FOLLOW-UP REPORT

Submitted to the
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

October 15, 2014

CERRO COSO COMMUNITY COLLEGE
3000 COLLEGE HEIGHTS BLVD.
RIDGECREST, CA 93555

Certification of Institutional Follow-Up Report

DATE: October 2014

TO: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
            Western Association of Schools and Colleges

FROM: Cerro Coso Community College
            3000 College Heights Blvd.
            Ridgecrest, CA 93555

This institutional Follow-Up Report is submitted to fulfill the requirement from the February 7, 2014 ACCJC letter to the college president.

We certify that there were opportunities for broad participation by the campus community in the development of this report and we believe the report accurately reflects the progress made in responding to the recommendations of the October 2012 ACCJC Evaluation Team.

_____

Sandra Serrano, Chancellor, KCCD

_____

John Rodgers, Board President, KCCD

_____

Jill Board, President, Cerro Coso Community College

_____

Corey Marvin, Accreditation Liaison Office

_____

Laura Vasquez, President, Academic Senate

_____

Julianne Maikai, Vice President, CSEA

Table of Contents

Contents

Complete List of Evidence

Doc. 1   Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report
Doc. 2   Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes—February 10, March 17, April 21, 2014
Doc. 3   Annual Assessment Self-Evaluation Rubrics
Doc. 4   Annual Assessment Reports, Spring 2014
Doc. 5   ACCJC's Feedback Memo on College Status Report on SLO Implementation, October 2013
Doc. 6   Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes—May 12, 2014
Doc. 7   2014 College Report Card
Doc. 8   Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes [draft]—September 15, 2014
Doc. 9   Student Learning Outcome Committee Minutes [draft]—September 2, 2014
Doc. 10   Program Review Committee Minutes [draft]—September 11, 2014
Doc. 11   College Annual Strategic Planning Survey

Statement of Report Preparation

On February 7, 2014, the college president received a letter from Dr. Barbara Beno, President of ACCJC, indicating that at its meeting on January 8-10, 2014, the College's 2013 Follow-Up Report from its 2012 comprehensive evaluation was reviewed and considered together with the report of the evaluation team that visited Cerro Coso Community College on October 28-29, 2013. It further stated that the College had provided evidence that it had addressed College Recommendations 1, 3, 4 and 5 and District Recommendations 1-4 and now meets Standards but that College Recommendation 2 still required evidence that all deficiencies have been fully resolved. For that reason, the Commission took action to require the College to submit a Follow-Up Report by October 15, 2014.

The Vice President of Academic Affairs, who served as the institution's Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) during the development of the 2012 Self Evaluation and the 2013 Follow-up Report, was designated as the coordinator for the 2014 Follow-Up Report.

The letter prompted dialogue at the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, which is a participatory governance committee and the subcommittee of College Council charged with providing oversight into the planning and assessment processes in order to develop and maintain continuous quality improvement. An action plan was formed to complete the final tasks addressing the recommendation by the end of the 2013-14 academic year.

The report itself was compiled by the Vice President of Academic Affairs during the summer. When faculty returned in the fall, it was reviewed by College Council on September 4 and by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee on September 15. The report was accepted by College Council on September 18, and submitted to the board for review. At its meeting in October, the Kern Community College District board of trustees officially approved this Follow-Up Report.

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)

The follow-up visit evaluation report stated that while the College had made substantive and complete progress in integrating planning activities in a way that linked mission, program review, and resource allocation, it had not fully completed the second half of the recommendation, implementing an effective evaluation instrument for the planning process **(doc. 1, pgs. 4-5)**. The team concluded that the recommendation had been partially addressed, and "the last step needed to meet this recommendation and meet Standards is implementing a formal, systematic evaluation process into its planning cycle."

Progress in Addressing Recommendation

In February and March, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) completed the design of a two-part instrument for annually evaluating the College's planning process, and it implemented the instrument in spring 2014 **(doc. 2)**.

One part is a comprehensive self-evaluation of each of the College's three major planning areas carried out by the steering groups responsible for each area: the Institutional Effectiveness Committee for planning, the Program Review committee for program review, and the Student Learning Outcome (SLO) committee for SLO's. This part is designed to be an "insider's" view: a detailed, frank assessment from groups with a level of special knowledge and institutional history in the areas.

Rubrics were developed by the IEC to guide the self-evaluations **(doc. 3)**. These documents were modeled closely on ACCJC's own rubrics for evaluating institutional effectiveness—the idea being that the College could and should be judging itself by what constitutes "Proficiency" in these areas. Each steering group was asked to provide a narrative of no more than 300 words for each bulleted item of the rubric **(doc 4.)**. This was also modeled on a Commission assessment: the SLO-readiness survey of 2012. IEC found that survey and the report it yielded **(doc. 5)** to be highly valuable in identifying the institution's progress in SLO implementation, so it designed its instrument to yield the same kind of feedback for all three major planning areas.

The IEC scored the responses on a 5-point scale. Each committee member rated the responses separately ahead of the meeting and submitted results to the chair. The group convened to discuss the scores and aggregate an overall rating for each bulleted item **(doc. 6)**.

In terms of making the results available, the self-evaluations and scores were posted to the college website as a much more detailed and comprehensive "College Report Card" than the institution has had in the past **(doc. 7)**. For loop back, the SLO and the Program Review coordinators are both sitting members of IEC, and all three committees used the results of the assessment to directly inform goal-setting for 2014-15 **(doc. 8, doc. 9, doc. 10)**. This is to be an annual process.

The second part of the College's formal, systematic evaluation of the planning process is a survey of the field. In contrast to the insider's view of the detailed self-evaluations, the Strategic Planning survey is intended to gauge the college community's understanding of and satisfaction with planning in the areas of "Mission and Institutional Goals," "College Planning," and "Budget and Resource Allocation."

The survey was designed by IEC in March and administered in April. It provided for comments as well as ratings **(doc. 11)**. The results were gathered and discussed by IEC in May at the same time the self-evaluations were discussed **(doc. 6)**. One immediate outcome of giving the survey in 2014 was informing the college president's address on the subject of college governance to classified staff during classified staff appreciation week and to faculty at fall's opening flex day. Like the self-evaluations, the yearly results are intended to become a part of the expanded College Report Card **(doc. 7)**.

Conclusion

Cerro Coso has fully addressed this recommendation. A formal, systematic evaluation process has been developed, it has been implemented into the planning cycle, and its results have already been looped back to drive improvements.

Future Plans

- None

List of Evidence

Doc. 1   Follow-Up Visit Evaluation Report
Doc. 2   Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes—February 10, March 17, April 21, 2014
Doc. 3   Annual Assessment Self-Evaluation Rubrics
Doc. 4   Annual Assessment Reports, Spring 2014
Doc. 5   ACCJC's Feedback Memo on College Status Report on SLO Implementation, October 2013
Doc. 6   Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes—May 12, 2014
Doc. 7   2014 College Report Card
Doc. 8   Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes [draft]—September 15, 2014
Doc. 9   Student Learning Outcome Committee Minutes [draft]—September 2, 2014
Doc. 10   Program Review Committee Minutes [draft]—September 11, 2014
Doc. 11   College Annual Strategic Planning Survey

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 **(CR2-1, 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 **(CR2-1, 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 **(CR2-1, pgs. 52, 54-55).**

Progress Reported in 2013 Follow-Up Report

Standard I.B

Further improvements have been made in the annual integrated planning cycle to increase the effective incorporation of documents and processes:

- The College completed drafting of its 2012-2015 Strategic Goals, which were approved by the Board of Trustees in February 2013; the new set of goals are more focused and in a much more measurable form than the prior set, each with an identified assessment indicator or set of indicators **(CR2-2)**.
- The College's Student Success Plan, which had been on an independent track since its creation in 2011 as a result of the dialogue surrounding the Student Success Task Force, has now been combined with the Student Equity Plan and is fully integrated into the annual process. In 2013, Cerro Coso Community College—together with Bakersfield College and Porterville College— joined the Achieving the Dream initiative, and a key element of the planning has been to

establish the Student Success Plan centrally within the cycle as the culmination and focal point of the year's educational direction-setting **(CR2-3)**.

- The annual unit plan template was revised to identify strategies related to the Student Success Plan **(CR2-4).**
- The administrative service units of Maintenance and Operations, Information Technology, and Marketing have now been fully integrated as operational units within the planning cycle; in spring 2013, these units wrote administrative unit outcomes (AUO's); beginning fall 2013, they will write unit plans and be on the program review timeline for periodic evaluation **(CR2-5; CR2-6)**.
- As detailed more fully below in College Recommendation 5, the college human resources office is also being integrated as a full operational unit within the planning cycle, writing AUO's, an annual unit plan, and a program review.
- As detailed more fully below in College Recommendation 3, the program review template was revised to better align the 6-year process with the annual planning cycle **(CR2-7).**
- As detailed more fully in College Recommendation 3, the annual unit plan template was revised to more explicitly tighten the connection to program review, including annual updates on every unit's progress in achieving program review goals **(CR2-4)**.
- Mid-point progress reports for annual unit plans have been instituted to keep better track of goal completion **(CR2-3)**.

In addition, as both the Self Evaluation Report and the External Evaluation Report indicate, one of the College's self-identified action items to come out of the last Institutional Effectiveness Review was to develop a mechanism for more formally keeping track of institutional progress on strategic goals and objectives as well as enabling follow-up **(CR2-8)**. In spring 2013, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee created a crosswalk of goals to specific measures. Every goal now has an identified assessment indicator or set of indicators, ranging from specific data points already found within our MIS system, to periodic accountability reports, to specially created reports written for and maintained solely at the College. Moreover, a chart showing this crosswalk has been created and posted to the college planning website, including persons responsible and timelines for the data gathering **(CR2-9).**

Standard III.D

At the time of the writing of the Institutional Self Evaluation Report and the visit by the Evaluation Team, the newly adopted planning cycle was in the middle of its second run. Subsequent changes have been made that greatly enhance the tie between planning and resource allocation:

- In the 2012 planning cycle for academic year 2013-14, the annual unit plan template budget worksheet was redesigned so that resource requests were directly linked to second-level resource plans (staffing, professional development, facilities, information technology, and marketing); this made it vastly easier for the developers of these plans to identify and analyze requests.

- In preparation for the 2013 planning cycle for academic year 2014-15, the budget manager provided a spreadsheet for each unit pre-populated with line-item budgets, the current-year adopted budget, and 3-year actuals; this greatly simplified the unit's ability to plan and the budget committee's ability to pull together the requests for a first-draft budget **(CR2-10)**.
- The entire list of college budgets was charted out by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and each one incorporated into an annual plan at the unit, section, or division level; this means every org from which money is spent on resources is now integrated at some point in the annual planning cycle **(CR2-11, pgs. 31-33)**.
- The budgeting procedure as it exists in the current integrated planning cycle was formalized in an official Academic Senate-recommended budget process pursuant to AB 1725 **(CR2-11, appendix C)**.

Further revisions are designed for the 2013-14 year. One greatly anticipated change, by faculty chairs and the budget committee alike, is the development of a web form that will simultaneously serve to capture the information in a database and automate the creation of the spreadsheets and budget committee reports. Another very important improvement planned for 2013-14 is the formation of an effective evaluation instrument for the budget process. In fall 2013, the budget committee will dialogue with the Institutional Effectiveness Committee about creating assessment measures, a timeline, and an official report-out mechanism. This instrument will specifically address the Evaluation Team's concern with formalizing an assessment regarding resource allocation and address the College's own self-identified action plan from the Self Evaluation Report **(CR2-12)**.

Standard IV.A

Progress has been made on evaluating planning processes for effectiveness. In its Self-Evaluation Report, the College identified two areas where it needed to implement a more formalized evaluation related to its planning and decision-making models. One was College Council **(CR2-13)**. In spring 2013, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee developed a rubric for assessing College Council through its representative function—how well it performs as a conduit of effective dialogue between stakeholder groups and the president for informed decision making **(CR2-14)**. The rubric was distributed to College Council members at the final meeting of 2012-2013, a self-assessment completed, and the results shared at the first College Council meeting of 2013-14 **(CR2-15; CR2-16)**. A similar rubric to be distributed to stakeholders is in development for fall 2013. This is especially important for students since another of the self-identified action items from the last self-evaluation was to develop a formalized evaluation of the effectiveness of student representation on College Council and its sub-committees **(CR2-17)**. Another improvement is that a statement of College Council's periodic evaluation is now formally embedded in the Participatory Governance Model **(CR2-11, pg. 17)**.

The second area of planning and decision-making that the College determined needed a formalized evaluation is the work of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee itself **(CR2-18)**. In spring 2013, dialogue ensued about evaluating the Institutional Effectiveness Committee that resulted in a series of

proposed changes to existing committees **(CR2-19)**. Since the Institutional Effectiveness Committee's charge is institutional planning, it was determined that it could and should work together with the SLO Committee and the (long defunct) Program Review Committee. The Program Review Committee is to be resuscitated and broadened to include all college operational units, not just instructional. The SLO Committee, which is currently a sub-committee of Academic Senate, would be similarly broadened. This proposal was introduced to College Council in May 2013 **(CR2-16)**.

In terms of evaluation, these three committees would each provide guidance for improving the College's performance on the ACCJC institutional effectiveness rubrics: the SLO Committee for student learning outcomes, Program Review Committee for program review, and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee for planning. These rubrics would, in turn, be the measure of their effectiveness—the extent to which the college achieves and maintains Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement. As of the filing of this follow-up report, the proposal has been approved by College Council and is moving forward with implementation **(CR2-20)**.

Progress Reported in 2014 Follow-Up Report

The result of the 2013 follow-up visit was that while the College had made substantive and complete progress in integrating planning activities in a way that linked mission, program review, and resource allocation, it had not fully completed the second half of the recommendation, implementing an effective evaluation instrument for the planning process **(CR2-21, pgs. 4-5)**. The team concluded that the recommendation had been partially addressed, and "the last step needed to meet this recommendation and meet Standards is implementing a formal, systematic evaluation process into its planning cycle."

In February and March, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) completed the design of a two-part instrument for annually evaluating the College's planning process, and it implemented the instrument in spring 2014 **(CR2-22)**.

One part is a comprehensive self-evaluation of each of the College's three major planning areas carried out by the steering groups responsible for each area: the Institutional Effectiveness Committee for planning, the Program Review committee for program review, and the Student Learning Outcome (SLO) committee for SLO's. This part is designed to be an "insider's" view: a detailed, frank assessment from groups with a level of special knowledge and institutional history in the areas.

Rubrics were developed by the IEC to guide the self-evaluations **(CR2-23)**. These documents were modeled closely on ACCJC's own rubrics for evaluating institutional effectiveness—the idea being that the College could and should be judging itself by what constitutes "Proficiency" in these areas. Each steering group was asked to provide a narrative of no more than 300 words for each bulleted item of the rubric **(CR2-24)**. This was also modeled on a Commission assessment: the SLO-readiness survey of 2012. IEC found that survey and the report it yielded **(CR2-25)** to be highly valuable in identifying the institution's progress in SLO implementation, so it designed its instrument to yield the same kind of feedback for all three major planning areas.

The IEC scored the responses on a 5-point scale. Each committee member rated the responses separately ahead of the meeting and submitted results to the chair. The group convened to discuss the scores and aggregate an overall rating for each bulleted item **(CR2-26)**.

In terms of making the results available, the self-evaluations and scores were posted to the college website as a much more detailed and comprehensive "College Report Card" than the institution has had in the past **(CR2-27)**. For loop back, the SLO and the Program Review coordinators are both sitting members of IEC, and all three committees used the results of the assessment to directly inform goal-setting for 2014-15 **(CR2-28; CR2-29; CR2-30)**. This is to be an annual process.

The second part of the College's formal, systematic evaluation of the planning process is a survey of the field. In contrast to the insider's view of the detailed self-evaluations, the Strategic Planning survey is intended to gauge the college community's understanding of and satisfaction with planning in the areas of "Mission and Institutional Goals," "College Planning," and "Budget and Resource Allocation."

The survey was designed by IEC in March and administered in April. It provided for comments as well as ratings **(CR2-31)**. The results were gathered and discussed by IEC in May at the same time the self-evaluations were discussed **(CR2267)**. One immediate outcome of giving the survey in 2014 was informing the college president's address on the subject of college governance to classified staff during classified staff appreciation week and to faculty at fall's opening flex day. Like the self-evaluations, the yearly results are intended to become a part of the expanded College Report Card **(CR2-27)**.

Conclusion Reported in 2014 Follow-Up Report

The College stated it had fully addressed this recommendation. This conclusion was accepted by ACCJC at its January 2015 Commission Meeting **(CR2-34).**

Sustained Improvements

Since the filing of the 2014 Follow-Up Report, an important advancement has been made in the integration, measurability, and target-setting of the College's strategic goals. In its 2012-2015 Strategic Plan, the College had adopted goals and objectives that ranged from the very narrow ("Increase the percentage of students who successfully complete 12 units within one year using 2011-12 as the baseline year") to the very general ("Reflect community needs as identified by various scanning data, unit plans, and measured by program review") and from the specifically measurable ("Increase scores on all benchmarks by 2-3% as measured by the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSEE) 2011 baseline") to the decidedly unmeasurable ("Implement or improve the following district-wide internal processes and measure their effectiveness annually: 1) tagging similar courses, 2) degree audit, 3) codifications of processes and dissemination of procedural information, and 4) data integrity") **(CR2-2)**.

For its 2015-2018 goals, the College much more clearly delineated this structure of goals, objectives, measures, and targets. It established a four-level hierarchy of action-planning—goals, objectives, strategies, and actions—with goals, the broadest level of the hierarchy, being directly related to commitments of the college mission. It identified very clear measures tied to just one of these levels—objectives. And it determined specific targets for 'moving the needle' on those measures that are the aim of objectives, strategies, and actions. This has simultaneously produced a clearer link to the college mission and a stronger foundation for the annual integrated planning and resource allocation process that flows from the strategic goals **(CR2-32)**.

Additionally, as anticipated in the 2013 Follow-Up Report, the College has now completed the design and implementation of a web form for submitting documents of the annual integrated planning process. Those responsible for completing planning documents fill out and submit the forms online, and the forms simultaneously serve to automate the creation of reports and capture the planning information in a database for future reporting and tracking **(CR2-33)**.

List of Evidence

CR2-1	External Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, February 2013
CR2-2	Cerro Coso Community College 2012-2015 Strategic Goals
CR2-3	Annual Integrated Planning Cycle Graphic and Timeline
CR2-4	Annual Unit Plan Template for Planning Year 2014-15
CR2-5	Annual Integrated Planning Work Page, 2014-15
CR2-6	Program Review Schedule
CR2-7	Program Review Template, 2013-14
CR2-8	Cerro Coso Community College Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, Standard I.B.2
CR2-9	Strategic Goals Assessment Matrix
CR2-10	Sample Budget Worksheets for 2014-15 Integrated Planning
CR2-11	Participatory Governance Model, 2012-2015 (revised, April 2013)
CR2-12	Cerro Coso Community College Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, Standard I.B.4
CR2-13	Cerro Coso Community College Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, Standard IV.A.1
CR2-14	College Council Self Evaluation Instrument (Participatory Governance Effectiveness Rubric)
CR2-15	College Council Self Evaluation Results, 2013
CR2-16	College Council Minutes, September 5, 2013
CR2-17	Cerro Coso Community College Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, Standard IV.A.2.a
CR2-18	Cerro Coso Community College Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, Standard IV.B.2.b
CR2-19	Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes, March 25, 2013