
College Recommendation 1

Mission

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

This recommendation was referenced in Standard I.A. The evaluation team arrived at the tail end of the mission review process. The new mission statement was undergoing its final adjustments prior to being sent to the Kern Community College District Board of Trustees for approval. The team noted that Cerro Coso had not completed a regular or systematic review of its mission since 2007 and that the College appeared to lack any formal procedure for systematically reviewing the mission and for making revisions that would be approved by the board (**doc. 25, pgs. 18-19**).

Progress in Addressing Recommendation

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

The College follows a three-year mandatory review and revision cycle (**doc. 46, pgs. 29-30**). This is done in concert with long-range planning undertaken at the district level. Cerro Coso begins its mission and guiding principles review at the same time KCCD’s mission, vision, values, and strategic plan are undergoing their own review and revision. Once KCCD’s documents are completed, the College finalizes its mission statement, vision, and values. And then, in a second step, it finalizes its strategic goals based on the prior planning documents. This sequence is followed for the purpose of reaffirming the relevance of the mission and service statements to the district and college communities served and of optimizing the dialogue surrounding integration of long-range plans. Moreover, the new section now describes how an off-cycle review might be triggered by unforeseen events of a substantial enough nature. Examples are listed in the Participatory Governance Model. Also described are the steps to be undertaken if either the three-year or triggered review calls for a revision of the mission statement.

The Participatory Governance Model document was edited over the summer, formatted and graphically designed, and then presented to College Council at its September 2013 meeting (**doc. 19**).

Conclusion

The College has fully addressed this recommendation.

Future Plans

None

List of Evidence

- Doc. 18 College Council Minutes, April 18
- Doc. 19 College Council Minutes, September 5
- Doc. 25 External Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, February 2013
- Doc. 46 Participatory Governance Model, 2012-2015

College Recommendation 2

Improving Institutional Effectiveness

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

Recommendation 2 was referenced at three places in the External Evaluation Report. In Standard I.B, it was noted that while the College had made significant progress in increasing the effectiveness of its planning, further work was necessary (**doc. 25, pgs. 20-21**). At the time of the site visit, the College's annual integrated planning cycle had run one time and was still not fully integrated; different components of planning had independent timelines and triggers that appeared not to line up well. There were also some instances when plans were not completed as called for in the cycle, including the Strategic Plan. Formal evaluation processes remained to be put into place to ensure that the integrated planning efforts are fruitful and continue to be improved.

In Standard III.D, the team concluded that a weak link in the planning process was that assessment/evaluation of the allocation of resources needs to be formalized and improvements from the assessment communicated to all constituent groups (**doc. 25, pg. 50**). In Standard IV.A, it was stated that a formal process of evaluation must be developed to assess the effectiveness of the governance and decision-making model (**doc. 25, pgs. 52, 54-55**).

Progress in Addressing Recommendation

Standard I.B

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

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

Progress Reported in 2013 Follow-Up Report

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

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

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

Conclusion Reported from 2013 Follow-Up Report

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

Sustained Improvements

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

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

List of Evidence

- CR1-1 [External Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, February 2013](#)
- CR1-2 [College Council Minutes, April 18, 2013](#)
- CR1-3 [Participatory Governance Model, 2012-2015 \(revised, April 2013\)](#)
- CR1-4 [College Council Minutes, September 5, 2013](#)
- CR1-5 [Cerro Coso Community College 2015-16 Catalog](#)
- CR1-6 [Cerro Coso Community College 2015-2018 Strategic Goals](#)
- CR1-7 [College Council Minutes, January 22, 2015](#)
- CR1-8 [College Council Minutes, March 5, 2015](#)
- CR1-9 [ACCJC Annual Report, 2015](#)
- CR1-10 [College Council Minutes, March 19, 2015](#)
- CR1-11 [2013 Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report](#)
- CR1-12 [ACCJC Action Letter, February 7, 2014](#)