

EVALUATION REPORT

**Willow International Community College Center
10309 N. Willow Avenue
Fresno, CA 93730**

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

**This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
Willow International Community College Center from October 18 to
October 20, 2011**

**Ron Taylor
Chair**

WILLOW INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE CENTER

Comprehensive Evaluation Visiting Team

October 18-20, 2011

Dr. Ronald C. Taylor (Chair)
Superintendent/President
Feather River College

Ms. Cynthia Hall (Assistant)
Executive Assistant to the President
Feather River College

Mr. Oleg Bepalov
Executive Director of Research and
Institutional Effectiveness
San Jose-Evergreen CCD

Dr. Matthew Goldstein
Instructor
Laney College

Dr. Joseph Bielanski, Jr.
Articulation Officer
Berkeley City College

Dr. Chris Hill
Professor, Earth Sciences
Grossmont College

Dr. Renee DeLong Chomiak
Dean of Counseling Services
Cerritos College

Mr. Yulian Ligioso
Vice President, Finance & Administration
Solano Community College

Dr. James Dire
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Kauai Community College

Mr. Charles Meng II
Former Trustee
Napa Valley College

Dr. Monte Perez
President
Los Angeles Mission College

Ms. Cheryl Stewart
Librarian
Coastline Community College

Dr. Jim Riggs
Professor of Community College Education
California State University Stanislaus

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION REPORT

INSTITUTION: Willow International Community College Center
State Center Community College District

DATES OF VISIT: October 18-20, 2011

TEAM CHAIR: Ron Taylor, Superintendent/President, Feather River College

A twelve-member accreditation team visited Willow International Community College Center from October 18 to October 20, 2011, for the purpose of evaluating the Center's request for candidacy for college status as "Clovis Community College," as proposed by action of the State Center Community College District (SCCCD, or District) Board of Trustees.

The site visit enabled the evaluation team to complete its analysis of how well the Center is meeting the Commission Standards. The team is thus able to provide recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submit a recommendation to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC, or Commission) regarding the status of the Center.

In preparation for the visit, team members attended an all-day training session on September 1, 2011, conducted by the ACCJC and studied Commission materials prepared for visiting teams. Team members read carefully the Center's Self Study report, as well as previous reports related to the status of the Center, including the Substantive Change Proposal submitted for the Center in August, 2007, and assessed the evidence provided by the Center. Prior to the visit, the team chair conducted a pre-visit to the campus on September 19, 2011. During the pre-visit, the chair met with the Vice Chancellor of the North Centers and the Vice President of Instruction and Student Services, as well as with the Chancellor and support staff at the SCCC District office.

On Monday, October 17, 2011, three team members met with the Chancellor, vice chancellors and members of the Board of Trustees at the District office in Fresno, prior to the start of the site visit at Willow International. These preliminary discussions helped the team understand the District's perspective on various matters related to the planning for the Center's proposed candidacy. Areas discussed included finance, physical facilities, human resources, technology resources, governance, leadership, and the planning related to the various instructional centers of the District.

During the visit, the team met with over 150 faculty, staff, administrators, members of the Board of Trustees, and students, and conducted over 80 interviews. The team also conducted two open meetings to allow for comment from any member of the campus or local community. Members of the team also observed classes at the Center, including online classes. Several team members met with representatives of college governance

committees and councils, including faculty and staff representatives from the Reedley College Academic Senate and Classified Senate. During the visit, team members also held additional meetings with District administration and staff via video-teleconference from the Willow International campus, and conferred with representatives of the visiting teams for Reedley College and Fresno City College.

The team reviewed numerous documents supporting the Self Study report in the team room, where copies of evidence supporting each Standard were available for review. Documents reviewed by the team included board policies and procedures, program reviews, strategic planning documents, enrollment reports, committee minutes, and manuals.

The team greatly appreciated the warm welcome, enthusiasm and helpfulness of Center staff throughout the visit. The Center was well prepared for the team's visit, and during the visit staff members assisted the team with responses to team requests for individual meetings, additional information, and practical logistics needs. Center staff met every request for documentation and meetings with individual members and groups of the campus community.

The team felt that the Self Study report was an honest assessment of the status of the Center in its preparation for candidacy and initial accreditation. The team appreciated the effort put into composing the report, and assembling the great many pieces of evidence supporting the report. The team verified that the report was founded on broad participation by Center faculty, staff and students. While the Self Study is generally adequate, the team noted that there was a relative lack of planning agendas for an institution that is seeking candidacy. It is apparent that the Center would benefit from further development—with emphasis on integrated planning, resource allocation, and the establishment of an identity separate from Reedley College—to move more confidently toward initial accreditation. The analysis in the Self Study should result in conclusions about what needs to be accomplished to improve. Some sections of the Self Study only cite survey data as the basis for asserting that the Standard has been met; the omission of more detailed evidence in those cases prohibits more in-depth analysis, leading to the possibility of fewer planning agendas outlining actions to improve. While the Self Study, supporting evidence, and other evidence reviewed provided the team with sufficient basis to draw conclusions for this report, the team encourages the Center to orient future Self Study reports to address these issues, as noted below in the team's recommendations.

The team reviewed the responses to previous recommendations for Reedley College from the visit conducted in 2005, along with the Progress Report of March 15, 2007 and the Midterm Report of October 15, 2008, and found that progress has been made toward meeting the recommendations, in so far as they apply to Willow International Community College Center.

ACCREDITATION EVALUATION REPORT
for
Willow International Community College Center

October 18-20, 2011

Introduction

Willow International Community College Center is an educational center within the State Center Community College District (SCCCD). It has operated at its current location since 2007. The District has offered courses in the immediate area around Clovis, California, since 1992, when the District purchased land on Herndon Avenue and Fir Avenue. The demand for educational services increased with population growth, and the District determined to plan a new full-service educational center in the north-Fresno-Clovis area, after passing a local bond in 2002. At present the Center is operated as part of the North Centers administrative unit of the District, but its offerings are accredited through Reedley College, which is located almost 40 miles to the south. Other sites in the North Centers are located at Madera and Oakhurst, California; those sites are also accredited through Reedley College. The Chief Executive Officer for the North Centers is a Vice Chancellor of the District.

Although the North Centers continue to be accredited through Reedley College, the SCCC Board of Trustees established for them a governance structure and administration that accorded them a great deal of autonomy from Reedley College, due to the rapid growth and complexity of administering physical sites so distant from the Reedley campus. The Willow International Community College Center, being the fastest-growing of the North Centers and the site with the largest enrollment, has been proposed for candidacy as an independent college. As a preliminary step in this process, the site was approved as an independent educational center through a Substantive Change Proposal to the Commission, acted on by the Commission's Substantive Change Committee on November 29, 2007. Leading up to that action, the District had proposed to the California Community Colleges Board of Governors and to the California Post-secondary Education Commission (CPEC) the establishment of a new educational center in the vicinity of Clovis. In February 2003 CPEC approved that proposal. In January 2010, the Willow International site was granted eligibility by the Commission. The current team report responds to the Center's Self Study in support of an Application for Candidacy.

The Willow International Community College Center operates on a 110-acre campus at the intersection of Willow Avenue and International Avenue in north Fresno, adjacent to

the City of Clovis, California. The physical facilities consist of Academic Center One, a building of 80,000 square feet that opened in Fall 2007, Academic Center Two, a building of similar size which opened in Fall 2010, and a child care facility operated in a joint use agreement with Clovis Unified School District.

The Center serves approximately 5,600 students (1,650 full-time equivalents), 58% of whom are female, and whose ethnic distribution is somewhat less diverse than that of the larger region of Fresno and Madera counties, but which reflects the ethnic make-up of the immediate area of Clovis and north Fresno.

The Center offers a comprehensive array of lower-division general education courses, as well as some courses specifically targeted at workplace skills in business and computer software. Student support services at the Center are comprehensive, including library materials and learning resources.

The Center is staffed by 36 full-time faculty, 28 regular classified staff (22 full-time and six part-time), nine administrators, and 133 part-time faculty (numbers of part-time faculty fluctuate according to the course offerings in a given term). Administration consists of a Vice Chancellor, who has overall charge of the campus, a Vice President of Instruction and Student Services, a Dean of Instruction and Technology (currently interim), a Dean of Students/Matriculation, a Financial Aid Manager, and representatives from the instructional divisions.

Long-term master planning for the Center has been conducted under the auspices of the North Centers. The Educational Master Plan for the Center forms a part of the Educational Master Plan for the North Centers, which addresses each of the three sites: Madera, Oakhurst, and Willow International. Mission, vision and values statements for the North Centers are intended to guide planning for the Willow International Center, along with the other North Centers sites.

Governance for the Center is accomplished through a Faculty Association formed in 2002, classified staff representatives who sit on the Reedley College Classified Senate, a North Centers faculty representative who sits on the Reedley College Academic Senate Executive Committee, and faculty representatives in the Reedley College Academic Senate. Since 2000, student representation in governance has occurred through a North Centers Associated Student Government. Recently, a separate Associate Student Government was formed specifically for the students of the Willow International Center. The North Centers have four instructional divisions, each having a representative who assists the administration with selection of part-time faculty, textbooks, recommendations on expenditures, and liaison with faculty of the centers. A College Center Council was established in 2006 to oversee the continuous improvement of the centers, including Willow International.

The team assessed the Center's compliance with the Commission's Eligibility Requirements and the Standards for accreditation, as explained in the following report. The team's major findings and recommendations are as listed below.

Commendations

- A. The team commends the Center, especially Student Services, for providing a variety of services to students in numerous delivery formats, showing creativity in a context of limited resources and under circumstances of transition and change. These formats include online and in-person services. Online services include application, assessment, financial aid application, course registration and degree audit utilizing Web Advisor, Counseling Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), Live Help counseling, online orientation, online probation workshop, Scheduling and Reporting System (SARS) Alert, and many web pages to support student success. In-person services include Registration-To-Go in conjunction with local high schools, Express Counseling in a dedicated area during peak registration times, and New Student Welcome sessions, as well as many special programs and services on site. (Standard II.B)
- B. The team commends the Center for emphasizing an appreciation for diversity with Student Activities sponsoring many multicultural activities and the Tutorial Center, in collaboration with North Centers staff and Willow International Community College Center art and English departments, for publishing an annual journal called, "The Review: Journal of Student Literature and Art." This journal features unique student writing from all English course levels and represents ethnic, gender, and age diversity. (Standard II.B)
- C. The team commends the Center for its Library Liaison Committee, which is comprised of faculty members from all divisions, library staff, and other staff members such as counselors and deans, and student leadership. The Library Liaison Committee enables faculty members to participate in library collection development and build a library collection tailored specifically to Center students and curriculum. The enthusiasm, commitment, *esprit de corps*, and intellectual responsibility of the Committee members is remarkable and a model for similar organizations on other campuses. The Library Liaison Committee's mandate may evolve beyond collection development to include other ways to advance the mission of the college library and in these times of financial challenges such support strengthens the library and strengthens the institution. (Standard II.C.1.a)
- D. The team commends the Center on the quality of its facilities and technology to support student learning. The buildings are well designed for educational activities, efficient, and attractive, and the technology hardware and software are up to date and selected carefully to support student learning and institutional effectiveness. (Standards III.B.1, III.C)
- E. The team commends the Center for establishing and maintaining a culture of

openness and inclusiveness, where all constituent groups feel a part of the governance of the Center, participate in collaborative decision-making, and exhibit a commitment to achieving the Center's mission. (Standard IV.A.1)

- F. The team commends the Center and its students for creating the Associated Student Government, a permanent participatory-governance organization, members of which are actively and energetically involved in college committees and councils, as well as college events. (Standard IV.A.2.a)

Recommendations

After carefully reviewing the Self Study, examining evidence, observing activities, interviewing employees and students, and discussing the findings, the team offers the following recommendations to the Willow International Community College Center:

1. In order to meet the Standards and to assure adequate quality, the team recommends that institutional functions currently housed at Reedley College and functioning on behalf of Willow International, be established at Willow International prior to its application for initial accreditation. The Center must develop its own processes related to the development and oversight of instructional programs, including an academic senate, a curriculum committee, and the articulation function, and must develop its own processes for support of institutional planning and governance, such as program review and a Classified Senate. (Standards I.B.5, II.A, II.B.1, II.B.3.c, II.B.3.f, II.B.4, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a)
2. In order for the colleges and District to fully meet the intent of the previous recommendation, the State Center Community College District (SCCCD) must engage in continuous, timely, and deliberative dialogue with all District stakeholders to coordinate long-term planning and examine the impact of the planned increase in the number of colleges and the future roles of the centers on the existing institutions. This includes creating, developing, and aligning District and college plans and planning processes in the following areas:
 - District strategic plan
 - facilities
 - technology
 - organizational reporting relationship of centers
 - location of signature programs
 - funding allocation
 - human resources
 - research capacity (E.R. 4, Standards I.B.5, II.A, II.C.1.a-c, II.C.2, III.A.2, III.B.2.a-b, III.C.1.c, III.D.1.a-c, III.D.2.a, IV.B.1.b, IV.B.3.c)
3. In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the Center initiate appropriate action to ensure that future Self Study reports are prepared in accordance with the ACCJC Institutional Self Evaluation Manual (E.R. 21; Standards II.A, IV.A.4).

4. In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the District document the process for review of board policies and ensure that District governance and decision-making processes are regularly evaluated. (Standards IV.B.1.e, IV.B.3.g.)

Evaluation of Institutional Responses to Previous Recommendations

Previous reports that are pertinent to the Center's application for candidacy are the 2005 comprehensive site visit team report on Reedley College, the October 2006 Progress Report submitted by Reedley College, the March 2007 Progress Report submitted by Reedley College, the October 2008 Midterm Report submitted by Reedley College, and the Substantive Change Proposal submitted in fall 2007 by Reedley College on behalf of the Center. The team also reviewed the Eligibility Application for the Center.

In recent years, Center has been accredited as a center of Reedley College, and it is a part of the District's North Centers organizational structure. The Center's Self Study does not directly address the specific recommendations that were made by the previous team in its evaluation of Reedley College. In this particular case, in which the institution submitting the Self Study is actually a center of another college, the responses to the previous team's recommendations are not entirely within the control of the Center. Nevertheless, the Center's Self Study does provide evidence that the previous recommendations were responded to, as far as concerns the development of the Center and its candidacy application.

While not all of the recommendations from these previous reports are equally pertinent to the development of the Willow International Community College Center, all of the 2005 recommendations are listed here for ease of reference. These previous recommendations provide historical context for the current report. Therefore the current team provides commentary on progress on the issues addressed in them, insofar as they are pertinent to the Center and its candidacy application:

Previous Recommendation 1. Student Learning Outcomes. The team recommends that the college conduct meaningful, timely, and inclusive dialogue with all constituent groups to identify, develop, and implement student learning outcomes at the course, program, and degree level. The college should determine and implement relevant assessment methodologies and procedures to evaluate student learning outcomes and enhance institutional effectiveness. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.4, I.B.7, II.A.1c, II.A.2a, II.A.2b, II.A.2e, II.A.2f, II.A.2g, II.A.2i, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.A.6a, II.B.1, II.C.1a, II.C.2, III.A.1b, III.A.1c, IV.A.1, IV.A.2b, IV.B.1b)

Insofar as the Center is concerned, both the Center and the District have mission statements and strategic plans that clearly articulate and support student learning. Dialogue about student learning occurs in a numbers of Center committees and opportunities for faculty and staff input on a broader scale occur during the Duty Day events prior to opening each semester. Thus the team finds that the Center has implemented institution-wide processes that facilitate meaningful and timely dialogue on student learning outcomes at the course, program and degree level.

Previous Recommendation 2: Institutional Planning. The team recommends that the college develop, implement, and evaluate a college-wide strategic plan that incorporates the individual planning efforts of the college and centers. The college-wide strategic plan should include assessment of student and community needs in

order to determine the efficiency of college programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. Additionally, the strategic plan should identify and define the allocation of fiscal, physical, human, and technical resources that are required during all operational hours for existing centers and campuses and those that will be needed as future centers and campuses are developed. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, I.B.7, III.A.2, III.B.1, III.B.1a, III.B.1b, III.B.2, III.B.2a, III.B.2b, III.C.1, III.C.1a, III.C.1c, III.C.1d, III.C.2, III.D, III.D.1a, III.D.1b, III.D.2b)

A site visit was conducted in late October 2006, and the visiting team concluded that Reedley College and North Centers staff were coordinating their planning efforts, but that the effort needed time and continuation. In October 2008, Reedley College submitted its required Midterm Report, with thorough responses to the 2005 visiting team's recommendations. Included in these responses was a detailed report on how planning was being conducted at Reedley College and the North Centers, including the establishment of the Institutional Oversight and Budget Committee for the North Centers, which included a representative from the Reedley College Strategic Planning Council. It also noted the creation of Strategic Plan Support Teams for both Reedley College and the North Centers, and reported on the coordination of planning through the use of a single planning consultant who conducted planning forums at Reedley College and the North Centers. These efforts resulted in strategic plans for both Reedley College and the North Centers. Based on the current Self Study for the Willow International Center and evidence available at the time of the current visit, the team finds that there remains work to be done in relation to this recommendation, on the part of the District. (See recommendation 2.)

Previous Recommendation 3: Dialogue. The team recommends that the college improve communication by engaging in dialogue that is inclusive of all constituents, informed, and intentional about institutional quality and improvement. The dialogue should purposefully contribute to planning and institutional change. This dialogue must include formal and informal pathways for effective communication links and conflict resolution mechanisms so that information and recommendations are equally accessible to all constituent groups and centers. (Standards I.A.3, I.4, I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, IV.A.1)

Insofar as the Center is concerned, the current Self Study details organizational structures that are designed to promote dialogue with all constituent groups. These primarily include the College Center Council at the Center and the Chancellor's Communication Council at the District. In addition, there is a newly-formed District Planning Council that will address planning and integration of the District's Strategic Plan with those of the various sites. Based on evidence presented, it appears that the District councils are still in the nascent stages. That said, the team concludes that insofar as this recommendation applied to the Center, it has been met, as discussed below under the relevant Standards.

Previous Recommendation 4. Program Review. The team recommends that the college implement the revised program review process. This process should include the assessment of student learning outcomes along with other assessments that yield quantitative and qualitative data for analysis. This information should be used for planning, decision-making, program improvement, and resource allocation.

(Standards I.B, II.A.2, II.A.1c, II.B.1, II.B.3, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.A.1c, III.A.6, III.C.2, IV.A.1, IV.A.2)

The program review process used at the Center is part of the Reedley College process. This particular process is currently in its third cycle and is integrated into the planning and resource allocation process at the Center via the “Continuous Improvement Collaborative Decision-Making Process,” thus addressing the recommendation.

Previous Recommendation 5: Library and Learning Resources. The team recommends that the college fully implement the previous team’s recommendation by ensuring that professionally qualified library and learning resource staff provide support at all locations where these services are offered currently and will be needed as future centers and campuses are developed. (Standards II.C.1a, II.C.1b, II.C.1c, II.C.2)

This recommendation was especially pertinent to the Center. The 2006 visiting team found that while adjustments had been made to library staffing at the North Centers, the Commission should continue to monitor the college’s effort to fill a professional librarian position for the North Centers. In response to the October 2006 Progress Report and site visit, the Commission called for another Progress Report in March 2007, renewing this recommendation. In Reedley College’s 2007 Progress Report, the college responded by hiring a new full-time librarian for the North Centers and presenting its plan for the new Willow International site, including a library facility. The Commission accepted this report. Reedley College’s Midterm Report noted that the librarian who had been hired would continue to provide and enhance library services to the North Centers locations. The North Centers had also hired two part-time instructional aides to staff the Madera and Clovis library sites in the evenings. Since the time of the Midterm Report, the Center has formulated a transitional staffing plan in collaboration with the District. The transitional staffing plan anticipates the addition of one half-time (17.5 hours per week) librarian and two Library Service Assistants. The Center should conduct research to determine whether additional service hours would benefit students and their learning. Based on the current Self Study for the Center and evidence available at the time of the current visit, the team finds that any further necessary staffing adjustments related to this recommendation should be addressed in the implementation of the transitional staffing plan for the Center. (See recommendation 2.)

Previous Recommendation 6: College Strategic Planning Connection with District Strategic Planning. The team recommends that the college develop, implement, and evaluate a college-wide strategic plan that 1) incorporates the individual planning efforts of the college and 2) results in a cohesive planning framework.

Simultaneously, the college should remain cognizant of the strategic direction of the State Center Community College District as it moves toward increasing the number of colleges in the District. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, I.B.7, III.A.2, III.B.1, III.B.1a, III.B.1b, III.B.2, III.B.2a, III.B.2b, III.C.1, III.C.1a, III.C.1c, III.C.1d, III.C.2, III.D, III.D.1a, III.D.1b, III.D.2b)

In regard to Recommendation 6, the 2006 visiting team acknowledged the coordinated planning that had been done between Reedley College and North Centers staff, and noted that the District Chancellor had initiated a District-wide Accreditation Planning and

Facilities Committee to address the needs of the various sites. Similarly, the 2008 Midterm Report reported on the progress made by the District on comprehensive strategic planning, with five District strategic directions having been established and vetted with the community and the staff of the colleges and centers. An effort was made to ensure that these strategic directions reflected the strategic goals and objectives of the colleges and centers. A District Strategic Plan Support Team was established in addition to the District-wide Facilities Committee to address District-wide planning issues. Based on the current Self Study for the Center and evidence available at the time of the current visit, the team finds that while substantial work was done to address this recommendation following the 2005 Reedley College Self Study, nevertheless the significant needs of the Willow International Community College Center make clear that there remains work to be done in relation to this recommendation, on the part of the District. (See recommendation 2.)

Eligibility Requirements

While the Commission has already acted to affirm the Center's eligibility for candidacy, the team reviewed the Center's continuing compliance with the ACCJC Eligibility Requirements in addition to its review of compliance with the ACCJC Standards.

1. Authority

The team verified that the Center is acting as a center of Reedley College within the State Center Community College District. Reedley College is accredited the ACCJC. Reedley College and the Center are authorized by the State of California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to operate as an educational institution offering courses of study leading to certificates and associate degrees.

2. Mission

The team verified that the Center has a clearly defined mission statement. The mission statement identifies the population that the institution intends to serve, and addresses student learning as its core element. The Center's mission statement was approved by the College Center Council on April 3, 2009. Following the January 2010 Commission action to grant the Center eligibility for candidacy, the SCCC Board of Trustees approved the Center's mission statement on February 2, 2010. The mission statement is reviewed annually as part of the Center's planning processes.

3. Governing Board

The team verified that the Center operates under the direction of a seven-member Board of Trustees. The SCCC Board of Trustees will be the governing board for the Center as candidate institution and will continue as the Center's governing board after initial accreditation. The SCCC Board is a functioning governing board that meets the ACCJC Eligibility Requirements. Two advisory student members also sit with the Board, representing student interests at meetings. It is the intent of the District to add a student representative for the Center once it achieves accredited status as a college.

4. Chief Executive Officer

The team verified that the Center has a chief executive who is a Vice Chancellor who operates under the supervision and direction of the District's Chancellor, in a role comparable to that of the current Presidents of Reedley College and Fresno City College. The Vice Chancellor of the SCCC North Centers has served in this role since 2004. The North Centers consists of the Willow International Center, Oakhurst Center, and Madera Center. This Eligibility Requirement requires that the Chief Executive Officer have full-time responsibility to the accredited institution. There is question as to the Vice Chancellor's responsibility and authority with respect to the Oakhurst and Madera Centers. Based on the current Self Study for the Center and evidence available at the time of the current visit, the team finds that this question needs to be resolved prior to initial accreditation. Eligibility Requirement 4 will not be met for initial accreditation unless the chief executive (CEO) of The Center is given full-time responsibility of the Center only. (See recommendation 2.)

5. Administrative Capacity

The team verified that the Center has sufficient, and adequately prepared and experienced administrative staff to support the Center’s mission and purposes. The administrative structure includes nine administrators or managers, and a support staff of classified assistants, technicians, and coordinators. As discussed below under Standard III.A, the Center’s plan for transitioning to a fuller staffing level upon the granting of independently accredited status includes changes to several administrative and support positions, thus further strengthening the administrative capacity of the site. This particular Eligibility Requirement is met in the institution’s current capacity as a center of another college. However, as the Center moves toward status as an accredited college, it will need to make staffing changes in order to continue to meet this Eligibility Requirement. (See recommendation 2.)

6. Operational Status

The team verified that the Center is fully operational with students actively taking courses and pursuing degree programs. The campus has modern facilities to support teaching and learning.

7. Degrees

The team verified that the Center offers 28 programs which lead to associate degrees. The majority of students are enrolled in credit courses with the intent of earning certificates or degrees.

8. Educational Programs

The team verified that the Center offers a range of degree and certificate programs consistent with the Center’s mission statement. The degree and certificate programs are offered in a manner, and at a level of rigor, consistent with Commission Standards at the time of the visit.

9. Academic Credit

The team verified that the Center awards academic credits based on generally accepted practices of degree-granting institutions of higher learning. The Center adheres to Standards set forth in the California Code of Regulations, section 55002.5. As noted below under Standard II.A, the Center’s offerings conform to relevant requirements of the U.S. Department of Education (USDE 602.16(a)(1)(viii), 668.8(k)(2))

10. Student Learning Achievement

The team verified that the Center has defined student learning outcomes for its courses and programs, and has established learning assessments to determine whether students achieve the learning intended by those student learning outcomes. Moreover, the team reviewed the Center’s longitudinal data on student achievement and verified that the Center tracks course completion, program/certificate completion and graduation (licensure rates are not currently relevant for the Center), thus complying with USDE regulations 602.19 (a-e) and 602.16, as explained more fully under Standard I.B.

11. General Education

The team verified that the Center defines and incorporates into all of its degree programs a substantial component of general education designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and promote intellectual inquiry.

12. Academic Freedom

The team verified that the Center's faculty and students are free to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of major study as judged by the academic community. SCCCD Board Policy 4030, Academic Freedom, spells out in detail that academic freedom is a basic right and that the District is committed to intellectual freedom and responsibility to ensure the right to investigate, discuss, and objectively interpret various subject areas. This Board policy is cited in the Faculty Handbook. Students have the right to question an instructor's interpretation of material without fear of reprisal. The Academic Freedom Policy for the Center is the same as that adopted for all of the North Centers and Reedley College, and has been adopted by the SCCCD Board of Trustees.

13. Faculty

The team verified that the Center has 36 full-time faculty who are qualified to conduct the institution's programs by meeting the minimum qualifications as established by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. These minimum qualifications are consistent with generally accepted academic qualifications applicable to each field of study at other accredited institutions of higher learning. The duties and responsibilities of faculty are outlined in Board policy, the collective bargaining contract, and in the Faculty Handbook.

14. Student Services

The team verified that the Center provides comprehensive student services. The services are aligned with the mission of the Center and meet the needs of the students.

15. Admissions

The team verified that the Center adheres to admissions policies consistent with its mission and with the practices accepted generally for comparable institutions, and with applicable regulation and law.

16. Information and Learning Resources

The team verified that the Center operates a library, a tutorial center and an open computer lab which provide students access to electronic and print resources sufficient to the educational purpose of the Center.

17. Financial Resources

The team verified that the State Center Community College District allocates financial resources annually for the Center, adequate to the operation of the Center to fulfill its mission as a center. The existing funding base, financial reserves, and plans for financial development are adequate to support the Center's mission and to ensure

its financial stability. The team verified that the Center and District comply with United States Department of Education (USDE) regulation 602.19 (a-e), as explained under Standard III.D. The District is developing a District Resource Allocation Model and reviewing its practices and policies in relation to resource allocation in anticipation of the Center becoming an independent, accredited college. It is important that the District adopt a resource allocation model that will support the Center as an independent college, prior to initial accreditation, as explained further below, under Standard III.D. (See recommendation 2.)

18. Financial Accountability

The team verified that the Center annually undergoes and makes available an independent external financial audit by a certified public accounting firm. The team verified that the Center and District comply with United States Department of Education (USDE) regulation 602.19 (a-e), as explained under Standard III.D.

19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation

The team verified that the Center has established a strategic plan and a comprehensive planning process that is consonant with the District's planning. The Center has an integrated planning process which evaluates all areas of institutional effectiveness including student learning and student achievement. The cycle includes broad-based dialogue and use of qualitative and quantitative data. Plans are linked to each other. Resource requests must be tied to specific goals, and require concrete targets. Goals require annual updates reported to the College Center Council. The outcomes of these plans are posted publicly online through Blackboard and discussed campus-wide during Duty Day events. Evidence suggests that the entire planning cycle is frequently reviewed and updated.

20. Public Information

The team verified that the Center provides a catalog for its constituencies under the auspices of Reedley College, and that the information contained in the catalog is accurate and current. The catalog and the institutional website present the official name, address, telephone, website address and other contact information, as well as the mission statement, a comprehensive listing of courses and programs, the academic calendar, and other information required under this Eligibility Requirement. The team further verified compliance with USDE regulation 668.43 concerning disclosure of accreditation organizations and contact information as well as state and federal agency contact information.

21. Relations with the Accrediting Commission

The team verified that the Center, Reedley College, and the District all adhere to the requirements and Standards of the Commission, and that these entities describe themselves consistently to all accrediting agencies, governmental agencies, and the public. The team verified that the Center, the College and the District communicate changes in their status to the Commission in a timely manner, and agree to disclose information needed by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities. The Center currently exists as a confirmed educational center. Having received initial confirmation from the Commission that

it meets the Eligibility Requirements, it has prepared an appropriate Self Study document, and its governing board has approved the document. The team found room for improvement in the Center's Self Study report (see recommendation 3), but verified that this Eligibility Requirement has been met.

STANDARD I

Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

A. Mission

General Observations

The mission statement for the Willow International Community College Center was approved by the College Center Council on April 3, 2009. Following the January 2010 ACCJC action to grant the Center eligibility for candidacy, the SCCCD Board of Trustees approved this mission statement on February 2, 2010. The mission statement is as follows:

The mission of the Willow International Community College Center is to provide affordable and comprehensive educational opportunities to a diverse population of students who seek opportunities for basic skills development, associate degrees, certificates, transfer, and lifelong learning that will enable them to become engaged participants in local and global communities. Student success will be measured through a continuous improvement process with an emphasis on student learning outcomes.

This mission statement supports the State Center Community College District's mission which is as follows:

State Center Community College District is committed to lifelong learning and success for all students by providing accountable, accessible, innovative and quality education programs and services that enable productive citizenship in a diverse, global society.

The Center's operations, activities, and planning processes are driven by its mission and the mission statement is referenced throughout the institutional Self Study. The mission statement, as well as the vision and core values, are on the Center's website, and are referenced in various planning documents. The mission is viewed as the focal element of the Center's "Continuous Improvement - Collective Decision Making Process," and is posted throughout the campus. The Center notes that the mission statement is included on correspondence and public communications, including internal and external e-mails, and it is read annually at the first fall meeting of every standing committee.

In an effort to ensure the currency of the mission statement, all faculty, staff, and students annually engage in a "Mission Statement Review and Revision Process."

Findings and Evidence

The Center's mission statement clearly defines the Center's broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning. The broad educational purposes are to provide opportunities for basic skills development, associate degrees, certificates, transfer, and lifelong learning. Interestingly the Center

does not cite career technical education even though that is one of the broad purposes of their certificate programs and is noted in the text for Standard I.A.1. The Center's commitment is to a diverse population of students with a focus on enabling them to become engaged participants in local and global communities. The mission statement specifically mentions the commitment to achieving student learning with a focus on "student success...measured through a continuous improvement process with an emphasis on student learning outcomes." Student learning outcomes are repeatedly noted throughout the institutional Self Study. (Standard I.A)

The institutional Self Study states that the mission statement is "foundational" to the Center's planning and review cycle and that the mission is foundational to ensure that student learning is fully supported and constantly improved. Various Evidence documents highlight this "foundational" purpose of the mission statement. For example, Evidence documents #14, #116, #673 show the critical importance of the mission to program review; #91 shows that it is the key to educational master planning; and #128 demonstrates how the mission is central to strategic planning. Also Evidence document #686 provides a sample mission statement poster which is displayed throughout the campus in an effort to keep the focus on the Center's mission.

In addressing the mission, the Center focuses on the common themes of accountability, full access, innovation, and quality in an effort to focus on student learning programs and services so as to ensure that those program and services are in keeping with the purpose, character, and population of the Center. In an effort to collaboratively and annually review purpose, character, and population served, the "Mission Statement Evaluation Form" requires evaluation of how effective the Center is in explaining its core values; how effective the mission is at representing the student body and educational opportunities; and whether the mission represents the purpose and the culture to the community.

In an effort to demonstrate that programs and services are aligned with the Center's purpose, character, and student population, there is mention of the comprehensive curriculum offered at the Center (650 courses in 39 areas); reporting of student and academic activities that focus on community involvement and outreach; reference to international study programs; and a listing of opportunities to study global business and economic environments. The Center characterizes itself as attempting to provide as many experiences as possible so that students can "become engaged participants in local and global communities." It also reports various efforts and strategies for outreach, including participation in the Clovis North High School's Annual United Black Men Leadership Conference, the Clovis West Chicano/Latino Success Conference, the Clovis High School Latino Conference, the California Work Opportunities and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKS) Job Faire, the Central Valley Teen Parents Conference, and outreach to the Chukchansi Native American Tribe, all of which demonstrate a commitment to diversity – a commitment in the mission statement.

In focusing on the purpose of the Center, the institutional Self Study throughout reports how the mission statement is foundational to the various planning processes of the Center

especially the Educational Master Plan that guides their integrated planning process. The mission is foundational to annual strategic planning which focuses the Center on “student access, awareness, and success,” “excellence in teaching and learning,” “workforce readiness and partnerships,” and “institutional awareness and communication.”

Throughout the Self Study examples of student access and success are provided, as well as approaches to effective teaching which can lead to effective learning. There is a strong focus on workforce readiness and partnerships which guide programs in child development, criminal justice, teacher preparation, and certificates in management and business administration, as well as programs being developed in allied health, alternative/sustainable energy and environmental technology, and water technology. The Self Study also notes that Reedley College has a “higher than expected” college transfer rate and it is anticipated that this will be the same for the Center when the Center is an accredited college.

The Educational Master Plan states key elements which link the mission to purpose and character: commitment to a process which engages in honest self-evaluation; hard analysis and observation of community needs; open-ended brainstorming of possibilities; the making of clear choices that are reflected in specific goals and objectives; and realistic plans for implementation. It is anticipated that this intensity of focus and mission will only increase when the Center becomes an independently accredited college and becomes the primary driver of its planning and outcomes. It is also recognized that an up-to-date Resource Allocation Model will be important, since all planning leads to resource allocation.

The program review process, which occurs every five years, involves making direct connections between the mission and the programs offered. Each program (instructional programs, student support services, and administrative services) do a self-assessment using quantitative, qualitative, and student learning data to assess the degree to which programs and services effectively support the mission and the strategic plan.

The Center also states that focusing on “where the Center is going” is essential to enhancing purpose, character, student population, as the Center moves forward to becoming a fully accredited and independent college. The Center has been well served through Bond monies which have provided it with state-of-the-art facilities. As the Center looks ahead it is planning for new programs, staffing, and to have the most current technology (for example, see Evidence documents #329 and #330). The Center has the good fortune of several important grants (i.e., USDE TRIO programs and STEM or Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics) which assist in providing effective student services. (Standard I.A.1)

As previously noted, the Center’s mission statement was approved by the State Center Community College District Board of Trustees on February 2, 2010. The Center takes every possible means to make stakeholders aware of the Center’s mission and uses various means to “publish” the mission statement. The team verified that the mission statement is included on correspondence and public communications, including internal

and external e-mails, and is read annually at the first fall meeting of every standing committee (Standard I.A.2)

As stated previously, the Center reviews its mission statement on an annual basis and has a process in place to make any needed revisions. This review process makes use of the Center's governance and decision making processes. Annually all standing committees, at their first fall meeting, read and evaluate the mission statement to determine whether it is still current or in need of modification. Any recommendations are forwarded to the College Center Council, a participatory governance council, for review and consideration. If needed, the Council can create an ad hoc committee to rewrite the mission statement to address any and all comments from the standing committees. This ad hoc committee is comprised of a broad range of representatives. If a revision is produced, then the revised mission statement is reviewed by all constituents with final approval by the College Center Council and the Board of Trustees. (Standard I.A.3)

The mission is central to the development of the Center's planning and decision making process as demonstrated through the "Continuous Improvement-Collaborative Decision Making Process" in which the Center asserts that the cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and reevaluation is used to improve student learning. The mission was central to the Educational Master Plan completed in 2010 and this plan projects the educational programs and support services needed through the year 2025. The mission and the Educational Master Plan drive functional plans which include enrollment management, matriculation, technology, facilities, and staffing. The various plans have led to the 2011-2012 Planning Matrix showing the interrelationships among strategic plan goals, the Educational Master Plan, accreditation planning agendas, and the District strategic plan goals.

All goals and plans in support of the Center's mission are integrated into the Center's budget development process and allocation of funds. The College Center Council representing all Center constituencies takes action to evaluate and prioritize all planning resource allocation requests. (Standard I.A.4)

Conclusions

The Willow International Community College Center meets Standard I.A. The team found evidence that the college's strategic planning, educational planning, functional plans, and resource allocation are driven by the Center's mission statement. As the Center moves to candidacy and full accreditation, it is evident that the mission will continue to be foundational to the work of the Willow International Community College Center.

Recommendations

The team has no recommendations for the Center related to Standard I.A, and commends the Center on its mission-centeredness.

B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

Planning activities of the Center include creating strategic organizational goals, program goals, course goals, as well as other types of plans like technology plans. Visible effort is made to link the various goals to each other, particularly when allocating resources such as the Action Funding Request form which requires that funding requests are linked to organizational goals.

Throughout the cycles of planning and program review, evidence was provided of widespread data-driven decision making using data available from the District office as well as data provided by the Center's Institutional Researcher who is shared half-time with Reedley College.

Findings and Evidence

The Center utilizes participatory governance to maintain an ongoing, collegial, and self-reflective dialogue about its improvement of student learning and institutional processes. This dialogue is evident in the various committees, workshops, and paper/electronic communications referenced in the Self Study. Committees meet regularly, have representatives from various constituencies, and have written handbooks and procedures to help facilitate structured dialogue. To reach a broad audience, the Center engages in campus-wide dialogue at the beginning of every semester during the Duty Day event where faculty and staff receive communications, as well as engage in hands-on activities. A review of the August 2011 Duty Day schedule shows broad communication about initiatives to improve student success such as the Scheduling and Reporting System (SARS) early alert, as well as a number of hands-on activities related to planning, program review, and student learning outcomes. For example, in one session, the Center reviewed the 2010 results of the strategic plan as well as a draft of the 2011 strategic plan for feedback. Another example of campus-wide dialogue was at the Spring 2011 Flex Day, where draft planning agendas resulting from this Self Study were reviewed, and specific strategies were identified. This information was then incorporated in the 2011-12 annual strategic planning process. A review of the Flex Day notes shows evidence of collegial discussion for continuous improvement. Broad dialogue at the program level on continuous improvement in student learning is also evident in the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Summits which were conducted throughout the Fall 2010 semesters for full-time and part-time faculty as well as student services. In an accreditation survey conducted May 2010, over 95% of faculty and staff agreed or strongly agreed that "College Center facilitates an ongoing dialogue about improving student learning and institutional processes." Interviews with groups of randomly selected faculty and staff, as well as part-time faculty, confirmed that dialogue about continuous improvement of student learning is frequent and focused on research and data for student success. The institutional researcher, along with other data-savvy colleagues identified through informal relationships, provides assistance to faculty and staff in interpreting the meaning

of specific data elements and approaches to designing assessments. (Standards I.B.1, I.B.4)

Institutional strategic goals are currently established through a participatory process which is led by the College Center Council. As the Willow International campus is currently classified as a Center, the District has chosen to establish a strategic planning process that sets goals for all of the North Centers combined. A review of the strategic planning timeline shows that goals for the Center are developed after the District Strategic Plan is approved. The North Centers use the District strategic goals as criteria to determine their priorities, and the linkage between District and North Center goals are displayed prominently in the North Centers Strategic Plan documents. Other criteria include quantitative data obtained from external scans such as local demographic trends, as well as qualitative sources such as surveys which are broadly discussed in depth at the College Center Council and throughout the Center during Duty Day. (Standard I.B.2)

Evidence suggests that there is broad-based understanding of the goals, and survey data from May 2010 found that 93.5% of faculty and staff agreed or strongly agreed that “The College Center’s planning process is broad-based, offering opportunities for input by all constituencies through established processes and committees.” Numerous faculty and staff expressed satisfaction with the strategic planning process, and confirmed their yearly active involvement in helping the Center create and measure strategic goals. (Standard I.B.4)

There are procedures in place to ensure institutional commitment to the goals. For example, the strategic plan matrix shows that there is a lead person or group assigned and accountable for that goal. Also, the Vice Chancellor is evaluated by the Chancellor annually based on these goals. Goals require specific activities which are often conducted by classified employees, and in those instances those specific activities are added to the yearly performance evaluation goals for the respective classified employees. Furthermore, goals are imbedded and linked through program reviews, and faculty have as part of their contract the requirement to conduct program reviews. (Standard I.B.2)

A review of the most recent North Centers Strategic Plan for 2011-12 shows that most goals are articulated so that the institution can later determine the degree for which they’ve been met. For example, most goals have clear baselines and targets, as well as identified activities which will be conducted to meet the targets. (Standard I.B.2)

The strategic plan is monitored and assessed periodically throughout the year, and the College Center Council receives a midterm report and then a final update on the objectives and accomplishments each spring. The team found the final reports to be clear and direct, indicating what activities had been conducted and whether targets had been met. The majority of goals were fully or substantially fulfilled. In particular, one successfully completed objective led to revised curriculum for all programs that had undergone program review. For unmet goals, the final reports suggested activities for next year’s Strategic Plan. (Standard I.B.2).

Multiple years of strategic plans and final reports, timelines for future planning, as well as standing committees and campus-wide Duty Day planning activities indicate a commitment on the part of the institution to ongoing planning. To integrate planning, all major plans are tied together with explicit links identified between goals. These major plans include the Educational Master plan, District goals, last year's strategic goals, accreditation planning agendas, and this year's goals. A review of the goals matrix provides evidence of this alignment of major plans. Also, certain strategic goals are expanded to create operational plans for major areas such as enrollment management, technology, and future staffing plans. (Standard I.B.3)

In addition to the cyclical strategic planning process outlined above, the institution incorporates ongoing program- and service-level reviews into planning. Unlike the linking of major goals above, the program-level goals do not require explicit linking. Instead, the program review requires a narrative response describing how the program supports the college mission and various aspects of the strategic plan. For program-level goals, it is implied that the goals should support the overall mission of increasing student achievement and learning. That being said, if resources are requested to support program-level goals, the program must show how those goals link to one or more of the above-mentioned major plans such as the master plan and strategic plan. Similar to the strategic plan goals, program review goals are required to be evaluated every year to see if benchmarks have been achieved. The College Center Council evaluates these program reviews. (Standard I.B.3)

Resource requests from programs and individual faculty are done through the Action Plan Funding Request form. As mentioned above, this funding request form requires the writer to state how the resource will tie to specific planning documents. The College Center Council prioritizes this list and develops a list of programs to fund using lottery and grant funds. Once funding is disbursed, programs are required to provide updates to the College Center Council on the progress of funded projects. A random selected group of faculty all confirmed their understanding and satisfaction with the Action Plan Funding Request form, and felt that resource allocations were fair and related to how well each program's request was integrated with college goals. (Standard I.B.3)

Similar to strategic plan updates, program review updates posted on Blackboard indicate that program goals are to some extent being met. The College Center Council provides oversight to objectively review the level to which program goals are met and provides feedback to programs. (Standards I.B.3, I.B.7)

Currently program reviews for the Center are part of Reedley College. As the Center moves towards college status, program review for the Center will be separated out from Reedley College. All Center faculty interviewed were highly optimistic and enthusiastically embraced the program review process. However, a number of faculty identified challenges in working with Reedley College faculty in completing program reviews, feeling that Reedley college faculty were less knowledgeable and less interested in completing the program review process. In all cases though, despite challenges, program reviews were submitted of varying quality to the program review committee for

vetting and feedback. If the programs were not of acceptable quality, they were sent back to the program review authors for revisions with feedback as well as with assistance from the program review chair, fellow colleagues, and the institutional researcher to help programs better understand how to use data for continuous improvement. (Standard I.B.3)

Evidence of changes implemented as a result of planning processes includes a diverse set of resources including new equipment, landscaping, increased staffing, and so forth. (Standard I.B.4)

All the District, college, and program-level planning above are supported by various sources of data and documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance. All major plans include goals that contain quantitative targets. The extent to which those targets are met is communicated in annual follow-up reports such as annual reports for strategic plans, program review, and SLO reports. (Standard I.B.5)

Institutional data are centrally available at the District Institutional Research (IR) office website. Locally collected program and course data is stored in program review and SLO documents which are publicly available on Blackboard. The location of data sources is publicized through various committee meetings and Duty Day presentations, and hard copies are distributed as well. In interviewing a randomly selected group of faculty and staff, all of them knew where to find data from the District IR website, and all have had contact with the college institutional researcher. A review of a sample of program review and SLO documents shows that programs and courses are using assessment data to measure student learning and achievement to make improvements. SLO and program review committees, as well as Duty Day activities and annual progress reports ensure that assessment results are discussed widely. (Standard I.B.5)

While faculty and staff were satisfied with their access to key data on enrollment and student achievement for program review, enrollment management, and other processes involving data-driven decision making, as well as the level of support they receive in interpreting the data to make meaningful decisions, they expressed concern about the limited staffing for institutional research, which in turn limited their ability to request the creation of more sophisticated analyses of student achievement such as cohort tracking and course progression. (Standard I.B.5)

The College Center Council also annually evaluates the collaborative decision-making process itself, and makes changes to improve the model. As evidence of improvement to the evaluation process, the technology plan was updated to better reflect the strategic plan, with specific links identified to strategic goals. Also, based on faculty feedback, the Action Plan Funding Request form was modified to make it easier to complete in terms of tying funding requests to planning documents. The program review process is improved through an oversight committee, who for example recently made a change to program review which now requires data to be disaggregated by distance education (Standard I.B.6)

Conclusions

The Self Study concludes that the Center is at the “Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement” level for program review (ACCJC Rubric on Program Review, Part I). Based on an analysis of program reviews, the program review process which has been refined in each cycle, the broad-based dialogue and input created through formal and informal meetings, evidence that program reviews had led to improvement in student success, and conversations with faculty and staff, the team agrees that the Center is at Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement.” (Standard I.B.3)

With regard to its planning process, the Center demonstrates a conscious and visible effort to create planning for organizational effectiveness and student success, create goals with measurable benchmarks, and make improvements, all while maintaining broad-based dialogue through various formal and informal activities ranging from flex days, committees, department meetings, and frequent informal conversations among colleagues. Visible effort is made to link the various goals to each other, particularly when allocating resources such as the Action Funding Request form which requires that funding requests are linked to organizational goals.

Throughout the cycles of planning and program review, evidence was provided of widespread data-driven decision making using data available from the District office as well as data provided by the Center’s institutional researcher. The Self Study concludes that the Center is at the “Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement” level for planning (ACCJC Rubric on Planning, Part II). Based on analysis of the evidence, the frequent updates of strategic planning and involvement of broad based dialogue to establish goals, the use of specific targets for goals, the number of goals that have had significant progress, the linking of goals to program review and other major plans such as the educational master and technology plans, and the required linking of strategic goals to resource allocation through the Certificated staffing request process and Action Funding process, as well as conversations with faculty and staff, the team agrees that the Center is planning at or near “Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement.” (Standards I.B.1-2, I.B.4)

The Center has a well-thought-out and integrated process for planning which is linked to resource allocation for lottery and grant funds. What is less clear is how resource allocation for the general fund is tied to planning, and then prioritized. The Self Study simply states that general fund budgeting involves a series of meetings with constituents followed by approval by the board. That being said, Standard IIIA describes the process for hiring faculty, which includes filling out a certificated staffing request form. Much like the Action Plan Funding Request form, the Certificated Staffing request form requires the requestor to link the needs of this position to specific goals for one or more of the major plans like college, District, accreditation, etc. The staffing requests are reviewed by division representatives and the list is prioritized. The Vice Chancellor for the North Centers has final approval of the list. Faculty and staff expressed that the process for Certificated Staffing requests was as well-thought-out and evidence-driven as the Action Plan Funding Request, but acknowledged that budget cuts meant that new

additional faculty and staff were less likely to be hired. Also, faculty and staff confirmed and expressed understanding that regardless of the Certificated Staffing process, other faculty and staff were going to be hired who were earlier approved through the transitional staffing plan which is overseen by the College Center Council and which was developed to support the educational master plan. (Standards I.B.3, I.B.4)

In addition to being supported by the District IR office, the Center shares a Research Coordinator with Reedley College who provides local support for ad hoc requests and various other local research projects. A review of the institutional research year-end report shows that the Research Coordinator provided a wide range of data to various constituents such as data packets for instructional and student services program reviews, enrollment data for master planning and enrollment management, and various ad hoc reporting. District and college IR staff lead in the implementation and communication of survey results such as the ACT College Outcomes Survey, and assist faculty in developing and measuring SLOs. A service request form is used to request ad hoc assistance from IR, which requires approval from a manager and the Vice President. No process is documented as to how IR research requests are prioritized, and how they are integrated into planning. The Research Coordinator is also directly involved in the assessment of the Center's effectiveness as a member of the College Center Council, Program Review Committee, and SLO Assessment Committee. Various faculty, staff, and administrators expressed very positive comments regarding their interactions with the college researcher, for both providing data as well as helping to interpret data. Faculty and staff also expressed high satisfaction with requesting ad hoc data, as well working with the researcher to resolve data discrepancies. However, these same faculty and staff expressed concern for the limited number of staff for the Center of .5 full-time equivalent (FTE). Similar comments were also identified by the College Brain Trust consultant, as well as the District Institutional Research staff.

Furthermore, a number of faculty and staff felt that the research office position should be elevated to director level, and integrated into executive-level discussions on planning. While faculty were overall satisfied with the data they received, some felt "guilty" to request too much additional data to measure student achievement since they knew the researcher was "swamped" with work and did not want to burden the researcher. Other staff did not come to the researcher for data as they needed a short turnaround time and felt that the limited number of research staff would not be able to produce the data needed in a short period of time. Both faculty and staff felt that with increased staffing, the Center's institutional researcher could help faculty and staff look into more complex research analyses for student success. For example, faculty members expressed an interest in obtaining information about cohort tracking for students, such as success in subsequent courses in sequences, as well as data about what types of schools their students transfer to. The Center is aware of the need to increase research capacity, and the hiring of additional IR staff is identified in the transitional staffing plan, as well as in the plan identified in the Self Study. Furthermore, conversations with senior administrators identified increasing research capacity as a top priority for future staffing. (Standard I.B.5)

In addition to Center-based research capacity, conversations with District level research staff identified the development of new business analytic reports through Structured Query Language (SQL) as a need. While several senior administrators at the Center were using these reports for enrollment management, as well as student services staff, most academic faculty were not aware of the development of these business information tools, but expressed great interest in being able to help create and receive access to dynamic reports to analyze student achievement and enrollment. Furthermore, the Center's institutional researcher expressed interest in using this tool for automated reporting, and also expressed concern about limited access to key data. The District, in collaboration with the Center, should further explore the possibilities for providing more access and creating more reports based on dialogue with faculty and staff at the Center to increase and enhance the ability of faculty and staff to use data for improvement in student success, and then to provide training and documentation in the use of these tools for current and future staff.

Although there is opportunity to improve access to more data, a recent survey conducted by IR found that 92% of faculty agree or strongly agree that the "College Center uses both qualitative and quantitative data to identify student learning needs and to assess progress towards achieving stated learning outcomes". Any public member interested in assessment results of the Center can find those resources on the above-mentioned IR and Blackboard web pages. Furthermore, as part of the staffing plan, as well as plans in the Self Study, the institution plans to expand the IR office to handle the increasing demands of data and research requests. The Center substantially meets this Standard, but the District needs to implement the transitional staffing plan and to improve coordination of services between District IR and Center IR staff, so as to provide better data availability to Center faculty and staff. In order to increase institutional effectiveness, the Center, in collaboration with the District, should implement a plan that will provide the necessary resources to increase the Center's research capacity to provide support to faculty and staff for obtaining and interpreting data, as well as obtaining new types of data for measuring student achievement as requested by faculty and staff to be used for continuous improvement in student achievement and student learning. (Standard I.B.5)

The Accountability Report for Community Colleges (ARCC) serves as a good tool to look at longitudinal data on student achievement, and compare these trends to the institution's peers. The team examined the 2011 ARCC report and found no major trends in the key performance indicators for the student progress and achievement rate, percent of students who earned at least 30 units, persistence rate, and course completion rate for vocational courses. The team did find improvement in pre-collegiate key performance indicators which include increases in course completion rates for credit basic skills courses, improvements rate for ESL courses, and improvement rate for basic skills courses. Compared to a statistically derived peer group, Reedley College performed near average or above average for all key performance indicators. Previous ARCC data for Reedley College included erroneous data on students which has since been corrected. If the Center becomes a college, separate ARCC data will be generated for the future Clovis Community College. The team understands that the institution is in the process of complying with job placement documentations for its graduates, along with other California community colleges statewide. The team also verified that the Center and

District apply the common standard of the Carnegie unit for hours-per-credited-unit, and that the Center offers no correspondence courses, currently offers no courses involving clinical placement, and no courses requiring conversion of clock hours to credit hours, explained more fully below under Standard II.A. (USDE 602.19(a-e), 602.16, 602.16(a)(1)(viii), 668.8(k)(2); Standards I.B, I.B.3, I.B.5, I.B.1-6, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a-b, II.A.2.f-I, II.A.5; E.R. 10)

Recommendations

1. In order to meet the Standards and to assure adequate quality, the team recommends that institutional functions currently housed at Reedley College and functioning on behalf of Willow International, be established at Willow International prior to its application for initial accreditation. The Center must develop its own processes related to the development and oversight of instructional programs, including an academic senate, a curriculum committee, and the articulation function, and must develop its own processes for support of institutional planning and governance, such as program review and a Classified Senate. (Standards I.B.5, II.A, II.B.1, II.B.3.c, II.B.3.f, II.B.4, IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a)
2. In order for the colleges and District to fully meet the intent of the previous recommendation, the State Center Community College District (SCCCD) must engage in continuous, timely, and deliberative dialogue with all District stakeholders to coordinate long-term planning and examine the impact of the planned increase in the number of colleges and the future roles of the centers on the existing institutions. This includes creating, developing, and aligning District and college plans and planning processes in the following areas:
 - District strategic plan
 - facilities
 - technology
 - organizational reporting relationship of centers
 - location of signature programs
 - funding allocation
 - human resources
 - research capacity (E.R. 4, Standards I.B.5, II.A, II.C.1.a-c, II.C.2, III.A.2, III.B.2.a-b, III.C.1.c, III.D.1.a-c, III.D.2.a, IV.B.1.b, IV.B.3.c)

STANDARD II

Student Learning Programs and Services

A. Instructional Programs

General Observations

The Self Study presented a well-rounded and thorough discussion regarding the instructional programs at the Center as well as the processes used to identify program offerings, the development and use of student learning outcomes (SLOs), program-level learning outcomes (PLOs), and general education learning outcomes (GELOs), as well as other general compliance issues associated with the many Sub-Standards and sections of this Standard. In general, claims are adequately supported by evidence.

The Center provides a breadth of course offerings in general education, transfer, vocational education, and remedial education. The Center also offers a limited number of learning communities within its instructional program. The Center has a process for developing, implementing, and assessing student learning outcomes throughout the curriculum. In addition, the Center provides support services for student learning through a tutoring center. The vocational programs, while limited, appear to focus on the greatest needs of the Center service area. In general, the course offerings, programs and different methods of providing courses and learning support for students align with the mission of the Center and the college District. (Standards II.B.1, II.B.3.b)

Findings and Evidence

The Self Study generally provided adequate information for the purposes of the comprehensive review conducted by the visiting team, and the team felt comfortable drawing conclusions on the Center's compliance with Standard II. The Study had a notable lack of planning agendas, however, for an institution seeking candidacy. It is apparent that the Center would benefit from further development—with emphasis on integrated planning, resource allocation, and the establishment of an identity separate from Reedley College—to move more confidently toward initial accreditation. (ER 21; Standard II.A)

The Center has a small but very active learning communities program that involves a number of English faculty and faculty in other disciplines, including computer science, library, and psychology. The learning communities have incorporated accelerated basic skills English and are paired up with courses from other disciplines. It was clear to the team that the learning communities program is a “grass roots” movement that came out of the efforts of a number of faculty. Faculty who participate in the learning communities coordinate syllabi and course assignments to support the integration of the curriculum between the courses involved in the learning community.

The Center has developed a number of processes to manage and improve course offerings and programs. Some of the processes are based at the Center and are overseen directly by

Center faculty and administration, while other processes are administered at Reedley College. SLOs at the course, program, and degree level are regularly reviewed and changes are made based on these reviews. At the heart of the SLO review and improvement efforts is a comprehensive program review process. The program review process is clearly tied to the Center's educational master plan. In addition, the Center has developed a map that links the course-level student learning outcomes, program learning outcomes, and the general education program learning outcomes. (Standards II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f)

The Center has developed and integrated a strong and thorough process for SLOs, although some courses and programs appear to remain in the early development phase. In addition, the college has provided a wide breadth of courses in a number of different delivery methods and modalities. The SLOs for each course are listed in the syllabus and PLOs and GELOs are widely distributed. There appears to be an institution-wide effort to provide SLO training, and an effort to facilitate dialogue among faculty regarding student learning. Conversations are occurring in a number of arenas, including the academic senate, curriculum committee, and departmental meetings. This includes the use of program review data and research on effective methods of student learning and instruction.

Center faculty have participated in workshops on how to develop and link SLOs, PLOs, and GELOs. The workshops were held in conjunction with Reedley College faculty during fall 2010. In addition, the Center administered the ACT College Outcomes Survey to 300 students in spring 2010. The survey assessed several important areas within the general education curriculum. Data from this survey were then used to help guide the development of SLOs for general education courses and to provide and strengthen the link between course SLOs and GELOs. (Standard II.A.3)

The Center has constituted a Faculty Association (FA), which includes a Faculty Council; the constitution and bylaws of the FA supply the outline for the structure of an academic senate. Based on a review of the FA constitution and bylaws, it is apparent that instituting a fully realized and functional Academic Senate would present relatively few challenges. In addition, the bylaws allow for the creation of a curriculum study committee. Therefore, it would be possible for the Center to establish an independent curriculum committee without having to overcome significant barriers. The FA will likely be the driving force for the establishment of an Academic Senate and curriculum committee, bodies that a freestanding college must have.

The Center shares an institutional researcher with Reedley College. It appears that data provided by the institutional research office are systematically reviewed by the faculty and instructional leaders in an effort to improve the instructional programs.

The Center provides release time for faculty to develop and teach distance education courses. In addition, faculty are supported by a committee that provides support and information on best practices in distance education. (Standard II.A.2.d)

The faculty at the Center have undertaken articulation and curriculum alignment efforts with feeder high schools. This has involved meeting with high school faculty and through the Center's involvement in the Cal-PASS partnership (California Partnership for Achieving Student Success). (Standards II.A.1.a, II.A.6.a).

The general education offerings at the Center conform to the Reedley College general education philosophy. The general education offerings are of an adequate breadth to comply with the appropriate Standards. (Standard II.A.3)

The team examined the Center's schedule of classes, confirming that the courses were meeting enough hours to comply with the commonly accepted Carnegie standard for hours-per-credited-unit. Several instructors were interviewed about the hours they met with students. Courses that are part of a learning community were also examined for compliance with the Carnegie standard, and the team verified that these courses are scheduled and meet the full amount of time to meet this Standard, independent of the other courses in the learning communities (there was no overlap or double-counting of hours). The team also observed numerous online, distance-learning courses, and verified that the courses are being conducted properly (with secure student identity access via user name and passcode) and in accordance with the course outline. The team observed two science lab courses as well, and three regular lecture/discussion courses. The team verified that the Center does not offer any courses involving clinical placements of students, no correspondence courses, and no courses requiring conversion of clock hours to credit hours. Thus, the team concluded that the Center complies with USDE regulations 602.16(a)(1)(viii), 602.17(g) and 668.8(k)(2). (Standards I.B, I.B.1-6, II.A, II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.2.a-e, II.A.2.h, II.A.6.a-c, II.A.3.a, II.A.7, II.B.1, II.B.2.c, II.C.1; E.R. 9)

Conclusions

The Center is building a solid foundation for candidacy. Basic requirements largely seem to be in place, but there remain some operational details to work out before the Center can successfully advance toward full comprehensive college status.

The Center has developed and implemented a robust process for developing, implementing and evaluating SLOs at the course, program, and general education level. It has also begun using assessment data of student learning and achievement in the planning process to improve and strengthen the course, program, and degree offerings.

There is a culture of dialogue at the Center, including steady communication and collaboration between faculty and student services staff. Examples of consistent dialogue taking place can be found in meetings such as the College Center Council, Vice Chancellor's Cabinet meetings, weekly deans meetings with the Vice President of Instruction & Student Services.

How the Center will formally distinguish itself from Reedley College remains unclear. Having a freestanding Center curriculum committee, for example, would be a vital step

toward establishing the Center as independent academic entity. The Center must develop mechanisms to prepare for initial accreditation.

The Center meets the minimum Standards for candidacy. However, the Center has much work to do, very little of which has been clearly set out in its planning agendas. Concrete planning agendas focusing on the details of what the Center needs to do to establish itself as a stand-alone institution. The two-year window for completion to prepare for an initial accreditation visit will be necessary.

Of particular concern is the lack of planning agendas in the Self Study. While the Center as a center of Reedley College has done an excellent job with developing and administering its instructional programs, there needs to be a set of planning agendas that address the ways in which the Center will develop and administer curriculum and SLO review and other oversight processes on their own. The Center appears to be reliant on Reedley College to administer many of these processes. In order to become a college the Center will need to shift the locus of control and responsibility of these processes from Reedley College to their campus. (Standards II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.5)

As the Center moves toward becoming a college, plans to expand and provide better support for curriculum oversight and other instruction-related functions will be predicated on accessing and using new funds the Center plans to receive upon becoming a college. While the plan is to use the existing governance processes to plan the allocation of these funds, it appears that the resources they may receive will be inadequate to cover the additional costs associated with expanding and better support. The Center may want to consider starting the process of determining what its priorities will be for the allocation for any new funds associated with becoming a college that will be used to support curriculum oversight and other instructional functions.

The Center appears to have appropriate and thorough processes for the development, implementation, and assessment of learning outcomes at the course, program, and degree level. There is evidence that shows that the Center's faculty and instructional leaders are engaged in ongoing and meaningful dialog associated with the improvement of student learning. In addition, there is evidence that the faculty and academic leaders at the Center have begun systematically incorporating student learning and achievement data into the course and program planning cycle. This is done primarily through the program review process and is supported by an institutional researcher that is shared between the Center and Reedley College. The team finds that the Center is clearly moving quickly through the "developmental" stage with student learning outcomes (per the ACCJC Rubric Part III), and have well-developed plans to be at the proficiency stage within the next eight-ten months.

The team reviewed the Center's longitudinal data on student achievement and verified that the Center tracks course completion, program/certificate completion and graduation (licensure rates are not currently relevant for the Center), thus complying with USDE regulations 602.19 (a-e) and 602.16, as explained more fully under Standard I.B. (Standards I.B, I.B.1-6, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a-b, II.A.2.f-I, II.A.5; E.R. 10)

The Center has done an effective job articulating courses and working with faculty at the area high schools. The number of students transferring from the Center to universities is high in comparison to other community colleges in the state. The percentage of students completing basic skills courses is also high in comparison to other community colleges. Instructional programs are well managed and have strong, ongoing involvement from the faculty in the processes of curriculum development, program planning, and program review. (Standards II.A.1.a, II.A.6.a).

Commission Standards clearly indicate that the institution must assure quality and improvement, recognize the central role of its faculty in establishing quality and improvement, and rely on the expertise of faculty to determine the appropriateness of each course. While faculty certainly play a role in determining quality and curriculum at the Center, the team does not believe that at this point in the Center's development it has the mechanisms in place to assure quality and improvement and assert the primary role of faculty expertise over the long term. The Center does not have an Academic Senate or a Curriculum Committee solely dedicated to the Center. Rather the Center has established a Faculty Association and within that structure a Faculty Council. As for curriculum the Center participates in the Reedley College Curriculum Committee. (Standards II.A.2, II.A.3)

It can be argued that currently the Faculty Association acts as an Academic Senate and the Faculty Council as the Executive Board of a Senate and that the joint curriculum committee with Reedley performs curriculum and quality assurance for the Center. As the Center seeks candidacy and initial accreditation as a freestanding independent college, however, it is essential that a stand-alone Academic or Faculty Senate and Curriculum Committee be established exclusively for the Center. (Standards II.A.2, II.A.3)

The Center's plan has been to continue the current model of an integrated Academic Senate and Curriculum Committee with Reedley, Madera, and Oakhurst. Continued reliance on this provisional model during eligibility and candidacy—that is, until the Center achieves initial accreditation—is understandable; however, the Commission needs assurance that the temporary bodies can assume the Center's need for a stand-alone Academic Senate and Curriculum Committee that are fully functional and focused exclusively on the needs of Center students. Therefore the team recommends that the Center establish these bodies during candidacy.

In contrast and comparison, the creation of a permanent shared-governance organization has already taken place with the Associated Students. The Board of Trustees approved the Center's Associated Student Association as an Associated Student Government (ASG). Now the ASG is a stand-alone student government body governed by a constitution and bylaws. The Center's ASG will interface with the Reedley and Fresno City College ASG and work through issues and concerns related to the three governing bodies at a District level. One of the impetuses to establish an ASG at the Center was to ensure that students participated in shared governance committees. The same impetus

holds true for faculty representation in the form of an Academic Senate and Curriculum Committee.

Future Self Study reports should be composed using the Institutional Self Evaluation Manual, which will lead to the identification of more planning agendas, which will be beneficial to institutional planning and quality assurance, and will assist the Center to move more confidently toward initial accreditation. (ER 21; Standard II.A)

Recommendations

3. In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the Center initiate appropriate action to ensure that future Self Study reports are prepared in accordance with the ACCJC Institutional Self Evaluation Manual (E.R. 21; Standards II.A, IV.A.4).

See also recommendation 1 under Standard I.B.

B. Student Support Services

General Observations

Willow International Community College Center offers a variety of student support services on site including Admissions and Records, Assessment, Financial Aid, Counseling, Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSP&S), CalWORKs, Veterans and Health Services. Student Services are located in Academic Center Two, which opened in Fall 2010. In addition to in-person services, Willow International offers many matriculation processes in an online format, including application (CCC Apply), online orientation, assessment testing using Accuplacer, Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) and WebAdvisor for financial aid, and course registration via WebAdvisor. Students are able to track their academic progress using a degree-audit program on WebAdvisor and the web-based Scheduling and Reporting System (SARS) Alert allows instructors to identify and connect with students who are having difficulty in the classroom. Probation workshops are offered online in order for students to gain information on success strategies.

Findings and Evidence

The Reedley College two-year catalog, which includes classes at Willow International Community College Center, Madera Center and Oakhurst Center, is accurate and available in identical printed and electronic formats. Addresses, numbers, course, program and degree offerings, academic calendar, information on financial aid, names and degrees of administrators and faculty, and names of the Board of Trustees are readily available. Admissions processes, fees, degrees, certificates and transfer information are included. Policies such as academic dishonesty, nondiscrimination, grievance procedures, sexual harassment, and fee refunds are noted. A District-wide Common Catalog Committee, which includes the Center staff, meets to ensure language in the catalog is consistent and user-friendly. In addition, Reedley College, including Willow International Community College Center, provides students with a schedule of classes that contains all the necessary information for students to follow the matriculation process. The class schedule is also provided in identical printed and electronic formats. (Standards II.B.2.a, II.B.2.b, II.B.2.c, II.B.2.d)

Student Services departments evaluate programs and services through participation in institutional program review every five years, submission of categorical reports, and by dialogue at various meetings on campus. Faculty and student surveys are conducted and data are analyzed by the Office of Institutional Research. Departmental program review reports are reviewed by the Program Review Committee and College Council, which have representatives from administration, faculty, classified staff, and students. Program review recommendations are given in annual program review reports. (Standards II.B.1, II.B.3.a, II.B.3.b, II.B.3.c, II.B.3.d, II.B.3.e, II.B.4)

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) have been developed for all Student Services areas, and these SLOs are linked to both Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and General

Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs). The Spring 2010 Accreditation Survey results indicated the following:

- 87% of the faculty/staff are satisfied with the efforts by the student services division to address the needs of the basic skills students
- 88% of faculty/staff believe the academic counseling services provided at Willow International are helpful to the overall success of the students
- 92% of faculty/staff make students aware of the services and resources available to students from the student services division.

The Student Achievement Data Report for Fall 2007 through Fall 2009 yielded the following information on successful students' completion and retention rates:

- Student success indicators showed an increase in GPA from 2.29 to 2.37
- Student success rate increased 5% over the three-year period
- The percentage of students receiving a "W" decreased from 13% to 10%

These data provide relevant evidence for this Standard. (Standards II.B.1, II.B.3.a, II.B.3.b, II.B.3.c, II.B.3.d, II.B.4)

There is a culture of dialogue at the Center, including Student Services staff, in order to identify and provide needed student support services. Implementation of identified needs has been contingent upon obtaining adequate funding for these services. Administrators, faculty, staff, and students participate in many Willow International Community College Center and District committees, and participants discuss issues related to student success. Examples of consistent dialogue taking place can be found in meetings such as the College Center Council, Vice Chancellor's Cabinet meetings, and weekly deans' meetings with the Vice President of Instruction & Student Services. (Standards II.B.1, II.B.3, II.B.4)

There are numerous ways in which staff at the Center research, identify and provide support in order to meet student learning needs. The Center admissions application has fifteen areas where students can specify special services they may need in order to become successful students. Some of these areas include the need for academic counseling, financial aid, career counseling, and disabled student support. Student support services staff contact students who have identified specific needs and inform them about the services. Through program review, SLO development and assessment, and student surveys, Center staff have created an improvement process in order to meet student needs. Some of the specialized programs and services at the Center include CalWORKs, Child Development Careers-WORKs, Career Advancement Academy (CAA), DSP&S, Student Support Services (SSS) TRIO program, and many scholarship opportunities. (Standard IIB.3)

Meeting students' needs, regardless of location or delivery method, is addressed by student support services in the forms of providing day, select evening, and Saturday hours during peak registration, as well as delivering services via in-person, online, and web-based media. Technology is used throughout student support services to assist students regardless of their location. For instance, students use the following online tools: CCC Apply for the application process, Accuplacer Computerized Placement Test (CPT) for assessment, FAFSA for the financial aid application, and WebAdvisor to assist them

with course enrollment, reviewing academic transcripts, degree audit, adding or dropping classes, and for updating student information. The Center and the District utilize Datatel to access student information and academic records throughout the District. Additionally, the Scheduling and Reporting System (SARS) tracking program assists with scheduling student appointments. Students are able to register for classes using the Touch Tone telephone registration system. (Standards II.B.1, II.B.3.a)

Many programs and services are in place at the Center to enhance students' overall college experience and encourage personal and civic responsibility. These programs include the Associated Student Government (ASG) consisting of members elected by the student body who oversee the ASG budget and serve on campus committees. Counseling offers a Leadership and Development course to promote student leadership, Student Activities sponsors many multicultural activities, and there are a variety of clubs on campus. In addition to activities on campus, the Center has attractive buildings and grounds that enhance the learning environment. (Standard II.B.3.b)

The Counseling Center provides many services, both in person and online, to assist students in meeting their goals of transfer, certificate, degree, or personal enrichment. All counselors meet the minimum qualifications for California Community College counselors and participate in professional growth activities. Counselors provide academic, career and personal counseling for the general student population as well as special counseling including transfer, veterans, DSP&S, CalWORKs, STEM, and Student Support Services (SSS). Counselors create Student Educational Plans (SEP) in conjunction with students so students understand their educational goal and the courses needed each semester to complete that goal.

Center counselors have been active participants in SLO development and assessment since 2006 and they are involved in the implementation of the Strategic Plan. Counselors, representing general and specialized counseling programs, meet monthly to discuss any concerns and to share new information. Some of the services offered through Counseling include the development of an online orientation program, New Student Welcome sessions each fall for new students, Registration-To-Go with high school applicants, Express Counseling in a specific location during peak registration times, SARS Early Alert program to identify students who have potential academic difficulties in the classroom, online probation workshops, online Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), and Live Help which is an online academic assistance program provided in real time during specific days and times. Eighty percent of students who participated in the ACT College Outcomes survey stated they were very satisfied, satisfied, or neutral with the quality of academic advising. (Standards II.B.1, II.B.3.c, II.B.4)

Center faculty, staff, and students embrace a commitment to diversity through a variety of activities, organizations, clubs and support services that show an appreciation of and support for diversity. The Associated Student Government (ASG), the Student Activities office, and some departments on campus provide leadership for campus-wide events including African American History Month, Asian Heritage Month, Cinco de Mayo, an International Holiday Festival, Women's History Month, and Veterans' Day events.

There are many student support programs that assist the diverse student population including Counseling, DSP&S, Student Support Services (SSS) TRIO program, Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) TRIO program, CalWORKs, Veterans' services, and an Honors program. Additionally, in collaboration with the art and English departments, the Willow International Tutorial Center publishes an annual journal, "The North Center Review: A Collection of Student Work from the English and Art Departments at the North Centers." This North Centers student publication features unique student writing from all English course levels, showcases student art and photography, and represents gender, ethnic and age diversity. (Standard II.B.3.d)

Willow International Community College Center utilizes the Accuplacer Computerized Placement Test (CPT) which provides students with recommendations for English (reading/writing) and math course levels. The Office of Institutional Research and instructional staff are responsible for evaluating the validity and reliability of the placement instruments. The Accuplacer Computerized Placement Test (CPT) is a California Community College Chancellor's Office state-approved standardized placement instrument for assessment, and the assessments measure educational levels, disability, interest and performance levels in reading, writing, and mathematics. The validation study, called a "consequential-related validity study," is done to gain agreement on placement decisions between faculty and students. In order to address cultural and/or linguistic bias, the assessment is offered in English online and in paper and pencil formats. The Accuplacer test publisher conducts a disproportionate impact study every three years in order to prevent cultural and/or linguistic bias prior to obtaining Chancellor's Office approval. The test is untimed and special testing accommodations are made for students with disabilities. The paper and pencil version of the assessment are also available in Braille. The ACT student survey indicated that 47% of Willow International students were satisfied or very satisfied with placement into reading/writing and math courses, with 34% of students stating a neutral response, and 9% of students dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the placement process (10% responded as non-applicable). All assessment instruments evaluated for validity and reliability meet rules and regulations of California Title 5 and California Education Code. Assessment instruments used by the Center are validated every six years as part of Reedley College's validation studies. (Standard II.B.3.e)

In coordination with Reedley College, student records at the Center are maintained and secured in compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and as required by the California Education Code. Willow International also follows FERPA rules in the release of student records. Student records are kept in both paper and online formats, and examples of student records include applications, transcripts, counseling, DSP&S, and other departmental records. Hard-copy admission applications dating back three years are kept securely in the Admissions and Records Office at Reedley College. Student information is inputted into the Datatel student record system, and Datatel access is limited to specific authorized users and is password-protected. User access is restricted to those Datatel elements which are appropriate for the user's position and duties. The Center uses the Hershey Singularity system (also known as STARRS), in conjunction with Reedley College, for security of records. All new Admissions and Records files are

digitized within one week, and paper records are shredded. Access to the Hershey system is restricted by password and user name. Recovery of student records is possible as all computer-based data for student records is backed up by Information Systems at the District Office. Specific student services departmental records kept in paper format are stored in secure, locked cabinets or locked offices and are not released without a student's signature and approval based on FERPA regulations. Student workers in all student services areas are required to sign the "Student Worker Confidentiality Agreement" prior to being given access to secure documents (Standard II.B.3.f).

The team examined student complaint files and the process used for student complaints, and verified that the Center's process for student complaints is consistent with the student grievances describe in the Reedley College catalog. There is an informal level, formal grievance filing, and hearing processes as well as appeals if needed. Moreover, the team verified that there has been no pattern of complaint that would indicate the Center or the District has failed to comply with ACCJC Standards, Eligibility Requirements, or ACCJC policies. Thus the team verified the Center's compliance with USDE regulation 602.16(a)(1)(ix). (Standards II.B, II.B.2.c, II.B.3.a, II.B.4)

The Center staff evaluate student support services in order to meet identified students' needs. Evaluations include program review, which is conducted every five years for Student Services, and program review recommendations are shared in annual program review reports. Results are used to improve programs and services. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) have been developed for all student services departments. There are three levels of SLOs that include course or department (SLOs), program (PLOs), and general education (GELOs) outcomes. The Center assessed student satisfaction with services by conducting the ACT College Student Outcomes Survey in 2010, and many departments in student support services have conducted their own student satisfaction surveys, including service delivery for Express Counseling, Registration-To-Go, New Student Welcome, CCC Apply application process, Live Help counseling, online probation workshops, and Health Services. In addition, Student Services are also evaluated through the categorical report process with the California Community College Chancellor's Office. Assessment information is used to assist in the planning program for strategic planning, budget allocation, and staffing needs to improve services to students (Standard II.B.4).

Conclusions

The Center meets Standard II.B insofar as its current status as a center is concerned. The Center provides a variety of Student Services and has a staffing plan that includes the need for additional staff and counselors. A variety of online services are available for students including admissions application, many counseling services, financial aid assistance, and degree audit. Counseling is provided on site in many formats and counselors assist students on campus during peak times with an Express Counseling service in a dedicated location. Some departments are only open during daytime hours and for specific days per week, with the intention of expanding to include some evening hours when additional funding becomes available. There is currently no Extended

Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) program on campus, and administration should pursue providing EOPS services once the Center becomes a college. Some functions currently shared with, or provided by Reedley College (such as student records and financial aid support, noted above) will need to be provided independently as the Center transitions to an independently accredited college. (Standards II.B.1, II.B.3.c, II.B.3.f, II.B.4)

Student services departments evaluate programs and services through participation in institutional program review every five years, submission of categorical reports, and by dialogue at various meetings on campus. Program review recommendations are given in annual program review reports. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) have been developed for all student services areas, and these SLOs are linked to both Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs).

Several Student Services webpages on the Center website need to be updated. Although the catalog and schedule of classes are available online and are accurate, many students go to specific departmental webpages for information. Office location and hours need to be noted and information updated continually.

Commendations

- A. The team commends the Center, especially Student Services, for providing a variety of services to students in numerous delivery formats, showing creativity in a context of limited resources and under circumstances of transition and change. These formats include online and in-person services. Online services include application, assessment, financial aid application, course registration and degree audit utilizing Web Advisor, Counseling Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), Live Help counseling, online orientation, online probation workshop, Scheduling and Reporting System (SARS) Alert, and many web pages to support student success. In-person services include Registration-To-Go in conjunction with local high schools, Express Counseling in a dedicated area during peak registration times, and New Student Welcome sessions, as well as many special programs and services on site. (Standard II.B)

- B. The team commends the Center for emphasizing an appreciation for diversity with Student Activities sponsoring many multicultural activities and the Tutorial Center, in collaboration with North Centers staff and Willow International Community College Center art and English departments, for publishing an annual journal called, “The Review: Journal of Student Literature and Art.” This journal features unique student writing from all English course levels and represents ethnic, gender, and age diversity. (Standard II.B)

Recommendations

See recommendations 1 and 2 under Standard I.B.

C. Library and Learning Support Services

General Comments

Willow International Community College Center has a new 8,000-square-foot library and other learning support services for students. These services include library reference, information competency instruction, library collections, tutoring in a variety of disciplines, writing center, open computer labs, meeting and study rooms, and inter-library loan services. The library provides onsite and online access to its collection and services; training is available to students on site so that library and other learning support services may be used effectively and efficiently. The library has plans to develop online resources to provide the same training opportunities to distance learning students. The Center systematically assesses the services using student learning outcomes, faculty and student input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of its services.

In relation to the needs of the North Centers for library services as identified in Reedley College's accreditation reports, the institution responded by hiring a new full-time librarian for the North Centers and presenting its plan for the new Willow International site, including the library facility now established at the Center's campus. The librarian who had been hired would provide and enhance library services to the North Centers locations. The North Centers also hired two part-time instructional aides to staff the Madera and Clovis library sites in the evenings. Recently, the Center has formulated a transitional staffing plan in collaboration with the District. The staffing transition plan through initial accreditation anticipates the addition of one half-time (17.5 hours per week) librarian and two Library Service Assistants for the Center.

Findings and Evidence

The Center's library is staffed by a half-time librarian (shared with the Madera Center), a full-time Library Services Assistant, and student assistants.

As noted, library services include library reference, information competency instruction, library collections, tutoring in a variety of disciplines, writing center, open computer labs, meeting and study rooms, and inter-library loan services. The library provides onsite and online access to its collection and services; training is available to students on site so that library and other learning support services may be used effectively and efficiently. The library has plans to develop online resources to provide the same training opportunities to distance learning students. (Standard II.C.1)

The Center systematically assesses the services using student learning outcomes, faculty and student input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of its services. (Standards II.C.1e, II.C.2)

The Goals Matrix 2011-2012 cross-references goals for the Willow International Community College Center Strategic Plan, the Educational Master Plan, the identified

accreditation planning agendas, and the SCCCD 2011 Strategic Plan. The library is listed in the matrix as item number 7 but it also figures into the activities and outcomes of a number of other Strategic Plan goals:

<u>Strategic Plan Goals</u>	Educational Master Plan	2010-2011 Strategic Plan Goals	Accreditation Planning Agendas	SCCCD 2011 Strategic Plan
7. Library – evaluate the effectiveness of library services.	Increase collection, particularly periodicals	Goal #5: Student Services	II.C. Increase collection & develop collection policy	4. Demonstrate that programs and services meet needs of students

In addition, during planning and budget dialog, the Center has allocated substantial one-time funds to double the size of the library’s bound book collection from 5,000 to 10,000 volumes. The library is able to provide access to over 23,000 e-books, electronic journals and databases, and other digital resources because of agreements with District colleges and collections and discounts developed by the California College Library Consortium. (Standard II.C.1; USDE 602.17(g))

The library relies on the expertise of the Library Liaison Committee, which is comprised of two members selected from each of the four divisions; one member each from Counseling & Guidance, Health Services, and the Child Development Center, and an ASB Student representative; and standing members of the committee are the Librarian for the North Centers, the Library Services Assistant for Madera Center, the Library Services Assistant for Willow International Center, and a Dean of Instruction (the latter membership alternating between Willow International and Madera annually). (II.C.1.a)

The Liaison Committee members communicate with their discipline colleagues, study collection development resources, and refer to professional journals to create lists of materials to add to the library collection. The minutes of their meetings reflect dialog pertaining to collection development and purchasing strategies. In working within their disciplines they function as ambassadors for the library and provide information regarding library services and resources to other faculty members. This information is especially vital to part-time faculty members who may not have as much knowledge or exposure to the Center’s library or learning support services. The collection, which is fairly small (10,000 volumes), is balanced between fundamental core volumes and recently published books. All materials are selected to directly support student learning and curriculum that fulfills the mission of the institution. (Standard II.C.1.a)

Development of information competency skills is an ongoing endeavor within the library. The librarian engaged in 1,056 reference interviews during 2009-2010. This was during the time when the library was situated in small temporary quarters and thus the number is quite low. This low number also may reflect the limited number of hours the librarian is available for student interactions. In any case, every reference interaction is an opportunity for information competency instruction. The librarian has established student learning outcomes for these one-on-one student interviews. It is not clear that assessment methods have been developed for measuring these SLOs, but student

satisfaction surveys indicate that students are satisfied or very satisfied with service received. (Standard II.C.1.b)

An information competency course outline was developed by the librarian and approved by the Curriculum Committee with the intention of being offered in Fall 2010. The course (LIKBSK1) will be offered in spring 2012 as a co-requisite to a face-to-face learning community (English 125 Basic Skills English—funded by a science-technology-engineering-mathematics, or STEM, grant). In order to establish the contribution of LIBSK1 to student success, data will be collected from the English 125 Basic Skills English sections and analyzed. Similar studies would help establish the efficacy of the Tutorial Center and Writing Center. (Standard II.C.1.b)

A study was undertaken to measure learning from bibliographic instruction sessions. Analysis of the results suggested that there was a problem with the methodology and the study was abandoned. A similar revised study is planned for Spring 2012. In this study, a “post test” will be given to students following bibliographic instruction workshops to measure what they know after the lesson. (Standard II.C.1.b)

Due to budget limitations the library and learning resources are open to students from 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Monday through Thursday, and until 3:00 p.m. on Friday. There are no higher education institution libraries in the region that are open on Saturday or Sunday, including California State University Fresno, Reedley College, or Fresno City College. Online access to online books and periodicals is available 24/7 with user names and passwords provided by the librarian. The certificated librarian is only available on site at the Center 17.5 hours per week. The headcount in fall 2010 was 5,600 and accounted for 1,652 full-time equivalent students (FTES). (Standard II.C.1.c)

The Tutorial Center is open 20 hours per week, but online tutoring is available by the District through services provided by Fresno City College.

Willow International is protected by a radio frequency identification security system which limits theft and enables self check-out. Security cameras have been installed in tutoring rooms, and District police provide security for the library and learning support services. (Standard II.C.1.d)

The Center evaluates its learning resources and learning support services, and assesses their effectiveness, in several ways. The Center library completed its program review in Fall 2009. Included in the results were the following:

Student Learning Outcome 1: When students interact with the librarian and library staff, students will be able to navigate the physical library, library Web site, and understand the services available to them.

Assessment: During the 09/10 academic year the librarian, and library staff, will issue brief surveys available in print and online formats, which evaluate and reveal the student’s ability to maneuver through the physical and virtual library resources, and measure awareness of library services.

Student Learning Outcome 2: When students exit a library instruction session with a librarian they will understand how to access library resources remotely.

Assessment: During the 10/11 academic year librarians during their bibliographic instruction sessions with instructional classes will emphasize how to access quality library resources remotely using our online databases. Students' demonstration of this outcome will be measured by the number of users and searches on our databases, and the number of hits on our Web-based Resources pages.

Student Learning Outcome 3: When students exit a library instruction session with a librarian they will be able to distinguish and use credible, academically-oriented print and online resources to use in scholarly research.

Assessment: During the 11/12 academic year librarians will emphasize the assessment of print and online resources as to their authority, bias, currency, and content. To assess these outcome librarians will consult with select faculty of classes that participated in library instruction sessions to evaluate the quality and content of Works Cited and References pages provided in classroom assignments to identify the number of library provided resources used on scholarly research projects.

Library instructional workshop pre- and post- workshop surveys that were going to be analyzed in Spring 2011 were deemed faulty and data collection and analysis postponed until Spring 2012. The Tutorial Center maintains and monitors enrollment and other data showing utilization of services. (Standards II.C.1.e, II.C.2)

Conclusions

The institution supports the quality of its instructional programs by providing library and other learning support services that are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety to facilitate educational offerings at the Center. The current library and learning support services are sufficient to support the institution's current instructional programs and intellectual, aesthetic, and cultural activities. Further, the Center has demonstrated its commitment to developing the library and learning support services in college planning. It meets the Standard in terms of quality and level of services and support for learning, and how resources and services are planned and selected. (Standard II.C.1.)

The Center has established processes to assess the quality and appropriateness of its learning resources and learning support services, using program review, student learning outcomes, and various quantitative and qualitative assessment data. Some measurements and assessment methods can and should be improved (as noted, it is not clear for example that assessment methods have been developed for measuring the SLOs for library one-on-one interviews—but student satisfaction surveys indicate that students are satisfied or very satisfied with service received). The Center is encouraged to continue developing its assessment methods for library and learning resources SLOs and to continue developing

and implementing studies to determine the efficacy of bibliographic instruction, tutoring and Writing Center services, as well as improving assessments for library instructional workshops. (Standards II.C.1e, II.C.2)

In addition, the Center should conduct research to determine whether additional service hours would benefit students and their learning. It is understandable that budget limitations may lead to restricted hours of service for the Tutorial Center as well as library staffing; however, as the Center works with the District on resource allocations, care should be taken to ensure that learning resources and learning support services are adequate to the assessed needs of students. It is noted, as well, that some services for Center students are currently provided by Fresno City College (specifically, online tutoring). As the Center works with the District on alignment of authority and responsibility for the colleges and centers, care should be taken to ensure that the Center's students' needs are met. Based on the current Self Study and evidence available at the time of the current visit, the team finds that any further necessary staffing adjustments and other resource needs should be addressed in the implementation of the transitional staffing plan for the Center, and through the establishment of an appropriate distribution of resources (District Resource Allocation Model). (Standards II.C.1.a-c, II.C.2)

Commendations

C. The team commends the Center for its Library Liaison Committee, which is comprised of faculty members from all divisions, library staff, and other staff members such as counselors and deans, and student leadership. The Library Liaison Committee enables faculty members to participate in library collection development and build a library collection tailored specifically to Center students and curriculum. The enthusiasm, commitment, *esprit de corps*, and intellectual responsibility of the Committee members is remarkable and a model for similar organizations on other campuses. The Library Liaison Committee's mandate may evolve beyond collection development to include other ways to advance the mission of the college library and in these times of financial challenges such support strengthens the library and strengthens the institution. (Standard II.C.1.a)

Recommendations

See recommendation 2 under Standard I.B.

STANDARD III Resources

A. Human Resources

General Observations

During the fall semester 2010, Willow International Community College Center had an enrollment of 5,600 students or 1652 FTE. The Center currently employs 36 full-time instructional faculty, 133 adjunct faculty, 22 full-time classified personnel, 6 part-time classified personnel and nine administrators. The Center has well-established minimum qualifications and hiring procedures. Policies and procedures are present to ensure that all employees are evaluated periodically.

Human resources services are centralized at the SCCCDC office. There are no human resources staff on the Center campus. All employee files, including applications, resumes, curriculum vitae, original transcripts, etc. are maintained at the District office. In addition, all classified employee evaluations are maintained at the District office. Copies of faculty and management credentials are maintained in the administration office at the Center campus, as well as evaluation materials (with the exception of the Vice Chancellor, whose evaluations are kept at the District office, and the Director of Technology whose evaluations are filed at Reedley College.)

Findings and Evidence

The Center uses the SCCCDC policies for all of its hiring practices. Search procedures, from vacancy announcements to final selection, are clearly outlined and quite excellent. The faculty play a major role in hiring of other faculty. The California 2010 Eighth Edition of the Minimum Qualifications Handbook is cited as the standards used by the institution. All of the full-time faculty hold master's degrees and 21% hold doctoral degrees. The full-time faculty were found to meet the minimum qualifications for the subjects they teach. A sampling of adjunct faculty credentials found none that did not meet the minimum requirements. Approximately 20% of the faculty are full-time and 80% are part-time. The Center uses the services at California State University Fresno for determining equivalency of foreign degrees. (Standard III.A.1.a)

The college has very comprehensive policies for the evaluation of all employees—faculty, classified, and administrators. Faculty are evaluated on achieving student learning outcomes in many ways. SLOs are addressed on student questionnaires, classroom observation forms, supervisor evaluations and self-evaluations. (Standards III.A.1.b, III.A.1.c)

Both the Center and the District maintain written codes of professional ethics or the equivalent for all employees. These documents include the SCCCDC Board Policy #3150 Code of Ethics for Administrators, the section on professional ethics in the agreement

between the State Center Federation of Teachers and SCCCD, and the section on personal conduct in the classified staff contract. (Standard III.A.1.d)

The Center employs 22 full-time classified personnel, 6 part-time classified personnel and nine administrators. These numbers seem sufficient for the physical size of the campus and faculty. For instructional faculty, the Center employs 36 full-time faculty and 133 adjunct faculty. Full-time faculty only constitute 20% of the total faculty. This ratio seems too low. The Center offers 12 AA degrees, 16 AS degrees, 15 Certificates of Achievement and 13 Certificates of Completion in 23 discipline areas. There are some areas in which the Center offers degrees and certificates—such as American studies, associate teacher, and water technology, to name a few—where there are no full-time faculty. (Standard III.A.2)

The Center follows SCCCD Board of Trustees policies and adheres to all employee collective bargaining agreements to ensure fairness in all employee procedures. Policies are cited in the Faculty handbook and on the SCCCD website. (Standard III.A.3.a)

Copies of all faculty records are housed securely in the office of the Vice Chancellor of the North Centers. All other personnel records are housed in the District's Office of Human Resources. All employees have the right to access their records and obtain copies thereof. (Standard III.A.3.b)

The institution has many policies addressing diversity and discrimination. These include Board of Trustees policies 3410 and 3420. The Center has a diverse collection of student organizations. The demographics evidence presented shows the diversity of faculty and staff is representative of the demographics of the area the Center serves. The institution collects data on diversity in hiring and uses it to evaluate its Educational Master Plan diversity objectives. The Center follows Board of Trustees and District policies on nondiscrimination, equal employment opportunity, prohibition of harassment, campus safety, and workplace violence. (Standards III.A.4.a-c)

To address professional development needs, the institution sponsors Flex Day activities, new faculty orientations, sabbatical leaves, study leaves, workshops and conference attendances for all faculty, administrators and classified employees. During the 2009-2010 academic year 106 faculty and staff attended 15 conferences. Forty-five faculty attended a SLO workshop. Conferences and workshops are assessed using participant evaluation surveys. (Standards III.A.5.a-b)

The institution integrates Human Resources planning into its Educational Master Plan, Strategic Plan, Staffing Plan, Facilities Plan and Technology Plan. (Standard III.A.6)

In order to transition into an independently accredited college, the Center will need to address various staffing needs. The Center has collaborated with the District to develop a transitional staffing plan, the highest priorities in which should provide minimally adequate staffing for independence as an accredited institution. This transitional staffing plan addresses needs for administrative and classified support staff. In response to a

question from the ACCJC Eligibility Committee, the Center has also assessed and clarified its needs for faculty to staff its various instructional programs upon accreditation. (Standard III.A.2)

Conclusions

The Center meets the Standard insofar as its current status as an educational center is concerned. When the Center's plan to achieve initial accreditation as an independent college is taken into account, the Center partially meets the Standard.

The District has well developed and detailed human resource policies and procedures. The Center uses these policies and procedures in all of its human resource activities. All employees meet the minimum qualifications for the positions they hold and evaluations are taking place according to established policies. (Standards III.A.1.a-d, III.A.3)

The Center's level of staffing for non-instructional functions is sufficient to meet current needs, given the physical size of the campus and faculty. Given the number of degrees, certificates and courses offered and planned, the institution may not have sufficient full-time faculty to adequately support all of the academic degrees and certificate it offers and may rely too heavily on adjunct faculty. The team encourages the Center to address this need as resources become available. (Standard III.A.2)

In order to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, the team strongly encourages the Center to collaborate with the District to ensure that sufficient staffing resources are allocated for effective operation as an independent, accredited college. The Center has a staffing plan that identifies high priority needs in non-instructional areas, and has mapped out its needs for faculty. The team encourages merging prioritized full-time faculty needs with the non-instructional priorities into an overall set of staffing priorities, and implementing the highest priorities in this plan prior to application for initial accreditation. (Standard III.A.2)

Recommendations

See recommendation 2 under Standard I.B.

B. Physical Resources

General Observations

Willow International Community College Center opened in fall semester 2007 after completion of its first 80,000-square-foot Academic Center One building (AC-1). The campus doubled in size with the opening of its second large structure, Academic Center Two building (AC-2) three years later in Fall 2010. Additionally, the Center operates a child development center, cafeteria, and bookstore and also operates a maintenance plant. All told, planning stages for the new campus are aligned to the Center mission and consistent with the Center and District Strategic Plans.

While the Center's capital expenditures are closely tied to District plans, including the Five-Year Construction Plan, Scheduled Maintenance Plan, the Educational Mater Plan and Program Review, the District only recently hired an architectural firm to develop a comprehensive Facilities Master Plan.

Findings and Evidence

The College Center Council, utilizing faculty, student and staff input, lead the planning for physical resources for the Willow International Community College Center. The College Center Council direction is aligned with the District's and Center's mission statements, Strategic Plans, Educational Master Plans, and Program Reviews, further strengthened through the Facilities Committee, and provides the overarching planning themes. The Facilities Committee, like many of the Center groups, is comprised of representatives from the various Center and District sites as well as members from District/College/Center constituent groups, and develops, monitors, and has implementation oversight of facilities. The Facilities Committee evaluates and recommends revisions of plans and design standards and, via its planning process and Facilities Master Plan goals, guides budget priorities. (Standard III.B.1.a)

Center construction, which falls under the auspices of the California Division of the State Architect, is in compliance with all applicable state and local building codes and also conforms to ADA requirements. (Standard III.B.1.b)

While campus safety and security is overseen by the District Police Department, the primary responsibility for the day-to-day safety and security is a shared responsibility among custodial, maintenance and grounds departments. The Center has an emergency response program that includes several communications and notification modes, tied into the District Police Department as well as the Fresno City Police Department. (Standard IIIB.1.b)

Additionally, health and safety training, covering Injury and Illness Prevention, Hazard Communication, Chemical Hygiene, Blood-borne Pathogen, Hearing Conservation, and Emergency Response, is available online and provided periodically. (Standard III.B.1.b)

Center representatives participate on the Strategic Planning for District-wide Facilities Committee whose purpose is to assist in planning for facilities, personnel, utilities, insurance, supplies, and other operational expenses. And as noted in relation to Standard III.B.1a above, the Center also has a Facilities Committee whose goals include guiding facilities related budget priorities. (Standard III.B.2a)

Center buildings and grounds are well maintained by a crew of six plus one lead custodian assigned to this site. And while operating ratios communicated currently show great productivity—for example, square footage per custodial staff is double that of other sites—total cost of ownership, including staff increases, will need to be revisited and updated. (Standard III.B.2.a)

Center physical resource planning is guided by the Center’s Strategic Plan, the Educational Master Plan, and will be guided by the future Facilities Master Plan, along with the Five-Year Construction Plan. The aforementioned plans are part of the District-wide plans, which helps ensure that planning will drive resource allocation. (Standard III.B.2.b)

Conclusions

The Center is committed to a systematic approach to all planning and budgeting activities, a method that includes the ongoing assessment of future programs, services, and facilities. The process has been well communicated to the campus community and interviews confirmed familiarity and confidence among constituency leaders. Additionally, the development of the college facilities master plan shows strong linkages to the educational master and strategic plans. The evaluation team concludes that the Center’s institutional planning supports student access, programs, learning and success. Insofar as its current status is concerned, the Center readily meets the Standard for integrated planning of physical resources based on student needs and appropriate input. (Standard III.B.2.b)

Insofar as its current operations are concerned, the Center readily meets the Standards for safety, health, security and sufficiency. The team considered the facilities well designed and appropriate to the needs of students. (Standards III.B.1.a-b)

Long-range planning for Center facilities and support are dependent on District planning and require some attention to total cost of ownership. In order to strengthen institutional effectiveness, the District should complete its facilities master plan, which also needs to address total cost of ownership, including appropriate staffing levels. (Standards III.B.2.a-b)

Commendations

D. The team commends the Center on the quality of its facilities and technology to support student learning. The buildings are well designed for educational activities, efficient, and attractive, and the technology hardware and software are up to date and

selected carefully to support student learning and institutional effectiveness.
(Standards III.B.1, III.C)

Recommendations

See recommendation 2 under Standard I.B.

C. Technology Resources

General Observations

The Willow International Community College Center has state-of-the-art technology resources. The campus has over 500 new Dell PC computers with myriad Dell printers and other hardware. The digital media art studio is equipped with 34 new dual-processor Macintosh computers with Adobe Creative Suite software and 30-inch LCD displays. The campus LAN has sufficient bandwidth, and wireless internet access is available everywhere in and around the buildings. There is a large computer center that is staffed with part-time and student technicians for consultation. In addition, there are PCs available in the library and several other classrooms in each of the academic buildings.

Findings and Evidence

Technology services are provided to the Center by the District. These services include the Wide Area Network and Video Teleconferencing. The Director of Technology spends two days a week at the Center. The three North Centers of the SCCCD share a Technology Advisory Committee that conducts technology strategic planning. (Standard III.C.1.a)

There appear to be ample computer resources on campus and classroom technology. A small technology staff (one full-time and 3 part-time) is dedicated to the campus. The campus uses Blackboard for distance coursework. The web site is modern and well maintained. Technology training is offered for all faculty, students and staff. Technology is widespread on the campus and well integrated into academics and support services. (Standards III.C.1.a,b,d)

The Technology Advisory Committee conducts technology strategic planning for the three North Centers. The Technology Advisory Committee also handles planning, implementation, and evaluation of Center's technology resources. The Center's technology plan is integrated into its Strategic Plan. The SCCCD Information Services department maintains the technology infrastructure. The Center has a five-year equipment replacement plan; however, they do not have funding set aside to execute the plan. (Standards III.C.1.c, III.C.2)

Conclusions

The Center's technology resources are coordinated through the community college District and the three North Centers share a technology advisory committee and Director of Technology. Technology planning is efficiently done. Willow International Community College Center is a very new campus and it was built with state-of-the-art technology and ample technology resources. Because the Center is only two years old, the technology equipment is sufficiently new. The Center has an equipment replacement plan. However, funding for the replacement plan has not yet been established. In order to increase effectiveness, the team suggests that the college fund a continuous replacement

cycle for technology equipment. Staffing to support future technology should also be reviewed and addressed in the Center's and the District's transitional staffing plan. (Standards III.A.2, III.C.1.c, III.D.1.a-c, III.D.2.a)

Commendations

See commendation D under Standard III.B.

Recommendations

See recommendation 2 under Standard I.B.

D. Financial Resources

General Observations

State Center Community College District, a fiscally stable multi-college district, is comprised of Fresno City College and Reedley College with the North Centers currently reporting for accreditation purposes under Reedley (administratively, the North Centers form a distinct unit within the District). District finances are very solid and Center resource allocations have linkages to District strategic, master and educational plans to lead toward the Center's candidacy. (Standards III.D.1.a-d, III.D.2.c)

The District audits for the last three years reviewed have resulted in unqualified opinions with no audit findings, attesting to strong financial controls, accuracy and appropriateness of expenditures in compliance with General Accounting Standards Board (GASB) standards. Financial information is readily accessible and regularly disseminated to Center staff with input and oversight from the District Finance & Administration Offices. (Standards III.D.2.a-b, III.D.2.d-f)

The Center's current funding is sufficient to sustain existing financial commitments, but the Center's budgets, moving toward candidacy, need to support additional expenses in human resources, instructional and student services areas. (Standards III.D.1.b, III.D.1.d)

Findings and Evidence

The District maintains strong fiscal policies and procedures in budget and accounting, purchasing, and position control, further supported by unqualified opinions by independent auditors. And financial information is shared and disseminated at the weekly College Center Council meetings, and budget managers are provided real-time access to their respective budget information through Datatel. Furthermore, financial oversight, including the Center finances, financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual agreements, is provided by District financial management staff. This conservative and sound fiscal planning has strengthened the District's financial position. The District's resource allocation model, however, with its intra-District site allocations, is neither well understood nor communicated, as noted in the Self Study. (Standards III.D.1.b-c, III.D.2, III.D.2.a-b, III.D.2.d)

Center planning activities are driven by the Center's mission and goals and include comprehensive Center constituent and administrative reviews, but there was no evidence of assessment of outcomes as part of the Action Plan Funding Request cycle. (Standards III.D.1.c, III.D.3)

As part of its ongoing review and oversight of institutional financial planning, SCCCDCD engages in fiscal scenario planning through District-wide and Center-level committee discussions to establish operating budgets. The budget planning and development process include varying revenue and expenditure projections, agreed-upon enrollment goals, targeted site resource increases as well as reductions as appropriate. While conservatism

is at the fore, the approach has strengthened the institution's financial stability, as evidenced by its strong reserves. (USDE 602-19.a-e; Standards III.D, III.D.1.b-d, III.D.2.b-c, III.D.2.g, III.D.3; E.R. 17; E.R. 18)

Conclusions

The Center partially meets this Standard. The team is concerned that District budget development and fiscal planning efforts do not adequately support Center operations, especially when the resource needs associated with independently accredited college status are taken into consideration.

To fully satisfy the Standard, the Center's Action Funding Request needs to incorporate an assessment piece to evaluate outcomes. The Center is strongly encouraged to refine this process to ensure outcomes are evaluated and that the results of the assessment are taken into consideration in further resource allocations. (Standards III.D.1.c, III.D.3)

The District is in the process of developing a new resource allocation model via a District-wide committee comprised of faculty, staff and administrators from all sites. The team strongly encourages the District to fast-track these discussions, such that the creation and completion of a revised Resources Allocation Model is accomplished prior to the Center's application for initial accreditation. In order to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirements, and to address the resource needs of the Center as it moves to independently accredited status, the Center and District should develop and implement a plan that will provide the needed resources to operate each site effectively. The District plan should include a timeline that will address questions related to the resources needed for effective operation of Willow International Community College Center as an independent college, prior to its application for initial accreditation. (Standards III.D.1.a-c, III.D.2.a, IV.B.1.b, IV.B.3.c)

Recommendations

See recommendation 2 under Standard I.B.

STANDARD IV

Leadership and Governance

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations

Willow International Community College Center has established governance processes and describes them in detail in its Self Study under Standard IV.

The Self Study generally provided adequate information for the purposes of the comprehensive review conducted by the visiting team; however the team was only able to draw confident conclusions on the Center's compliance with Standard IV after review of additional evidence. As mentioned elsewhere in this report as well, the Study had a notable lack of planning agendas for an institution seeking candidacy. The analysis should result in conclusions about institutional effectiveness and educational quality and lead to decisions about what needs to be accomplished to improve. Several of the self-evaluation sections in Standard IV only cite survey data as the basis for asserting that the Standard has been met. The omission of more detailed evidence prohibits more in-depth analysis, leading to the possibility of fewer planning agendas outlining actions to improve. (ER 21; Standards II.A, IV)

The Center's mission, vision, and core value statements establish that the institution is dedicated to excellence in education. Leadership and governance processes appear to be a major factor in the Center's ability to successfully execute its mission. The evidence points to the Center being an institution where there is much collaboration, collegiality and communication, and where leadership recognizes the importance of creating an environment for delivery of quality education to its students.

As a college center that is in transition, the responses to the Standards within Section IV (Leadership and Governance) do not accurately reflect what the eventual governance and communication structure will look like should the Center advance to candidacy and eventual accreditation.

Findings and Evidence

Across the board, faculty, staff, students and administrators indicated that the campus environment provides a sense of community, one in which they feel that their voice is heard and by which they feel empowered to achieve and succeed. Although the Center's Self Study document is somewhat lacking in demonstrating that the Standard has been met, the team found sufficient evidence to draw conclusions concerning the Standard. (Standard IV.A.1)

Written policies outlining constituent group responsibilities for participation in governance are found in Board Policies, North Centers Faculty Association Constitution, and Reedley College Classified Senate By-Laws. These policies provide for faculty,

administrators, staff, and students to have a substantial voice in the development of policies, plans, and budgets that relate to their areas of responsibility. The institution will need to create additional committees for functioning at the college level since some of these functions are currently at Reedley. This action is provided for in the institution's planning agenda. (Standards IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a)

The team verified that the Center has established an Associated Student Government to ensure a role and ability for students to participate in governance and campus culture. The student government is a permanent participatory-governance organization, authorized by SCCCD Board action. The team directly observed that members are very actively and energetically involved in college committees and councils, as well as college events. (Standard IV.A.2.a)

Board Policy 4020, Administrative Regulation 4020, and the Curriculum Handbook establish the policies and procedures for program, curriculum, and course development and modification. The Curriculum Committee must approve all credit courses. The Reedley Academic Senate through its Curriculum Committee is responsible for all aspects of curriculum. The Center faculty and administration are represented on the Curriculum Committee. The program review process is outlined in the Program Review Cycle Three Handbook. This process is another mechanism for obtaining recommendations about student learning programs and services and monitoring these functions. Center faculty, staff, and administration are represented on the Reedley College Program Review Committee. (Standard IV.A.2.b)

Board Policy 2510 establishes the process for participation in local decision-making at the District and the Center. The Board must consult collegially with the Academic Senate on academic and professional matters. Staff opinion and recommendations are considered through participation of the Classified Senate in governance. Student opinion and recommendations are considered through participation of the Associated Student Government. (Standard IV.A.3)

Board Policy 1200 lists integrity as a core value for SCCCD. Board Policy 2720 addresses communications among board members. Ethics policies for trustees and administrators are specified in Board Policies 2715 and 3150. The Center's vision statement indicates outreach and building community partnerships as part of the vision. Core values include integrity, respect, cooperation/collaboration, communication, and responsibility. Faculty utilize an American Association of University Professors ethics statement. Communications with external agencies include two USDE grants awarded to the institution. Board policy 3200 addresses the District's relationship with the ACCJC and requires compliance with ACCJC accreditation processes and Standards. No report of ethics violations or problems of honesty and integrity with external agencies or the ACCJC were noted. In the Self Study review of this Standard, several evaluation conclusions indicating that the Standard had been met are not based on analysis and evaluation such that areas requiring improvement are identified. These sections only contain survey data. (Standard IV.A.4)

The Center subscribes to the Community College League of California (CCLC) Policy and Procedure Service and receives updates to policies on a regular basis. The District's General Counsel also reviews board policies. The Continuous Improvement-Collaborative Decision-Making Process is evaluated annually by the College Center Council. The strategic planning processes, as well as committee and council structures and operational procedures are also evaluated at this time. Modifications are discussed at the fall Duty Day and changes are posted on the website and Blackboard, at the Center and in Faculty Handbooks. A modification in these handbooks was issued in 2010 and discussed at the Fall 2010 Duty Day. Program review processes are assessed by the Reedley College Program Review Evaluation Committee. (Standard IV.A.5)

Conclusions

District and Center leadership have created an environment that promotes institutional improvement. The institution has established written policies to guide governance, and implements them in practice. Governance processes allow participation by constituent groups and implementation of improvement actions. The institution clearly relies on faculty and faculty structures for recommendations about student learning programs and services. The evidence indicates that leadership is effective in enabling the institution identify values, achieve goals, and improve. The Center has established a strong campus culture of collaboration, in which communication among the Center's constituencies occurs readily and regularly. The institution evaluates its processes and communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement (Standards IV.A.1-3, IV.A.5)

Across the board, faculty, staff, students and administrators indicated that the campus environment provides a sense of community, one in which they feel that their voice is heard and by which they feel empowered to achieve and succeed. The Center is to be commended on its inclusive, collaborative and effective campus culture. (Standard IV.A.1)

The team commends the Center and its students for creating the Associated Student Government, a permanent participatory-governance organization, members of which are actively and energetically involved in college committees and councils, as well as college events. (Standard IV.A.2.a)

The institution will need to create additional committees for functioning at the college level since some of these functions are currently at Reedley. This action is provided for in the institution's planning agenda. (Standards IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a)

While the Self Study generally provided adequate information for the purposes of the comprehensive review conducted by the visiting team, in a number of areas the team was only able to draw confident conclusions on the Center's compliance with Standards after review of additional evidence. As noted above and in other parts of this report, the Self Study contains evaluative conclusions indicating that Standards had been met without clear basis in analysis and evaluation, such that areas requiring improvement were not

identified; and in some places the Self Study clearly identified institutional needs or weaknesses and yet presented no planning agenda related to those needs or weaknesses. In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team urges the Center to ensure that future Self Study reports follow ACCJC guidelines more closely. (Standard IV.A.4)

Commendations

- E. The team commends the Center for establishing and maintaining a culture of openness and inclusiveness, where all constituent groups feel a part of the governance of the Center, participate in collaborative decision-making, and exhibit a commitment to achieving the Center's mission. (Standard IV.A.1)

- F. The team commends the Center and its students for creating the Associated Student Government, a permanent participatory-governance organization, members of which are actively and energetically involved in college committees and councils, as well as college events. (Standard IV.A.2.a)

Recommendations

See recommendation 1 under Standard I.B, and recommendation 3 under Standard II.A.

B. Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations

The SCCCD Board establishes policies to ensure that programs and services are of high quality. The Board delegates responsibility to the Chancellor for the operation of the District offices and its colleges. The Chancellor, in turn, delegates responsibility and authority to the Vice Chancellor of the North Centers for the operation of the Center, along with the Madera and Oakhurst centers.

Findings and Evidence

The Governing Board at SCCCD is an independent policy making body. Board Policies 2012 and 2270 establish the authority, duties, and responsibilities of the Board. (Standard IV.B.1.a)

The SCCCD mission statement, vision statement and core values statement are evidence of the District's commitment to quality, integrity and improvement in student learning programs and services. Likewise, the Center's mission statement, which aligns with the District's, demonstrates these commitments. The Center's mission statement is reviewed annually and is posted in classrooms and other prominent locations. Board policies are based on templates received from the CCLC Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Service. (Standard IV.B.1.b)

The Board approves all curricular and student services policy changes and receives reports of educational programs and student support services. The board handles legal matters during board meetings. In addition, the District General Counsel attends board meetings. Financial oversight is accomplished through approval of the budget and review of financial reports. The independent financial audit has shown no findings of reportable condition, material weaknesses, or non-compliance for several years. (Standard IV.B.1.c)

The Board's size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures are specified in Board Policies 2010, 2012, 2210, 2220, 2230, 2260, and 2270. (Standard IV.B.1.d)

The Board subscribes to the CCLC Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Service, which provides regular updates to policies and regulations. Board Policy 2410 requires the Chancellor to provide each board member copies of board policies biennially. There is no specific requirement for review of the policies, however. A spreadsheet listing all board policies indicates the date that each policy was last revised. Although board policies are being periodically revised, the team notes that the frequency and process by which this is accomplished is not clear. At board meetings the SCCCD General Counsel and Chancellor are responsible for ensuring that the Board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The Board President indicated that it is planned that the Board will review policies at special meetings. (Standard IV.B.1.e)

Board Policy 2740 requires a trustee education program that includes new trustee orientation. Trustees have attended CCLC conferences and workshops. A recently appointed new trustee attended the CCLC new trustee orientation. Annual board retreats are also an opportunity for board development. Board Policy 2100 sets forth policy regarding election of board members and provides for four year, staggered terms of office. (Standard IV.B.1.f)

The Board's self evaluation process is set forth in Board Policy 2745. The board evaluation is conducted annually. The results of the evaluation are used to identify accomplishments during the past year and goals for the next year. An evaluation of Board and Chancellor goals was conducted in May 2011. (Standard IV.B.1.g)

Board Policy 2715 establishes the code of ethics for trustees and includes a policy for dealing with behavior that violates the code. (Standard IV.B.1.h)

Board Policy 3200 and Administrative Regulation 3200 establish the policies and procedures for accreditation. The Chancellor is responsible for ensuring that the Board is involved in any accreditation process in which board participation is required. The Chancellor is also responsible for keeping the board informed about the status of accreditation matters and provides the Board with accreditation report summaries and actions to be taken in response to recommendations. An overview of the process for Center candidacy and accreditation was presented to the Board in March 2008, October 2008, and August 2010. The Self Study draft was reviewed by the board in July 2010. Board retreats and discussion at board meetings are used to involve and update the Board on accreditation matters. (Standard IV.B.1.i)

Board Policy 2431 sets forth the procedure for selection of a Chancellor and succession of a Chancellor. Board Policy 2435 outlines the process used in evaluation of the Chancellor. An evaluation is required at least annually using a process developed and jointly agreed to by the Board and Chancellor. Board Policy 2430 provides the policies and procedures concerning delegation of authority to the Chancellor. Board Policy 7250 and Administrative Regulation 7220 describe the recruitment, employment and hiring requirements for educational administrators such as college presidents, vice chancellors, and other administrators. The evaluation procedures for college presidents and vice chancellors are outlined in Board Policy 7125 and Administrative Regulation 6712. (Standard IV.B.1.j)

Based on Standard IV.B.2, the president of a college has full responsibility for functions at the college. In accordance with those Standard subsections, and as one of three centers of Reedley College, the primary responsibility for presidential leadership would typically fall to the President of Reedley College. However, the administrative structure and associated presidential responsibilities for the Center (as well as the other centers) are somewhat unique in relation to this Standard. Upon the development of the North Centers (of which the Center is a part), the SCCC Governing Board, recognizing the eventual transition of at least two of the North Centers (Madera and The Center) to fully-accredited colleges, put into place an administrative structure that parallels that of a

college, effectively treating the three North Centers as one administrative entity. With the institution of that structure, the administration of the North Centers fell under the responsibility of a Vice Chancellor, who fulfills the responsibilities of a college president as outlined within the accreditation Standards. Indeed, with this particular administrative structure in place, the Center received initial confirmation from the ACCJC that it meets the Eligibility Requirements necessary to apply for candidacy.

The Self Study provides evidence that, in a “presidential” role, the Vice Chancellor has provided quality leadership via chairmanship of, or membership on, a number of college governance committees and properly delegates responsibility to other administrators on campus. One of the strengths of the Center is its inclusive culture and commitment to a process of assessment, planning, implementation, resource allocation and re-evaluation that support student learning. This is reflected in the strategic planning process and the Center’s “Continuous Improvement Collaborative Decision-Making Process”, which is directed primarily through the overarching College Center Council (the leading participatory governance body on campus). In addition to his leadership on the College Center Council and in other governance groups, the Vice Chancellor sets the tone for continuous improvement on campus through open communication to Center employees via a number of means such as email and Duty Day presentations. (Standard IV.B.2.a-b)

In addition to implementing statutes, regulations and Board policies, the Vice Chancellor ensures that institutional practices are consistent with both the Center and District policies and missions. He also provides effective fiscal stewardship. As a member of a number of community organizations, the Vice Chancellor maintains effective communication with the community that is served by the Center. (Standard IV.B.2.c-e)

The delineation of Center and District responsibilities is outlined in a detailed mapping document within the Self Study. While the mapping document outlines those responsibilities, evidence within the Self Study suggests that those areas of responsibility are not as widely understood as they could be (results of the employee survey). An orientation workshop to help communicate about District functions was scheduled for September 2011. College Brain Trust recently performed an evaluation of the District organizational structure and effectiveness of responsibilities and found that the organizational structure of the District might be refined to more effectively serve the institutions within the District. Based on interviews conducted with District personnel, it appears that some of the recommendations from the recent consultative report by College Brain Trust are being implemented with an eye toward providing more effective District services. Other recommendations are still being considered. (Standard IV.B.3.a.)

The District has centralized many services for efficiency. The Self Study cites no problems and states that operational efficiency is increased. The feedback mechanism to the District about service issues appears to occur mainly at the Chancellor’s Cabinet. Other District-level committees provide oversight and assessment of services in their functional areas. The District has recently implemented an Administrative Unit Services review program. This program is designed to determine the effectiveness of the services that the District provides to its colleges and centers. The process includes employee

feedback regarding the service as well as the development of administrative unit 5-year plans and goals. (Standard IV.B.3.b.)

Concerning distribution of District resources, the Self Study indicates that the allocation to the Center is currently sufficient to support current financial commitments. However, additional funding is necessary for service expansion and hiring of additional staff and faculty that will be necessary for the Center to function as a comprehensive and independent college. Very recently the District established a District Resource Allocation Model (DRAM) task force to develop a resource allocation model. The task force has completed orientation on its project and is now beginning to collect models from other districts to study. (Standard IV.B.3.c.)

The team's review of District finances associated with Standard III.D confirmed that the District controls its expenditures very well, having established a large reserve which will help the District through the current state fiscal crisis. (Standards III.D, IV.B.3.d)

Board Policies 2430 and 7250 specify the delegated responsibilities of the North Centers Vice Chancellor. Policy 7250 outlines employment requirements for educational administrators. There is a job description for the Vice Chancellor; however, a job description for the new president position (after initial Center accreditation) has not yet been developed. (ER 4, Standards IV.B.2, IV.B.3.e)

The District administration acts as a liaison between the Center and the Board. The Center Vice Chancellor reports to the District Chancellor and attends board meetings. The Vice Chancellor is the spokesperson for all matters involving The Center. Exchange of information between the Center and the District occurs in a number of ways, including District-wide participatory committees such as the Chancellor's Communication Council and the Educational Coordinating and Planning Council. It is the responsibility of representatives on these councils to bring information for discussion and consideration at the District level and to disseminate information back to their respective constituencies following action by the councils. The Board also encourages information exchange by placing special presentations on their agendas and holding at an annual meeting at each site location, in addition to regular publication of their agendas and minutes. Discussion with constituent group leaders validated that the communication at the Center on governance matters is very effective. (Standard IV.3.f)

This Standard requires the District to regularly evaluate its role delineation and governance and decision-making processes to assure their effectiveness in assisting the colleges to meet their educational goals. The Center indicates that this is accomplished at the Center itself through annual evaluation processes within the College Center Council and that role delineation between the District and the Center is accomplished through the SCCCDC Functional Map. A separate report on review of governance and decision-making at the District level was not found. (Standard IV.B.3.g)

Conclusions

District and Center leadership have created an environment that promotes institutional improvement. Governance processes allow participation by constituent groups and the implementation of improvement actions. Evidence indicates that leadership is effective in enabling the institution to identify values, achieve goals, and improve. However, the team considers that the District needs to take an aggressive stance towards ensuring that the Center will be ready for initial accreditation within two years after candidacy is granted, including addressing any recommendations for evaluation and improvement of District services and provision of adequate resources.

In addition to District support of initial accreditation, the Center needs to begin preparations in earnest for independence in all areas of instruction and student support to include governance structures such as appropriate councils and committees.

Review of evidence confirms that the Center has a governing board responsible for establishing policies to assure quality, integrity and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services of the Center, as well as assuring its financial stability. The SCCCCD Board adheres to a policy for the selection of the chief administrator of the Center as well as the chief executive of the District. The Board exercises policy-making independence, and its policies are consistent with the missions of the District and the Center. The Board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity, and it publishes its bylaws and policies concerning board size, roles and responsibilities. The Board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws, and frequently evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary. (Standards IV.B.1.a-e)

The team noted, however, that there is no specific requirement for review of the policies by the SCCCCD Board, and that while board policies are being periodically reviewed and revised when necessary, the frequency and process by which this is accomplished is not clear. The Board clearly plans to adopt a more rigorous process for review and revision of its policies. In view of this planned change, the team recommends that the District document the proposed review process. (Standard IV.B.1.e)

Review of evidence confirms that the SCCCCD Board has a program for Board development and new member orientation. The Board's self-evaluation processes for assessing Board performance are clearly defined and are used. The Board has a code of ethics and a procedure for addressing Board member behavior that violates the code. The SCCCCD Board has been well informed about the accreditation process. The Board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the Chancellor, and delegates to the Chancellor the implementation and administration of Board policies across all sites of the District. The Board also has a defined process for selecting and evaluating college presidents within the District. (Standards IV.B.1.f-j)

The team confirmed that the Vice Chancellor of the North Centers serves as chief executive officer for the Center, or "college president" for purposes of this Standard. In

this role, the Vice Chancellor exercises the appropriate responsibilities, and has an appropriate level of authority to administer the educational offerings and services of the Center. Insofar as Center operations, leadership and institutional integrity are concerned, the current administrative leadership of the Center meets the Standard for the purpose of continuing accreditation as an educational center under the accreditation of Reedley College. As the Center is applying for candidacy toward initial accreditation, however, the team points out that the District must ensure full-time responsibility and authority as a college president in order to meet this Standard upon initial accreditation. The team encourages the District to move forward with an appropriate adjustment, and notes that a similar recommendation is pending based on the College Brain Trust consultant study. (Standards IV.B.2.a-b)

Through review of evidence, the team confirmed that the Vice Chancellor implements statutes, regulations, and Board policies, and assures that institutional practices at the Center are consistent with the Center's mission and with SCCCD Board policies. He also controls budget and expenditures effectively, and represents the Center effectively to the community served by the Center. (Standard IV.B.2.c-e)

In relation to the organizational structure and effectiveness of responsibilities and services performed by the District for the various educational centers and colleges in the District, the team found the recent study by the College Brain Trust, which was presented in evidence by the Self Study, to be a valuable contribution to the ongoing effectiveness of the District. The team encourages the District to implement appropriate recommendations from this study, and to address the needs identified therein, in order to improve understanding of, and effectiveness of, District services to the Center as well as other sites in the District. (Standard IV.B.3.a-b.)

The team also notes, from interviews with Center as well as District staff, that District services can be more regularly evaluated with respect to their effectiveness, and improvements made on the basis of the assessments. The team encourages the District to continue with implementation of its new District Unit Services Program Review process. Moreover, while this unit services program review process puts a long-term, repetitive cycle in place, a more specific, and perhaps timely, review of District services is necessary to ensure that appropriate services will be available at The Center when it obtains initial accreditation. It is recommended that the District conduct such a review of services as part of the preparations to achieve initial accreditation for the Center. (Standard IV.B.3.b.)

The team verified that the District is engaged in developing a District Resource Allocation Model to clarify the appropriate distribution of resources to the colleges and centers of the District. The completion of this work is essential for the District to be able to demonstrate that the Center will have adequate financial resources and staffing resources to function as an independently accredited college. It is recommended that the District establish a realistic timeline for development and implementation of a new resource allocation model. (Standard IV.B.3.c.)

The team verified that the District does an excellent job controlling its expenditures, and is to be commended on its fiscal strength during a time of state fiscal crisis. (Standard IV.B.3.d)

In his current role, the Vice Chancellor of the North Centers fulfills the responsibilities of the president, and while the current administrative structure at North Centers seems to be effective operationally, in order to strictly meet the requirements of Standards IV.B.2 and IV.B.3.e, as well as Eligibility Requirement 4, the CEO position should have full-time responsibility for the Center only. The team verified that the District Chancellor gives full responsibility and authority to the Vice Chancellor of the North Centers to implement and administer delegated District policies without interference, and holds the Vice Chancellor accountable for the operation of the Center. As noted above in relation to Standard IV.B.2, however, the District must ensure full-time responsibility and authority is provided to a college president for the Center exclusively, in order to meet this Standard upon initial accreditation. The team encourages the District to move forward with an appropriate adjustment. Regarding the centers at Oakhurst and Madera, it is understood that the decision of how these centers will be administratively controlled has not yet been made. This matter is also addressed in Eligibility Requirement 4 (ER 4) since that ER requires that the college president be full-time. The team urges the District to determine how the Oakhurst and Madera Centers will be administratively controlled so that ER 4, as well as Standards IV.B.2 and IV.B.3.e will be met. (ER 4, Standards IV.B.2, IV.B.3.e)

Through review of evidence, the team confirmed that the District acts as the liaison between the Center and the SCCC Board. (Standard IV.3.b.f.)

While role delineation between the Center and the District has been clarified through the SCCC Functional Map, the team did not find a separate report on review of governance and decision-making at the District level per se. The team recommends that the evaluation process for District governance and decision-making be clarified and made readily available. (Standard IV.B.3.g)

Recommendations

4. In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the District document the process for review of board policies and ensure that District governance and decision-making processes are regularly evaluated. (Standards IV.B.1.e, IV.B.3.g.)

See also recommendation 2 under Standard I.B.