

**College of the Redwoods**  
7351 Tompkins Hill Road  
Eureka, California 95501

**Accreditation Progress Report Addendum**

**May 13, 2008**

College of the Redwoods (CR) enthusiastically welcomes the opportunity to offer evidence of its continued progress toward fulfilling the ACCJC recommendations since the April 1, 2008 Progress Report and the April 4, 2008 ACCJC Team site visit to the CR campus. Since the April report and site visit, CR has focused its attention on

1. revising the program review process and forms to increase efficiency and usefulness;
2. continuing to update course outlines;
3. revising the college's education master plan, *CR 2020*.
4. completing the college's technology plan, *Technology Assessment and Planning 2008-2011*;
5. developing a facilities master plan;
6. completing the spring 2008 action planning pilot project;
7. reviewing and revising CR's integrating planning model; and
8. developing an institutional assessment plan and a fall 2008 assessment training schedule.

As the April 2008 progress report and this addendum make clear, CR has made significant progress toward completing all of the work recommended by the ACCJC, and the college continues to institutionalize the values, practices, and expectations that ensure CR's sustained commitment to educational and institutional effectiveness and to continuous improvement.

### **Response to Recommendation 1 (2005)**

**Recommendation 1:** *The team recommends that the college develop and implement a means of systematic, collaborative, and evidence-driven Program Review for all instruction, student services, and institutional support areas. In order to assure maximum effectiveness, such reviews should be conducted on a regular cycle that links the findings to the annual planning process for all programs and services.*

With 100 percent of scheduled annual and comprehensive program reviews completed, summarized, and evaluated for all instructional, administrative, and student services areas, the Program Review Committee (PRC) shifted its focus to revising both the annual update and comprehensive program review forms to make them more efficient and effective. The PRC used information and feedback gathered from its spring survey of program review participants and from interviews with faculty and functional groups using program review information for action planning to develop new instructional and non-instructional program review forms that incorporate features that more accurately reflect CR's data capabilities and planning process. For example, the new forms require programs to report course-level student success using the same signifiers used by the Office of Institutional Research in their analyses. Likewise, all reporting of faculty loads within a program or discipline will now be reported as "teaching load units" (TLU's) to mirror data used in other areas of the institution. The new forms also provide

more concise reporting for the functional groups that will use the data for planning. For example, the portion of the forms related to facilities needs has been revised to include a grid for describing how effectively or ineffectively specific instructional spaces facilitate achievement of student learning outcomes, and the form now requires an estimate of the number of students using each facility and an estimate of the cost of eliminating facility inefficiencies. This grid will make it much easier for CR to extract and synthesize critical data that allows facilities planning and work groups to identify specific facilities-related problems and needs shared by multiple disciplines/programs. A similar grid has been developed for equipment and equipment repair.

Another addition to the forms is a section that asks the authors to describe how their program is tied to action plans that have been submitted and/or approved. This will allow the program review process to track the impact of these plans on programs as well as the level of success a program has had using the action plan model as a means of achieving their goals.

In addition, the forms have been transferred to an "auto fill format" that provides for a uniform format and ease of use. The PRC also reorganized the discipline groupings used for the annual update process to allow for more efficient evaluations of the areas linked to the Associate Arts Degree programs. The program review process for the 2007-08 academic year consisted of 44 disciplines/programs undergoing annual updates and 30 disciplines/programs undergoing comprehensive reviews or annual updates. The large number of discipline updates provided useful information; however, some of the individual disciplines included overlapping discussions of facilities, faculty, and equipment related to the AA degree program, and this made it exceedingly difficult for the PRC to identify trends both within and across programs. In response, the PRC developed a new list of discipline groupings that are based on function (i.e. how the discipline fits into a degree or GE area), facilities (based on shared use of facilities), and organizational structure (based on which faculty oversee multiple disciplines and how the discipline fits within our current divisional structure). These groupings will allow the PRC to more efficiently evaluate how disciplines share needs, challenges, and possible solutions.

In May 2008, the PRC will conduct comprehensive review training sessions for faculty, staff, and administrators, and it will conduct annual update training sessions in August during CR's convocation activities.

As of May 13, 2008, the course outline inventory currency is over 80 percent. The Curriculum Committee has created and distributed to all academic divisions lists that indicate 1) remaining outdated course outlines in each subject and 2) the additional oldest 20 percent of outlines in each discipline's inventory. The Curriculum Committee attached to these lists instructions for updating and, in accordance with CR's new procedure for automatic inactivating of outdated course outlines, instructions for requesting one semester extensions for out-of-date outlines before they are inactivated and removed from the college catalog. CR expects 100 percent of the course outline inventory to be current by the end of the fall 2008 term. At that point, CR can focus on maintaining an ever-current course outline inventory by updating 20 percent of outlines every year.

## **Response to Recommendation 5 (2005)**

**Recommendation 5:** *The team recommends that the district improve its planning processes to include: the development of a long-range education plan; the development of a facilities master plan; and the development of an information technology plan. It is further recommended that the district develop a long-range financial planning process to provide early notice of structural imbalances between revenue and expenditures; to identify resources needed to adequately support changes in technology systems, facilities, and enhancement to student support systems; and to regulate the pace of changes consistent with available funds.*

### **Master Planning**

Recognizing that CR's distinct education and functional master planning processes are interdependent, the college has developed and adopted a master planning methodology based on a blend of methodologies from a variety of sources, including methodologies described in the Chancellor's Office's Facilities Planning Manual, and augmented these with CR-specific best practices identified by CR's master plan development team members. This methodology integrates all planning processes (i.e. facilities, education, and technology master planning) in a comprehensive master planning process, while at the same time respecting the unique staffing needs and practices of each master planning team. The comprehensive master planning process provides efficient mechanisms for each plan to inform and "converse" with other plans, and it establishes strategically-defined goals and timelines for all master planning so that the processes are integrated. Ultimately, this unifying process will allow CR to develop and implement a coherent, usable comprehensive college master plan that includes education, facilities, technology, and fiscal components. Since the ACCJC team visit to CR in April, the college has accomplished the following on each master plan component:

#### **Education Master Plan**

In April 2008, a small group consisting of faculty, the chief business officer, the director of Institutional Research, the acting chief instructional officer, and the Institutional Technology Services manager met with Scott Epstein from the Datatel Center for Institutional Effectiveness to generate an action framework for revising and implementing CR's Education Master Plan 2020. The group defined its task and the process by which the task would be completed, established a rough timeline, and discussed the makeup of the broadly-representative committee that would be needed to complete this task. In May 2008, Education Master Plan Development Team (EMPDT), a large, diverse committee of faculty, staff, and administrators, was convened and charged with the following:

#### **Phase 1: June 2008**

Gather internal data (e.g. trends in enrollment, programs, and courses) and external data (e.g. trends in local employment and demographics).

Conduct internal (i.e. CR) and external (i.e. community at large) focus groups to gather data on expectations and needs.

**Phase 2: June 2008**

Establish planning assumptions (i.e. define the principles and goals that should drive the education master plan and the education master planning process).

Conduct internal and external surveys as appropriate.

**Phase 3: July/August 2008**

Conduct SWOT (i.e. strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis.

Analyze forecasts of programs.

Analyze forecasts of labor trends and demographics.

Draft education master plan.

Conduct work sessions on education master plan draft with entire college community at fall convocation.

**Phase 4: September/October 2008**

Revise education master plan.

Present education master plan to Board of Trustees.

The education master plan will align with state and regional educational policies, and it will define the philosophy and mission of CR. Additionally, because CR recognizes the essential role a usable education master plan plays in all integrated planning and because CR believes its revised education master plan will serve as an effective “driver” for all other planning, the college has made its education master plan a top priority and has continued its contract with the Datatel Center for Institutional Effectiveness throughout summer 2008.

**Technology**

In addition to completing all follow-up interviews with program review authors to determine annual and long-term technology activities and needs, the Technology Advisory Group (TAG) has completed its rough draft of CR’s technology plan, *Technology Assessment and Planning 2008-2011* and, after hosting districtwide feedback forums via Blackboard, has begun to formally present this document to key campus bodies for further input—the Del Norte and Mendocino Coast education centers; the Academic Senate; the Coordinated Planning Council; and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. In addition to establishing technology goals that support the college’s mission and align with CR’s *Strategic Plan 2008-2011*, the technology plan now identifies specific baseline measurements and targets for all technology objectives, and by mid-summer 2008 the document will include a districtwide PC hardware survey that will serve as the foundation for an ongoing computer replacement program.

## **Facilities**

The Facilities Master Plan Development Team (FMPDT) is a task force established in March 2008 and whose articulated purpose is to

1. create a planning framework that allows CR to address the existing and future facilities needs of the college district with a view to being responsive and accountable to the community;
2. construct a working plan to be utilized by the Facilities Planning Committee in meeting the goals and objectives identified in the education master plan and college strategic plan; and
3. promote stewardship in the execution of the ongoing and integrated planning process.

The FMPDT met again on April 22 and 23, 2008 for all-day work sessions with Scott Epstein from the Datatel Center for Institutional Effectiveness. These work sessions focused on

- gathering input from a professional architect about key features possessed by workable facilities master plans;
- continuing discussions about input needed from current facilities bond expenditure plans;
- finalizing the master planning framework and timelines;
- conducting an information audit (i.e. what does CR currently know and have access to that is relevant to facilities planning?); and
- generating documents key to the facilities master planning process.

As indicated in the April 1, 2008 Progress Report, CR recognizes the importance of creating a workable, long-range facilities master plan and has established as a standing member of the team an architect with the firm coordinating CR's bond-funded campus renovation projects. At the April work sessions, the Team used the following questions to solicit expert information from the architect that can help serve as some of the underlying assumptions for the development process:

- From an architectural perspective, what is a facilities master plan?
- What are the most important elements of information that a client needs to furnish or develop to make a successful facilities master plan?
- What kind of collaboration is needed from stakeholders and how would you suggest the client organize this effort?
- What would you suggest for a development process and timelines?

- Concerning the existing bond expenditure plans, how will this affect the facilities planning effort?

In addition, the FMPDT established the following goals to be accomplished during the summer 2008:

- Inventory all owned facilities e.g. site, buildings, equipment, systems.
- Evaluate the physical condition and projected life span of all facilities.
- Research new and upcoming regulations and trends affecting facilities.
- Prepare a plan to correct current and upcoming physical and regulatory deficiencies.
- Identify physical and regulatory deficiencies that require facility and system improvements.
- Evaluate the program use and adequacy of facilities.
- Evaluate the capacity and utilization of facilities.

Finally, the FMPDT has set the following goals to be accomplished in fall 2008:

- Review the education master plan for changes in programs and program requirements.
- Prepare a plan to improve assignment, adequacy, and utilization.
- Identify inadequacies and capacity deficiencies that require facility\system improvements.
- Combine the lists of facility and system and evaluate physical, financial feasibility.
- Prepare a physical design of the campus.
- Propose a prioritized list of projects showing time frames and magnitude of cost.

The Team also created at these work sessions and subsequently published to its Blackboard site for districtwide feedback the following key facilities master plan documents:

- Facilities Master Plan Purpose Statement
- Facilities Plan Schematic
- FUSION Data

- Architect Questions and Answers
- Topic Areas
- CCCCCO Facilities Master Planning Manual Chapter 2
- Analysis of Inputs
- Education Master Plan Issues

Because CR recognizes that every plan to expend resources needs to have a companion plan that identifies where resources will come from, the Comprehensive Master Plan includes fiscal plans for the technology and facilities master plans. In fall 2008, CR will complete the following and publish its findings with drafts of the facilities master plan:

- Evaluate current and future human, financial, and material resources.
- Review the feasibility of program changes in the education plan.
- Review the feasibility of capital outlay projects in the facilities plan.
- Show proposed district, state and alternative funding sources and schedules for capital outlay projects.
- Indicate project feasibility in terms of downstream operational funding.

Embedding funding plans within master plans and annually reviewing CR's progress toward its goals and revising college priorities in light of that progress will make it easier for planning to inform budgeting (rather than budgeting driving planning) by identifying current needs and required funding development efforts.

### **Action Planning Pilot Project**

As part of its effort to create and refine usable, sensible planning and budgeting processes, CR has continued the Action Planning Pilot Project described on pages 15-17 of the April 1, 2008 Progress Report. The purpose of the project is to allocate \$150,000 from the unrestricted general fund to specific action plan proposals that satisfy needs articulated in program reviews and that align with the goals and objectives of the college's strategic plan.

On April 25, 2008, the large, broadly-representative Coordinated Planning Council (CPC) concluded a series of presentations by action plan authors and evaluated the merits of each proposed action plan using six criteria:

1. How well does the action plan align with the goals and objectives of CR's *Strategic Plan 2008-2011*?
2. How well does the action plan align with ACCJC/WASC Accreditation Standards?
3. How measurable are the action plan objectives?
4. How reasonable and attainable is the action plan?
5. How sustainable is the action plan?
6. How innovative is the action plan?

Based on its evaluations, the CPC approved eleven action plan proposals, denied five, and put one on hold until the next academic year. The funded action plans have now been given to CR's Budget Office, and budget office personnel will work with action planners and cost center managers to develop expenditure plans, purchasing requisitions, work orders, and other personnel and business forms as appropriate.

As discussed in the April 1, 2008 Progress Report, this pilot project has served as an extremely effective vehicle for implementing and testing CR's integrated planning model. It has allowed the college the opportunity to create and revise working links between program review, functional work groups, planning committees, and budget units and to create data tools that facilitate more transparent, consistent, and reliable planning and decision-making. In the course of this pilot project, for example, the Office of Institutional Research developed and deployed web-based data collection tools and interview forms that feed centralized databases. In May 2008, the CPC held two meetings to reflect upon the action planning process and CR's integrated planning model and to develop recommendations for revising both to make for more streamlined, effective planning and budgeting processes.

In addition, the pilot project has compelled CR to grapple not just with important structural questions but also with critical philosophical questions about the relationship between planning and budgeting, and it has helped the college make significant progress toward becoming an institution in which planning thoughtfully and deliberately drives budgeting rather than budgeting arbitrarily driving planning.

### **Response to Recommendation 7 (2005)**

**Recommendation 7:** *The team recommends that the college improve its capacity for collaborative and data-driven decision-making. Such decision-making should incorporate broad-based participation, use of qualitative and quantitative data, and establish appropriate measures of effectiveness.*

Since it first convened in February 2008, the CR Assessment Team has initiated a number of projects designed to institutionalize ongoing assessment across all CR programs and services. The Team began by reviewing and discussing professional assessment literature and developing a staff/faculty-owned assessment philosophy and process. These define what assessment at CR should be and should not be and what CR should do and should not do in the process of assessment. The Team also implemented a formal institutional methodology to collect and document program and student assessment and launched the CR Assessment and Program Review website to provide the college with critical information related to outcomes assessment at CR (<http://inside.redwoods.edu/Assessment/index.asp>). The website offers links to the Team's mission and membership, assessment tools and data, assessment resources, and a significant collection of links related to CR's primary self-assessment tool, program review. The site provides access to all completed annual and comprehensive program reviews, program review guides and schedules, historical data, and information on CR's program-review-driven integrated planning process. The site will serve as an information "clearinghouse" where the Assessment Team and Program Review Committee can provide faculty, staff, and administrators with current and historical self-assessment data.

The Assessment Team also developed two key components of CR's assessment infrastructure: 1) an assessment self-study framework and 2) common assessment language. The Team began by surveying the state of outcomes assessment in the CR district to determine how programs currently use assessment to improve student learning and then studied assessment audit procedures used by other colleges. The Team decided to use Bakersfield College's assessment process to develop an assessment self-study framework to be implemented at CR in fall 2008. The Team also identified, defined, categorized, and published on the Assessment and Program Review website an inventory of assessment-related terms to be used as much as a possible in CR's assessment conversations and documentation. This common language will help CR maintain a shared narrative about the state of CR's programs and services.

Currently, the Team is working with an external consultant (Fred Trapp) to identify a trainer to lead convocation week workshops for the Assessment Team and members from the Program Review Committee, the Curriculum Committee, the Basic Skills Initiative Steering Committee, Institutional Research, and administration. Additionally, in June 2008, five Assessment Team members will attend the International Assessment and Retention Conference titled "Assessment Reconsidered: Improving Learning, Student Success and Transparency."

## **Integrated Planning Model Assessment and Revision**

As reported above, CR completed the action planning pilot project in late April, and in May 2008, the Coordinated Planning Council (CPC) held a work session assisted by Datatel Center for Institutional Effectiveness consultant Burt Peachy to assess and modify CR's integrated planning model based on its performance during the pilot project. The CPC began by cataloging observations about the effectiveness of the integrated planning model and noting apparent problems and strengths and then brainstormed specific revisions to the model to capitalize on its strengths and eliminate its weaknesses. For example, the CPC noted that integrated planning processes may function more efficiently if the action planning processes and deadlines were more closely associated with program review processes and deadlines. During the 2007-08 year, program reviews were largely completed by mid fall semester and action planning took place in mid spring semester. The Council noted that it may eliminate duplication of work if the action planning process was simply integrated into the program review process. The Office of Institutional Research is investigating how this integration can efficiently take place. Additionally, the CPC noted that the current action planning process (in which individual funding requests are limited to \$10,000) does not allow for CR's integrated planning model to address significant portions of CR's unrestricted budget and the integrated planning model does not yet clearly articulate how long-term planning will serve as the driver for long-term budgeting. In May 2008, the CPC developed two proposals to strategically address these and other issues during the 2008-09 academic year:

1. Increase fivefold the dollar limit of individual action plan requests to \$50,000. The spring 2008 action plan pilot project that limited individual requests to \$10,000 allowed CR to explore the effectiveness of the integrated planning model and to discover some of its strengths and weaknesses. However, because requests were limited to such a small dollar amount, it did not compel the college to grapple with large funding requests, nor did it allow the college the opportunity to use the integrated planning process to link significant amounts of CR's budget to program review findings. By substantially raising the request cap, the Coordinated Planning Council will be able consider more complex, resource-intensive requests and to use these requests to more meaningfully tie program review findings to planning and budgeting.
2. Initiate a zero-based budgeting pilot project for 2008-09 for one instructional and one non-instructional program. CR recognizes the need to extend the program review/planning/budget link beyond unrestricted general fund spending to base allocation spending, and the college is committed to developing the processes and practices that will allow CR to defend with data decisions to allocate every dollar of the college's budget. However, the initial steps toward these goals have been difficult to conceptualize because the movement toward deliberate, data-informed, program-review rooted base funding decisions represents a sharp departure from CR's past practice of simply rolling over budgets from year to year. The limited-in-scope zero-based budgeting pilot project will allow CR to begin to break from past practice; to take meaningful steps toward its budget process goals without jeopardizing the stability of programs; and to develop and refine a workable, sustainable budget process that can be applied to additional programs and eventually implemented college-wide. Additionally, because the college plans to host multiple information sessions during the pilot project to share with the entire college

community what is being done, why it's being done, and how it's being done, CR will continue to institutionalize the developing relationship between program review, planning, and budgeting. This pilot project should help all CR employees deeply appreciate the purpose of program review: to determine the identity and future funding of each college program.

It is not just the staff, faculty, and administrators who have working toward fulfilling ACCJC standards. At its April 6, 2008 retreat, the CR Board of Trustees participated in a training session offered by Dr. Barbara Beno, President ACCJC, titled "Accreditation and Trusteeship: What Every Board Should Know." The presentation provided valuable information in three areas:

1. Accreditation and the ACCJC.
2. The role of trustees in assuring quality and educational effectiveness.
3. The role of the president in assuring quality and educational effectiveness.

At that same retreat, CR's Institutional Research Director, Martha Davis, presented to the Board of Trustees an overview of the development of the strategic planning process and how measurable objectives link to key performance indicators. Davis also offered a presentation on CR's Integrated Planning Model and explained how program review requests are addressed by functional groups such as facilities, technology, library resources, student services, and human resources. The Office of Institutional Research also offered a presentation at the May 6, 2008 Board meeting on downloading information from the California State Data Mart and navigating the CR's new internal and external web pages. These presentations and the enthusiasm with which they were requested and received serve as testimony to the commitment of CR's Board of Trustees and employees to develop and work within collaborative decision-making processes.

In May 2008, CR hired Dr. Jeff Marsee to serve as president/superintendent of College of the Redwoods beginning July 1, 2008. Dr. Marsee brings with him to CR a history of experience with and demonstrated commitment to compliance with ACCJC standards. As vice president of El Camino College, for example, Dr. Marsee shared administrative oversight responsibility for Compton College when that institution lost its accreditation and was integrated into the operational structure of El Camino. Additionally, in April 2008 Dr. Marsee completed work as Standard 3 Team Leader for the Woodlands Center (Yuba Community College District) accreditation team; last year he served as Standard 3 Team Leader for the Cerro Coso College (Kern Community College District) accreditation team; and in the 1990's, he served on three accreditation teams. Dr. Marsee's accreditation experience and expertise will serve as valuable assets in CR's continued efforts toward maintaining full compliance with all ACCJC standards. In fact, Dr. Marsee's formal job performance evaluations by the CR Board of Trustees will be based explicitly his work toward increasing the college's overall effectiveness as measured by its demonstrated compliance with ACCJC standards. In addition, the Board of Trustees will require Dr. Marsee to present formal monthly reports to the Board on the college's compliance with ACCJC standards. Each monthly presentation will focus on one ACCJC standard and will offer

a review of the standard, an assessment of state of the college's compliance, and a plan of action to further the college's effectiveness regarding that standard.

### **Conclusion**

As the above narrative and the attached evidence make clear, College of the Redwoods has sustained its commitment to fully implementing all of the ACCJC recommendations. CR has completed 100 percent of all instructional and non-instructional program reviews; updated over 80 percent of its course outlines; made significant progress on or completed education, technology, and facilities master plans; completed the action planning pilot project; reviewed and revised its integrated planning model to increase efficiency and effectiveness; begun to institutionalize ongoing assessment of programs and services; and engaged in essential accreditation training.

Perhaps most significant, though, is College of the Redwoods' demonstrated long-term commitment to compliance with all accreditation standards. In May 2008, CR "re-missioned" the standing Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) and charged this large, broadly-representative body with one task: to oversee the college's effectiveness as measured by compliance with accreditation standards. Chaired by the chief accreditation liaison, the IEC will monitor all college policies, processes, and practices to make sure these are clearly aligned with ACCJC standards, and the committee will have the power to task work units with specific objectives aimed at bringing the college into stronger compliance with accreditation standards. This new IEC will prevent CR from ever facing in the future the possibility of being far out of compliance with ACCJC standards and from having to confront a crush of work to come into compliance. In fact, the ability to easily produce future accreditation self-studies and reports and the ability to successfully maintain full, unqualified accreditation should be the natural byproducts of this new IEC, and CR looks forward to successful accreditation reviews in the future.