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, 2013

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, 2013

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, 2013

Introduction:
A comprehensive visit was conducted at 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 on November 6, 2013.

The purpose of the team visit was to examine and verify evidence provided in the October 15, 2013 Follow-Up Report prepared by the college, as well as to determine if the institution had made sustained, continuous, and positive improvements, had addressed the recommendations made by the comprehensive evaluation team, resolved the deficiencies noted in those recommendations, and now meets the Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, and Commission policies.

In general, the team found that the college had clearly documented the significant progress made within the one 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 Visiting Team. Evidence was effectively demonstrated throughout the report and also within systems accessed while on campus (TracDat and the college portal). 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, SLO coordinator, Academic Senate President, and Director of Planning, Research and Student Success. Additionally, the Chairs of the DE committee, budget and planning committee and program review validation team were also interviewed.

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

District Recommendation 1:
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.

District Recommendation 2:
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

District Recommendation 3:
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)

District Recommendation 4:
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)

District Recommendation 5:
In order to fully meet the Standard, the teams recommend the District develop policies and procedures that clearly define and follow the process for hiring and evaluating the college presidents. (IV.B.1, IV.B.1.j)

Evaluation of District Responses to the Team Recommendations:

District Recommendation 1:
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:

The District, in collaboration with the colleges, has established five short-term goals to assist the institution in meeting its mission for 2013-15. These goals include improving student success and completion; improving leadership and managerial competencies; completing the transition to a multi-college district; increasing regional leadership; and prioritizing economic and workforce development to meet regional, state and national needs. The planning process utilized was inclusive of the planning at the colleges and district services; drives allocation of resources; incorporates external factors; and includes a planning, budgeting and evaluation calendar with distributed responsibilities. Program and service vitality criteria have been drafted and will be reviewed by the District Consultation and Coordination Council comprised of representative district and college personnel for inclusion within the planning cycle.

Long-term goals will emerge from the 2014/15 strategic planning process and will include prioritized information from SLO assessment, program review, external demand and workforce needs.

Conclusions:

YCCD has done a great deal of work over this year to develop short-term goals, articulate a process for planning, and utilize an inclusive and transparent process that is clearly communicated. The process was inclusive of planning at the colleges and the cycle includes budget planning, implementation, and evaluation. The process appears to integrate planning, drive resource allocations, based on prioritization, and include agreed upon roles, responsibilities and timelines. Long-term goals will be established through the 2014/15 planning cycle. The model will need to be fully implemented, assessed and modified as necessary in order to fully resolve this recommendation. The college partially meets this Standard.

District Recommendation 2:
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:

According to interviews with district and college personnel, the revenue model that the district had previously used could not adequately address new program development or growth at any college because it was based upon fractions of state-funded growth distributed to either college. Additionally, that model prescribed uniform cuts across the board during the recession, which did not adequately support existing programs and resulted in some unhealthy situations within programs.

The follow-up report depicts a schematic that relates the Comprehensive District Master Plan with emergent strategies and prioritization of programs and services to develop annual action plans. These annual action plans are then used to determine the allocation of resources. The model also provides for an adequate fund balance as well as execution of the annual action plan. The prioritization of programs, services and human resource needs will be central to allocating resources across the district in a manner which enables the colleges and district to achieve their mission. The goal is to move away from a system in which resources are shared in a strict percentage split based upon revenue, to a resource allocation model that is based upon prioritization of needs and services that prepares the district to position itself for growth as those funds and opportunities present themselves. This new model will be initially implemented in the 2014/15 budget year.

Conclusions:

The district and colleges have worked together to create a resource allocation model that utilizes a comprehensive district master plan along with emergent and program service prioritization into an annual action plan to drive resource allocation. The budget allocation formula will need to be implemented and assessed to ensure that it is inclusive, transparent, and allows planning to shape the institution and colleges to best meet the needs of its community (mission) within the parameters of budget constraints. In order to fully resolve this recommendation, a complete cycle will need to occur with subsequent assessment and modification. The college partially meets this Standard.

District Recommendation 3:
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:

Evidence in the report and an interview with the president indicated that there had been conversation district wide through College Leadership of Academic and Student Success (CLASS) regarding the functional map. The document was most recently revised approximately two months ago regarding changes that had been made at the district level. Following agreement on the modifications, the changes were disseminated more broadly to constituent groups. YCCD is in the process of conducting a survey of college expectations for district-provided services in fall 2013 and the results are not yet available. Additionally, functional responsibilities for distance education courses taught by WCC have been modified so that the college has more direct oversight of hiring and scheduling related to these courses. Additionally, technology infrastructure support for DE has been centralized to lend better support for these courses. DE functions and responsibilities are currently scheduled to be evaluated in fall 2014. It will be important to use that feedback to maximize student learning outcomes and continuous improvement of learning in DE courses.

Conclusions:

The college and district have done a great deal of work over the year in discussing and modifying the functional map and in disseminating that information to constituent groups. An assessment of expectations of district-provided services is currently being conducted; however, results are not yet available. Further assessment of DE functions and responsibilities is scheduled for fall 2014. The recommendation has been completed. The college partially meets this Standard.

District Recommendation 4:
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:

The district and college leadership have been engaged in discussion regarding long-term and short-term human resource planning. The framework for the human resource plan is composed of four basic elements that include: equity and diversity; staffing planning; professional development; and personnel and employment relations services. Given this framework, the bulk of the plan will be crafted throughout the 2013/14 year. The goal of the staffing component will be to ensure that appropriate staffing levels are in place at the district offices, colleges and centers. Interviews with the Chief HR officer and college president indicate that the staffing component will be driven by an analysis of current staffing levels across the district, analyzing where areas might be adequately staffed or need to be leveled off. The analysis will also create metrics by which the district and colleges might grow as growth funds and student demand materialize. This type of analysis will be crucial, in conjunction with the college's own prioritization of staffing needs performed by the Faculty, Staff, Administrator Planning Council (FSAPC). The district has also drafted written protocols for evaluating all faculty, staff and managers on a timely basis and has revised administrative procedures, which are currently being reviewed by the Chancellor's Executive Committee (CHEX) and District Consultation and Communication Council (DC3) for approval. A master calendar of evaluations is tracked by HR analysts and the district has conducted research into best practices for evaluations. Discussions are underway with each group to modify the current evaluation tools and timelines. The district has reached a tentative agreement with the full-time faculty union to include a component which assesses the individual's contribution to improving student learning within the evaluation instrument. Discussions with the part-time union are just beginning related to this evaluation component. The intent language to be included in the faculty contracts was shared with the team along with a sample of the faculty evaluation tool, itself.

Conclusions:

The district and college have made tremendous progress in this area during the year and are on target to complete the work for human resource planning and integration with institutional planning by the end of the year. Assessments of HR functions have now occurred annually for the past three years and the department appears to be using this information for improvement and planning. Additionally, the issue of timely, consistent evaluations has been addressed through administrative procedures as well as tracking and inclusion of best practices. This recommendation has been resolved. The college partially meets this Standard.

District Recommendation 5:
In order to fully meet the Standard, the teams recommend the District develop policies and procedures that clearly define and follow the process for hiring and evaluating the college presidents. (IV.B.1, IV.B.1.j)

Findings and Evidence:

Evidence and interviews indicate that AP 7122 has been recently evaluated and revised regarding evaluation of the college president. The process now more closely aligns with the chancellor's evaluation and includes a survey to solicit feedback from faculty, staff and administrators that work closely with the president. Constituent feedback is used to create professional development goals for the president. This process was most recently completed in summer and early fall 2013.

Conclusions:

The college has completed work on this recommendation and meets the Standard.

College Responses to the Team Recommendations:

College Recommendation #1 (Integrated planning):
In order to fully meet the Standards, the College needs to complete a full cycle of planning, assess the effectiveness of the planning processes, and modify the process, timing and committee structures as needed. The planning process at the College and the District should integrate technology planning and assessment as well as human resource planning and grant planning. These processes and information about how the college mission is central to all decision-making should be communicated broadly to all college constituencies. The College should identify and broadly communicate measurable college wide goals and use data to analyze progress towards achievement of these goals. (I.A, I.B, II.A, II.B, II.C, III.A.6, III.C.2, IV.A.4)

Findings and Evidence

Evidence cited in the Woodland Community College Accreditation Follow-Up Report, as well as interviews conducted at the college, indicated that the college has a well-documented integrated planning process. They have established committee structures and have posted committee minutes to the web.

Through the Institutional Effectiveness Model (i.e., academic program reviews, student services reviews, administrative unit reviews, and planning committees and process reviews), the college reviewed and provided feedback on program vitality using program and student learning outcome data. In addition, the college prioritized all resource requests, including technology, human resources, and facilities requests, and allocated resources (general funds as well as grant funds) based upon this data using a program review validation rubric developed by the newly formed (in fall 2012) Program Review Validation Team (PRVT). The PRVT evaluated how departmental requests support the college mission and goals and improve institutional

effectiveness. Progress towards meeting college goals was broadly disseminated to the campus community in the spring through the College Accountability Report. Following the completion of the planning cycle, the college then assessed the planning process and made modifications to planning timeline by changing the deadline for all program reviews from February to October in order to meet budget deadlines within the district. Furthermore, the PRVT made improvements to the program review process by adding a new field to the college's SLO and program review tracking software (TracDat) as a mechanism to report back PRVT recommendations to the program review authors and departments.

The college has developed and instituted a biannual evaluative process of all committees through which all committees complete a review of committee charges, goals, and effectiveness. This committee evaluation process informed the college's efforts to modify its committee structure. The college has begun streamlining committee structures by merging the basic skills and student success committees. Because of duplicative work, further discussion has commenced to consolidate the Faculty, Staff, Administrator Planning Committee (FSAPC), Scheduling Committee, and the Program Review Validation Team.

The college began to clarify its different plans and consolidate its goals into one document. All planning documents are conveniently located on the college's Planning, Research and Student Success website. While the draft YCCD Institutional Effectiveness Handbook 2013-14 at the district-wide level includes discussion about key performance indicators that measure progress towards established goals and student success, WCC should continue efforts to measure *institutional* performance using benchmarks and institutional standards. Academic Senate minutes provided evidence that the college has begun discussing institutional standards regarding student outcomes and achievements, which still must be established and broadly disseminated.

Conclusions:

Since the October 2012 comprehensive visit, the college had completed a full cycle of integrated planning, evaluated the results and made modifications to the process, timing, and committee structure, as needed. In accordance with the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement level of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges planning rubric, the college has resolved this recommendation and meets the Standard.

College Recommendation #2 (Student Learning Outcomes):
In order to fully meet the Standards, the College should identify Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in all courses, programs (including all service and administrative areas), and progress through an entire cycle of assessment. The College should reflect on results to focus on improving student learning. This must become an integral and iterative part of continuous improvement plans. Additionally, the College and District must work together to include effectiveness in producing learning outcomes in the evaluations of faculty and others directly responsible for student progress towards achieving student learning outcomes. (II.A.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.i, II.A.6, II.C, III.A.1.c)

Findings and Evidence:

Evidence provided in the report and within TracDat, as well as interviews with the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) coordinator and Director of Planning Research and Student Success, indicated that the college significantly improved in identifying, assessing, and discussing SLOs. SLOs have been identified and assessed for all programs, student service departments and administrative units. In addition, all eight institutional student learning outcomes (iSLOs) have been assessed through indirect and direct methods of assessment and gaps in iSLO assessments have been analyzed and discussed.

The college's mantra to "assess every course, every semester" has laid the foundation to swift progress in completing a full cycle of course SLO assessments. The percentage of courses that have undergone documented SLO assessment increased by 65 percent (54% in fall 2012 vs. 89% in spring 2013) since the comprehensive visit in October 2012, despite facing the significant challenge that 80 percent of faculty at the college are part-time faculty. Therefore, the college took great efforts to include part-time faculty in this dialogue, which led to improvements in gathering SLO assessment data from part-time faculty with a simplified form. Lastly, the college created a clear and uniform deadline for the recording SLO assessments every semester by requiring data submissions when term grades are due.

Dialogue about SLO assessment occurs in a variety of venues. For example, SLO assessment information is required within PRVT rubric and program vitality documentation. Dialogue about student learning occurs at both the department and division levels, at SLO committee meetings, and PRVT meetings. Conversation about student learning continues at the monthly all-faculty meetings as well.

Interviews with the Chancellor and Chief Human Resource Officer indicate that involvement in SLOs has been included in the tentative contract agreement between the district and the full-time faculty union. The conversation is just beginning with the part-time faculty union.

Conclusions:

Based on the evidence reviewed during the visit, the college meets the Proficiency standard of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges student learning outcome rubric. Thus, the college has resolved this recommendation and meets the Standard.

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:

The district has created a structure and mechanism for inclusion of college input in the oversight and responsibility for distributive education (DE). Through inclusive collaboration, the district DE committee created a draft functional map (DE Responsibility Matrix), outlining the responsibilities of each entity in the district. Recently, YCCD centralized some IT support functions related to DE and the dialog across the district has improved. There have been some improvements in DE responsibility, funding, and oversight; however, the team found that the issues surrounding administrative responsibility and ensuring quality remain unresolved.

A survey of students enrolled in DE courses was performed in spring 2013 and provided information about the support services needed and used by DE students. Success rates disaggregating DE and face-to-face modalities are provided as part of the program review data and reviewed by the WCC DE Committee.

A technology training survey was also conducted to inform decision on technology training for students, staff, and faculty. In addition, YCCD IT provided training related to the implementation of a new learning management system (Canvas).

The results of all these assessments and the district-wide assessment of DE to be conducted in fall 2014 should be used to make improvements in these areas and in decision-making related to DE.

Conclusions:

Inclusive dialogue, IT support of DE, and professional development related to DE have improved since the October site visit; however, continued assessment of DE programming, responsibility, and functions must continue in order ensure appropriate authority and oversight over instructional quality. Therefore, the college has not fully resolved this recommendation and partially meets the Standard.

College Recommendation #4 (Professional development and training)
In order to fully meet the Standards, the College must develop and implement comprehensive technology training for faculty, staff and students in order to increase effectiveness, as well as student learning and success. Additionally, the effectiveness of current professional development offerings for faculty, staff and administrators on campus should be assessed to support continuous improvement. (II.A.1.b, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.c, II.A.2.d, II.C, III.A.5, III.A.5.a, III.A.5.b, III.A.6, III.C.1.a, III.C.1.b, III.C.1.d, III.C.2)

Findings and Evidence:

Based upon the evidence provided in the report and site interviews conducted at the college, the college and district have worked together to provide multiple technology training opportunities to faculty and staff. They have assessed the workshops, gathered feedback, and planned for training, which seems to have been well-received. Multiple technology trainings, Canvas workshops, and other online materials (e.g., YouTube Videos) have been produced throughout the year. The WCC Technology Training Survey was also conducted in the spring to inform decision on technology training for students, staff, and faculty. Lastly, the district has identified the improvement of leadership and managerial competencies as one of the five short-term goals across the district.

Conclusions:

The college has resolved issues related to this recommendation and meets this Standard.