College of the Sequoias

Institutional Self Study Report in Support of Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Submitted by

College of the Sequoias
915 South Mooney Boulevard
Visalia, CA 93277

To

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

September 2006

Certification of the Institutional Self Study Report

Date: August 21, 2006

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

From: College of the Sequoias
                915 South Mooney Boulevard
                Visalia, CA 93277

This Institutional Self Study Report is submitted for the purpose of assisting in the determination of the institution's accreditation status.

We certify that there was broad participation by the campus community, and we believe the Self Study Report accurately reflects the nature and substance of the institution.

Signed,

_____

Dr. William Scroggins, Superintendent/President

_____

John A. Zumwalt, President, Board of Trustees

_____

Dale Norton, Interim VP Academic Services, Accreditation Liaison

_____

Dr. Dorothea Trimble, Accreditation Chair

_____

Stephen Natoli, Academic Senate President

Table of Contents

Introduction

History & Change

Founded in 1926, College of the Sequoias (COS) serves the residents of Tulare and Kings Counties as a center for higher education and vocational training. COS has occupied its current location since 1939. The campus is continuing to change and in the last six years has seen the completion of the Music Building and the Learning Resource Center. Additional portable buildings have been located on the Visalia campus in order to accommodate a number of different programs, including Computer Services, COS Health Center and the CSU Fresno Center.

In Fall 2004, COS served 10,616 students which represents an increase of 6.2% since Fall 2000. During the same period COS has seen a decrease in the number of full-time faculty from 167 to 157, or 6%. The number of classified staff has decreased 15.7% (30 positions) since the last accreditation self study. The number of Administrators has increased by 2, or 7%.

Demographic Information

The population of Kings and Tulare Counties has continued to out-pace the increase in population of the State of California. Since 2000, the local population has increased 8.2% while the State population has increased only 6.7%. Unfortunately, the unemployment rates for Kings and Tulare Counties, 14.6% and 15.5% respectively, also are significantly higher than those for the State, 6.7% (2003 data).

COS has made progress towards increased diversity of students, faculty and staff.

Demographics of College of the Sequoias Fall 2004 & Fall 2000

Category	Fall	Kings & Tulare County	Students	FT Faculty	PT Faculty	Classified	Administrators
American Indian	2004	0.9%	1.3%	1.3%	0.7%	3.7%	0.0%
	2000	0.9%	1.5%	0.5%			0.0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2004	3.2%	6.0%	3.2%	1.8%	5.6%	0.0%
	2000	3.3%	4.8%	2.9%			0.0%
Black	2004	3.0%	3.6%	5.1%	0.4%	0.0%	3.3%
	2000	3.2%	3.0%	(5.2%)			0.0%
Hispanic	2004	51.8%	42.6%	11.5%	9.9%	31.7%	23.3%
	2000	48.9%	40.4%	7.6%			25.9%
White	2004	39.2%	38.0%	79.0%	73.9%	59.0%	73.3%
	2000	42.5%	44.2%	83.7%			74.1%
Other/ Unknown	2004	8.4%	8.5%	0.0%	13.4%	0.0%	0.0%
	2000	1.2%	4.5%				
Male	2004		40.2%	50.3%	57.4%	32.3%	70.0%
	2000		40.8%	52.3%			59.3%
Female	2004		59.8%	49.7%	42.6%	67.7%	30.0%
	2000		59.2%	47.7%			40.7%

- County Data from Census/American Fact Finder
- Fall 2004 data source: IPEDS data for 2004-05
- Fall 2000 data source: Personnel Records; none available for PT Faculty or Classified

Fall 2004 enrollment at COS was 10,616. Current forecasts predict COS enrollment will climb to 15,131 by 2012 (California Community College, Research and Planning Unit). If achieved, this represents a 42.5% increase in enrollment. However, it should be noted that the same forecast predicted Fall 2004 enrollment would be 11,383 which represents an over-estimation of 7.2%. Preliminary data for Fall 2005 shows a decrease of 4.6% in enrollment (9952), a phenomenon seen throughout the State. From 2003 to 2010, the population of Kings County is forecasted to increase by 13.8% and the population of Tulare County is forecasted to increase by 16.2% (CA Department of Finance, January 2005).

Recommendations from 2000 Accreditation

The last comprehensive accreditation review was in Fall 2000. The Visiting Team made seven recommendations to COS. In addition, COS was required to submit a Focused Interim Report in Fall 2002, a Focused Midterm Report in Fall 2003 and a Progress Report in Fall 2004.

COS addressed the first recommendation by producing a comprehensive Educational Master Plan. The Educational Master Plan was synthesized from Program Review Reports, Institutional Performance Indicators, the Student Equity Plan, the Matriculation Report, workforce data, and student demographics.

In addressing the second recommendation, the College modified the Program Review Report format in order to ensure that all areas and services were addressing various accountability mechanisms and that each area was directly addressing student performance issues. In addition, the College developed and adopted Institutional Performance Indicators.

Recommendation three was to review the faculty evaluation process, including tenure review, and to implement appropriate changes. The Academic Senate reviewed the faculty evaluation process and recommended changes that were negotiated by faculty association and incorporated into the COSTA Master Agreement. However, during this review, no dialogue and no changes were made in tenure review.

The fourth recommendation was to demonstrate that issues of staff diversity in hiring and training are major priorities. COS has addressed this several ways, including: recruiting in publications of a diverse nature; providing numerous training opportunities for faculty and staff on diversity issues; and monitoring staff diversity and hiring processes by the Faculty & Staff Diversity Committee. Review of full-time faculty demographics indicates the College has been successful in increasing diversity.

Recommendation five was to develop and refine the budget development processes, focusing on streamlining the process, providing user-friendly budget information to campus constituencies, and educating the campus on budget procedures. The College of the Sequoias has made many changes as a result of this recommendation. These changes have streamlined the process of Above Base Budget requests and approvals by removing all committees from the ranking process except for the College Council. The College produces an annual *Budget Book*, which is the Final Budget adopted by the Board of Trustees and contains key budget information used to develop the Preliminary Budget. This *Budget Book* is distributed to governance committee members and may

be requested by anyone on campus that does not receive one as a result of serving on a committee. Educational efforts have focused on presentations to governance committees on the processes of budget development.

Recommendation six was to communicate more proactively and publicly Governing Board actions. The process for new and revised Board Policies now includes three readings at the College Council prior to action to recommend adoption by the Board of Trustees. This ensures adequate time for any group to recommend changes or submit concerns.

Recommendation seven to streamline the participatory governance structure in order to facilitate communication between these groups and the Superintendent/President was addressed by having the Superintendent/President chair the College Council. This ensures direct communication between all of these entities and the Superintendent/President.

Student Achievement

Over the last several years COS has seen improvements in many student achievement measures. A comparison of this data is shown in the table below.

Category	2000-01	2003-04	2004-05
All Course Completion *	70.0%	75.8%	69.7%
Basic Skills Completion *	55.9%	59.8%	55.3%
Vocational Course Completion *	72.4%	78.7%	72.4%
Retention (Fall)	86.9%	88.9%	89.4%
Persistence (Spring to Fall)	52.1%	56.3%	55.9%
Number of Degrees *	739	729	690
Number of Certificates *	457	456	720
STRK Graduation Rates **	35.8%	37.2%	32.3%
STRK Transfer Rates **	12.0%	13.8%	10.8%
Transfers to UC/CSU *	534	488	452

* Partnership for Excellence data from CCC
** Student Right To Know data from CCC
Persistence data – COS MIS reports
All other data from CCC DataMart (www.cccco.edu)

Course Completion, Basic Skills, and Vocational Completion saw an increase in 2003-04 followed by a decrease in 2004-05. Both Retention and Persistence have increased over the last few years. While there has been a decrease in the number of degrees awarded, there has been a significant increase in the number of certificates awarded by the College. A fluctuation in Transfer and Graduation rates can also be seen.

Student Learning Outcomes

COS has established a Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Committee with representatives from every division and Student Services. The committee is chaired by a faculty member and it is a standing committee of the Academic Senate. Committee members have sought training through AAHE/WASC, CCCAOE Conference Central Region, and on-campus training funded by the LISTO Program. Committee members have access to a library of relevant articles and books and

to information on a campus SLO website. The SLO Committee has practiced using outcomes in their own courses, shared learning outcomes activities with each other, and suggested outcomes for Sabbatical evaluation. The SLO Committee decided to begin the process of student learning outcome development at the individual course level. It was felt that starting at this level (bottom-up approach) would encourage dialogue and serious adoption of outcomes and assessments, which might not occur beginning at the degree or program level (top-down approach).

The SLO Committee has encouraged campus participation through periodic "Everyone" e-mails, making assessment books available in the library, advertising the SLO website, and offering on-campus training workshops. A specialized training effort led by the SLO Committee members was with Basic Skills Math and English faculty as a part of a Carnegie grant. SLO Committee members also mentor other faculty members from their divisions or areas. Participants in training include both full-time and part-time faculty. In addition, employment recruitment and interview questions include aspects of student learning outcomes.

In Fall 2005, the Campus Curriculum Committee adopted a new Course Outline form that requires course authors to identify Learning Outcomes and Assessment Methods. Rubrics or evaluation standards are optional so that those courses where faculty are working more closely with SLOs, will have the ability to incorporate the appropriate rubric. Most of the SLO components in the new course outline are not new, but are now aligned to make conversation more focused on the compatibility of outcomes, assessments and standards. Language on the Course Outline is now "Outcome" instead of "Objective" and, with this change, the SLO Committee will focus on intensive dialogue and training. Training workshop topics include rubrics, course outlines, "Calibrated Peer Review", comprehensive program SLOs, experimental and quasi-experimental design, and classroom assessment techniques. As new courses are developed and as existing courses are submitted for review and updating, they will be focused on the student learning outcomes and the assessment of those outcomes.

Off-Campus Sites & Distance Learning

In Fall 2004, COS had a total of 84 courses at seven off-campus sites, not including the COS Farm. The COS Hanford Center offers the most courses with 55 day and evening classes being taught. In that same term, COS offered twenty distance education classes. Fourteen classes were offered in an on-line format and six in a televised/video format. Five different divisions offer distance education classes including the Business, Consumer Family Studies, Language Arts, Library, and Mathematics & Engineering Divisions.

Audits & Federal Grants

COS has a standard independent audit performed every year. All audit findings are presented to the Board of Trustees. The most recent audit, June 2005, noted no "material weaknesses" in the internal control of financial reporting and operations. The independent audit of the compliance of COS with the *U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-133* found that the District "complied, in all material respects" with the requirements of this OMB Circular. In addition, the audit found that the College met all of the State laws and regulations in accordance with Section 400 of the Chancellor's Office's *California Community Colleges Contracted Audit Manual.*

Self Study Abstract

Standard I: Institutional Mission & Effectiveness

College of the Sequoias, COS, has a comprehensive Mission. The Mission of the College is reviewed and updated on a regular basis. This review process involves dialogue and participation from all campus constituencies.

The Program Review process at COS is well established and serves as a main planning instrument for the College. The Program Review reports have served as the basis for the Educational Master Plan. This process has been reviewed by the Institutional Planning Committee and the Program Review Steering Committee and changes have been made based on those reviews. The evaluations that occur within each program area utilize the appropriate data for that group.

Institutional planning involves a number of campus committees and, periodically, Planning Task Forces. The College Council and its Institutional Standing Committees (Budget, Facilities, Planning and Technology) are responsible for the oversight, evaluation and altering of the planning processes, as well as the products of such planning. All of these governance committees have members from all campus constituencies. The institutional goals that are developed are evaluated annually.

In order to improve the planning process and the evaluation of institutional goal attainment, some modifications are needed. One improvement will be to include, as a part of the goal, a plan for implementation including responsible parties and funding sources. In an attempt to strengthen the evaluation process even further, College Council will investigate models of assessing institutional effectiveness and adapt them to COS processes.

Standard II: Student Learning Programs & Services

College of the Sequoias offers a wide variety of educational courses and programs for our diverse student population. The College is committed to meeting the educational needs of its students. Courses and programs are offered at numerous sites, at different times and, in some cases, using different distance education methodologies.

The curriculum offered by COS is developed almost entirely by faculty within the divisions and undergoes numerous reviews as it progresses through the process of approval. The Campus Curriculum Committee is charged with the development of the curriculum approval process and for implementing that process. Curriculum that is approved by the Campus Curriculum Committee is forwarded to the Academic Senate for approval and from there to the Board of Trustees.

COS is committed to the development of student learning outcomes for its courses, programs, certificates and majors. This commitment is being spearheaded by the Student Learning

Outcomes Committee. This committee has representation from all educational divisions and Student Services. It has developed a five-year implementation plan for incorporating student learning outcomes at the course, program, certificate and major levels. It has sponsored numerous educational opportunities for faculty on identifying and assessing student learning outcomes. The initial focus has been on developing student learning outcomes at the course level and divisions have different levels of attainment towards this end. Student Services has developed a set of student learning outcomes for that area. The Campus Curriculum Committee has adopted changes to the Course Proposal template to accommodate the identification of student learning outcomes and their assessment.

While much has been accomplished in identifying student learning outcomes, the College still has much to do. All courses offered by the College need to identify their student learning outcomes. Student learning outcomes for programs, certificates and majors also need to be developed and identified. The identification of student learning outcomes at all levels must be coupled with methods of assessment of student achievement of those learning outcomes. In addition, the curriculum process and the evaluation of divisions during Program Review will need to be altered in order to include evaluations of student achievement of the identified learning outcomes.

Another area that is in need of improvement is developing and consistently adhering to criteria within the curriculum approval process. The College has had difficulty in adhering to the policy of five-year review of all curriculum. It has also not consistently applied the definitions of lecture, laboratory and activity that have been developed and approved. In addition, adherence to course objectives is an issue in some areas with multiple sections and multiple faculty teaching those courses. These consistency issues must be addressed.

There are a multitude of student support services available for the College's student population. These services are indeed comprehensive and are all aimed at providing students with the necessary assistance to successfully matriculate through COS. Beginning with outreach to students within the District, Student Services has attempted to provide students with all of the necessary information and tools to apply for, to enroll in, to pay for, and to successfully complete their chosen college courses. It is often difficult to inform all students of all the services at their disposal. Where feasible, Student Services have employed technology to assist in providing services (admission application, placement testing, and registration for classes) to all potential students in the District. The student-centered focus of these programs is universal and are continually evaluated in an attempt to strengthen them even further.

Library and Learning Support Services have been increased with the completion of the new Learning Resource Center. This new facility has greatly increased student access to computer technology. However, with increasing costs of books and periodicals, the Learning Resource Center has noted some difficulty in maintaining the diversity of these resources. The increase in space and available computers has also led to an increase in use of the Learning Resource Center. Unfortunately, this increased usage has also seen an increase in student misconduct. So much so, there is an identified need for further security during operating hours.

Tutorial services are offered to COS students. In an attempt to meet the needs of the students, specialized programs are being implemented in tutoring. These include the Math Lab, a Learning Skills Lab, and an English Writing Center.

Instructional Media Services, IMS, endeavors to provide faculty with the classroom technology appropriate for their curriculum. IMS provides training to faculty, maintains the technology, and assists in training students in the use of the technology, when needed. As technology changes and advances, IMS attempts to keep these College resources as current as funding will allow.

Standard III: Resources

The College recruits and hires qualified individuals for available positions. There has been a reduction in personnel in the areas of full-time faculty and classified staff since the last accreditation cycle. The hiring procedures are established and are generally adhered to. However, there are not Board Policies for hiring of all constituent groups. This will need to be addressed. In addition, hiring procedures are not easily available for classified staff or for administrators. Another area of concern identified is in the evaluation of College employees. A substantial percentage of all constituent groups have the perception that evaluations do not lead to improvements in job performance. Faculty evaluation was reviewed and modified since the last accreditation report; however, no changes were made to tenure review (recommendation #3 from last accreditation site visit) and the evaluations of faculty do not currently include assessment of how effective they are in achieving student learning outcomes in their courses. Substantial work on the evaluations will be needed. There is also an identified desire for additional professional development opportunities in all campus constituencies.

The physical resources of the District are sufficient and safe. The Program Review process offers all areas of the College the opportunity to identify areas of concern or additional needs for physical resources, including spaces and equipment. This ensures that physical resource planning is integrated into institutional planning. The College has been successful in being awarded building projects from the State. However, in three attempts, the College has been unsuccessful in passing local bond issues for buildings. Currently, classroom utilization is not being evaluated. This will need to be addressed in order to maximize enrollment at the College.

The College's technology resources are maintained by Computer Services. Program Reviews provide all programs and services an opportunity to identify their technology needs and justify them in relationship to the program or service. The Institutional Technology Committee has developed a Technology Plan 2.0 that has been adopted by the College Council. However, there is currently no funding for implementation of this plan. In addition, there is an identified lack of training in technology and software available to campus employees. In order to maximize the effective use of the technology that exists on campus, this deficiency will need to be addressed.

The financial resources of the College have been strained in the recent past. An over-allocation of funding from the State was subsequently withheld the following year. This short fall occurred at

the same time the State was reducing its funding of education because of the State fiscal crisis. This necessitated cut-backs at the College, including personnel loss. Currently, the financial health of the College is within District and State mandates. The vast majority of the College budget is dedicated to personnel costs, including salary, benefits and retirement.   The initial budget development is accomplished by the VP of Administrative Services and the President's Cabinet. The Institutional Budget Committee is informed of the budget status. The amount of funds allocated to Above-Base Budget items is determined when the Preliminary Budget is developed. The College Council is only involved in making recommendations to the Superintendent/President on Above-Base Budget expenditures. These requests are identified by the program and service areas during their Program Review process. Currently there is no mechanism in place to evaluate how the Above-Base Budget expenditures help the College meet its mission and its institutional goals. The College undergoes yearly audits and responds to any findings in a timely manner.

Standard IV: Leadership & Governance

COS has a well established shared governance system. The College Council and its Institutional Standing Committees discuss campus-wide issues and make recommendations to the Superintendent/President. All campus constituencies have representation on the College Council and the Institutional Standing Committees. This system has been evaluated and changes have been made to streamline the communication process between the Council and the Superintendent/President.

The Academic Senate is charged with the responsibility for academic and professional matters. There is a Board Policy on the Delegation of Authority for these matters. The Academic Senate makes recommendations directly to the Board of Trustees. The Academic Senate has three standing committees, the Campus Curriculum, Student Learning Outcomes and Faculty Enrichment Committees. The Instructional Council is another committee that is responsible for representing the divisions in the context of implementing the College's educational programs.

While these governance structures have been in place for some time, there is a perception of a significant percentage of all constituent groups that these groups do not always work collaboratively to the benefit of the Institution. Whether this is an issue of communication or an issue of different priorities is not known at this time.

The Board of Trustees is the policy making body of the College. They have established a comprehensive set of board policies. These policies are contained within the *Board Policy Manual*, which is found at a number on different places on campus, and is also published on the College's website. These policies are developed and updated as needed. Depending on the nature of the policy, some policies are taken before the College Council for their input, while others are taken through the Academic Senate. The Board members represent the voters from their respective Wards.

The Superintendent/President is responsible for administration of board policies and for the overall leadership and oversight of the College. The Superintendent/President actively participates in shared governance by chairing the College Council and the President's Cabinet. Where appropriate, the Superintendent/President delegates oversight and authority to the administrators of the College. In addition, the Superintendent/President represents the College to the District communities and to the State.

Accreditation Calendar and Timeline

Date	Event
March 2004	Solicitation for Accreditation Chair
April 2004	Accreditation Chair selected
May 2004	Accreditation Steering Committee structure & timeline developed
September 2004	Accreditation Standard Chairs selected
	Campus-wide solicitation for standard committee participants
	Accreditation Training Workshops for Steering Committee members
October 2004	Writing of Self Study begins
March 2005	Description sections completed
March-April 2005	Steering Committee reviews description sections
May 2005	Accreditation Survey questions developed
August 2005	Presentation to President's Cabinet – progress report
September 2005	Accreditation Survey conducted
February 2006	Evaluation sections completed
Feb.-March 2006	Evaluation sections reviewed by Steering Committee
	Description & Evaluation sections sent to campus committee members for feedback and input
March 2006	Planning Agendas completed
April 2006	Draft of Self Study published on campus website; campus notified by e-mail and in writing
	Planning Agendas sent to campus committee members for feedback & input
May 2006	Draft of Self Study presented to Board of Trustees
July 2006	Accreditation Self Study completed
August 2006	Accreditation Self Study approved by Board of Trustees
September 2006	Accreditation Self Study and documentation sent to AACJC
	Complete planning for site visit
October 2006	Site visit by AACJC Visiting Team

Accreditation Committees

Steering Committee

Dr. Thea Trimble, Accreditation Chair
Elaine Hord, Standard I Co-Chair
Donna Robinson, Standard I Co-Chair
Jan Woodall, Standard IIA Chair
Dr. Donald Mast, Standard IIB Chair

James Tucker, Standard IIC Chair
Beckee Hobson, Standard IV Chair
Dale Norton, Accreditation Liaison
Elaine Webb, Director of Research & Grants

Standard I
Elaine Hord, Co-Chair
Donna Robinson, Co-Chair
Janice Brown, Faculty
Cindy DeLain, Administrator
Shirley Rankin, Classified/Confidential
Elaine Webb, Administrator
Amanda Huerta, Student
Ruben Ortega, Student
Sal Ortiz, Student

Standard IIA
Jan Woodall, Chair
Brain Bettencourt, Faculty
Larry Dutto, Administrator
Jane Thomas, Faculty
Jan Loveless, Faculty

Standard IIB
Dr. Donald Mast, Chair
Gail DeLuce, Classified
Joyce Ellingsen, Classified
Linda Fontanilla, Administrator
William Garcia, Administrator
Sharmeen Lakhani, Classified
David Maciel, Administrator
Nancy Morgan, Classified
Lois Norman, Classified
Ajay Chagan, Student

Standard IIC
James Tucker, Chair
Gina Haycock, Faculty
Kathie Lewis, Faculty
Linda Yamakawa, Faculty
Carol Demmers, Classified
Chris Hagthrop, Classified
Bob McMahan, Classified
Sandy Williams, Classified
Patrick Mitchell, Classified
Hunter Church-Gonzales, Faculty

Standard III
Thea Trimble, Chair
Eric Mittlestead, Administrator
Ron Frese, Administrator
Mike Skaff, Faculty
Kristen Risner, Administrator
Nancy Schneider, Faculty
Karen Roberts, Faculty
Stephanie Cardoza, Faculty
John Bratsch, Administrator

Standard IV
Beckee Hobson, Chair
Robert Line, Board of Trustees
Don Goodyear, Superintendent/President
Jeff Basham, Faculty
Alicia Crumpler, Faculty
Lori Jones, Classified
Glena Crumal, Faculty
Lorraine Holguin,

Certification
Continued Eligibility Requirements for Accreditation

1. Authority

The College of the Sequoias is a fully accredited two-year community college. The College is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. College of the Sequoias is listed in the directories of the United States Office of Education, American Council on Education and is a part of the California Community Colleges system. The University of California and the California State University systems, as well as other public and private colleges and universities, grant credit for transfer courses completed at College of the Sequoias.

2. Mission

The College of the Sequoias Mission Statement is:

College of the Sequoias is a comprehensive community college focused on student learning.

College of the Sequoias affirms that our mission is to help our diverse student population achieve their transfer and/or occupational objectives and to advance the economic growth and global competitiveness of business and industry within our region.

College of the Sequoias is committed to supporting students' mastery of basic skills and to providing programs and services that foster student success.

Therefore, our mission focuses on preparing students for productive work, lifelong learning, and community involvement.

This Mission Statement was approved by the Board of Trustees on January 23, 2006. The Mission Statement was reviewed and revised by the Institutional Planning Committee. It was then presented to and approved by the College Council, before being forwarded to the Board of Trustees for approval.

The Mission Statement is published in the *General Catalog*, the *Schedule of Classes*, the College website, and is displayed in many offices around campus.

3. Governing Board

The Board of Trustees of the College of the Sequoias consists of five elected representatives from the five geographical wards that comprise the District. The Board of Trustees is the policy making body of the College. The Board of Trustees *Policy Manual* contains policies, duties, responsibilities, ethical conduct requirements, and structure and operating procedures for the

Board. The Board of Trustees is responsible for establishing the policies that ensure the quality and effectiveness of student learning programs and services, and to maintain the financial stability of the District. No member of the Board of Trustees is employed by the District.

4. Chief Executive Officer

The Superintendent/President of College of the Sequoias is Dr. William Scroggins. Dr. Scroggins was appointed by the Board of Trustees effective July 1, 2006. The Board of Trustees delegates to the Superintendent/President the executive responsibility for administering the policies adopted by the Board and executing all decisions of the Board under the Education Code 70902 and 72400, under Title V regulations and Board Policy 1095. The Superintendent/President serves as Secretary to the Board of Trustees.

5. Administrative Capacity

The administrative staff is outlined in the organizational charts for the College. Currently, there are a number of administrative positions that are vacant or are staffed with interim personnel. The duties of those positions that are vacant are being covered by other administrators. Once the vacant positions have been filled, the College will have sufficient administrative capacity. All administrative personnel meet or exceed the minimum qualifications for the positions they hold.

6. Operational Status

College of the Sequoias Community College District is in its eightieth year of operation. The College offers courses at the main campus, the College Farm, the Hanford Center, and in various high schools throughout the District. In the Fall 2005, COS served 9,952 students.

7. Degrees

College of the Sequoias offers 66 Associate of Arts/Science degree programs. The College also offers 71 vocational certificate programs. The requirements for these degrees and certificates are published in the *General Catalog*, are available on the College's website, and are available as "Major Sheets" from the Counseling Division.

8. Educational Programs

All educational programs at the College of the Sequoias are listed in the *General Catalog*. These programs have been developed by specific departments and approved by the Campus Curriculum Committee, the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees. Each program is in a recognized postsecondary field of study and contains sufficient content and rigor. In addition, each program meets the mission of the College "...to help our diverse student population achieve their transfer and/or occupational objectives and to advance the economic growth and global competitiveness of business and industry within our region."

The College also provides instruction in English and mathematics basic skills and in English as a Second Language. These courses help the College meet its mission "...to supporting students' mastery of basic skills and to providing programs and services that foster student success."

9. Academic Credit

College of the Sequoias awards credit for coursework using the Carnegie Standard, as defined in Title V of the California Education Code, as a minimum. Generally, one unit of academic credit is awarded for one hour of lecture/discussion per week. A minimum of three hours of laboratory per week is equivalent to one unit of credit.

10. Student Learning Achievement

College of the Sequoias is in the process of developing student learning outcomes for its courses and programs. The Academic Senate has established a Student Learning Outcomes Committee. This committee has representatives from all academic divisions and Student Services. This committee has sponsored numerous workshops on establishing and assessing student learning outcomes. They have also made recommendations to the Campus Curriculum Committee on altering the Course Outline form to include learning outcomes and assessment methods. These recommendations were adopted by the Campus Curriculum Committee in Fall 2005.

11. General Education

All degree programs at College of the Sequoias require the completion of eighteen units of general education. At least three units are chosen from each general education area: Written Communication; Oral Communication and Analytical Thinking; Natural Science; Humanities; Social/Behavioral Science; and Exploration. The Campus Curriculum Committee is responsible for the approval of courses that meet these requirements. Courses that meet these area requirements are listed in the *General Catalog*. The *General Catalog* also includes the College's philosophy of general education.

12. Academic Freedom

Academic freedom for faculty at College of the Sequoias is granted in Board Policy 5002. This policy was adopted by the Academic Senate in April 1999 and by the Board of Trustees in February 2000. The Academic Freedom policy stipulates that "Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject..." In addition, the Academic Senate has a *Statement of Professional Ethics* which is published in the *General Catalog*. This statement includes that "... faculty members encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students."

Board Policy 7035 is a Student Bill of Rights. This policy includes a statement that "Students shall have the right to take stands on issues, the right to examine and discuss questions of interest to them ..."

13. Faculty

As of Fall 2004, the College of the Sequoias employed 157 full-time faculty and 261 part-time faculty. All faculty meet the minimum qualifications for employment as outlined in the Hiring Policy. All full-time faculty and their degrees are listed in the *General Catalog*.

Faculty duties and responsibilities are described in the Faculty Handbook (available on-line) and in the COSTA Master Agreement (distributed to each faculty member and available on-line).

14. Student Services

The College of the Sequoias provides a comprehensive set of student services. These services are described in the *General Catalog*, the *Schedule of Classes*, the College's website, and on the on-line orientation video. The College offers many programs that serve the general student body (Academic Counseling, Financial Aid, Student Health Center, Transfer/Career Center), as well as specialized services designed for certain student populations (Disability Resource Center, Extended Opportunity Programs and Services/Cooperative Agencies Resource for Education, CalWORKS). The student services support student learning and assist students with their matriculation.

15. Admissions

College of the Sequoias' admissions policy and procedures are clearly outlined in the *General Catalog*, the *Schedule of Classes*, and on the College's website. In general, students must be 18 years or older and have graduated from high school or successfully completed the California High School Proficiency Examination or the General Education Development Test. The College may admit students under 18 years of age if there is evidence that the student will benefit from college level instruction.

16. Information and Learning Resources

The College of the Sequoias has a Learning Resource Center on the Visalia campus. This center includes a library, Tutorial Center, Computer Commons, computer classroom, and distance education classroom. A small satellite library with computers and reference books is maintained at the Hanford Center. A Math Lab is available to students as a part of the Tutorial Center. In addition, the College is developing a Writing Center.

A number of divisions and departments also house and maintain information and learning resources. These include numerous computer labs and subject-specific laboratories.

17. Financial Resources

College of the Sequoias is a publicly funded institution. The majority of the unrestricted financial resources at the College's disposal are derived from a State mandated revenue limit. Financial resources arrive in the form of local taxes, student enrollment fees and an apportionment from the

State. The College has an established budget development process that includes the publication of a *Budget Book*, which is the Final Budget. The VP of Administrative services, the President's Cabinet and the Institutional Budget Committee are involved in this process.

The College also receives financial resources that are restricted in their use, such as financial aid from the federal government. The College has also been the recipient of numerous State, Federal and privately funded grants. The College of the Sequoias has a COS Foundation which raises funds for use by programs and services.

18. Financial Accountability

The College of the Sequoias undergoes an annual external audit. The audit reviews both funds and processes in order to determine compliance with established accounting and reporting standards. The most recent audit, June 2005, noted no "material weaknesses" in internal control of financial reporting and operations and that the College "complied in all material respects" to Federal and State laws and regulations.

19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation

The College Council and its Institutional Planning Committee are responsible for the development and implementation of planning efforts across campus. A Planning Task Force, with representatives from all constituencies, has developed a set of institutional goals for a three-year period. The progress towards achieving these goals is monitored yearly.

The College has an established Program Review process. All programs and services undergo a major Program Review once every five years and complete a yearly Program Review Update. All Program Reviews are forwarded to the Board of Trustees. This process is overseen by the Program Review Steering Committee.

An Educational Master Plan is developed using the Program Review Reports as a core source of information. The Educational Master Plan also incorporates information from Institutional Performance Indicators, Student Equity Plan, Matriculation Report, Five-Year Facilities Plan and external evaluation reports (such as workforce needs).

20. Public Information

The College of the Sequoias strives to present itself accurately in all of its printed and electronic publications. The *General Catalog* is published bi-annually and contains all key information students require to enroll and matriculate through the College. There is an extensive review of the Catalog prior to publication to ensure currency and accuracy. The College's website is updated more frequently as needed. The *Schedule of Classes* is published twice each year and includes some of the information found in the *General Catalog*.

The College has a Public Information Officer that coordinates the dissemination of information to District constituencies.

21. Relations with the Accrediting Commission

The College of the Sequoias is committed to adhering to all AACJC accreditation eligibility requirements and standards, and to accurately portraying itself to the Commission. The College publishes a general statement of accreditation in its *General Catalog.*

A Dean of Academic Services has been delegated as the Accreditation Liaison Officer. The Dean is responsible for ensuring all necessary reports, documentation and evidence of compliance is provided to AACJC in a timely fashion. The College of the Sequoias has responded to all recommendations and requests for reports from AACJC.

Some programs at the College undergo their own accreditation process. One such example is the Nursing program which is reviewed by the State Board of Registered Nurses.

Responses to Recommendations from the 2000 Accreditation Site Visit

Recommendation #1: Coordinate and integrate the various college planning processes and develop a comprehensive educational master plan.

The Institutional Planning Committee, a standing committee of the College Council, has the responsibility for oversight and coordination of the planning processes at the College of the Sequoias. The Institutional Planning Committee reports to and makes recommendations to the College Council. This committee has spearheaded the efforts to coordinate the planning activities of the College. To that end, this committee has worked with other committees, most notably the Program Review Steering Committee and the Student Equity Committee, to ensure that recommendations and/or goals identified in Program Review reports and the Student Equity Plan are incorporated into the Educational Master Plan. The Institutional Planning Committee has identified four critical elements of the planning process: Program Review Reports; Institutional Performance Indicators; External Evaluation Reports; Student Equity and Matriculation Reports.

A Planning Task Force met during Fall 2001 and Spring 2002. This task force identified four areas that needed further attention: Student Retention & Basic Skills; Technology; Future Growth; and Economic Development. This process culminated in a Town Hall Meeting attended by members of the Task Force and community members from the District. Both short-term and long-term goals were developed during this meeting which were used in preparing a Strategic Plan.

The Annual Planning Task Force meeting in February 2003 developed institutional goals for the next three years. The Planning Task Force utilized several different planning documents including the Strategic Plan, the Fiscal Health Analysis and Evaluation of Internal Controls, the recommendations form the 2000 Accreditation Report, and the newly revised Accreditation Standards. These goals were adopted by the Board of Trustees in October 2003. The Institutional Planning Committee will institute another series of goal setting workshops at the beginning of Fall 2006.

The most current Educational Master Plan, *2005-2006 Blueprint for the Future*, was developed by Academic Services. Information was synthesized from Program Review Reports and annual updates, from data about the changing student demographics and workforce needs, from legal mandates at the State and Federal levels, and from other institutional planning documents.

Recommendation #2: Place greater focus on institutional outcomes assessment, in particular student learning outcomes, as they relate to institutional effectiveness and accountability. Campus leaders from all constituency groups need to take proactive efforts in this area.

Program Review Reports are the main source of evaluations of COS programs and services. Each program and service undergoes a major Program Review on a five year cycle. Yearly update reports are also required of all areas and services. After the first five-year cycle, the Program Review Steering Committee made changes to the requirements of the Program Review Report in order to

ensure that programs and services were addressing various accountability mechanisms and that each area was directly addressing student performance issues. Each area must address specific data (student enrollments, success rates, retention rates, currency of curriculum review, frequency of curriculum offerings, FTES generation, staffing, etc.) and cite specific examples for areas requiring improvement.

The Institutional Planning Committee developed and recommended the adoption of Institutional Performance Indicators as a way of measuring institutional effectiveness. They were adopted by the College Council and the Board of Trustees. These indicators include: 1) community access; 2) student performance and progress in several categories; 3) institutional health (FTES, staff diversity). Where appropriate, these Institutional Performance Indicators have been incorporated into Program Reviews.

The College of the Sequoias has a Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Committee which is a committee of the Academic Senate. This committee has representatives from all divisions and Student Services, as well as Academic Deans. The SLO Committee has been very active in learning about, in training, and in implementing student learning outcomes and their assessment. Committee members have attended numerous workshops throughout the State. They have sponsored training seminars on-campus which brought speakers to the College to discuss outcomes and assessments. SLO Committee members have offered workshops for other faculty to train them in the implementation of learning outcomes and assessment methods. The SLO Committee sends out campus-wide e-mails to inform and educate the campus community about learning outcomes and assessment. The SLO Committee has also developed a website that contains useful information and links to other websites related to student learning outcomes and their assessment. The SLO Committee recommended and the Campus Curriculum Committee adopted changes to the Course Outline form which require the identification of student learning outcomes and assessment methods.

The Administration has aided these efforts in numerous ways, including bringing speakers to campus for opening day convocations which address these issues. Dr. Kenneth Wesson spoke on the latest brain research and what this research tells us about learning in the classroom. Dr. Fred Volkwein from the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Penn State University spoke on the identification and assessment of student learning outcomes.

The College of the Sequoias has made substantial progress in this area. This progress has been the result of broad-based involvement of many different campus groups. These include the College Council, the Institutional Planning Committee, the Program Review Steering Committee, the Academic Senate, the Campus Curriculum Committee, the Student Learning Outcomes Committee, and the Instructional Council.

Recommendation #3: Review the faculty evaluation process including tenure review of faculty, an implement appropriate changes with all due speed.

In Fall 2001, the Academic Senate established a sub-committee to review the faculty evaluation process. Administrators from Academic Services were invited to participate on the committee. The Committee surveyed faculty, attended national conferences and researched current trends in faculty evaluation practices.

Changes to the faculty evaluation were made as a result of contract negotiations in Fall 2002. The format of the evaluation was altered, the student survey was altered, the Division Chairs were removed from the process, and the timeline and specific responsibilities were delineated.

During this examination and alteration of faculty evaluation, no dialogue and no changes in tenure review occurred.

Recommendation #4: Demonstrate that issues of staff diversity in hiring and training are major priorities, and commit appropriate attention and resources to affect change.

The College of the Sequoias continues to demonstrate the importance of diversity and equity issues to the College. Substantial efforts can be documented in these areas. The Planning Task Force in Spring 2003 set as an institutional goal "COS will address all aspects of diversity in its operations". As is the case with all institutional goals, this goal is reviewed annually for progress.

The Faculty & Staff Diversity Committee monitors the status of staff diversity at COS. They meet periodically and review campus hiring. They also review legislative mandates from the State as they relate to equity and diversity.

Human Resources continue to offer training to hiring committees on procedures for use in screening applications and interview processes. In an attempt to broaden the diversity of the application pools, Human Resources places job announcements in a number of publications, such as <u>Black Careers Now</u>, <u>Asian Pacific</u>, and <u>Hispanic Hotline</u>. Interview candidates are asked to fill out an exit interview on their perceptions of the process. Approximately 98% of those candidates interviewed are satisfied with the interview process employed by COS.

A review of demographics of full-time faculty in Fall 2000 with that of Fall 2004 shows that COS has significantly increased the diversity of its teaching faculty in several categories. American Indian faculty have increased from .05% to 1.3%. Asian/Pacific Islander faculty have increased form 2.9% to 3.2%. Hispanic faculty have increased from 7.6% to 11.5%. And women faculty have increased from 47.7% to 49.7%. The increases in diversity over these four years are all the more impressive when the hiring freeze of the 2002-03 school year is taken into account. There was no comparable demographic information regarding part-time faculty and classified staff for this time period.

COS also provided training to faculty and staff on diversity and equity issues in the learning environment. Staff development resources were allocated to provide training workshops focused on staff diversity and the creation of a climate which respects the contributions of all students and faculty. These workshops included *Cross-Cultural Mentoring* and *A Case for Diversity*. In addition, the opening day convocation in August 2001 was *Lessons from Little Rock* presented by Terrance Roberts. Dr. Roberts also led a workshop for management staff on leadership in a diverse setting.

Training opportunities have been limited since the funding for staff development was eliminated by the State. This lack of funding has been compounded by the negotiated reduction in the number of Flex days. However, grant funded training opportunities have occurred. For example, the LISTO Program funded a summer workshop on diversity issues in the classroom learning environment.

Recommendation #5: Further develop and refine the budget development process to ensure that the college community understands the process, particularly pathways for funding requests and approvals, and that appropriate levels of user-friendly financial information are communicated to members of the college community. It is also recommended that the budget development process be streamlined by reducing the number of procedural junctions where submittals, reviews, revisions, and recommendations begin and end. In addition, it is recommended that the college further develop linkages between planning and budget processes.

The College of the Sequoias has made many changes to its budget processes as a result of this recommendation. These changes have streamlined the process of Above-Base Budget requests and approvals. Steps have also been taken to educate the campus constituencies on budget processes. And finally, financial information is more readily available to campus groups.

A *Budget Book*, which constitutes the Final Budget, is developed every year and distributed to appropriate campus committees. In addition, the availability of the *Budget Book* is announced via e-mail and a copy may be requested by any individual who may not automatically receive it as a result of serving on a committee. This comprehensive document includes sections on Revenues, Apportionment, Expenditures, Staff Changes, Other Fund Budgets, the COS Detail Budget, Budget Schedule Summary (for the following year), FTES Trends, Student Financial Aid Data, COS Funds at County Treasury, COS Project Status Report (Facilities), COS Co-Curricular Budget, Health and Welfare Expenditures, Banked Leave Calculations, and COS Long Term Contracts. The implementation of the Banner software package has also made real-time budget information available to all budget managers. The VP of Administrative Services has been conducting educational sessions with the Institutional Budget Committee and the College Council regarding budget development and the *Budget Book*.

Program Review Reports are used as the basis for all requests for Above-Base Budget funding. All programs and services create a major Program Review Report once every five years and annual update reports. All requests for funding originate in these reports. All areas understand that this is the pathway to request additional budget allocations. The development of the Educational

Master Plan from these same reports provides additional linkages between planning and budget allocations.

The process of prioritizing the Above-Base Budget requests has been extensively streamlined. Previously, all Institutional Standing Committees prioritized all requests. These prioritizations were presented to the College Council, which then created their own prioritizations. Those recommended prioritizations were then forwarded to the Superintendent/President, who then reviewed them with the President's Cabinet. Currently, only the College Council prioritizes Above-Base Budget requests. However, during this process, the chairs of the Institutional Standing Committees take part in this process. One exception is for requests for replacement and/or new faculty. These requests are first prioritized by the Instructional Council. The prioritized list is then presented to the College Council, which may accept the list or alter it. The process has also been streamlined since the Superintendent/President now chairs the College Council and so is aware of the discussions and concerns of all constituencies as the College Council proceeds with its prioritization process.

Recommendation #6: Communicate more proactively and publicly Governing Board actions in relationship to revision of policies, and processes and outcomes of their self-evaluation and the evaluation of the superintendent/president.

All new and revised Board Policies are presented to the College Council for three readings prior to submittal to the Board of Trustees. There are two weeks between each reading which allows the Institutional Standing Committees and other campus groups sufficient time to review these policies and submit suggestions and/or concerns. The College Council has representatives from all campus constituencies. In addition, the College Council agenda and minutes are distributed campus-wide via e-mail and the COS website. Once the Board of Trustees has approved a Board Policy, the campus is notified via e-mail and the policy is placed on the College's website.

The Board of Trustees uses the Association of Community College Trustees instrument for its annual evaluation. They are asked to evaluate their individual performance as a member of the Board and the performance of the Board as a whole. The topics of their evaluation range form confidentiality of board deliberations, to understanding that policy making is the basic function of board members. Their knowledge of State and local issues is also explored. Outcomes of the Board of Trustees annual evaluation are not routinely communicated to campus constituencies.

The outcome of the Board of Trustees evaluation of the Superintendent/President in September 2003 was announced publicly at a Board meeting and was subsequently published in a summary of Board action. However, this practice is not routinely done. Recent revision of Board Policy 1001 stipulates that the President of the Board of Trustees will present the Superintendent/President with a written summary of the evaluation findings and recommendations at a closed session Board meeting scheduled for that purpose.

Recommendation #7: Review the participatory governance structure comprised of the College Council and the extensive number of committees. The focus of this review should be on streamlining and simplifying the process to facilitate more direct access and communication between constituent groups and the superintendent/president.

The College Council reviewed the structure of the Council and the Institutional Standing Committees with the goal of increased communication and reduction of duplicated efforts. The outcome of this review was to have the Superintendent/President serve as the Chair of the College Council. In this way the Superintendent/President is privy to all of the discussions that lead to the College Council recommendations. This change, along with the notification and publication of College Council agendas and minutes, has gone a long way to ensure access of all constituent groups to the Superintendent/President.

Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes achievement of student learning and to communicating the mission internally and externally. The institution uses analyses of quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation to verify and improve the effectiveness by which the mission is accomplished.

A. Mission

The institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution's broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.

1. The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student population.

Description

College of the Sequoias (COS) has established student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character and its student population.

When the research process for preparing this Self Study began, the Mission of College of the Sequoias stated:

College of the Sequoias is a comprehensive, student-centered community college, dedicated to enhancing our diverse educational and cultural campus climate.

College of the Sequoias affirms that our mission is to help students achieve their transfer and/or occupational objectives and to advance the economic growth and global competitiveness of business and industry within our region.

College of the Sequoias is committed to supporting students' development of basic skills and to providing self-supporting community education classes, contract education and training, and related student services.

Therefore, our mission focuses on preparing students for productive work, lifelong learning and community involvement.

Since that time, the COS Mission has been revised. The new Mission is:

College of the Sequoias is a comprehensive community college focused on student learning.

College of the Sequoias affirms that our mission is to help our diverse student population achieve their transfer and/or occupational objectives and to advance the economic growth and global competitiveness of business and industry within our region.

College of the Sequoias is committed to supporting students' mastery of basic skills and to providing programs and services that foster student success.

Therefore, our mission focuses on preparing students for productive work, lifelong learning, and community involvement.

Student learning programs focus on providing students with opportunities to transfer, earn an associate degree or vocational certificate, develop basic skills and English as a Second Language proficiency, as well as fostering the economic development of the District. The College uses labor market needs statistics and other data to establish programs of study that are current with the identified needs of its ever-changing student population.

College of the Sequoias offers 137 Major and Certificate Programs (2004/2005 *General Catalog*), 71 vocational certificate programs and 66 Associate of Arts/Science degree programs. A variety of transfer majors are offered which allow students to complete their lower division requirements in the major before transferring to a four-year institution.

To meet the needs of our diverse community, the College offers English as a Second Language (ESL) as well as basic skills courses in English and mathematics. These classes accommodate the large multi-cultural population and the under-prepared population in Kings and Tulare counties. COS has been the recipient of several grants designed to expand instructional programs and to work with underrepresented students. One major grant was the Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSI) grant which spanned five years and concluded in December, 2004. The LISTO Program funded by this grant placed students in ethnic studies learning communities. The courses within each community were linked to facilitate student learning and student success.

COS provides various services to students to help them achieve their educational goals. These services are detailed in the orientation process which the majority of students complete. Support services for students are also listed in the *COS General Catalog* and on the COS website. These services include Academic Counseling, Financial Aid, EOP&S/CARE, Disability Resource Center, Transfer & Career Center, Mini Corps, and Student Health Center. Student Services use Program Review and Matriculation guidelines ensure that student needs are being addressed.

COS has a newly revised Student Equity Plan in place to ensure that all students, regardless of their background and skill levels, have the opportunity to achieve their educational goals. The plan was developed by the Student Equity Committee which consisted of five faculty, one student, four administrators and two classified employees.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. The Accreditation Survey demonstrates that all campus groups believe that COS's Mission is appropriate to the student population.

Statement: The Mission Statement is appropriate for our College.					
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Students	Board
Great/Moderate Importance	87	84.6	90.2	42.9	100
Little/No Importance	9.1	7.7	5.9	10.1	
Do Not Know	3.9	7.7	3.9	47	
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Students	Board
Strongly Agree/Agree	86.2	81.8	82	46.5	100
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	9.2	9.1	8	2.4	
Do Not Know	4.6	9.1	10	51.1	

COS has demonstrated success in meeting the Mission in terms of student services and assisting students in completing their educational goals. The 137 Major and Certificate programs provide the students with a wide variety of options in pursuing their educational objectives. And special programs, such as LISTO, show the commitment of the College to helping students be successful. Student success in the LISTO Program averaged about 10% above students in non-LISTO courses.

Another way that COS has met this standard is the development of a Student Equity Plan with goals and objectives to increase the level of student access and success. The Student Equity Plan was updated by the Diversity Committee, a committee convened by the Academic Senate, and submitted to the Chancellor's Office in January 2005.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

2. The mission statement is approved by the governing board and published.

Description

The Mission statement is approved by the College Council, the College's shared governance committee, and the Board of Trustees. It is published in the *General Catalog*, on the COS website, in all planning documents of the Institutional Planning Committee (College Council Standing Committee) and is displayed in many offices across campus, including Division offices.

The Mission was last revised in 2005, and adopted by the Board of Trustees on January 23, 2006.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. There is extensive publication and distribution of the Mission statement. An indication of the wide distribution and knowledge of the Mission is demonstrated in the Accreditation Survey. Survey indicated that only 3.8% of Faculty, 7.7% of Administrators,

and 9.1% of Classified responded with **Do Not Know** when asked about the Mission statement being appropriate to our college. (see Table in I.A.1)

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

3. Using the institution's governance and decision-making processes, the institution reviews its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary.

Description

The Mission is reviewed annually by the Institutional Planning Committee, a standing committee of the College Council. Any suggestions for changes in the Mission statement are submitted to the College Council for approval and then forwarded to the Board of Trustees. Prior to 2003, a Planning Task Force convened annually to review the Mission as well as college goals and objectives. In 2005, the Institutional Planning Committee facilitated a review and revision of the Mission with input from all campus constituencies. The review of the Mission considered student needs and state mandates. The Board of Trustees has final approval of the Mission.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard by integrating the review of the Mission Statement with the work of the Institutional Planning Committee. The process of approval ensures that the College Council, and through them all campus constituencies, have input into any revisions of the Mission.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

4. The institution's mission is central to institutional planning and decision making.

Description

Since the development of the institutional master planning process in 1995, the college's Mission and Vision have provided the foundation for all planning and decision making.

The Institutional Planning Committee coordinates planning efforts on campus. As a member of the Research and Planning Group of California (RP Group), COS has participated in many workshops on community college planning and has adopted the tenets and operational definitions of this organization as stated in the RP Planning Manual. One of the primary tenets is that the

institution's programs and services should be focused on the Mission. Consequently, when the Program Review model was developed, COS required each area to justify that their programs and services were centered on and relevant to the Mission. These Program Review reports form the framework for an evaluation of past performance and proposed changes for the future. In addition, the Program Review reports are used as core elements in the development of the Educational Master Plan. This helps to ensure the prominent position of the Mission in planning at all levels of the College.

Program goals/objectives, including staffing and equipment needs, are developed by each program during the Program Review process. The Program Review report is initially critiqued and evaluated by a Validation Committee consisting of campus personnel and a community member. The Program Review Steering Committee makes the final determination and validation of each Program Review report. Once validated the reports are forwarded to the Superintendent/President, and ultimately the Board of Trustees for approval. In 2003 a Planning Task Force developed new institutional goals and objectives, and made budget recommendations based upon the Mission and Program Review efforts.

Evaluation

This Standard has been met with regard to institutional planning. Using RP Group recommendations, the Mission statement has been successfully incorporated into the Program Review process. With the Program Review format requiring each program or service to directly relate their current or planned operations into the scope of the Mission, the areas are at least reminded annually of the college's focus. It is difficult to assess whether this focus continues beyond the Program Review report into the implementation phase.

This Standard has been met with regard to decision making. The processes employed by the College focus on the identified and validated needs within the context of the COS Mission. In turn, these findings are then used as a basis for making recommendations and decisions.

However, based upon the Accreditation Survey results, this perception is not shared campus wide. Faculty, administrators, and the Board of Trustees survey results (84%, 84.6% and 100% respectively) indicated it was important that the *Mission Statement guide the development of new programs and services.* Their level of agreement (61.8%, 66.7%, and 80% respectively) left a fair margin for disagreement. Twelve percent of faculty and 8% of administrators indicated they did not know. A method needs to be developed in which the Mission is always clearly considered when making institutional decisions. The scope of the Mission is very broad, however, and consequently sets parameters that seem to encompass all existing programs and services.

Statement: The Mission Statement guides the development of new programs and services.			
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Board
Great/Moderate Importance	84	84.6	100
Little/No Importance	5.3	7.7	
Do Not Know	10.7	7.7	
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Board
Strongly Agree/Agree	61.8	66.7	80
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	26.4	25	
Do Not Know	11.8	8.3	20

Planning Agenda

1. College Council and the Institutional Planning Committee will refine the process which articulates the relationship between the decisions that are made and the Mission of the College.

B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

The institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student learning. The institution also organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to effectively support student learning. The institution demonstrates its effectiveness by providing 1) evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes and 2) evidence of institution and program performance. The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.

1. The institution maintains an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes

Description

The opportunity for faculty and staff to engage in dialogue about continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes exists in both formal and informal settings.

Formal dialogue about student learning at COS occurs in a number of different campus committees and during various processes instituted across campus. These committees include the Campus Curriculum Committee, Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Committee, Program Review Steering Committee, and the Institutional Planning Committee. The established processes include Program Review, course outline review and faculty evaluation.

The Campus Curriculum Committee is responsible for reviewing and acting upon all proposals from the divisions to establish new programs, add new courses to existing programs or make changes to existing courses and programs. The Campus Curriculum Committee is composed of a college-wide elected chair, representatives from the twelve divisions, the three Academic Deans, the

Vice-President of Academic Services, a student representative and the Articulation Officer. This is an important forum for dialogue about issues critical to student learning. Since the process of curriculum proposal and review begins within the divisions, it affords the opportunity for faculty to have course and subject specific discussions about student learning.

The SLO Committee is comprised of faculty representatives from every division and administrators from Academic and Student Services. They have developed a 4-year plan (2004-2008) for identification and implementation of student learning outcomes across campus.

The Program Review model was revised at the completion of the first cycle to more fully address student access, success, and retention and these inclusions have enhanced dialogue at all levels – course, program, division, and ultimately, college-wide.

Institutional processes are discussed in numerous forums including College Council (and its Institutional Standing Committees), Instructional Council, Associated Student Body, Student Services Managers, Student Services program and advisory committee meetings, and Academic Senate. Process effectiveness and needed improvements are the focus of these regular agenda items.

In addition to formal processes, faculty often engage in dialogue among themselves about how to improve opportunities for student learning. An example of these more informal opportunities is the Conversations on Writing (COWS) group, where interested English faculty gathers to discuss issues relevant to student success in writing courses.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. Through the Program Review model and processes, program performance and relevance is addressed and evaluated throughout the college, not just in the academic areas. COS maintains on-going dialogue regarding institutional processes in College Council and its Institutional Standing Committees.

The SLO Committee is continually working to inform and teach the College community how to identify SLOs and assess student learning..

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

2. The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.

Description

College of the Sequoias has institutional goals which are developed collaboratively with all constituent groups and are given wide distribution throughout the college community. They are usually developed at planning meetings at which faculty, classified staff, and administrators are invited to participate. Following RP Group guidelines, objectives are written in measurable terms to facilitate evaluation. They are then approved and given wide distribution. Institutional goals are published in the Educational Master Plan which is distributed to various campus committee members and is available to anyone on campus. Institutional goals and objectives are presented to the Board of Trustees for approval. As an action item, they will be published in the Board minutes. Electronic and hard copies of the goals and objectives are available to anyone on campus.

Goals are developed for a period of three years. Progress achieving the goals is evaluated annually. COS involves faculty and staff in the evaluation of the goals and objectives. COS publishes the progress towards the achievement these institutional goals and objectives. At the end of the three year cycle, some goals may need to be carried forward if sufficient progress has not been made.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. Institutional goals with measurable objectives are developed through a collaborative effort of campus constituencies and are published in several formats, i.e. the Educational Master Plan, Board minutes, and campus meetings. However, the evaluation of these goals is not always consistent. In some cases the evaluation was not performed every year. The evaluation relies on the participation and input from the entire campus community and, at times, the input has not been forthcoming. This makes it difficult to assess whether there is a lack of progress or whether there is a lack of documentation of progress towards achievement of goals and objectives.

Planning Agenda

1. See planning agenda 1 in standard I.B.3.

3. The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.

Description

COS uses a three-step institutional planning process: Plan – Implement – Evaluate (PIE). This process is used not only with institutional goal development, implementation, and assessment but also with the Program Review process. Program Review can influence goal development directly by identifying areas of concern that may become goals/objectives. Conversely, goals/objectives may identify concerns that are then rectified through the Program Review process.

The institutional goals and objectives developed in February 2003 by the Planning Task Force were intended to guide the institution from 2003 through 2006. Realizing that not all objectives could realistically be accomplished during the first year of the three-year life cycle, an ad hoc committee reviewed all of the objectives and assigned a tentative timeline for implementation.

The institutional planning process calls for an annual assessment of progress toward implementation of institutional goals and objectives. Progress reports are distributed annually and completed by individuals who are involved in the implementation of specific objectives for each institutional goal. Based on the type of objective being addressed, the progress reports will cite qualitative and/or quantitative data. The progress reports are then evaluated by the Planning Task Force for degree of completion. The Planning Task Force is comprised of faculty, classified staff, administrators and students.   Based upon these reports, objectives are categorized as: accomplished, in progress, or are revised. The status of objective implementation is reported college wide, to the Board of Trustees and to the community via the publication, *Institutional Accomplishments at College of the Sequoias*.

In Spring 2006, the Institutional Planning Committee initiated a new goal-setting planning cycle. This committee distributed a call for "Challenges" facing COS. The committee will organize the responses from across campus into themes. The themes and challenges will be sent to College Council. College Council will then develop goals and objectives from these documents.

In addition to the institutional goals, the College has a formal set of Institutional Performance Indicators that are updated annually. The Institutional Performance Indicators were developed by the Institutional Planning Committee and approved by the College Council and the Board of Trustees as a method of reporting: 1) community access 2) student performance and progress in several categories and 3) institutional health (FTES, staff diversity) to the college as a whole, to the Board of Trustees, and to the community at large.   The Institutional Performance Indicators closely parallel the Partnership for Excellence goals (access, overall course completion, basic skills course completions, degrees, transfer) and also match the new accountability elements that are being proposed by the State. These Institutional Performance Indicators are basically the same ones addressed by divisions and departments in their Program Review reports and this process provides an opportunity to carry the Program Review process through to the institutional level. The evaluation of these indicators is based upon an analysis of quantitative data at the institutional level.

Evaluation

This Standard, as it relates to assessment of progress toward goals and the use of a systematic cycle of planning, resource allocation, implementation and evaluation to guide decision-making, has been substantially met based upon the following evidence:

The College uses the PIE process in goal development, implementation and evaluation. This planning cycle is depicted in published planning documents.

Based upon the Program Review Steering Committee's recommendations, the PIE philosophy has been successfully incorporated into the Program Review model, demanding both qualitative and quantitative analysis of a program or service's health.   Program Review Annual Updates further strengthen the PIE cycle.

While the PIE method appears to have worked well at the program level, there are concerns at the institutional level with regard to goal implementation and resource allocation.   The Institutional Planning Committee has had many discussions regarding the effectiveness of goal planning efforts. Discussions have also centered on the lack of goal delegation to individuals who are then provided the resources (staffing or funding) to implement these goals. Annual Goal Assessments reflect that some goals requiring no additional staffing or funding or that naturally fall within the scope of operations for a specific area are easily accomplished.   Others have received limited attention.

When funding is available, the process to prioritize Above-Base Budget requests identified in Program Reviews allows for input from various groups and constituencies before reaching the Superintendent/President. However, with the small percentage of the annual budget that is not committed to salaries and related costs, allocation of funds for implementation of some goals continues to be a challenge.   Evaluations of goal achievement have shown that prior to future goal planning efforts, it is paramount that identification of responsibility, staffing and funding be resolved.

This Standard as it relates to evaluation based on analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data has been met based upon the following evidence:

At the institutional level, Planning Task Force participants are instructed to construct goals that have measurable outcomes ~ qualitative and/or quantitative – to allow for a thorough evaluation of implementation. Old Partnership for Excellence goals, as well as the new Institutional Performance Indicators and the proposed AB 1417 accountability measures, require an analysis of quantitative data. At the program and service level, the revised Program Review model requires qualitative and/or quantitative analysis from each area. This analysis is then incorporated into the institutional PIE process.

Planning Agenda:

1. The College Council will refine the goal development process to include identification of responsible staff and funding resources and will develop a process for consistently evaluating goal attainment.

4. The institution provides evidence that the planning process is broad-based, offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.

Description

The planning process falls under the purview of the college's governance body, the College Council, and one of its four standing committees – the Institutional Planning Committee. The College Council includes constituents from all of the college's representative groups – faculty, classified, administration, adjunct faculty and students.

During Program Review, Above-Base Budget requests for human resources, equipment and facility resources are identified and validated. The College Council is responsible for prioritizing the requests and making recommendations to the Superintendent/President. The College Council can receive input from its Institutional Standing Committees and from Instructional Council. This process provides opportunities for all constituent groups to have input into these recommendations.

In 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2003, the Institutional Planning Committee convened an annual planning meeting. Representatives from faculty, classified, administration, students, and Board of Trustees were brought together to assess progress completing institutional goals, examine both internal and external factors affecting the institution's ability to meet its goals, develop draft goals for the coming year, and to receive input from constituent groups about these draft goals and objectives.

In 2002, the process was modified somewhat. The College developed a *Strategic Plan* focused on the input of both campus constituents as well as representatives from the community. After initial drafts were developed during study sessions on campus, a Town Hall meeting, which brought together community members with campus representatives, was held. This day-long event resulted in the creation of the College's *Strategic Plan*. In 2003 goals were set for a three-year periods and were modified based upon this annual assessment by the Planning Task Force, and the outcomes from the Strategic Planning meeting.

Beginning with the 2003/2004 academic year, the number of Flex days was reduced to one per semester. This did not allow the College to follow the process which included the annual Planning Task Force meetings. Since then, the Institutional Planning Committee has reviewed the progress achieving institutional goals and made recommendations to College Council related to planning or the assessment of institutional effectiveness. However, everyone on campus is given the opportunity for input through the college's governance structure.

Another example to demonstrate that the planning process is broad based is the recent adoption of the 2005 *Educational Master Plan*. While it originated in the Academic Services area, the Plan was based upon the Program Review documents that were prepared in the Student Services, Administrative Services, and Academic Services areas. The Plan was sun-shined by the Academic Senate and College Council before being taken to the Board of Trustees for its approval.

In 2004 the College Council accepted the recommendation from the Institutional Planning Committee for Institutional Performance Indicators and forwarded those to the Superintendent/President who in turn forwarded them to the Board of Trustees for

recommended adoption. The Institutional Performance Indicators were then adopted by the Board of Trustees. These indicator will assist the College in evaluating institutional effectiveness.

Evaluation

COS substantially meets this standard. The planning process provides the opportunity for participation from all constituent groups. However, representatives from these groups do not always avail themselves of these opportunities.

The College has a process in place for allocating human resources, equipment and facility resources through the Above Base Budget process. However, in recent years, there have not always been resources to allocate to these identified needs. A primary example is Instructional Equipment money. When the college does receive money from the State, it follows the process that has been identified through the College Council's Above Base Budget process for allocation of the funds. When no funds are available, nothing happens.

It is difficult to assess the effectiveness of resource allocation. There are no clearly defined methods to assess the impact of resource allocation on institutional effectiveness.

Planning Agenda:

1. The College Council will identify and investigate models of measuring institutional effectiveness, and adapt a method to the planning process at COS.

5. The institution uses documented assessment results to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies.

Description

Quality assurance information from planning, evaluation, and research activities is made available to the public from a variety of academic programs and services and in many different formats. High school counselors, faculty, and administrators receive such information at workshops scheduled by their counterparts here at the College. The Research & Grants Newsletters, Annual Planning Compendium and Institutional Master Plan, which detail research and planning efforts, are distributed internally and to individuals outside the college community who are in education, government, business, and to the public in general, if they request them.

Results of assessment tests, specifically English and mathematics, of incoming students have been made available in the Annual Planning Compendium and, at times, in the Research & Grants Newsletters. The information is shared with high school administrators and counselors each year. The numbers and percentages of students placing in each area of mathematics and English can be used as a monitoring tool, not only of the capabilities of high school and re-entry students, but also a gauge of how many class sections are needed.

Some programs on campus must meet outside agency regulations specific to total program evaluation. These evaluations include assessments and action plans. An examples of this is the Registered Nursing program. Quality assurance matters pertaining to the nursing program are reviewed and discussed with the program's Advisory Committee, the local Nurse Executive Council, and the California Board of Registered Nursing.

Student Right to Know information is available from the California Community College Chancellor's Office. The *General Catalog* continues to publish the "Student Right-to-Know Disclosure" statement. Any individual wanting details may request this information from the Dean of Student Services, or secure it from the State Chancellor's Office website. This information is shared across areas of the college and with Advisory Committees of the various vocational disciplines.

Members of the community serve on each Program Review Validation Team and can informally share results with interested parties. Program Review results are ultimately presented to the Board of Trustees for approval and, therefore, become part of the agenda that is available to the public. There is no current formal mechanism to share Program Review and evaluation results with the public, other than perhaps through various Advisory Committees.

Evaluation

This standard has been met. Copies of newsletters, Annual Planning Compendiums, and Education Master Plans have been disseminated internally and externally. Each of these publications contains quality assurance information. Assessment test data is also published and distributed once a year both internally and externally to K-12 administrators.

Program-specific external evaluation documents are validated by the various agencies and results are available to interested individuals.

Student Right-to-Know information has been provided to students and the public through the COS General Catalog and through the State Chancellor's website. Specific rates continue to be shared internally via newsletters and the Compendium. The Student Right-to-Know rates are prepared by the Chancellor's Office. Since the data are not prepared by COS, there is no way to check for accuracy.

Program Review statistics for each area are prepared by Academic Services area from MIS data and are assumed to be valid. The quality of each area programs or services must be validated. Results are available to interested constituent groups.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

6. The institution assures the effectiveness of its ongoing planning and resource allocation processes by systematically reviewing and modifying, as appropriate, all parts of the cycle, including institutional and other research efforts.

Description

The College Council engages in planning efforts and in identification of areas requiring improvement. The various Institutional Standing Committees of the College Council have each developed planning tools to guide their individual efforts:

1) The Institutional Technology Committee developed and uses a campus-wide Technology Plan 2.0.

2) The Institutional Budget Committee utilizes the Preliminary Budget Report and the *Budget Book* (adopted Final Budget). Each area's (President's Office, Academic Services, Student Services, and Administrative Services) chief administrative officer may provide their divisions/departments with an opportunity for input and allocation revision.

3) The Institutional Facilities Committee uses the Five-Year Facilities Plan when addressing campus facility needs.

4) The Institutional Planning Committee periodically reviews the effectiveness of the institution's planning process. The Committee discusses each facet of the P-I-E (Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation) model and its relationship to the Mission. Also included in these discussions are the connections between processes, such as accreditation, program review, institutional goals, and accountability mechanisms (such as PFE). The model has been mapped by the committee and the connections between processes have been formatted into a three-dimensional visual representation which is used at various planning events. It is during these discussions in the Institutional Planning Committee that weaknesses in the processes are identified and modifications are proposed. The concept of "Performance Indicators" was developed during these sessions as a method to expand the evaluation process at the institutional level.

Resource allocation processes occur at many levels. The major budget allocation decisions occur in the President's Cabinet and are not currently included in the College Council's planning model. The funds available for additional staff and equipment are identified at this level. Recommendations on how these funds are ultimately allocated to various programs across campus are a responsibility of College Council. College Council evaluates the requests identified during Program Review and makes its recommendations on which should be funded to the President's Cabinet. For faculty and instructional equipment, the Instructional Council makes recommendations to the College Council; which they may accept or alter. The Instructional Council consists of Division Chairs, Academic Deans and Directors, the Vice-President of Academic Services and Director of Institutional Research. The Instructional Council has developed a set of criteria for evaluating requests for faculty and uses those criteria in their evaluations of requests.

While each area within COS may conduct their own individual research efforts, the Institutional Research Office serves the entire college. There is no formal evaluation of the effectiveness of institutional research, but as processes change (e.g., revision of Program Review model), the qualitative and quantitative data required to assess outcomes may also change. Research efforts are informally critiqued by academic and/or service areas requesting specific data.

Evaluation

While the College has made progress informally assessing the effectiveness of its planning and resource allocation processes, the lack of a formal process indicates the need for improvement in meeting this standard.

Currently, the College Council attempts to assure its effectiveness through informal evaluation processes. The 2001 Participatory Governance Model contains no written provision for procedural changes. The Council has the prerogative to evaluate the work of each Institutional Standing Committee and request a revision of its charge if needed.

To assure effectiveness of its guiding document, the Technology Plan 2.0 states that "it is a work in progress" and is "reviewed and revised as necessary to support the Mission of COS."

The Institutional Budget Committee, while considering questions and concerns surrounding the budget, does not have a formal mechanism to assure its effectiveness or to modify the resource allocation process.

The Institutional Facilities Committee has no formal process to evaluate the effectiveness of its operations.

The Institutional Planning Committee has no formal evaluation process to assess its own effectiveness. However, the Committee is diligent in conducting an annual (at a minimum) review of the various phases of COS' planning efforts. While formal feedback or evaluation of campus-wide planning events does occur, the large Planning Task Force has not convened since the development of the 2003-2006 goals.

Informal feedback from areas under review on how to improve the process is always requested by the Program Review Steering Committee. Programs and services are asked for input mid way through and at the end of the cycle on what did and did not work well in the process and preparation of the reports.

As there is no formal evaluation of institutional research efforts, the Accreditation Survey provided insight regarding the perceptions of campus constituencies with regard to these efforts. While institutional performance data is distributed by the Institutional Research Office in a variety of methods, recognition of such information is minimal. Faculty, administrators, and classified staff were asked for input regarding the distribution and availability of information regarding institutional performance. While the three groups each felt this was an important function (89.4%, 75% and 94.2% respectively), the level of agreement that this, indeed, occurred differed

greatly (59.5%, 84.7% and 49% respectively). Twenty-five percent of faculty and 39.6% of classified disagreed that the data was available and 15.2% and 11.3% did not know the status of availability.

Statement: Information about institutional performance is distributed and available to all staff.			
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified
Great/Moderate Importance	89.4	75	94.2
Little/No Importance	6.6	25	
Do Not Know	3.9		5.8
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified
Strongly Agree/Agree	59.5	84.7	49
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	25.3	15.4	39.6
Do Not Know	15.2		11.3

The Accreditation Survey asked two other questions regarding providing institutional and program performance information. The same survey respondents for faculty, administrators and classified rated the College higher. It is unclear why this disparity should exist.

Statement: The College provides evidence of institutional performance.				
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Board
Great/Moderate Importance	93.6	100	89.8	100
Little/No Importance				
Do Not Know	6.4		10.2	
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Board
Strongly Agree/Agree	81.7	75	59.6	100
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	9.8	8.3	19.2	
Do Not Know	8.5	16.7	21.2	

Statement: The College provides evidence of program performance.				
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Board
Great/Moderate Importance	90.9	92.3	89.8	100
Little/No Importance	2.6	7.7	2	
Do Not Know	6.5		8.2	
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Board
Strongly Agree/Agree	77.9	58.3	64.7	60
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	13.3	25	13.7	20
Do Not Know	8.8	16.7	21.6	20

Planning Agenda:

1. The College Council and the Institutional Standing Committees will formalize processes for systematically reviewing and modifying the planning cycle. At the end of the year, completion of the action plans will be communicated to all constituencies.

7. The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.

Description

Program Review is the evaluation mechanism that assesses the effectiveness of instructional programs, student support services, learning support services, and administrative services. The Program Review model was implemented in 1999 and every appropriate area of the College was reviewed within the first five-year cycle.

With the last round of program reviews in 2003, the model was revisited in its entirety by the Program Review Steering Committee and the Institutional Planning Committee. In an effort to more fully address the requirements of the various accountability mechanisms (PFE, Student Equity, and COS' Institutional Performance Indicators) and to assure that each area directly addressed student performance issues, the Program Review template was revised. The revisions included the need for each area to address specific data (student enrollments, success rates, retention rates, currency of curriculum review, frequency of curriculum offerings, FTES generation, staffing, etc.) and cite specifics for areas requiring improvement. Templates for services were also revised to assure a more thorough program evaluation.

It is anticipated that the second five-year review cycle in 2008 will generate additional process revisions

Evaluation

This Standard has been met.

There is an annual evaluation of the Program Review process by both the Program Review Steering Committee and by the programs and services under review. The process was refined based upon this feedback. To make the Program Review template more user friendly and to provide more information to those under review, major revisions were made in 2002.

The Accreditation Survey asked faculty, administrators, classified, and the Board of Trustees their perceptions regarding Program Review's usefulness in identifying needed improvements. The importance of this use of Program Review was high in each groups' responses – ranging from 80% to 92%. Responses regarding agreement varied greatly with only 40% of the Board, 62% of the

faculty, and 64.2% of classified staff agreeing. Ninety-two percent of administrators agreed that that Program Review does identify needed program improvements.

Statement: Program Review is used to identify needed improvements.				
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Board
Great/Moderate Importance	87.2	91.7	90.2	80
Little/No Importance	7.7	8.3	3.9	
Do Not Know	5.1		5.9	20
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Board
Strongly Agree/Agree	62	92.3	64.2	40
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	26.6	7.7	24.5	40
Do Not Know	11.4		11.3	20

Initially, there was much resistance to the implementation of Program Review. Instructional programs and service areas were fearful that process would be punitively used by administration. Evaluation of programs and services was threatening. However, this perception changed somewhat when areas were able to realize benefits (equipment, staffing, remodeling, etc.) that were justified in their program reviews.   Funding constraints reduced the immediate, tangible benefits to programs and many areas do not yet fully comprehend the subtle, intangible value of program improvements.

The development of the Educational Master Plan, in addition to validating the importance of Program Review, will also serve as a valuable blueprint for the future of the college. The main focus of the Plan is on change: changes which are needed to help the institution better meet the challenges of its Mission.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

Documentation

1. College of the Sequoias Mission Statement

2. 2005-07 COS General Catalog

3. Program Review Reports

4. Educational Master Plan

5. Board of Trustees Agendas & Minutes

6. Institutional Planning Committee Minutes

7. College of the Sequoias Strategic Plan

8. Research & Grants Newsletters

9. Institutional Master Plan

10. Technology Plan 2.0

11. Preliminary Budget 2005-06

12. 2005-06 Final Budget

13. Five-year Facilities Master Plan

14. 2001 Participatory Governance Model

15. College Council Minutes

16. Campus Curriculum Committee Minutes

17. Student Learning Outcomes Committee Minute

18. Program Review Steering Committee Minutes

19. Accreditation Survey Results

20. Board of Trustees Policy Manual

21. Student Equity Plan

Standard II: Student Learning Programs & Services

The institution offers high-quality instructional programs, student support services, and library and learning support services that facilitate and demonstrate the achievement of stated student learning outcomes (SLO). The institution provides an environment that supports learning, enhances student understanding and appreciation of diversity, and encourages personal and civic responsibility as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all of its students.

A. Instructional Programs

The institution offers high-quality instructional programs in recognized and emerging fields of study that culminate in identified student outcomes leading to degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education institutions or programs consistent with its mission. Instructional programs are systematically assessed in order to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and achieve stated student learning outcomes. The provisions of this standard are broadly applicable to all instructional activities offered in the name of the institution.

1. The institution demonstrates that all instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, address and meet the mission of the institution and upholds its integrity.[1]

Description:

College of the Sequoias (COS) maintains instructional programs that meet the unique needs of its students. In Hanford, at the COS Farm, on the main campus and throughout the COS District, students are offered instructional programs that provide education and training for career opportunities, for transfer to other institutions, for vocational training, and for basic skills achievement.

Educational programs are monitored by the Campus Curriculum Committee through the five-year review process. The Campus Curriculum Committee, which is composed of faculty, administrators, and students, has the responsibility for oversight of College of the Sequoias' curriculum.

The Program Review process, which has as its goal to evaluate the success and relevancy of every COS program and service, requires each campus entity to perform a self evaluation and comment/respond to success and retention information to evaluate their courses and programs.

Fields of study offered by the College are chosen to meet the educational and training needs of its students. Courses in general education, academic majors, and lower division preparation for transfer are developed in collaboration with the four-year school to which students most often transfer. IMPAC, discipline-specific meetings among two- and four-year faculty, and the work on the liberal arts transfer degree have all supported this dialogue. The vocational divisions rely

heavily on advisory boards, student surveys, and graduate questionnaires for input into fields of study and refinement of certificates

Evaluation:

The College, through its curriculum and Program Review processes, meets this standard. However, the Accreditation Survey reveals some disagreement with this.

Statement: The curriculum process ensures that courses/programs meet the Mission.				
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Board	Curriculum Cmt.
Great/Moderate Importance	92.1	84.6	100	87.5
Little/No Importance	2.6	15.4		12.5
Do Not Know	5.3			
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Board	Curriculum Cmt.
Strongly Agree/Agree	68.5	53.8	80	68.5
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	24.7	46.2		25.0
Do Not Know	6.8		20	6.4

It is clear that the majority of faculty, administrators, board members and Campus Curriculum Committee members believe that it is important for the curriculum process to ensure that the College's courses and programs meet the Mission. However, approximately one quarter of the faculty and the Campus Curriculum Committee members disagree that this occurs. Even more worrisome is that almost half of the administrators do not believe this statement to be true. The source of the disagreement is unclear. Perhaps it is the perception that the actual curriculum process in cumbersome and slow.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

a. The institution identifies and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through programs consistent with their educational preparation and the diversity, demographics, and economy of its communities. The institution relies upon research and analysis to identify student learning needs and to assess progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes.

Description:

The COS Mission statement "affirms that our mission is to help our diverse student population achieve their transfer and /or occupational objectives and to advance the economic growth and global competitiveness of business and industry within our region." (COS 2005-2007 *General*

Catalog). Furthermore, COS "is committed to supporting students' mastery of basic skills and to providing programs and services that foster student success."

Through the 2003-04 academic year, the Office of Research and Grants (ORG) produced the Annual Planning Compendium, a collection of data about the demographics of the COS service area, labor and employment data, enrollment trends, placement test results, COS student characteristics, retention, persistence, and success data, and information about faculty. Although a new edition of this document is no longer produced yearly, the ORG disseminates updated information through other venues as new data become available every year. The ORG also produces a newsletter four or five times a year that presents information about student persistence and success, results of placement testing, student right to know information, and Institutional Performance Indicators. This information is available to the entire campus community, and is potentially useful to academic administrators, faculty, and classified staff for developing programs to meet the unique learning needs of our students.

In order to assist students and to "increase the level of student access and success", COS adopted the Student Equity Plan in 1994, updating it in 1996 and 2005. This plan went to the Chancellor's Office in 2005. Additionally, COS has a Matriculation Plan, designed to assist students in achieving "their educational goals through a coordinated program of instruction and support services tailored to individual needs." The Matriculation Plan describes services available to students at COS to enhance their retention, persistence, and success. The Matriculation Plan also identifies methods to strengthen the Institutional effectiveness in delivering educational programs and services to meet students' educational needs. The COS Matriculation Plan was last updated in 2004.

The Equal Opportunities Programs and Services (EOPS), along with the Disability Resource Center (DRC) develop the specific plans to assist COS students with special needs. Examples include supplemental instruction programs for basic math courses and updated technology. The DRC uses technologically enhanced equipment and programs to assist students, such as *LP Windows with Speech, JAWS for Windows, Dragon Naturally Speaking,* left – and right-handed keyboards, and closed circuit TV.

Most COS students either hold jobs while attending College or are retraining for a changing job market. The challenge to meet the variety of student needs has led COS to offer classes at a number of off-campus sites, during various times of the day and week, with a variety of delivery methods, including distance learning.

The College has endeavored to keep abreast of employment and industrial trends of the community. The vocational programs at COS have advisory boards made up of faculty and local employers. The College is a member of the Tulare County Workforce Investment Board (WIB) and the Kings County WIB and receives valuable educational and training information as a participating member. The College uses all these sources of information to review the programs, certificates, and majors offered by the Institution and adapts, removes, and adds new programs where deemed necessary.

In order to meet employment needs requiring a higher level of education, the College has transfer agreements with State and private universities in California. For the 2003-04 academic year the California Postsecondary Education Commission reported that 482 College of the Sequoias students transferred to public four-year schools in California.

COS, through its eleven academic divisions, offers a wide variety of courses, majors, programs, and remediation to meet the diverse needs of the COS students. Students who are new to the COS campus take placement examinations in mathematics and English. These examinations determine the level of the individual's preparation in these key areas of study. Each student is counseled to take the appropriate level of mathematics and English to ensure success. The COS counselors routinely review the *Schedule of Classes* to ensure that course offerings address student needs.

Student learning needs are addressed at the division and program level. The vocational divisions, through their associations with advisory boards, community employers, and work in the community, maintain a strong awareness of the needs of the community. These community needs are translated into courses, programs, majors and certificates. Student learning outcomes are gradually being developed and incorporated into individual courses. Non-vocational divisions also have a successful relationship with transfer-accepting institutions and upper division colleges so that students are successfully prepared to course work after transfer. Recent dialogue concerning student learning outcomes at the course level, has been based on information about student learning needs for success in coursework beyond COS.

The Institution has been vocal in the increased concern for the development of basic skills in our students. The Instructional Council put basic skills on its planning agenda for the 2004-05 academic year. The new *Educational Master Plan* acknowledges the need to support opportunities for students to develop basic skills by expanding its programs in College Prep/Basic skills, Human Development, and tutoring.

Evaluation:

The College partially meets this standard. Data concerning students' placements into mathematics and English are widely distributed and the level of student preparation for College coursework is generally well known.

The College employs numerous methods to identify student needs. Program Review evaluates student success and retention data for all divisions. The curriculum process requires a justification for new courses and programs outlining the need. Numerous divisions and departments rely on Advisory Committees and employer groups for information regarding their employment requirements. In addition, data from placement test indicate the need for various levels of English and mathematics courses.

It can be seen in the data below, taken from the Accreditation Survey, that the majority of faculty, administrators, and Campus Curriculum Committee members believe that it is important to

identify SLOs as a part of course approval. It is important to note, however, that significant percentages of these same campus entities do not believe that SLOs are actually identified during course approval. This indicates that more dialogue about the value and usefulness of SLOs during course construction is imperative.

Statement: The curriculum process includes identification of Student Learning Outcomes as a part of course approval.			
Degree of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Curriculum Cmt.
Great/Moderate Importance	77.9	84.6	82.4
Little/No Importance	13.0	7.7	11.8
Do Not Know	9.1	7.7	5.9
Degree of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Curriculum Cmt.
Strongly Agree/Agree	49.3	36.4	25.0
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	33.8	45.4	62.5
Do Not Know	16.9	18.2	12.5

Planning Agenda

1. The Academic Senate, the Campus Curriculum Committee, and the Student Learning Outcomes Committee will work in concert to educate the campus community in identification of student learning outcomes and methods of assessment of student learning.

b. The institution utilizes delivery systems and modes of instruction compatible with the objectives of the curriculum and appropriate to the current and future needs of its students.

Description:

The curriculum oversight and approval process at COS involves review of any new course, program, major, or certificate at the department, division, and campus wide level. Although COS heavily relies on traditional instructional delivery methods, a small number of distance education classes are offered each semester. Those divisions which offer distance education are asked to review the success and retention of distance education students during their Program Review. Some distance education courses have a higher attrition and failure rate compared to traditional delivery methods.

The Campus Curriculum Committee has engaged in vigorous dialogue over the last 5 years about the designation of course delivery as a "lecture" or as a "lab". Part of the difficulty with these designations is the limited definitions provided by the Education Code, the Carnegie unit, and Board Policy 8005. Twenty-first century instruction does not fit well into definitions of delivery systems constructed 100 years ago. The Campus Curriculum Committee developed and approved definitions for lecture, laboratory and activity. A main problem and source of resistance to first

developing and then enforcing these definitions is that they have effects on instructor's load and therefore, pay.

Evaluation:

The College partially meets this standard. The College of the Sequoias does not have a campus culture of evaluation of delivery systems and modes of instruction. Although the Office of Research and Grants publishes student retention and success data, student profiles, and other useful information, there is no evidence that theses data are used for evaluation of course delivery methods.

The Accreditation Survey reflects the need for evaluation. In the table below, it can be seen that one-fourth of Campus Curriculum Committee members and one-third of faculty and administrators do not believe that course delivery methods are appropriate for course objectives and content, in spite of the fact that the overwhelming majority believe this to be important.

Statement: The curriculum process ensures that delivery methods are appropriate to course objectives and content.			
Degree of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Curriculum Cmt.
Great/Moderate Importance	94.8	92.3	87.5
Little/No Importance	1.3	7.7	12.5
Do Not Know	3.9		
Degree of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Curriculum Cmt.
Strongly Agree/Agree	62.9	50.0	68.8
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	31.4	33.3	25.0
Do Not Know	5.7	16.7	6.3

Planning Agenda

1. The Campus Curriculum Committee will develop a series of workshops to assist course authors in pairing appropriate course delivery methods with course objectives and content.

2. The Campus Curriculum Committee and the Academic Senate will enlist the assistance of the Office of Institutional Research and Grants to develop an evaluation process for modes of course delivery.

c. The institution identifies student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees; assesses student achievement of those outcomes; and uses assessment results to make improvements.

Description:

Dialogue about student learning outcomes from the course level to the institutional level has begun on the College of the Sequoias campus. The Campus Curriculum Committee began the conversation two years ago and out of that discussion evolved the campus' Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Committee. The SLO Committee is composed of "early adopter" faculty representatives from each division as well as administrators. They have vigorously led the charge to engage faculty in development of SLOs and have met with some success. Throughout the divisions, examples exist of courses and programs that have been revised to include student leaning outcomes and the use of rubrics for evaluation of SLO achievement.

During Fall 2005 the Campus Curriculum Committee adopted a format change to the course outline template that forces the course outline author to identify SLOs. On February 2, 2006, the SLO Committee hosted a workshop for the COS community to learn more about SLOs. The workshop presenter was Dr. Norena Badway who is Associate Professor, Higher Education Leadership, University of the Pacific. The SLO Committee has sponsored numerous other workshops and training opportunities for faculty, including bringing other speakers onto campus and offering "Brown-bag" sessions with SLO Committee members.

Several divisions have SLOs in place in courses, programs, certificates, and degrees. The Division of Nursing and Allied Health is one that has identified student learning outcomes. Regulation by outside agencies and California state legislation has prompted the development of student learning outcomes in this division's skill certificates and major. The Division of Consumer Family Studies and the Economics Department in the Business Division have both made great strides in incorporating student learning outcomes into courses, as well as promoting dialogue throughout these divisions.

Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard. The inclusion of student learning outcomes into courses, programs, certificates and majors has begun. Although much progress has been made, COS has much yet to do. The Accreditation Survey revealed that at least three quarters of faculty and administrators believe it is important that the programs and divisions develop SLOs. A majority of these groups, 66.7% of faculty and 80% of administrators, agree that the programs and divisions are now developing SLOs. These findings indicate the success of the SLO Committee in educating the College and fostering dialogue regarding SLOs.

Statement: Your program or your division is in the process of developing SLOs.		
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators
Great/Moderate Importance	75.6	75.0
Little/No Importance	15.4	16.7
Do Not Know	9.0	8.3
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators
Strongly Agree/Agree	66.7	80.0
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	27.7	10.0
Do Not Know	5.6	10.0

The majority of the College's faculty, administrators, and Campus Curriculum Committee members believe that SLO assessment is an important means of improving courses and programs. A smaller majority agree that this is currently occurring in courses and programs.

Statement: SLO assessment is used to improve courses and programs			
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Curriculum Cmt.
Great/Moderate Importance	79.2	76.9	82.4
Little/No Importance	13.0	15.4	11.7
Do Not Know	7.8	7.7	5.9
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Curriculum Cmt.
Strongly Agree/Agree	63.2	53.8	68.8
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	29.4	38.5	31.2
Do Not Know	7.4	7.7	

Planning Agenda

1. The Campus Curriculum Committee, with the assistance of the Student Learning Outcomes Committee, will develop tools and techniques for the assessment of student achievement of course SLOs. Identification of the means of assessing SLOs will become a mandatory part of the course outline template.

2. The Institution assures the quality and improvement of all instructional courses and programs offered in the name of the Institution, including collegiate, developmental, and pre-collegiate courses and programs, continuing and community education, study abroad, short-term training courses and programs, programs for international students, and contract or other special programs, regardless of type of credit awarded, delivery mode, or location

Description

The College of the Sequoias offers traditional college courses, characteristic of most community colleges. In addition, the College offers developmental, pre-collegiate, continuing and community education, short-term training, international, contract education, Mini-Corps courses, LISTO learning communities, Foster Care Education, and college orientation.

Board Policy 1110 identifies "Curriculum" as one area where the Board of Trustees and Academic Senate will work toward mutual agreement.

In almost all instances, new curriculum originates in individual divisions and/or with individual instructors. Instructors are in the best position to track trends and changes in their field, which may necessitate adaptations to certificate, vocational, or transfer programs. In many cases, members of Advisory Committees or colleagues at four-year colleges and universities will alert instructors to needed changes. At other times, business and community members may identify skills they would like to see in new employees. Whatever the method used for identifying the curriculum need, development of new courses begin at the division level after some sort of needs assessment. There should be substantive indicators to support the need for the course. The most important of these indicators is identifying how the proposal will meet student needs. All new curriculum must be a part of an approved program at COS. Programs are submitted to the Chancellor's office for approval.

Modifications of current courses can occur for several reasons. Instructors are mandated to review course outlines and pre-requisites every 5 years for currency. Scrutiny by the COS Campus Curriculum Committee is part of this review. Advisory boards, community members, alerts from four-year schools' faculty, or changing technology may indicate the need to modify a course outline. In the justification portion of the course outline form, the instructor is required to explain why the course is being modified. Although a formal needs assessment is not required, a clear-cut need for modification must be presented.

The Academic Senate passed a resolution during the Fall 2005 semester stating that all course outlines are expected to be no older than 5 years. During Program Review, all courses, programs, certificates, and majors are scrutinized. Data from the Office of Research and Grants assists each division in the evaluation of its offerings. Retention, persistence, and success are all useful evaluation tools for reviewing courses, programs, certificates, and majors. During the Program Review process courses may be modified or deleted, to maintain the currency of the course and/or program.

As much as is humanly possible, all courses and programs are of high quality at the College. The multi-step approval process provides for input from many interested parties as well as time to review the need for the new course, certificate, program, or major. As described in the previous paragraph, the Program Review process ensures that all courses certificates, programs and majors

are periodically reviewed and revised as necessary to meet the learning needs of our student population.

Evaluation

The Institution meets this standard. The faculty-driven curriculum creation process requires scrutiny by faculty and administrators directly involved with the delivery of curriculum. Once a course, certificate, program, or major is in place, review occurs once every 5 years during the Program Review process. These processes ensure the high quality of curriculum at College of the Sequoias

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

a. The institution uses established procedures to design, identify learning outcomes for, approve, administer, deliver, and evaluate courses and programs. The institution recognizes the central role of its faculty for establishing quality and improving instructional courses and programs.

Description

College of the Sequoias has established processes for the development and maintenance of courses and programs, as identified in the *Curriculum Approval Process*, which was adopted by the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees in 2002. This process ensures that faculty have the central role in creating and reviewing curriculum. The process for new curriculum development was described in a previous section of this report (II.A.2).

Established programs and services are evaluated through the Program Review process. Every five years each program, service, and division on the COS campus undergoes this evaluation process. They also must complete yearly updates to Program Review. In the academic programs, faculty complete the Program Review and part of the evaluation is a review and updating of course outlines. Faculty use factors such as retention and success within the course, responses to student surveys, and the degree to which the course achieves acceptable minimum enrollment each semester to evaluate courses in the division. Evaluation of programs includes the number of students who complete certificates, majors and lower division preparation for transfer. Vocational divisions also evaluate courses and programs through feedback from advisory committees.

There is no quantitative data to indicate whether these procedures lead to assessment of quality and improvement. However, qualitative feedback is constantly sought by the vocational divisions from Advisory Committees. The community volunteers who sit on advisory committees provide invaluable information concerning the preparation of our students and graduates for the workplace.

Student learning outcomes are now being identified for each course. The new requirement of the Campus Curriculum Committee that all new and modified courses identify SLOs will ensure this process continues. Some departments and divisions are further along in this endeavor than others. Since the development and modification of curriculum begins with the faculty, the faculty will also be responsible for identifying SLOs. The Campus Curriculum Committee will review the learning outcomes as a part of the approval process. The next step will be to develop validated methods of assessments for these learning outcomes and make that a requirement of the curriculum process. Currently, this is not a requirement of the process, only a suggestion/option. Dialogue is now beginning on the identification and assessment of learning outcomes for programs.

Each division has a division curriculum committee charged with overseeing the curriculum in their area. Once a course proposal reaches the division curriculum committee, it is reviewed to make certain that it meets the standards set by the State of California and identified in policies and procedures developed by College of the Sequoias. Among the factors to be considered are rigor, effectiveness, and currency. This committee must determine that proposed courses will fit into a program approved by the Chancellor's office. It is the primary responsibility of the division curriculum committee to scrutinize all pre-requisites, co-requisites, advisories, and limitations on enrollment for each new and modified course. The division curriculum committee, along with the Division Chair, has the responsibility of making curriculum decisions that may impact courses, programs, certificates, and majors within the division. In addition, the division curriculum committee has the responsibility to identify which resources are necessary to offer a course and ensure they are available to instructors and students for this course.

The appropriate Dean also has the obligation to assist the author in identifying any inconsistencies, grammatical and spelling errors, and to be sure that the course outline is technically correct, including pre-requisites, co-requisites, advisories, and limitations on enrollment. The Dean works with the Division Chair to determine that the course fits within the division's program offerings and the overall Mission of the College.

It is the responsibility of the Articulation Officer (AO) to determine the transferability of a course, to establish and to maintain transfer and articulation agreements with the UCs and CSUs. The AO works closely with faculty in the development and modification of transfer courses including all issues related to articulation such as pre-co-requisites, general education and lower division major preparation. The AO also plays an important role in overseeing standardization of language for prerequisites used in course outlines, the *General Catalog*, and the *Schedule of Classes*, as well as the computerized prerequisites

The Campus Curriculum Committee members are divided into sub-committees which review the course outline for both substantive and non-substantive concerns. After the review, the sub-committee either sends the outline back to the author for adjustments or recommends that the course be approved by the entire committee. Once approved by the entire Campus Curriculum Committee the course is then presented to the Academic Senate to be considered and approved by

that body. If the Academic Senate approves the course, it is sent to the Vice President of Academic Services, Superintendent/President and the Board of Trustees for consideration and approval. The California Community College Chancellor's Office also receives and approves all new courses.

Courses and programs are evaluated as a part of the five year Program Review that every division, program and service must undergo. Part of the Program Review for academic divisions is review and updating of all courses, certificates, and majors.

One example of improvement to courses and programs occurred in the Science Division. The Science faculty have been involved with the state-wide IMPAC program to make sure that biology majors courses are in step with the state-wide standards. The Science Division faculty have updated catalog descriptions, topic descriptors and lab topics, and are monitoring the IMPAC discussion on SLO's for these courses.

Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard. COS effectively uses established procedures to develop, approve, and administer its courses, and programs. Faculty have a central role in the entire process of development and approval of new and modified curriculum. The Campus Curriculum Committee has become increasingly effective through the use of computer-assisted dialogue, support and file sharing. The Program Review process for all divisions requires that all course and program information be current and that data concerning student retention and success is addressed.

As can be seen in the following data taken from the Accreditation Survey, a significant portion of the campus population believes that evaluation of courses and programs is important. However, 32.9% of the faculty and 43.8% of the Campus Curriculum Committee do not believe that evaluation of courses and programs occurs.

Statement: Courses and Programs are evaluated for effectiveness.			
Level of importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Curriculum Cmt.
Great/Moderate Importance	96.1	100	94.1
Little/No Importance	2.6		5.9
Do Not Know	1.3		
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Curriculum Cmt.
Strongly Agree/Agree	61.4	76.9	50.0
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	32.9	15.4	43.8
Do Not Know	5.7	7.7	6.2

While it is assumed by some that courses and programs are reviewed every five years as required by Program Review, this may not be uniformly done (see II.A.2.e).

Planning Agenda

1. The Academic Senate will identify criteria used to define quality in instructional courses and programs. These criteria will be forwarded to the Program Review Steering Committee for inclusion in the Program Review process.

b. The Institution relies on faculty expertise and the assistance of advisory committees when appropriate to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The Institution regularly assesses student progress towards achieving those outcomes.

Description:

The College's faculty has primary responsibility for curricula at COS. The faculty initiates and writes the course outlines, completes course outline updates and revisions, and serves on division curriculum committees. The majority of the members of the Campus Curriculum Committee are faculty. Vocational departments and divisions maintain Advisory Committees in which faculty participate. Specific programs, such as the Fire and Police Academies have outside agencies that determine student learning outcomes and the faculty must ensure that fire and police academy students achieve these outcomes.

Student learning outcomes are now being incorporated into course outlines, as previously discussed in the description of II.A.2 a. The dialogue about inclusion of SLOs into general education and vocational certificates and majors is in the initial stages. Some vocational areas, such as welding, have certificates with very specific student learning outcomes, mandated by external agencies.

Although not done consistently across the College, COS does assess student progress toward SLOs. For example, in the Registered Nursing core courses, economics, and developmental math courses, student achievement of SLOs is evaluated.

COS has long identified general learning objectives in courses, majors and the general education pattern. These are identified in the *COS General Catalog.* However, the SLO Committee has not begun work yet on formally identifying SLOs for majors and the general education pattern. Therefore, the assessment of learning outcomes for majors and the general education pattern is not possible.

Evaluation

COS partially meets this standard. The expertise of faculty and input of Advisory Committees are the primary sources for identifying competencies and SLOs. However, the College has not yet identified SLOs and competencies throughout all courses, programs, certificates, and degrees.

Statement: There is a process to determine student achievement in programs, certificates and majors.			
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Curriculum Cmt.
Great/Moderate Importance	93.4	92.3	87.5
Little/No Importance	2.6	7.7	12.5
Do Not Know	3.9		
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Curriculum Cmt.
Strongly Agree/Agree	62.5	61.5	47.1
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	18.1	15.4	17.6
Do Not Know	19.4	23.1	35.3

The Accreditation Survey data reveal that, although almost all faculty and administrators believe the process for determining student achievement in programs certificates and majors is important, less than two-thirds acknowledge that the process exists. Less than half of the Campus Curriculum Committee members believe this process is in place, and it is these faculty that is most aware of curricular processes on this campus. It should be noted that significant percentages of all groups **Do Not Know** of the existence of a process.

Planning Agenda

1. The Academic Senate will establish a realistic deadline for inclusion of evidence of student achievement of learning outcomes in all programs, certificates, and majors. This evidence will be documented in Program Review information.

2. The Campus Curriculum Committee will review all programs, certificates, and majors for evidence of a process to determine student achievement of learning outcomes.

c. High-quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning characterize all programs.

Description

The identification of quality of instruction, including appropriate breadth, depth, and rigor begins at the division level. Each division has a curriculum approval process in place. The curriculum model calls for a division to have a division curriculum committee. The size and the level of activity of these committees vary between divisions; however, they are all composed of faculty from the division. Faculty experts in the discipline provide information about breadth, depth and rigor.

The Campus Curriculum Committee, as a part of the approval process of courses, certificates, and majors, reviews depth, rigor and sequencing of courses. However, no specific guidelines or set

policy is in place to guide this review. The Campus Curriculum Committee must rely on the author of the course outline, certificate, or major under review. COS has not had a campus-wide dialogue on these issues, although the Campus Curriculum Committee and the Articulation Officer have expressed concerns about the lack of specific policy.

A campus-wide dialogue on sequencing of courses, time to completion, and synthesis of learning has not occurred. A set policy about these issues would be very helpful to administrators and faculty during the first few weeks of each semester, when decisions about course cancellations must be made. Time to completion is totally dependent on scheduling and filling of classes.

Synthesis of learning is not evaluated systematically across the campus. Vocational programs are forced to address synthesis of learning due to the impact of outside accrediting agencies, such as the Board of Registered Nursing. This is the exception rather than the rule.

Evaluation:

The College partially meets this standard. The division and Campus Curriculum Committees attempt to evaluate breadth, depth, rigor, and sequencing. The primary source of input is from appropriate faculty and this reliance on faculty assumes that faculty are current and up to date in the area being addressed

Planning Agenda

1. The Campus Curriculum Committee will develop written guidelines to address breadth, depth, rigor, and sequencing of courses that will be disseminated to course authors.

d. The institution uses delivery modes and teaching methodologies that reflect the diverse needs and learning styles of its students.

Description

COS offers a variety of teaching methodologies, such as traditional on-campus lecture/discussion courses, laboratory application courses, and distance education courses. Within the context of these delivery modes, different strategies are employed including learning communities, small group instructional feedback, small group study, and classroom assessment of learning styles, to name a few. In some cases, the choice of teaching methodology and delivery mode depends on faculty teaching style and preference, rather than on students' learning styles. In other cases, instructors us a variety of instructional techniques and classroom delivery methods based on student needs. The Campus Curriculum Committee reviews methods of assessment in proposed course outlines.

The College offers a number of different types of distance education courses. These include video taped classes, hybrid courses that employ on-line and face-to-face meetings, real-time distributed

learning, and purely on-line courses. These distance courses are offered by relatively few divisions. The Campus Curriculum Committee requires the submittal of a separate distance education plan for any course that will be offered in a distance education mode. The Campus Curriculum Committee reviews and approves these plans prior to the offering of a distance education course. There is a recent initiative to increase the number of offerings in distance education.

The Campus Curriculum Committee has developed definitions of lecture, laboratory, and activity styles of course delivery. The Committee has not been successful in consistently applying these definitions in all divisions.

Since the reduction of Flex hours to one day per semester, the COS faculty have had fewer opportunities to explore new teaching methodologies or to attend on-campus classes about assessing student learning styles. Faculty still have the option of attending off-campus conferences through the Faculty Conference program. In addition, various campus groups and committees offer "Brown Bag" sessions to explore a variety of topics related to the teaching. The SLO Committee has been particularly active in this area.

Evaluation

The College substantially meets this standard. A variety of instructional delivery modes are employed across campus. Evaluation of whether these methods are tied to the learning needs of the students occurs in Program and Review and during Faculty Evaluation. In both of these processes, students are surveyed and given the opportunity to provide feedback to the program and the individual instructor.

The requirement of a separate distance education plan in the curriculum approval process ensures that this mode of delivery is reviewed for appropriateness. There is a current effort underway to increase the number of distance education classes offered by the College. This is being pursued, not only to increase the enrollment in the College, but also to acknowledge the different learning styles of students and the difficulties they may experience in trying to physically attend classes on campus.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

e. The institution evaluates all courses and programs through an on-going systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans.

Description

Every academic division undergoes a Program Review once every five years. One of the major components of this review is the evaluation of all courses and programs within the division. All

course outlines are to have been reviewed and brought up to date during the previous five years. Division faculty are provided with information about students persistence, retention, and success and must respond to significant issues. Programs are evaluated for currency, relevancy, and success in meeting students' needs. The final component of the Program Review process leads to identification goals and plans for the next five years regarding curricular issues.

The Campus Curriculum Committee is charged with reviewing majors and certificates. Division faculty evaluate courses in the major, receive feedback from Advisory Committees, dialogue with faculty in four-year universities, and review students' retention and success in the majors during Program Review. This in-depth review results in majors that are current and meet the needs of students.

Student learning outcomes are being developed within each division. The emphasis thus far has been on SLOs at the course outline level. The campus community has participated in many workshops and has had many lively conversations about SLOs at the course level.

Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard. The processes exist to ensure that courses and programs are evaluated systematically. However, the COS curriculum librarian has stated that there are currently approximately 300 course outlines, or roughly 30% of the entire curriculum, which are older than five years. There is only one division at COS in which all course outlines are current.

The following two tables present data from the Accreditation Survey. It can be seen that, in general, the COS community agrees in the importance of evaluating COS majors and certificates for relevance and effectiveness. Unfortunately only a little more than half of the campus community agrees that this process occurs. Significant percentages of faculty, administrators, Campus Curriculum Committee members and Students indicated **Do Not Know** when asked if majors and certificates are reviewed routinely. It is possible that some of these individuals are aware what occurs with majors, but not certificates, or vise versa.

Statement: Majors are reviewed routinely for relevance and effectiveness.				
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT& PT)	Administrators	Curriculum Cmt.	Students
Great/Moderate Importance	90.9	92.3	100	70.3
Little/No Importance	3.9			6.6
Do Not Know	5.2	7.7		23.1
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT& PT)	Administrators	Curriculum Cmt.	Students
Strongly Agree/Agree	59.2	53.8	68.8	60.2
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	15.4	15.4	6.2	9.6
Do Not Know	25.4	36.8	25.0	30.2

Statement: Certificates are reviewed routinely for relevance and effectiveness.				
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Curriculum Cmt	Students
Great/Moderate Importance	88.3	92.3	88.2	70.3
Little/No Importance	2.6			6.6
Do Not Know	9.1	7.7	11.8	23.1
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Curriculum Cmt	Students
Strongly Agree/Agree	51.5	53.8	56.3	60.2
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	11.7	15.4		9.6
Do Not Know	36.8	30.8	43.2	30.2

The Campus Curriculum Committee does not have a formal mechanism for review of majors and programs. Although the five-year course outline updates must be approved by the Campus Curriculum Committee, there is not parallel process for review of majors, certificates, and programs.

Planning Agenda

1. The Campus Curriculum Committee will develop a timeline and a process to review majors and programs for relevance and effectiveness.

2. The Campus Curriculum Committee will enforce the five-year review policy, through the Program Review process.

f. The institution engages in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning to assure currency and measure achievement of its stated student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution systematically strives to improve those outcomes and makes the results available to appropriate constituencies.

Description

The College is in the process of developing student learning outcomes in all courses, certificates, programs and degrees. All vocational divisions, because of mandates from industry or legislation, have made more progress toward the development of student learning outcomes. All vocational divisions work closely with advisory boards to share information and to ensure that identified SLOs meet industry standards.

The academic divisions are in the process of developing student learning outcomes through dialogue within departments. For example, the Language Arts Division has utilized identified SLOs and scoring rubrics in English 251 for a number of years.

Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard. The review and revision of SLOs does occur in vocational divisions in courses, certificates and programs. It is too soon in the SLO development process for the Institution as a whole to review and improve SLOs. COS has not yet adopted a formal plan to review and evaluate the SLOs once developed in courses, certificates, programs and degrees.

Planning Agenda

1. See planning agenda 1 in standard II.A.1.a.
2. See planning agenda 1 in standard II.A.1.c.
3. See planning agenda 1 in standard II.A.2.a.
4. See planning agendas 1 and 2 in standard II.A.2.b.
5. See planning agenda 1 in standard II.A.2.e.

g. If an institution uses departmental courses and/or program examinations, it validates their effectiveness in measuring student learning and minimizes test biases.

Description

The Automotive Technology Department uses a certification program that is nationally recognized: NATEF (National Automotive Technician Education Foundation). This entity uses all resources (manufacturers, private industry, education, and government) to establish guidelines for automotive education criteria. The classroom knowledge and laboratory task lists are obtained by textbook writers so that each textbook follows the NATEF guidelines. NATEF has recently established an End of Program Test that is available to students on-line. This test can be used to measure achievement of SLOs and also measures the quality of material covered by the instructor.

The ASE (Automotive Service Excellence) is a testing facility that uses the same resources as NATEF to establish a series of tests for our core automotive courses. The ASE tests are voluntary in the field but most automotive shop employers want technicians with some testing credentials prior to a job assignment. These tests are constantly updated as technology changes and advances.

The Welding Department uses standardized tests for end-of-course certification. These tests are developed by the American Welding Society and are used nationally to assess the minimum qualification of students completing a welding course.

Evaluation

The Institution meets this standard. Although the College uses a limited number of end-of course or program examinations, the ones in place are developed by nationally recognized agencies who

maintain standards specific to each discipline. The tests are used nation-wide and effectively test specific areas of knowledge and skill.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

h. The institution awards credit based on student achievement of the course's stated learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education.

Description

Many divisions are actively engaged in the development of SLOs, but have not yet progressed to the level of completion to be able to use SLOs achievement as a criterion for award of credit for a course.

Units of credit are awarded by the number of lecture, laboratory, or activity hours per semester the student accomplishes. The Carnegie unit has been the minimum standard for determining academic credit for all courses, and this is consistent with accepted norms in higher education.

Vigorous dialogue occurred within the College, particularly in the Campus Curriculum Committee, to define exactly what constitutes a lecture, laboratory, or activity course. The impetus for this discussion was the recognition that current courses blend student learning methods and the distinction between lecture, laboratory, and activity courses has blurred. The application of these definitions has not been consistently applied throughout the College. The prevailing bias is that if a course occurs in a classroom it must be a lecture course and if the course occurs in a laboratory it must be a laboratory course. For example, many computer classes are awarded pure lecture units, even though students spend class time working at computers, practicing and applying lecture concepts. These difficulties are compounded by the issue of compensation. Laboratory and activity hours are compensated at a lower rate and faculty who teach these courses must teach more hours to achieve a full teaching load. In some cases course hours have been shifted to activity to allow adjunct instructors, who can only teach up to .6 of a full-time load, to teach more hours and more classes.

Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard. COS awards credit consistent with College policies and is working to make certain that SLOs are the foundation for defining success.

The Accreditation Survey indicates that while faculty, administrators, and Campus Curriculum Committee members all believe that it is important to ensure consistency in units awarded, there is a significant perception that this does not occur. Of particular interest is the finding that the

Campus Curriculum Committee members are evenly split on whether units are consistently awarded. The Campus Curriculum Committee is the body where units awarded is most likely to be discussed. Perhaps the Committee's greater awareness of the lecture/lab unit debate has prompted the negative responses.

Statement: The curriculum process ensures that there is consistency in units awarded.			
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Curriculum Cmt.
Great/Moderate Importance	90.8	91.7	94.1
Little/No Importance	3.9	8.3	5.9
Do Not Know	5.3		
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Curriculum Cmt.
Strongly Agree/Agree	63.0	75.0	50.0
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	26.0	16.7	50.0
Do Not Know	11.0	8.3	

Planning Agenda

1. The Campus Curriculum Committee will develop criteria that will provide consistency in awarding unit values to lecture, laboratory, and activity courses.

i. The institution awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program's stated learning outcomes.

Description

COS has not yet developed SLOs throughout its majors and certificates. Vocational divisions have achieved this to some degree. For example, the RN major has eight student learning outcomes, by which student achievement is measured.

Evaluation

The Institution partially meets this standard. Many of the vocational divisions have SLOs that are used to award degrees and certificates. Those divisions who do not have fully developed SLOs are working toward that goal. These divisions are engaged in dialogue about SLOs as a basis of awarding degrees and certificates.

Planning Agenda

1. See planning agenda 1 in standard II.A.1.a.
2. See planning agenda 1 in standard II.A.2.a.
3. See planning agenda 1 in standard II A.2.b.
4. See planning agenda 2 in standard II A.2.b.

3. The institution requires of all academic and vocational degree programs a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy that is clearly stated in its catalog. The Institution, relying on the expertise of its faculty, determines the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education curriculum by examining the stated learning outcomes for the course.

Description

The College's philosophy of general education for the Associate Degree, appearing in the 2005-07 *College of the Sequoias General Catalog* is as follows:

> General education breadth requirements emphasize democratic concepts based on the value and dignity of each individual, thus helping students prepare to undertake the responsibilities of citizenship and to participate knowledgeably in the varied experiences of life.

> We also believe that the general education breadth requirements are of vital importance in the personal, social, and vocational/professional life of each student. (*2005-2007 General Catalog*, page 56)

Requirements for graduation with an AA or AS degree include completion of eighteen units of general education. At least three units are chosen from each general education area: Written Communication; Oral Communication and Analytical Thinking; Natural Science; Humanities; Social/Behavioral Science; and Exploration.

The process for developing general education courses at College of the Sequoias includes proposal of courses within divisions, review of those courses by division curriculum committees, then submission of the proposed courses to the Campus Curriculum Committee for further review and discussion by representatives from all divisions before forwarding for approval and implementation. The Campus Curriculum Committee now requires that all new and revised courses include SLOs.

The Campus Curriculum Committee follows general guidelines in Title 5 for placement of courses in the general education pattern. Although specific criteria do not exist, vigorous discussion among Campus Curriculum Committee members and review of general education patterns at four-year Institutions assists the Campus Curriculum Committee in placing courses.

Evaluation

COS meets this standard. The Campus Curriculum Committee, composed chiefly of faculty, determines course placement in the general education pattern. However, about 20% of the Campus Curriculum Committee and general faculty either disagree or do not know whether this occurs.

Statement: The curriculum process ensures that courses are appropriately placed in G.E. areas.			
Level of importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Curriculum Cmt.
Great/Moderate Importance	89.5	100	100
Little/No Importance	2.6		
Do Not Know	7.9		
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Curriculum Cmt.
Strongly Agree/Agree	78.1	63.6	81.3
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	8.2	18.2	6.3
Do Not Know	13.7	18.2	12.5

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

a. An understanding of the basic content and methodology of the major areas of knowledge: areas include the humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences.

Description

The general education requirements for all degrees include at least one course each in humanities and fine arts, natural science, and social/behavioral science. The review process for the courses placed in these general education areas ensures that they meet the criteria for providing the appropriate levels of student knowledge and understanding. (See section II.A.3)

Evaluation:

The College meets this standard. The curriculum review process outlined in this report is in place to ensure this occurs. The Accreditation Survey indicates that the majority of faculty and administrators believe this is an important achievement. While over half of campus administrators and faculty agree or strongly agree that identification of content for GE areas occurs, almost 25% said they **Do Not Know**.

Statement: Content knowledge is identified for each G. E. area.			
Level of importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Curriculum Cmt.
Great/Moderate Importance	78.9	91.7	76.5
Little/No Importance	9.2	8.3	11.7
Do Not Know	11.8		11.8
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Curriculum Cmt.
Strongly Agree/Agree	61.8	54.5	62.5
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	17.6	18.2	12.5
Do Not Know	20.6	27.3	25.0

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

b. A capability to be a productive individual and life long learner: skills include oral and written communication, information competency, computer literacy, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis/logical thinking, and the ability to acquire knowledge through a variety of means.

Description:

Requirements for graduation with an AA or AS degree include competency in writing, reading and computation, as established by the following:

Writing: ENGL 1, 251 BUS 184 at COS or an equivalent course at an accredited College, with a grade of "C" or better; OR a CLEP Examination with a score of 500 or higher on the written test and 50 or higher on the computerized test. Writing courses include information competency and computer literacy, as well as the ability to conduct research and acquire knowledge through a variety of means. In Fall 2005, ENGL 1 was expanded to a 4 unit course to include more time for information competency and research. The revised course will be implemented in Fall 2006.

Reading: A score of 25 or higher on the APS Paper and Pencil Reading Placement Test; a score of 85 or higher on the CPT Computerized Reading Placement Test; ENGL 1, 265AB at COS or an equivalent course at an accredited College with a grade of "C" or better; or a CLEP English Composition or English Composition and Essay Examination with a score of 500 or higher on the written test and 50 or higher on the computerized test.

Mathematics: High school algebra 1 and geometry (one each) with a grade of "C" or better, or a more advanced math course with a grade of "C" or better. OR MATH 240 or 235, with a more advanced math course at COS, or an equivalent course at an accredited College with a grade of "C" or better. OR passing the Math competency exam with a successful score (at least 70%). Or passing the CLEP College Mathematics Examination with a score of 500 or higher on the written test and 50 or higher on the computerized test.

Scientific reasoning is included in the Natural Science area general education courses. To be included in this area, these courses must have as a learning objective the scientific method. These courses assist the student in questioning simple solutions of complex problems and, if appropriate, seeking alternatives. Courses in this category are offered by the following divisions: Science, Agriculture and Consumer Family Studies.

Information Competency was adopted by the Curriculum Committee and the Academic Senate in 2003. Implementation was delayed because of the lack of sufficient numbers of courses that would fulfill this requirement. In the interim, the Community College Board of Governors voted down the inclusion of information competency as a graduation requirement for the entire system. As a

consequence, there has been little impetus to follow through with this as a graduation requirement. However, many classes exist that provide students with instruction in information competency.   These include courses in Language Arts, Library, and Science.

Critical Analysis/Logical Thinking: Courses fulfilling this requirement assist students to learn to make rational decisions based on the utilization of problem-solving techniques. Courses meeting this graduation requirement exist in Business, Administration of Justice, English, and Philosophy.

Evaluation:

The College meets this standard. The College's general education philosophy and requirements are clearly delineated in the COS *General Catalog* and courses to meet these requirements are offered by a majority of the College's divisions.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

c. A recognition of what it means to be an ethical human being and effective citizen: qualities include an appreciation of ethical principles; civility and interpersonal skills; respect for cultural diversity; historical and aesthetic sensitivity; and the willingness to assume civic, political, and social responsibilities locally, nationally, and globally.

Description:

Student learning outcomes in ethics, citizenship and diversity have been developed in courses across campus. These qualities are also developed through student activities and clubs.

Some courses have at their core the development of these qualities in the students. Examples would include Speech 9, Intercultural Communication and Philosophy 5, Ethics. Other courses, such as Government 5 and Ethnic Studies 1 – 5, include aspects of these values as part of the course learning objectives and assignments. Examples of assignments include writing assignments in English courses that deal with topics related to cultural diversity, discussions in Business classes about computer software piracy, and study of music from different cultures and religions in choral Music classes.

Evaluation:

The College meets this standard. Results from the Accreditation Survey indicate that the majority of faculty, administrators, classified employees, and students, as well as all Trustees, believe that the College meets this standard.

Statement: The College environment promotes intellectual, aesthetic and personal development of students.					
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Students	Trustees
Great/Moderate Importance	94.7	93.3	98.0	81.1	100
Little/No Importance	5.3	7.7		11.8	
Do Not Know			2.0	7.1	
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Students	Trustees
Strongly Agree/Agree	73.6	84.6	73.6	76.0	100
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	26.4	15.4	20.7	15.6	
Do Not Know			5.7	8.4	

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

4. All degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core.

Description:

A review of the College of the Sequoias majors, found in the *General Catalog*, demonstrates that all degree programs have an area of focused study. The College has identified 137 Major (degree) and Certificate programs. Each major and certificate is described in the COS *General Catalog* including a description of the major, potential for employment, and required and support courses.

Evaluation

The College of the Sequoias meets this standard. The vocational and transfer majors present COS students with a wide variety of choices of study and/or careers. The major sheets give the students comprehensive information about required study for each major.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

5. Students completing vocational and occupational certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment and other applicable standards and are prepared for external licensure and certification.

Description

The vocational divisions rely on Advisory Committees to provide information concerning employer needs and employment standards. Those vocational divisions with certificates mandated by law or governed by a regulatory agency successfully assist students to meet the required competencies. An example of this is the Division of Nursing and Allied Health. The Registered Nursing program Spring 2005 graduates achieved an 87% pass rate on the NCLEX RN licensure examination. The division's Phlebotomy Technician program's Spring 2005 completers achieved 100% pass rate on the industry's certificate.

Faculty in vocational areas work with area employers and with instructors from transfer Institutions to ensure that their curriculum is up to date and meets the needs of employers. For example, the faculty in the Division of Agriculture attends a three-day workshop at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, annually. At this workshop agricultural faculty from community colleges around the State meet to discuss curriculum, latest advances in technology, and teaching strategies. The dialogue and information exchange provide the faculty with effective knowledge concerning the content and skills their students will need to meet certification, occupation, and degree requirements.

Evaluation

COS meets this standard. The vocational programs have active Advisory Committees that provide invaluable information about work requirements, desirable characteristics of employees, and the knowledge and skills necessary to do the job. The vocational divisions actively maintain currency in certificate, occupation and transfer curriculum.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

6. The institution assures that students and prospective students receive clear and accurate information about educational courses and programs and transfer policies. The institution describes its degrees and certificates in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected student learning outcomes. In every class section students receive a course syllabus that specifies learning objectives consistent with those in the Institutions officially approved course outline.

Description:

The COS *General Catalog* contains information on degrees and certificates awarded by the College. Each degree or certificate description includes lists of required courses, lists of optional courses, and a description of job and or transfer options to students who achieve the degree or certificate. During the process of updating the COS *General Catalog*, departments that offer degrees and/or

certificates are directed to review the appropriate pages for accuracy. In addition, the information is checked against the current list of approved majors and certificates. While general student learning outcomes are included in some descriptions, at present, there is no formal requirement that student learning outcomes be included in course descriptions. In addition to the COS *General Catalog*, Major and Certificate Sheets are available to students and the public in labeled racks located outside of the Counseling Department office.

Every instructor is required to give each student a course syllabus during the first few days of the term. In addition, each instructor is required to submit two copies of their syllabi to the Division Chair.

The content of the syllabi vary from instructor to instructor. Some syllabi are extremely detailed and have extensive information about course student learning outcomes. Others include only basic information on the course. According the COS Faculty Handbook "the course syllabus must contain the course policies, procedures and course expectations. If a student concern arises, the syllabus should be complete enough to provide protection for the student and the faculty member. As such, the course syllabus should be specific and thorough. At a minimum it should include the following:

- Course Title
- Instructor name, office location and hours, telephone or message number, email address, and/or other means of how to contact the instructor.
- Textbook information
- Course objectives
- Outline of content to be covered in the course
- Grading standards
- Examination information
- Attendance requirements
- Final withdrawal date
- Statement conveying the students' responsibility for dropping the class if desired
- Statement conveying College of the Sequoias cheating/plagiarism policy per the student code of conduct.

Note: if your class contains sensitive/mature subject matter, include a statement of clarification."

COS recognizes the importance of consistency between sections of the same course. Program Review includes a survey of program students which assesses their perspective on these matters (syllabus, course objectives, etc.). The program is then required to respond to any identified problems.

Evaluation:

The College partially meets this standard. Every effort is made to ensure that accurate information is presented to students in all official publications. In addition, students in all courses receive a syllabus, copies of which are kept on file. As has been described before, the College's dialogue

about student learning outcomes is in the early, albeit, vigorous stage. Many faculty include SLOs in course syllabi and the latest course outline template includes a request for SLOs

Even though COS has a clearly stated guide for creating course syllabi, there is little consistency across/within divisions on campus. The Accreditation Survey indicated that, although the majority of faculty, administrators, and Campus Curriculum Committee members agree that it is important for all faculty to adhere to course learning objectives, a significant percentage do not agree that this occurs (Faculty & Curriculum Committee members) or **Do Not Know** (Administrators).

Statement: Methods exist to verify that individual sections adhere to course learning objectives.			
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Curriculum Cmt.
Great/Moderate Importance	89.5	81.8	86.7
Little/No Importance	3.9	18.2	6.7
Do Not Know	6.6		6.7
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Curriculum Cmt.
Strongly Agree/Agree	38.4	27.3	29.4
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	46.5	27.2	53.0
Do Not Know	15.1	45.5	17.6

Planning Agenda

1. The Academic Senate will work with the Campus Curriculum Committee and the SLO Committee to develop a method(s) to ensure that official student learning outcomes identified in the official Course Outline are communicated to students in a consistent manner in the course syllabus.

a. The institution makes available to its students clearly stated transfer-of-credit policies in order to facilitate the mobility of students without penalty. In accepting transfer credits to fulfill degree requirements, the institution certifies that the expected learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable to the learning outcomes of its own courses. Where patterns of student enrollment between institutions are identified, the institution develops articulation agreements as appropriate to its mission.

Description:

The College does not have written policies for the transfer of coursework into the College. Courses are evaluated to ensure compatibility with the Institution's courses by the Transcript Evaluator. The Institution does not have written policies for the evaluation of learning outcomes of courses from Institutions which students previously attended.

The COS *General Catalog* provides information for students who wish to transfer to a California State University or University of California. In addition, the Transfer Center offers services to help students prepare for transfer to a four-year Institution. Examples of services include: regularly scheduled visits by representatives from four-year Colleges and universities; workshops; assistance with completing applications; and college catalogs and a reference library.

The Articulation Officer develops, maintains, and disseminates general education/breadth, major preparation, course-to-course and system-wide articulation agreements with the CSU, US and California independent Colleges and universities. The Institution currently maintains extensive lower division articulation agreements with 14 CSUs, 7 UCs, and 3 independent universities and partial agreements with 4 additional CSUs, 3 additional UCs, and 3 additional independent universities.

COS maintains comprehensive transfer advising sheets for all majors with our two main transfer Institutions: CSU, Fresno and Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo. The College maintains and annually updates the CSU General Education Certification pattern and the IGETC Pattern. The College's articulation, counseling, and advising staff use Web ASSIST (the official statewide computerized articulation repository for public Institutions) and web-based College Source Online (a national College and university catalog database) to facilitate smooth transfer of students to four-year Institutions. Articulation with independent Colleges and universities is not centralized like that of the public Institutions with ASSIST but the information is accessible on their individual websites.

Transfer information, including general education patterns and comprehensive transfer advising sheets for COS's two main transfer institutions, are available for students in the counseling center. Students are also encouraged to use ASSIST and other web-based information on their own to gather accurate and current information necessary to plan for a smooth transfer to a four-year institution.

Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard. Although transfer and articulation agreements have been developed with those institutions to which our students most frequently transfer, COS has no formal written policies or information available publicly to those students who wish to transfer into College of the Sequoias. Likewise, there is no method to certify that courses transferred into COS have comparable learning outcomes.

Planning Agenda

1. The Office of Academic Services in concert with the Articulation Officer will develop a written policy for those students who wish to transfer to College of the Sequoias.

2. Written policies for transfer to College of the Sequoias will be placed in the COS *General Catalog* and on the website.

b. When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the Institution makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.[3]

Description:

The Campus Curriculum Committee is charged with overseeing any changes to degrees and certificates. The COS *General Catalog* and *Schedule of Courses*, which are reviewed by each division, department and/or service, attempts to communicate changes along with timelines. The Counseling Department is made aware of the changes and assists the students in modifying their schedules. The responsibility for scheduling classes so students can complete within a timely manner relies upon each individual division and appropriate Dean. The College allows some low enrolled courses to be offered, rather than be cancelled, in order to assist students complete course sequences in a timely manner. Courses that are offered once a year, courses that are third or fourth in a sequence of courses and courses that are required by specific majors all qualify for this minimum enrollment exemption.

An example of this process is illustrated with changes that occurred in the curriculum of the Registered Nursing degree. In response to their accrediting body, the Nursing Division was directed to reduce the number of units within their program. This provided an opportunity to examine all levels of the program and resulted in substantial changes, not only in units, but in content and sequencing as well. In order to limit disruption to students, the new curriculum was phased in over two years and temporary curriculum was developed to fill the gaps for those students who were already progressing through the program.

Evaluation:

The College meets this Standard. The existing processes seem to work well for most students and programs.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

c. The institution represents itself clearly, accurately, and consistently to prospective and current students, the public, and its personnel through its catalogs, statements, and publications, including those presented in electronic formats. It regularly reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations about its mission, programs, and services.

Description:

The COS *General Catalog* has been published annually. Beginning in 2005, it will be published bi-annually. Extensive review of the catalog and its contents occurs at many different levels. The responsibility for the production of the catalog resides in the Academic Services office.

Course outlines are maintained by the division in which the courses reside. As part of each division's Program Review process, courses are reviewed, updated, revised, and/or deleted every five years. Curricular modifications are implemented only after the appropriate approvals by the Campus Curriculum Committee, Academic Senate and Board of Trustees. The Articulation Officer checks the pre-requisite language for accuracy because Banner has produced errors in this area.

Division Chairs, Academic Deans, Vice President of Academic Services and Vice President of Student Services receive the catalog pages appropriate to their areas. They are given several months to review these pages for accuracy and completeness.

The Vocational Dean is charged with keeping the certificate and major sheets up to date. These are forwarded to the Academic Services office for inclusion in the *General Catalog*. The certificates and majors provided by the Dean are checked against those on file as being approved by the Campus Curriculum Committee and those listed at the Chancellor's Office before being incorporated into the COS *General Catalog*.

After all modifications to the *General Catalog* are made, a draft is sent to the appropriate areas for approval and/or further revisions. The *General Catalog* is then reviewed by the VP of Academic Services. A camera ready copy of the catalog is forwarded to a printer. An electronic version of the printed catalog (PDF) is forwarded to the College webmaster who puts it on the COS website. The DRC also makes alternative formats available in accordance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and ADA requirements. When the catalog is returned from the printer, it is then forwarded to the Board of Trustees for approval.

The College's Institutional Planning Committee reviews the planning policies and procedures and assures their integrity regarding the College's Mission. The Academic Services area assures integrity regarding programs and publications. The Student Services area assures the integrity of services provided to students.

Evaluation:

The College meets this standard. The procedure of review for publications is extensive and has worked well over the years. The decision to move to bi-annual publication demonstrates that the College reviews its policies and procedures.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

7. In order to assure the academic integrity of the teaching-learning process, the institution uses and makes public governing board-adopted policies on academic freedom and responsibility, student academic honesty, and specific institutional beliefs or worldviews. These policies make clear the institution's commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge.

Description:

Board Policy 5002, Academic Freedom Policy, was adopted in 2000 and is available for review on the College of the Sequoias website. This board policy outlines academic freedom for faculty at College of the Sequoias and was based upon the Association of American University Professors 1940 Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom.

The Academic Senate has adopted a Statement of Professional Ethics which is published in the COS *General Catalog* and in the web-based *Faculty Handbook*. The *Faculty Handbook* also outlines faculty responsibilities.

Board Policy 7040, Student Code of Conduct, was adopted in 1969, revised in 1981, and can be viewed on the College of the Sequoias website. This document describes unacceptable student behavior, consequences of unacceptable behavior, and those who may impose the penalties described in the document.

Board Policy 7041, the Student Athlete Code of Conduct, was adopted in 2002 and outlines specific rights and responsibilities of COS' student athletes, including academic honesty. This document can be found in the Physical Education Division and in the *Faculty Handbook*.

The Student Bill of Rights identifies the rights of the student on the College of the Sequoias campus and includes the corresponding responsibilities of students on the COS campus.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard in that it has the appropriate Board Policies outlined in the standard. All Board Policies are available on the College's website and are widely disseminated throughout the campus and in publications. These policies adequately set appropriate standards and meet the needs of all campus constituencies.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

a. Faculty distinguishes between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. They present data and information fairly and objectively.

Description:

Board Policy 5002, Academic Freedom Policy, describes the College's beliefs about academic freedom. This policy states that when faculty speak as private citizens, they should remember that the public might judge their profession and their Institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the Institution.

As a part of the faculty evaluation process, student surveys are administered by the Academic Services Office to all courses of faculty going through evaluations. This survey instrument includes a statement regarding this standard. Students are asked to rate the faculty on this point. Faculty are then expected to address any problems in this area when writing their evaluation.

Evaluation:

The College meets this standard in that it has the appropriate Board Policies outlined in the standard. The current policy on academic freedom does not include sections on academic responsibilities. However, these are listed in the *Statement of Professional Ethics* and the *Faculty Handbook*.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

b. The institution establishes and publishes clear expectations concerning student academic honesty and the consequences for dishonesty.

Description

The Board Policy on Student Code of Conduct (7040) includes a section on academic honesty and the potential consequences for violating that policy. This policy is available on the College's website. In addition, it is included in the *COS General Catalog*, the *Schedule of Courses* and in the on-line orientation that all students are required to view.

Individual faculty may also include descriptions of academic honesty and consequences for violating that in their specific courses within their syllabi. With the advent of on-line resources, plagiarism has become an issue in many courses.

Evaluation:

COS meets this standard in that the expectations of student academic honesty and consequences for dishonesty are published in a variety of places and easily accessible to the College community.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

c. Institutions that require conformity to specific codes of conduct of staff, faculty, administrators, or students, or that seek to instill specific beliefs or worldviews, give clear prior notice of such policies, including statements in the catalog and/or appropriate faculty or student handbooks.

Description:

This standard does not apply to College of the Sequoias

8. Institutions offering curricula in foreign locations to students other than U.S. nationals operate in conformity with standards and applicable Commission policies.[2]

This standard does not apply to College of the Sequoias

Documentation

1. 2005-07 COS General Catalog

2. Student Equity Plan

3. Program Review Reports

4. Educational Master Plan

5. Research & Grants Newsletters

6. Student Learning Outcomes Committee Minutes

7. Matriculation Plan

8. Accreditation Survey Results

9. Board of Trustees Policy Manual

10. Student Code of Conduct

11. Athletic Code of Conduct

12. Program Review Guidelines

13. Curriculum Approval Process

14. Articulation Agreement Examples

15. Faculty Handbook

16. Student Bill of Rights

17. COS Schedule of Courses

Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services

B. Student Support Services

The institution recruits and admits diverse students who are able to benefit from its programs, consistent with its mission. Student support services address the identified needs of students and enhance a supportive learning environment. The entire student pathway through the institutional experience is characterized by a concern for student access, progress, learning, and success. The institution systematically assesses student support services using student learning outcomes, faculty and staff input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of these services.

1. The institution assures the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, support student learning and enhance achievement of the mission of the institution.

<u>Description</u>

By providing a range of educational opportunities to our diverse population, the College prepares "students for productive work, lifelong learning and community involvement" (COS *Mission Statement*). The *Student Services Mission Statement* states: "Students are our business: The Student Services Division provides a range of services to support students' educational, occupational, cultural, social and lifelong learning potential and goals; and by addressing their physical and mental health needs, healthy behaviors and lifestyles are promoted which support the teaching-learning environment and serve the student in life." It is based on the ideals expressed in these Mission statements that Student Services strives to provide quality support services to meet the needs of our diverse student population.

The College offers classes at the main campus in Visalia, a satellite campus in Hanford, at the COS Farm and on many high school campuses within the District. Many specialized student services are available at all locations where courses are offered, e.g., Disability Resource Center services, while other services lend themselves only to particular locations. An example of the latter is tutorial services, which are available at the main campus, the Hanford Center and the COS Farm. Accommodation of student needs can be initiated by the student, instructor or program staff regardless of the course's location.

Although the College had utilized telephone registration since spring semester 1999, Banner, a commercially available software program, offered the opportunity to add Web registration as an option for our students. As a complement to the on-line admission application, Web registration and other on-line Banner features, a Computer Online Services lab was created in room 156 of the Student Services' building. The room contains 24 Internet accessible computers and six telephones, and is staffed from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. by a half-time classified employee and trained student employees who are supported and supervised by regular Admissions and

Registration staff. Students may use this lab to apply for admission, register for and add or drop classes, file their Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA), view the on-line listing of course offerings, review scholarship information and view and print their class schedule, billing statement or recent grade report.

COS offers many specialized services for students, including services for the disabled and the educationally or economically disadvantaged, which are available at any site the student attends class. The Disability Resource Center (DRC) provides a wide range of individualized services for students with disabilities, including specialized courses, support services, specialized equipment and a range of counseling services. Of particular note are the Adapted Physical Education courses for the physically disabled, the Learning Skills courses for students with Learning Disabilities and the High Tech Center which provides training in the use of adapted computer hardware and software. In addition, the DRC has an alternate media specialist who creates text and course materials in an alternate format to accommodate students' needs, e.g., Braille, audio tape.

Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) / Cooperative Agencies Resource for Education (CARE) provide an array of support services to meet the needs of educationally and socio-economically disadvantaged students, including specialized counseling, tutorial services, assistance with child care expenses, referral services and numerous other social support services.

The CalWORKs program complements other student services by providing paid work study, paid child care, counseling and advocacy specifically for CalWORKs and TANF recipients. CalWORKs services support student learning by minimizing barriers to education and employment, thereby enhancing student success and self-sufficiency.

The Transfer/Career Center offers bibliographical career information, career and occupational assessments, career-related workshops and individual career counseling. The Puente Project is another special program whose mission is to increase the number of educationally underserved students who enroll in four-year colleges and universities, earn degrees and return to their communities as leaders and mentors for succeeding generations.

Student Services also offers many programs that serve the general student body. Included are the Student Health Center, Academic Counseling and Financial Aid. The Student Health Center offers a range of direct services, referrals to community agencies and resources, psychological counseling, nursing assessments and over the counter medications. The Academic Counseling office provides academic counseling, interpretation of assessment scores, development of Student Educational Plans, and offers career guidance services.. The Academic Counseling faculty also enhance and support student learning by offering Human Development courses which address personal/social issues. The Financial Aid program coordinates State and Federal financial aid, including PELL grants, Cal Grants, Board of Governor grants and Stafford loans.

The quality of these student support services is evaluated in a number of ways. All student services programs undergo Program Review. Program Review requires each area to address the Mission of the College. Additional evaluations are accomplished through surveys of graduating students;

Chancellor's Office initiated evaluations, and ongoing Student Services management and program meetings.

<u>Evaluation</u>

The College substantially meets this standard. The College offers comprehensive services at the main campus and at other sites in the District. The quality of these programs is evaluated in a number of different ways. The Accreditation Survey (N = 2063) reveals that 76.7 % of students agree that it is of great or moderate importance that services are available at all locations where classes are offered, and that 63.1% agree that the College is successful in achieving this. A survey of full-time and adjunct faculty (N = 80) shows that 85.5% feel it is of importance to offer services at all locations where classes are offered, and 50.7% agree that this is accomplished. Although the majority of students (63.1%) felt the College accomplished this element, administrators (33.3%), staff (45.3%) and faculty (50.7%) do not achieve as high a level of agreement that services are available at all locations where classes are offered.

Statement: Services to meet the needs of students are available at all locations where classes are offered.					
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Students	Board
Great/Moderate Importance	85.5	92.3	84.3	76.7	80
Little/No Importance	7.9	7.7	5.9	9.5	
Do Not Know	6.6		9.8	13.8	20
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Students	Board
Strongly Agree/Agree	50.7	33.3	45.3	63.1	40
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	37.7	33.4	35.8	18.6	20
Do Not Know	11.6	33.3	18.9	18.3	40

The Accreditation Survey revealed that 80.3% of students felt it was of importance, when asked if services offered by Student Services' programs support student learning, with a 76.7% indicating this goal has been achieved. Full-time and adjunct faculty indicated an importance rating of 93.5%, while 78.8% agree this has been accomplished. Only 13.6% disagree with this.

Statement: The services offered by Student Services' programs support student learning.					
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Students	Board
Great/Moderate Importance	93.5	100	96	80.3	100
Little/No Importance	2.6		2	6.8	
Do Not Know	3.9		2	12.9	
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Students	Board
Strongly Agree/Agree	78.8	76.9	90.6	76.7	100
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	13.6	15.4	5.6	7	
Do Not Know	7.6	7.7	3.8	16.3	

Planning Agenda

1.   No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

2. The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information concerning the following:

    a. General Information
- *Official name, addresses, telephone numbers, and web site address of the institution*
- *Educational mission*
- *Course, program, and degree offerings*
- *Academic calendar and program length*
- *Academic freedom statement*
- *Available student financial aid*
- *Available learning resources*
- *Names and degrees of administrators and faculty*
- *Names of governing board members*

    b. Requirements
- *Admissions*
- *Student fees and other financial obligations*
- *Degrees, certificates, graduation, and transfer*

    c. Major Policies Affecting Students
- *Academic regulations, including academic honesty*
- *Nondiscrimination*
- *Acceptance of transfer credits*
- *Grievance and complaint procedures*

    d. Locations or publications where other policies may be found

Description

The *College of the Sequoias General Catalog* is the primary printed source for information on programs, policies, and procedures pertaining to students. The *General Catalog* is reviewed and updated every two years and is available to students for a nominal charge at the campus bookstore, free to all new students seeing an academic counselor for the first time, and upon special request. The *General Catalog* is also mailed to the District's feeder high schools and is distributed to college administrators, faculty, and staff.

The College of the Sequoias website (www.cos.edu) provides the *General Catalog* in an electronic format with both a version identical to the current printed version and a "live" version that is continually updated as changes in curriculum occur. An electronic supplement detailing other catalog changes will be available on the website in the years the catalog is not published. The *General*

Catalog is also available on the subscriber website *College Source*. Students needing alternate media to access the catalog may visit the Disability Resource Center or www.cos.edu/DRC to request a Braille version, access to software (such as JAWS) that has the capability to verbally transmit the publication to the student or other formats, e.g., large print.

The process for reviewing and updating the *COS General Catalog* was described in II.A.6.

The *College of the Sequoias General Catalog* is organized into nine sections, with a table of contents and complete index. Those sections are:

- General Information
- Admissions/Matriculation
- Academics
- Student Rights and Responsibilities
- Student Services
- Divisions
- Graduation and Transfer Requirements
- Course Descriptions
- Faculty and Administrators

The **General Information** section contained in the *General Catalog* includes the College's official name, address (including off-campus locations), telephone numbers and website. Names of administrators and the governing board members are also listed in this section. The College's Mission statement is included, as well as College objectives, responsibilities, philosophy and open access principle. Here the College also sets forth its nondiscrimination policy as it pertains to students and employees of the College. The published academic calendar, which is included in this section, details the college school years and events of importance to students, faculty, and staff. It provides an easy to follow timeline for academic deadlines.

Complete information about the admission and matriculation process is found in the **Admissions/Matriculation** section of the *General Catalog*. The cost of attending College of the Sequoias, including course fees, health, material, non-resident tuition, parking, and Student Center fees is detailed. Payment and refund policies are explained. In addition, information about the Board of Governors Fee Waiver is presented.

Both the **Admissions/Matriculation** and **Academic** sections include information about acceptance of transfer credits from other colleges and universities, credit by examination, independent study, and other non-traditional learning, as well as credit granted to Veterans of the United States Armed Forces. Appeal and Grievance procedures, with regard to matriculation at College of the Sequoias, are detailed in the **Admissions/Matriculation** section, while those dealing with sexual harassment are located in **Student Rights and Responsibilities.**

The **Academics** section provides information to students about grading, course repetition, dropping and withdrawing from classes, as well as probation and dismissal policies. The procedure to regain good standing status is also explained.

Finally, statements acknowledging the importance of academic freedom for both students (the Student Bill of Rights) and faculty (Statement of Professional Ethics) are found in the **Academics** section, with a more extensive policy of academic freedom as it pertains to faculty spelled out in the Faculty Handbook located on the College website.

In the *General Catalog* section titled **Student Rights and Responsibilities**, college regulations pertaining to privacy rights, access to official student records, sexual harassment, and code of student conduct (including academic honesty) are found.

The **Student Services** section provides students with information about the many special services and programs offered at College of the Sequoias, including a Disability Resource Center (DRC), Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS), Liberal & Integral Studies Transfer Opportunity (LISTO), Puente Project, Associated Student Body (ASB), clubs, media center, veterans' educational benefits, child care, health care, mental health and academic counseling services, student employment, Transfer/Career Center, Tutorial Center, scholarships, and financial aid, as well as information to assist in the application for that aid. Details about available learning resources, including the new Learning Resource Center, the Tutorial Center and Instructional Media Services, are also found in this section.

The **Divisions** section contains a complete listing of the various divisions within the Academic Services area. The divisions include Agriculture, Business, Consumer Family Studies, Fine Arts, Industry and Technology, Language Arts and Communications, Mathematics and Engineering, Nursing and Allied Health, Physical Education, Science, Social Sciences, and Student Services (Academic Counseling). Included within the description of each division is the name of the current chairperson.

In **Graduation and Transfer,** students will find comprehensive information about graduation from College of the Sequoias and transfer requirements to the University of California and California State Universities.

In **Major and Certificate Requirements** information is located about all degrees and certificates offered at the College, including the length of program and courses required. Information is presented in an alphabetical listing in tables by certificate and major, and cross-listed by division. The programs can also be found alphabetically in the extensive index at the back of the *General Catalog.*

In the **Course Descriptions** section, every discipline the College offers is listed alphabetically by department. Each course in the discipline is listed by course number, unit value, prerequisites and co-requisites, and a description of the course.

And finally, all **Faculty and Administrators** are included in the last section with the title and education level attained.

Details about programs, policies, and procedures are also located elsewhere on the College of the Sequoias campus and website. For example, a copy of the *Board Policy Manual* is located in the office of the Superintendent/President, in the offices of all Vice Presidents and Deans, the Learning Resource Center and on the Web.

There are several other methods utilized by the College to disseminate this information. The *Schedule of Classes* is published each semester and mailed to all residences in the College of the Sequoias Community College District, and is available on-line as well. The *Schedule of Classes* details much of the information that is also in the *General Catalog*.

An on-line orientation provides new students with comprehensive information about the College, including applying for admission, registration, financial aid and many other available services. Information is also disseminated during high school outreach visits, biannual meetings of the directors of high school counseling, individual counseling sessions, financial aid workshops and College Nights.

A *Student Handbook* and a *Faculty Handbook* are also available on-line, as well as policies of the Financial Aid, EOPS (including a Mutual Responsibility Contract), and Disability Resource Center offices (including a DRC Faculty/Staff Handbook). Each of these offices also has hard copies of their policies available, and the DRC provides students with any of them in an alternate format, upon request. A *Student Conduct Standards: Discipline and Grievance Procedure* handbook was adopted by the Board of Trustees. This document combines students' rights and responsibilities, causes of disciplinary action, disciplinary procedures and student and Matriculation grievance information. Standard definitions of academic dishonesty and previously unaddressed issues, e.g., protests, demonstrations, are also discussed.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard in all areas. Furthermore, of the 2,063 student respondents in the 2005 Accreditation Survey, 85.6% agreed with the statement that the *General Catalog* helps students locate information, policies, and requirements. This is good news, in light of the fact that in the same survey, 88% of the students surveyed indicated they placed great to moderate importance on the catalog providing this information. The findings of the Survey were equally positive when the perceptions of faculty, administrators and the Board of Trustees were assayed. All groups placed a very high level of importance on this and each group also had a high level of agreement that this is accomplished.

Statement: The general catalog helps students locate information, policies and requirements.				
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Students	Board
Great/Moderate Importance	94.8	92.3	88.0	100
Little/No Importance	2.6	7.7	6.6	
Do Not Know	2.6		5.4	
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Students	Board
Strongly Agree/Agree	90.5	91.7	85.6	80
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	8.2	8.3	8.1	
Do Not Know	1.4		6.3	20

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

3. The institution researches and identifies the learning support needs of its student population and provides appropriate services and programs to address those needs.

a. The institution assures equitable access to all of its students by providing appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable service to students regardless of service location or delivery method.

Description

Access to programs and services is one of the measures by which the College assesses its performance. The commitment of the College to student access is evident in several areas. COS has a philosophy that is "based upon a belief that all individuals are innately valuable and entitled to develop their full potential" and that "a healthy and vigorous society benefits from an informed appreciation of the cultural, racial, and socio-economic variations among its members". In keeping with this philosophy, COS has a newly revised *Student Equity Plan* in place to ensure that all students, regardless of their background and skill levels, have the opportunity to achieve their educational goals. The *Student Equity Plan* was developed by the Student Equity Committee whose members included five faculty, one student, four administrators and two classified employees. The *Student Equity Plan* states that the college is committed to coordinating and supporting efforts to achieve educational equity among students in various success indicator areas including student access. The *Student Equity Plan's* goals are monitoring access of target groups to COS's educational programs; making access a priority for all groups by devising more ways for students to complete matriculation requirements; and expanding marketing and outreach services.

The Matriculation process is designed to assist students in successfully reaching their educational goals. Matriculation targets all credit community college students for comprehensive services in admissions, assessment, orientation, counseling and advising, and follow-up activities. It promotes

student retention and persistence through a coordinated plan of assessment, feedback, and support services, while maintaining California's long-standing tradition of open access to higher education.

COS is using technology, where appropriate, to facilitate student access to services. The admission application process is on-line using the College's website. Students who do not have access to a computer may apply on-line using the Computer Online Services Lab on campus. The comprehensive orientation video is now accessed on the College's website as well. It acquaints students with COS's academic programs and courses; certificate, degree, and transfer requirements; services; and other activities; as well as other important policies and procedures. It also prepares students for web and telephone registration and provides a virtual tour of the campus. It ends with a brief questionnaire and a "submit" button that clears orientation holds.

Assessment of students is conducted in the Assessment Lab on the main campus. Assessments available include English and mathematics placement tests, mathematics and reading competency testing, English as a Second Language test and Ability to Benefit test (financial aid eligibility for non-high school graduates). Students are able to receive their results immediately after testing. Placement tests are also administered in hard-copy formats at the COS Hanford Center and District feeder high schools. Follow-up on assessment results also occur during individual counseling sessions, when counselors use results for advising and course placement. This process is designed to determine initial course placement in mathematics and English classes in particular, as well as academic remediation needs. Students do have the option to retake the placement tests.

Access to counseling is offered to new students who have completed an admission application, placement tests, and orientation. Counseling is also available to continuing and returning students by appointment or on a walk-in basis. A counselor is scheduled at the Hanford Center one day a week to serve COS students in Hanford. Implementation of a new scheduling program (Scheduling and Reporting System—SARS Grid) allows students to make appointments more efficiently and with a counselor of their choice. Counselors and designated professional staff meet with students on an individual basis for a range of purposes. All new students who intend to pursue a certificate, associate degree, or transfer programs, as well as all students who receive financial aid and Veterans' benefits, are required to meet with a counselor to obtain a comprehensive Student Education Plan (SEP). Increased summer counseling hours and increased adjunct counselors have been implemented to increase counselor accessibility during peak periods.

The Financial Aid program supports the open access principal and equal opportunity for students. By offering a coordinated program of Federal and State Grants and Scholarships, subsidized loans and work opportunities to students who qualify according to the National Standardized Needs Analysis, the College facilitates attendance for students from low-income families. The number of students seeking financial aid and the amounts expended continue to increase significantly each year (from 7,746 applicants in 2000-01 to 9,971 applicants in 2003-04), and efforts are being made to ensure that all students, current and potential, are aware of financial aid opportunities. To this end, the Financial Aid department conducts group outreach to high schools, employment and training agencies, correctional facilities, foster care organizations, and other community-based organizations. Financial Aid Outreach (FAO) provides financial aid and general COS information

and assistance to students and parents. FAO consists of explaining the financial aid process and walking potential students through the entire Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) during classroom presentations and workshops, and periodically dropping off materials, such as the paper FAFSA, *COS General Catalogs*, and brochures. Information is tailored to the age and grade level of the recipients. FAO also receives follow-up calls from students and parents who may have additional questions. One-on-one appointments may be scheduled on the COS campus.

The COS Financial Aid department is currently taking part in the California Community Colleges (CCC) Statewide Financial Aid Media Campaign which is designed to increase access. This campaign is geared toward raising knowledge among graduating high school seniors and young adults about the availability of financial aid and to assure them that there is free one-on-one assistance available at their local community college. The campaign includes Internet banners, sending out the "Icanaffordcollege.com" logo and banner ads to all of the radio and television stations, English and Spanish radio spots, standing bill boards, and more.

The Mission of the Disability Resource Center (DRC) is to help students with disabilities overcome limitations and circumvent barriers to their educational and occupational goals. DRC services are individualized to aid each student's independence, productivity and self-esteem. Support services (Adaptive PE, High Tech Lab, test accommodations, etc.) are provided to enhance students' access to, and success in, all classes and activities offered at COS. The College's Matriculation process provides students with information about the DRC, and each potential DRC student receives a comprehensive intake appointment, including a special orientation regarding services available to enhance their educational success. The DRC also has a counselor whose main priority is disability-related counseling. The DRC offers Learning Disability testing in order to identify students who would qualify for additional support services. Many of the DRC services are available to students at the Hanford Center as well.

Extended Opportunity Programs & Services (EOPS) has the responsibility to recruit and successfully retain college students of educationally and socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds from throughout Kings and Tulare Counties. Part of the *EOPS Mission Statement* is to improve the delivery of programs and services to disadvantaged students. Cooperative Agencies Resource for Education (CARE) is a unique educational program geared toward welfare recipients who desire job relevant education to break the dependency cycle. CARE is a supplemental component of EOPS. The goal of the CARE program is to provide educational support services, such as assistance with child care expenses, special counseling, and referral services, to increase the retention, persistence, graduation and transfer rates of the welfare-dependent student.

The CalWORKs program provides services that meet the needs of welfare recipients. The goal of this program is to provide a wide range of opportunities that will improve the self-sufficiency skills of low-income students and enhance their potential for long-term employment. Direct student services include: advocacy; vocational counseling; paid work-study; paid childcare; resume assistance; and job placement. The CalWORKs staff works closely with their students to identify needs and frequently request feedback to modify and improve services. Students are encouraged regularly to complete service satisfaction forms upon meeting with CalWORKs staff.

The DRC, EOPS, and Financial Aid offices have specific individuals dedicated to outreach. Within the COS service area, these individuals visit high schools, present current information at community functions (college and career nights, focus group events, etc.), make regular contacts with identified school representatives/counselors, and conduct campus tours. In March 2005, the College filled the vacant School Relations Liaison and Outreach Specialist position. In 2004 the College hired a Public Information Officer who is currently working on a 2006 media plan to reach all communities within the District's service area.

The College offers distance education courses using various formats. Students opting to utilize this mode of education will have access to all on-line student services from any location. However, for all other student services, they will need to physically go to either the Visalia campus or the Hanford Center.

Evaluation

The College substantially meets this standard.

A Student Services Student Satisfaction Survey was composed and conducted the first two weeks of August 2005. The majority of the students surveyed were college freshmen waiting to see a counselor and students waiting in line to receive their financial aid award. The remainder of the surveys were distributed to selected summer school classes. Of the 1,000 surveys distributed, a total of 495 responses were collected. The majority of the students (83.3%) indicated that they were able to independently register for a class using COS' telephone and/or Web registration process.

Statement: Using COS telephone and/or Web registration process, I was able to independently register for a class.			
Students (Valid Number)	Yes	No	Not Applicable
483	83.4%	6%	10.6%

Similarly large majorities indicated they could add courses (80.2%), drop courses (68.7%), with low numbers indicating that they could not (3.6% and 4% respectively).

The on-line admission application is designed to generate and send an e-mail to all applicants indicating the status of their application. The Student Services Satisfaction Survey indicated that 62.2% of the students surveyed reported receiving an e-mail that indicated their status, while 16.4% indicated that they did not. This is partially a product of the percentage of students who do not have and/or fail to enter a personal e-mail address, and given the relative complexity of accessing ones e-mail via CCCApply, numerous students failed to receive their confirmation of status e-mail. This poses a problem since some students are then unaware of their acceptance, assume non-acceptance, and fail to register, while others are not aware of issues with their application or status, e.g., non-residence.

The Student Services Satisfaction Survey revealed relatively positive responses for the Financial Aid Program. Accessibility to the financial aid process was examined related to process (paper and computerized) and staff availability for assistance. A large majority of students (72.6%) were aware that the College provided both computerized and paper applications, while 62.8% of the students surveyed felt staff availability was convenient. Only 47.5% of the students surveyed received financial aid information at their high school, while 17% indicated No and 35.7% indicated this was Not Applicable. This finding is of concern, considering the increased emphasis on financial and outreach.

Statement: The College makes BOTH a computerized and paper process available to all students who are interested in filling out a FAFSA for financial aid.			
Students (Valid Number)	Yes	No	Not Applicable
486	72.6%	3%	24.7%

Statement: Financial Aid has staff available during time periods that are convenient for me to access information regarding the financial aid application process.			
Students (Valid Number)	Yes	No	Not Applicable
487	62.8%	6%	30.8%

Statement: The College provided financial aid information at my local high school and/or middle school.			
Students (Valid Number)	Yes	No	Not Applicable
488	47.5%	17%	35.7%

In addition, relatively few students (30.7%) indicated that they received information regarding EOPS and CARE Programs during outreach sessions.

Statement: During outreach sessions, I was informed about the EOPS and CARE Programs at COS.			
Students (Valid Number)	Yes	No	Not Applicable
469	30.70%	26%	43.30%

During the CalWORKs Program Review in 2004-05, 100% of the CalWORKs students surveyed indicated high satisfaction with awareness of program services and ease in accessing and understanding CalWORKs intake procedures and printed materials. Furthermore, 96% of the student respondents were satisfied with staff availability and assistance.

Planning Agenda

1. Student Services will review and revise outreach efforts to ensure information regarding financial aid and EOPS/CARE is presented during these sessions.

b. The institution provides an environment that encourages personal and civic responsibility, as well as intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all its students.

Description

The College of the Sequoias recognizes its responsibility for students' emotional and social growth and, has therefore, provided a wide variety of programs and activities that encourage personal and civic growth.

As the center of college community life, student government serves as a catalyst to citizenship, training students in leadership and social responsibility. The Associated Student Body (ASB) and the Student Executive Board are very active and highly involved in many leadership activities by institutional governance and committee representation. Additionally, ASB provides cultural, social and recreational programs. A philosophy of the ASB is to provide high quality and diverse student activity programs. The ASB and faculty advisors support forty-five (45) clubs through the College's Co-Curricular programs, all of which have separate activities for students and the community. Some of the activities coordinated by the ASB and other departments include food and toy drives, voter registration, AIDS awareness, Red Ribbon Week (drug free promotion), Alcohol Awareness Week, Earth Day/Recycling Awareness, Career and Health Fair, March of Dimes Walk America, Giant Tech Prep Expo, and the Multi-Cultural Fair.

The *Students in Government & Leadership* course, IS 120AD, is offered for members of the Student Executive Board.   These students are elected by the Associated Student Body or are appointed by the Executive Board membership committee. It emphasizes the development of leadership, critical thinking skills, working as a team, and parliamentary procedure. These students serve as representatives on the College Council's standing committees including the Institutional Technology Committee, the Institutional Facilities Committee, the Institutional Budget Committee and the Institutional Planning Committee. Additionally, there are students on the College Council, Scholarship Committee, Crisis Prevention and Intervention Team, Campus Curriculum Committee, Academic Senate and various advisory committees. A student also serves as the Student Trustee on the College's Board of Trustees. In the 2003-04 academic year, the Student Executive Board members provided student representation on 19 campus-wide committees.

Other programs that provide a variety of opportunities for the personal and intellectual development of students include: CALWORKs; LISTO, Puente Project, Student Health Center; Transfer/Career Center; DRC; and EOPS/CARE.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. Results from the Accreditation Survey, conducted during the fall 2005 semester, indicated that 76% of students and 73.6% of faculty agreed that the College's environment promotes the intellectual, aesthetic and personal development of students.

Statement: The College's environment promotes the intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development of students.					
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Students	Board
Great/Moderate Importance	94.7	92.3	98.0	81.1	100
Little/No Importance	5.3	7.7		11.7	
Do Not Know			2.0	7.1	
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Students	Board
Strongly Agree/Agree	73.6	84.6	73.6	76.0	100
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	26.3	15.4	20.7	15.6	
Do Not Know			5.7	8.4	

The Student Activities Program, coordinated by ASB, provides activities and opportunities that develop students' leadership skills through classroom, club and shared governance participation. The 2005 Student Services student satisfaction survey collected input from 580 students who participated in co-curricular activities. Of the 580 students responding, 76.7% agreed or strongly agreed that these activities offered at the College of the Sequoias promoted the intellectual, aesthetic and personal development of students.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

c. The institution designs, maintains, and evaluates counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function.

Description

Counseling at the College of the Sequoias provides complete educational guidance services. The purpose of counseling is to help students succeed in their studies through self-evaluation, decision-making, careful planning and commitment. Counselors meet with students on an individual or small group basis for a range of purposes: interpreting assessment scores; recommending further assessment/testing (Disability Resource Center); determining specific courses for immediate and future registration needs; and developing Student Education Plans that conform to the students' short-term and long range goals. Follow-up services (grade progress reports, referrals to on-campus resources such as tutorial services, and revised Student Educational Plans) related to students' academic success are also provided. On the main campus, counselors are available during the day (M-F, 8:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.) either by appointment or on a walk-in basis. Evening counseling is available by appointment only. The Hanford Center has counseling available one day a week on alternate Mondays or Tuesdays, with an adjunct counselor available 24 hours per week at peak times, e.g., just prior to and during registration, and the initial two weeks of the semester.

In addition to addressing institutional factors that might impede students' success (prerequisites, matriculation process) the counselors assess and evaluate external factors that can affect student success, such as balancing family obligations and academic demands. In doing so, the counselors take a holistic approach to the provision of counseling services. They provide information and referral services to students that may require community interventions in order to address or eliminate external impediments to student success.

There are currently eight full-time and four adjunct counselors in the Counseling Division. Any new student who enrolls in more than six units with a goal of receiving a certificate, degree, or transfer must receive an individual counseling appointment to generate a Student Education Plan (SEP).

The Counseling program utilizes the Program Review process to evaluate its services. To maintain currency regarding curriculum, major requirements, and admission procedures at four-year institutions, the Counseling faculty participate in professional development activities such as meeting weekly for training, attending UC and CSU conferences and seminars, and participating in an annual retreat. The counselors meet twice a year with feeder high school head counselors. They also work to maintain positive relationships with K-12 schools and parents by attending college night activities. On campus they network and collaborate with division and campus committees.

Currently there are seven locations that students can receive counseling services at College of the Sequoias. In addition to the general counseling office on the main campus and the Hanford Center, counseling services are provided by categorical programs for underrepresented populations such as:

CalWORKs – A half-time counselor provides specialized counseling to students who are Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) recipients. The counselor assigned to this caseload assists students with academic and personal counseling, as well as assisting students in meeting mandatory requirements affiliated with welfare reform. Additionally, the counselor assists students in addressing psychosocial issues associated with being low-income single parents.

Disability Resource Center (DRC) – Currently there are 1.5 FTE counselors assigned to this categorically funded program. The DRC counselors provide specialized counseling services to students with verified disabilities. The specialized services include identification, authorization, and coordination of academic accommodations necessary to address student educational limitations. In addition to these functions, the counselors provide personal/academic counseling, conduct tours for incoming students and provide information on disability related issues by conducting faculty enrichment activities.

The Liberal & Integral Studies Transfer Opportunity (LISTO) program formerly had a part-time counselor dedicated to its students; the program now relies upon the general counseling division to provide counseling support for its students.

Extended Opportunity Program and Services (EOPS) provides academic, personal, and vocational counseling services to students. The program has 2.5 FTE Counselors dedicated to its students.

The Puente Project provides academic and personal counseling services (.4 FTE) to students who are assessed at the English 251 level and are interested in courses which emphasize Latino culture.

Evaluation

The College substantially meets this standard. Comprehensive counseling services are provided for all students. The counseling services are evaluated utilizing formal methods, Program Review, as well as informal methods, by obtaining feedback directly from students.

A Student Services' Student Satisfaction Survey indicated overall satisfaction with academic counseling.   A majority, 63%, indicated they could meet with a counselor in a timely fashion. In addition, 60.7% indicated the time between scheduling and meeting with a counselor was reasonable. It should be noted that many students who were targeted with the survey were waiting in lines for services.

Statement: I was able to meet with an Academic Counselor in a timely manner prior to registration.			
Students (Valid Number)	Yes	No	Not Applicable
487	63.0%	22.4%	14.6%

Statement: The time from scheduling the appointment to actually meeting with the Counselor was reasonable.			
Students (Valid Number)	Yes	No	Not Applicable
489	60.7%	18.0%	21.3%

This survey also indicated that the services and information provided by the counselors met the needs of the students.

Statement: The Counselor provided the information I needed on my educational program.			
Students (Valid Number)	Yes	No	Not Applicable
482	64.1%	14.3%	21.6%

Statement: The Counselor provided me with an adequate amount of time to meet my needs.			
Students (Valid Number)	Yes	No	Not Applicable
486	65.6%	12.1%	22.2%

Statement: The Counselor provided the information I needed on College processes.			
Students (Valid Number)	Yes	No	Not Applicable
484	63.4%	13.8%	22.7%

Statement: The Counselor provided the information I needed on College procedures.			
Students (Valid Number)	Yes	No	Not Applicable
482	61.0%	14.7%	24.3%

Statement: The Counselor provided the information I needed on College policies.			
Students (Valid Number)	Yes	No	Not Applicable
488	53.7%	20.5%	25.8%

Statement: The Counselor referred me to campus services and resources I needed.			
Students (Valid Number)	Yes	No	Not Applicable
481	49.1%	21.8%	29.1%

Statement: The Counselor referred me to the community services and resources I needed.			
Students (Valid Number)	Yes	No	Not Applicable
479	32.4%	32.2%	35.5%

Measuring referrals to community and on-campus resources is difficult since referrals are not routinely necessary in the majority of counselor/student contacts.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at his time.

d. The institution designs and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity.

Description

The College of the Sequoias is committed to diversity as stated in its Mission, Philosophy, and Vision for the Future. The College encourages and provides funding for the implementation of appropriate programs, practices, and services that support and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity.

As part of its commitment to diversity, the College financially supports and recognizes student organizations that represent and help celebrate the diverse student body through the Student Activities Office. Currently, forty-five student organizations are chartered through the Associated Student Body (ASB) with the following centering on racial and ethnic diversity: B-STARS – Black Students Taking Action to Reach Success; California Mini-Corps Club; EOPS Achievers Club; MECHA; Native American Club; Pride Club; Puente Club; and Society of Hispanic Professional Engineers (SHPE). Student organizations help coordinate campus-wide events that include guest speakers, musical/theatrical performances, political forums, and members may

attend regional conferences that foster a greater appreciation for diversity. Annual campus-wide events such as the AIDS Awareness Day, Disability Awareness Day, Multi-Cultural Fair, Black History Month and Cinco de Mayo provide the campus community an opportunity to learn more about the diversity that exists at the College by hosting guest speakers, art exhibits, food, musical and theatrical performances. The College also encourages non-traditional diversity groups to coordinate events that focus on introducing issues of community members who are disabled (e.g., physically, learning, psychological, communication), gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, veterans and re-entry students. All college administrators, faculty, staff, and students are invited to all campus-wide events and are encouraged to participate in the planning and execution of the events.

The College strives to admit a student body that is reflective of the surrounding community and has done so through increased outreach efforts throughout the College district. The enrollment of American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, and African-American/Black students at the College has risen in recent years, but remains comparatively small in number. In contrast, the enrollment of Hispanic/Latino students has increased dramatically but continues to be slightly lower in comparison to the District's greater Hispanic/Latino population which continues to grow at a faster rate than any other racial and ethnic group. In comparison, our enrollment of White/Caucasian students has decreased during the past few years.

Although the College does not actively recruit abroad, it does enroll a small number of international students who represent the continents of North and South America, Africa, Asia, and Europe. International students provide a new perspective in the classroom and allow the rest of the student body an opportunity to learn more about the world beyond our borders. The College also provides a study abroad program for students to become proficient in a foreign language and to fully immerse themselves in a culture to gain a better appreciation of its uniqueness.

The College has also sought and been awarded various grants to academically support minority students as they seek to gain basic skills and transfer to four-year universities. A Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) grant was awarded to the College (applicant and lead institution) in conjunction with Porterville College (partner institution) for a five-year period (2004-09) to improve student success through distance education classes and learning communities that include personalized tutorial services and linked college curriculum that has helped to create a sense of community among first generation college students. The U.S. Department of Education also awarded the College a three-year grant to focus on the recruitment, retention, and increase the transfer rates of minority students studying science and engineering. In the Fall 2004, the College was recognized by The Hispanic Outlook magazine for its efforts to welcome Hispanic/Latino students and help them achieve their academic goals.

During Fall 2004, the Academic Senate formed the Diversity Committee which was comprised of administrators, faculty, staff, and students, and came together to work on drafting and implementing the *Student Equity Plan* as mandated by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. The *Student Equity Plan* outlines ways in which the college can establish student success indicators; implement policies, activities, and procedures related to student equity;

and analyze how college activities and programs provide equal opportunity for all students. The College has taken proactive steps to ensure that all of its employees are given opportunities to explore and appreciate the diversity that exists at COS by hosting guest speakers and events that foster a greater appreciation for multiculturalism.

The College also supports and funds an Ethnic Studies curriculum which includes courses that focus on American Indians, Black Americans, Mexican-Americans, Asian Americans, and Americans of European ancestry. Other academic disciplines that incorporate diversity include English (e.g., Chicano Literature and Native American Literature), History (e.g., Mexican American), Nursing (e.g., Cultural Diversity/Healthcare), and foreign languages.

Through the following on-campus programs and offices, the College provides its diverse student body with specialized direct student services that allow them to meet their educational goals: California Mini-Corps; California Work Opportunity and Responsibility Kids Act (CalWORKs); Career Ladder Teacher Preparation; Counseling Office; Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education (CARE); Disability Resource Center (DRC); Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS); and Financial Aid Office. Each of these programs and offices employ ethnically and racially diverse faculty and staff members, many of whom are proficient in a second language other than English to serve our diverse student body.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard as evidenced by the College's Mission, Philosophy, and Vision for the Future, all of which have been approved by the Board of Trustees and implemented campus-wide. The importance of diversity is expressed and celebrated through the many activities and programs offered on the College campus and by the College throughout the local community.

Planning Agenda

1.   No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

e. The institution regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases.

Description

In September 2003 College of the Sequoias implemented CCCApply, a state-wide on-line admission application. During the development of the on-line application, COS had the opportunity to provide input. As a complement to the on-line admission application, Web registration and other on-line Banner features, a Computer On-line Services lab was created.

All new, returning and transfer students must complete the admission application. The process involves the student logging on to the College's website and clicking on "Apply for Admission." That link takes the student to the on-line application where a first time user will establish an

account. Upon completing the on-line application, the student is instructed to print the signature page, sign it and submit it to the College in one of three methods: in person, by mail or by fax; however, as of January 25, 2006, the CCCApply e-signature was implemented. Applications are typically downloaded in the Admissions office once per day, however, during registration this increases to two or three times per day given the increased volume of applications. Once applications are downloaded, processing involves editing and placing the applications into Banner. This process takes from one to two days, depending on other demands on the single staff person processing applications.

Within two to three days of completing the admission application, each student receives one of numerous e-mails which have been created by the College and loaded into CCCApply. These e-mails inform the student of his/her successful application, potential non-resident status or other situations based on responses on the application. If a student lists an e-mail address, CCCApply will send the e-mail to that address; if an e-mail address is not listed, CCCApply will issue the student an address and the student can access these e-mails through this address.

COS evaluates this application process by receiving input from students and staff, posting questions and comments to the Admissions and Records listserv and by communicating directly with the Chancellor's Office or the XAP Corporation's representatives. The XAP Corporation has made numerous upgrades to the application based on input from the implementing colleges, including COS. Additionally, after each registration process, the Admissions and Records staff specifically, and Student Services staff generally, identify issues that require resolution. This includes all Matriculation processes (admission application, orientation, assessment and counseling) as well as registration-related procedures.

The Assessment Office conducts placement testing and generates the placement recommendations and is housed in a lab created in 2001 specifically for the assessment process. The primary purpose of the College's assessment program is to provide students and counselors with basic skills assessment data to be utilized for accurate placement in English, mathematics and ESL courses. The assessment program also monitors and evaluates assessment instruments and procedures for validity, reliability and sensitivity to cultural differences; works in conjunction with the English, mathematics and ESL departments to improve the efficacy of the program; coordinates the mathematics competency testing program; and coordinates the Federal Ability to Benefit (ATB) testing required of all non-high school graduates to establish Title IV financial aid eligibility.

In March 2002, the College implemented computerized assessment testing. This includes: the ACCUPLACER Computerized Placement Tests (CPT)-reading, sentence structure and mathematics; the COS Algebra Readiness Test; the Math Diagnostic Testing Project (MDTP) Elementary Algebra Test; MDTP Intermediate Algebra Test; MDTP Precalculus Test; and the Combined English Language Skills Assessment (CELSA) for the English as a Second Language population. The CELSA test is approved and utilized for both course placement and ATB. The CPT reading, sentence structure and mathematics test battery is approved and utilized for ATB; however, the College does not utilize the CPT Mathematics test for placement. Thus, students who take the CPT for both

course placement and ATB must take two math tests (the CPT Mathematics Tests for ATB and one of the other four math tests for course placement).

Various methods are used to evaluate the placement instruments and practices in order to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases and to ensure the instruments and procedures are valid, reliable and appropriate for use as course placement tools. First, a collaborative effort between staff of the Assessment Office and the Matriculation sub-committees for both English and mathematics is employed when critical decisions need to be made and when changes and validation studies are conducted relative to assessment. The Assessment Coordinator locally manages the COS Algebra Readiness Test (i.e., conducting all research normally required by test publishers and all local validation research). The Coordinator developed the new multiple criteria English placement model for the Computerized English placement test, including retroactive testing and validation research. The Assessment Coordinator also completes all disproportionate impact studies and validation studies for all other placement tests.

Evaluation

The College substantially meets this standard.

The CCCApply process allows each student to be assigned an e-mail address if they do not possess a personal e-mail address; however, the process to access the CCCApply e-mail system is somewhat difficult. A student survey indicated that 62.2% received an e-mail regarding their status after applying for admission; with only 16.4% indicating they did not receive an e-mail (18.6% indicated "Not Applicable," even though every applicant was sent an e-mail). This communication issue could lead to students not being aware of their admission status and/or any difficulties with their admission to COS.   In turn, these students may not register for classes.

All placement tests currently utilized have passed examination for cultural/linguistic bias, insensitivity, and offensiveness as determined by the test publishers or by local management of a test instrument. All placement tests are also currently approved for matriculation by the California Community College Chancellor's Office. The College has historically monitored the effectiveness of the Assessment and Placement program, and the last formal evaluations of the instruments for English and ESL were conducted during the 2004-05 academic year, and the last formal evaluations of the instruments for mathematics were conducted during the 2005-06 academic year. The primary method was the collection and analysis of consequential validity evidence in which both students and faculty are surveyed regarding their "satisfaction with course placement." The results for both the English and mathematics placement procedures exceeded the Chancellor's Office standard; the percentage of both students and faculty that believed course placements were correct ranged between 76% and 92%. The results for the ESL placement procedures were favorable, but more difficult to interpret due to the small number of students completing the test and placing into the target courses. The results of these studies have been included in the documentation to this report.

Planning Agenda

1. Identify and implement a convenient, cost effective e-mail process to communicate with all students.

f. The institution maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially, with provision for secure backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. The institution publishes and follows established policies for release of student records.

Description

College of the Sequoias has been in existence since 1925 and has records spanning that time in three different formats: hard copy, microfilm and electronic. Records from 1925 through Spring semester 1986 are on microfilm with the exception of the S through Z portion of the alphabet, which are still in hard copy. These records are continuing to be microfilmed and this process is expected to be completed by the end of 2006. Beginning with Spring 1986, the College implemented a local software system (legacy) in which student records were maintained. That system was utilized until Spring 2004, at which time the College implemented Banner, a commercial software system. All legacy system records were converted to Banner, thus academic history from Spring 1986 to the present is maintained in Banner. In addition, Admissions and Records purchased a scanner and LaserFiche software and implemented a document imaging system during Summer 2002. All incoming transcripts from other colleges and universities, high school transcripts, graduation checklists and other documents identified in the *Document Imaging Protocols* are scanned and subsequently available to approved campus LaserFiche users.

The College has used an underground bunker for storage, including student records. During Fall 2004, a water valve leak caused water and mold damage to the backup records stored in that location. After consulting with a firm that specializes in cleaning and/or copying damaged records, it was determined that the quantity of mold and the expense to clean/copy the records were too great and a decision was made to destroy the records. All records lost from the Admissions and Records Office were backup records for electronic and microfilm files. The bunker has been cleaned and is available for storage.

Currently, all hard copy and microfilmed records are located in the Records office (room 107), with the past years' grade rosters maintained in the Admissions and Records Coordinator's office. The electronic records are maintained on the Banner system server and the LaserFiche scanned records are on a separate server. Access to records, regardless of the format, is by an established security and confidentiality approval process. All regular employees and all student employees must sign and submit a confidentiality statement (Employee Acknowledgement of Responsibility for Security and Confidentiality of Student Records, and Student Employee Acknowledgement of Responsibility for Security and Confidentiality of Student Records) ensuring personally identifiable information will not be released inappropriately prior to being approved for access to and/or release of records.

During the 2003-04 academic year, the maintenance of paper files for check out to the academic counselors was discontinued. This became possible with the ability to scan records into LaserFiche and make those electronic records available on staff's desktop computers. Some records, e.g., microfilmed records, must still be printed and reviewed in hard copy. *Student Records Procedures* were developed to achieve and maintain consistency in the check out of hard copy files/records.

Various other Student Services offices/programs maintain student records, including Financial Aid, the Disability Resource Center and Extended Opportunity Programs and Services. Those programs are advised of and held to State and Federal guidelines and regulations pertaining to establishing, maintaining and managing student records. To aid in this process, a *Security and Confidentiality of Student Records* document was developed and distributed to all departments who maintain student records. In addition, a memo regarding confidentiality of records has been periodically sent to Student Services' staff.

Routinely the College is served with subpoenas or court orders for various types of student records. The Admissions and Records office handles the majority of these requests, following State and Federal regulations for notifying the student of the request for records and informing them of their right to file a motion to quash the subpoena, preparing the records for transmission and transmitting the records within the allowable time line. In addition, the College receives many requests for records, both from current and former students or from a third party secondary to a signed release of records by the student. Again, each request is managed in a confidential manner, following Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) guidelines for release of directory and personally identifiable information.

A large component of the records requests received includes requests for official, unofficial and in-house transcripts, general education certification and evaluation of other college/university transcripts. Official and unofficial transcripts must be requested directly by the student. In-house transcripts are requested by counselors or other staff who require a working hard copy. General education certification is typically requested by students at the time they ask for an official transcript. Evaluation of other college/university transcripts occurs during the student's initial semester of attendance at COS if the transcript arrives in a timely manner. Transcripts that arrive late in the semester may not be evaluated until the following semester. The student receives copies of their general education certification and the evaluation of their transcripts from other institutions once the process is completed.

Confidentiality of student records is an ongoing quest. When the College implemented Banner, security levels for staff were established based on their position's needs. In addition, all student employees and regular employees must sign a *Security and Confidentiality of Student Records* form. This ensures staff and student employees are provided information on security and confidentiality of student records and are aware of the consequences of violations. In addition to distributing information on confidentiality, e-mails are sent prior to finals week each semester reminding instructors that they should not post students' grades using personally identifiable information, e.g., name, social security number or partial social security number, student identification number

Three Board of Trustees policies pertain to student records. Board Policy 7020, *Confidential Records*, states the College's intent to maintain the confidentiality and security of students' records. Board Policy 7021, *Student Records and Directory Information*, identifies the College's process and requirements for release of student records. Board Policy 7022, *Student Records–Challenging Content and Access Log*, delineates how a student may challenge the content of their record to correct or remove information, as well as the maintenance of an access log that identifies all persons, agencies or organizations requesting or receiving information from the student's records and their legitimate interest. The *COS General Catalog* and the website both contain information about confidentiality of students' records and students' access to their records.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. Student records are securely stored. Board Policies are in place, are published, and are followed.

The Accreditation Survey indicates a high level of importance as well as a high level of agreement from the students on the issue of permanent and confidential records.

Statement: The College has a records process that creates permanent, confidential student records.	
Level of Importance	Students
Great/Moderate Importance	78.3%
Little/No Importance	7.6%
Do Not Know	10.5%
Level of Agreement	Students
Strongly Agree/Agree	71.1%
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	7.1%
Do Not Know	17.2%

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

4. The institution evaluates student support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

Description

College of the Sequoias evaluates its student support services using three primary methods: (a) evaluation processes and reports, including the College's Program Review process and categorical

program reviews by the Chancellor's Office; (b) regularly scheduled program and division meetings; and (c) other data collected and analyzed.

Student Services evaluates their programs and departments using the current Program Review process. The five areas addressed are centrality of mission, quality of staff, quality of service, need/demand for services or program and facilities/equipment. The Program Review report is approved by the Validation Team, the Program Review Steering Committee and, eventually, the Board of Trustees. During the intervening years of the five year Program Review cycle, each program/department provides an Annual Progress Report, in which they address progress from their program review report in the five areas noted above. The progress report also provides the opportunity to include additional issues or concerns that may have arisen since the completion of the last full Program Review Report.

In addition to Program Review initiated by the College, many programs respond to external evaluations. For example, numerous categorical programs, e.g., the Disability Resource Center (DRC), underwent a program evaluation initiated by the Chancellor's Office. This process included a self-study report and a site visit of peers from other community colleges. These reviews have been discontinued until the State budget improves. Matriculation also has a self-study and site review every five years, completes an annual expenditures report that is submitted to the Chancellor's office and has a *Matriculation Plan* that is updated on a periodic basis as changes occur.

One of the mandatory program categories specified by the California Community College Chancellor's Office is the coordination of services with on-campus and community partners by CalWORKs. This includes provisions for planning collaboratively with the county welfare department and other agencies, and coordination within the college. This coordination offers opportunities for evaluation and improvement of the services offered by this program.

On an ongoing basis student support services are discussed, reviewed, evaluated and recommendations made in various meetings held in Student Services. Twice a month the Student Services Cabinet meeting is held, consisting of the VP of Student Services, two Deans of Student Services and the three Directors of Student Services. These meetings are devoted to updating these Student Services Administrators on college-wide issues and activities, discussing issues and resolutions within Student Services and generally ensuring that students' needs are being met. Once each semester a meeting of all Student Services Department Heads/Program Managers (includes the VP of Student Services, Deans, Directors, and Coordinators) is held. Again, the purpose is to update these managers on College and Student Services topics and to discuss service delivery issues and concerns. Beginning this year, monthly meetings are held with small groups of Student Services' staff to gather input on improving services to students, enhancing the work environment for staff and to generate ideas. In addition, departments/programs hold staff meetings at various intervals and devote a significant portion of these meetings to discussing services to students, service delivery methods, issues that have been identified and how to improve the service to students. Also, many Student Services programs have advisory committees, e.g., DRC, EOPS, Student

Health Center, which meet on a regular basis to review program services, discuss issues and consider the addition of new services or a revision of existing services.

Three other meeting formats contribute to the evaluation of student support services: the Creating a User Friendly Environment and Atmosphere in Student Services Committee, the Customer Service Training Committee and the Directors of High School Counseling meeting. The first is a committee that was formed at the end of Spring semester 2004. This committee brainstorms ways in which the atmosphere and environment in Student Services could be improved for students. Some of the ideas presented were practical elements such as adequate signage in student services and adequate lighting in the hallway. Other ideas address support services, e.g., ensuring counseling opportunities are available to students considering their various circumstances (day, evening, walk-in, appointment, information only) and creating step-by-step instructions on how to enroll at COS, i.e., the *Matriculation Process*. The second is a committee that assesses customer service training needs, provides customer service training and is implementing methods to recognize individuals and departments that provide exemplary customer service. The latter committee invites directors of high school counseling to COS to receive information about the college and to discuss issues and identify resolutions.

An additional opportunity to evaluate student support services and identify ways in which to improve services to students is monthly folder meetings with all Student Services' department heads and program managers. These meetings focus on programmatic elements, concerns and innovations to address student needs. Other data that assists in the evaluations of student support services and the improvement of these services includes data collected and information received from four-year colleges/universities on the performance of our former students and input from the College's external auditors as they evaluate our processes and procedures in Student Services.

Lastly, each Student Services' program developed a Mission statement, goals, student learning outcomes and outcome assessments. The initial phase of assessments are being conducted and compared to the goals and SLO's originally developed to determine how this information can be utilized to improve services to students.

Throughout Student Services, a planning-implementing-evaluating process is employed. The various committee structures provide a forum for planning; the individual programs implement planned program elements and components; and various methods are used to ascertain that the services support student success and the achievement of student learning outcomes. These evaluation techniques include data collected (demographics, placement tests results, etc.), student satisfaction surveys, retention and persistence rates, grade point averages, grade distribution statistics, course completion rates, probation and dismissal information, discussions of processes and procedures, transfer raters, certificate and degree completion and student learning outcome assessments.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. The Student Services' Division routinely evaluates its student support services to ensure student needs are being met. This is accomplished by employing multiple methods of formal and informal evaluation, including internal and external evaluations.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

Documentation

1. College of the Sequoias Mission Statement

2. 2005-07 COS General Catalog

3. Student Equity Plan

4. Program Review Reports

5. Matriculation Plan

6. Accreditation Survey Results

7. Board of Trustees Policy Manual

8. Student Code of Conduct

9. COS Schedule of Courses

10. Student Services Mission Statement

11. Student Services Special Programs

12. EOPS Mission Statement

13. CCCApply e-mail options

14. Disproportional Impact Studies

15. ACTT Report

16. Document Imaging Protocol

17. Form Acknowledging Security & Confidentiality

18. Student Form for Security & Confidentiality

19. Student Records Procedure

20. Security & confidentiality of Student Records

21. Memo regarding Record Confidentiality

22. E-Mail to Instructors regarding Posting Grades

23. Program Review Annual Progress Reports

24. 2000 Matriculation Program Review Report

25. 2004-05 Credit Matriculation Expenditure

26. Student Services Student Learning Outcomes

Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services

C. Library and Learning Support Services

Library and other learning support services for students are sufficient to support the institution's instructional programs and intellectual, aesthetic, and cultural activities in whatever format and wherever they are offered. Such services include library services and collections, tutoring, learning centers, computer laboratories, and learning technology development and training. The institution provides access and training to students so that library and other learning support services may be used effectively and efficiently. The institution systematically assesses these services using student learning outcomes, faculty input, and other appropriate measures in order to improve the effectiveness of the services.

1. The institution supports the quality of its instructional programs by providing library and other learning support services that are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety to facilitate educational offerings, regardless of location or means of delivery.

Description:

College of the Sequoias maintains a Learning Resource Center (LRC) on the Visalia campus that includes a library, tutorial center, computer commons, computer classroom, and distance education classroom. Usage of the new LRC by students has increased steadily over the 1.5 years since it opened, as witnessed by the fact that the *3M Security System Log* showed there were over 3,000 visits on the first day of the Fall 2005 semester, which was higher than any day the previous year. A small satellite library with computers and reference books is maintained at the Hanford Center. An adjunct librarian provides library services as needed.

The LRC employs three full-time and two part-time faculty librarians, three full-time paraprofessionals, three part-time clerical staff, a Tutorial Center Coordinator, and a senior secretary. There is a Director of Learning Resources and Technology as well. A classified paraprofessional is always on duty in the computer commons to assist students in the use of the computers. There is also a Computer Resources Specialist who maintains the computers in the LRC. IMS employs a staff of four with specializations in audiovisual services, television studio operations, and audiovisual materials.

The Tutorial Center is located within the LRC, and services are available to students Monday through Friday 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Tutorial services are not provided on Saturdays. The Tutorial Center Coordinator recruits and trains student tutors who are then assigned to work with students who need help with their studies. The tutors must have completed the course(s) which they tutor with a "B" or better and be recommended by their instructor. They are student workers who are paid employees of the Tutorial Center. An ad hoc Tutorial Services Committee was convened in 2004 to review the tutorial program and make recommendations on how tutorial services could be improved, and the best use made of its space in the new building. Major recommendations in its report, titled *Assumptions and Proposals for the Tutorial Center*, were to bring

all tutorial services on campus into the LRC, and to create learning skills and basic skills programs that would be located there. The Math Lab program started in February, 2006. The learning skills program, which will be operated in conjunction with the Disability Resource Center, is scheduled to open in August, 2006. The English Writing Center will also open in August, 2006. During fiscal 2004-05 1,470 students received 9,445 hours of tutoring in 143 subjects. Usage of tutorial services (not including the new programs) has been stable the past two years. It is not possible to close the Tutorial Center area in the new LRC the way it was in the old Library. This means that while the space is open to students after 4:00 p.m., tutorial services are not. The new basic skills and learning skills programs will take up about two thirds of the Tutorial Center space, leaving one third for traditional one-to-one tutoring.

Instructional Media Services (IMS) staff on the Visalia campus provide audiovisual services and equipment to the campus. This includes TVs, VCRs, DVD players, LCD projectors, editing equipment, and audio systems. IMS staff trains faculty and staff in the proper use of AV equipment. They also act as cameramen at various institutional functions. They work closely with instructors on AV projects. For example, the IMS Coordinator instructs biology students every semester in the use of the video editor as part of their assignment to make a video program from tape they shoot on a field trip. IMS has moved back into its area after a renovation that took place over the summer of 2005. Additional space in this area was gained when two computer technicians who were stationed in the IMS area have been relocated to another space.

Evaluation:

The College meets this standard for the Visalia campus and the Hanford Center. Services have grown on the Visalia campus largely due to the construction of the new LRC. Services have remained unchanged at the Hanford Center even though enrollment there has fallen in recent years.

Planning Agenda:

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

a. Relying on appropriate expertise of faculty, including librarians and other learning support services professionals, the institution selects and maintains educational equipment and materials to support student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission of the institution.

Description:

Learning Resource Center:

The Learning Resource Center at College of the Sequoias supports the Mission of the College and enhances the learning opportunities available to assist students.

In October 2004, the College opened its new LRC. At 53,000 square feet, it is twice the size of the old Library. The budget for the new building included about $2,000,000 in its *Detailed Equipment List* for new furniture and equipment. Learning Resources staff, including librarians and classified personnel, and Instructional Media Services staff participated in a series of meetings to determine the needs for the new building. These staff members have daily contact with students, and designed the floor plan and selected the equipment best suited to meet student needs. The budget includes funding for a new integrated library system (ILS) that is yet to be purchased.

Housed within the LRC are a collection of 80,000 books, 340 periodical titles, 15 periodicals on microfilm, and 2,000 videos. At their weekly meetings the librarians work together as a committee to select titles for acquisition. They consider curricular needs, requests from students, and the age of the collection in making selection decisions. The heaviest weight is given to input from the faculty on titles they want in their subject areas. Librarians sometimes work with faculty from a specific discipline to build a collection that meets the needs of their students. For example, one librarian worked closely with the Nursing Department on reviewing the medical books and periodical collections for currency, depth, and variety.

There are 109 computers available for student use in the LRC. The number of computers in the Computer Commons increased from 48 to 82 with the move to the new LRC. Ten of the Computer Commons computers are word processors, while 72 access the Internet. There are also eighteen computers that access six subscription databases. These databases provide access to thousands of professional and academic journals that are not available for free over the Internet.

There are two classrooms in the LRC. One is a fully equipped distance education classroom. Live interactive television has been used mainly for nursing classes. Remote broadcasts have been conducted in conjunction with Hartnell College, Porterville College, and CSU Bakersfield, as well as the College's Hanford Center. Distance education has allowed RNs living in Visalia to obtain a BSN from CSU Bakersfield. Plans are being made to expand live interactive television to other disciplines. In Fall 2005 there were 5 televised and 11 on-line distance education classes. There are 9 televised and 26 on-line classes scheduled for Fall 2006.

The other classroom is a library orientation computer lab. In it librarians give bibliographic instruction to classes brought in by their instructors. Librarians work closely with the faculty on this important service, gearing their presentations to the specific course, and frequently to a specific assignment. The classroom is also used by individual faculty to run specific class or laboratory activities.

Instructional Media Services:

As noted above, the IMS area, which is in a separate building from the LRC, was renovated in 2005. A lot of obsolete and broken equipment was discarded, and compact shelving installed. The acquisition of new equipment is funded in several ways. Funds have come from the College's general fund which pays for specific budgeted items and Above Base Budget requests, the State's

annual technology allocation, and grant funds. IMS has a $5,000 per year line item for equipment repair, but no line item for New Equipment.

The Institutional Technology Committee, which includes members from IMS and the library, has developed a *Technology Plan*, which is in its second edition (2.0). It provides a framework within which to purchase and maintain instructional equipment. The College also relies on input from faculty about what instructional technologies they want in their classrooms. IMS staff provides the technical expertise to select equipment for purchase.

In addition to the equipment under the supervision of IMS, various divisions and other institutional subdivisions purchase and maintain instructional equipment that is specific to their programs. An example is the Business Division which maintains its own computer labs.

Evaluation:

Learning Resources:

The Learning Resource Center substantially meets this standard, and is working to improve the quantity and quality of materials and equipment available to students and faculty by soliciting continual input from faculty.

The Accreditation Survey shows that a very large majority of both faculty and administrators agree that evaluating Learning Resources collections to ensure they enhance curriculum is important. However, a significant proportion of each group indicated that they do not know if collection evaluation is taking place. This shows that there is a need for Learning Resources to better communicate what it is doing in the way of collection development.

Statement: Learning Resources collections are evaluated to ensure they enhance the curriculum.		
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators
Great/Moderate Importance	81.8	72.7
Little/No Importance	3.9	
Do Not Know	14.3	27.3
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators
Strongly Agree/Agree	41.8	69.2
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	17.7	
Do Not Know	40.5	30.8

Instructional Media Services:

The College does rely on the expertise of faculty and IMS staff in developing and implementing technology plans. While funds have been allocated when needed for instructional equipment, the

lack of stable funding is a concern. Since there is no line item for replacement equipment, the funds must be taken from some other area when something needs to be purchased. The space issue has been partly addressed by eliminating obsolete equipment, installing compact shelving, and moving the computer technicians. The Technology Plan 2.0 is not yet fully implemented, but continues to provide goals for Instructional Media Services, as well as the rest of the College.

The Accreditation Survey shows that over 90% of the faculty and all of the administrators consider systematic maintenance, upgrading and replacement of technology to important. However, almost half of both groups believe that is not happening.

Statement: Technology resources are maintained, upgraded and replaced systematically.		
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators
Great/Moderate Importance	93.6	100.0
Little/No Importance	3.8	
Do Not Know	2.6	
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators
Strongly Agree/Agree	51.3	46.2
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	41.0	46.2
Do Not Know	7.7	7.7

Planning Agenda:

1. Learning Resources will explore additional sources of funding for books and on-line databases in order to keep pace with price increases.

2. See planning agenda 1 in standard III.C.1.c.

b. *The institution provides ongoing instruction for users of library and other learning support services so that students are able to develop skills in information competency.*

Description:

The librarians at COS support student development of information competency skills through formal and informal instruction.

The Reference Desk in the LRC is staffed all hours it is open by either a faculty librarian, or, in the case of some evenings, by a paraprofessional. A typical reference interview with a student would include instruction in basic information competency skills such as defining the information needed to complete the assignment, and how to locate it using LRC resources. These sources include the on-line public access catalog (OPAC), periodical collection, and on-line databases. The librarian may also suggest appropriate websites to complete the process.

There are no hours of scheduled reference service for the Hanford Center. However, service is available by telephone and appointment. A librarian will also visit classes at the COS Farm and other off campus locations to conduct bibliographic instruction upon request.

The librarians conduct bibliographic instruction sessions for individual classes in the LRC. This instruction is given in the Library Orientation Classroom that is equipped with 39 computers. In these sessions students receive information competency instruction by being introduced to the best resources for the assignment they are working on. These usually include reference books, circulating books, on-line journal databases, newspaper indexes, and Internet directories and search engines. The librarians customize their hand-outs for the specific class and create electronic guides for the specific class. There are currently 45 such electronic guides linked to the library web page for specific class assignments.

As an example, one librarian has implemented an information competency module for Biology 20, Frontiers in Biology. The librarian team teaches four to six class sessions with the instructor, instructing and helping the students through the research process to the completion of their projects. Another librarian has done a series of bibliographic instruction sessions with an instructor for his Speech 1, Fundamentals of Public Speaking. Instruction includes introducing students to research sources and methods appropriate to the assignments. Informal feedback from the instructors indicates that they have seen improvement in the quality of their students completed projects.

Two of the librarians teach one unit CSU transferable courses covering the components of information competency. Library 101, Library Research Strategies, is a basic research course that has at times been offered on-line as well as in the traditional classroom setting. Library 102, Internet Information Resources, is an introduction to the Internet which emphasizes Web searching skills and strategies, evaluation, and citation. Library 103, Evaluating Information Sources, is a course in the evaluation of all types of information resources with an emphasis on there usefulness for research papers. Normally one session of each of these three information competency classes is offered each semester. In order to meet the scheduling needs of students, these courses are sometimes offered as short term weekend classes. Library 101 has also been taught as a class linked to a learning community.

The librarians have developed and maintain an extensive website that includes information about the LRC and access to databases the LRC provides to students. The website's main function is to provide a web directory linking authoritative and appropriate sites for student access. This site is continuously maintained and updated by the librarians. There are over 150 individual web documents created and linked to the library website. These include the guides mentioned above, such as the one to the Speech 1 classes. The guides are an extension of the information competency instruction students receive in the classroom. Their usefulness to students can be seen by the fact that the Speech 1 guide has received over 6,000 hits. There are also links to periodical index databases which, with one exception, students can access off campus. During 2005 over 5,000 searches were conducted on one of the databases.

Librarians are working with the English Division to develop an information competency component for English 1, College Reading and Composition. The Campus Curriculum Committee has recently approved increasing the course from three to four units with the idea that the fourth unit would be an information competency component. The unit will be taught by the course instructors with assistance and support from the librarians.

The College of the Sequoias Academic Senate approved Information Competency as a graduation requirement in 2001. Unfortunately, implementation of this requirement has been delayed.

Evaluation:

COS substantially meet this standard.

The LRC is providing adequate service at its reference desk, including informal information competency instruction. With the current level of staffing and rooms available, LRC librarians are meeting the demand for bibliographic instruction session in the Library Orientation Classroom. They are flexible in their willingness to accommodate the instructors' needs for times, but the classroom is not always available. The room scheduling procedure has been revised to increase efficiency so that instructors will not have to be turned away. Bibliographic instruction and reference service at the Hanford Center is by appointment only as there are no hours of scheduled coverage by a librarian. This arrangement has been adequate to meet the low demand.

The three one unit library courses have been approved by the Campus Curriculum Committee and the Academic Senate as courses that would fulfill an information competency graduation requirement. The information competency graduation requirement has been postponed partly because these few classes could not be offered enough with current staffing and scheduling to meet all students' needs. When the information competency unit is implemented for English 1, it is envisioned that the issue of the information competency graduation requirement will be revisited.

The Accreditation Survey shows that faculty, administrators and students all consider information competency to be important. However, over 20% of each group said they do not know if information competency instruction is available. Two thirds of the students, who are the ones who receive the instruction, agree that it is available.

Statement: Instruction in information competency is made available to students.			
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Students
Great/Moderate Importance	81.1	72.7	74.7
Little/No Importance	6.5		9.3
Do Not Know	11.7	27.3	15.9
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Students
Strongly Agree/Agree	45.0	53.8	66.7
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	26.3	15.4	12.7
Do Not Know	28.8	30.8	20.6

<u>Planning Agenda:</u>

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

c. The institution provides students and personnel responsible for student learning programs and services adequate access to the library and other learning support services, regardless of their location or means of delivery.

<u>Description:</u>

The Learning Resource Center is open 62 ½ hours a week. Monday through Thursday the LRC is open 7:30 a.m. until 8 p.m.; on Friday it is open 7:30 a.m. until 4 p.m.; and on Saturdays it is open from noon until 4 p.m. As a result of budget cuts in 2003, the library lost twelve hours of adjunct librarian time. This adjunct librarian time was spent staffing the reference desk. Some of those hours are now being covered by a library assistant.

During the hours the LRC is open there is access to all parts of the library including the Computer Commons, periodicals, books, study rooms and reference service. The Tutorial Center is open Monday through Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. and is not available on Saturdays. According to the *Reference Interviews Report*, from August 2004 thru the August 2005 the Reference Desk staff answered 5,107 reference questions and 3,376 directional questions.

The LRC offers electronic access to seven databases that are paid for with Telecommunications and Technology Infrastructure Program (TTIP) funds. The on-line public access catalog (OPAC) is also available via the Internet. Six of the electronic databases as well as the OPAC catalog are available 24 hours a day, seven days a week, to any student on or off campus, who has the passwords. Students can pick up a list of the passwords at the LRC or call the LRC during hours of operation for the passwords. Computers at the Hanford Center also provide Internet access. One database, Lexis/Nexis, is not available off campus.

A librarian stays at the main reference desk approximately 50 hours a week. The librarians and library assistant work one-on-one with students who seek help and also give reference service on the phone. A student may also set up an appointment with a librarian when he/she is not on the desk for more individualized help. An instructional assistant is available in the Computer Commons all the hours the LRC is open.

The LRC has a system set up for students attending classes at the Hanford Center to request and receive books and magazine articles on interlibrary loan without the students needing to come to the Visalia campus. Students taking classes at other off campus sites may also use the Hanford Center as a pick up point for books and magazines requested from the LRC. Students taking classes at remote locations or by distance education are encouraged to come to the Visalia campus if possible for additional assistance in accessing reference services and LRC resources.

Instructors can request that the library place books from its collection, or the instructor's own materials, on reserve for student use. The reserve items are held behind the circulation desk and can be checked out for an hour, overnight, or two weeks depending on the instructions from the instructor. The LRC has a $3,000 budget to purchase some of the major textbooks and place them on reserve for the students who cannot afford to buy their own textbooks. These textbooks check out for an hour at a time and do not leave the LRC building. The LRC provides copy machines, microfilm readers, and televisions with VCRs and DVD players to watch videos. Through the GoPrint system students can send print jobs from any computer in the LRC to either a black and white or color printer. There is also a scanner available.

The LRC Library Orientation Classroom has two ADA compliant workstations, an LCD projector, a visualizer, color and black and white printers, and an instructor control station. The LRC Computer Commons area also has three ADA compliant workstations, one that is set up with a video enlarger and a scanner. The is also a video enlarger located on the second floor. The twelve computers that only access the electronic databases are on wheelchair accessible tables. There are on-line catalogs both downstairs and upstairs that can be accessed by students in wheelchairs. The Distance Education Classroom, which is set up to accommodate thirty-six laptop computers, has two ADA compliant workstations. It also has three LCD projectors, two video cameras, a visualizer, and color and black and white printers.

Title 5 grant funds have been used to install distance education equipment in rooms on both the main Visalia Campus and the Hanford Center. Classes that originate at one site can be broadcast simultaneously to the other. Among other things, this arrangement will increase the enrollment of historically low-enrolled classes by allowing the same class to be offered at two locations simultaneously. Also, the ability to partner with other colleges in distance education programs will also be expanded.

Evaluation:

The College substantially meets this standard. Library and learning resources are available to students and faculty at the LRC, at the Hanford Center and through the LRC Website.

The Accreditation Survey shows that while faculty, administrators and students all agree that providing services to students at remote locations is important, students placed somewhat less importance on it. Interestingly, students were more likely than faculty and administrators to agree that remote services are actually available. However, a large proportion, about 30% of each group, indicated they Do Not Know if library, media and tutorial services are available at remote locations. This could be a result that they do teach or take course at these sites and so, are unaware if they are available.

Statement: Library, Media, and Tutorial Services are available to students at other locations.			
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Students
Great/Moderate Importance	84.6	83.3	71.7
Little/No Importance	5.1		7.2
Do Not Know	10.3	16.7	21.1
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Students
Strongly Agree/Agree	41.3	46.2	57.9
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	26.3	23.1	11.4
Do Not Know	32.5	30.8	30.7

The number of electronic databases available to the students has remained the same. The costs of the databases have increased in recent years while the amount of TTIP funds has remained constant. This jeopardizes the ability of Learning Resources to maintain subscriptions to all of the current databases.

The loss of the adjunct librarian hours has caused the library to be open four fewer hours per week, which has some negative impact on night students. Due to declining enrollment, the adjunct librarian who services the Hanford Center no longer makes regular visits. She fills all requests for reference service and class instruction by appointment only.

The larger Tutorial Center has increased the ability of the College to provide tutorial services. The Library Orientation Classroom in the new LRC is larger and better equipped than the one in the old Library, and has increased the librarian's ability to provide bibliographic instruction to students. The Distance Education Classroom that was built with the new LRC adds a new venue for providing instruction.

Planning Agenda:

1. See planning agenda 1 in standard II.C.1.a.

d. *The institution provides effective maintenance and security for its library and other learning support services.*

Description:

Security in the LRC is addressed in several different ways. LRC staff received training from the Campus Police Chief in security procedures and has discussed security issues in meetings as needed. A *Learning Resource Center Conduct Policy* has been written and posted in the building and on the website. However, there have been problems with loud, disruptive, and disrespectful students who have been intimidating to staff and students. In order to get things under control, a temporary part-time security guard was hired for the Spring 2006 semester. The LRC is situated in

close proximity to the Campus Police Station, affording quick response time when they are called for assistance. The Director of Learning Resources and Technology has discussed security issues with the Campus Police Chief and Dean of Students.

Confidentiality of staff and student personal information is maintained at all times. Personal information stored in LRC computers is not released to anyone unless they have proper authorization. Computer files are periodically purged to maintain confidentiality. Personal information on paper forms is kept in locked cabinets, and is shredded when no longer needed. COS student identification numbers are used instead of Social Security numbers to check out materials and to logon to LRC computers. The LRC staff has received training in USA PATRIOT Act provisions and how to respond to requests for personal information under its provisions.

Books and laptop computers are tagged to set off an alarm at the security gate at the entrance of the LRC if anyone tries to remove materials without authorization. The 3M Security system helps to prevent theft. There are student workers and/or LRC staff stationed near the gate to monitor the alarm. Antivirus software is installed and maintained on all campus computers by Computer Services. Computers in the LRC that are accessed by students also have Altiris monitoring software that allows staff to view what the student is viewing. This software is also used by librarians doing bibliographic instruction to view student work and provide assistance.

There is no staff stationed on the second floor of the LRC. In order to monitor the second floor, a Pelco security camera system has been installed. With it staff can monitor the second floor from the Reference, Circulation, and Computer Commons Desks on the first floor, or from selected staff computers. The Pelco security system was valuable in identifying a suspect in a bomb threat.

The staff entrance/emergency exits are alarmed on both floors of the building. A key is needed to leave the building through the emergency exits without sounding the alarm. The entire building is alarmed for unauthorized entry. Each authorized person has his/her own code which is entered on a key pad.

A number of maintenance issues with the new LRC were handled while it was under warranty. Since the warranty period has ended, maintenance needs are now reported to Facilities. Even though the new building has twice the square footage of the old Library, no additional custodial service has been provided. Routine maintenance of the instructional equipment and computers is handled by Instructional Media Services and Computer Services personnel. Computer Services has designated a staff person to maintain the LRC's approximately 200 computers. In the case of more difficult repairs, the audiovisual equipment and/or computers are sent to an outside repair facility.

Evaluation:

The College substantially meets this standard. In spite of ongoing efforts to maintain a quiet study atmosphere in the LRC, disruptive behavior has occurred. The camera system helps to document

incidents, but does nothing to prevent them. The Campus Police have been helpful in dealing with problem patrons.

Confidentiality and privacy issues are being addressed through current policies and procedures.

The building maintenance standard is achieved through the Facilities Department's work-order system. Instructional equipment and computer maintenance are achieved through staff assignments and outside repair procedures that are in place.

Planning Agenda:

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

e. When the institution relies on or collaborates with other institutions or other sources for library and other learning support services for its instructional programs, it documents that formal agreements exist and that such resources and services are adequate for the institution's intended purposes, are easily accessible, and utilized. The performance of there services is evaluated on a regular basis. The institution takes responsibility for and assures the reliability of all services provided either directly or through contractual arrangement.

Description:

Since 1998, COS has had a contractual agreement with California State University, Fresno that includes provisions for their students to receive the same library service and access to materials that are provided to COS students. This includes use of the computers, reference service, and borrowing privileges. COS also provides space on its campus for CSU Fresno to have an off-campus program. In return the contract provides that CSU Fresno pays for the hours that a COS librarian works at the LRC on Saturdays. CSU Fresno also provides interlibrary loan service for books and magazines from its library to COS students on a priority basis. A library assistant processes and keeps track of the inter-library loans, which are usually filled within ten days. The librarians are also given access to CSU Fresno's electronic databases. COS students may not access the databases themselves, however the librarians can access them to answer reference questions. The librarian may print out articles from these databases to give to the student or request an inter-library loan if the article/book is not in the database full-text.

The Director of Learning Resources and Technology gets feedback from the librarians and interlibrary loan staff annually on how the arrangement is working. The Director then contacts CSU Fresno about renewing the Saturday librarian, database access, and interlibrary loan provisions of the MOU. It has been routinely renewed every year since its inception. A copy of the *Memorandum of Understanding Between California State University, Fresno and College of the Sequoias* is kept by the Director, Learning Resources and Technology.

In 2005, COS initiated an agreement with Fresno Pacific University (FPU) that is similar in some ways to the one it has with CSU Fresno. Under this agreement COS gains access to excess classroom space in FPU's Visalia facility in exchange for FPU students gaining access to the

services and collections of the COS LRC. The COS librarians are also given access to the FPU library's on-line databases. This new agreement will be reviewed annually to ensure that it is meeting the needs of COS and FPU students. A copy of the *Fresno Pacific University and College of the Sequoias Memorandum of Understanding* is kept by the Director, Learning Resources and Technology.

Evaluation:

The College meets this standard. The reciprocal agreement with CSU Fresno has enhanced services to students of both institutions for eight years. The impact of this relationship has been reviewed periodically, but no substantive changes have been made and none are foreseen. The agreement with FPU is new, but early experience is that it is also enhancing services to students of both institutions.

Planning Agenda:

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

2. The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provided evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of there evaluations as the basis for improvement.

Description:

College of the Sequoias uses the Program Review process to evaluate programs and services every five years. Learning Resources underwent a full Program Review during 2000-2001. Each year thereafter the staff reviewed their progress toward meeting established goals and documented the results in Program Review Annual Updates. Learning Resources recently completed its 2005-2006 Program Review process. There were separate Program Reviews for the Library, Computer Commons, Instructional Media Services, and Tutorial Center. The Program Review process includes taking surveys of students, faculty, and staff in order to get direct feedback.

In addition to Program Review, the Learning Resources staff reviews services and materials on a continuous basis to ensure that student needs are being met. The Director of Learning Resources and Technology meets weekly with the librarians to discuss library services, including what students and faculty have been requesting. The Director also meets regularly with Instructional Media Services, Tutorial Services, and other classified staff to discuss issues, make plans, and monitor progress. Learning Resources is in the process of incorporating student learning outcomes into its review process in a more formal way with the use of procedures described in *Measuring What Matters: A Library/LRC Outcomes Assessment Manual* .

A review of usage of the old Library generated valuable information that was incorporated into plans for the new Learning Resource Center. The number of computers in the Computer

Commons was increased from 48 to 82. This reduced, but did not eliminate, the waiting lines to get on a computer during peak hours. There are also more study rooms, which again are usually all in use during peak hours. The perceived need to increase distance education offerings led to the construction of distance education classrooms in both the LRC and the IMS area.

Librarians who conduct bibliographic instruction work directly with instructors to tailor the instruction to specific course needs. After selected bibliographic instruction sessions, the students are surveyed for feedback. Similar surveys are also taken at the end of selected Library 101, 102 and 103 classes.

As noted in II.C.1, an ad hoc Tutorial Services Committee studied the needs of students for different kinds of tutorial services, and made recommendations for the creation of new tutorial programs. These include a Math Lab, Learning Skills Lab, and Writing Center. The Math Lab opened in February, 2006, and the Learning Skills Lab and Writing Center will open in August, 2006. A Writing Center had existed in previous years, but became inactive several years ago. This newly restructured Writing Center will be an integral part of tutorial services offered at COS.

Learning Resources staff members, both faculty librarians and classified personnel, participate on various campus committees and task forces. In these positions they receive feedback on the effectiveness of Learning Resources materials, programs, and services. This information is then shared at staff meetings, and becomes part of the planning process. For example, two IMS staff are on the Institutional Technology Committee where they receive information about instructional technology needs, and participate in developing plans to meet those needs.

Learning Resources participates in three annual surveys that provide information that is used in analyzing how well the Library is meeting student needs. They are the California Community College Chancellor's Office survey of libraries and learning resource centers, the Association of College and Research Libraries survey, and the National Center for Educational Statistics survey.

Evaluation:

The College meets this standard, through the Program Review process. Program Review is ongoing and is integrated into the planning processes of the College. Goals are set based on the review and progress toward achieving the goals is evaluated annually.

Students receiving bibliographic instruction generally rate the experience very highly on surveys. Instructor satisfaction is evident by the high demand for this service. Survey results and high demand also indicate satisfaction with tutorial services. Instructors have also given positive feedback indicating their satisfaction with Instructional Media Services.

The three outside surveys Learning Resources participates in provide useful statistical information. Also, comparing COS responses to the averages gives us an indication of where we stand in relation to other community colleges.

The Accreditation Survey contained two statements which were worded slightly differently, but they address the same issue. That issue is how well the various Learning Resources programs support student learning. Not surprisingly, over 80% of the students, faculty and administrators agreed or strongly agreed that it is important for Learning Resources to support student learning. Over 80% of each group also agreed that the Learning Resources programs providing library, media and tutorial services do support student learning.

Statement: The services provided by the Library, Media, and Tutorial Services support student learning.	
Level of Importance	Students
Great/Moderate Importance	87.1
Little/No Importance	5.0
Do Not Know	7.9
Level of Agreement	Students
Strongly Agree/Agree	84.9
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	5.3
Do Not Know	9.8

Statement: The services provided by Learning Resources support student learning.		
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators
Great/Moderate Importance	92.4	84.6
Little/No Importance	5.1	7.7
Do Not Know	2.5	7.7
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators
Strongly Agree/Agree	82.5	83.4
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	10.0	8.3
Do Not Know	7.5	8.3

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

Documentation

1. Technology Plan 2.0

2. Accreditation Survey Results

3. 3M Security Log

4. Assumptions & Proposals for Tutorial Center

5. Learning Resource Center Equipment List

6. Tutorial Center Statistics

7. Bibliographical Instruction Statistics

8. Reference Interview Report

9. Learning Resource Center Conduct Policy

10. College of the Sequoias & CSU Fresno MOU

11. College of the Sequoias & Fresno Pacific University MOU

12. Library/LRC Outcomes Assessment Manual

13. Learning Resource Center Program Review Report

14. Technology Plan 1.0

Standard III: Resources

The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes, and to improve institutional effectiveness.

A. Human Resources

The institution employs qualified personnel to support student learning programs and services wherever offered and by whatever means delivered, and to improve institutional effectiveness. Personnel are treated equitably, and evaluated regularly and systematically, and are provided opportunities for professional development. Consistent with its mission, the institution demonstrates its commitment to the significant educational role played by persons of diverse backgrounds by making positive efforts to encourage such diversity. Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.

1. The institution assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing personnel who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support these programs and services.

a. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority. Criteria for selection of faculty include knowledge of the subject matter or service to be performed (as determined by individuals with discipline expertise), effective teaching, scholarly activities, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Institutional faculty play a significant role in selection of new faculty. Degrees held by faculty and administrators are from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are recognized only if equivalence has been established.

Description

The policy for hiring faculty is found in the Board Policy 5000. The current faculty hiring procedures were adopted by the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees in November 2000. The procedures outline the entire process for hiring of both full-time and adjunct faculty.

Faculty job descriptions are jointly developed by area faculty and Human Resources. The job description includes description of the position, minimum qualifications and desirable qualifications. The job descriptions include information on courses to be taught, academic responsibilities, academic and work experience needed, and knowledge of and commitment to working with students of diverse backgrounds. The Screening Procedure and Application Procedure are also outlined in the job description. Faculty degrees must be from an accredited institution. Applicants claiming equivalency must follow Board Policy 5001 and go through the Equivalency Procedures prior to interviewing.

Faculty make up the majority of the faculty hiring committees. There may be up to five faculty on the hiring committee. The Committee screens the applications and determines who to interview. The Hiring Committee develops the interview questions and answer criteria. They determine the teaching demonstration topic(s) and any other requirements (tests, syllabi, etc.) of those applicants to be interviewed.

There are no Board Policies on hiring for Administrative or Classified Personnel. The *Personnel Polices for Management Council* does contain information on recruitment and selection of management and confidential employees.

However, pursuant to the classified collective bargaining agreement, representatives from both the classified employees association and the Human Resources Office collaborate to develop classified job descriptions. Job descriptions include: description of the position, minimum qualifications, duties, conditions of employment, working conditions, screening procedure and the application procedure. Classified job descriptions must be approved by the Board of Trustees. Additionally, classified employees participate in the hiring process of classified positions.

When a management position opens up, the supervisor responsible for the management position works jointly with the Human Resources Office to develop a job description. Job descriptions include: basic function, representative duties, required knowledge and abilities, education and experience, working conditions, screening procedure and the application procedures. Management job descriptions must be approved by the Board of Trustees.

Selection of management positions include input from at least one faculty representative (appointed by the faculty association) and an equal number of faculty representatives who are appointed by the Academic Senate President. Additionally, the District may invite additional faculty, a CSEA member, an adjunct faculty member, and/or a student and community member to serve as needed.

Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard.

The policy and procedures for hiring faculty, both full time and adjunct, are well established and public. The policy and procedures fully meet this standard.

The College does not adequately meet the standard as it relates to the hiring of classified staff or of administrators. There are no Board Policies regarding the hiring of classified staff or administrators. While there are some procedures that are outlined in various places, such as contracts, the procedures are not comprehensive and are not easily accessible to members of the campus community or to the public in general. In addition, the lack of concrete procedures leaves open the possibility that hiring of these positions will not be uniformly implemented.

An example of a problem occurred when hiring a classified position in Computer Services. During the interview, the job description and classification were altered and a person hired, without re-opening or announcing this new position.

The Accreditation Survey did identify concerns among all groups about hiring personnel based on established criteria. However, the statement also includes hiring to meet the goals and objectives of the College. It is not possible to determine whether either or both of these factors are the

concern for these individuals. Nearly twenty percent of all groups feel that the College could improve its handling of hiring.

Statement: Personnel are hired based on established criteria related to the College's goals and objectives.				
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Board
Great/Moderate Importance	96.1	91.7	94.1	100
Little/No Importance	2.6	8.3		
Do Not Know	1.3		5.9	
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Board
Strongly Agree/Agree	71.1	84.6	63.6	60.0
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	19.7	15.4	23.7	20.0
Do Not Know	9.2		12.7	20.0

Planning Agenda

1. Human Resources will work with the appropriate groups and develop comprehensive hiring procedures and Board Polices for classified staff and administrators.

b. The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluation of all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.

Description

The Board of Trustees conducts an evaluation of the Superintendent/President yearly, to be completed no later than June. Board Policy 1001 outlines the evaluation procedure for the Superintendent/President.

Board Policy 5070 states that Full-Time Faculty will be evaluated yearly prior to tenure and every other year after tenure. Currently, non-tenured faculty are evaluated yearly, but tenured faculty are evaluated once every three years. The evaluation procedures were developed jointly by the Academic Senate and Administration and were included in the *COSTA Master Agreement*. The evaluation process for faculty identifies the purposes of evaluation as: "recognize and acknowledge good performance, to enhance satisfactory performance and help employees who are performing satisfactorily to further their own growth, to identify weak performance and to assist employees in achieving needed improvement, and to document unsatisfactory performance."

Board Policy 5560 outlines the evaluation procedures for Adjunct Faculty. Adjunct Faculty are evaluated during their first semester and at least once every 6 semesters after that. There is no

statement of purpose(s) for the evaluation in BP 5560 or in the master agreement for this group (COSAFA).

Classified personnel evaluation is set forth in Board Policy 6000. The procedures are outlined in the master agreement with CSEA. Classified personnel are evaluated yearly. There is no statement of purpose(s) of evaluation for this group.

There are no Board policies regarding the evaluation of management and Confidential employees. The *Personnel Policies for Management Council* lay out the evaluation process for these groups. Each administrator and confidential employee is formally evaluated at the end of his/her initial year and every two years thereafter. The evaluations include Action Plans for improvement.

The criteria for evaluations of all employees are stated in the procedures and evaluation forms.

Responses to evaluations are completed within set deadlines for each group of employees.

Recommendation 3 from the 2000 Accreditation Visiting Team Report directed the College to "Review the faculty evaluation process including tenure review of faculty, and implement appropriate changes with all due speed." After review by the Academic Senate and negotiation by the faculty association, the faculty evaluation process was altered slightly. The format of the evaluation was altered, the student survey was altered, the Division Chairs were removed from the process, and the timeline and specific responsibilities were delineated. No dialogue and no changes to tenure review have occurred.

Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard. There are established Board Policies for Faculty (full-time and part-time) and for Classified personnel. There are procedures for the evaluation of all campus constituencies. These policies and procedures appear to be uniformly applied.

The College does not meet this standard as it relates to Administrators and Confidential Employees. There are no Board Policies for these groups. In addition, the availability of the procedures is limited. The *Personnel Policies for Management Council* is not widely available. Members of the Management Council have copies, but they are not currently available on the web or in other locations.

Only the COSTA *Master Agreement* stipulates the purpose of the evaluation process as to promote improvements. The Accreditation Survey identifies a serious deficiency in the effectiveness of the evaluations and their ability to bring about improvement in job performance. A very large percentage of all groups disagree that evaluations lead to improvement. It can be assumed that the perception is that in many cases evaluations are merely forms that must be completed. It is particularly troubling that the faculty evaluation procedure has been recently changed and still this perception persists. It must be noted that this statement does not distinguish between perceptions of the evaluations within a group (ex.: faculty have issues with faculty evaluations) or perceptions of evaluations of other groups (ex.: classified have issues with administrator evaluations).

Statement: There is a connection between evaluations and improvement in job performance.				
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Board
Great/Moderate Importance	88.9	84.6	96.1	100
Little/No Importance	5.5	15.4		
Do Not Know	5.6		3.9	
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Board
Strongly Agree/Agree	43.8	61.5	56.4	40.0
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	48.0	38.5	30.9	60.0
Do Not Know	8.2		12.7	

The criteria for evaluations are set out in forms used for each group. There have been some issues related to which criteria should be mandated in the evaluation process for faculty. One such area is the participation in institutional committees by faculty, which is not currently required. The Accreditation Survey assessed the perception of Faculty and Administrators on this subject. It should be noted that job announcements for faculty generally include in the description of the position "participation in the governance of the College by way of committee assignments…". As can be seen, the majority of faculty and administrators believe this is important and agree that it should be included in the evaluation of faculty members.

Statement: Faculty evaluations should include information on participation in institutional committees, councils, etc.		
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators
Great/Moderate Importance	68.1	91.7
Little/No Importance	27.7	8.3
Do Not Know	4.2	
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators
Strongly Agree/Agree	58.3	100
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	38.1	
Do Not Know	5.6	

Planning Agenda

1. Human Resources will work with the appropriate groups and develop Board Policies for the evaluation of confidential employees and administrators.

2. Academic Senate will review the evaluation process and content of faculty evaluations and make recommendations for changes that will reflect professional obligations, other than teaching, and will strengthen the connections between the evaluation and improvement in job performance.

3. CSEA will review the evaluation process and content for classified staff and make recommendations that will strengthen the connections between the evaluation and improvement in job performance.

4. The President's Cabinet will review the evaluation process and content for administrators and confidential employees and make recommendations that will strengthen the connections between the evaluation and improvement in job performance.

5. Human Resources will initiated a change in Board Policy 5070 to reflect the practice of evaluating tenured faculty once every three years.

c. Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes.

Description

The evaluation of faculty includes an evaluation of teaching methods, materials and effectiveness. Faculty are evaluated based on their ability to "assist students in attaining the learning goals of the course" (COSTA Master Agreement). Faculty are to develop specific goals and objectives for meeting the official course outlines and their success as an instructor should be judged on how they meet these specific goals and objectives.

Evaluation

The College does not meet this standard. The College is in the early stages of developing student learning outcomes. Identified student learning outcomes do not currently exist for all courses; and more importantly, there are no established assessment criteria to determine how well individual instructors are producing those learning outcomes.

Planning Agenda

1. The Academic Senate will make recommendations that incorporate the assessment of how effective the faculty are in achieving the student learning outcomes of their courses into their evaluation process.

d. The institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel.

Description

Within the *Personnel Policies for Management Council* is a "Statement of Ethics." This statement discusses: the definition of ethics, the importance of ethics and the District's expectations for ethical behavior. There is no information about whether the College upholds this policy.

A Statement of Professional Ethics was adopted by the Academic Senate and is published in the *General Catalog*. There is also a written policy on Academic Freedom. There is no information about whether the College upholds this statement.

There is no written code of ethics for classified personnel.

Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard. Written codes of professional ethics for administrators and faculty do exist however, there is no such policy for classified personnel. There is also no information as to whether these policies are upheld by the College or the respective constituencies.

Planning Agenda

1. CSEA will develop a written code of professional ethics for classified staff.

2. The institution maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution. The institution has a sufficient number of staff and administrators with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support the institution's mission and purposes.

Description

A comparison of numbers of types of personnel between Fall 2004 and Fall 1999 is shown in the Table below. There has been a decrease in full-time faculty and classified and an increase in part-time faculty and administrators.

	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty	Classified	Administrators
Fall 2004	157	284	191	30
Fall 1999	160	256	221	32
Percent Change	-1.25%	10.9%	-15.7%	7.1%

The College has generally maintained a high percentage of full-time faculty. In order to meet funding criteria by the State, the College will be hiring six new full-time faculty beginning Fall 2006. Full-time faculty positions were lost during the fiscal crisis the State and the College experienced several years ago.

Although the numbers indicate an overall increase in the number of administrators, this is somewhat deceiving. Some administrative positions were established because of grant requirements. In addition, some areas of the campus, most notably Academic Services, have lost administrators which have not been replaced.

The loss of classified personnel over the last several years has been the most severe. The impact of these reductions is dependent on the departments affected. The majority of these losses were due to not replacing retiring personnel during the time of fiscal constraints.

All personnel hired must meet the minimum qualifications for their respective positions. This includes educational background and work experience.

Evaluation

The College substantially meets this standard. There are sufficient numbers of full-time faculty. The sufficiency of administrative and classified personnel is problematic and area dependent. Some areas have sufficient staff, others may not.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

3. The institution systematically develops personnel policies and procedures that are available for information and review. Such policies and procedures are equitably and consistently administered.

Description

Board Policies related to Human Resources have been developed and approved periodically. Review of Board Policies in general begins in the area associated with the policy, in this case Human Resources. Policies are taken to the College Council for review and input. Some policies related to Human Resources must be reviewed and approved by the appropriate constituent groups (Academic Senate, COSTA, CSEA, COSAFA and Management Council). After approval by the above groups, policies then go to the Board of Trustees for final approval and adoption. All policies related to personnel are available on the College website.

Procedures related to Human Resources are developed in a similar manner. Most procedures are available on the College website. The exception is the *Personnel Policies for Management Council.* This publication is not available on the website. Current members of Management Council do have copies of this publication.

Each constituent group has a process by which they can protest if they feel a policy or procedure was not equitably applied in a particular instance. For those groups represented by bargaining units (COSTA, COSAFA, CSEA), there are formal grievance procedures. Administrators and Confidential employees have a procedure outlined in the *Personnel Policies for Management Council.*

Evaluation

The College substantially meets this standard. For those policies that exist, they are updated as required and available for information and review. One area of concern is the lack of availability of the *Personnel Policies for Management Council* to the College as a whole.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

a. The institution establishes and adheres to written policies ensuring fairness in all employment procedures.

Description

Board Policy 4000 is a policy on Equal Employment Opportunity. It was revised in November 2003. All job announcements contain an Equal Employment Opportunity statement. Human Resources Mission Statement includes a section stating their goal of "Ensuring compliance with Affirmative Action, equal opportunity and applicable legal mandates...". The Faculty Hiring Procedure includes sections on Affirmative Action and how it is to be applied during the hiring of faculty. Training for hiring committees in affirmative action is provided.

Job announcements are placed in a number of publications with the intent of reaching a diverse population (publications include: <u>Black Careers Now</u>, <u>Asian Pacific</u> and <u>Hispanic Hotline</u>).

The College has a Faculty & Staff Diversity Committee. The committee consists of administrators, faculty and staff.

All applicants that are interviewed are asked to fill out an exit survey in order to receive feedback on their perceptions of our procedures.

In addition to policies, unit contracts outline procedures to ensure fair treatment of their respective members. These include evaluation procedures, grievance procedures, and re-classification procedures

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. The policies and procedures in place ensure fairness.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

b. The institution makes provision for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Each employee has access to his/her personnel records in accordance with law.

Description

Personnel records are maintained in the Human Resources office. They are kept in locked cabinets in a separate room in the office. This room is also used for interviews and meetings.

Utilizing the Banner software, each employee has access to some of their personnel file. These include time sheets, benefits, tax information, addresses and phone numbers, and emergency contact information.

Additionally, pursuant to State law, employees have the right to inspect their personnel records maintained in the Human Resources Office.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

4. The institution demonstrates through policies and practices an appropriate understanding of and a concern for issues of equity and diversity.

Description

Within every job announcement it states "COS is an Equal Employment Opportunity Employer, committed to equal opportunity and treatment in all aspects of its relations with faculty, students and staff members, without regard to race, color, national and ethnic origin, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, religion, age or handicap." Additionally, this is stated within Board Policy 4000. The job announcement also includes a statement in the job description and desirable qualifications that applicants be willing to contribute and participate in creating and sustaining a "an atmosphere of equity, justice, and an appreciation for diversity ..."

Additionally, it is the practice of the Human Resources Office to train every hiring committee of its commitment to equity and diversity before all job applicant interviews.

And finally, there is a Faculty & Staff Diversity Committee.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

a. The institution creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support its diverse personnel

Description

The College understands the importance of promoting diversity on campus and in supporting its diverse personnel. The Human Resource Office encourages all hiring committees to include diverse members and provides some affirmative action training. Once hired, COS is also committed to supporting its diverse personnel. There exist many opportunities for employees to participate in activities for our diverse campus community. These include, but are not limited to, Multi-Cultural Fair, Cinco de Mayo, and Club Rush.

Evaluation

The College substantially meets this standard.

The Accreditation Survey identified that the vast majority of personnel believe that it is important that the College have these programs and nearly the same majority agree that the College achieves this goal.

Statement: Through programs, practices and services, an understanding and appreciation for diversity is promoted.				
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Board
Great/Moderate Importance	88.2	76.9	98.0	80.0
Little/No Importance	9.2	23.1	2.0	20.0
Do Not Know	2.6			
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Board
Strongly Agree/Agree	84.1	76.9	83.3	100
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	11.6	15.4	14.8	
Do Not Know	4.3	7.7	1.9	

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

b. The institution regularly assesses its records in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission.

Description

The diversity of the College personnel is tracked and reported to various campus groups. The makeup of college personnel is compared to the surrounding communities. While the diversity of college personnel does not exactly match the demographics of the District, the College has made improvements in the diverse makeup of its staff.

Demographics of College of the Sequoias Fall 2004 & Fall 2000

Category	Fall	Kings & Tulare County	Students	FT Faculty	PT Faculty	Classified	Administrators
American Indian	2004	0.9%	1.3%	1.3%	0.7%	3.7%	0.0%
	2000	0.9%	1.5%	0.5%			0.0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2004	3.2%	6.0%	3.2%	1.8%	5.6%	0.0%
	2000	3.3%	4.8%	2.9%			0.0%
Black	2004	3.0%	3.6%	5.1%	0.4%	0.0%	3.3%
	2000	3.2%	3.0%	(5.2%)			0.0%
Hispanic	2004	51.8%	42.6%	11.5%	9.9%	31.7%	23.3%
	2000	48.9%	40.4%	7.6%			25.9%
White	2004	39.2%	38.0%	79.0%	73.9%	59.0%	73.3%
	2000	42.5%	44.2%	83.7%			74.1%
Other/ Unknown	2004	8.4%	8.5%	0.0%	13.4%	0.0%	0.0%
	2000	1.2%	4.5%				
Male	2004		40.2%	50.3%	57.4%	32.3%	70.0%
	2000		40.8%	52.3%			59.3%
Female	2004		59.8%	49.7%	42.6%	67.7%	30.0%
	2000		59.2%	47.7%			40.7%

- County Data from Census/American Fact Finder
- Fall 2004 data source: IPEDS data for 2004-05
- Fall 2000 data source: Personnel Records; none available for PT Faculty or Classified

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. The institution remains committed to the promotion of diversity in its personnel and has achieved some success in regards to increasing the diversity of its personnel.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

c. The institution subscribes to, advocates, and demonstrates integrity in the treatment of its administration, faculty, staff and students.

Description

There are safeguards to ensure that all employees and students at COS are treated fairly. Within the *COSTA, CSEA and COSAFA Master Agreements* – employees are given certain rights to guarantee their fair treatment. Bargaining unit employees are provided representation throughout their careers at COS.

Administration is provided guarantees of equitable treatment – as contained in the *Personnel Policies for Management Council*.

Students are provided fair and equal treatment as outlined in the *Student Handbook*, which is maintained by Student Services.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. The policies and procedures are in place to safeguard all employees and students.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

5. The institution provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on identified teaching and learning needs.

a. The institution plans professional development activities to meet the needs of its personnel.

Description

Staff development activities have been reduced. In August of 2003, COSTA, the faculty association, and the District signed a MOU that limited mandatory Flex activity to two days/year, one each at the beginning of each term. Faculty are required to attend a campus-wide meeting, whose content is determined by the administration; and a Division Meeting. Previously, there

were five Flex days per year. Significant numbers of workshops were offered on campus, as well as a campus wide meeting with an invited speaker during the Flex days. In addition, State funding for faculty development has been eliminated in the last several years. In 2001-02 the College received $15,671 for faculty staff development and has received no funds since that time. Workshops are still offered on campus at various times throughout the academic year.

The Academic Senate has discussed the number of Flex days and has passed a resolution to increase the number to six days per year, or three per semester. This increase must now be negotiated by the faculty association.

Faculty continue to have access to funds in order to attend professional meetings. These funds are mandated by contract and are administered by the Division Chairs and Instructional Council. The procedures and guidelines for approval are developed and enforced by the Instructional Council. Each faculty member is allowed two conferences and a minimum of $200/year. The number of faculty that avail themselves of this opportunity varies from year to year. On average approximately 45 faculty attend conferences each year.

Faculty also have the ability to take sabbatical leaves. Faculty are eligible for sabbatical leaves after seven years of service and again once every seven years thereafter. Sabbatical leave requests are submitted to the Faculty Enrichment Committee. They recommend to the Superintendent/President proposals for approval. Sabbatical leaves were suspended for two years during a fiscal crisis. They have been reinstituted beginning Spring 2006. Faculty have been required to make presentations to the Board of Trustees upon completion of their leaves.

Classified employees are afforded personal growth through PACE, Professional Association of Classified Employees. Classified employees have development activities planned for and implemented by the PACE committee. In accordance with their Master Agreement, Classified employees are periodically asked to participate in district-sponsored training or to attend conferences. CSEA provides scholarships of $250 for its members to further their education

As outlined in the *Personnel Policies for Management Council*, Administrators are afforded the opportunity to attend conferences relevant to their job duties. However, funds for attendance and getting time off from campus duties can be problematic.

In addition, the College has arranged for allowing all staff at COS to take courses at COS at no expense to the employees. These procedures were implemented Spring 2006.

Evaluation

The College substantially meets this standard. There are opportunities for professional development for all employees.

However, the Accreditation Survey identifies significant dissatisfaction by faculty and administrators regarding their professional development opportunities. Whether or not the return to increased number of Flex days will alleviate this dissatisfaction remains to be seen. It is also possible that this dissatisfaction is related to the increased costs of attending professional conferences and the perception that $200/year is not a sufficient amount of funds.

Statement: The institution provides appropriate professional development opportunities.				
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Board
Great/Moderate Importance	92.3	91.7	98.0	100
Little/No Importance	3.9	8.3		
Do Not Know	3.8		2.0	
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Board
Strongly Agree/Agree	31.2	7.7	55.6	60.0
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	61.0	84.6	38.8	20.0
Do Not Know	7.8	7.7	5.6	20.0

Planning Agenda

1. The Academic Senate, PACE and the Management Council will research the professional development needs of their relative constituencies to better understand the source of dissatisfaction and then make recommendations on improving professional development opportunities.

b. With the assistance of the participants, the institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

Description

Previously, Flex workshops would be evaluated by the attendees. The results were reviewed by the Faculty Enrichment Committee. The Faculty Enrichment Committee was responsible for overseeing and developing the Flex schedule of workshops and events. The committee had representatives from every division. The committee was disbanded for a couple of years because of the loss of staff development funds, the loss of sabbatical leaves and the loss of reassigned time for the chair of this committee. This committee has begun its work again with the reappearance of sabbatical leaves

There are no current evaluations of professional development opportunities being conducted. This includes all aspects of professional development: sabbatical leaves, professional conferences, on-campus activities and Flex meetings at the beginning of the semesters.

Evaluation

The College does not currently meet this standard. When there were Flex workshops, evaluations were conducted and results evaluated in an attempt to provide quality development opportunities for faculty. However, no current systematic review of developmental opportunities is being conducted.

Planning Agenda

1. See planning agenda 1 in standard III.A.5.a.

6. Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of human resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

Description

Planning for human resources occurs in all areas during the process of Program Review. Areas evaluate their needs and justify requests based on their findings. Requests for additional personnel are submitted to the appropriate committees for review and recommendation.

Faculty positions are taken to Instructional Council. Based on established and published criteria, Instructional Council ranks the faculty positions requested from divisions. Their recommendations are forwarded to the College Council. The College Council may alter the recommendations, which are then sent to the President's Cabinet for final review and recommendations. The number of positions finally approved is based on requirements for full-time/part-time faculty ratios as set by the State and by available funding.

Most classified positions and administrative positions identified in Program Review documents are presented to the College Council for review and recommendations. These recommendations are forwarded to the President's Cabinet for final approval. The number of the positions hired is determined by available funding.

Unplanned changes in Human Resources do occur because of resignations, grants, extended illnesses, etc. In these instances, the appropriate Dean for the area affected consults with the personnel from the affected program or service. Based on that consultation and the overall needs of the College, a recommendation regarding replacement of the lost personnel is made to the President's Cabinet for their consideration.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. The use of Program Review as a source for all personnel requests ensure that decisions are made in light of program need and in the context of needs in other programs and services.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

Documentation

1. Accreditation Survey Results

2. Board of Trustees Policy Manual

3. Student Handbook

4. Faculty Job Descriptions

5. Equivalency Procedure & Forms

6. Faculty Hiring Screening Forms

7. Classified Job Descriptions

8. Administrator Job Descriptions

9. COSTA Master Agreement

10. CSEA Master Agreement

11. Evaluation Documents for Employee Groups

12. Personnel Policies for Management Council

13. Statement of Professional Ethics – Faculty

14. Faculty & Staff Diversity Committee Minutes

15. Faculty Conference Procedure and Forms

16. Sabbatical Leave Requests

17. Request for Replacement/New Faculty Forms and Criteria

Standard III: Resources

B. Physical Resources

Physical resources, which include facilities, equipment, land, and other assets, support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.

1. The institution provides safe and sufficient physical resources that support and assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services, regardless of location or means of delivery.

<u>Description</u>

The size of the facilities is a major aspect of the physical resources of the college. The College of the Sequoias currently has 510,270 gross square feet of buildings that the district owns or leases. This represents an increase from 410,632 gross square feet in 2001-02. The College also offers classes at facilities that are under the management of other agencies. These include area high schools, the Tulare County Department of Education, a senior center and an art center.

One method to measure sufficiency is the use of the formulas developed by the Chancellor's Office. The Capacity/Load ratio is the primary mechanism employed to determine if a college's space is adequate and/or if they are eligible to request funds for buildings. Ratios over 100% are deemed under utilized and those under 100% could qualify the college for additional square footage. For 2004-05, COS under utilized lecture spaces (103%) and office spaces (111%). The laboratory spaces (87%), library spaces (65%) and AV/TV spaces (24%) all indicate the need for additional room.

The Chief of Campus Police is the Safety Officer. Unsafe conditions are reported to that office. Depending on the nature of the condition, Campus Police may be dispatched, the maintenance department may be notified, or the matter may be referred to the Institutional Facilities Committee for evaluation and recommendations.

The Facilities Office reviews all Program Reviews produced on campus to identify maintenance or safety issues. If the identified problems are not major projects, then they are assigned to the appropriate personnel for completion. Major projects that require additional funding are handled by the Above Base Budget request mechanism.

The college has recently added significantly to its ability to offer distance education classes. As stated in previous sections (II.C), the LRC has a classroom outfitted for distance education classes. In addition, grant money provided funding for the addition of another distance education room in the Instructional Media Center.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard as it relates to sufficiency of physical resources. The size of the facilities is adequate to allow the functioning of all programs and services. The State formulas indicate sufficient spaces for lecture and offices and a shortage of laboratory, library and AV/TV spaces. These represent a global evaluation and do not take into account spaces allocated for specific programs and services and whether or not they are adequate for the program or service that uses them. Spaces under utilized by programs or services can hinder the ability of the district to qualify for additional buildings.

The college meets the standard as it relates to safety of the physical resources. A review of the accidental injury reports for the last several years indicates a decrease and leveling off from a high of 23 in 2001. During this time the college has increased in physical size, and in the number of students and staff members using the facilities.

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Accident Reports	16	23	13	12	13

Another measure of safety was identified in the Program Review survey conducted by Facilities Services. The survey asked a question that relates to safety on campus: "How do you feel about exterior lighting at COS?" Of the 353 respondents, 27.8% gave this a grade of A or B, 41.9% gave it a grade of C and 24% gave it a grade of D or F.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

a. The institution plans, builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services.

Description

Programs and services within the college evaluate their physical resources during their Program Review cycle. They identify facility issues including sufficiency of space and maintenance requirements. Requests of maintenance and upgrades/remodels are submitted through the funding mechanism of the College Council. The College Council determines the funding recommendations for these projects. The same process is used in evaluating equipment within each program and service. Whether these projects and requests are completed also depends on the funding available. Projects/requests can be highly recommended, but without sufficient funding, they are not accomplished. Projects have stayed on the list for years before being funded. Sometimes requests that were less expensive were completed prior to more expensive projects that were higher on the recommendation list. Equipment requests are divided into two categories, Instructional Equipment and Non-instructional Equipment. Instructional equipment funds

received from the State are used to fund the prioritized list of equipment requests. Generally, the requests were funded down the list until the funds were expended. In years when there was substantial funding, most requests were funded. In years with little funding, few requests were funded. Non-instructional equipment requests are funded from the general fund. There has not been a set amount allocated to fund these requests. Instead, the requests have been prioritized and then awaited a decision by the President's Cabinet on how much funding to allocate to this endeavor. In recent years, this has been zero. In an attempt to help areas purchase their own equipment, the District has allowed supply money to be carried forward to the next fiscal year in an attempt to get enough funds together to make the necessary purchases.

Program Reviews provide the basis for the *Educational Master Plan* of the college, including the physical resources that are needed. Capital outlay projects, such as new buildings, are identified based on the *Educational Master Plan*. However, the California Community College system guidelines must validate the need based on their formulas. These formulas do not take into account the age of the buildings or the changes in programs and instructional methods. In addition to Capacity/Load ratios, the State formulas currently include the ability of the District to supplement funding of new facilities with local bond monies. COS has been unable to pass local bond measures.

COS has attempted three times to pass local bond measures to fund additional facilities at the Visalia campus, the Tulare Center and the Hanford Center. Two of the attempts were prior to the changing of the law requiring a two thirds majority to pass local bonds; the third attempt was under the new provision of needing only 55%. Unfortunately, with each attempt, there was a decrease in the overall percentage of votes for approval of the bonds. While outlying areas voted in favor of the bond measures, the residents of the City of Visalia did not. Given the formulas in place at the Chancellor's Office, COS is at an extreme disadvantage in further attempts to qualify for building funds.

The process of identifying a need and working through the system can be illustrated with the Nursing and Allied Health Building. The needs of the program for additional spaces were identified in 2002. The State formulas concurred with the need and a Final Project Proposal has been submitted that would allow the program to double in size. Faculty from the program were included and consulted throughout the planning process to ensure that the spaces planned fit the needs of their program.

The District has received funding to construct a new Science Building. However, the building has been delayed because all bids came in significantly over budget. The lag time between submittal of a proposed building and the funding of that building is substantial and the increase of building costs over the last several years has far exceeded anything that could have been foreseen. The building has been "value engineered" and is still over budget. The Board of Trustees has voted to sell land owned by the District in order to make up the short fall. Construction began in 2006.

Another example of planning and improving physical resources can be seen in the new Student Center. The Student Center was opened in Fall 2005. In addition to the Associated Student

Body offices and student lounge, the Student Center houses the campus Bookstore, Student Health Center and a student-run branch of a local credit union. The Student Center is housed in the remodeled Library building. The Student Center was planned in collaboration with the ASB. Students voted on and approved the Student Center in Spring 2003. This approval (72% of the vote) included a student fee that started being assessed in Fall 2003. The student fee ($1/unit to a maximum of $5) is helping to cover the costs of the re-modeling of the building. The Bookstore also contributed to the costs.

Evaluation

The College substantially meets this standard as it relates to planning and building physical resources. The college has been successful in the recent past in receiving State funding for additional buildings. The process of planning ensures the integration of the facilities with the Educational Master Plan and the full participation of those who will be housed in those facilities. However, the College has struggled with the increasing costs of building and maintenance at a time when fiscal resources on campus and from the State have been reduced.

The College meets the standard as it relates to maintaining, upgrading or replacing its physical resources in that there exist processes by which programs and services can request these actions. However, the ability of programs and services to accomplish this is necessarily impacted by the funding available for each of these endeavors. The Facilities Department budget was reduced by $489,000 in 2002-03 compared to the previous year's budget (total $4,144,691). This funding level has not been restored as of Fall 2005. During this same period, additional buildings have been added to the campus and overhead costs, such as electricity, gas and cleaning supplies are continuing to increase. In addition, there has been no funding for facility remodel/upgrade requests since that time. Previously, there was approximately $200,000 allocated annually for those requests. During the State financial crisis in 2002-03, individual programs and services were also asked to cut the base budgets for supplies and maintenance by 25%. These funds have not been restored as of Fall 2005. Funds for equipment requests, especially non-instructional equipment, have been sporadic at best and non-existent at worst.

The Accreditation Survey assessed the perception of the campus constituencies as to the maintenance of the facilities as shown below. The rating of the importance was nearly 100%. However, the agreement levels indicate some concerns about the maintenance and effective operation.

Statement: Facilities are maintained and operated effectively in support of programs and services.				
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Board
Great/Moderate Importance	100	100	98	100
Little/No Importance			2	
Do Not Know				
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Board
Strongly Agree/Agree	67.6	100	77.8	100
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	28.6		20.4	
Do Not Know	3.9		1.9	

During the last Program Review cycle (2002-03), Facilities Services surveyed students, faculty, staff and community members. Several questions relate to the ability of the existing facilities to support the integrity and quality of the services provided and to whether that are being properly maintained.

Question	% A , B	% C	% D ,F
How do you feel about the condition of the grounds at COS?	59.6	30.5	8.7
How do you feel about the condition of the public areas in your building?	29.1	48.7	19.2
How do you feel about the condition of the classrooms/office you are in?	36.8	40.8	20.1

These questions also indicate some dissatisfaction with the facilities. However, these questions do not differentiate between problems due to maintenance and problems due to the age of the buildings.

The Accreditation Survey also asked students and classified staff to rate the sufficiency of equipment. As indicated in the table below, there is a significant dissatisfaction with equipment levels. While this question does not differentiate between instructional and non-instructional equipment, it can be reasonably assumed that Students were referring to instructional equipment, since that is what they would be utilizing. The lack of funds for non-instructional equipment would likewise disproportionately affect classified staff.

Statement: There is sufficient equipment to support programs and services.		
Level of Importance	Students	Classified
Great/Moderate Importance	80.2	94
Little/No Importance	7.9	
Do Not Know	12	6
Level of Agreement	Students	Classified
Strongly Agree/Agree	59.3	52.8
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	23.9	35.9
Do Not Know	16.8	11.3

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

b. The institution assures that physical resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and services are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment.

Description

As stated previously, Program Review offers programs and services the opportunity to identify facility issues with regard to access, safety and a healthful environment. The Institutional Facilities Committee, a standing committee of the College Council, is responsible for examining and making recommendations of campus-wide facility issues, including those covered in this standard. The Facilities Committee has representatives from all constituent groups and meets on a regular basis. An example of an issue they have been studying is the location of designated smoking areas on campus. To that end they researched the applicable laws, conducted a campus survey and made a recommendation to the College Council.

The DRC oversees compliance of the district with the American Disabilities Act. Access to facilities at the Visalia campus has been improved with the addition of an elevator in the Administration Building which allows access to classrooms and services on the second floor of that building. In addition, automatic doors have been installed in nearly all buildings.

Safety is maintained at the Visalia campus and the Farm by Campus Police. Employees of the Visalia campus are instructed to contact Campus Police in the case of any emergency. Campus Police then make a determination if any additional response from outside agencies is warranted. There are a number of buildings and rooms that are equipped with burglar alarms. Patrol of the Hanford Center by Campus Police was eliminated in 2004 and personnel at that location have been instructed to contact Kings County Sheriff's Department in the case of an emergency. The fire alarm system on the Visalia campus is not connected to the city's fire department. Personnel from the college must call the local fire department to elicit a response.

An Emergency Plan is in the process of being modified and updated by the Institutional Facilities Committee. The plan was originally taken from another institution and must now be altered to reflect the infrastructure and personnel responsibilities at this institution. The Emergency Plan will then go to the College Council for review and recommendation.

Periodically, there is a survey and identification of hazardous materials that must be properly disposed of. The Safety Officer is responsible for this process and for identifying the appropriate agencies to eliminate the materials. There is an allocation of funds to cover these costs.

In order to address maintenance issues in a timelier manner, the Facilities Office has instituted a computerized, web-based work order system. Any member of the campus community can report any maintenance problems that affect the working and learning environment around them. While the number of work orders has not changed significantly (929/6 months prior to new system, and 918/6 months with the new system), there has been a reduction in processing time of requests and more efficiency in assignment to the appropriate personnel for completion. Work orders are also no longer lost in the mail and the person requesting work receives an e-mail confirming the generation of the work order.

Issues of access, safety and security at locations not under the control of COS are reported to the appropriate administrator, who then contacts the persons responsible for those sites.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard in all respects. The processes and personnel exist to ensure continued adherence to this standard.

The Emergency Plan, once completed, will fill a gap in the preparedness of the College. However, it is essential that this plan receive wide distribution and that the appropriate personnel receive whatever training is necessary to ensure the success of the plans in an actual emergency.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

2. To assure the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services, the institution plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account.

Description

The College Council, along with its standing committees, is responsible for providing the global perspective in planning for the Institution. Proposals for additional buildings, for re-modeling and upgrading existing buildings and for the purchase of new/replacement equipment are all brought

to the College Council. With representatives from each constituency, these governance committees make recommendations to the President's Cabinet about all of these physical resource issues.

Each program and service is responsible for evaluating its physical resources during Program Review. During this process the programs are provided with appropriate data regarding their programs to help them in evaluating their needs. For example, divisions are provided with WSCH/Load information for the last several years and student service areas receive the number of students they served. The Educational Master Plan, which is derived from the Program Reviews, drives the 5 Year Construction Plan which is updated every year.

The Director of Facilities and Facilities Planning has conducted several meetings in which all campus constituents were invited to attend and participate. During these meetings the facilities plans were described, including potential funding sources, and questions and input were encouraged.

The College does not formally evaluate individual room utilization. Classroom utilization is determined by scheduling which is done within each division. In Fall 2005, a committee was established to look at how to increase the number of courses being taught by the College. This committee, the FTES Committee, is looking at numerous ways to increase offerings, including how classrooms are utilized.   How they will evaluate utilization and what the outcomes of that evaluation will be, is not known at this time.

Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard. The Program Review mechanism provides each area the method and the forum to evaluate their physical resources, including both facilities and equipment. The College Council and its Institutional Standing Committees are charged with making recommendations regarding physical resources to the President's Cabinet. The practice of the Director of Facilities and Facilities Planning of conducting campus-wide meetings to discuss the facility plans for the College and the District ensures adequate opportunity by all members of the campus to have input into those plans and to question them.

The College does not meet the standard with regard to evaluating classroom utilization (see III.B.2.b)

Planning Agenda

1. The Facilities Office will work with Academic Services to develop a method by which effective classroom utilization can be assessed

a. Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment.

Description

The College ensures that the plans support the programs and services offered by the Institution by using Program Review as the basis for planning, by offering additional opportunities for input by the campus personnel and by gathering input from the community.   The Program Reviews provide the basis for the *Educational Master Plan* which, in turn, drives the Facilities Master Plan. Community input is gathered at meetings with County Boards of Supervisors, with local City Councils, and with service organizations. The development of facilities in Tulare and Hanford are identified in the *Educational Master Plan.*

Total cost of ownership includes cost of maintenance, cost of personnel (certificated and classified) to utilize the space, and cost of utilities to run the additional spaces. Additional FTES generated by the new spaces offsets and helps fund the total cost of ownership. Additional square footage at the main campus and the Tulare Center qualifies the District for additional maintenance funding from the State according to a set formula.

Facilities' planning has included integrating new building plans to existing infrastructure in order to reduce the overall cost of utilities. In addition, in the last five years an energy management system has been installed in many buildings which allow individualized climate control in occupied rooms. This computer-based system allows facilities personnel access to the system from any computer connected to the Internet. The system is 20% more efficient that the previous energy management system. These savings are being put back into the maintenance budget. In addition, the system has qualified the District for $25,000 in rebates when building the Science building.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. The College has a planning process that ensures adequate input from the campus constituencies and the surrounding communities. The total cost of ownership is evaluated and taken into account during the planning process.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

b. Physical resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of physical resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

Description

Physical resource planning is integrated into institutional planning by relying on Program Reviews and by utilizing the established governance structures to recommend funding. The College

Council along with two of its standing committees, Institutional Planning Committee and Institutional Facilities Committee, are the governance structures most involved with facility planning.

An example of using evaluation to make needed improvements is illustrated in the 2002-03 Program Review of Facility Services. The comprehensive survey done during the Program Review identified two main problems across campus; clocks not telling the correct time and cleanliness issues in the restrooms. As a result of these findings, a new system of clocks was installed and personnel were shifted to clean restrooms during the day.

As stated above, the College has historically not evaluated classroom utilization. Classrooms have been "assigned" to divisions. Those divisions schedule their classes into those rooms. Once the initial scheduling is done, other divisions may place classes in any available rooms. Certain rooms are required by specific courses because of the need for specific equipment and resources available in those rooms. Examples would be science laboratories and physical education areas (weight room, dance studio). The desire by faculty and students for courses scheduled in the morning and for fewer days per week, has resulted in substantial vacancy of classrooms in the mid to late afternoon and on Fridays. Some divisions have attempted to capitalize on this and offered classes that meet all day on Friday.

Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard.

The College meets this standard in that processes exist to integrate physical resource planning into institutional planning. The use of Program Review reports to identify needs in all program areas of the college assures all areas an equal opportunity to evaluate their physical resources and to make necessary requests. The program areas are in the best position to analyze their resources and determine if they are sufficient. The cycle of yearly program review updates and the 5-year cycle of full Program Review reports is a systematic approach to planning, assessing and improving. The limitations to this system are because of lack of consistent funding sources. In addition, the process relies on the thoroughness of the program or service in evaluating their physical resources.

The College does not meet this standard in regards to systematic evaluation of effective utilization of classrooms. While some data is available regarding room occupancy, evaluation of efficiency has not been done. An example of lack of efficient use of a classroom would be to have courses that enroll only 25 students in a classroom that holds 35 students. The practice of assigned classrooms to divisions, while helping in the scheduling process, may not allow the most efficient use of these physical resources. The lack of evaluation of classroom utilization means the College has no concrete information on the effective use of these physical resources. The FTES Committee may develop an evaluation protocol and may provide recommendations as to how the College can better evaluate classroom utilization. The Accreditation Survey indicates that significant numbers of both faculty and administrators believe that these physical resources are not being used

efficiently. In order to provide courses for our growing student body, this problem will need to be addressed.

Statement: Classroom facilities are used efficiently.			
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Students
Great/Moderate Importance	94.9	100	84.1
Little/No Importance	5.01		8.5
Do Not Know			7.4
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Students
Strongly Agree/Agree	55.7	50.0	76.8
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	36.7	50.0	13.3
Do Not Know	7.6		9.9

Planning Agenda

1. See planning agenda 1 in standard III.B.2.

Documentation

1. Program Review Reports

2. Educational Master Plan

3. Five-year Facilities Master Plan

4. Accreditation Survey Results

5. Facilities Program Review Report

6. CCC Capacity/Load for COS

7. Institutional Facilities Committee Minutes

8. Emergency Plan

Standard III: Resources

C. Technology Resources

Technology resources are used to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning.

1. *The institution assures that any technology support it provides is designed to meet the needs of learning, teaching, college-wide communications, research, and operational systems.*

<u>Description</u>

The technology needs of the various departments on campus are identified during their Program Review. During that process, the members of that department determine what technology they require to meet their needs. These needs would include computer software and hardware, multi-media equipment, as well as the campus infrastructure to support them. Identification of technology needs for learning and teaching would occur in the Program Reviews of the academic divisions and the library and learning resources areas. Identification of technology needs related to operational systems of the College would occur in Computer Services Program Review.

The responsibility for technology at COS falls under two different administrators. The Director Learning Resources and Technology oversees the Learning Resource Center, including all of its services and programs, distance education and Instructional Media Services. The Dean of Computer Services is responsible for overseeing the technology of non-academic areas (Student Services, Administrative Services, etc.) and the operational systems used by the entire College. In addition, the majority of computer technicians responsible for maintaining computers across campus are directed by the Dean of Computer services.

The Institutional Technology Committee, a standing committee of the College Council, is charged with making recommendations to the College Council on technology issues. This committee has developed a *Technology Plan 2.0*, which was accepted by the College Council. Among other things, this plan has set standards for computer and software systems to ensure uniform compatibility across campus. The primary focus of this committee is the technology related to teaching and learning.

The commitment of the College to meet the technology needs of its departments can be seen in the process followed when a new computer software system for the College, Banner, was selected. In order to determine the best software system to purchase, a committee was formed with representatives from across the campus. They worked together to develop an RFP that identified all of the various requirements of the campus community. They were responsible for evaluating the proposals and making a recommendation on which system to purchase. During their evaluations, they invited faculty, administrators and staff to attend presentations and submit their own evaluations of the software. Every attempt was made to get as much input as possible during

this process. Ironically, the committee was deadlocked on the final choice, and the Dean of Computer Services made the final recommendation.

Evaluation

The College substantially meets this standard. The identification of technology needs is the responsibility of those who will use those technologies since they are in the best position to evaluate what technology they require and the best way to meet those needs. At the same time the Institutional Technology Committee, working with the Director of Learning Resources and Technology has set standards in an attempt to provide adequate technology and at the same time have compatibility amongst the technology utilized by different departments. This has also made it easier for Computer Services to keep the systems updated and repaired.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

a. Technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are designed to enhance the operation and effectiveness of the institution.

Description

The Computer Services department is responsible for operation and maintenance of campus computers, including the mainframes, faculty and staff computers, and all instructional computers in various departments and the Learning Resource Center (LRC). This staff is also responsible for maintaining the college website and all software on campus, from Banner to word processing packages, to the Outlook e-mail system. They manage the site licenses for software, install software, upgrade and troubleshoot all software packages. In addition, they are responsible for the necessary wiring of classrooms, offices and laboratories for connectivity to the Internet.

These responsibilities have been consolidated within this department over the last several years. Previously, certain departments had their own computer technicians which were responsible for only the computers and software of that area. As the number of computers grew and the diversity of software emerged, it became apparent that this organization was not efficient. And while some technicians may still be housed within a department, their oversight and duties are assigned by the centralized Computer Services department.

The development of the *Technology Plan 2.0* has also increased efficiency because it has standardized computer and software purchases for different levels of users. For example, a computer which will be used primarily for word processing and connection to the Internet need not be as advanced as a computer which will be used to develop graphic designs.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. The centralization of the responsibility for maintenance of computers is an example of the College's commitment to enhancing the operation and effectiveness of these services.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

b. The institution provides quality training in the effective application of its information technology to students and personnel.

Description

Computer Services is responsible for providing training to faculty and staff in the Banner software system. As a part of the implementation of Banner, an individual knowledgeable in Banner was hired to provide training sessions to all faculty and staff. In addition, training manuals were developed for the different modules of Banner. Faculty and staff were required to attend those training sessions relevant to the use of Banner in their respective jobs.

Training in other software systems is not universally available. Previously, when there were more Flex days, workshops in using software were offered on a regular basis each term. While there may be a software workshop offered occasionally, there are no regular workshops offered. Coupled with the lack of manuals, since most software systems have gone to help systems as a part of the software, it is not always easy to find the answer to a question or problem related to software. Faculty and staff can take courses at the College and the tuition and related fees are waived. This can allow staff to update their skills in job related software, such as Outlook and Excel.

Computer Services staff does help with some other software training; primarily the necessary training for maintaining web pages on the campus website. However, this training may consist only of instruction sheets with a follow-up for trouble-shooting any problems the staff member is having.

Training of students in information technology is accomplished in several different ways. Students can take classes offered in various software systems in several different divisions; including the Agriculture, Business, Industry and Technology, and the Mathematics and Engineering divisions. The LRC also offers courses on information technology (see II.C). In addition, students get instruction from their instructors on how to use course-specific software. This training occurs in a wide variety of courses and divisions, from nutrition courses to science courses.

Evaluation

The College only partially meets this standard. The training for the Banner modules has been sufficient and is on-going. There is also ample opportunity for students to acquire the training they require to use various information technology systems and software.

However, the training for staff in software, other than Banner, is sparse at best. The Accreditation Survey indicated close to fifty percent of the groups surveyed disagree that training is sufficient. This is a serious deficiency that the College needs to address in order to have the most productivity from its personnel.

Statement: There is sufficient training in technology applications available.			
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified
Great/Moderate Importance	85.9	100	92.3
Little/No Importance	11.5		3.9
Do Not Know	2.6		3.8
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified
Strongly Agree/Agree	50.0	53.8	37.0
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	41.0	46.2	46.3
Do Not Know	9.0		16.7

Planning Agenda

1. The Institutional Technology Committee will research the training needs of each constituent group and make recommendations to the College Council on how to meet those needs. The Institutional Technology Committee will coordinate and work with the Academic Senate, PACE and the Management Council as they research the professional development opportunities their constituents need (see planning agenda 1 in standard III.A.5.a.).

c. The institution systematically plans, acquires, maintains, and upgrades or replaces technology infrastructure and equipment to meet institutional needs.

Description

Technology resource planning occurs at different levels. Computer Services is responsible for planning as it relates to the mainframe and institutional software package, Banner. The departments and programs are responsible for planning as it relates to their technology resource needs during their Program Reviews. The requests for technology resources are presented to the College Council which is responsible for making recommendations to the President's Cabinet on which requests should be funded. The Institutional Technology Committee advises the College Council on issues related to technology resources.

The acquisition of technology resources for new, up-graded or replacement technology is dependent upon available financial resources. Instructional equipment funds from the State are used to purchase computers and software for use in classrooms and laboratories and for faculty computers. The purchase of technology resources for non-instructional uses is dependent upon the allocation of financial resources from the general fund of the College. In years where the instructional equipment funds from the State were ample and the general fund healthy, technology resource purchases were adequate. However, these funds have been limited or non-existent in the last several years, especially for non-instructional purchases.

The *Technology Plan 2.0* calls for systematic replacement of all technology resources according to a timetable. In order to accomplish this, the Plan recommends that the College set aside funds from its general fund as a line-item in the budget. This has not been done. During the development of the *Technology Plan 2.0* the Institutional Technology Committee conducted several campus-wide surveys of the technology resources in place and the age of these resources.

When computers are purchased, the computers that they are replacing are sometimes re-allocated to other areas that are in need of additional resources or whose resources are older and out of date compared to the "hand-me-down" computers. Some computers removed from service are stored against some future need or are scavenged for usable parts by Computer Services.

The maintenance of existing technology resources is the responsibility of Computer Services. Maintenance can be requested by notifying the computer "Helpdesk" by phone or by e-mail. A work order is generated by that request and assigned to a technician. E-mail confirmation of the work order is sent to the requesting party. When the maintenance has been completed, or the problem solved, an e-mail is again sent to the requesting party. There was some dissatisfaction when the Helpdesk was initially instituted. The name implied that if you called the phone number, you would get help with a computer problem, including questions about how to use software. The phone was answered by a student worker who could only say a work order would be generated.

Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard. There exists systematic planning for technology resources. The College also has a mechanism in place, the Helpdesk, to provide needed maintenance of the technology resources.

However, the College does not systematically acquire, upgrade and/or replace technology resources. The Accreditation Survey indicates a strong dissatisfaction in this area. Over forty percent of faculty and administrators disagree that the College is accomplishing this.

Statement: Technology resources are maintained, upgraded and replaced systematically.		
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators
Great/Moderate Importance	93.6	100
Little/No Importance	3.8	
Do Not Know	2.6	
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators
Strongly Agree/Agree	51.3	46.2
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	41.0	46.1
Do Not Know	7.7	7.7

Although the *Technology Plan 2.0* has been developed, the College has not found the funds to implement this plan.

Planning Agenda

1. The Institutional Technology Committee will review their plans for systematic replacement of technology resources and make any necessary modifications. The Institutional Technology Committee will then work with the Institutional Budget Committee to develop recommendations to the College Council on the methods by which these plans can be implemented in a realistic and on-going fashion.

d. The distribution and utilization of technology resources support the development, maintenance, and enhancement of its programs and services.

Description

The distribution of technology is primarily determined by the Program Review process, because programs and services must request funding for the initial purchase of the technology resources. The requests include a justification about how the technology will be used and why it is needed. Such factors as the age (or existence) of current technology, the critical nature of the technology to the course goals (or service operation), and the number of students that will be served are a few of the factors that are looked at in making recommendations. The recommendation processes of the College Council determine the rank order of the requests, but the number of items funded and the final rank order is determined mostly by the President's Cabinet. As mentioned previously, instructional equipment funds from the State vary from year to year. The availability of funds for non-instructional equipment is spotty at best. Categorical funds and grant monies have also been used to purchase some technology resources for both instructional and non-instructional uses.

When there have been additional technology resources available because of the purchase of new technology, these resources are distributed by Computer Services.

<u>Evaluation</u>

The College partially meets this standard. The Program Review process and the requests generated by them provide the mechanism for programs and services to have technology resources (distribution). In addition, re-cycled or used technology resources are distributed by Computer Services as they become available.

The activity of the Institutional Technology Committee has been reduced in recent years. This reduction in activity coincided with a turnover of membership. In addition, Computer Services was without the services of their Dean who was called up to active duty in the Middle East for a year's tour of duty during 2005.

The Accreditation Survey identified a significant number of classified staff do not agree that there are sufficient technology resources to support their programs and services, while there are nearly twenty percent of students that disagree that they have sufficient technology resources. It is likely that one reason the classified staff had a higher level of disagreement is that much more of their technology resources are dependent on general funds and categorical funds. Both of these sources of funding have been severely limited in the last several years. Because staff require the use of technology resources to accomplish their jobs, this lack in technology is something they must struggle with daily.

Statement: There are sufficient technology resources to support programs and services.		
Level of Importance	Students	Classified
Great/Moderate Importance	83.5	92.2
Little/No Importance	6.5	
Do Not Know	10.0	7.8
Level of Agreement	Students	Classified
Strongly Agree/Agree	67.9	61.1
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	18.4	31.5
Do Not Know	13.7	7.4

<u>Planning Agenda</u>

1. See planning agenda 1 in standard III.C.1.c.

2. Technology planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of technology resources and uses the results of evaluation as the basis for improvement.

Description

As mentioned previously (III.C.1.c), technology resource planning occurs at different levels. All technology requests that arise out of planning during the Program Review process are sent to College Council. They receive information from the Institutional Technology Committee to help them make their recommendations to the President's Cabinet. In this way, technology resource planning is integrated into institutional planning.

The assessment of the effective use of technology is a responsibility of the programs and services during their Program Review. Program Review has as its focus the improvement of all programs and services, including any technology resources used. The Institutional Technology Committee, through its surveys, has also assessed some aspects of effective utilization. Their assessment was part of the impetus to consolidate all technicians into one department. The *Technology Plan 2.0* was designed to maximize the effective use of technology across campus.

Evaluation

The College substantially meets this standard. The mechanisms exist to plan for technology resources and all planning is coordinated through College Council and its standing committees.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

Documentation

1. Program Review Reports

2. Technology Plan 2.0

3. Technology Plan 1.0

4. College Council Minutes

5. Accreditation Survey Results

6. Institutional Technology Committee Minutes

7. Computer Services Program Review

Standard III: Resources

D. Financial Resources

Financial resources are sufficient to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. The distribution of resources supports the development, maintenance, and enhancement of programs and services. The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability. The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency. Financial resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.

1. The institution relies upon its mission and goals as the foundation for financial planning.

Description

Financial planning has two aspects, income and expenditures. The College's 2005 budget expenditures were approximately $47,300,000 consisting of 83% for personnel costs (salaries and benefits), 12.6% for supplies and services, and 4.5% for other areas, including discretionary spending. The Preliminary Budget is developed by the Vice President of Administrative Services and the President's Cabinet in May and is presented to the Board of Trustees in June. During this time, the Institutional Budget Committee is kept informed on the status of the budget. This budget projects income and expenditures for the next fiscal year. This includes a projection of the FTES generated by the College along with other potential impacts on the budget, such as: equalization, salary and benefits changes, and new hiring. The Final Budget goes to the Board in September for approval. The Final Budget and pertinent material used to develop the budget are published in the *Budget Book*.

Financial planning occurs at several different levels of the College. Individual departments, programs and divisions use the Program Review process as the focus of their financial planning. During Program Review, these programs evaluate their needs in all areas, including financial needs. Funds for supplies, equipment and personnel are requested and justified at this time. Program Review at these levels is based on the Mission and goals of the College and the goals of the individual programs. However, the funds available for these requests are determined by the VP of Administrative Services and the President's Cabinet.

The shared governance structures of the College Council are also involved in financial planning. This group, with representatives from all campus constituencies, makes recommendations to the Superintendent/President about funding allocations for Above-Base Budget monies. They have no involvement with the development of any other area of the budget.

The VP of Administrative Services has been conducting budget reviews with the Institutional Budget Committee 3-4 times per year. Informational sessions are also conducted for the College Council. The focus of these informational sessions is the unrestricted general fund revenues and expenditures.

The President's Cabinet reviews the recommendations from the College Council and makes its own recommendations to the Superintendent/President.

Financial planning also occurs at the level of the Board of Trustees. They receive budget reports at every meeting. The Board discusses financial issues at their monthly meetings, as well as their yearly retreat.

The majority of the financial planning has focused on expenditures. In Fall 2005, an FTES Committee was established as a result of contract negotiations. The committee is trying to develop plans and recommendations on how to increase enrollments and thereby increase income.

Evaluation

The College generally meets this standard. The utilization of Program Review and the shared governance structures to make recommendations on budget and financial matters help focus the budgeting process on the Mission and goals of the College.

However, the Accreditation Survey identifies serious concerns about funding allocations.

Statement: Funding allocations that focus on student learning are given appropriate priority.		
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators
Great/Moderate Importance	91.0	91.7
Little/No Importance	2.6	
Do Not Know	6.4	8.3
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators
Strongly Agree/Agree	42.9	61.5
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	40.2	30.8
Do Not Know	16.9	7.7

This concern could arise for several reasons. The College has experienced several years of reduced budgets due to the State fiscal crisis. At the same time, the College budget was furthered reduced by the State because of a prior year over-allocation of funds. The resultant shortfall required serious cutbacks in budgets, including personnel loss. The College has also only relatively recently (June 2005) settled a protracted and at times contentious contract negotiations with the faculty association representing full-time instructors.

Budget procedures and limitations are frequently difficult to understand, which may also lead to a general dissatisfaction with the budget and the budget process. The Institutional Budget Committee has not been particularly active in the last few years and did not have a chair for a while. They have questioned their role in the budget process. The VP of Administrative Services has been conducting education sessions with the committee to help them understand the process.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

a. Financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning.

Description

Program Review is a main source for institutional planning. It not only provides plans for individual programs, but it also significantly contributes to the Educational Master Plan. The requests for funds for equipment, facilities and personnel that arise out of Program Review reports are therefore justified based on the plans developed in the individual programs.

These requests are then reviewed and ranked by the College Council, before being forwarding to the President's Cabinet. At each of these levels the opportunity exists to discuss the requests in light of institutional plans. The College Council also has the availability of input and recommendations from its Institutional Standing Committees. Recommendations for expenditures are only for above-base budget items and personnel.

There is a problem with institutional goals and objectives that do not fall within the scope of individual programs or divisions, but instead are over-arching goals and/or objectives. These goals and objectives are not addressed during Program Review. This means that requests for resources may not be forthcoming. One example of this situation is the improvement of Basic Skills. Since Basic Skills courses are a part of several different divisions, a coordinated series of requests to achieve the objectives identified for this Goal have not been presented to the College Council.

The FTES Committee, which was established as a result of the last contract negotiation with the faculty association, has a goal of increasing FTES (income). The committee is too new to verify if they are accomplishing this goal. It is unknown how the outcomes of this committee will be reported and/or implemented.

The allocation of funds into different budget categories is accomplished by the VP of Administrative Services and the President's Cabinet. The VP of Administrative Services has instituted a Fiscal Oversight Group (FOG) which consists of the Director of Fiscal Services (vacant) and the Coordinators of Accounts Payable, Accounts Receivable and Payroll. This group reviews the budget allocations in light of projected income and expenditures.

Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard. While the opportunity exists to discuss requests and recommendations in light of institutional plans, divisions or programs whose requests are not funded consequently may complain about the fairness of the process. In addition, there is an inability to carry out institutional goals because of the lack of available funds to do so. The funds available for Above-Base Budget requests are not consistent, nor are they known prior to the

Program Review reports being developed. This can lead to the perception that performing Program Review will not lead to needed improvements because funds are not allocated to accomplish them. The Accreditation Survey has identified a concern that funding does not always support institutional plans.

Statement: Funding priorities help the College achieve its goals and objectives				
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Board
Great/Moderate Importance	93.6	91.7	96.2	100
Little/No Importance	1.3	8.3	3.8	
Do Not Know	5.1			
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Board
Strongly Agree/Agree	49.4	76.9	67.9	80
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	38.9	23.1	26.4	20
Do Not Know	11.7		5.7	

The majority of the budget consists of items that are structural and cannot be altered (or allocated differently), i.e. salaries, benefits, utilities, etc. This may make it difficult to perceive and document how institutional planning and financial planning can be meaningfully integrated. That being said, there are significant examples of planning that did not lead to any meaningful allocations of funding. The *Technology Plan 2.0* is an example of this problem. When committees invest a great deal of effort in developing such plans which are accepted but not implemented, the usefulness of such endeavors is difficult to explain and justify.

Planning Agendas

1. The Superintendent/President will work with governance committees to develop a process for funding institutional goals, especially those not identified or associated with specific divisions or programs.

b. Institutional planning reflects realistic assessment of financial resource availability, development of financial resources, partnerships, and expenditure requirements.

Description

The main source of unrestricted income is the number of FTES that the College generates every year. To a large extent, the College controls this factor. Increases in unrestricted resources can also come in the form of COLA adjustments and equalization. The State budget process controls these factors. The number of FTES produced by the College is a direct function of the scheduling of courses and the enrollment in those courses. Academic Services works with Administrative Services to develop a projection of FTES generation for the year. The budget is based on meeting that FTES projection. If scheduling and enrollment are not sufficient to meet this goal, then income to the College will be less than planned for. Another key factor in the development of the budget is the projection of the cost of generating the FTESs. The main factor is the number of

FTESs that are generated by adjunct instructors and overloads (in excess of 15 LHE) taught by full-time instructors. The salary expenditures are substantially less for these FTESs.

As mentioned above (III.D.1), the vast majority of the expenditures are for personnel costs. The salary portion of these expenditures is planned for since they are a function of negotiated contracts. The costs for benefits can be more difficult to predict and plan for; but the coverage levels are also covered by the contracts. Costs for supplies and services are also planned for, however, costs of utilities have increased substantially in the last few years.

The College Council and its Institutional Standing Committees receive briefings from the VP of Administrative Services several times a year so they can be well informed as to the budget process and the level of agreement with the projected income and expenditures. This information allows them to make informed recommendations to the Superintendent/President. Discussions of FTES projections and accomplishments are also discussed in Instructional Council, since the scheduling process is performed by this group.

The College also has developed additional financial resources through partnerships with local agencies and by applying for and being awarded grants, both Federal and State. An example of a partnership with a local agency is the agreement between the District and the Kaweah Delta Hospital District. This partnership provides the College with substantial financial assistance in meeting the needs of the Nursing Program at the College. The College has been the recipient of numerous grants, both large and small. An example of such a grant was the federal grant that funded the LISTO Program.

Evaluation

The College substantially meets this standard. The appropriate planning does occur. The information is disseminated to those whose responsibility it is to meet the projections and/or to make recommendations for expenditures.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

c. When making short-range financial plans, the institution considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability. The institution clearly identifies and plans for payment of liabilities and future obligations.

Description

The main long term financial liabilities are for Retiree Health Benefits and for Certificates of Participation (COPs, loans). Based on an actuarial study in 2000, the Board decided to contribute funds to Retiree Health Benefits account over a fifteen year period in order to make this fund self-

sustaining. Funds were temporarily borrowed from this account in 2002-03, during the fiscal crisis. These funds were paid back in 2004-05.

The College has a number of COPs that it is currently paying for. These include an Energy Project COP, Parking Lot COP, Hanford COP and Student Center COP. Partial payment of the Student Center COP is being made by the Student Center Trust and the Bookstore. These COPs have allowed the College to make needed facility upgrades which were not eligible for State funds.

Other long-term contracts include those for insurance, copy machines and the lease of the Hanford Center. All of these expenses are detailed and accounted for during the development of the yearly budget.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. All long-term liabilities are included in the budget and taken into account when budget planning occurs, both short-term and long-term planning.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

d. The institution clearly defines and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development, with all constituencies having appropriate opportunities to participate in the development of institutional plans and budgets.

Description

A great deal of the budget process is dictated by the State, both in timing and process. In 2002, the College employed School Services to review its financial practices. School Services is a private company that provides accounting and management services to K-12 and community colleges. They suggested 3-year budget projections which the College has adopted.

The budget process, as it relates to Above-Base Budget funding allocations, includes all constituencies through their representation on the College Council and the Institutional Budget Committee. The process of developing the Preliminary Budget in May provides opportunities for discussion and input before the Final Budget is adopted by the Board in September. In addition, informational updates are also provided as to the status of the budget (income and expenditures) several times a year.

These groups, along with the other Institutional Standing Committees, are also those charged with institutional planning. This ensures that those who make recommendations on planning and expenditures are also those that have received current and detailed budget information.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. The budget processes are defined by the State and adhered to by the College. All constituent groups have the opportunity to have input into the budget process and development and these are the same groups responsible for institutional planning.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

2. To assure the financial integrity of the institution and responsible use of financial resources, the financial management system has appropriate control mechanisms and widely disseminates dependable and timely information for sound financial decision making.

Description

The College utilizes Banner software as its financial management system. Those individuals that have budget responsibilities, generally referred to as budget managers, are given access to the appropriate levels of the financial management software. The process of spending funds from an account includes the approval of these expenditures by at least one supervisor. This helps ensure proper use of funds.

Once the budget has been developed, the appropriate funds balances are placed in Banner. All expenditures are processed by the Banner software. The budget managers have the ability to view their budgets as often as they wish in order to monitor expenditures. They can also print out budget reports for dissemination to their areas.

Budget reports are presented to the Board of Trustees at all regular Board meetings.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. The use of Banner allows all budget managers to have real-time access to their accounts. This, in turn, allows them to plan for future expenditures. In addition, multiple levels of approval ensure the appropriate use of funds.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

a. Financial documents, including the budget and independent audit, reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services.

Institutional responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately.

Description

The Final Budget adopted in September clearly states the expected income and expenditures for the year, including assumptions that were used to develop the budget. This constitutes the *Budget Book* which is distributed to key groups and made available to anyone who wishes to view it.

The College undergoes a yearly external audit. The audit reviews both funds and processes in order to determine compliance with established accounting and reporting standards. The audit begins after the end of the fiscal year, June, and is generally presented to the Board before the end of the calendar year. Findings by the auditors fall into two categories, major findings and minor findings. Minor findings would include such things as a missing signature on financial documents. These findings are usually reported to the VP of Administrative Services who then reviews the processes with his personnel to make any necessary changes. Major findings include processes which do not conform to established accounting and reporting processes. These findings are included in the audit report that is presented to the Board. The VP of Administrative Services develops a remediation plan to address any major finding. This also is presented to the Board.

The College discovered a major error in its budget which was not found by the external auditor. The audit did not find the over-payment of the State to the College, which required the College to lose funding the next year when the State withheld that amount, 1 million dollars, from its allocations. This occurred at the same time the State was undergoing a financial crisis and was reducing their funding to the schools. The subsequent financial shortfall in the District required severe cut backs in expenditures, including personnel loss.

As mentioned in III.D.1.d, the College requested a review of its financial practices by School Services. As a result of the findings of this evaluation, the College created specific goals and objectives that were incorporated into the Institutional Goals of the College.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. Accurate and comprehensive budget information is made available to campus constituents and the public in the *Budget Book*. External audits are conducted annually and the findings are reported to the Board. Audit findings are addressed in a timely manner.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

b. Appropriate financial information is provided throughout the institution.

Description

The *Budget Book* is distributed to several groups including the College Council and the Institutional Budget Committee. In addition, anyone who requests a copy can receive one. The *Budget Book* is also presented to the Board during a regular board meeting.

Budget Managers have the ability to access their accounts through the Banner software at any time in order to ascertain the status of their budget. They can print reports and distribute those reports to the appropriate personnel within their areas.

Regular budget updates are presented to the Board at their meetings.

Evaluation

The College substantially meets this standard. The *Budget Book* is comprehensive and is distributed to representatives from all constituencies.

However, the Accreditation Survey did identify a significant dissatisfaction with the availability of budget information. Since this information is disseminated and available, it is unclear the source of the dissatisfaction. It is possible that the representatives on the College Council and the Institutional Standing Committees do not report back to their constituents regarding the budget. Another potential source of the concern may center around the nearly 1 million dollars the College received in over-allocated funds from the State. During this time, a rumor that the funds were "missing" circulated. There apparently was a lack of understanding that the State sets the maximum income the College can receive and any funds over that amount must be returned to the State. These reduced funds precipitated substantial cutbacks. Also, during this time, the College was in a protracted contract negotiation with the faculty association, which represents the full-time faculty. Any or all of these factors could have contributed to the perception by some that financial information is not provided throughout the campus.

Statement: Appropriate financial information is provided throughout the institution.				
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Board
Great/Moderate Importance	88.5	100	92.3	80
Little/No Importance	3.8		1.9	
Do Not Know	7.7		5.8	20
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Classified	Board
Strongly Agree/Agree	39.7	76.9	46.3	60
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	46.2	23.1	31.5	
Do Not Know	14.1		22.2	40

Planning Agenda

1. Administrative Services will place the *Budget Book* and all budget updates reported to College Council and the Institutional Budget Committee on the College's website. The locations and availability will be announced to the College via e-mail.

2. Programs and services will provide pertinent, program-specific budget information a minimum of four times/year to their area personnel.

c. The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, strategies for appropriate risk management, and realistic plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences.

Description

Board Policy stipulates that the College have a reserve of six percent. During the last several years the College was not always able to accomplish this. The current budget projection for 2005-06 has a 5.5% reserve at the end of this fiscal year. This is a decline in reserves from 2004-05 (5.8%). The budget reserve allows the College to meet unforeseen financial obligations.

The College maintains adequate cash flow to meets its financial obligations. During the last fiscal year, cash flow was maintained by borrowing funds from the Retiree Health Fund. This was done three separate times to cover construction costs. This was necessary because the State was over five months late in providing funds for building construction. All loans were paid back once the State transferred the funds to the College. These loans to maintain cash flow are itemized in the *Budget Book*.

The College has contracted with the Tulare County School Districts' Authority for property and liability insurance. The College also participated in the Tulare County Schools Insurance Group to purchase worker's compensation.

Evaluation

The College substantially meets this standard. There are processes and practices in place to limit liability and to ensure adequate cash flow. The College has been struggling to maintain the policy mandated budget reserve of six percent. The financial crisis of the State, the subsequent loss of the over-allocated funds to the State and the ability to meet FTES projections are some of the causes for this difficulty. The College is maintaining a reserve above the "fiscally distressed" designation of three percent set by the Chancellor's Office.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

d. The institution practices effective oversight of finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations or foundations, and institutional investments and assets.

Description

Oversight of finances is the responsibility of the VP of Administrative Services. The VP meets with the FOG to review financial practices on a regular basis. Administrators in every area are given the responsibility for monitoring the budget in their areas. For example, the responsibility for oversight of the Financial Aid program lies with the Dean of Financial Aid. The COS Foundation Board and the Director of the COS Foundation are responsible for oversight of the Foundation finances. The VP of Administrative Services is also responsible for the oversight of institutional investments and assets.

The external audit reviews the practices and processes used by the College in management of financial aid, and grants. It also reviews the management of the assets of the COS Foundation. The audit did not find any problems with any of these areas in the most recent audit report.

Evaluation

The College substantially meets this standard. The findings of the external audit support this assertion. However, the Accreditation Survey identified a significant percentage of faculty who disagree that effective oversight is, in fact, occurring. It is possible that the source of this disagreement stems from loss of the over-allocated funding in 2001/02. The shortfall this created also came at a time the College was in protracted contract negotiations with the faculty association representing full-time faculty. Improved budget practices and increased briefings instituted by the current VP of Administrative Services, should alleviate this perception.

Statement: The institution practices effective oversight of finances.			
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Board
Great/Moderate Importance	90.9	100	100
Little/No Importance	3.9		
Do Not Know	5.2		
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administrators	Board
Strongly Agree/Agree	28.6	92.3	80
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	54.5	7.7	20
Do Not Know	16.9		

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

e. All financial resources, including those from auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grants are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the mission and goals of the institution.

Description

Specific expenditures for categorical funds, including grants, are overseen by the managers of those areas. There is no one central manager to oversee all of these areas. General expenditures within these areas are reviewed by the VP of Administrative Services and/or other VP in the affected areas. The external audit report does look at the College's compliance with established government requirements for State and Federal programs, including grants and financial aid.

The COS Foundation does raise funds. There is a Foundation Governing Board which oversees the activities and practices of the Foundation. The Foundation budget processes and accounts are also reviewed during the external audit.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. The external audit report found the College in compliance with all applicable rules and laws.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

f. Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution.[5]

Description

The College has a number of contracts with external entities. All contracts of this kind are overseen by the VP of Administrative Services. These contracts range from leases, to service contracts (copier machines), to contracts with individuals (attorneys), to construction contracts. The VP of Administrative Services utilizes the expertise of the Tulare County Counsel, as well as other attorneys, when reviewing contracts the College may enter into in order to ensure they contain the appropriate provisions.

Board Policy 3005 delegates to the Superintendent/President or his/her designee the authority to enter into external contracts. In addition, this policy outlines guidelines and limitations for outside contracts. Board Policy 3300 outlines the approval process for external contracts.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. The Board Policies are in place that governs the awarding of outside contracts. The review of contracts ensures that they contain the appropriate provisions specific to that contract.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

g. The institution regularly evaluates its financial management processes, and the results of the evaluation are used to improve financial management systems.

Description

Financial processes are evaluated on a regular basis by several different entities. The Institutional Budget Committee reviews the budget development process. The FOG reviews budget management processes. The external audit evaluates the entire budget for compliance with various legal standards of budget management and reporting. And after the problems in 2002, School Services evaluated the fiscal processes at the College and made recommendations for changes. All of these evaluations do lead to changes and improvements in the budget processes. Specific changes recommended by School Services include increasing the number of budget updates given to the Board of Trustees, the multi-year FTES and budget report both of which have been implemented; as well as increasing the number of faculty and staff reviewing budget documents, which is currently being attempted.

Another example of a process that was altered after review by the auditors was in the area of budget beginning and ending numbers for allocations and expenditures. Previously, at the end of the fiscal year, the beginning allocations in each line item were changed to exactly match the ending expenditures. This practice not only required time to complete, it made it impossible to locate where budget assumptions were not adequately predicting expenditures. This practice has been stopped.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

3. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of financial resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

Description

As stated previously, the vast majority of the budget expenditures are for personnel costs. Evaluation of effective utilization of these funds can be done when a position becomes vacant. By evaluating whether the position should be filled, or whether it should be left vacant, the College has the opportunity to make more effective use of its funds. Recommendations for new positions do go through the Program Review process and are recommended by the College Council. Requests for replacement personnel may also go through this process.

Allocation of funds for Above-Base Budget items identified during Program Review, such as equipment, are generally not evaluated for effectiveness once the decision has been made to expend the funds. It is difficult to measure and document effective utilization of funds on these items.

Evaluation

The College partially meets this standard. The Program Review process and the review and recommendation processes of College Council and its Institutional Standing Committees do allow for the evaluation of effective utilization of financial resources. However, there is not currently a method by which, over the long term, effectiveness is being evaluated. The difficulty in defining what constitutes effective use of financial resources notwithstanding, the complexities of the budget processes as mandated by the State and Federal governments and the structural nature of most of the budget expenditures make evaluation problematic at best.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

Documentation

1. Program Review Reports

2. Preliminary Budget, 2005-06

3. Final Budget, 2005-06 (Budget Book)

4. College Council Minutes

5. Accreditation Survey Results

6. Institutional Budget Committee Minutes

7. 2005 External Audit

8. School Services Report

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

The institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief administrator.

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

The institution recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the institution to identify institutional values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve.

1. Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.

Description

The leadership of COS pursues a practice of open governance and participation which facilitates empowerment and involvement from students, faculty, classified staff and administrators. There are many different venues for submitting ideas on improving practices, programs and services such as: Academic Senate, College Council and its Institutional Standing Committees, Associated Student Body (ASB), Instructional Council, and the President's Cabinet.

Shared governance at COS encourages active participation of campus constituents at all levels of the Institution. This is demonstrated by the representation of administration, full-time and adjunct faculty, classified staff, and students on governance committees. Each member is charged with representing their constituency.

College Council provides a forum for debate on institutional issues and obtains input from various other campus committees. College Council does accept recommendations from these constituent groups, but will revise recommendations when necessary to maintain what is best for the institution. Traditionally the College Council has done an informal evaluation of its goals and objectives at the beginning of the academic year. In the year or two prior to 2005, some committee members did not feel there was an incentive to evaluate and change objectives since there was no fiscal gain. The current Superintendent/President is working to rebuild confidence in the College Council membership as a decision making and advisory body.

Faculty have representation on the College Council and its Institutional Standing Committees. Currently, there are four full-time and one adjunct faculty on the College Council. Faculty

members also participate in governance at the COS through the Academic Senate and its Campus Curriculum, Student Learning Outcomes, and Faculty Enrichment standing committees. The Academic Senate makes committee appointments to campus-wide committees when membership is not elected by the faculty: examples include the Program Review Steering and Scholarship Committees. Faculty members participate on hiring committees for faculty, administrative, and classified positions. The Academic Senate President is the faculty representative to the President's Cabinet. Faculty division chairs are members of the Instructional Council which also participates in the governance process.

Classified staff representation on all committees is encouraged as part of the shared governance model. In addition, classified staff representatives serve on the Professional Association of Classified Employees (PACE) which is responsible for planning and implementing staff development activities. These activities provide personal and professional growth opportunities to the classified staff at COS.

COS students participate through ASB representation on the Board of Trustees, Academic Senate, Campus Curriculum Committee, College Council and its Institutional Standing Committees.

 Evaluation

The College meets this standard. There is an environment that enables faculty, staff and administrators to participate in the shared governance processes at the College.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

2. The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special- purpose bodies.

Description

Board of Trustee minutes reflects the adoption of the original participatory governance model through "Principals of Collegial Governance" on April 17, 1989. This adoption allowed for the development and continuance of the College Council and its Institutional Standing Committees. The most recently revised participatory governance model was adopted by Academic Senate and College Council in April of 2001. The College Council was established to serve as a forum for discussion on college-wide issues and to formulate and provide recommendations to the Superintendent/President regarding institutional planning and budget development.

Board policy 1110, Delegation of Authority, has empowered the Academic Senate to make recommendations to the Superintendent/President and to express its views directly to the Board on any matter pertaining to academic and professional matters at the College. The Board of

Trustees has identified areas for which it primarily relies on the Academic Senate: degree and certificate requirements, grading policies, and policies for faculty professional development activities. It also identifies areas for which they will seek mutual agreement: curriculum, educational program development, standards or policies regarding student preparation and success, College governance structures as related to faculty roles in the accreditation process, Program Review, institutional planning and budget development.

Student participation with the Board of Trustees is documented in Board Policy 1004 "Student Member of the Governing Board." This policy outlines the election process of the student representative, the importance of conferring with leaders of ASB and appropriate student groups regarding Board actions, and rights as a student Board member.   Student representatives also participate on Academic Senate, Campus Curriculum Committee, College Council and its Institutional Standing Committees.

Evaluation

The College substantially meets this standard. All constituency groups have established representation on governance committees. The Board of Trustees and the administration regularly receive recommendations from the College Council and the Academic Senate. There is evidence of Board Policy on Delegation of Authority with the Academic Senate. There is no evidence the current model of participatory governance was adopted by the Board of Trustees.

Planning Agenda

1. The Board of Trustees will review the "Principles of Collegial Governance" adopted in 1989 to ascertain whether the policy reflects current practice.

a. Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions.

Description

Academic Senate serves as the primary governance structure for faculty members on campus, (Board Policies 1110 & 5020.)   As outlined in IV.2, the Board of Trustees and the Academic Senate have an established delegation of authority for academic and professional matters at COS (Board Policy 1110).

College Council with its Institutional Standing Committees serves as governance entities and provides a voice for all campus constituents. One of the goals of the College Council is to maintain a forum for discussion of campus wide issues. College Council has four standing committees. 1) The Institutional Planning Committee develops policy recommendations involving short-range and long-range planning for the college.   2) The Institutional Budget Committee is charged with monitoring the budget for the college; ascertain the need and priority

of staffing and instructional support by coordinating the recommendations of the Institutional Planning Committee and the College Council. 3) The Institutional Facilities Committee considers and recommends requests for remodels, investigates non-instructional facility needs, and prioritizes capital construction projects. 4) The Institutional Technology Committee recommends coordination and integration of technology for the college. All of the committees have representation from all campus constituent groups.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard through broad participation on Academic Senate and College Council and its Institutional Standing Committees.

The policy for delegation of authority with the Academic Senate is being followed and seems to serve the needs of both the Board and faculty. The Board of Trustees delegates, regularly reviews, and has final approval over the Academic Senate's recommendations on course curriculum.

The current structure of College Council and its Institutional Standing Committees is made up of representation of all constituent groups. The Institutional Standing Committees are designed to meet the needs of the College.   However, there has been dialogue as to their roles in the governance process. With the lack of goal direction in the past for some of these committees it seems there was confusion among committee members as to the purpose of their assigned committee charge. As an example, in the past the Institutional Budget Committee did not have a clear stated purpose in duties which was partially attributed to a lack of participation over the 2003-04 and 2004-05 academic years.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

b. The institution relies on faculty, its academic senate or other appropriate faculty structures, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services.

Description

The Board of Trustees has delegated authority to the Academic Senate for making recommendations with respect to academic and professional matters under Board Policy 1110. The Academic Senate meets twice a month and its Standing Committees have separate meeting schedules. During the 2004-05 academic year, Academic Senate meetings were suspended. The faculty association requested all faculty abstain from attending and participating in all campus meetings.

Student learning programs and services are discussed and debated in a number of faculty forums. They are discussed in Instructional Council which is composed of the chairs of all divisions as well

as academic administrators.   In addition, counselors and librarians discuss updates and receive presentations on student learning programs and services at weekly meetings.

The Campus Curriculum Committee is a standing committee of the Academic Senate. It is composed of one faculty representative from all divisions, representatives from academic administration, and a student representative. Within this committee, issues related to academic programs, course curriculum and student learning are raised.   The Campus Curriculum Committee has a written policy for approving new or modified courses. Once a modified or new course is approved by the Campus Curriculum Committee, it is then presented at Academic Senate for approval and then goes to the Board of Trustees for final approval.

The Academic Senate created the Student Learning Outcomes Committee in order to encourage dialogue among faculty and staff regarding identification of student learning outcomes and assessment at the course and program level.   The long range goal of this committee is to have the college community identify learning outcomes and establish assessment for student learning at the course, program, and institutional levels.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard through faculty and administrator participation on the Instructional Council and the Academic Senate standing committees, Campus Curriculum Committee and the Student Learning Outcomes Committee. The Board of Trustees has delegated authority to the Academic Senate through Board Policy 1110 to make recommendations to the Board with respect to these academic and professional matters.

Appropriate relationships and lines of participation are normally observed. In 2004-05, the Academic Senate was not meeting due to labor troubles. The Board of Trustees took some actions regarding curriculum that had not been forwarded from the Academic Senate because they were not meeting.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

3. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution's constituencies.

Description

The College Council, Academic Senate, Instructional Council and ASB provide forums for discussion and communication through shared governance. Students, staff, faculty, and administrators have the right to participate in College governance and the opportunity to express

their opinions at the campus level. By working together collaboratively as members of these groups, they can work towards institutional improvement. Board Policy 5020 outlines how the Senate shall present its written views and recommendations to the Superintendent/President and then to the Board of Trustees. Board Policy 1004 outlines the duties and responsibilities of the ASB representative to the Board of Trustees. In addition, the Board has designated a trustee to serve on the Accreditation Self Study team.

The College Council and its Institutional Standing Committees meet twice monthly. Summaries from the College Council meetings are posted on the College website with an e-mail announcement from the President's Office on the posting. The Institutional Standing Committees provide reports at the College Council meetings. Some of the Institutional Standing Committees keep minutes and some do not. If minutes are recorded they may be distributed to committee members or even posted on the College website.

The Academic Senate meets twice a month with minutes being recorded at each meeting. Minutes are distributed via email to Academic Senate members and to administrative staff when they are guest speakers. The Standing Committees of Academic Senate meet on a regular schedule with the committee chairs presenting progress reports at the Academic Senate meetings. Standing Committees that record minutes usually distribute the minutes to committee members. In addition, the SLO Committee posts minutes on the College website.

Instructional Council is chaired by the Vice-President of Academic Services. Members include division chairs and Academic Administrators. Instructional Council meets twice a month with minutes being distributed to the members and any guest presenters.

Members of ASB meet every Tuesday in an open meeting session in which all students are welcome to attend. At each meeting members of ASB receive a copy of the previous meeting minutes for approval. Each week ASB minutes are posted at three locations throughout campus.

Administrators and full-time faculty have COS email accounts. Only a small percent of adjunct faculty have COS email accounts. Students do not have COS email accounts to receive campus information and news. Currently, the email system is being upgraded to improve electronic communication and to provide e-mail accounts for all student and adjunct faculty.

In September 2004, the College hired a new Public Information Officer (PIO) to head the Marketing and Community Relations unit of the campus. A new marketing plan was developed and work began immediately to increase communication in the community as well on the college campus.   COS employees receive weekly email notices on campus happenings through the COS & Company newsletter. A public relations company was hired to do radio and TV ads for COS. The PIO also sends the monthly Board of Trustee meeting summaries via email to COS employees.

Evaluation

COS substantially meets this standard through establishing structures for collaborative work between constituent groups. The College does have structures, processes and practices in place to communicate with all campus constituents. Most communication is sent via email or posted on the website. The recent plan to provide e-mail accounts to all students and adjunct faculty will improve campus-wide communication. In the last year more shared governance committees have started to post their minutes on the College website for easier access by students and staff.

The PIO's weekly news releases have allowed the public and the campus community to have a better understanding of COS events.

Statement: Administration, faculty and classified work collaboratively on behalf of institutional improvements.			
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administration	Classified
Great/Moderate Importance	93.6	100	98.1
Little/No Importance	5.1		
Do Not Know	1.3		1.9
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administration	Classified
Strongly Agree/Agree	52	61.6	58.5
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	42.9	38.5	39.6
Do Not Know	5.2		1.9

The Accreditation Survey identified that all constituent groups felt this was of importance to work collaboratively on behalf of institutional improvements. While a majority from all groups agreed this was being done, there was a significant percentage in all groups that disagreed this occurred. Efforts have been made to expand channels of communication to the campus; however, there is no guarantee the communication is being read. Each shared governance committee needs to evaluate and attempt to improve communication with the campus as a whole.

Planning Agenda

1. All shared governance committees and standing committees will post minutes from their meetings on the COS website.

4. The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self study and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.

Description

COS is committed to the accreditation process. As required by the Commission the Institution has submitted four interim reports to the Accrediting Commission since 2000. The College responds to recommendations from State agencies, the Chancellor's Office, Federal grant programs, and other accrediting associations.

The College follows a process of reporting findings of accreditation reports to all members of the campus community prior to its receipt by the Board of Trustees in open session. Copies of the final report are sent to the library and made part of the public record.

As a requirement to maintain eligibility for financial aid funding (Title IV reporting requirements), the College participates in the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) for the National Center for Education Statistics. The series of interrelated surveys that allow for the collection of data in such areas as enrollment, program completions, faculty, staff, and finances is completed according to the IPEDS timetable. In addition, a Student Right To Know (SRTK) statement is published in the *General Catalog*.

Evaluation

COS meets this standard. There are systems in place to inform campus constituents and the public on accreditation findings and other government surveys in an open and honest manner. For example, the STRK statement has been printed in the *General Catalog* as required by legislation. The STRK rates are determined by the Chancellor's Office based upon our submitted MIS data and it is our assumption that their reporting is accurate.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

5. The role of leadership and the institution's governance and decision making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

Description

Recommendation # 7 of the 2000 Visiting Team Report was to streamline and simplify the decision making process for more direct access and communication between constituent groups and the Superintendent/President. Changes were made with the structure of College Council; the Superintendent/President is now a member of the Council and serves as the chair. One level of structure was eliminated with this change. Due to labor issues, the activities of the College Council were greatly impeded for the academic year 2004-05. For the academic school year 2005-06 the Council has been reshaping its processes in order to have greater effectiveness as a

recommending body. The College Council engages in planning efforts and in identification of areas requiring improvement (see standard I.B.6).

In the past, the Academic Senate used Program Review to identify strengths, weaknesses, areas that needed change, and plans to make necessary improvements.   The 2005/06 Annual Update to the Program Review is posted on the Academic Senate website. The Senate has documented progress in achieving planning agendas items identified in its 2000-01 Program Review.

The Academic Senate was scheduled to undergo Program Review during 2005-06. However, during discussions in 2005 about what constituted a "program", the Academic Senate was removed from the Program Review process because it does not meet the definition of a program. Despite not undergoing a Program Review during 2005-06, the Academic Senate's constitution calls for the development of an Action Plan at the beginning of each academic year and evaluating their progress at the end of the year in April or May. The Academic Senate President presents findings from the Action Plan to the Academic Senate Executive Board and Standing Committee chairs for their evaluation, amendment, and suggestions. Then it is presented to members of the Academic Senate and used as a blueprint for Academic Senate initiatives in the coming academic year. The Academic Senate President presents the Action Plan to the Board of Trustees at their first or second Board meeting at the beginning of the academic year.

The Instructional Council represents the interests of faculty and administrators in Academic Services. While many of the issues discussed at Instructional Council meetings are for information purposes only, the Instructional Council annually considers issues relating to the hiring of full-time tenure track faculty and prioritization of instructional equipment requests. Instructional Council makes recommendations in each of these areas and forwards these recommendations to College Council. College Council relies upon the expertise of Instructional Council for advice regarding these issues. The Instructional Council does not undergo a formal evaluation process such as Program Review. It assesses its processes on an informal basis and makes adjustments to its procedures as necessary.

The ASB Board annually evaluates its progress in achieving its goals through Program Review and the annual progress report. Goals and objectives are set annually for the beginning of the academic year. Progress is evaluated using student surveys on campus events and services provided through ASB. Results of the annual progress report are included in the end of year report to Student Services and the student Trustee gives a summary of the results to the Board of Trustees.

Evaluation

The standard has been substantially met.

The College Council structure and Institutional Standing Committees have been streamlined for easier communication between the Superintendent/President and constituents. While the College Council has its 2006-07 Goals listed on the COS website, their annual review is not posted and there is no formal evaluation process.

The Academic Senate posts its Program Review Annual Updates on the campus website. It also communicates its Action Plan to the Board of Trustees at the beginning of the academic year.

ASB has used the Program Review process along with the annual progress report to evaluate how effective their processes are and report these findings to Student Services and the Board of Trustees.

Instructional Council uses informal tools to assess their decision making structures and tools. There is not a defined system or timeline in place for assessing its processes.

Planning Agenda

1. See planning agenda 1 in standard I.A.4.
2. See planning agenda 1 in standard I.B.6.

B. Board and Administrative Organization

In addition to the leadership of individuals and constituencies, institutions recognize the designated responsibilities of the governing board for setting policies and of the chief administrator for the effective operation of the institution. Multi-college districts/systems clearly define the organizational roles of the district/system and the colleges.6

1. The institution has a governing board that is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the college or the district/system.

Description

The Board of Trustees is the policy making body of the College and is entrusted with the responsibility to oversee all college programs and assets. The policies adopted by the Board of Trustees have been written to be consistent with the provisions of law, but do not encompass all laws relating to the District's activities. The Superintendent/President has custody of the *Board Policy and Procedure Manual* which is available to employees of the District and the public through the COS website.

The Board of Trustees is responsible for ongoing fiscal stability. The Board has delegated to COS administrators the responsibility to safeguard and manage district assets and ensure ongoing effective operations. BP 1091 outlines the principles to promote an environment for growth, productivity, self-actualization, and progress based on a foundation of sound fiscal management.

BP 1010 includes the selection, appointment, and evaluation of the Superintendent/President as a Board duty. In the fall of 2005, written procedures for the search process in hiring a new Superintendent/President were adopted by the Board.

BP 1110 delegates authority to Academic Senate to make recommendations on academic and professional matters. The Academic Senate reviews recommendations from the Campus Curriculum Committee regarding educational programs, curriculum, and degrees and certificates. The College has an active Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Committee that is providing education and training to faculty in identifying student learning outcomes and in assessing achievements of those outcomes.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. The Board is responsible for the establishment of policies to ensure the quality and effectiveness of student learning programs and services, to maintain financial stability of the institution, and to select and evaluate the Superintendent/President.

Statement: The Board is effective in remaining focused at the policy level.				
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administration	Classified	Board
Great/Moderate Importance	88.5	100	80.8	80
Little/No Importance	6.4		1.9	
Do Not Know	5.1		17.3	20
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administration	Classified	Board
Strongly Agree/Agree	30.4	76.9	40.4	100
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	51.9	15.4	28.8	
Do Not Know	17.7	7.7	30.8	

The Accreditation Survey indicated that all constituent groups agree on the importance of the Board remaining focused at the policy level. The Board members and administration strongly agree/agree this is the Board's practice. The perception among some faculty (51.9%) and classified (28.8%) is that the Board does not remain focused at the policy level. This perception may be due to the decisions made by the Board during the recent State fiscal crisis and prolonged faculty contract negotiations.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

a. The governing board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions. Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.

Description

The Board of Trustees is an essential link with the community and represents five separate geographic wards. The Board considers input from the College community and the greater community they represent in their decision-making process. Each Board member is an advocate

for the College and articulates the College successes and needs to their respective constituents. The Board of Trustees determine broad general policies which govern the operation of COS and review these policies periodically. The Board does not confuse policies with the administrative regulations for the operation of the College. Trustees follow a code of conduct not to use their Board position for personal gain.

Evaluation

The COS Board of Trustees meets this standard by acting on the majority vote of the Board and implementing the decision as a group.

Statement: The Board of Trustees represents the best interests of the public.				
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT &PT)	Administration	Classified	Board
Great/Moderate Importance	94.8	100	88.4	100
Little/No Importance	.3		1.9	
Do Not Know	3.9		9.6	
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administration	Classified	Board
Strongly Agree/Agree	26.9	92.3	32	100
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	57.7	7.7	37.8	
Do Not Know	15.4		30.2	

The Accreditation Survey found that all constituent groups believed it of importance that the Board of Trustees represents the best interests of the public. However, not all groups on campus share this perception. Administration and the Board agree that the Board represents the public's interest whereas the faculty and classified staff had a large percentage that disagreed with this. Prolonged contract negotiations for classified and especially for faculty may have contributed to this perception.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

b. The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.

Description

The Mission of COS, as described in Standard I.A.1, "focuses on preparing students for productive work, lifelong learning, and community involvement." The Educational Master Plan (2005-2006) was adopted by the Board on September 12, 2005 and states, "the Mission of COS is reflected in planning documents, accomplished through programs and services, and measured by

Program Review, external accreditations, and institutional performance indicators." The College places importance on allocating its financial resources to achieve institutional goals by establishing this as Institutional Goal #6 of the Educational Master Plan. Board Policy 8001 Program Review, identifies Program Review as one of the elements of formal evaluation and mentions the Accreditation Self Study and Institutional Performance Indicators as other elements.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. The COS Mission is reflected in the College's institutional planning, implementation, and evaluation of student learning programs and services. The College does place priority to allocate resources in support of student learning programs. At times budget constraints do not allow for full resource support of student learning programs. As an example, not all new full-time faculty positions were hired for the academic year 06/07 due to low student enrollment from the previous academic year. When resources are available these positions will be added back in priority order as determined through the shared governance process.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is proposed at this time.

c. The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.

Description

A review of Board agenda items demonstrated regular opportunities for the Board to be informed on program, fiscal and legal issues as well as taking action on these topics. The Board of Trustees reviews educational programs and curriculum that have undergone the required approval processes, which includes input from the departments, divisions, the Campus Curriculum Committee and the Academic Senate.

The Board of Trustees closely monitors the financial resources of the District. At each meeting the Board receives detailed reports on the district's current financial state, progress toward attainment of specified financial goals, and projections concerning the District's ongoing financial viability. A Preliminary Budget is adopted in May after it has been developed by the VP of Administrative Services in consultation with the President's Cabinet. The preliminary budget is presented to the Institutional Budget Committee and the College council for information purposes. The Final Budget is adopted in September following passage of the State's final budget.

In addition, the Board contracts with Tulare County Council for legal assistance. When necessary, the Board also contracts with other attorneys.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. The Board of Trustees takes an active leadership role to ensure the financial stability of the college. The Board relies on the expertise of attorneys regarding the College's legal matters.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

d. The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board's size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.

Description

The Board of Trustees *Policy Manual* contains policies, duties, responsibilities, ethical conduct requirements, and structure and operating procedures. Recommendation #6 in the 2000 Accreditation Visiting Team Report recommended the Board communicate more proactively Board actions in relation to revision of policies. All Board Policies are currently available on the COS website. Written copies of the Board Policies are available in the President's Office and in the reference area of the Learning Resource Center for public access. As new policies are adopted or as existing policies are revised, the President's Office updates the website and also sends notification to everyone on the campus about changes.

Board Policy 1002 specifies the number of Board members and qualifications each member must meet. Board Policy 1000 relates to the general responsibility and code of conduct of Board members. Board Policy 1010 lists the duties of the Board.

Evaluation

The college meets this standard.

Board polices are posted on the COS website. There is also a copy available in the President's Office, the Learning Resource Center, and in various offices across campus.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

e. The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.

Description

The Board of Trustees evaluates its policies and practices at its annual evaluation meeting. The Board has requested that administration update Board policies on a regular basis. The College subscribes to the Community College League of California's Policy and Procedure Service. This service assists in the development and maintenance of policies and procedures legally required and/or recommended by statute.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard in that the Board does follow its policies and bylaws. The Board does emphasize the importance of regular review and update of Board policy and procedures.

COS does receive timely notification of policy updates through CCLC policy service.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

f. The governing board has a program for board development and new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.

Description

The Board of Trustees has a policy (1002) on membership that includes qualifications and elections specified by law from the five geographical wards of the district. Board elections are staggered every two years with either two or three positions up for election.

Each member of the Board receives the updated Community College League of California Trustee (CCLC) Handbook annually. In addition, new members are encouraged to attend the Trustee Orientation Workshop at the beginning of the annual CCLC Conference. The Superintendent/President meets with each new Board member to orient them on the College's organization, structure, priorities and introduces them to administrative leaders.

The Board has an annual retreat during which reports from major areas and services may be presented. Appropriate administrators, faculty, and staff have been invited to attend and to present reports and to participate in question and answer sessions.

Evaluation

The college meets the standard in both policy and practice.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

g. The governing board's self-evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws.

Description

As per Board Policy 1000, "The Board of Trustees will hold its own evaluation and discussion to evaluate its effectiveness in setting policy and representing the constituency by which it is elected". The Board uses the instrument provided by the Association of Community College Trustees for its annual evaluation. This instrument asks each trustee to evaluate his/her individual performance in their role as a member of the Board, as well as the Board's performance as a whole. This is done annually at the evaluation session of the Superintendent/President. In addition, at the annual retreat, the Board does an introspective informal assessment on their performance and progress over the past year with the management team.

Board policies are posted on the COS website and staff are notified of new policies by email. Since the addition of the PIO, there is regular communication to College staff and the community on Board actions.

The 2000 Accreditation Visiting Team Report recommendation #6 recommended the Board communicate more proactively and publicly governing Board actions in relation to the revision of policies, and the processes and outcomes of the Boards' self-evaluation. Outcomes of the Board's self-evaluation and of the superintendent/president are not routinely communicated to campus constituents.

Evaluation

The college meets this standard through established Board policy and practice. Recommendation #6 from the 2000 Accreditation Visiting Team Report asked the Board to publish the outcomes of their self-evaluation which is not required in this standard.

In the Accreditation Survey, Board members placed great importance on their self-evaluation review process. Most Board members (60%) agree this process is effective, (20%) disagreed and (20%) did not know. The Board is currently reviewing this process and is examining exemplary evaluation policies and procedures acquired from other community colleges for both Board self-evaluation and evaluation of the Superintendent/President. Once this review has been completed, the Board will determine what changes, if any, need to be adopted.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

h. The governing board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.

Description

The Board of Trustees has a policy (BP 1000) outlining their general responsibility and code of conduct. The code of conduct stipulates Board members must represent constituents honestly and equally, not use Board membership for personal gain, take no private action to compromise the Board or District, shall preserve confidentiality of closed sessions, abide by majority decisions of the Board, and encourage and respect free expression of opinion by fellow board members.

If unethical behavior occurs, the Board of Trustees would follow the recommendations listed in the CCLC Handbook. The Board chair would need to raise the code of conduct issue with the individual board member. If the problem(s) continued, the entire Board may wish to discuss the issue. Public censure is the last step in the process.

Evaluation

The college partially meets this standard. The current Board of Trustees has not had to handle a code of conduct issue among its membership. There is no Board policy that outlines the process to deal with unethical behavior. If a situation would occur, Board members have stated they would adhere to the standards set forth in the CCLC Handbook regarding unethical conduct.

Planning Agenda

1. The Board of Trustees will develop a policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code of ethics.

i. The governing board is informed about and involved in the accreditation process.

Description

The Board of Trustees is involved in the accreditation process by having a member serve on the Governance and Leadership Committee for this accreditation cycle. This Board member reports to the Board on a regular basis regarding the accreditation progress. The Accreditation Self Study was distributed to Board members for review in the Spring semester 2006 and the Accreditation Chair attended Board meetings to update the Board on the progress of the Accreditation Steering Committee.

Evaluation

The college meets this standard. The Board takes an active role in accreditation by serving on committees, receiving periodic updates, and being available to provide information for the accreditation self study process.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

j. The governing board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the district/system chief administrator (most often known as the chancellor) in a multi-college district/system or the college chief administrator (most often known as the president) in the case of a single college. The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to him/her to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively. In multicollege districts/systems, the governing board establishes a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the presidents of the colleges.

Description

A duty of the Board of Trustees is to select and appoint the Superintendent/President of the College. The Board follows written procedures for the selection process: on inviting internal and external applicants, on developing the Superintendent/President position profile, including budget information, student enrollment, demographics, faculty and staff information, community information, and accomplishments expected of the Superintendent/President. In the 2005-06 academic year, COS followed a process which included: the Board developing and formally approving a Superintendent/President profile that was sent to a contracted consultant group who searched for qualified candidates. The consultant advertised the position State-wide and nationally.   COS established a 13 member search committee comprised of representatives from across campus and it was directed to select 10-12 candidates for interviews. The consultants narrowed the candidate selection to 4 unranked finalists and forwarded them to the Board for final interviews. The Board reserved the right to interview additional candidates in the pool. Prior to the final interviews, there was a public forum at which all four finalists answered a series of questions. The Board interviewed the finalists and selected the new Superintendent/President.

 The Board of Trustees establishes District policies and delegates to the Superintendent/President the responsibility to implement the adopted policies.   The Superintendent/President is empowered to interpret Board policy. In situations where there is no Board Policy the Superintendent/President has the power to act, but such decisions are subject to review by the Board. It is the duty of the Superintendent/President to inform the Board of such action and to recommend written Board policy if one is required.

The performance evaluation of the Superintendent/President is completed by the Board of Trustees annually, on or before June 30th. The Board considers the following items in the evaluation: Board-Superintendent/President relationship, success with the Superintendent/President's relationship with faculty, classified, and management personnel; as well as the community, development and maintenance of instructional and student services programs, administrative skill in the management of district finances, campus growth, and development and maintenance of facilities.

In reference to the recommendation #6 from the 2000 Accreditation Visiting Team Report, Board actions regarding the evaluation of the Superintendent/President are announced publicly at the Board of Trustees meeting and in the subsequent Board minutes.

<u>Evaluation</u>

The college meets this standard.

The Board is currently reviewing their evaluation process and is examining exemplary evaluation policies and procedures acquired from other community colleges for both Board self-evaluation and evaluation of the Superintendent/President. Once review has been completed, the Board will determine what changes, if any, need to be adopted.

<u>Planning Agenda</u>

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

2. The president has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution he/she leads. He/she provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.

<u>Description</u>

The Superintendent/President serves as secretary to the Board of Trustees. The Board delegates to the Superintendent/President the executive responsibility for administering the policies adopted by the Board and executing all decisions of the Board under Ed Code 70902, 72400, under Title V Regulations, and Board Policy 1095.   The Superintendent/President may delegate any powers and duties entrusted to him/her by the Board, but will be specifically responsible to the Board for execution of such delegated powers and duties (BP 1095). The Superintendent/President provides overall leadership and oversight to the college, including Student Services, Academic Services, Human Resources, and Administrative Services.

The College Council and President's Cabinet are both chaired by the Superintendent/President. Students, full time and adjunct faculty, classified staff, and administrators are represented on the College Council. Their representatives have the opportunity to voice their concerns and advocate their position directly to the Superintendent/President before casting their vote on the issues presented to the College Council. The President's Cabinet includes senior administration. The Academic Senate president and CSEA President attend the President's Cabinet.

The Superintendent/President traditionally takes an active role in lobbying for financial support of the both the District and the California Community College system with the California Legislature and the Chancellor's Office.

It is a priority with the office of Superintendent/President to be working with the communities within the COS District. The Superintendent/President is active in meeting with local representatives and senators from the California Legislature to discuss issues regarding California Community College system for financial and educational needs of COS.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard by following BP1095, annual reviews by the Board of Trustees, and current practices of the Superintendent/President.

Since the last accreditation review, changes have been made to facilitate more direct communication between constituent groups and the Superintendent in regard to shared governance structure. In 2005-06, campus constituencies have been able to compromise on major issues and move forward to work collaboratively through shared governance.

Statement: The Superintendent/President provides effective leadership.				
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administration	Classified	Board
Great/Moderate Importance	97.5	100	98.1	100
Little/No Importance	2.6			
Do Not Know			1.9	
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administration	Classified	Board
Strongly Agree/Agree	73.8	84.7	74.1	100
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	18.8	15.4	16.7	
Do Not Know	7.5		9.3	

The Accreditation Survey demonstrated that all constituent groups were in agreement on the importance of the Superintendent/President providing effective leadership and majorities of each group agreed to the level of effective leadership.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

a. The president plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution's purposes, size, and complexity. He/she delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.

Description

The Superintendent/President oversees an administrative structure which includes the President's Office, Academic Services, Student Services, and Administrative Services. The Vice President of

Academic Services, Vice President of Administrative Services, Vice President of Student Services, Dean of Students, the Executive Director of the COS Foundation/Institutional Advancement, the Dean of Human Resource/Legal Affairs, and the Public Information Officer (PIO) make up the President's Executive Cabinet.

The Superintendent/President regularly reviews the College's administrative structure to make certain that it supports the institutional Mission. For example, in the Fall of 2004 a Public Information Officer (PIO)was hired. This position had been eliminated more than a decade ago because of budget constraints. The need for a PIO had been identified in previous institutional planning sessions and was part of the recommendations arising out of the Strategic Plan in 2002, when enhancing marketing efforts was identified as a key finding. The PIO communicates weekly news releases on events and happenings at COS which has allowed the public to have a clearer view on COS contributions to the community.

The Superintendent/President has organized the administrative staff to meet the needs of the College and the budget. In the last five years, the Superintendent/President has had to sacrifice administrative positions in support of the overall budget of the institution. As an example, one of the Academic Dean positions was vacated and has not been replaced. This has necessitated the assignment of new duties to management positions and to reassign some managers to different positions with the loss of some grant funding and other cutbacks. Given the fiscal and budgetary constraints, changes were made so the needs of students, staff, and community could be met.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. The Superintendent/President plans and organizes administrative structure to best meet the needs of the institution.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

b. The president guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by the following:
• **establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities;**
• **ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis on external and internal conditions;**
• **ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and distribution to achieve student learning outcomes; and**
• **establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts.**

Description

The Superintendent/President provides overall leadership for the college and is dedicated to providing an effective learning environment and a quality educational experience for all students.

Since the last Accreditation report the Superintendent/President has presided over the development and implementation of six key goals for 2003 – 2006.

1. College of the Sequoias will address all aspects of diversity in its operations.
2. College of the Sequoias will operate efficiently and effectively and will ensure the accountability of program, services, and processes.
3. College of the Sequoias will promote dialogue among its internal and external constituencies to develop the best use of fiscal resources for personnel, program and facilities and services
4. College of the Sequoias will provide the highest level of service to our students by identifying and implementing effective practices for faculty/staff career development and training.
5. College of the Sequoias will provide programs and services to facilitate student success in meeting their goals as verified through measurable outcomes.
6. College of the Sequoias will allocate its financial resources to achieve institutional goals.

The Board of Trustees, Academic Senate, Instructional Council, College Council and its Institutional Standing Committees, and the President's Cabinet are all a part of the collegial process which is used to set the values, goals, and priorities for the College. The Superintendent/President facilitates the interaction of these groups to achieve institutional goals.

Student learning programs are developed to meet the needs of the District's students. Program courses are approved and monitored through the Campus Curriculum Committee. The Program Review process evaluates the success and relevancy of every COS program and service. Program Review is also used as a mechanism to establish resource allocation to programs and services. The Superintendent/President delegates implementation of the Program Review process to senior administrative staff.

The Office of Research and Grants generates and distributes numerous reports. Among these is the Institutional Performance Indicators Report which includes data on FTES, WSCH, and Load, staff composition, workforce development; student basic skills improvement, successful course completion, degrees and certificate completions, transfer prepared and transfer data.

In the past, the Office of Research and Grants has been housed with the Vice President of Academic Services, with the Director having open access to the Superintendent/President and his Cabinet, assisting them with research needs and providing analyses of internal and external conditions that affect the institution. As of Spring 2006 this office was relocated to the President's Office as part of the administrative reorganization.

In September 2005, a new Educational Master Plan was adopted by the Board of Trustees. It included information from Program Review reports, Institutional Performance Indicators, external evaluation reports, and student equity and matriculation reports. The Educational Master Plan was approved by the College Council and was reviewed by the President's Cabinet before being adopted by the Board.

Evaluation

The institution substantially meets this standard.

The goals set forth in the Institutional Master Plan identify specific strategies for each goal as well as a timeline for completion. There is no written procedure for evaluation of goal attainment. With the adoption in 2005 of the Educational Master Plan, specific educational programs are identified for sites in Visalia, Hanford and Tulare.

Statement: The President ensures that educational planning is integrated with resource distribution to achieve SLO's			
Level of Importance	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administration	Classified
Great/Moderate Importance	79.2	100	84.6
Little/No Importance	13		1.9
Do Not Know	7.8		13.5
Level of Agreement	Faculty (FT & PT)	Administration	Classified
Strongly Agree/Agree	49.3	61.5	55.6
Disagree/Strongly Disagree	16.4	30.8	13
Do Not Know	34.2	7.7	31.5

The Accreditation Survey indicated that a majority of faculty, administrators and classified staff found it of importance that the President ensure educational planning be integrated with resource distribution. There is less agreement about whether or not this occurs. It is interesting to note that a significant percentage of faculty and classified staff indicated Do Not Know.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

c. The president assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies.

Description

The Superintendent/President is responsible for overseeing the implementation of Board Policies, administrative procedures, statutes and regulations for the College and ensures the actions of the College are consistent with its stated Mission. These policies, statutes and regulations provide context for discussions and decisions in President's Cabinet, Management Council and College Council.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. The Superintendent/President oversees implementation of Board policy, statutes and regulations.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

d. The president effectively controls budget and expenditures.

Description

The Superintendent/President works with the Vice President of Administrative Services to develop the budget and set the budget controls. Recommendation #5 from the 2000 Accreditation Visiting Team Report recommended developing and refining the budget development process to ensure the College community understands the process. Substantial progress has been made by College Council in streamlining the Above Base Budget process and using data generated by the Program Review process. All of this was accomplished through shared governance.

The Vice President of Administrative Services in consultation with the President's Cabinet prepares a Preliminary Budget. The Preliminary Budget is reviewed by the College Council and the Institutional Budget Committee. The Institutional Budget Committee has had low participation over the last few years and is currently in a rebuilding process. The President/Superintendent receives budget recommendations from the College Council which are then discussed in the President's Cabinet. The College produces a comprehensive *Budget Book* that is available to all college constituents. Budget reports are routinely presented at the monthly Board of Trustees meeting.

In 2001-02 there were budget expenditures that were not accurately reported. Subsequently, this caused problems the next fiscal year. The College made changes to resolve these issues. The 2002-03 *Fiscal Health and Analysis Report* from the School Services of California made several recommendations that were written into the Institutional Goals. The most recent audit report as of January 2006 reported no major findings.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. There has been significant improvement in coordinating budgets with programs, but more can be accomplished. The actions taken from the last accreditation to streamline the budget process have allowed for a more systematic approach through shared governance.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

e. The president works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.

Description

The Superintendent/President and his designees represent the College on various local boards and commissions. The Board of Trustees and the Superintendent/President have had regular meetings with the City Councils from Visalia, Hanford, and Tulare, at which time issues of importance to these three communities are discussed.

The Superintendent/President has participated as a member of the Chambers of Commerce in Corcoran, Hanford, Tulare, and Visalia and the Kings-Tulare Counties Hispanic Chamber of Commerce.

The Superintendent/President chaired a local group which includes as members CEOs of large non-profit businesses in Visalia. They met once a month to discuss issues that related to all of the organizations.

In the Summer of 2001, the Superintendent/President's office established an "On Target with COS" forum. The monthly luncheons provided the Superintendent/President an opportunity to interact with members of the community in the COS District. The monthly luncheons were well attended in the first 1-2 years with good representation from school districts and city governments. By the third year attendance was down even with an extended outreach to local churches.   This last year the Superintendent/President's Office re-established the High School Superintendents/Principals Forum of public, private, and continuation high schools. This provides a regular venue for Superintendents/Principals to share concerns regarding educational access for their students and suggestions on improving COS services to their schools.

The Superintendent/President has been attending meetings of local service groups in the College district to communicate the benefits COS can provide to their communities and the future growth needs of COS. The Superintendent/President is working with local hospitals (Kaweah Delta Health Care District, Hanford Community Medical Center, Tulare District Hospital, and Corcoran District Hospital) and the Tulare County Medical Foundation to expand the COS nursing program.

The Superintendent/President provides leadership to the COS Foundation as a member of the executive committee and routinely attends their monthly meeting to report on campus issues. The PIO assists the Superintendent/President in communicating and marketing the services and programs of COS.

Evaluation

The College meets this standard. A good faith effort continues to be made by the Superintendent/President to communicate to all communities with in the COS District.

Planning Agenda

No planning agenda is recommended at this time.

Documentation

1. Board of Trustees Agendas & Minutes

2. Institutional Planning Committee Minutes

3. COS Strategic Plan

4. College Council Minutes

5. Campus Curriculum Committee Minutes

6. Student Learning Outcomes Committee Minutes

7. Accreditation Survey Results

8. Board of Trustees Policy Manual

9. Institutional Facilities Committee Minutes

10. Institutional Technology committee Minutes

11. Institutional Budget Committee Minutes

12. Academic Senate Minutes

13. College Council Goals & Accomplishments

14. College Council Members & Institutional Standing Committees Members

15. Academic Senate Yearly Action Plan

16. ASB Minutes

17. ASB Subcommittee Minutes

18. ASB Program Review

19. ASB Annual Goals & Objectives

20. Instructional Council Minutes

21. President's Cabinet Minutes

22. CCLC handbook

23. CCLC Policy & Procedure Service

24. Office of Research & Grants – IPEDS, SRTK, MIS Data, FTES, WSCH, Load

25. 2001-02 Leadership Program Review

26. Search Procedure for new Superintendent/President