

Follow-Up Visit Report

Woodland College
2300 E. Gibson Road
Woodland, CA 95776

A Confidential Report Prepared for the Accrediting Commission
For Community and Junior Colleges
This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited

Woodland College
on
November 6, 2014

Dr. Sunita V. Cooke, President
Grossmont College

Mr. Christopher Tarman, Sr. Dean of Research Planning and Institutional Effectiveness
Grossmont College

Follow-Up Visit Report

DATE: November 6, 2014

TO: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

FROM: Dr. Sunny Cooke, Team Chair

SUBJECT: Report of Follow-Up Visit Team to Woodland College, November 6, 2014

Introduction:

A comprehensive visit was conducted to Woodland Community College (WCC) in October 2012. At its meeting in January 2013, the Commission acted to require WCC to submit a Follow-Up Report followed by a visit. The visiting team, Dr. Sunita V. Cooke and Mr. Christopher Tarman, conducted the follow-up site visit to WCC in November 2013. The Commission considered the 2013 follow-up report and acted to keep the college on warning with an additional follow-up visit and report due in October 2014.

The purpose of the 2nd follow up visit by Mr. Tarman and Dr. Cooke scheduled for November 6, 2014, was to examine and verify evidence provided in the October 2014 Follow-Up Report prepared by the college, and to determine if the institution had resolved the recommendations made by the comprehensive evaluation team and now meets the Accreditation Standards and Commission policies.

In general, the team found that the college had clearly summarized the progress made in the first year and documented the significant progress made within the second year since the comprehensive visit. The college was well-prepared for the visit and had arranged meetings with the individuals and groups requested by the site visitors. Evidence was effectively demonstrated throughout the report and also within systems accessed while on campus. Over the course of the day, the team met with the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor of Education Planning Services, Chief Business Officer, Chief Human Resource Officer, College President, Accreditation Liaison Officer, faculty co-chair for accreditation, and faculty chair of the DE committee.

The Follow-Up Report and visit were expected to document resolution of the following recommendations:

College Recommendation #3 (Distance Education):

In order to fully meet the Standards, the College should develop mechanisms that ensure participation in ongoing dialog about the continuous improvement of student learning for distance education (DE) students. All DE courses and programs, ongoing learning support, and services required by DE students, appropriate staffing levels, and oversight through the college, resource allocation, and technology training should be regularly and systematically assessed and that information should be used for continuous quality improvement. (I.B, II.A, II.A.1, II.A.1b, II.A.2, II.A.2d, II.B, II.C, III.A, III.B, III.C, III.D)

Findings and Evidence:

Through a collaborative effort, the District Distance Education (DE) Committee finalized the functional map (DE Responsibility Matrix), outlining responsibilities and roles of each entity in the district. YCCD centralized IT support functions related to DE and the college reported that these support services are timely and responsive. Administrative authority, responsibility, funding, oversight, and scheduling of DE courses and programs now reside solely at Woodland College. The college has identified a DE liaison to coordinate with the California Community College Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) and recommended the need for a permanent DE coordinator.

The college regularly assesses its DE courses and programs through annual program reviews which include evaluations of Student Learning Outcome and student achievement data (as compared to courses employing face-to-face instruction) as well as regular, biannual surveys of DE students. These evaluations inform scheduling decisions as well as professional development opportunities. For example, courses that consistently reflect poor student success and retention have been removed from the schedule.

Conclusion:

Woodland College now has complete oversight and authority over all distance education (DE) courses, which allows the college to ensure continuous quality improvement of student learning, to provide appropriate student support services, to provide technology training to students and faculty, and to control staffing levels and resource allocation. The college regularly assesses its DE courses and programs through established program review policies and uses results from Student Learning Outcomes, student achievement data, and biannual surveys of students enrolled in DE courses. The college has resolved this recommendation and meets the standards.

District Recommendation #1 (Strategic Planning):

To meet the Standards, the teams recommend that the chancellor develop and implement short term and long term data driven strategic plans. These should be developed in an inclusive manner, be transparent, clearly communicated and inclusive of the planning at the colleges. Particular focus should be in the development, implementation, assessment, and evaluation of the following: (I.A.4, I.B.2, I.B.5, II.A.2, II.C, III.B)

- **A strategic plan guiding the District in integrating its planning processes that result in the district meeting its goals set forth and in line with their vision and mission;**
- **A planning structure driving allocation of district resources for the District, the colleges, and the off-campus centers; and**
- **A planning calendar including timelines that are delineated with parties/positions responsible.**

Findings and Evidence:

Preceded by local planning and prioritization at the college and district offices as well as the identification of strategic initiatives, emerging trends, and other external factors, the Yuba Community College District initiated its annual Integrated Planning and Evaluation Cycle for 2013-14.

In fall 2013, the colleges and district services updated their respective Educational Master Plans. Academic Program Reviews, Student Services Reviews (SSR), and Administrative Services Reviews (ASR) as well as Student Learning Outcome (SLO), and Administrative Unit Outcome (AUO) assessments were submitted in October 2013. Reviews included requests for curriculum development, staffing, technology, equipment, and facilities. Teams at all sites were charged with Program Review validation and prioritization of requests. This was followed by budget and administrative review and further prioritization at the local level. Taken together, these processes resulted in Annual Action Plan Objectives for each site along with prioritized lists of requests reflective of Program and Services Vitality criteria (PSV). The Annual Action Plans from the three entities were compiled into the District Annual Action Plan.

District planning began in the spring of 2014. The District Consultation and Coordination Council charged three standing committees (District Annual Action Plan Team, Budget Advisory Team and the Institutional Effectiveness Review Team) and two work groups (Program and Service Vitality Prioritization workgroups) with oversight of the four components of the annual planning process. All committees and workgroups were inclusive and representative of the different constituent groups as well as colleges, district services, and centers. The PSV workgroups and the Chancellor's Executive Team prepared a master list of ranked resource requests that eventually drove budget development and allocation of one-time augmentation funding. The tentative budget was presented to the Board of Trustees in June for adoption. The Institutional Effectiveness Review (IER) team designed the Board of Trustees IER Report, which included: 2013-14 goal achievement outcomes; SLO and Program Review themes; key performance indicator results; participatory decision-making assessments; and results of planning and budget process evaluations. Evaluations of the process used data from a survey administered to all District employees in fall 2014. In addition, committee feedback on the process was solicited. Among others, recommendations implemented for 2015-16 planning

included: the addition of differing budget scenarios (e.g., budget reduction or stability as opposed to augmentation funding); modification of the Program and Service Vitality Prioritization process in order to demarcate it from site-specific decision-making processes; additional training on the District integrated annual planning, budget and evaluation cycle; and changes in communication to ensure broad dissemination and knowledge of the process.

After reviewing the Colleges' Educational Master Plans, the District Services Master Plan, the Facilities Master Plan, the Human Resources Master Plan draft, and the District Technology Plan, long-range district goals were created and distributed for dialogue and feedback. Each of the goals included measureable objectives and strategies. These strategic goals were approved by the Board of Trustees in November 2014.

Lastly, the YCCD developed several diagrams to illustrate the Annual Integrated Planning, Budget and Evaluation Cycle timeline and strategic planning protocol. These charts were distributed widely throughout the district. Indeed, communication about the strategic planning process utilized several different venues and modalities (e.g., open-forums; convocations; monthly newsletters and emails; strategic planning websites).

Conclusion:

YCCD has a well-defined ongoing process for integrated planning that is inclusive, transparent, and broadly communicated across the district. The process integrates all components of planning at the colleges and district services. The process allows planning to drive resource allocations, based on collaborative prioritization and well-defined roles, responsibilities, and timelines. Long-term districtwide goals with measurable objectives have been established and will inform the 2014-15 planning cycle. A complete cycle of the integrated planning model has been fully implemented, assessed, and modified with robust dialogue in accordance to the principles of sustainable continuous quality improvement. The district and the colleges have developed recurring cycles with annual timelines that align across sites. The college has documented progress toward achieving its educational goals over time (using longitudinal data and analyses) and has communicated matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies. The college has resolved this recommendation and meets the standards.

District Recommendation #2 (Resource Allocation):

To meet the Standards, the teams recommend that the District, in conjunction with the colleges, develop and implement a resource allocation model that is driven by planning and student success. The model should be developed in an inclusive manner, be transparent and clearly communicated and evaluated periodically for effectiveness in supporting the district's and colleges' missions. (I.A.1, I.B, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.2, III.D.4, III.D.1.a, III.D.1.b, III.D.1.C, III.D.1.d, III.D.2.b, III.D.3, IV.B

Findings and Evidence:

After the District Consultation and Coordination Council (DC3) adopted the strategic planning protocol and program services vitality criteria (PSV) these were utilized in the 2013-14 planning cycle. Local planning at each college included information from program reviews, analyses of student learning outcomes, and college prioritization of resource requests fed into the district planning process. In February of 2014, the DC3 charged three standing committees and two work groups with oversight of the annual planning process. These groups were the District Annual Action Plan Team (DAAPT), Program and Service Vitality work groups, Budget Advisory Team (BAT) and the Institutional Effectiveness Review Team (IERT). The District's Annual Action Plan Team made resource allocation recommendations and the BAT allocated resources to the highest priorities. The IERT designed and administered a survey instrument sent to all district employees to evaluate the effectiveness of the integrated planning process. Following analysis of the survey results, there were several modifications made to the planning and resource allocation process. These modifications centered around the need for additional training about the process, broader communication and clarification of the interface between college and district planning steps, and simplification of the process. In addition, modifications will be made to the evaluation instrument.

The district has charged BAT and IERT to move toward a longer-term planning and budgeting cycle that will enable a more stable and predictable environment for the colleges to identify strategic areas of need and to plan funding to meet those needs.

Conclusion:

The colleges and district have now completed a cycle of inclusive planning, budget development and resource allocation. The resource allocation model has been evaluated with input from all constituents groups across the district and results of this evaluation have been used for sustainable continuous quality improvement. The college has resolved this recommendation and meets the standards.

District Recommendation #3 (Delineation of Functional Responsibilities): To meet the Standards, the teams recommend that the District provide the following:

- **Delineation of its functional responsibilities;**
- **Determination of whether current functions provided by the District offices should be centralized or decentralized to better serve the needs of the students; and**
- **Clarification of the district level process for decision-making and the role of the district in college planning and decision-making.**

The District should clearly identify district committees, perform a regular review of their work, conduct review of the overall effectiveness of district services to the colleges, and widely disseminate the results of those reviews. (I.A.4, I.B.1, III.B, IV.A, IV.B.3)

Findings and Evidence:

Representatives of Woodland College, Yuba College and the District have continued to work through the delineation of functional responsibilities. District services implemented an annual evaluation schedule to assess the level to which centralized services in the district are meeting the goals of providing effective and efficient support to the colleges. The College Leadership in Academic and Student Services (CLASS) established college expectations of district provided services through a series of meetings in spring 2013.

An annual evaluation of district functions was developed by CLASS based upon the college expectations for services and implemented in October 2013. The results were posted and modifications were made (based upon the assessment) to business services technology, the implementation of an open access technology training site, new employee orientation, and access to documentation and training materials from human resources.

On July 23, 2014, a gathering of district representatives met to review the newly created functional map in response to the evaluations of district services and college expectations for services about which functions should be centralized or decentralized. As a result of this retreat, seven specific responsibility matrices were developed to communicate the current state of roles and responsibilities. The DE responsibility matrix developed by Distance Education Committee, which had reduced some of the concern at Woodland College related to DE responsibilities, served as a model for identifying additional functions with shared roles and responsibilities. For example, a separate responsibility matrix was also created for information technology and media services. Additional work on the delineation of technology responsibilities for Yuba College was addressed collaboratively by the Yuba College Technology Committee and the district.

Conclusion:

Over this past year, the district has worked to communicate broadly college and district functions, assess the effectiveness of centralized functions and make modifications as needed based upon assessment results. There appears to be an infrastructure and process in place for evaluating and improving district provided services in support of the colleges. The college has resolved this recommendation and meets the standards.

District Recommendation #4 (Human Resources Planning):

To meet the Standard, the teams recommend human resources planning be integrated with institutional planning and the District and colleges should systematically assess the effective use of human resources and use the results of the evaluation as a basis for improvement and identify needed staff in faculty, classified and management positions. Further, the teams recommend the systematic evaluation of all personnel at stated intervals with appropriate documentation. For all employee groups, the District should also follow clearly defined appropriate written evaluative processes that are in written terms. (III.A.1.a-b, III.A.6)

Findings and Evidence:

Working with the colleges, the district has integrated human resource planning into both college and districtwide planning. Program reviews conducted at each site (both colleges and district services) yield information that is used for prioritization at each site of human resource (and other) needs. Site prioritization remains intact as the broader districtwide prioritization of needs is considered. The Human Resources Master Plan, inclusively developed in 2013-14, comprehensively addresses all of the human resources services and functions, including the staffing planning, performance management (evaluation), and professional development needs of the college and district. As part of this plan, there is a series of metrics displaying current levels of faculty, classified staff and administrators at each of the colleges and centers for the baseline year 2013-14 and projections for the 2014-15 year. This plan was developed to provide predictability and direction to appropriate staffing levels, greater accountability between sites, efficiency in human resource planning and greater communication and collaboration across the sites regarding human resource planning.

Conclusion:

As a result of the work done over the past two years, the college and the district have implemented timely and consistent evaluation processes and a systematic approach to human resource planning that is integrated into the overall college and district planning processes. There is also evidence of ongoing assessments of human resources planning and processes that is used for sustainable continuous quality improvement. The college has resolved this recommendation and meets the standards.