advising programs. Analyze and respond to most recent feedback (e.g. Self Study Employee Survey and Admissions and Records Counter Survey) (Standard II.B.3.c.).*

The new online Navigator system, released in Fall 2006, was developed based on student needs. The Navigator provides access to students for online registration, unofficial transcripts, and class schedules.

18. *Assess the effectiveness of the newly completed Welcome Center as a cost-effective and student-friendly means of providing student matriculation (Standard II.B.3.c.).*

There is an overall sense of the effectiveness of the Welcome Center; however, there has been no formal assessment of its effectiveness.

19. *Study other advising/counseling systems to determine best practices and opportunities for improvement at COS. (This will be the focus of a 2003-04 sabbatical project for a COS counselor.) (Standard II.B.3.c.)*

A group of counselors and staff from Student Services attended the Learning Conversations Conference in September 2005. As a result of ideas gained from that conference, the Navigator system was devised. Other changes were made to services provided by the Student Services division.

20. *To further enhance student diversity, explore extending the Tools for Tolerance workshop opportunity to students (Standard II.B.3.d.).*

The diversity issue has been tackled in different ways. The Tools for Tolerance committee changed its name to the Diversity Council. The Diversity Council has created opportunities for students, staff, and faculty to engage in activities designed to promote awareness and appreciation of diversity. Most significant in providing students opportunities to explore issues of diversity, the faculty have added a diversity component to the General Education program beginning Fall 2005, requiring all degree-seeking students to take a course that helps them to achieve learning outcomes relating to issues of diversity.

21. *Seek speakers from the Native American tribes in our area to discuss local history and culture (Standard II.B.3.d.).*

The Diversity Council has provided speakers from local tribes to provide lectures on local Native American history and culture.

22. *Seek additional evaluation tools which focus on the achievement of identified learning outcomes (Standard II.B.4.).*

Student Services division has revised its SLO processes. Each department has designed an assessment tool to use to assess student achievement of identified outcomes.

23. *Develop an effective means to distribute findings to relevant campus constituencies (Standard II.B.4.).*

Currently there is no plan to publish assessment results in Student Services because SLOs have not yet been assessed. Once the departments in Student Services have gone through at least one cycle of assessment, each department will report its findings in the Spring 2008 Annual Plans.

24. *Establish focus groups for EOPS students (as a potential pilot project for other departments) (Standard II.B.4.).*

This plan has not been carried out.

25. *Analyze pre and post student assessment surveys for GUID 5 (Standard II.B.4.).*

This task has been done.

26. *Record student comments in a student follow-up database. Make effective use of data to enhance Student Services (Standard II.B.4.).*

A follow-up database has not been created, but the most recent survey—the Marketing Survey, conducted Fall 2006—provided many useful student comments about the College’s recruitment and marketing strategies.

Standard IIC. Library and Learning Support Services

1. *Tutoring Services will ensure tutors are knowledgeable about the topic they are tutoring through direct referral from instructors and successful completion of the tutor-training course (Standard II.C.1.).*

Since Spring 2004, all tutors must obtain a referral from an instructor in the target discipline in which the tutor plans to assist. The instructor must approve the tutor’s application to tutor. No tutor will be employed by the College without an instructor referral. It is therefore expected that an instructor would refer tutors who have gained the appropriate skills or knowledge to be able to assist students needing help in the discipline.

2. *The TLC Lab will increase the percentage of faculty participation rate by implementing the following (pending funding): expand TLC services to include visits to instructor’s offices, offer a wider spectrum of cohort group topics and more comprehensive training software updates, include training for instructors and the software needed to offer eventually an AA degree option via distance education (Standard II.C.1.).*

In 2004-05, the Technology Learning Center (TLC) offered a number of training opportunities in the form of one-hour workshops and two- or three-hour cohorts. Topics covered included using PowerPoint in the classroom, posting grades online, working with digital cameras and photographs, developing course web pages, using online quiz software, etc.

In Summer 2005, the full-time faculty member responsible for the TLC, which provides training opportunities for staff and faculty on software used in instruction and in other capacities on campus, retired suddenly. As a result, TLC coverage was reorganized. No single staff or faculty member was available to take over the

responsibility of overseeing the TLC. One adjunct faculty member and one classified staff person were identified as go-to persons for specific software questions that staff and faculty may have, and they would be available on an on-call basis if someone had a question. But the TLC no longer offered workshops or cohorts during the academic year to train staff and faculty on instructional software. Instead, beginning in August 2004 faculty members who are familiar with the software have provided training sessions on FLEX days, which are professional development days built into the academic calendar prior to the start of each semester.

Workshops and training on the Etudes course management platform has been led by an adjunct instructor since January 2005. As a result, more and more courses have been created for online delivery. Also, more instructors are using the Internet for posting supplemental course material online for traditional face-to-face courses. Several hybrid courses that use a combination of face-to-face classroom interaction as well as interactive online activities have been developed. At least one course in every general education area is available online. But as of yet, there is no complete degree option available online.

3. *The library will offer additional instruction sessions to a variety of classes, including all Student Success Skills classes (a.k.a. GUID 5). The Reference Librarian will expand the assessment tools for instruction sessions (Standard II.C.1.b.).*
8. *The Library and other learning support services will identify concrete ways to provide evidence that they contribute to students' achievement of learning outcomes (Standard II.C.1.f.).*

In response to the above two plans, the reference librarian currently contacts both adjunct and full-time faculty several times each semester to offer instruction and assistance. In addition, in Spring 2006 she designed and distributed a flyer that describes the most popular instruction sessions. This flyer is now distributed via email each semester to all faculty and others. In Fall 2006, the librarian began scheduling individual meetings with full-time faculty members to determine not only satisfaction levels regarding library services and resources, but also to solicit suggestions on improving instruction and services. All of these efforts have resulted in an increased number of faculty requesting instruction sessions in their classes. Instructors in history, speech, and sociology, who had not previously scheduled instruction, now do so. The library continues to offer instruction sessions for Student Success Skills (GUID 5) classes.

In 2005 the Reference Librarian modified the Instruction Session intake form to include student learning outcomes. She also added a section to the form to identify assessment methods for the session. For several semesters, the librarian has used a variety of assessment methods—pre-tests and post-tests, observation of student research behaviors, students oral responses to questions, student self-assessment—to verify that each student has acquired particular skills. The librarian has also worked extensively with the English Department to create a pre and post test on information competency to be administered to all English 1A classes. In Fall 2006 the library director and reference librarian developed a Research Assignment Evaluation Survey

that will assess the library's student learning outcomes. This survey will be administered to English 1A classes during the sixteenth week of each semester.

In Spring 2005, a new position, Basic Skills Coordinator, was created. The position was filled beginning Fall 2005. In Summer 2006, the name of the Learning Resource Center was changed to the Academic Success Center. In Fall 2006 the Basic Skills Coordinator of the Academic Success Center has researched and identified possible sets of student learning outcomes for the Computer Lab, Reading Lab, and Writing Lab. Lab specialists will review the sets. After the sets are selected, assessments will be developed.

4. *Both Writing Lab and Reading Lab staff will receive training to ensure the quality and accuracy of service to students in the area of research assistance (Standard II.C.1.b.).*

In Fall 2004, the English department purchased several copies of the latest edition of the MLA Handbook to be used in the Writing Lab as reference tools to help all Writing Lab staff stay current with the latest practices for writing research papers in MLA format. The Writing Lab does not keep copies of an APA handbook. In the spring of 2006, the director of the Reading Lab provided training in reading and evaluating electronic sources to the two Reading Lab Instructional Assistants. The training consisted of reading strategies students should use when looking for or when evaluating sources, especially online sources. As a result of this training, the Reading Lab staff can assist and provide quality and accurate support to Reading Lab students.

5. *Tutoring Services will develop and implement a survey to assess the possible problem areas, concerns, and needs of the College's distance education students in regards to tutoring and other assistance (Standard II.C.1.c.).*

This project has not been completed due to changes in staffing and due to reorganization of Tutoring Services in Summer and Fall 2006.

6. *The TLC will develop more online training cohorts for staff and faculty (Standard II.C.1.c.).*

This task was not implemented in the 2004-05 academic year. Then the director of the TLC retired in Summer 2005. Without regular staff available in the TLC, this plan has not been revisited.

7. *The facilities repair and improvement projects will be addressed in the Institutional Planning and budgeting processes (Standard II.C.1.d.).*

The annual review process for the Strategic Master Plan, which was first implemented in January-February 2006, requires that individual departments report on their progress toward their program goals as they relate to the goals and objectives identified in the Strategic Master Plan. These annual departmental reports include facilities repair or improvement requests to help sustain or improve the program or department. When facilities repair or improvement requests are identified in individual programs' or departments' Action Plans, the program or department is

responsible for including the costs of the facilities request so that, if the project is approved by PAC, the project will be included in the budget.

This process is not new to the College. It is just better defined and tied more explicitly to program planning and development.

Standard III: Resources

Standard IIIA. Human Resources

1. *Personnel Services will review existing hiring documents for currency and consistency between policies and procedures that refer to these (Standard III.A.1.a.).*

The Human Resource Department is working on reviewing and revising Board Policy 5.12.1 on "Hiring Procedures for Faculty." College Procedure 5.5, "Faculty Hiring Procedures," is also being reviewed. Proposed revisions include changing the title of the document so as to avoid confusion with the Board Policy and removing references to Administrative Rules and Regulations. The "Hiring Procedures Information" page on the College website is reviewed regularly to be sure it reflects most current practice and is in line with approved policies and procedures. Collective bargaining agreement language on hiring for both CSEA and Faculty is also being reviewed to ensure they are consistent with policy and procedure

2. *The balance of the personnel policies and procedures will be uploaded to the COS web site (Standard III.A.1.a.).*

All personnel policies and procedures are available on the COS website, including links to the most recent salary information and collective bargaining agreements. Classified job descriptions and adjunct application forms are available on the web. An application coversheet and equivalency application was developed and is also posted on the web.

3. *Language will be included in hiring policies and documents that ensures hiring is consistent with the mission and goals of the College (Standard III.A.1.a.).*

Proposed changes will be finalized at the March 2 procedure and policy review day.

4. *Board Policy, No. 5.12.1 will be updated to include mention of the College's mission and goals in hiring practices (Standard III.A.1.a.).*

Proposed changes will be finalized at the March 2 procedure and policy review day.

5. *Board Policy, No. 5.0, Lines of Authority will be updated to reflect current staffing (Standard III.A.1.a.).*

Several changes have taken place on campus since the 2004 Accreditation Visit. Revisions will go to the President's Advisory Council for approval in February 2007 and to the Board of Trustees at their March 2007 meeting.

6. *A review of resources used to check accreditation status for U.S. institutions to ensure currency will be conducted (Standard III.A.1.a.).*

The Human Resource Office periodically uses the following websites for the regional accrediting organizations for public and private higher education institutions in order to check accreditation status for US institutions including:

- North Central Association of Colleges and Schools
- Middle States Commission on Higher Education
- New England Association of Schools and Colleges
 - Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
 - Commission on Technical and Career Institutions
- Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities
- Southern Association of Schools and Colleges / Commission on Colleges
- Western Association of Schools and Colleges - Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities
- Western Association of Schools and Colleges – Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

This review process will be formalized in a desk audit document.

7. *A review of the procedure for checking degrees from non-U.S. institutions to assure equivalency would be met for these cases will be conducted (Standard III.A.1.a.).*

A survey of other colleges will be conducted to obtain best practices for a procedure on checking equivalency or translation of foreign degrees.

8. *During the 2003-04 academic year, the faculty bargaining unit, in conjunction with the Academic Senate, will decide how the issue of student learning outcomes will be infused into the evaluation process for full-time and adjunct faculty (Standard III.A.1.c.).*

9. *During the 2003-04 academic year, supervisors of instructional support staff, such as classified instructional aides and tutors, will develop a method for evaluating their effectiveness at helping students achieve learning outcomes (Standard III.A.1.c.).*

Responding to the above two plans, an ad hoc committee of the faculty Senate began working in September 2003 on a revision of the tenure evaluation process. The revised process did little to include a meaningful reflection on student achievement of SLOs as part of faculty evaluations. Nevertheless, the Faculty Senate approved the changes at its October 2004 meeting and forwarded the changes to the faculty bargaining unit for approval. The Faculty Association (CCA/CTA) approved the changes in the evaluation process at their April 2005 meeting.

Although the revised faculty evaluation process looks at faculty members' success with SLOs and assessment very minimally, it is hoped that individual faculty members will take it upon themselves to include more discussion of SLOs and assessment in their dialogues with their peers and in their self-evaluations, even though such dialogue and self-reflection are only minimally required.

The Human Resource Office and CSEA, the bargaining unit for classified staff, have not yet included discussions of student achievement of SLOs as part of staff

evaluations. The primary reason that they have not yet attempted to address this issue is the *enormous complexity* of determining just how and to what degree classified staff influence student achievement of learning outcomes, and how it all can be assessed and documented.

10. *The Office of Instructional Services will provide Official Course Outlines to members of faculty evaluation teams as a regular part of the evaluation process. Likewise, the Office of Instructional Services will provide Official Course Outlines to evaluators of adjunct faculty (Standard III.A.1.c.).*

This procedure has not yet been formally included in the evaluation procedures of tenured, tenure-track, or adjunct faculty. Nevertheless, Official Course Outlines of all courses are available online for faculty evaluators to review, and faculty members being evaluated are required to submit copies of syllabi and first-day handouts for comparison to the Official Course Outlines.

11. *Complete the development of a faculty code of ethics by June 2004. A code of ethics should be developed for staff by June 2005 (Standard III.A.1.d.).*

The faculty Professional Ethics Statement was developed by a sub-committee of the Academic Senate and subsequently approved by that body on April 15, 2004. The statement was forwarded to the Board of Trustees for information at their May 2004 regular meeting. It is now published in the Faculty Handbook, which is distributed to all faculty and is also available electronically on the COS website. In addition, all full-time faculty receive this document on a flash drive so that it is accessible in a variety of mediums.

The code of ethics for staff will be discussed at the Policy and Procedure day in March 2007 and a plan for forming an Ad Hoc Committee will be finalized. The timeline for completion of this process is January 2008.

12. *Develop a plan to attract a larger pool of qualified applicants for faculty and staff positions (Standard III.A.2.).*

Several projects have been completed and are in progress to address this issue:

- Adjunct application forms are now available on the web, including an application coversheet and equivalency application.
- The format of the job opportunity web page was revised for ease of reading, and a status column informs applicants of the current status of the position for which they have applied.
- In December 2005 the Human Resource Office began working with Job Elephant to assist with identifying potential places both on-line and print in which to advertise.
- To increase promotion of faculty and administrative positions the Human Resource Office participated in the following job fairs:
 - January 2006, California Community College Registry (CCCR) job fairs in Los Angeles and San Francisco.
 - January 2007, CCCR job fairs in Los Angeles and San Francisco

- With the increased advertising, the faculty recruitment for 2007 did result in larger pools compared to the faculty recruitment in 2006.
- We are now advertising our position on the Southern Oregon University website and will be contacting other universities to try to develop similar relationships for posting positions on their websites.
- When recruiting for specialty positions (i.e., technology, nursing, athletics) advertising is targeted to those populations.
- A review of the applicant pools will be conducted in Summer 2007 to determine the impact of the new advertising partnership and increased exposure from the job fairs.

13. *Develop written documentation regarding the College's implementation of various policies and procedures and laws (Standards III.A.3., III.A.3a., III.A.3.b.).*

Several resource books have been prepared to include references to Education Code, Title V, Labor Code, etc. that relate to personnel. As time allows, written documentation is completed.

14. *Develop a Classified Employee Handbook by June 2004 (Standards III.A.3., III.A.3a., III.A.3.b.).*

The new completion date for the handbook is December 2007. The Grant Manager's Handbook will be used as a template for the development of the classified employee handbook. A committee will be formed to assist with review and development of this handbook.

15. *Restructure hiring committees to reflect State changes in equal opportunity (Standards III.A.4., III.A.4.a., III.A.4.b., III.A.4.c.).*

New Screening Committee trainings were developed in Spring 2006 and have been provided to staff that have not been previously trained. Some of the previously trained Equal Employment Opportunity Representatives no longer work for the District. New representatives need to be recruited, and some staff members have expressed interest in serving in this capacity. All EEO Representatives will receive updated training by December 2007.

16. *Adjust practice to coordinate with State model plan for diversity. Currently this plan will be due back to the State by Spring 2004 (Standards III.A.4., III.A.4.a., III.A.4.b., III.A.4.c.).*

The model plan presented by the Chancellor's Office was completed and presented to the field in Fall 2006. Concerns about the model plan have been expressed by many Chief Human Resource Officers (CHRO) that:

- The availability data is outdated and therefore not a good measurement.
- There are extensive "suggestions" that seem to be requirements that are not legal mandates of Title V.

- Availability data is not consistent with other measurements, such as Federal census data or even what is required for reporting in MIS data (in terms of the categories of groups.
- There seems to be some references to penalty or lack of “diversity” funding if significant representation is not addressed. This seems to create a preference which is illegal.

CHROs will be communicating their concerns directly to the Chancellor’s Office. A deadline for completion and approval of the plan has not been received from the Chancellor’s Office; however, it is important to move forward with getting the District’s plan drafted and reviewed. By the end of the Spring 2007 semester, the Faculty and Staff Diversity Committee will meet to review a draft plan and work on completion of the plan within the coming year.

17. *Seek ways to provide staff development opportunities to all staff (Standard III.A.5.).*
A Professional Development Committee was formed in 2005-06 and meets at least twice a year to discuss and plan for campus-wide staff development. In 2006-07 funds were allocated from the state level. A plan will be developed for the use of those funds. The Flex/Faculty Development and the Classified Staff Development Committee continue to meet regularly to review and approve proposals for use of funds they are responsible for.

Standard IIIB. Physical Resources

1. *All campus personnel should be empowered to address some safety issues; for example, access to safety related resources such as ice melt should be made available in central locations, to all employees (Standard III.B.1.a.).*

Emergency evacuation maps have been posted in each room in every building on both the Weed and Yreka campuses. Each building on the Weed campus has an assigned “building steward” who participates in annual trainings to handle emergency situations. The responsibility of building stewards is to ensure that conditions in and around their buildings are safe for students and staff. If problems are noted, the building stewards report the problem to the appropriate authority or department depending on the nature of the problem.

2. *The College will provide information to the Chancellor’s Office regarding possible building replacement needs for possible inclusion in the Capital Outlay (Standard III.B.1.a.).*

In November 2005, Bond Measure A was passed to fund building new facilities on both the Yreka and Weed campuses. The passage of this bond measure sparked the need for the College to develop a Facilities Master Plan. Fall 2006 meetings for the Facilities Master Plan have involved discussions of what to do with outdated temporary buildings on campus and what to do about possible hazards in the Life Science Building. In early Fall 2006 the College also submitted an application for the modernization of the Life Science building related to safety and lab instruction.

3. *The College will develop formal safety standards for leased facilities (Standard III.B.1.a.).*

Formal safety standards for leased facilities are in progress, and expected to be completed by July 2007. The College is working with Keenan and Associates, the College's insurance carrier, on this project.

4. *Implement the Custodial Staffing and Standards recommendations, including the prioritization of work requests. Develop a method to utilize the computerized work requests to improve response to maintenance requests. Meet with the campus community to carefully match needs and expectations with available resources (Standard III.B.1.b.).*

The Custodial Supervisor, Assistant Director of Maintenance, Director of Maintenance, and Vice President of Administrative Services all regularly solicit feedback on completed tasks to assess satisfaction. Currently a new position is being proposed to assist in the prioritization of duties and maintenance requests in order to free up staff for assigned duties, as well as to improve communication within the department between the department and other areas on campus. Since 2004, there have been changes made in the assignments of custodial staffing to match the needs of the campus. Recently two persons in custodial positions retired, and the College has filled those vacated positions. New standards are being applied for each type of cleaning to which these employees are assigned, and the Custodial Supervisor will be inspecting the work and adjusting work schedules as appropriate to meet these standards.

5. *The Accessibility Committee will prioritize completion of the remaining accessibility items to ensure accessibility for all students (Standard III.B.1.b.).*

The Accessibility Committee is a sub-committee of the Facilities and Grounds Committee. In October 2005, a draft of the Access Standards was approved by the Accessibility Committee. This document outlines the accessibility items needing to be completed, and prioritizes those items. The Accessibility Committee continues to meet several times each year, with the monitoring of the completion of the items on the Access Standards document being one of the main priorities of each meeting.

6. *Develop formal assessment strategies for all renovations, capital projects, and physical resources (Standards III.B.2., III.B.2.a., III.B.2.b.).*

The Fusion program from the California Community College Chancellor's Office is being used to assess the condition of facilities in order to gain input for modernization and input. The District has hired a project manager for the planning and construction which will occur as a result of Measure A, and he has developed a site plan for capital improvements. This site plan is driven by the Educational Master Plan.

Standard III.C. Technology Resources

1. *The current Technology Plan will be thoroughly reviewed by January 2004, at which time a new Information Technology Strategic Plan will be implemented for 2004-2006 (Standard III.C.1.a.).*

The Information Technology Strategic Plan initially drafted in January 2003 was revised in November 2003. It was reviewed, approved, and finalized in April 2004, soon after the completion of the March 2004 Accreditation Visit. The plan was implemented in Fall 2004. This implementation brought to light several weaknesses in the plan. It was revised and approved again in January 2005. The January 2005 plan serves as the basis for the College's technology needs and includes the basic framework on which technology decisions are built.

2. *The 2004-2006 Information Technology Strategic Plan will address the computer replacement cycle, the maximum life of and appropriate assignments of computers, and the inclusion of associated technology within the computer/technology replacement cycle (Standard III.C.1.c.).*

The 2004-2007 Information Technology Strategic Plan addresses the computer replacement cycle, maximum life of technology, appropriate assignment of computers to staff and students, and the associated technology within the computer/technology replacement cycle. The 2006 update to the plan adds Distance Learning needs into the replacement cycle plan, including technology associated with the College's two-way interactive video conferencing equipment and infrastructure. This document is currently under review and is being revised to aggressively address replacement strategies to ensure technology is current for additional educational and operational needs.

3. *In order to achieve continuous feedback from the customer communities and therefore evaluate the basis for improvement, the College plans to use the following strategies:*

- *Present the new IT Strategic Plan to departments within the College for input and feedback.*
- *Develop customer feedback mechanisms for the Technology Council, Technology Team, and other technological professionals within the College, as part of the three-year planning process (Standard III.C.2.).*

The Information Technology Strategic Plan was adopted after three drafts and a final revision. Representatives from several departments/areas on campus were consulted: Library, Fine/Graphic Arts Department, Natural and Applied Sciences Area, Disabled Student Programs, Admissions and Records, Business Office, Telecommunications, the Yreka Campus, Vice President of Instruction, Vice President of Student Services, and Vice President of Administrative and Information Services. In addition, the Instruction Council, made up of faculty members from various academic areas on campus, prioritized the technology and software needed for new and existing academic programs on both campuses. These priorities were implemented under the current Technology Strategic Plan.

Meetings of the Technology Council are regularly scheduled and held. The membership of this group includes employees from each constituent group on campus, and feedback happens through these individuals. In addition, a newly created and posted Applications Specialist position, as well as the existing Technician positions and an additional Technician position, all respond to electronically submitted requests, and then schedule follow-up visits to assess customer satisfaction.

Standard IIID. Financial Resources

1. *Formally integrate into the planning process an evaluation of how effectively funds are being used within each department (Standard III.D.3.).*

The district adheres to a Budget Development Timeline that requires budget managers to develop assumptions for review by the administration and approval by the Board.

Each budget manager within all departments is required to submit preliminary unit budgets each year. These budgets are reviewed by the Administration and the Budget Oversight Committee (BOC), which makes recommendations to the President's Advisory Council (PAC).

The BOC/PAC reviews the projected revenues and salary schedules and recommends to the President/Superintendent a strategy for balancing the budget to meet the objectives of the Strategic Master Plan. Subsequent drafts and revisions are prepared following the timeline prior to the Board's review and adoption of the tentative budget. This process is repeated for any revised projected revenues as necessary to prepare a final proposed budget to be sent to the Board for adoption within the established fiscal year timeline.

The BOC meets at least quarterly and reviews significant variance requests to evaluate the effectiveness of this process for each department. To date, this process has provided information to PAC guiding recommendations for hiring and funding of programs and projects. For example, the evaluation provided by the BOC has prompted recommendations for group buying of supplies and multi-year budget forecasting.

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

Standard IVA. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

1. *Resurvey faculty and staff to see if the perception of the Board has changed following the President's clarification of the Board's role (Standard IV.A.1.).*

The survey has not been not administered.

2. *Develop an annual evaluation of the planning process, to be implemented each fall (Standards IV.A.2.a., IV.A.3.).*

While an evaluation instrument was developed, it has not been implemented.

3. *The College will develop a system for publicizing the annual goals for senior administrators (Standard IV.A.5.).*

The College no longer establishes annual goals for individual administrators. Instead institutional goals are generated – and publicized – through the strategic planning process.

Standard IVB. Board and Administrative Organization

1. *The District will explore whether policy language specifically addressing legal responsibility needs to be created (Standard IV.B.1.c.).*

After consultation with CCLC, the District decided that current policy language is adequate.

2. *By December 2003, the District will establish a formal system to evaluate regularly and, when necessary, revise policies and practices (Standard IV.B.1.e.).*

The Board of Trustees approved a Board Policy 1.7.3 and Board Procedure 1.7.1 at its January 2007 meeting. This policy establishes that the President/Superintendent oversee the process for reviewing board policies on a regular basis and for ensuring they are updated as needed. This policy also establishes that at least one section of Board Policies will be reviewed each year. The procedure that was approved supplies more detail of how this review process will take place, and it identifies the parties responsible for the different steps in the process.

3. *The District will document and formalize trustee development and orientation procedures by December 2003 (Standard IV.B.1.f.).*
4. *The District will develop a procedure to fill a Board vacancy by appointment by December 2003 (Standard IV.B.1.f.).*
5. *The Board will evaluate this newly implemented process by December 2003, and make changes as necessary (Standard IV.B.1.g.).*
6. *The District will amend its ethics Board policy to include dealing with behavior that violates its code by December 2003 (Standard IV.B.1.h.).*

Plans 3 through 6 have not yet been addressed. However, this spring is the first implementation of the policy and procedure review process (referred to above). These goals will be addressed as part of this process.

7. *An abbreviated version of the Accreditation Employee Survey will be administered in Fall 2003 (Standard IV.B.1.j.).*

The survey was not administered. It was decided this plan was unnecessary.

8. *The Academic Senate will engage in discussion with the President to resolve its concerns about faculty representation on hiring committees for administrators (Standard IV.B.1.j.).*

Since the self-study, a VP of Instruction was hired. That search committee was comprised of more than 50% faculty members, to the satisfaction of the Academic

Senate. However, a commitment by the district to replicate this type of search committee composition has not been formalized.

9. *The District will evaluate the effectiveness of the area director form of academic administration, and implement changes if necessary, by the end of the 2003-04 academic year (Standard IV.B.2.a.).*

In the summer of 2005, a joint administrative/faculty committee examined alternate forms of administration within instruction. That body generated a structure recommendation and forwarded it to the academic senate. After much discussion, a two-dean structure was approved by both the senate and by PAC, and presented to the board, which approved it. Currently a faculty member is serving as interim Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and a search is proceeding to fill the position on a permanent basis.

10. *The institution will conduct an evaluation of the President's influence in institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment that is independent of his annual evaluation process. This independent evaluation will take place by May 2004 (Standard IV.B.2.b.).*

The evaluation has not been administered.

11. *The Accreditation follow up survey scheduled to be administered in Fall 2003 will include a section that will effectively evaluate this manner (Standard IV.B.2.d.).*

The survey was not administered. It was decided this plan was unnecessary.

12. *The institution will formally solicit feedback regarding communication between the President and organizations and communities with which he has contacts by December 2004 (Standard IV.B.2.e.).*

The survey was not administered.