



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

Statement of Report Preparation.....	1
Response to College Recommendation 2.....	3

Complete List of Evidence

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

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](#)