

EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

For

**EDUCATIONAL QUALITY AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
IN SUPPORT OF APPLICATION FOR INITIAL ACCREDITATION**

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

**A Confidential Report Prepared for the Accrediting Commission
For Community and Junior Colleges**

**This report represents the findings of the External Evaluation team that visited
Clovis Community College Center from March 9, 2015 to March 12, 2015**

Dr. Kindred Murillo, Chair

May 5, 2015

LIST OF TEAM MEMBERS

Chair

Dr. Kindred Murillo
Superintendent/President
Lake Tahoe Community College

Assistant

Ms. Lisa Shafer
Executive Assistant to the Superintendent/President
Lake Tahoe Community College

ACADEMIC REPRESENTATIVES

Faculty

Ms. Marcy Alanraig
English Professor and SLO Coordinator
Cabrillo College

Faculty

Dr. Kelly Cooper
Instructor, ICS, Digital Media, Business
West Valley College

Faculty

Dr. Fermin Irigoyen
Professor of Communication Studies
Skyline College

Mr. Vincent Jackson
Dean of Academic Affairs & Workforce
Development
Los Angeles Trade Technical College

Dr. Leandra Martin
Vice President of Instruction
Mission College

Ms. Kim Morrison
Library Coordinator/Information Literacy and
Outreach Librarian
Chabot College

ADMINISTRATIVE REPRESENTATIVES

Dr. Kathleen Hart
Superintendent/President
San Joaquin Delta College

Dr. Julianna Barnes
Vice President, Student Services
San Diego Mesa College

Ms. Michelle Marquez
Vice President Administrative Services
Canada College

OTHER REPRESENTATIVES

Research

Dr. Lan Hao
Director of Institutional Research, Planning,
and Effectiveness

Trustee

Dr. Teresa Brown
Trustee
San Joaquin Delta College

Summary of the Report

INSTITUTION: Clovis Community College Center

DATE OF VISIT: March 9, 2015 through March 12, 2015

TEAM CHAIR: Kindred Murillo
Superintendent/President, Lake Tahoe Community College

A team of thirteen professional educators (team) visited Clovis Community College Center (Center) from March 9 through March 12, 2015, for the purpose of evaluating educational quality and institutional support for an initial accreditation through the assessment of the Center's performance relative to the Accreditation Standards, and the compliance with the Eligibility Requirements and Accrediting Commission for Junior and Community Colleges (Commission) policies.

The team members prepared for the visit in advance by attending an all-day training session February 9, 2015 conducted by Commission personnel. The team also reviewed the Self Evaluation Report on Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness in Support of Application for Initial Accreditation (Self Evaluation Report), previous documents submitted for accreditation candidacy, and assessed the various forms of evidence provided by the Center.

Prior to the visit, team members provided written assessments of the Center's Self Evaluation Report, reviewed the evidence, and identified areas for investigation during the campus visit. Before visiting the Center, the team met and reviewed issues, concerns and needs for additional evidence. Interviews with Center faculty, staff, committees, and leaders were scheduled Tuesday morning until Wednesday afternoon. The team conducted two open forums to listen to interested stakeholders, as well as met with various governance groups, campus leadership, and faculty. Members of the evaluation team met with members of the State Center Community College District (District) Governing Board (Board). The team met originally with five members of the board together and later two members via phone conference. Later the team requested individual meetings with Board members after several issues emerged.

The Center was organized and prepared for the visit. Above all, the College demonstrated a sincere enthusiasm for the work of the accrediting team, as the visit was the culmination of many years of focused progress toward becoming a college. The entire Center community provided the visiting team with a welcoming and very accommodating environment. The team had access to evidence, faculty, staff, students, and committees. The Center community and Board demonstrated their commitment to the accreditation process through their writing, actions, and prompt responses to any inquiries.

Throughout the entire visit, the team was impressed with the interactions with faculty, staff, administration, students, and board members. While the Center's Self Evaluation Report was a bit lengthy, it was highly reflective and demonstrated the enthusiasm the faculty, staff, and management have for becoming a college. The Self Evaluation Report could provide more direct correlation to answering the Standards. The team in several instances had to work at demonstrating the Center met the Standards through interviews and additional evidence.

There is pride in working together on behalf of the community and students, which thrive on the campus and is apparent in the way people treat each other and the Center's students. It was evident that the Center faculty, staff, administration, and the District Office personnel are enthusiastic and committed to the Center becoming a community college. While some issues arose with the Board and prior compliance with their Board Policies and delegation to the Chancellor, it was clear the Board is holding itself accountable for meeting the Standards. The Center becoming a college has created an impetus for the Board to work together on behalf of the entire District.

Overall the Center is ready to take on the responsibility of a College. It has positioned itself well through budget allocations from the District, staffing appropriately to take on the additional requirements of a college and has a collegial culture that provides a basis for a strong governance system. The Center is not mature yet in respect to totally understanding the ramifications of becoming a college, although clearly has the drive, knowledge, and ability to develop the maturity that comes with running a college in a multi-college district. This maturity and understanding can only happen when they have received accreditation and operate as a community college. The team overwhelmingly supports the approval of the accreditation.

Introduction

In 1964, State Center Community College District (District) was formed to include Fresno City College and Reedley College. The District serves over one million residents, 18 unified and high school districts in a 5,500 square mile area that including both urban and rural communities. The District serves most of Fresno and Madera counties and portions of Kings and Tulare counties. A seven-member board of trustees represents seven trustee areas within the district. Total district enrollment for the fall semester 2013 is over 33,789 students.

The Clovis site was established in 1992, when the District purchased property at Herndon Avenue where a former private college had resided. In 1992, the District established an entity called the “North Centers” which included Madera, Oakhurst, and Clovis Centers, under Reedley College. The North Centers grew to serve 9,200 students through offering 1,100 classes with a budget of over \$19.5 million.

In 2003, the Board completed the acquisition of 110 acres for a permanent site located at Willow and International Avenues in Fresno. The Center opened in fall 2007. The Center offers 42 degrees and 23 certificates to assist students as they transfer to universities, pursue career technical education, and develop basic skills required for college success. Approximately 19 % (2011-12 data) of all enrollments are in distance education (DE), and course success in DE sections appears to have comparable success and retention rates as students taking face-to-face equivalent courses.

The Center’s age distribution trend has been consistent over the years, with a small increase of students in the 20-24 age range. Seventy four percent of the Center’s students are under the age of 24, which is similar to the District. The ethnic group distribution is 45% White/non-Hispanic, 34% Hispanic, 13% Asian/Pacific Islander, 4% African-American, and 1% American Indian. There has been a 9% growth in the Hispanic population since 2009 and during the same period, experienced a decrease in White/non-Hispanic students.

Enrollment status has remained relatively stable over the past six years with continuing students fluctuating between 58 and 66%, and first time students between 23 and 27%. The Center serves a primarily day load with 4,536 enrollments attending during the day in fall 2013 and 995 in the evening. For the last five years, between 48 and 50% of students take 12 units or more.

Student success indicators show that the GPA for the college has remained around 2.37 for the past five years. Over the same period of time, there has been a 2.5 percent increase in students who have successfully completed a course with a grade of A, B, C, or CR; retention rates have increased about 1.7 percent from 90.1% to 91.8%; and the attrition rate has dropped from 9.9 to 9.2%. Actual transfer numbers have dropped during the recent 2013-14 year after remaining relatively steady for five years.

Major Findings of the 2015 Evaluation Team

Commendations

Commendation 1 – Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

The team commends the Center on its inclusive and collegial planning and dissemination processes.

Commendation 2 - Instructional Programs

The team commends the Center on the organization and student-friendly format of both the 2014-15 Catalog and Spring 2015 Class Schedule.

Commendation 3 – Student Support Services

The team commends the Center for its Associated Student Government and their elected leadership for their professionalism and dedication to the Center. Student leaders are actively involved in participatory governance committees, and in improving campus life and the learning experience for all students.

Commendation 4 – Instructional Programs and Student Support Services

The team commends the Center for its commitment to creating clear pathways for prospective high school students through its outreach efforts and through its strong high school partnerships and programs.

Commendation 5 – Student Support Services and Human Resources

The team commends the Center for its strong student-centered culture and spirit of collaboration as demonstrated in its development of “Creating Opportunities: One Student a Time” program. The team’s observation was that entire culture is enveloped in supporting the students.

Commendation 6 – Human Resources

The team commends the faculty, staff, and administrators for their commitment to serving students and moving the Center toward college status, with limited resources. The campus spirit of collaboration and collegiality of the entire staff is demonstrated through the obvious care of their students, and the surrounding community.

Commendation 7 – Physical Resources

The team commends the Center staff for its student-centered design, clean, and well maintained facilities. The student focused learning areas stand out as a distinctive

attribute of the Center. The facilities promote a positive teaching and learning environment.

Commendation 8 – Technology Resources

The team commends the Center for the commitment to providing state-of-the-art instructional equipment that is interwoven into the Center’s programs and services.

District Commendation 9 – Financial Resources

The team commends the District for building healthy reserves with a conservative and realistic budget. The strong financial leadership and investment from the District has allowed the Center to build operations that are sufficient to transition to a college campus. It was apparent the District Board and leadership are committed to the Center moving toward College status through their financial support and encouragement.

Commendation 10 – Leadership and Governance

The team commends the Center’s leaders for creating an environment conducive to improvement, innovation, and institutional excellence. Faculty, staff, students, and administrators effectively support one another in service of student success.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1 – Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends the Center ensure evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data. The Center is encouraged to use more data and evidence in its cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation implementation, and re-evaluation processes toward continuous improvement in programs and services. (I.B.3, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.)

Recommendation 2 - Instructional Programs

In order to increase institutional effectiveness, the team recommends the Center expand their current best practices in SLO assessment and the analysis of its results at the course level to program, certificate and degree, and general education student learning outcomes. The team recommends that the results of the SLO assessment at all levels be used to support decision making to improve student learning. (IIA.1.c, IIA.2)

Recommendation 3 – Instructional Programs

In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the Center institutionalizes the best practices in regular and effective student contact as outlined in the Distance Education Handbook approved by the Academic Senate. (II.A.1.a)

Recommendation 4 – Student Support Services

In order to increase institutional effectiveness and assure equitable access and success among the Center’s diverse student body, the team recommends that student support services accelerate the use of student learning outcomes and equity data to inform activities, programs, and services. (II.B.3.a, II.B.4)

Recommendation 5 – Human Resources

In order to increase institutional effectiveness, the team recommends the Center analyze the level of its future staffing requirements as it moves toward college status. It further recommends the Center use the results of that assessment to ensure a stable and sufficient number of faculty, staff, and administrators to support the College’s mission and provide quality and equitable access to students. The team recommends this analysis consider library resources, institutional research, and other critical areas that will emerge as the Center transitions to a college. (II.C.1.a, II.C.1.b, II.C.1.c, III.A.S, III.A.6, IV.B.2.a)

Recommendation 6 – Financial Resources

In order to increase institutional effectiveness, the team recommends the Center review existing budget development processes to improve information communication, dissemination, and inclusion of the Center community in collaborative decision-making, prioritization, allocation, and use of funds. (III.D.1.d, III.D.2.c)

District Recommendation 7 – Financial Resources

In order to increase institutional effectiveness, the team recommends the District Budget and Resource Allocation Advisory Committee evaluate the current resource allocation model to determine appropriateness and effectiveness, and communicate the process and results widely across the district. (IV.3.c)

District Recommendation 8 – Leadership and Governance

In order to increase institutional effectiveness the team recommends that the Board continue to make a concerted effort to learn about, and act in a manner that is consistent with, its policies and bylaws. The team also recommends the Board conduct regular reviews of its policies and procedures, particularly related to board operation and behavior. (IV.B.1.a-j)

District Recommendation 9 – Leadership and Governance

In order to increase institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the Board improve its performance through continuing its efforts to allow the Chancellor to fully exercise the authority of his/her position to improve the effectiveness of the District. (IV.B.1.a)

Evaluation of Institutional Responses to Candidacy Recommendations

In February of 2012 the Commission requested the Center address three areas, after a comprehensive evaluation visit. These areas included one Eligibility Requirement, a Center recommendation, and a District recommendation as follows:

Eligibility Requirement 4 – Chief Executive Officer: The institution has a chief executive officer appointed by the governing board, whose full-time responsibility is to the institution, and who possesses the requisite authority to administer board policies. The institution informs the Commission when there is a change in the institutional chief executive officer.

Recommendation 1: In order to meet the Standards and to assure adequate quality, the team recommends that the 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, 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)

Recommendation 2: This is District Recommendation 1 in the Reedley College and Fresno City College reports. As recommended by the previous accreditation team and affirmed by this visit, the State Center Community College District (District) 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 Center on the existing institutions. This includes creating, developing, and aligning district and college plans in the following areas:

- District strategic plan
- Facilities
- Technology
- Organizational reporting relationship of centers
- Location of signature programs
- Funding allocation
- Human resources
- Research capacity

(Eligibility Requirement 4 and Standards I.B.5, II.A, II.C.1.a-c, II.C.2, III.A.2, III.B.2.a-b, III.C1.c, III.D.1.a-c, III.D.1.c, III.D.2.a, IV.B.1.b, IV.B.3.c)

The Center and District addressed all three issues in the submission of the October 15, 2012 Addendum. The ACCJC sent a letter to the Center on March 6, 2013 stating the

Center “has met all of the requirements of Candidacy” and requested the Center seek state approval before applying for Initial Accreditation. The Center received approval from the California Community Colleges Board Governors in May 2014.

Eligibility Requirements

The team found Clovis Community College Center (Center) to be in compliance with the eligibility requirements set forth by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges.

- 1. Authority:** The team confirmed that Clovis is a public two-year Center of Reedley Community College operating under the authority of the State of California, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and the Governing Board (Board) of the State Center Community College District (District). The Center is accredited by the Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), Western Association of Schools and Colleges and complies with the California Education Code and the California Code of Regulations through Reedley Community College.
- 2. Mission:** The team confirmed that in order to reflect the most current priorities of the institution, the Center conducts periodic reviews and updates of its mission statement. The Center incorporated the mission into the strategic planning process, which was reviewed at Board workshops and approved by the Board on July 2, 2013. The mission was widely vetted in Center-wide meetings, as well as incorporated into Center documents, publications, and planning materials.
- 3. Governing Board:** The team confirmed that the District has a functioning governing board responsible for the quality, integrity, and financial stability of the district. The Board is comprised of seven-members elected by the voters from the local communities by trustee districts, and serve four-year terms. Student trustees are elected from each College to serve in an advisory capacity.

The team confirmed the Board is an independent policy-making body capable of reflecting constituent and the public interest. The Board adheres to conflict of interest policies and ensures the interests of the board are disclosed annually.

- 4. Chief Executive Officer:** The team confirmed that the President (President) serves as the chief executive officer who has primary authority and responsibility for leadership and management of all programs and services provided by the Center. Upon recommendation of the District Chancellor, the Board appoints the President. The President possesses the requisite knowledge and authority to administer board policies.
- 5. Administrative Capacity:** The team confirmed that the Center has sufficient administrative staff with appropriate preparation and experience to support the mission and purpose of a college.
- 6. Operational Status:** The team confirmed the Center is operational, with students actively enrolled in degree and certificate programs. The Center also serves students

interested in completing occupational/vocational programs, as well as the needs of special populations.

7. **Degrees:** The team confirmed that the Center offers over 50 degree and/or certificate programs that lead to certificates, associate degrees, and/or transfer to four year institutions.
8. **Educational Programs:** The team confirmed that the Center's degree programs are congruent with its mission to provide associate in arts and science degrees, occupational certificates, and transfer education preparation. Programs are based on recognized fields of study in higher education, are of suitable content and length, present sufficient variety within disciplines, and are conducted and maintained at appropriate levels of quality and rigor.
9. **Academic Credit:** The team confirmed that the Center awards academic credit for coursework based on generally accepted practices in degree-granting institutions of higher education and in compliance the California Code of Regulations, Title 5. All degrees, certificates, and courses are listed in the Center's catalog and on the website.
10. **Student Learning and Achievement:** The team confirmed that the Center has a variety of collaborative processes in place to ensure the integrity of its instructional programs. The Center defines course, program/degree, and institutional learning outcomes, assesses these student learning outcomes, and engages in meaningful dialogue leading to continuous improvement.
11. **General Education:** The team confirmed that the Center students pursuing degree programs are required to take a significant number of general education courses. General education requirements are designed to cultivate a breadth of knowledge and encourage intellectual inquiry, with a significant emphasis on demonstrated competence in writing and computational skills, and an introduction to some of the major areas of knowledge. The Center incorporates critical thinking, reading, speaking and listening, and personal ethical standards, along with awareness and appreciation of diversity through learning outcomes into general education coursework. The team verified the quality and rigor of the Center's general education is consistent with the academic standards appropriate to higher education.
12. **Academic Freedom:** The team confirmed that the District has adopted an Academic Freedom policy (BP 4030) and adheres to the policy. The Board supports and promotes academic freedom through leading a culture in which intellectual freedom and independence are valued. The academic freedom statement is published in the Center catalog.
13. **Faculty:** The team confirmed that the Center employs a sufficient core of full-time instructional and non-instructional faculty (51) with the full-time responsibility that includes development and review of curriculum and the assessment of learning, as well as library services, health services, and counseling. All faculty members possess

minimum qualifications in professional training and experience to conduct the institution's educational programs.

- 14. Student Services:** The team confirmed that the Center offers a wide variety of student services to support student learning. These services are aligned with the institution's mission and support student learning and development; additionally, these services are offered through multiple formats in order to serve the Center's many student populations. These services are focused on retention and success and are regularly assessed. The student services the Center provides are clearly evident and are institutionalized into the culture.
- 15. Admissions:** The team confirmed that the College's adopted and published admissions policies and practices are consistent with its mission and are in compliance with the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 5.
- 16. Information and Learning Resources:** The team confirmed the Center provides appropriate information and learning resources to support its mission and the student learning outcomes of its programs appropriate to the format or location where offered. The Center has made a significant effort to ensure electronic learning resources are readily available to all students through various databases and services.
- 17. Financial Resources:** The team confirmed that the Center, in conjunction with the District, has the necessary funding base, financial resources, and projected financial development to address financial stability. State general funds, tuition and fees, grants and contracts are the primary sources of revenues. The Center and District have excelled at managing resources during the recent budget downturn and are in excellent financial condition.
- 18. Financial Accountability:** The team confirmed that the Center, in conjunction with the District, undergoes annual independent external audits, and makes these audits available to the public. The District has received unqualified audits on its financial statements for the past five years and is in compliance with federal and state mandates.
- 19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation:** The team confirmed the Center uses data about student achievement and learning in its planning and resource allocation processes. The planning model is integrated with student learning outcomes assessment, program review, and resource allocation. The Center's planning process is also integrated with the other colleges within the district (Reedley and Fresno) and District strategic plans. The Center is developing a culture of integrated planning and evaluation that is clearly institutionalized.
- 20. Public Information:** The team confirmed that the Center publishes the mission, purposes and objectives; course, program, and degree offerings; admissions requirements; fees and refund policies; requirements for degrees, certificates, graduation and transfer; names of Board members; major policies affecting students;

and related items in the catalog, class schedule and other appropriate web locations. The team examined the Center's grievance/complaint procedure and complaints for the preceding five years. There were no patterns identified that indicate deficiencies in standards, eligibility requirements, or accreditation policies.

21. Relations with the Accrediting Commission: The team confirmed that the Center consistently adheres to the requirements, standards, and policies set forth by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. The Center has created a culture that is committed to the spirit of accreditation principles of continuous improvement.

Compliance with Selected United States Department of Education Regulations and Commission Policies

Public Notification of an Evaluation Visit and Third Party Comment

- The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of a comprehensive evaluation visit.
- The institution cooperates with the evaluation team in any necessary follow-up related to the third party comment.
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions* as to third party comment.

The team verified that the institution made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of the comprehensive evaluation visit. The Center posted a link to the Self Evaluation Report under the eNewsExpress. This site directed the public to the form associated with the draft report to make public comment. Members of the community attended the two “Open Forum” public sessions provided by the team to make comment, and the comments were positive about the partnerships the Center had established in the community. It was obvious people in the community were aware of the initial candidacy application, as they commented favorably regarding the efforts of the Center to become a College. There were no adverse written or verbal comments submitted.

Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement

- The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance across the institution, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. Course completion is included as one of these elements of student achievement. Other elements of student achievement performance for measurement have been determined as appropriate to the institution’s mission.
- The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance within each instructional program, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. The defined elements include, but are not limited to, job placement rates for program completers, and for programs in fields where licensure is required, the licensure examination passage rates for program completers. The institution-set standards for programs and across the institution are relevant to guide self-evaluation and institutional improvement; the defined elements and expected performance levels are appropriate within higher education; the results are reported regularly across the campus; and the definition of elements and results are used in program-level and institution-wide planning to evaluate how well the institution fulfills its mission, to determine needed changes, to allocating resources, and to make improvements.
- The institution analyzes its performance as to the institution-set standards and as to student achievement, and takes appropriate measures in areas where its performance is not at the expected level.

The team verified the Center has defined elements of student achievement performance across the institution, and has identified expected measures of performance. As the Center is still operating under the accreditation of Reedley College, successful efforts have been implemented to break out the research data to ensure the Center is on strong footing as an accredited college. Benchmarks have been set and are assessed, and student learning outcome assessments at the course, program and institutional levels were verified. The results are reported annually to the College Center Council.

Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

- Credit hour assignments and degree program lengths are within the range of good practice in higher education (in policy and procedure).
- The assignment of credit hours and degree program lengths is verified by the institution, and is reliable and accurate across classroom based courses, laboratory classes, distance education classes, and for courses that involve clinical practice (if applicable to the institution).
- Tuition is consistent across degree programs (or there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition).
- Any clock hour conversions to credit hours adhere to the Department of Education's conversion formula, both in policy and procedure, and in practice.
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits*.

The team verified that credit hour assignments and degree program lengths are within the range of good practice in higher education. The Center, operating under Reedley College, conforms to the minimum program length of 60 credit hours for the associate degree. The Center has also established policies and procedures determining a credit hour, and adheres to the policies and procedures. The Center demonstrated that it implements accepted practices when awarding credit, complies with the California Education Code (Education Code), and the California Code of Regulations Title 5 (Title 5). The Center demonstrates that all courses, regardless of modality, operate under the same rigor and transferability. The Center awards credit based on the Carnegie unit, and complies with the Commission Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits.

Tuition is consistent across degree programs and is consistent with the Education Code and Title 5.

Transfer Policies

- Transfer policies are appropriately disclosed to students and to the public.
- Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to accept credits for transfer.
- The institution complies with the Commission *Policy on Transfer of Credit*.

The team verified the Center discloses transfer policies appropriately to students through the catalog, website, and Student Support Services. Articulation agreements between California State University and the University of California are available on the Center's website. The Center policies contain information about criteria the institution uses to accept credits for transfer, and the Center complies with the *Commission Policy on Transfer of Credit*.

Distance Education and Correspondence Education

- The institution has policies and procedures for defining and classifying a course as offered by distance education or correspondence education, in alignment with USDE definitions.
- There is an accurate and consistent application of the policies and procedures for determining if a course is offered by distance education (with regular and substantive interaction with the instructor, initiated by the instructor, and online activities are included as part of a student's grade) or correspondence education (online activities are primarily "paperwork related," including reading posted materials, posting homework and completing examinations, and interaction with the instructor is initiated by the student as needed).
- The institution has appropriate means and consistently applies those means for verifying the identity of a student who participates in a distance education or correspondence education course or program, and for ensuring that student information is protected.
- The technology infrastructure is sufficient to maintain and sustain the distance education and correspondence education offerings.
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the *Commission Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education*.

The team verified the Center has developed and used policies and procedures for defining and classifying course offerings. Courses are approved through the Curriculum Committee and are aligned appropriately with the Course Outline of Record. The Center has developed and is institutionalizing the Distance Education Handbook, which is a strong best practices guideline.

The Center is consistent in their application of policies and procedures for course determination, and requires a supplemental application for distance education. The Center demonstrated that it has a process for verification and identification of students who participate in distance education or correspondence education. The security of these students is protected through secure login and passcode protocols.

The Center uses the appropriate technology to maintain and sustain distance education through the Blackboard Learning Management System and other technology solutions. Online student support services are available in the admissions, academic, counseling, early alert, orientation, financial aid, and registration areas.

The Center demonstrates that it meets the requirements of the *Commission Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education*. The Center ensures that distance education courses adhere to the same quality standards and learning outcomes as the face-to-face courses that it offers.

The Center has put a significant emphasis on quality for distance education through the establishment of the Distance Education Technology Advisory Committee, the Distance Education Co-Coordinator, and the Distance Education Committee.

Student Complaints

- The institution has clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, and the current policies and procedures are accessible to students in the college catalog and online.
- The student complaint files for the previous six years (since the last comprehensive evaluation) are available; the files demonstrate accurate implementation of the complaint policies and procedures.
- The team analysis of the student complaint files identifies any issues that may be indicative of the institution's noncompliance with any Accreditation Standards.
- The institution posts on its website the names of associations, agencies and governmental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the institution and any of its programs, and provides contact information for filing complaints with such entities.
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the *Commission Policy on Representation of Accredited Status* and the *Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions*.

The team verified the Center has a clear policy and procedure for handling student complaints as evidenced in Administrative Regulation (AR) 5530. The Center faculty and staff have used the informal resolution process identified in AR 5530 with success, as there were no pending complaints or grievances.

The Center maintains student complaint procedures on the website at Current Student/Student Support Services /Complaint. Links were available and functioning to all appropriate agencies listed in the complaint processes. The team verified the Center demonstrates compliance with the *Commission Policy on Representation of Accredited Status* and the *Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions* through appropriate posting and access to complaint procedures and processes.

Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials

- The institution provides accurate, timely (current), and appropriately detailed information to students and the public about its programs, locations, and policies.
- The institution complies with the *Commission Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status*.

- The institution provides required information concerning its accredited status as described above in the section on Student Complaints.

The team verified the Center provides accurate, timely, and appropriately detailed information to students and the public through its website, catalog, and schedules, as well as its Student Conduct Standards, and Grievance Procedure Handbook. The Center complies with the *Commission Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status*.

As noted earlier the Center provides information on its accredited status.

Title IV Compliance

- The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program, including findings from any audits and program or other review activities by the USDE.
- The institution has addressed any issues raised by the USDE as to financial responsibility requirements, program record-keeping, etc. If issues were not timely addressed, the institution demonstrates it has the fiscal and administrative capacity to timely address issues in the future and to retain compliance with Title IV program requirements.
- The institution's student loan default rates are within the acceptable range defined by the USDE. Remedial efforts have been undertaken when default rates near or meet a level outside the acceptable range.
- Contractual relationships of the institution to offer or receive educational, library, and support services meet the Accreditation Standards and have been approved by the Commission through substantive change if required.
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the *Commission Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations* and the *Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV*.

Until the Center becomes a fully accredited college, the Title IV Compliance is under the authority of Reedley Community College. Also, until the Center is a fully accredited college it does not have its own default rate. It is worthy of note that the Center is fully prepared and set up to implement its own financial aid program, and has set up processes that are in compliance with Title IV requirements. The Center does not have any contractual relationships. The Center is fully prepared to comply with the *Commission Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations and the Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV*.

Note: The completed Appendix E: Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with Federal Regulations and Commission Policies is attached to this report.

Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement

The team verified the Center has defined elements of student achievement performance across the institution, and has identified expected measures of performance. As the Center is still operating under the accreditation of Reedley College, efforts have begun, and are successful, at breaking out the research data to ensure the Center is on strong footing as an accredited college. Benchmarks have been set and are assessed, and student learning outcome assessments at the course, program and institutional levels were verified. The results are reported annually to the College Center Council.

STANDARD I

INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND EFFECTIVENESS

Standard I.A - Mission

General Observations

The Clovis Community College Center (Center) mission statement was approved by the District Board of Trustees on July 2, 2013. The Center's mission is well aligned with the State Center Community College District's (District) mission. Both emphasize access, diversity, student learning, and success through innovation and student support.

The Center is intentional in its mission statement, addressing its broad educational purposes and its commitment to achieving student learning. The mission statement, with the value statements embedded, is published in many documents and posted in public places around the campus.

Findings and Evidence

The Center's mission and values statement define broad educational purposes and a strong dedication to student learning. The mission defines the intended student population as "community". Although it is evident from team interviews that "community" is a very meaningful word for Center administrators, faculty and staff, this broad term may create future issues with the use of data analysis to measure how well the Center addresses the needs of its student population. The Center has developed student-centered learning programs, student services and ancillary programs aligned with its purpose, character, and student population. (I.A)

The Center reports achievement data consistent with the mission statement. These data have not been disaggregated by age, gender, or ethnicity (except within some categorical programs) although they will be in the near future. Presentations at planning meetings display rich data content.

The Center uses its mission to drive institutional planning and decision making as evident in their commitment to student learning. The process is documented in the Continuous Improvement-Collaborative Decision Making Process. The use of this process is evident in the minutes of the key committees such as the Enrollment Management Committee, Student Success Committee, Program Review/Student Learning Outcomes Committee, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Curriculum Committee and College Center Council. The process reflects a data-aware, collegial culture that regularly links back to the mission statement, educational master plan, strategic plan, integrated planning/participatory governance handbook, planning matrix, and program reviews. (I.A.1, I.A.4)

The District's Board of Trustees approved mission statement is published in the Center catalog, schedule of classes, on posters in classrooms, on the website, and in additional

public places around the Center. It is evident that the mission statement is visible on campus and is well known by the staff members on campus. (I.A.2)

The most recent version of the mission statement was widely vetted by Center constituent groups. The Center has established a process for the review of the mission, through the Student Success Committee, that was adopted by the College Center Council. The mission and values statement is reviewed and evaluated on a regular basis. (I.A.3)

Conclusions

The Center meets the standard. The mission statement emphasizes the achievement of student learning and is communicated internally and externally. The mission is central to the Center's planning and decision making processes as evidenced by the fact that each committee is asked to review the mission statement at the first meeting of the academic year. The Center uses quantitative and qualitative data in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation. The Center Continuous Improvement – Collaborative Decision Making Process chart shows that integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation begin with the Center's mission, vision, and values. The Center's mission statement drives continuous quality improvement efforts to verify and improve programs and services through its focus on student learning and success. The Center is encouraged to review and possibly refine the mission statement so that it defines the intended student population in a way that supports data analysis and reflection toward meeting the needs of its student population relative to its location, resources, and role in higher education.

Planning at the Center is integrated with all elements of the planning process. Results from the accreditation survey indicate a high level of agreement that planning is broad-based with opportunities for input from all constituencies.

The Center can make better use of data in planning and decision-making, including but not limited to the Enrollment Management Committee. The Center is in growth mode and needs to be strategic and intentional about expanding and meeting students' needs. It is important that the Center creates time and space for committee members to review data together, discuss their meaning and implications for the Center, and develop corresponding action items derived from data.

To improve effectiveness and to measure progress toward achieving specific goals, the team encourages the Center to refine future benchmarks or targets based upon their data analysis and other institutional metrics, so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed.

STANDARD I

INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND EFFECTIVENESS

Standard IB – Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

The Center has a collegial culture on campus, as campus interviews revealed people enjoy working with each other. Faculty offered they felt supported by the Center administration, adjunct faculty described an inclusive work environment, and classified staff cited they are respected as professionals. All stakeholders described productive and representative consensus at committee meetings. The Center partners and articulates courses with area high schools.

The Center's planning model has five steps: 1) Evaluation; 2) Integrated Planning; 3) Resource Allocation; 4) Implementation; and 5) Re-evaluation and Improvement. The Strategic Plan matrix aligns goals for the following five plans: the District Strategic Plan, Educational Master Plan, 2013-2017 Center Strategic Plan, accreditation planning agendas, and the Campus President's Goals. The Center is currently in the second year of a 4-year strategic plan. An Annual Progress Report (APR) documents progress made in the Strategic Plan. The Center annually reviews the strategic plan on Duty Day.

A newly created strategic plan sub-committee will conduct ongoing assessment and planning. Program review is the major planning and assessment process at the Center; their comprehensive 5-year cycle integrates with SLO assessment.

Center faculty, staff, and administration assess objectives and goals in the strategic plan annually through a planning matrix and/or annual report. In addition in the fall of 2014, a Process Review was conducted to collect feedback from faculty and staff regarding the perception of the processes of strategic planning, resource allocation, program review and SLO assessment. The Center has not had the opportunity to share and discuss the findings from this survey.

The Institutional Researcher, assigned 50% on the Clovis campus, meets basic Center research needs on campus ranging from providing program review data packets, to conducting faculty and staff surveys, to supporting ad hoc research requests from the campus, in addition to attending committee meetings and providing mentoring to committees and departments at the outset of their program review cycle.

All constituency groups are involved in the planning process as evidenced by the Duty Day review of the mission and results of previous year's strategic plan objectives. Membership of the College Center Council includes representatives from faculty, administration, classified staff, and students. All standing committees are well represented. Accreditation survey results support the claim that the Center's planning process is broad-based.

The Center uses two primary mechanisms for assessment of the evaluation process. The first is program review and the second is varying types of surveys. An example student survey is the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) and an example staff survey is the planning process survey, a survey of the effectiveness of the existing planning process on strategic planning, program review and SLO assessment.

SLO assessment results are used to inform practice and change. One example is a child development class; the pass rate was increased from 60% to 82% after a re-design of the class assignments, as reported from an onsite interview meeting.

SLO assessment is integrated into the program review process. Comments gathered from the interview meetings with faculty and staff members who work at the Center describe a shift in SLO culture from compliance mode to SLO assessment viewed as an opportunity for reflection and change.

Findings and Evidence

The institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes through well attended and constituent represented committees such as the Enrollment Management Committee, Student Success Committee, Program Review/Student Learning Outcomes Committee, College Center Council, Educational Coordinating Planning Committee, Academic Senate, Classified Senate and Curriculum Committee. The college structures its dialog by creating handbooks and guides that detail the purpose, process, and assessment. For example, the five-year cycle of program review includes student learning outcomes review and assessment, program review (comprehensive or update), annual action plan funding requests, and action plan outcome assessments for measuring funded projects. Strategic plans and annual updates are informed by this dialogue and the constituent groups link back to the Strategic Plan, Educational Master Plan and Planning Matrix, among other guides, for a purposeful approach to dialogue that incorporates a collective understanding of the meaning of evidence, data and research used in the evaluation of student learning. (I.B, I.B.1)

Sample evidence of the college embracing and understanding the purpose of the dialogue and impact it has on student learning includes well-defined program reviews, a high rate of completion of student educational plans (SEP), a collaborative resource allocation guide (action plan funding request process), and a rich collection of data.

The November 2014 update of the 2013-2017 Center Strategic Plan tracks completed and ongoing goals, prioritizes objectives by year and demonstrates progress toward achieving goals. There is a broad-based understanding of the goals and the processes to implement them and institutional commitment to achieving them. (I.B.2, I.B.3)

The Center assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation and re-evaluation.

Administrators, faculty, and staff are enthusiastic and collegial participants. Institutional data are relevant and available. Additional training in the use of data and a deeper understanding of analysis and interpretation will lead to more measurable goals and evaluation of data toward continuous improvement.

The Center has an annual planning process in place designed to coordinate improvement planning, implementation, and re-evaluation. The Planning Matrix aligns the Educational Master Plan, 2013-2017 Center Strategic Plan Goals, Accreditation Planning Agendas and the Campus President's Goals with the District Strategic Plan Goals for planning at the campus level. Student Learning Outcomes, Program Review, the Action Plan Funding Request Process, and Action Plan Outcome Assessment Form close the loop of continuous quality for planning at the program level. Data and evidence available include the above documents, student demographic data, survey data, meeting minutes, enrollment management reports, and additional guides such as the Distance Education and Technology Plan, Student Equity Plan, and Integrated Planning-Participatory Governance Handbook 2014-2015. The primary internal communication group is the College Center Council, where all constituent groups are represented. This group links back its decisions to the Center mission and strategic plans. (I.B.4, I.B.5)

The Center reviews and modifies its planning and resource processes annually within the College Center Council. Constituent groups, administrative, faculty, staff, and student as well as committees such as the Enrollment Management Committee, Student Success Committee, Program Review/Student Learning Outcomes Committee, College Center Council, Educational Coordinating Planning Committee, Academic Senate, Classified Senate and Curriculum Committee are represented on the College Center Council. The Institutional Researcher presents data and advises on analysis and implications for improvement. College Center Council meetings are well attended, and on-site interviews observed them be well organized, consistent and reflective. As Center data become distinct from District data, the College Center Council is well poised to expand and deepen its re-evaluation toward fostering improvement. (I.B.6)

The Office of Institutional Research has done an outstanding job of providing data and reports to the Center, as evidenced by the Institutional Research Year End report. Current evaluation methods are substantial considering one 50% assigned researcher. Expansion to a 100% researcher, slated to begin immediately, will offer additional opportunities to assess evaluation in areas such as disaggregating student success by ethnicity. Current evaluation processes and results significantly contribute to improvement in programs and services through the program review, budget allocation, enrollment management, student services and educational planning processes. For program review, each department provides annual updates to their program review. The College Center Council reviews all funded initiatives annually for their achievement and future needs. The Enrollment Management Committee assesses courses for enrollment and pathway completion. Student Services measures student participation in areas such as SEP completion. As the Center becomes a college, the existing planning and evaluation methods will scale, and the collaborative committees will further tie data to improvement. Recommended emphasis for this transition is the use of data in strategic and intentional planning for

growth to include meaningful time for existing committees to dialogue and reflect so that action items may be, in great part, derived from data. (I.B.7)

Conclusions

The Center meets the standard. Planning at the Center is integrated with all elements of the planning process. Results from the accreditation survey indicate a high level of agreement that planning is broad-based with opportunities for input from all constituencies.

The Center can make better use of data in planning and decision-making, including but not limited to the Enrollment Management Committee. The Center is in growth mode and needs to be strategic and intentional about expanding and meeting students' needs. It is important that the Center create time and space for committee members to review data together, discuss their meaning and implications for the Center, and develop corresponding action items derived from data.

To improve effectiveness and to better measure progress toward achieving specific goals, the team encourages the Center to improve their benchmarks or targets based upon their data analysis and other institutional metrics, so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1 – Improving Institutional Effectiveness

In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends the Center ensure evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data. The Center is encouraged to use more data and evidence in its cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation implementation and re-evaluation processes toward continuous improvement in programs and services. (I.B.3, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.)

STANDARD II - STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Standard II.A - Instructional Programs

General Observations

The Clovis Community College Center (Center) offers high-quality degree and certificate programs that are in alignment with its mission. The Center offers 754 courses per year in 39 areas of study. The number of students enrolled has increased by almost 12% between Fall 2010 and Fall 2014. Due to the increasing student demand for classes, a satellite site, the Herndon Campus, was established in Fall 2015. This site does not include 50% of a program at this time. Currently, the majority of courses are offered in a face-to-face format, although some courses are offered in a hybrid or Distance Education modality.

The Center ensures that student learning takes place as evidenced through a review of documents, processes, and minutes. Faculty, staff, and administrators care deeply about student success and work diligently to maintain the quality of its courses, programs, and services. The student learning was verified by interviews with faculty, staff and administrators during the site visit.

The Center has defined student learning outcomes for all of its courses. The program, degrees, and certificate level student learning outcomes (SLOs) are defined as areas of study. General Education learning outcomes include communication skills, critical thinking and information literacy, global and community literacy, and personal development. Course level SLOs are mapped to program SLOs and the general education student learning outcomes (GELOs).

Course and student services SLOs are assessed as part of the annual program review cycle, and the results are captured in annual reports. Comprehensive program reviews are performed every five years, and all courses and student services SLOs are assessed within the program review cycle. Course curriculum, including the course SLOs, is currently on a five-year cycle as part of the program review cycle. Course level SLOs may be updated more frequently if desired, through the curriculum review process. The assessments are used in both the annual and comprehensive program review documents to assess student learning and to provide evidence to support resource allocations if appropriate. The assessment data is sometimes used to promote improvement in student learning outcomes if appropriate.

The Center developed the Distance Education Handbook in 2014; the Faculty Senate approved it in January 2015, with plans to implement the policies outlined in the document after the institution is granted college status. The handbook was co-written by the Distance Education Co-Chairs as part of the Distance Education Strategic Plan 2014-2017. This document includes the Standards for Teaching and Learning for quality distance education courses, the Student Integrity and Authenticity Guidelines and the

Student Support guidelines for Center. Blackboard is used as the learning management system for DE courses.

The Center publishes clear and accurate information about its courses, programs, and policies in its catalog, course schedule, and website.

Findings and Evidence

The team confirmed the Center offers programs that are relevant to and meet its mission. The Center has been collecting student data since it was established as a center in 1992 for Reedley College. The Center tracks demographic data including gender, age, ethnicity, enrollment status, academic levels, day and evening enrollment, and unit loads. The Center also collects student success data including English and math basic skills improvement, GPA, retention, completion, transfer rates, and enrollment in CTE courses.

The current schedule of courses has been developed based largely on past enrollment data, course fill rates, and course wait lists. The counseling department created a course grid of required courses for ADT degrees. This grid was used by departments to ensure that all courses required for ADT degrees would be included in the schedule of classes. Assessment of student learning is integrated into the planning process through the current program review and resource allocation process.

The Center interacts with the surrounding community through effective partnerships and programs with local high schools. One example of this is Center English faculty worked with high school faculty in a project that significantly increased the number of high school students assessing into college level English. (II.A.1, II.A.1.a)

The Center makes use of a variety of delivery systems and modes of instruction that are appropriate to its students' needs. These include face-to-face, distance education, and hybrid courses. Guidelines for distance education, in alignment with ACCJC distance education standards, including policies regarding regular effective student contact are contained in the Distance Education Handbook, 2014. Although the Center Academic Senate has approved the policies, compliance mechanisms may not be currently in place to ensure that faculty follows these policies. Faculty evaluations are under the preview of the district/faculty union contract. Currently, the approved form does not include a review of regular effective student contact as part of the peer evaluation process although, according to faculty interviews, this is often done on a volunteer basis. A review of Distance Education Courses by the evaluation team indicated that the vast majority of these courses included discussion boards and other indicators of regular effective student contact, although it was not always clear that the level of student interaction was sufficient to meet the guidelines fully. Evaluation of distance education math courses for effective student contact was particularly problematic because the courses did not use Blackboard as the primary learning management system. (II.A.1.b)

Courses offered off-site at the Herndon Center are held to the same standards for quality and evaluation as courses offered at the Center. Appropriate support services personnel

from Admissions and Records and Financial Aid are located at the Herndon Center as needed. In addition, a shuttle bus regularly runs between the Herndon Center and the Clovis Center during normal class hours. (II.A.1.b.)

All courses, regardless of mode of instruction, complete the same Course Outlines of Record documentation; however Distance Education or Hybrid courses also complete a request for Course via Distance Learning addendum that must be approved by the department chair/dean and curriculum committee. Currently, all curriculum must be approved by Reedley College until the Center achieves accreditation as a college. The distance education addendum currently being used was developed by Reedley College; however, a revised form, contained in the Distance Education Handbook, is expected to be approved by the Center Curriculum Committee and will be implemented after the Center transitions to college status. At that time, a predetermined, state-approved list of courses and programs will be approved to be offered at Center, and the curriculum committee at the Center will be officially activated. All courses and programs approved or revised after that date will go through the Center curriculum process. The Curriculum Committee reviews each course, regardless of delivery or mode, and determines its appropriateness for the institution. As part of this process, the SLO coordinator reviews the SLOs to ensure that they are appropriate. All courses are reviewed and updated every five years as part of the program review process. Data on the student success and retention of DE courses versus face-to-face courses are supplied to discipline faculty as part of their comprehensive program review process. Using student and service area data assessments, faculty and administration recommend appropriate course delivery systems and modes when courses are scheduled. (II.A.1.c)

It is clear that SLO assessment, particularly at a course level, is integrated into the culture of the Center. SLOs have been developed for all of the Center's courses and most programs, degrees, and certificates. Course level SLOs are mapped to program-level SLOs and appropriate GELOs. Assessments have been identified for each course-level SLO and are assessed on a regular basis, although the rigor and sophistication of both the SLO assessment methods and analysis of SLO data varied widely across the institution. The SLO Coordinator provides regular training individually, during professional development days, and through the program review process to educate the Center on best practices.

Departments meet annually to discuss the results of their SLO assessments, and the results of these discussions are documented in annual program review updates and discussed at length in a program's comprehensive program review. These results are used as documentation for resource requests when appropriate. (II.A.1.c)

Program level SLOs have been developed through Reedley College for the majority of disciplines. Program outcomes often seem to serve a dual role, reflecting student competencies for both the degree and any certificates. Currently, these SLOs are evaluated by an SLO mapping document and a data upward analysis that is somewhat problematic. While it is clear that departments dialogue about the assessment results of the course outcomes and use them to improve the program overall, the team

could not verify that the discussion of SLO results at the degree and certificate level was quite as robust or widespread. It was also not clear that faculty make a distinction between what the results reveal about student mastery of certificate and degree competencies. Interviews with college faculty confirmed that the use of degree and certificate SLO assessment results to promote student learning is at a developmental level and that further work in that area is needed. After college status is achieved for Center, the SLO Coordinator, working with Center faculty, plans to reexamine the process for establishing, approving and assessing these outcomes and will review the current practice (II.A.1.c).

Quality assurance for the SLO process is the joint work of the Program Review/SLO Committee and the SLO Coordinator. The team was given several examples of how the Committee regularly assesses the efficacy of its work and makes changes to processes as a result. Overall, the college is working diligently on SLOs and their assessment, but could use improvement and/or additional training in assessment methods, particularly for degree and certificate outcomes assessment, and the use of the assessment data to improve student learning. (II.A.1.c).

The Center assures the quality and improvement of all instructional courses through regular outcomes assessment and the program review process. Based on the expertise of the Center faculty through its curriculum committee, the Center develops curriculum, which is approved by the Reedley Curriculum Committee. The assessment procedures and review of course level outcomes is designed and implemented by faculty and overseen by the SLO/Program Review Committee. Advisory committees are used to assist in identifying competencies and appropriate learning outcomes for certain disciplines as appropriate. (II.A.2, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b)

The Center assures that it offers high-quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning to characterize all programs through the curriculum process and the program review process. The counseling department works with department faculty to ensure that the appropriate ADT courses are offered to enable students to complete ADT degrees in a timely manner. The Curriculum Committee assures that all courses and programs are appropriate to the institution and of high quality, and programs address continuous improvement during the program review process. (II.A.2.c.)

The Center offers courses in face-to-face, distance education, and hybrid mode to meet the needs of the students. Faculty reviews student success data on the different teaching modalities as part of the program review process and adjust the offerings based on this data. The Center provides a variety of training opportunities for faculty in different teaching methodologies and supports the offering of learning communities to ensure that the learning needs of the students are met. (II.A.2.d)

The Center evaluates all courses and programs through the five-year program review process to ensure their relevance, appropriateness, and achievement of student learning

outcomes. Advisory committees for CTE programs provide guidance and support for these programs. (II.A.2.e)

The Center has a well-developed five-step planning process that draws on the Educational Master Plan, Strategic Plan, program review process, its institutional set standards, and SLO assessment data for overall integrated planning and resource allocation. The Student Success Committee has been particularly effective in examining data and developing programs designed to help students achieve. The Student Educational Plan campaign has been very successful and serves as a model program for other institutions. A First Year Experience program will be launched in Fall 2015. (II.A.2.f.)

The institution does not currently use departmental or program examination. (II.2.A.2.g)

Course credit is rewarded on the basis of student achievement of course requirements, including SLOs, and all requirements are discussed in each course syllabus. The college catalog, the course outline of record, the faculty evaluation form, the syllabi website, as well as the Center's adherence to Title V guidelines, reflect the institutional policies that shape the awarding of credit and are consistent with the norms of higher education. The 2014-2015 Catalog and the Spring 2015 Class Schedule are particularly well designed to allow student easy access to relevant information. (II.A.2)

Students receive certificates and degrees when they have completed a series of courses. Course SLOs are assessed and, since those assessments are carefully mapped to program outcomes and measured through a data upward analysis, student achievement of course SLOs (which leads to grade achievement) is used to measure student achievement of programs. (II.A.2.i)

A philosophy of general education (GE) can be found in the Center catalog. The Center's Curriculum Committee approves each course for inclusion in the GE program. The Curriculum Committee, along with its College Center Council, developed four GE learning outcomes (GELOs) that include communication, critical thinking, and informational literacy, global and community literacy, and personal development. These were approved by the Curriculum Committee, along with the Academic and Classified Senates, indicating center-wide agreement on the key components of General Education. The GELOs are mapped to specific general education courses and assessed through the same data upward process that is used to measure program outcomes. In addition, the Center uses the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) as another measure of its GELOs. The Student Success Committee analyzes the CCSSE data and has used the results to suggest changes to improve student learning and engagement at the Center. (IIA.3, II.A.3.a, II.A.3.b & II.A.3.c)

Students completing the general education requirements possess a basic understanding of the humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences. In addition, they are productive and life-long learners and recognize what it means to be an ethical human being and effective citizen. (II.A.3 a., II.A.3.b. and II.A.3.c.)

The Center offers thirty-nine areas of study and the general requirements for degrees, all of which include at least one area of focused study. The program review and curriculum process ensures the quality of those areas of study. (II.A.4.)

Advisory committees have been established at the Center for business, child development and information technology. These committees ensure that Career and Technical Education (CTE) students who receive degrees and certificates in these areas demonstrate the appropriate technical and professional competencies. CTE programs in criminology use established curriculum to prepare students for either employment or for further specialized training that requires satisfactory completion of appropriate college courses. A CTE certificate program for water treatment operator also uses established curriculum to prepare students for the State Water Resources Control Board. (II.A.5)

The Center provides clear information to students about its programs through the catalog, the website, and departmental brochures. The public can find additional information about college planning process and student learning outcomes assessment results through the “About Us” tab on the Center website. The catalog describes the purpose, content, and requirements for all degrees and certificates, along with program outcomes and other appropriate materials including transfer of credit policies. The catalog is particularly well designed and student friendly.

The team confirmed that course syllabi included student learning outcomes that mirror those found in the course outline of record. Evaluation of course syllabi to ensure that SLOs are consistent with the Course Outline of Record is included as part of the regular faculty evaluation process.

The Center has identified an Articulation Officer, who will work closely with the Curriculum Committee to develop, implement and evaluate articulation agreements as appropriate after the Center achieves accreditation status. Until that time, all Center articulation agreements go through Reedley College’s articulation officer. Counselors evaluate records for transfer students to determine if they are equivalent to Center curriculum. Course and program discontinuation must be approved by the Curriculum Committee. In the case of a program discontinuation, the Center will work with any impacted students to ensure that they can complete their programs in a timely manner. The Center regularly reviews policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations. (II.A.6, II.A.6.a, II.A.6.b, II.A.6.c.)

The Center Catalog and the Faculty Handbook clearly state the Center’s policies on academic freedom, student academic dishonesty, and institutional beliefs and worldviews. The Academic Freedom and Responsibility portions of the Faculty Handbook instruct faculty in the Center’s policies to assure that faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. In addition, the faculty evaluation process ensures that faculty are in compliance with these policies through classroom visits, student and peer evaluations, and examination of syllabi.

The Center's catalog clearly states the student expectations and consequences concerning student academic dishonesty. Center does not require conformity to specific codes of conduct nor seeks to inculcate specific worldviews or beliefs. The Center deliberately crafted its mission to reflect its values, including embracing diversity and integrity, generosity and accountability. (II.A.7, II.A.7.a, II.A.7.b, II.A.7.c.)

The Center does not offer courses in foreign locations to students other than U.S. nationals. (II.A.8.)

Conclusions

The Center meets the standard. The team found that the Center has enthusiastic, dedicated faculty and staff who ensure high quality instructional programs. Currently the Center is reviewing curriculum through an established Center Curriculum Committee under Reedley College's Academic Senate, and they are positioned to assume responsibility for curriculum through a college academic senate after the Center is granted accreditation status.

The Center has developed a robust culture of SLO assessment and analysis at the course level. Although some work has been done to assess and analyze program, degree and certificate SLOs, further work is needed to bring the Center to the standard of sustainable, continuous quality improvement. It is clear that faculty, staff, students, and administrators are engaged in the process and are using results to implement changes that improve courses, programs, and student learning.

The Center also has a very robust program review process that includes SLO assessment data, and examination of equity, success, and other pertinent data. The Program Review/SLO Committee monitors and assists faculty as they undertake this process, providing quality assurance. The program review process helps departments align their work with the college mission, analyze the most current data on student success, retention, equity, and SLOs and then use that analysis to define program goals and resource allocations to improve student learning.

The Center provides clear information on courses, programs, policies, and procedures in a variety of media. Materials, particularly the catalog and schedule of classes, are created with the student and public in mind, and are both well designed and easily understood; they reflect the values of the college, mirroring the tenets expressed in the mission and also capture the enthusiasm and sense of welcome that the team experienced from all staff on the campus.

The Center has developed a Distance Education Handbook that presents best practices in regular and effective student contact, student support services, and student access to distance education, and distance education instruction. Approved by the Academic Senate in January 2015, this document will be an important component of ensuring academic excellence in all distance education and hybrid classes.

Recommendations

Recommendation 2 - Instructional Programs

In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the Center expand their current best practices in SLO assessment and the analysis of its results at the course level to program, certificate and degree and general education student learning outcomes. The team recommends that the results of SLO assessment at all levels be used to support decision making to improve student learning (IIA.1.c, IIA.2).

Recommendation 3 - Instructional Programs

In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the Center institutionalizes the best practices in regular and effective student contact as outlined in the Distance Education Handbook approved by the Academic Senate in January 2015. (II.A.1)

STANDARD II - STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

II.B - Student Support Services

General Observations

The Clovis Community College Center (Center) recruits and admits diverse students consistent with its mission through open access policies and services. The Center offers an array of student support services, both onsite and online, assuring the quality through its institutional effectiveness practices. Student support services have embarked upon innovative initiatives and services, in part prompted by the Student Success Act, to meet the needs of students. Some highlights include Registration to Go, Registration Express, Live-Help (online academic counseling), Online Orientation, a robust Student Education Plan (SEP) campaign, Behavioral Intervention Team (BIT), and Veteran Services.

The Center takes pride in building a culture of inclusivity, both on and off campus, with a number of multicultural activities on campus and healthy partnerships in the schools and community. The outreach and recruitment team has been instrumental in developing meaningful school partnerships and a strong presence in the community, which includes participation in a number of events that serve diverse populations. Student Activities is also actively engaged on campus, with active Associated Student Government members who are represented on key committees and are engaged in civic responsibilities.

Also noteworthy is the work that occurs from Health Services with proactive in-reach to students and information campaign efforts such as the “Stall Street Journal” located in the campus facilities. Overall, the staff and faculty describe the culture as being one that resembles a “family” which allows them to work collaboratively in serving students.

Student support services are engaged in a cycle of improvement with a five-year program review cycle, and annual program review and SLO reports. Surveys, including the CCSSE, are a primary means by which student support services measure their efficacy. A highlight of these processes is the robust dialogue that staff and faculty have within student support services to inform improvement. Additionally, the Center proactively seeks out the input of students to improve services having recently appointed five students to the Student Success Committee.

Findings and Evidence

The Center recruits, admits, and supports students who benefit from the instructional programs and services, aligned with its mission of the institution. As evidenced in the Self Evaluation Report, documents, and interviews, the Center is has an outstanding focus on the support of the student. The Center offers an array of student support services, both onsite, at the satellite site, and online. Some examples of the primary departments and services include Admissions and Records, Assessment/Placement Testing, CalWORKs Career Planning Services, College Relations- Outreach &

Recruitment, Counseling, Disabled Student Program and Services (DSPS), Financial Aid and Scholarships, Health Services, Student Activities- Associated Student Government (ASG), Transfer Services, TRiO, and Veterans Services. Additional services, such as EOPS, are forthcoming upon receiving college status. The Center has self-identified needing improvement in the areas of Career Services and Transfer Services. Additional student support services are also offered online. Examples include web-based assessment (Accuplacer), Counseling Live-Help (online counseling), online orientation, and a robust online FAQ program. (II.B, II.B.1, II.B.3.a)

The learning support needs of students are informed by application data and by way of program review. As previously indicated, there are an array of student support services to address student needs, some of which are strengthened through district wide collaboration. There is pride in the “high touch” services and activities that are carried out in student support services. For example, Financial Aid calls all students who have incomplete files to facilitate timely packaging and disbursements. Likewise, Counseling calls all students as part of their early alert program. Health Services is also proactively engaged in reaching out to students, through collaboration with instruction, via classroom presentations. While student support services work collaboratively and maintain a student-friendly environment, the team noted a theme in which staff expressed “wearing many hats” due to limited staffing. As the Center grows and continues to meet the needs of students, it will want to strategically plan for adequate staffing in student support services. This was evident in such areas as Admissions, areas of Counseling (e.g. transfer services and career services), and Financial Aid. (II.B. 1, II.B.3)

The Center provides a catalog, schedule of classes, and web-presence for its constituencies with current and accurate information. The catalog and schedule of classes is well-organized and attractively designed easily referencing general information and academic requirements for admissions, fees, and completion. The Center’s Dean of Students and Counseling Department Chair send out weekly emails to all students with key information via “Center 411”. Since the catalog was initially published this year, the college intends on developing a more systematic process for catalog review. (II.B.2.a, II.B.2.b)

The Center provides current information on the major policies affecting students in its catalog, schedule of classes, and website internal processes for student grievances, grade disputes, general complaints, student discipline procedures, and claims of alleged unlawful sexual harassment. The website offers the public and students a quick way to access information on complaints. The complaint policies are being consistently followed and records of complaints are kept confidential, are well organized, and easily retrievable. The team verified there were no significant student complaints or trends that suggest any patterns that needed further investigation. (II.B.2.c)

Major policies impacting students are outlined in the college catalog and detailed documents are included on the website. The team verified updated policies as of 2012 and verified the policies were complete and met the details required by the Standard. (II.B.2 d)

The institution gathers and analyzes data to identify the learning support needs of its student population in order to provide appropriate and comparable services and programs to address student needs in both face-to-face, online, and distance education environments. With its strong high school and community partnerships, the Center recruits and admits a diverse student body, which is more diverse than the community it serves. In fact, the College Relations Specialist participates in a number of activities and events with diverse communities, including College Black Men activities, Native American College Information Day, Fresno County Foster Youth, and the Hispanic Youth Symposium. The Center collaborates with local organizations and Reedley in identifying the learning support needs of the business community and general public. (II.B, II.B.3.a, II.B.3.d)

The Center provides an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility. The Associated Student Government (ASG), Student Clubs, and Student Activities play an integral role in facilitating a robust student life. The ASG has a full staff of executive members and senators who are very active on campus and who actively participate on committees. This includes five (5) internal ASG committees, and several key participatory governance committees of the Center. The ASG also has a statewide presence, having recently participated in the March in March. The ASG President is an active and contributing member of the Board of Governors for the California Community Colleges. The ASG has been able to bolster student participation, in part due to more robust use of social media. Through this wide array of student activities the Center promotes discourse that promotes personal and civic engagement, in addition to aesthetic and intellectual development. The Center has been analyzing and reflecting on the results from the CCSSE data to increase student learning and engagement in these areas. (II.B.3.b)

Counseling services are comprehensive and robust. Counselors provide academic, career, and personal counseling for both the general population and for targeted groups under the categorically funded programs (e.g. DSPS). There is a strong culture of collaboration in Counseling along with a student-centered approach. Counselors are engaged in college wide efforts such as strategic planning, and engage closely with one another in areas such as SLO assessment. Counselors have devoted significant time to the planning and implementation of SSSP requirements. There was strong evidence of a robust Student Education Plan (SEP) Campaign, which has improved student access to student education planning. Counseling has been able to significantly increase the percentage of students with SEPs to an impressive 85%. To further strengthen education planning efforts, they are exploring an online tool, which they have listed as an actionable improvement. Additionally, Counselors are engaged in high school outreach and take pride in making personal connections with prospective students and their parents. “Center 411” is a collaboration between Counseling and Student Activities and is an effective way in which new students and their parents receive critical information prior to the start of the semester. Counseling is engaged in an institutional effort to establish a First Year Experience (FYE) program to facilitate the success of first-time students. As part of that effort, a special FYE course (COUN-47) will be offered with a focus on learning

strategies. Another strength of Counseling relates to their proactive approach to communicating with students. Counselors proactively reach out to students in a number of ways including weekly mass emails, classroom presentations, and through a monthly newsletter entitled “Counseling Chronicles”. (II.B.3.c)

A variety of multicultural events and activities under the leadership of the Student Activities Office take place on campus each year, which includes celebrating a variety of history months (e.g. Black History month). A number of diverse student organizations add to the culture of inclusion as well. Upon the team’s arrival, the team noted artwork and posters throughout the campus commemorating civil rights events that took place in Selma, Alabama. (II.B.3.d)

The Center also has a number of programs that support the diverse college population such as a federally funded TRiO program (Student Support Services), Veteran Services, DSPS, and CalWORKs. While there is evidence of the Center’s commitment to access and inclusion through programming and activities, there is limited focus on equity in outcomes and student achievement despite its diverse population. Moving forward, student support services would benefit from utilizing equity data and developing its own Student Equity Plan to ensure that all students can benefit from programs and services, and further, that they are able to meet their educational goals to completion. (II.B, II.B.3.a, II.B.3.d, II.B.4)

To assure quality and inform improvement, student support services use surveys such as satisfaction and engagement (CCSSE) surveys. They also take the next important step of having dialogue about the results and implications for improvement. Two examples where the use of survey data informed improvement include the development of Online Probation Workshops and changes to Express Counseling (now a more private “drop-in” counseling model). As previously shared, to strengthen access and success among its diverse student body, use of disaggregated data focused on student achievement is an imperative (e.g. access to services disaggregated by ethnicity, persistence disaggregated by gender, etc.). Additionally, advancing the use of student learning outcomes data in student support services would equally strengthen student learning and achievement. (II.B.1, II.B.3.a, II.B.4)

Other programs that contribute to a positive learning environment include transfer activities, Honors Program, learning communities, and Tutorial Center activities. The Counseling department offers a Leadership and Development course (Counseling 263) to promote student leadership. Additionally, Counseling engages with the ASG to promote student educational planning as part of their SSSP efforts. There are about a dozen clubs, with different areas of focus, which enrich the students’ experiences through participation in college and community activities. Student Activities also organizes college activities and events, including a number of activities with a multicultural focus. (II.B.3.b, II.B.3.d)

Currently, the Center works with Reedley College and their Institutional Researcher to conduct validation studies in assessment, minimizing disproportionate impact as per Title 5. By the end of the semester a new research position will be added to the Center, which

will strengthen the Center's institutional research capacity. The Center currently uses the Accuplacer placement test and admissions practices are open and accessible to all (II.B.3.e). The Admissions department, while small, is very student friendly with staff that goes above and beyond to assist students with their needs. (II.B.3, II.B.3.e)

The institution maintains student records both electronically and in hard-copy formats, ensuring compliance with FERPA. They utilize the Hershey STARRS system to scan and digitize all student records. Paper records are destroyed by shredding. (II.B.3.f)

Student support services are engaged in a cycle of improvement with a five-year program review cycle, and annual program review and SLO reports. Surveys, including the CCSSE, are a primary means by which student support services measure their efficacy. The Program Review/Student Learning Outcomes Committee and the College Center Council serve as the primary participatory governance bodies overseeing these processes. In addition to program review, each student support services area has developed student learning outcomes (SLOs). The SLO process is organic in that they evolve through each student services department, with the SLO Coordinator providing support as-needed. Broad dialogue about survey results is evident. While each of the student support services areas develop SLOs, use of results to inform improvement is sporadic. To advance student learning, student support services should continue to strengthen the use of SLO results in all areas to inform improvement and resource allocation. (II.B.1, II.B.4)

Conclusions

The Center meets the Standard. The Center provides a wide variety of student support services and takes pride in its student centric focus. The center recruits and admits a diverse population of students from the community who benefit from its programs and support services. There is a strong commitment by the faculty, staff, and administration to serving students and their needs to support student success. The Center provides an array of student support services, both onsite and online, assuring quality through its institutional effectiveness practices. Systematic assessment of the student support services has been implemented and is in process, and this process will benefit by continued refinement of the equity data to ensure the services continue to support the diverse student population.

The Center has a uniquely exemplary student centric focus. The team found this student focus outstanding, as the student is truly at the center of the Center culture.

Recommendations

Recommendation 4 - Student Support Services

In order to improve institutional effectiveness and assure equitable access and success among the Center's diverse student body the team recommends that student support services accelerate the use of student learning outcomes and equity data to inform activities, programs and services. (II.B.3.a, II.B.4)

STANDARD II - STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Standard II.C - Library and Student Learning Support Services

General Observations

Overall the library and other learning support services for students are sufficient to support the Clovis Community College Center's (Center) instructional programs and intellectual, aesthetic, and cultural activities. The Center Library has been transitioning from a center to a college library as other areas on the campus have done. As with other areas on the campus, the Library staff has accomplished this transition with a small yet competent staff. The overall feel of the library is one of a place of learning, access to resources, and a willing staff that assists in student learning.

The team found the library staff to have made extraordinary efforts to ensure the Library meets the learning needs of the students, and meets the library requirements of an accredited college. The facilities and resources are well thought out, comfortable, and provide the necessary resources to ensure adequate learning resources to students.

Findings and Evidence

The Library and learning support services are sufficient to support the Center's instructional programs. The newly remodeled facilities and enhanced technology enable the Library to offer a quantity, currency, depth, and variety of educational offerings regardless of location or means of delivery. The Library and learning support services are provided to students and faculty on site and electronically through the Library's website. Learning support is also administered at the tutorial center and student computer labs. On-campus library hours during the semester are just over 55 hours each week. Students, faculty, and staff have remote access to the library's electronic resources available around the clock. Faculty and students also have access to off-site reference librarians through the online chat, Question, point of service. Directions for using the Clovis library are provided via an online resource and research tools guide. Library and learning support services accommodate disabled students with accessible furniture and specialized equipment. (II.C, II.C.1.)

The Center Library offers access for students and faculty to a collection with the depth, breadth, and variety sufficient to support the curriculums offered at the college. The collection is comprised of over 13,000 items that include e-books, print volumes, current periodical subscriptions, reserved textbooks, and 26 research databases for on- and off-campus research. The Center Library offers student study space and access to computers. Online library support is provided via databases, email, a new juvenile/ children's section, online library tutorials, and 24/7 chat reference. The Center allocates resources in the budget annually to ensure print, online, and media resources are available.

The library occupies a small wing within the Learning Resources Building spanning 7,732 square feet with approximately 12 study carrels for students with electric outlets, 23 computer workstations, group and individual soft chair study spaces, three group study rooms, and a state of the art reference desk area with an adjoining circulation area with computers. During peak hours all desktop computers are occupied along with every seat. In order to increase student access to the internet and the ability to research and complete assignments, a combination of ten tablets are circulated.

The Center Library is comprised of a staff of one full-time Librarian, one full-time Library Assistant, one permanent part-time Library Assistant I, and two work-study students, each working nine hours per week.

The Library offers an Instructor Reserve Section where faculty members provide copies of their textbooks to students for use within the library. These textbooks range across the many disciplines offered at the Center. The librarian, to determine that adequate resources are available to support curriculum offered, reviews many course outlines.

The Library's selection of material is guided by course curriculum and departmental needs. The Library's Liaison Committee, with representation from all curricular departments, staff, and students participate in collection development. This model of collection development and its inclusivity of the broader campus garnered a commendation in 2011 from the ACCJC team. The Library provides a Books/Media request form on the library page that encourages campus wide input on obtaining library resources. The faculty, students, and staff also receive emails to solicit input on increasing library resources. Request are compiled and vetted by the librarian and then used to purchase and update materials. A course approval form, with a specific library resource need section, soon to be created by the Curriculum Committee, will also help guide collection development in providing sufficient material for new class offerings.
(II.C.1.a)

The library provides outcomes related to Information Literacy competency and assesses student competence in SLOs and PLOs. Assessments and evaluation of services are done with post orientation surveys, student and faculty library satisfaction surveys, final projects, and forum questions. The library conducts surveys regularly to evaluate the effectiveness of its services and uses these surveys to develop plans for improvement. Survey statistics enable the library to evaluate their services. The self-evaluation provided evidence of annually compiled statistics detailing the number of On-Demand Instruction, Directional Questions, course integrated instruction, faculty and staff's view on the library's function on information literacy attainment, collection resources (both in print and online), number of searches performed in all online databases, number of reference questions asked, number of circulated items, number of orientations taught, and number of students that attend orientations just to name a few. Access to actual survey questions was provided.

Library orientations are provided to address information literacy for several classes, on-demand, informal sessions, and one-on-one instruction at the reference desk and around

the library. Instruction in Information Literacy is also conducted in the one credit transferable Library Research Skills class every semester, offered as a distant education class. In Library Orientations the librarian conducts student learning outcome assessments to measure student information competency skills. (II.C.1.b)

The Center librarian uses Libguides, a web application developed by Springshare, to create subject area tools to access the Clovis library holdings. Faculty and students can also do a quick book search from the new library operating system, OCLC's Worldshare. This library system has the capacity to monitor cataloging and statistics to help the library collection stay current and topic areas balanced. The librarian also uses monthly topics for the opportunity to feature books held in their collection. (II.C.1.c)

The library has sufficient maintenance and security for computers, and the resources housed within along with other learning support services. The library's security system is a Radio Frequency Identification system (RFID) with gates stationed in all four entries/exits. All library print and media sources are embedded with RFID. Campus police are available for library security also. Software is provided to prevent viruses and off campus hacking.

Additional services provided to students are Kurzweil 3000 text reading and eBook adaptable software, two elevating computer desks, and software such as Dragon naturally speaking software, and scanning capacity to assist student with special needs. (II.C.1.d)

Collection of material is guided by consulting bibliographic resources and reviews provided by the Library Journal, American Libraries, College and Research Libraries, Choice, various publishers' catalogs, Amazon reviews, and other reviews. Databases are purchased through the California Community College Consortium. The library collection is growing and potential materials and subject areas are being sought out in order to strengthen resources for students and faculty as time provides. The agreements and resources mentioned above for the library are monitored and assessed for relevancy to the Center's mission and learning resources requirements. The Center goes out of its way to ensure resources are accessible to students, although may want to assess the effectiveness and accessibility of the current Library website and make improvements. (II.C.1.d, II.C.1.e)

The Center evaluates library and other learning services to assure adequacy in meeting student needs through the Center program review process. The Library collects data to include library attendance, circulation statistics, materials acquisitions, on-demand and directional queries, course-integrated research sessions, reserve book use, study room, and library computer use. This data is use to evaluate the needs of the students and appropriate improvements are made. The Tutorial Center undergoes the same program review process, including student exit surveys for evaluation; the results are used to make improvements to the Tutorial Center. (II.C.2)

Conclusions:

The Center meets the Standard. While currently the staffing and support services for the Center are sufficient, Library staffing and resource budgets will need to be continually assessed and revised based on student needs as the Center moves to College status, and enrollments increase. As the Center becomes a college, a concerted effort toward enhancing library website access, and continuous review of the library resources to ensure adequate staffing to meet student needs will be required. The Center has a process in place through program review to assess all learning support functions to include the Tutorial Center.

Recommendations

None.

Standard III – Resources

Standard III.A – Human Resources

General Observations

Clovis Community College Center (Center) employs qualified personnel to support student learning programs and services to improve institutional effectiveness. The Center's human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The Center adheres to State Center Community College District (District) Board Policies and Administrative Regulations that provide the basis for hiring of three types of personnel: faculty, classified professionals, and management.

Findings and Evidence

The Center assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by qualified employment personnel. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly in place and are publicly stated in board policy and administrative procedures.

The team verified that the criteria for the selection of faculty includes knowledge of the subject matter or service to be performed, effective teaching, and the potential to contribute to the mission of the Center. This criterion includes appropriate degrees from accredited institutions and minimum qualifications is noted in Board Policy 7120. This is accomplished through appropriate Board Policies and Administrative Regulations (AR 7120) and hiring process through the District Office. The Center faculty play a significant role in the selection of new faculty as noted in AR 7120. The District has a process for determining the number of full-time faculty for each college, and the Center has an opportunity to submit requests into this process. The Center also has established a process for staffing positions due to retirements, transfer, or resignation, as well as for growth in programs and service needs. The District is a Merit System District, which requires coordination with a District Personnel Commission for hiring of classified employees. (III.A, III.A.1, III.A.1.a)

The Center assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The Center provided evidence of a tenure-track evaluation and part-time faculty evaluations. The District has appropriate evaluation policies in place to ensure constructive and honest evaluations to employees. The team verified these policies are followed for certificated, classified, and management employees of the Center. (IIIA.1.b)

Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, data gaging the effectiveness in producing those outcomes. The Center provided satisfactory evidence of faculty being evaluated based on classroom effectiveness in meeting SLO objectives. Administrative Regulation 7122 delineates the responsibility of the faculty to participate

in the assessment of student learning outcomes. Adequate language was negotiated in Article XII.1.B.5 of the collective bargaining agreement to ensure student learning progress. The Center has a thorough Program Review Cycle Handbook which has components imbedded in the faculty evaluations. (III.A.1.c)

The Center upholds a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel. Written codes of professional ethics and conduct for employees are clearly in evidence in Board Policy 2715 (BP 2715) and Administrative Procedure 1200 (AP 1200) and additional ethics codes are in evidence for faculty and students. (III.A.1.d)

The Center maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty with full-time responsibilities to the institution. The institution has a sufficient number of staff and administrators with appropriate preparation and experience. The Center operates with 44 full-time and part-time classified employees and 50 full-time faculty members and is adding additional faculty. The Center has seven full-time counselors, one librarian, and one nurse in addition to teaching faculty. Library staffing and research staffing were two areas of note in assessing sufficient staffing for the Center. While the staffing is sufficient to meet the Standard, the team encourages the District and leadership of the Center to assess staffing levels as it becomes a college and grows to provide the staffing resources to support the institution's mission and purpose. (III.A.2)

The District has the responsibility for systematically developing personnel policies and procedures that are available for information and review. The team verified the policies and procedures are in place, reviewed under the guidelines of the CCLC policy service, and are equitably and consistently administered at the Center. The Center adheres to the District hiring policies and procedures. (III.A.3, III.A.3a)

The team verified the Center makes provisions for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Each employee has access to his/her personnel records in accordance with law. Personnel records are secured and the Center complies with Education Code and Administrative Regulation 7145 for how records are made available to each employee. (III.A.3b)

The Center demonstrates, through policies and practices, an appropriate understanding of and concern for issues of equity and diversity. The team verified the appropriate policies and procedures are in place. The District has clearly stated its commitment to diversity. The Center's mission statement and core values also state this commitment and the Center monitors its diversity, and created an action plan to increase the diversity of applicant pools to better reflect the demographics of the Center students and the community. Center programs, practices and services are consistent with its mission and core values. (III.A.4, III.A.4.a)

The Center regularly assesses its records in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission. The District formed an Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Advisory Committee, made up of constituency groups from the district. The EEO developed an

Equal Opportunity Plan, which was eventually adopted by the Board on June 4, 2013. (III.A.4.b)

The Center subscribes to, advocates for, and demonstrates integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff, and students. The campus is, “a friendly place to work”. “Everyone helps where needed”. There’s transparency about budget matters within the college. Classified Senate members are represented on all committees including Center College Council. Through individual meetings, they seem knowledgeable about the Program Review Resource Allocation process on how departments are funded. In a breakout meeting with members of the Classified Staff and by participating in the Center Open Forum meetings, it is clear, no matter what your title, everyone is united in ensuring the Center achieves initial accreditation status. Moreover, in the Open Forum, there was an acknowledgement from faculty praising how Center Administration has been incredibly supportive in moving the Center forward and highlighting the collegiality that is part of the Center culture. (III.4.c)

The Center provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on identified teaching and learning methods. There is evidence in this area, from the District Classified Professional Technology Training Series, to Duty Day activities for Part-time faculty, to Flex Day events for convocation. Program Development programs are also evaluated for effectiveness and reflection. (III.A.5, III.A.5.a, III.A.5.b)

The Center human resource planning model is integrated with institutional planning at the District and at the Center. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of human resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement. The need for certificated, classified, and administrative staffing is a component of the Center’s Program Review allocation recommendations. The Center has submitted a transition staffing plan to the College Center Council and to the Campus President’s Cabinet for final approval. The District allocated additional funding to the Center to ensure a smooth transition from center to college status. (III.A.6)

Conclusions

The Center meets the Standard. The Center has policies and procedures in place to ensure the employment of qualified faculty and staff to support student learning, programs, and services. It has appropriate processes, does evaluations on personnel, and manages personnel records appropriately. The Center demonstrates, through its policies and practices, an appropriate understanding and concern for equity and diversity. In planning for the future the team believes the Center needs to pay attention to human resource needs and training as it moves into College status and the demands change.

Recommendations

Recommendation 5 – Human Resources

In order to increase institutional effectiveness, the team recommends the Center analyze the level of its future staffing requirements as it moves toward college status. It further recommends the Center use the results of that assessment to ensure a stable and sufficient number of faculty, staff, and administrators to support the College's mission and provide quality and equitable access to students. The team recommends this analysis consider library resources, institutional research, and other critical areas that will emerge as the Center transitions to a college. (II.C.1.a, II.C.1.b, II.C.1.c, III.A.S, III.A.6, IV.B.2.a)

Standard III – Resources

Standard III.B - Physical Resources

General Observations

The Center is situated on a 110-acre site located at Willow and International Avenues in Fresno. The Center opened in this location the Fall 2007 and serves the northeast Fresno/greater Clovis area. Campus facilities include two Academic Centers (each roughly 80,000 square feet), central plant, café, and bookstore. “Academic Center One” facilities include computer laboratories, a multi-media studio, art studio, physics and science laboratories, assembly hall, distance learning and traditional classrooms, library, student services, and offices. “Academic Center Two” opened in 2010 and includes a counseling center, admissions and records office, financial aid office, library/learning center, assessment center, dance studio, fitness center, three chemistry labs, three biology labs, nursing skills lab, business services complex, two distance learning conference rooms, one distance learning classroom, a large-group instruction lecture hall, offices, and other classrooms. As with Academic Center One, funding for the facility came from a local bond and matching state bond funding. Additionally, California Joint Use Facilities legislation awarded funding through AB-16 to construct a child development center (CDC) through collaboration with the Clovis Unified School District (CUSD) and the State Center Community College District. The \$6 million dollar building is comprised of state-of-the art facilities, including a playground, funded through a grant from the Fresno County First Five organization for \$280,250.

Physical resources at the Center, including facilities, equipment, and land support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. Faculty and staff participated in Center facilities design to guarantee efficient and effective instructional and student service program space. The Center has 50 classrooms including lecture rooms, library, an 88-station (approx.) open computer lab, café, bookstore, allied health and sciences laboratories, fitness lab, dance studio, student services, tutorial center, assessment center, art studio, and multi-media graphics lab.

The team observed physical resources that are well maintained and secure with excellent signage both inside and outside. Facilities are accessible and have both open and private spaces to support student learning and collaboration. The Center’s Facility Master Plan reflects inclusion of all constituencies and a focus on student learning and services. Interviews with Center representatives confirmed that physical resources are considered in short- and long-term planning, as well as when the Center considers seeking grants and other external funding.

The campus facilities are fairly new, and the campus community expresses great pride in their facilities. The institution plans, builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services. The Center, in collaboration with the District, has a five-year equipment replacement policy in place and a security plan in

place to prevent instructional and staff equipment from being stolen. In conversations with the Vice Chancellor of Grants and Special Programs, equipment purchased via grants and other bonds are identified through a District inventory tagging plan. This is in place in case of an audit, and ensures equipment being purchased using specially funded dollars is being used for the purpose of the grant and not necessarily for general campus use.

Findings and Evidence

The Center provides safe and sufficient physical resources that support and assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services, regardless of location or means of delivery. The Center has physical resources, which include facilities, equipment, land, and other assets, which support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. They have a multi-year Facilities Master Plan in place as they grow. The campus utilizes the Strategic Plan and program review processes as well as participation on important oversight committees, including the College Center Council, in order to ensure that safe and sufficient physical resources are available to support and assist in the continuous improvement of Center programs and services. As stated in the Educational Master Plan, the Center has as its next priority the building of a Career Technical Education Facility that would house an Electrician Technician program, an Entrepreneurial Center, a Culinary Arts program and Water and Solar Technology programs. Faculty, staff, and administrators have determined the priorities for the next buildings in an exercise during the Spring 2014 Duty Day. Currently, the District Police Department has overall responsibility for safety in the District. Clovis is a safe campus based on the Cleary Act crime statistics. (III.B, III.B.1, III.B.1.a, III.B.1.b)

Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment. The Center conducts long-range capital planning through a Facilities Master Plan with updates, and funding requests to guide facility decision-making aligned with institutional goals. In coordination with the District, the Center considers total cost of ownership in long term planning of capital projects. The District hired a consulting firm to develop a square footage calculation for allocating maintenance staff, and the Center has plans to hire additional maintenance staff in the future. The Center considers students, faculty, and staff when planning, building, maintaining, upgrading, or replacing physical resources. More than 90% of staff agreed that the college center systematically maintains and upgrades its physical resources to support programs and services. (III.B.2, III.B.2.a)

The Center integrates physical resource planning with institutional planning. Planning is done in a manner which supports the institutional mission. The Center Vice President of Administrative Services sits on the District Facilities Planning Committee. Center participation is encouraged through forums, committees, and councils. College budget development process includes physical resource requests, and the College Center Council prioritizes the requests, and funding recommendations are forwarded to the Center President. (IIIB.2.b)

Conclusions

The Center meets the Standard. Through careful planning and financing, the facilities are a great attribute to the learning environment at the Center. Not only are the facilities relatively new, they are well maintained and there is a strong sense of pride by the faculty, staff, students, and administrators in the learning environment.

Recommendations

None

Standard III- Resources

III.C - Technology Resources

General Observations

Technology resources are used to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. The primary technological hub for the Center is driven by the District. Technology support is a priority through district-level services and college-level centered services to improve institutional effectiveness and planning. Collaboration between the District and Center technology staff meet the needs of the institution (research, college wide communications, and operational systems), faculty, staff, and students.

The technology services team at the Center maintains the required support of hardware, software, and networking needs to enhance student learning and overall institutional effectiveness. The Center regularly offers training workshops for faculty and staff during flex-day activities and through off campus technology training conferences. In addition to college staff being adequately trained, the District and Center systematically upgrades technology infrastructure to meet the needs of the institution, program and services development. The technology needs of the Center are woven into the planning process through the Educational Master Plan, Program Reviews, Technology Plan, and the Strategic Plan. Additional support in the planning process comes from the College's Distance Education Technology Advisory Committee (DETAC).

Findings and Evidence

Technology resources are used to support student learning programs and services, and are integrated with the District and Center planning. The District provides the primary support for technology networking and administrative (email & Datatel/Ellucian). The Center has a dedicated staff serving the needs of faculty, staff, and students for overall operational effectiveness. College-wide communication is supported by the Distance Education Technology Advisory Committee (DETAC) who advises the Director of Technology. In addition, technology planning and dialogue is conducted through the Educational Master Plan, the Strategic Plan, Program Review Recommendations and Student Learning Outcome Assessments. Action Plans are submitted from the DETAC for technology support. (III.C, III.C.2)

The District ensures that the technology support it provides is designed to meet the needs of learning, teaching, college-wide communications, research, and operational systems through the use of a district-wide enterprise resource platform designed for colleges. The Datatel/Ellucian (Colleague and WebAdvisor) administrative system manages student information, human resources, and financials. Colleague is used by Admissions & Records and Student Services. WebAdvisor is the web application that faculty and students use to maintain current status information (registration, financial, grades, etc.). District Information Systems provides support of the Wide-Area network (WAN) and the

Voice Over Internet Protocol (VOIP) and a help desk to support technological needs for institutional effectiveness. Video conferencing is used to hold meetings with the other colleges in the District. Staffing at the Center is supported by one Microcomputer Resource Technician and three-part time Instructional Technicians while the Director of Technology oversees the Department. A computer lab contains eighty-four PC computers and four Macintosh computers; a graphic computer lab holds thirty-three Apple Mac Pro computers and large printers. All classrooms are “Smart Rooms” and the library has twenty-three PC computers. Blackboard is the primary course management system used on the various teaching formats, face-to-face, hybrid, or online. Distance education is also supported with Camtasia software tools. (III.1, III.1.a)

The Center offers quality computer training to personnel and students regularly. Center personnel may participate in workshops via the Classified Professionals Steering Committee, and faculty may receive technology training during Flex Day activities. Moreover, personnel may receive one-on-one training from the Technology staff. In addition, off-campus training may take place and is paid for through grants and funds offered by the Center. Students may receive technology training by enrolling in an Introduction to Online Education course and through interactions with Center Counseling personnel. The Center library also offers technology training for students in navigating through library resources. Center personnel and students have been supportive of the technology training from college-wide survey results. (III.C.1.b)

The District and Center systematically plans, acquires, maintains, and upgrades technology infrastructure to meet the Center’s needs. The core administrative systems (Datatel/Ellucian, WebAdvisor, Exchange, and Institutional Research data) and the WAN are on an annual maintenance program. The hardware used by the Center is under warranty and on maintenance plans once the warranty expires. The Five-Year Replacement Plan describes current projects, which supports the current Technology Plan. The Information Systems Priorities Committee is responsible for coordinating projects related to Colleague/WebAdvisor systems. The DETAC regularly updates the technology plan to meet the institutional needs. (III.C.1.c)

The distribution of technology resources support programs, services, personnel, students, and institutional effectiveness. Every full time faculty member, and classified professionals has a computer for instructional or program purposes. All students and College personnel have District email accounts. There are 530 computers on campus; approximately 400 are located in student labs. In addition, all classrooms are “Smart Rooms” for all instructors to utilize in the classroom. Videoconferencing is vital when College personnel communicate with the other colleges in the District. (III.C.1.d)

Technology planning and assessment is integrated with institutional planning through the Action Plan, Educational Master Plan, Annual Program Plans, Program Review, Strategic Plan, and the Technology Plan. DETAC is a standing College committee that makes recommendations which get integrated into the Technology Plan. (III.C.2)

Conclusion

The Center meets the Standard. The Center's technology resources are directed and planned through the District in collaboration with the Center and other colleges. The Center has a Microcomputer Resource Technician, three-part time Instructional technicians, technology and the DETAC committee who advises the Director of Technology (District) who oversees the technology needs of the institution. All classrooms are "Smart Rooms" supporting teaching, learning, and student success. The technology planning is woven with the Educational Master Plan, Strategic Plan, and Program Reviews meeting the Center's mission. The Center has developed a Five-Year Replacement Plan to stay current in the area of technology. Technology equipment is readily available for students and Center personnel and offers appropriate training in technology for personnel and students. The on-campus Technology resources staff is available to assist faculty and staff on a one-on-one basis if needed for technical help.

Recommendations

None.

Standard III – Resources

III.D - Financial Resources

General Observations

Financial resources are sufficient to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. The Center's financial picture is stable, with the District showing an ending reserve of more than twenty percent last year. The District has prudently managed financial resources so that even with the uncertainty and fluctuation of state funding in recent years, the District has maintained an average reserve of nearly 25% each year for the past three years. With the looming increases in state retirement costs, impact of the ACA, and new laws expanding sick leave benefits, the current reserve levels are prudent. Furthermore, the Center has a contingency fund equal to 3% of the operating budget. The District and Center should be commended for such valiant efforts to strengthen financial stability to support student learning programs and services to improve institutional effectiveness, while bringing a new college on line.

A District Resource Allocation Model is in place to determine the amount of unrestricted general funds allocated to the Center. The District Budget and Resource Allocation Advisory Committee (DBRAAC) developed the allocation model in 2013. In 2014, the Interim Chancellor revised the model because the approved model did not provide stable funding to the individual campuses. The Interim Chancellor presented the model to the DBRAAC for approval in May 2014, and the model is scheduled to be evaluated during the 2014-2015 fiscal year. It is evident that the District and Center view the resource allocation process as an evolutionary process, rather than a fixed process. Members of the DBRAAC raised concern about the feedback and recommendations from constituent groups going directly to the Interim Chancellor rather than through the DBRAAC, as well as approving and implementing the model over the summer break. The allocation model provides additional funding to the Center in the amount of \$1.2 million allocated from District reserves for staffing as the Center makes the transition to a fully accredited college campus, in anticipation of increased funding to the Center.

Findings and Evidence

Through review of evidence and interviews with Center and District representatives, the team concluded that the Center's financial planning is integrated across college planning processes including the Educational Master Plan, Enrollment Management Plan, Technology Plan, and program review. Center has identified clear institutional mission and goals that are communicated to the campus. Ninety two percent of employees at the Center believe that the center relies upon its mission, goals, and strategic plan as foundation for financial planning and budgeting. The Center has worked closely and collaboratively with the District to incrementally increase staffing, services, and technology consistent with enrollment growth. Requests for additional resources are required to demonstrate linkage to institutional goals in order to be considered for prioritization. Faculty and staff hiring is prioritized and funded based on available

allocations and guided by the transitional staffing plan. Financial planning is conducted through a collaborative process that includes participatory governance and is done in a timely manner. There is a clear connection between college planning and the overall mission of the college. (II.D.1, III.D.1.a)

The Center's institutional planning reflects realistic assessments of financial resource availability, development of resources, partnerships, and expenditure requirements. The District is responsible for developing the Allocation Model budget projections. In coordination with the District, the Center assesses and integrates a variety of resources beyond their general unrestricted allocation including local bond funding, categorical funding, and grant funding. Conservative budgets are developed to mitigate changes in funding during budget development, and budgets are routinely assessed and adjusted. The Center monitors the budget and makes adjustments to the operational budget throughout the year. Center plans, such as the Facility Master Plan, reflect realistic goals based on conservative financial estimates. (III.D.1.b)

The Center, in collaboration with the District, identifies, plans, and allocates resources based on short- and long-range financial priorities. The District develops long-range budget projections to consider increases in total compensation and operational expenses, and the Center uses these projections for budgeting and resource allocation. The District has an irrevocable Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) trust with a healthy balance, as well as a fund for post-employment health care benefits. The District handles risk management and benefits and works to protect against volatile premium increases. (III.D.1.c)

Clear guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development exist and are used to promote collaborative decision-making and prioritization between competing needs. These processes are well documented through College Council minutes, Board of Trustee meetings, lottery action plans, and budget development records. However, in practice these processes may not be transparent or communicated to Center staff and faculty. In the accreditation survey, 62% of respondents agreed that faculty and staff have opportunities to participate in budget development and resource allocation, while 34% do not agree. According to interviews and review of evidence, some resource requests providing substantial documentation of need have not been included in the prioritization process. This finding indicates there is opportunity for participation in this process. (III.D.1.d)

To ensure that expenditures fall within budget, the Center has a series of internal controls in place. The district uses the California Community Colleges State Chancellor's Office chart of accounts to ensure financial integrity and responsible use of financial resources. The college budget office maintains budget control and monitors the college budget. The District Board of Trustees reviews and approves contracts over a specified amount. All college purchases must pass through an approval process involving department deans, the Vice President of Instruction and Students, and the Vice President of Administrative Services. The President's approval is required for all unrestricted general fund purchases.

College budget updates are provided to the President's Cabinet and Board of Trustees (III.D.2).

Financial documents have a high degree of credibility and accuracy and reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services. The district provides budget reports to the Board of Trustees and public annually to report total expenditures. The Center participates in an annual independent audit consistent with Title 5 Regulations. Previous audit reports indicate findings and exceptions, although the self-evaluation report indicates a timely response to findings and exceptions. Audit reports are presented to the Board of Trustees and made available to the public. Internally, there appears to be a perception that the college does not have adequate resources. In the accreditation survey, only 65% of respondents agreed that financial resources are adequate and support student learning programs and services. This perception is likely due to the rapid growth of the Center. To address this, the District has invested reserves in the Center in anticipation of receiving additional funds once Center is accredited. These additional funds were used to hire five faculty and several classified staff. (III.D.2.a, III.D.2.b)

Appropriate financial information is provided in a timely manner through multiple methods. The District provides budget development timelines and deadlines to the Center. The Center budget development is inclusive and involves position control validation, resource requests through program review action plans, and prioritization and ranking of resource requests. These processes are followed for the Center's general fund allocation as well as lottery funds. The Board of Trustees has dedicated budget workshops and discussions to obtain a thorough understanding of the budget and budgeting process. The Center includes a 'state of the budget' and associated issues at the mandatory faculty Duty Day each semester. Additionally, all budget managers receive regular reports for their respective areas of responsibility. Center employees also have access to real-time financial information through the Ellucian/Datatel financial management system. Based on information provided in the self-evaluation and interviews with campus representatives, financial information may not be disseminated in a manner that is widely accessible. Accreditation survey results indicate 57% of respondents do not feel that financial information is readily available throughout the College Center. Interviews revealed that information shared at the committee level may not be communicated down, and information that is emailed may not be read. (III.D.2.c)

Financial resources at the Center are used with integrity and in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the funding source. The District manages auxiliary services (Bookstore and Food Services), provides coordination for grant development and implementation, and Measure E bond activities. State Center Community College District Foundation provides opportunities for scholarships and solicits gifts, grants, and other private resources to support all campuses in the District. Last year the Foundation provided \$18,000 in scholarships to Center students. The Center Business Office monitors and audits the Associated Student Body's fundraising efforts. (III.D.2.d)

The Center has sufficient internal control systems in place to ensure fiduciary responsibility. The Center works closely with the District to regularly monitor systems and assess effectiveness. While the Center and District participate in annual independent audits, it is unclear how the Center's internal control systems are evaluated and assessed for validity and effectiveness and how improvements are made based on any assessments. As the Center grows in size, operations, and staffing, assessment and improvement of controls will need to be incorporated into the practices of the campus. (III.D.2.e)

The District has sound fiscal management and oversight, and there is sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability for the Center. The District has a level of reserves averaging higher than 20%, far exceeding the minimum requirements of 5%, and the Center has a contingency fund of 3%. The District develops a conservative budget and regularly projects ahead to determine impact of retirement benefits, cost of living allowances, and medical benefits. (III.D.3, III.D.3.a)

Center practices effective oversight of finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations, and institutional investments and assets. The financial aid is administered through Reedley College, and Center staff work to process financial aid applications and process awards. As the Center transitions to a college, a fully independent financial aid office will be required. Currently, the Center has a transitional plan to create a college financial aid office and is already working through the required steps. The District's Grants Office provides oversight for grant proposals and categorical programs to ensure alignment with the strategic plan and compliance with the U.S. Office of Management and Budget. Center Business Office staff monitor and provide ongoing review of grants at the campus level. The Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration and District legal counsel to assess risk and liability review contracts. A Citizen's Bond Oversight Committee monitors and assesses Measure E bond expenditures. (III.D.3.b)

The Center plans for and allocates appropriate resources for payment of liabilities and future obligations. The District maintains a healthy reserve, has limited debt, and uses conservative budgeting practices. Items such as scheduled maintenance, step and column increases, retirement benefits, or total cost of ownership for new facilities are included in short and long term planning, and resource allocation at the District and Center level are based on these projections. The District has identified excess vacation accrual as an issue, and has attempted to deal with the issue through excess vacation payouts for managers and confidential staff. The District provides post-employment benefits other than pensions (OPEB), and an actuary performs valuations of the plan in accordance with the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (III.D.3.c, III.D.3.d).

The District has non locally-incurred debt instruments. (III.D.3.e)

The Center monitors and manages student loan default rates, revenue streams, and assets to ensure compliance with federal requirements. The Center's Financial Aid is administered by Reedley College, requiring student loan default rates to be reported in aggregate. The most recent three-year default rate is 39% (2011). This high rate requires

Reedley College to develop a Default Prevention Plan by the Code of Federal Regulations. Center does not have authorization to participate directly in student loans until it is a fully accredited institution, and therefore technically does not have any student loan defaults. Recognizing the growing issue of student debt, the Center has developed a plan to proactively address this concern. (III.D.3.f)

Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the Center. Contracts are monitored and reviewed at multiple levels including deans, vice presidents, purchasing, district administration, and the Board of Trustees. The Center will not create any purchase orders, requisitions, or payments until a contractual agreement is fully executed. The Center regularly evaluates its financial management practices as part of the budget development process. Prior year expenditures are analyzed and new budgets are developed based on the analysis. (III.D.3.g, III.D.3)

Annually, the Center begins their budget development process with an evaluation of expenditures for the prior and current fiscal years, and effective practices. The Center and District relies on the annual external audit report findings and reviews by the colleges and centers budget development committees to provide primary feedback on operations and internal control structures. The District implements any recommendations within the next audit cycle. The district-wide Information Systems Priority Committee evaluates and prioritizes recommendations to improve financial management practices related to technology. (III.D.3.h)

Financial resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. Prioritization for resource allocation is led by recommendations of the College Center Council. The Council reviews Action Plan Funding requests, and requests are required to have a clear link to the Center mission and plans including the Educational Master Plan, strategic plan, and program review. The Center currently does not systematically assess the effective use of financial resources and use the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement of the Center. There are some informal and anecdotal instances of assessment and changes made, but not a systematic or data-driven process for assessment and continuous improvement. (III.D.4)

Conclusion

The Center and District meet the Standard. The Center is part of a large district that has demonstrated strong financial management for many years, including during the most recent economic downturn. This financial conservative approach to managing the district and college resources has positioned the District to support the Center in its efforts to become an accredited college. As the Center moves into college status it will need to develop stronger tools to ensure internal controls are assessed and the results are used to improve practices. This is an issue, which until the Center becomes a college they have little responsibility for.

Recommendations

Recommendation 6 – Financial Resources

In order to increase institutional effectiveness, the team recommends the Center review existing budget development processes to improve information communication, dissemination, and inclusion of the Center community in collaborative decision-making, prioritization, allocation, and use of funds. (III.D.1.d, III.D.2.c)

District Recommendation 7 – Financial Resources

In order to increase institutional effectiveness, the team recommends the District Budget and Resource Allocation Advisory Committee evaluate the current resource allocation model to determine appropriateness and effectiveness, and communicate the process and results widely across the district. (IV.3.c)

Standard IV – Leadership and Governance

Standard IV.A - Leadership

General Observations

The Center has exemplary leadership and governance practices. The center community, from the administration to the students, recognize all areas of leadership throughout the organization. The faculty was very vocal about how they believe their input is valued, along with the students. The administration, faculty, staff, Board, and students have created a student-centric culture where students come first and where the student's learning is valued above all. Students themselves play a key role in the climate and culture of the Center, and they are uncharacteristically involved in an array of activities including shared governance. Everyone at the Center is working toward the common goal of becoming a full-fledged community college, and they are planning to focus in the same way on Student Success once they have achieved college status.

The Center constituencies value their participative governance processes, and they have created an authentic culture that values leadership throughout the organization that stands out as a model.

Findings and Evidence

The Center has created an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence, where all voices are heard and valued. The evidence shows that the Center recognizes and utilizes the leadership contributions from all campus constituencies. The administration has created a leadership culture that encourages and promotes leadership at all levels, and there is not a focus on the administrators for all the leadership. The Center aligns its goals to the District and delineates the Center specific goals separately. The team verified that the institution engages in systematic participative processes that promotes dialog into planning. The Center practices what is documented in the College Center Council Handbook. (IV.A, IV.A.1)

The Center has established and implemented written policy and documents that provide all Center constituencies a process to follow for planning purposes. Comprehensive District and Center planning documents including the District Strategic Plan 2012-16, the Willow Strategic Plan Draft 2013-17, the District Functional Map, the Technology Plan Draft 2014-17, the Educational Master Plan 2010, the Transitional Staffing Plan, the Enrollment Management Plan, and the Student Success and Support Plan. Comprehensive handbooks such as the Integrated Planning-Participatory Governance Handbook, a model document, serves to provide all constituency groups with all of the necessary tools for participating in mission/vision development and revision, Center planning processes, all governance committees, budgeting and resource allocation processes, human resources processes, purchasing processes, etc. Especially noteworthy are the committee operating agreements, which specify goals and objectives for

committees, membership, and how committees will work together to achieve their desired outcomes. The documentation of processes is helpful to the current staff and will be helpful as the Center expands with new faculty and staff as it grows as a College. Other similar comprehensive procedural documents are the Faculty Handbook, the Program Review Cycle Three and Four Handbooks, and the Curriculum Handbook.

It was not evident in the Self Evaluation Report that administrators have a substantive and clearly defined voice in institutional governance. However, the practice and the documentation provided evidence that there is a defined role for both faculty and administrators. (IV.A.2, IV.A.2.a)

The Center demonstrated that they relied on faculty, the Academic Senate and other faculty structures for appropriate student learning programs and services. The Center has documented these structures through the Curriculum Committee, SLO Committee, and Program Review Handbook. Faculty have a significant role in the Center College Council and other structured committees. (IV.A.2.b)

The governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution as documented in the BP 2510. The Center demonstrates they follow the policy for committees, task forces, and other processes. The Board interfaces appropriately through receiving recommendations from the Center participatory governance processes provided by the appropriate committees such as the College Council, Academic Senate, Program Review/Student Learning Outcomes Committee, etc. Noteworthy are the operating agreements developed by the constituency groups to provide guidance and a road map for working together. (IV.A.3)

The Center and District demonstrated they advocate and demonstrate honesty and integrity in their relationships with external agencies. The Center has demonstrated a strong commitment to Accrediting Commission Standards through appropriate policies and guidelines. Evidence provided demonstrated the Center meets the Commission's requirements for public disclosure, self-evaluation, and other reports. The Center demonstrated they move expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission in applying for Candidacy. Consideration of conduct and ethics policies for faculty and staff would enhance the Center's current practice policies and practices. (IV.A.4)

The Center evaluates the governance and decision-making structure and processes as evidenced by their revising its policies in 2011 and their continued efforts to review and revise their processes. The Center has implemented a Continuous Improvement-Collaborative Decision Making Process and modified its College Center Council Handbook. The evidence provided demonstrates the committees adhere to Center's commitment to review processes each spring. The Center communicated the results of these evaluations and used them as the basis for improvement. The emphasis on dialog leading to continuous improvement comes up repeatedly throughout the Self Evaluation Report and evidence with the focus on planning and collaborative decision-making is commendable. (IV.A.5)

Conclusions

The review of the Institutional Self Evaluation Report, examination of the evidence and the site visit, and extensive interviews with individuals in key positions and governance groups, demonstrate that the Clovis Center meets the requirements of Standard IV.A.

Overall, the Clovis Center exemplifies, recognizes, and employs leadership throughout the Center to continuously improve. A message of concern for students first, then for each other as colleagues, and finally for the Center itself, and its future as a College have guided institutional leaders from all constituency groups to a common set of values and goals and to focus on continuous improvement for the sake of students. These individuals together create an environment that encourages empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence that is articulated by everyone. Everyone seems to have an interest and a stake in student success, the success of the faculty and staff, and the success of the Center as it makes its way to full college status.

Recommendations

None.

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

Standard IV.B - Governance

General Observations

The Board of Trustees, the Interim Chancellor, members of the District's Chancellor's Cabinet and the leadership team at the Clovis Community College Center were clearly excited and eager to help the Center attain college status. The Board members each spoke enthusiastically about the hard work and student-centered accomplishments of the Center. They expressed their confidence that the Center will be a key factor in the District's growth in the future through serving the unmet needs of the community. They also see the potential college as a critical factor in the economic growth of the area and the success of individual students. The Board has been supportive of Center throughout the process of candidacy and accreditation, particularly in the area of providing the necessary resources.

Based on the evidence, it is apparent that, while the Board performs admirably in many aspects of their duties, there are important areas where the Board has previously had some issues adhering to the accreditation Standards.

The composition of the District's seven-member governing board slowly changed since the 2008 election. Prior to 2010, the District selected trustees in at-large elections. Under the recently adopted method of area voting, each trustee is elected only by voters in his/her geographic area, as determined by census figures every ten years to reflect shifts in population. The District governing board had been relatively stable for many years, but that began to change when one new trustee was elected in November 2008 and another in 2010. Both replaced veteran trustees. In 2012, two new trustees were elected, and two more new trustees came onto the Board after the 2014 election. One trustee replaced a 12-year veteran, and the other defeated a trustee who had served for 33 years. As a result, the current Board is made up of one trustee who has served for 32 years, one for 6 years, one for 4 years, two for 2 years, and two for just a few months. This composition of a governing board reflects some gaps in continuity and the understanding of District history as trustees work at learning their roles and responsibilities, in addition to developing a dynamic for working together as a group.

The team took into consideration the significant change in Board leadership in reviewing Standard IV.

Findings and Evidence

The Center and District recognize the designated responsibilities of the governing board for setting policy and for the Chancellor to ensure effective operation of the District. Board Policy 2270 prescribes that the members of the board only have authority when acting as a whole. While there has been some controversy about hiring attorneys outside

the District policy, the Board has resolved those issues. The District has clearly defined the organizational roles of the District, the colleges, and centers.

The Board is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs, services, and financial stability of the District. The team verified the Board acts as an independent policy-making body that reflects the community interests. While not always the case in the past, Board minutes reflect the Board acts as the whole. The Board adheres to the policy set for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator, although it is questionable as to the Board's adherence to these policies during a situation with the previous chancellor. Interviews with Center and District personnel, as well as the Board and a review of the minutes, demonstrated the Board has been working hard to ensure compliance with Standard IV. The Board takes responsibility for hiring and evaluating the Chancellor of the District. (IV.B, IV.B.1, IV.B.1.a.)

The Chancellor brings board policies forward, and the District subscribes to the policy service provided by the Community College League of California (CCLC). This policy service monitors and develops recommendations when changes in the California Education Code and other relevant laws occur and policy needs to be updated. When the Clovis Center achieves college status, the District will update a number of policies and administrative regulations to include a third college. The policy reflects the Board's commitment to its core mission through the support of student learning programs and services in Board Policy 4020, 4025, 4040, and 5120, as well as its Strategic Plan. (IV.B.1.b.)

Based on the agendas and minutes of board meetings and district processes, it is evident that the Board takes the responsibility for educational quality and financial stability very seriously. Education quality is developed through the Educational Coordinating and Planning Committee, and recommendations are forwarded to the Board. The Board receives reports at each regular and special meeting from the college and center presidents and appropriate staff. These reports cover instruction and student performance, student services, student success and equity, the budget planning process plus quarterly updates, audit and fiscal policy, including approving contracts and accounts for goods and services. The excellent financial condition of the District is evidence of strong financial oversight. For a period, the Board was operating outside their Board Policy for legal services, although have resolved this issue and are currently in compliance with its Board Policies and accreditation standards. (IV.B.1.c.)

All board policies and regulations are published on the District website. These policies in Chapter Two refer specifically to the board's size, duties, and responsibilities as noted in BP 2010, 2012, 2210, 2220, 2260, and 2270. Where appropriate, the District also creates Administrative Regulations for policies. Further comment is made in IV.B.1.e. (IV.B.1.d.)

Based on the evidence and conversations with all trustees during the site visit, it is clear that the Board has not always acted in a manner consistent with Board Policies and

Administrative Regulations. The team found that the Board recognized this was an issue and is acting in compliance with Board Policy and regulations. Evidence was presented to the team that confirmed these changes. As noted in IV.B.1.b the District utilizes the CCLC Policy Service for regular review of the Districts policies and procedures, and this provides important updates as needed. While this is consistent with Board Policy (BP) 2405, the policy also notes, the Board is responsible for knowing its policies and procedures. Administrative Regulation 2405 states that the administration will ensure all members of the Board have a copy of the policies and procedures and will work with new trustees to ensure compliance. With the loss of a chancellor, the Board is regaining ground in this area. With regard to the policy review that is supposed to take place for all new trustees, nothing in the evidence indicates this happened following the 2014 election, even though a lot of other information about the District was made available to both candidates for office and the newly elected trustees. Individual interviews with the Board verified the Board has copies of their Board Policies and Administrative Regulations. Recent changes in the CEO role have delayed the process for the regular review of policies, but the interim Chancellor and Board are regaining their momentum. (IV.B.1.e.)

The Board has a program for board development and new member orientation as spelled out in BP 2740, although the policy has no accompanying procedures. The evidence provided to candidates running for office and the newly elected trustees appears to be a thorough overview of the District and its organization, facilities, instructional programs, human resources, and fiscal areas. It appears the Board would benefit by having additional information about the roles, responsibilities, and limits of individual board members. Some evidence of board development for all trustees is well documented, particularly reports on strategic planning, budget study sessions, audits and reports presented at board retreats. Each trustee receives a copy of the Trustee Handbook published by CCLC. The Self Evaluation indicates trustees attend state and national conferences, but the only evidence provided is a program from the 2011 Effective Trustee Workshop. Additional evidence was provided to show that four trustees attended the CCLC Annual Convention in November 2014, clarifying the reference in the report.

There appears to be no systematic and ongoing effort to document trustees who attend conferences or critical local training for board members. There was no mention of Brown Act Training on the agendas or minutes, although the Board minutes indicated there was a session on participatory governance at the 2013 retreat. The Board has a mechanism for the continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office as evidenced in the board policy. (IV.B.1.f)

The Board has a process in place for annually assessing its performance as documented in BP 2745. In 2014, the Board did not conduct an evaluation, although the Board has a history of evaluating its performance annually. The Self Evaluation Report states that the Board delayed the 2014 self-evaluation because of the transition to an Interim Chancellor and many trustees interviewed supported doing the self-evaluation in June 2015 at their annual retreat. The Board used the self-evaluation tool developed in 2010. Board members evaluate themselves, without seeking input from constituent groups. There is no

indication the Board has reviewed or updated this policy since 2010, although there is no specified timeline for review of Board Policy. (IV.B.1.g)

The Board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates that code. In October 2014 the Board enforced BP 2715 the policy to investigate alleged misconduct by one of its members. The Board ad hoc committee (per Board Policy) employed the services of an outside attorney to advise them on their investigation, and that attorney then employed an investigative firm. The contract with the outside attorney was never brought to the governing board in open session for approval, as required by BP 6011 and 6340, “Contracts are not enforceable obligations until they are approved or ratified by the Board.” After it was brought to the Board’s attention they had gone outside their own policy, the Board terminated the contract. (IV.B, IV.B.1.h.)

The Board received regular reports on the accreditation process as the final step of the Clovis Center’s application for college status (Evidence IV.10-11, annual retreat 3/28-29/14). Staff requested input from the Board and their comments were noted. The Board gave unanimous approval to the Self Evaluation Report at the January 13, 2015 meeting. All trustees met willingly with members of the site visiting team, six in person and one by phone. The Board members expressed support for the accreditation process and their knowledge of the importance of accreditation standards. (IV.B.1.i)

The Board takes responsibility for selecting and evaluating the chancellor. A chancellor was selected in May, 2010 and evaluated according to BP 2435 on an annual basis in May of 2011 September of 2012, and June of 2013. In December 2013, the Board agenda included a closed session item for the Chancellor’s mid-year evaluation. Six closed session items followed this in January through March of 2014, listed on the agenda as Employee Discipline/Dismissal/Release. A change of leadership was announced at the March 17, 2014 meeting when the Board appointed an interim Chancellor. BP 2431 states that in the event of a vacancy in the office of Chancellor, the Board will establish a search process to fill the vacancy. The search process for a new chancellor has not commenced. The Board Policy 7250 and 7720 defines the role of the college presidents and lays out the recruitment and hiring process.

In BP 2430 the board delegates authority to the Chancellor to implement board policies. Some members of the governing board have violated BP 2430 and engaged in micromanaging instead of delegating authority to the chancellor. However, changes have been implemented and the Board is currently in compliance with BP 2430. It was evident in the interviews with board members and senior staff, and a review of the board agendas, that the Board is aware it was not adhering to processes and has made positive progress to ensure it is currently adhering to board policies and procedures, as well as accreditation standards. The team found that the Board is making monumental efforts to improve their performance and move past some of their prior issues. (IV.B.1.j)

The president of the Center has the primary responsibility for the quality of the institution and has done an outstanding job in leading the planning, budgeting, personnel issues, and

institutional effectiveness, as evident in the prior discussion on the standards. The Center President serves on multiple governance committees throughout the Center. The President has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution she leads. She provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness. (IV.B.2)

The President plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative team that is organized to ensure the College meets its goals and mission. The President directly supervises the vice presidents and other direct reports whose responsibilities are clearly delineated, measured, and reviewed. The President has created an environment retaining administrative capacity through the development of a collegial, nurturing, and positive environment. (IV.B.2.a.)

The President guides the institutional improvement of teaching and learning through setting and modeling the values, goals, and priorities. She ensures educational planning is integrated with resources planning and ensures the Center follows the established planning procedures. The President has set a strong tone that is student focused and where high quality research and analysis is not only valued, but used in planning processes to ensure that students are successful. (IV.B.2.b)

The President uses her authority appropriately through constituent groups to ensure that statutes, regulations, governing board policies, and Accreditation Standards are the foundation for decision-making and implementation. She has done an excellent job of keeping the campus community focused on the Center vision, mission, and students. (IV.B.2.c)

As the Center has progressed, the President has set a clear expectation of fiscal prudence and responsibility. She ensures through working with governance councils, that budgets and expenditures are controlled as evidenced in budget documents and the fiscal stability of the District. (IV.B.2.d)

The President has demonstrated a strong commitment to communication on the campus and in the communities the college serves, through regular and open communications, attending community events and functions, and ensuring multiple communication channels. (IV.B.2.e)

The District clearly delineates and communicates the operations responsibilities and functions of the District from those of the colleges through the District functional mapping document which delineates responsibilities as primary, secondary, or shared. (IV.B.2, IV.B.2.a-e)

As noted earlier in Standard IV the Board/District provides leadership through setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity through board policy, regulations, strategic planning, and continuous updates. The District has clearly defined the operational responsibilities and functions of the district from those of the colleges and centers through a formalized map as provided in the evidence.

In an effort to ensure more effective communication of the roles, the District has development and implemented new employee workshops. The District also evaluated the effectiveness of the District organization structure and various operational responsibilities. Appropriate changes were made to the organization and operations based on the results of that assessment.

The team verified the District provides legal, collective bargaining, information technology, human resources, and financial/payroll services for the colleges and centers. The District has been reviewing and revising its allocation model to accommodate the potential new college. As discussed in Standard III, the District is in excellent financial condition. (IV.B.3.a-c)

The District effectively controls its expenditures and is in excellent financial condition. Independent outside audits are conducted annually in conformance with Board policy. The District has maintained a strong ending balance consistently. (IV.B.3.d.)

According to Board policy, the Chancellor delegates to each College President the executive authority and responsibility to lead, direct, and supervise the college, and to administer programs and operations in compliance with legal requirements and policies. The President of the College is held accountable through an annual evaluation. (IV.B.3.e.)

Conclusions

Although the Board of Trustees is enthusiastic about the future of the Clovis Community College Center and has supported the institution's application process for college status, it is clear the Board has had some challenges as it transitions to a new board selection process with new board members. As a Board, the trustees are learning about their roles and responsibilities, district policies, delegating authority, and developing a working relationship among themselves and with the interim chancellor. Participating in a systematic plan for Board development and engaging in critical self-evaluation with the goal of continuous improvement can help the Board as it moves ahead with the important task of selecting a new Chancellor. The team extensively verified through documentation and interviews with the Board their understanding of accreditation requirements and the consequences of not adhering to the standards.

Recommendations

District Recommendation 8 – Leadership and Governance

In order to increase institutional effectiveness the team recommends that the Board continue to make a concerted effort to learn about, and act in a manner that is consistent with, its policies and bylaws. The team also recommends the Board conduct regular reviews of its policies and procedures, particularly related to board operation and behavior. (IV.B.1.a-j)

District Recommendation 9 – Leadership and Governance

In order to increase institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the Board improve its performance through continuing its efforts to allow the Chancellor to fully exercise the authority of his/her position to improve the effectiveness of the District.
(IV.B.1.a)