

## **College Responses to the 2012 External Evaluation Team Recommendation**

**College Recommendation 1: 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)**

**Findings and Evidence:** At the time of the current visit, the College had revised its Participatory Governances Model to include a regular cycle by which the College would review the mission statement. The newly established procedure calls for a three-year mandatory review and revision cycle of the College's Mission Statement.

The revised Participatory Governances Model was reviewed by the College Council in April of 2013. The document was proofed, edited, and published for the September 2013 Council meeting. The Mission Statement Review process is conducted in concert with the District's long-range planning and takes place at the same time the District's mission vision, values, and strategic plan undergo their review and revision. The revised document includes provision for off-cycle review in the case of unforeseen events of a substantial nature.

**Conclusion:** The College has developed through a collegial process a schedule for a regular cycle of review and revision of its mission statement. Continued adherence to the newly adopted cycle should result in a regular and systematic review of the mission that is integrated with all of the colleges planning processes. The team believes that the College has fully met the expectations of the recommendation and now meets the Standards.

**College Recommendation 2: 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)**

**Findings and Evidence:** At the time of the current visit, the team noted that the College has made substantive and complete progress in integrating all of its planning activities, including linking mission, program review, and resource allocation with its identified goals. The College has adopted new strategic goals that are both measureable and have identified assessment indicators. Human Resources, Maintenance and Operations, Information Technology, and Marketing have been fully integrated as operational units and have established Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUO's). These units are in the process of writing unit plans that will be included in the College's overall program review cycle. The College has revised many of its planning forms that are designed to simplify and integrate the resource allocation process. The College continues to rely on its use of broad-based dialogue to improve its processes and the quality of its planning activities.

**Conclusion:** The College has demonstrated that it has an effective and integrated planning process that includes both instructional and support services. Evidence was provided that supports the existence of a fully integrated planning process. Through what appears to be a more informal evaluation process, the college has evaluated its planning process and made improvement, demonstrating continuous quality



improvement. While substantial effort has been made to establish an effective evaluation of the planning process, it has not been fully developed. The team concludes that this recommendation has been partially addressed and the last step needed to meet this recommendation and meet the Standards is implementing a formal, systematic evaluation process into its planning cycle.

**College Recommendation 3: To fully meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College ensure that all courses and programs are evaluated through an ongoing systematic review and that Student Learning Outcomes, Service Department Outcomes, Program Level Outcomes, and Institutional Learning Outcomes assessment results are integrated into the planning and allocation process. (I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.i, II.C.2, II.B.4, III.A.1.c)**

**Findings and Evidence:** Cerro Coso has worked diligently to meet its schedule for completing program review deadlines. Evidence was given and reviewed for the following programs: Art, Kinesiology, Computer Science, General Education which represented those program that were identified during the initial team visit as being out of compliance. Revisions were made to the both the annual unit plan and the program review templates that helped to closer align and allow for the explicit tie-back to the last program review. Additional training was developed by members of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and delivered for the first time in September, 2013. This comprehensive training program included; understanding continuous quality improvement, analyzing data, generating productive dialogue, and drawing conclusions/setting proper goals. The team observed that Student Learning Outcome improvements are now listed and integrated into program reviews. Budgeting is the last step in the College's planning process, and program reviews are utilized to form the basis for resource allocation.

**Conclusion:** The team recognizes that the College has made substantial progress regarding this recommendation. Process improvements are evident and well documented. The College is on track with adhering to its established timeline for program review. Learning assessment outcome results are included in the process, although not every area has fully integrated learning outcome assessments. The College has a plan with a timeline to have them fully implemented by the spring of 2014 and has demonstrated that those areas with assessed learning outcomes are integrating them into the planning and allocation process. The team concludes that the College has fully met the expectations of the recommendation and now meets the Standards.

**College Recommendation 4: To fully meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College develop and implement appropriate policies and procedures that incorporate effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes into the evaluation process that includes Adjunct faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving student learning outcomes. (III.A.1.b, III.A.1.c, III.A.3)**

**Findings and Evidence:** The visiting team verified that the correspondence between the faculty association and the district administration which affirmed that the current contract language includes SLO assessment in the evaluation of the adjunct faculty. In an April 18, 2013 letter to the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources, the faculty union president affirmed that "because the creation and facilitation of the learning environment includes the production of student learning outcomes, the current contract requires adjunct faculty to participate in the process of assessing student learning outcomes. As part of their evaluation, adjunct faculty will include a statement indicating that he or she has provided assessment information to his or her faculty chair and include a brief summary . . . of this information."