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Overview

College of the Redwoods embraces the standard of institutional effectiveness as described in the 2002 Accreditation Standards of the Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), as follows:

“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.”

The institutional effectiveness (IE) process at the college reflects an ongoing cycle of improvement related to program review, planning, and assessment of student learning. Institutional effectiveness processes affect every level of the institution through the continuous process of evaluation, planning, and implementation. As part of the comprehensive planning cycle, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) reviews the integrated planning process, tracks institutional effectiveness metrics over time, and provides an annual report to the President, the Board of Trustees, and the college community.

As part of the quality improvement process at College of the Redwoods this report includes:

- a summary of accomplishments related to program review, planning, and student learning outcomes
- a summary of the college's overall progress towards institutional goals
- an evaluation of the institutional effectiveness process at the college and a summary of needed process improvements
- a description of institutional effectiveness process improvements planned for 2012-2013

While an Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard is included in the appendix, this report does not intend to judge the college's effectiveness; rather, the intention of this report is to ensure the college is engaged in continuous quality improvement as described in the ACCJC Rubrics for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness for Planning, Program Review, and Student Learning Outcomes.
In Spring 2011 College of the Redwoods adopted new vision and mission statements for the college. These revised statements were used during the 2011-2012 year as a guide for college planning and institutional effectiveness activities.

**Vision**

College of the Redwoods is a learning community where lives are transformed.

**Mission**

College of the Redwoods puts student success first by providing outstanding developmental, career technical, and transfer education. The college partners with the community to contribute to the economic vitality and lifelong learning needs of its service area. We continually assess student learning and institutional performance and practices to improve upon the programs and services we offer.

**Values**

1. Student Success and Access: We put students first, ensuring that student learning, advancement, and access are pivotal to all we do.
2. Educational Excellence and Innovation: We value ongoing and systematic planning and evaluating methods that move us towards excellence.
3. Honoring Diversity: We value all the members of our community and strive to create a nurturing, honest, open environment.
4. Participatory Governance: We value ethical behavior and strive to create a culture where all students, staff, faculty and administrators engage in inclusive, ongoing and self-reflective decision making.
5. Environmental Awareness: We value the environment and the need to minimize our impacts upon it.
6. Community Development: We value the economic and intellectual development of the various communities we serve.
7. Supportive Culture: We strive to create a supportive, problem-solving culture, and we recognize the proven usefulness of an interest-based approach (IBA) for achieving trust, cooperation and effective problem solving.
Program Review Accomplishments

Implementation of Program Review Process | Thirty nine (39) instructional disciplines completed annual program reviews during the 2011-2012 year, and three comprehensive instructional program reviews were completed (Administration of Justice, Fire Technology, and Paramedic). Ten student development program reviews were completed during the year. Thirteen program reviews were completed for administrative areas. The bookstore was the only program unable to complete a program review during the 2011-2012 cycle by the deadline for this report.

Program Review Executive Summary | The Program Review Executive Summary included common themes found in the areas of trends, budget and assessment and noted the following comments and recommendations:

- Online course success rates are improving in some disciplines and additional analysis may assist in further improving online course success.
- Basic skills data indicate that approximately 20% of incoming students do not have English and math placement information in their files, indicating that many students have not participated in assessment and placement activities.
- Limited funding for some student development programs may be having a negative impact on student success.
- Resources for technology and equipment may be inadequate for some programs.

Program Review Framework | The program review template was refined for the 2011-2012 year to reduce the annual instructional review to seven tabs. Data sets were simplified to incorporate indications of whether program indicator data fall within suggested parameters.

Integration of Program Review Results | Requests for allocation of resources based upon the 2010-11 program reviews were collated and submitted to the various integrated planning functional committees (IPFCs) in October 2011. The IPFCs ranked the funding requests based upon planning rubrics, and the Budget Planning Committee prioritized them in Spring 2012 for funding. The executive summaries from the program reviews from 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 were reviewed by the Strategic Planning and Education Master Planning Committees to inform the development of institutional goals and objectives.

Program Review Process Improvements | In the 2011-2012 year, the Program Review Committee addressed many of the 2010-11 recommendations for program review process improvement. Improvements included ensuring better data accuracy, incorporation of educational center data and information into the program review process, and incorporating a discussion of grant-related financial obligations into program reviews.

Program Review Process Evaluation | The Program Review Committee evaluated the 2011-2012 accomplishments and identified additional recommendations for incorporation into the 2012-2013 program review process.
Planning Accomplishments

Following is a summary of major accomplishments related to planning during the 2011-2012 year.

Strategic Plan

Analysis of 2008-2011 Strategic Plan | The Strategic Planning Committee reviewed the 2008-2011 Strategic Plan to identify elements to include and elements to change in the new plan. The five goals in the 2008-2011 Strategic Plan were focused on student access and success, the management of institutional resources, the development of a culture of assessment, and contribution to the community. During the development of the 2012-2017 Strategic Plan, members of the Strategic Planning Committee were of the opinion that the next strategic plan should avoid generic goals and should adopt specific goals to prepare the institution to meet future challenges. As part of its evaluation of the 2008-2011 Strategic Plan, the committee reviewed data regarding the college’s key performance indicators (KPIs) as presented in the college’s Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard as well as the master executive summaries from the Program Review Committee’s work in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011.

Development of 2012-2017 Strategic Plan | In August 2011 Interim President/Superintendent Utpal K. Goswami’s Convocation keynote address led the kick-off of the college’s strategic planning effort. In September 2011, a district Strategic Planning Committee comprised of representatives from faculty, classified staff, and administrative staff was formed to update the strategic plan for the college. In recognition of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee’s (IEC) role in developing the strategic plan, as recognized in Administrative Procedure 3250, Institutional Planning, many members of the IEC agreed to serve on the Strategic Planning Committee.

The committee met seven times between September 8, 2011 and March 20, 2012. The Strategic Planning Committee reviewed and discussed an environmental scanning summary provided by the Institutional Research Department and developed initial strategic planning themes. Beginning in November 2011 a series of conversations took place throughout the district in order to discuss the themes identified by the committee during the environmental scanning process and gather input and ideas from college constituents. In January 2012 the Planning Director and the Interim President/Superintendent led a workshop to present the planning model and provide an update on broad institutional themes such as budget and funding, student success, pedagogical innovations, technology, and community partnerships. In January and February the Strategic Planning Committee drafted strategic plan goals and objectives and solicited feedback from the college community. After constituency review and feedback was incorporated, the Board of Trustees reviewed the draft strategic plan. The revised plan was submitted to the College Council in March for ratification prior to Board approval in April.

The Strategic Plan goals and objectives are available on the college website at www.redwoods.edu, and the entire Strategic Plan, including a detailed description of the methodology, implementation, and evaluation for the Strategic Plan is available on the college’s strategic planning web page.


**Education Master Plan**

**Analysis of 2009-2020 Education Master Plan** | The Education Master Plan Committee evaluated the 2009-2020 Education Master Plan and determined the following:

- The plan was overly focused on growth which, while appropriate at the time, is no longer funded as a result of the state budget crisis and reduced funding for community colleges.
- The revised plan must have a shorter timeline in order to remain current throughout its implementation and to remain in alignment with the Strategic Plan which is scheduled to be updated in 2017.
- Goals and objectives in the Education Master Plan were unclear and did not contain clearly measurable targets.

**Development of 2012 – 2017 Education Master Plan** | The ad hoc Education Master Plan Committee was convened in September 2011 to update the 2009-2020 Education Master Plan in response to changing environmental conditions. The Education Master Plan Committee met seven times between September 2011 and May 2012.

The committee reviewed summary notes from the service area advisory committee meetings, an external scan presented by the Director of Institutional Research, program review master executive summaries for the past two years, and preliminary institutional effectiveness data being incorporated into a refined Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard.

The external environmental scan focused on the following:

- Projected population growth in the college’s service area
- High school graduate trends and projections for California and for the college’s service area
- College-going rates and high school yield rates for College of the Redwoods
- Regional economic forecasts and occupational employment projections

The Education Master Plan Committee developed Education Master Plan goals and measurable objectives in alignment with the 2012-2017 Strategic Plan and the mission of the college. The committee distributed a draft of the Education Master Plan goals and objectives college wide. The committee received feedback from the college community and incorporated this input into revised goals and objectives.

The Education Master Plan goals and objectives are available on the college’s website at [www.redwoods.edu](http://www.redwoods.edu), and the entire plan, including a detailed description of the methodology, implementation, and evaluation plan is available on the college’s education master planning web page.
Functional Plans

Numerous planning efforts have been accomplished or are underway throughout the college. The functional planning updates provided here include technology, facilities, enrollment management, distance education, student equity, basic skills, staffing, and budget planning. Year-end highlights as well as planning accomplishments are outlined below.

Technology

**Highlights** | Technology services staff initiated a number of projects to support college operations, including the following:

- The college executed a contract with Corporation for Education Network Initiatives in California (CENIC) to substantially increase the internet bandwidth for the district from 45 megabits to 1,000 megabits.
- Technology services staff collaborated with a consultant to redesign the network architecture to current best practice and increase the speed and reliability of the network.
- Staff began the process of implementing voice over internet protocol (VoIP) for the district’s phone system to upgrade the aging PBX and reduce the amount of cabling required district wide.
- Staff began implementation of an initiative to expand wireless access at all three education centers. All equipment has arrived, implementation begins in August.
- Technology services staff set up over 100 computers in the new Student Services and Administration building on the main Eureka campus and transferred user data.

**Planning Activities** | During Spring 2012 the Technology Planning Committee reviewed each of the initiatives identified in the 2010-2012 Technology Plan. For each, the committee evaluated progress on the initiative and determined whether it should be carried forward into the new plan. The committee will be developing updated goals and objectives in alignment with the college’s Strategic and Education Master Plans.

Distance Education

**Highlights** | The Distance Education Department has accomplished a number of projects, including the following:

- Faculty and staff training included weekly workshops in education technology (e.g. Sakai, Tegrity, CCC Confer etc.); online teaching, learning, and pedagogy; one-on-one training for faculty in MyCR and other online tools; and the creation of stand-alone versions of all faculty trainings.
Other faculty support included technical assistance regarding graphics and multimedia as well as support for on-campus grants such as the Open Academic Analytics Initiative and the Kaleidoscope grant to provide free, openly licensed textbooks in selected courses.

Support for students included providing student advising for distance education students, live monthly online orientations (DE-101) for students in distance learning courses, and the creation of a standalone version of DE-101.

Professional staff developed curriculum for online hospitality classes sponsored by Del Norte County’s Department of Rural Human Services.

The department presented on the DE-101 orientation at the 2012 Online Teaching Conference.

Planning Activities | The Distance Education Department held monthly advisory committee meetings to garner input and feedback from stakeholders. In Spring 2012, the Distance Education Advisory Committee determined a need to update the Distance Education Plan which previously had been incorporated into the college’s Technology Plan. The revised goals and objectives were developed in Spring 2012 and, upon review by the committee, will be incorporated into a new Distance Education Plan.

Facilities

Highlights | The college has commenced a number of local- and state-bond funded construction projects. These projects were undertaken to improve college facilities in accordance with the College of the Redwoods Facilities Plan. The college identified a designated capital project cost control manager to ensure on-time completion of these projects and prepare reports to enable effective oversight.

A new student services and administration building was completed on the main campus; services that are currently housed in two portable buildings will be relocated to the new buildings.

The college broke ground on two new academic buildings.

Plans to seismically stabilize the Old Library building on the main campus are underway.

The science lab upgrade project at the Mendocino Coast Education Center was completed, and plans to upgrade the science lab on the Del Norte Campus are underway.

Planning Activities | During Spring 2012 the Facilities Planning Committee reviewed the 2009 Facilities Master Plan to identify elements requiring update. These elements include the Facilities Master Plan goals as well as the facilities planning priorities that were identified for the main campus in Eureka and the Del Norte and Mendocino Coast Education Centers.
Enrollment Management

**Highlights** | The Enrollment Management Committee facilitated dialogue and discussion leading to the development of a TLU-allocation model (model for allocating funds for instruction) based upon location, division, needs of the student population, and degree and certificate needs.

**Planning Activities** | The Enrollment Management Committee had a clearly defined work plan for 2011-2012. The work plan status report available on the committee’s website shows that all planning items were accomplished in the 2011-2012 year. In November 2011 the Enrollment Management Committee formed an Enrollment Management Plan Subcommittee to develop enrollment management goals and strategies. Enrollment Management Plan 2012-2015 was drafted in alignment with the college’s Strategic and Education Master Plans. This draft document was reviewed, modified, and approved by the Enrollment Management Committee on May 14. The Enrollment Management Plan includes the identification of responsible persons or areas for the objectives and activities included in the plan, as well as proposed timelines and associated costs. The updated Enrollment Management Plan can be found on the committee web page.

Student Equity Plan

In Spring 2012 an ad hoc Student Equity Committee was formed to update the college’s Student Equity Plan. The committee evaluated the college’s progress regarding the previous Student Equity Plan and reviewed a number of datasets provided by the Institutional Research Department. The updated Student Equity Plan was drafted in May 2012 for college approval.

Basic Skills

**Highlights** | The Basic Skills Committee (BSC) completed its program review and presented the findings during the Assessment Summit in May 2012. The BSC awarded several thousand dollars in basic skills grants to increase success of our at risk/underachieving students. Two calls for proposals went out, one in the Fall and one in the Spring; twelve proposals were received and ten were funded. Funded proposals included:

- **Fall**
  - Basic Skills Researcher for IR (9 months)
  - Student Success Task Force Pilot
  - Eureka Math Mobile Mac Cart (Extension)
  - Math Lab Tutor Training and Substitute Stipends
  - Math 372 Textbooks
  - Mendocino Mobile Mac Cart
  - ESOL Outreach and Programming

- **Spring**
  - Math Pathways Conference Attendee
  - ESOL Pilot Eureka (Outreach, Coordination, and TLUs to cover a 2nd course in Spring 2013 should the State Initiative not pass)
  - Del Norte- Orientation Video
**Planning Activities** | In Spring 2012 the Basic Skills Committee updated the 2011-2012 Basic Skills Plan to ensure alignment with the new Strategic and Education Master Plans. The Basic Skills Plan can be found on the Basic Skills Committee web page.

**Staffing and Professional Development**

**Highlights** | A Professional Development Committee was formed with the following mission: “In support of the college’s Mission and Strategic Plan, the Professional Development Committee provides a comprehensive professional development program to include assessment of needs, planning and evaluation of activities.” This committee will ensure development and coordination of a robust professional development plan for district employees.

**Planning Activities** | In Spring 2012 the Interim Human Resources Director collaborated with a consultant from the Collegiate Brain Trust to begin development of a staffing plan for the college. The outline and basic structure for the plan was reviewed by the Board of Trustees at its regular meeting on May 1, 2012 and will be refined during Summer 2012.

**Budget Planning**

**Highlights** | For the second year in a row, the college integrated planning and resource allocation with program review results. The Budget Planning Committee also adopted a total cost of ownership (TCO) approach to evaluating long term projects.

**Planning Activities** | In February 2012 the Budget Planning Committee held a series of listening sessions to gather ideas for potential savings to enable the college to address the anticipated 2012-2013 budget reduction. These ideas were investigated by the committee and incorporated into the tentative 2012-2013 budget presented to the Board of Trustees in June 2012. In Spring 2012 the committee reviewed the three-year budget forecast that addressed several scenarios related to community college funding in California. In May 2012 the Budget Planning Committee evaluated the committee’s progress with respect to its 2011-2012 work plan and is developing a work plan for the 2012-2013 year that is aligned with the 2012-2017 Strategic Plan.
This section outlines learning outcomes activities that were accomplished during the 2011-2012 year.

Faculty and Staff Highly Engaged in Assessment Activity

- Assessment reporting has dramatically increased. About ninety percent of all courses offered in Spring 2012 had at least one SLO assessed, and about one-third of courses offered in Fall 2011 had at least one SLO assessed. Finally, in Spring 2012 at least one outcome was assessed for over 60 percent of all degrees and certificates.
- Learning outcomes were in place prior to the end of spring for all degree and certificate programs.
- All Student Development areas completed their third year cycle of assessment for student learning and program outcomes.
- General Education assessment took place in the fall and spring semesters.
  - Faculty assessed the Critical Thinking outcome in the fall. Instructors volunteered to evaluate twenty-one general education courses. Aggregate results were gathered in terms of the extent to which students met defined expectations, with 38% exceeding, 43% meeting, and 19% not meeting expectations.
  - The Global/Cultural Awareness outcome was assessed in Spring 2012 using a common rubric to directly evaluate student work. A random stratified sample of instructors evaluated thirteen general education courses. Aggregate results were again defined in terms of the extent to which students met defined expectations, with 48% exceeding, 36% meeting and 16% not meeting expectations. The instructors teaching these courses discussed the results in group dialogue sessions.

Facilitated Widespread Dialogue

- Assessment Fridays (discussion sessions with an open invitation to all interested faculty and staff) were held throughout the spring semester. A wide range of topics were discussed including the coordination of Mathematics, English and Student Development, a review of placement and performance of Basic Skills students, and the results of a graduate survey.
- Thursday morning sessions were held during the spring semester for Student Development personnel to evaluate and improve assessment work. Discussions were enriched by participation from Assessment Committee members as well as faculty involved with shared outcomes work related to increasing student success through educational planning.
- A three day Assessment Summit was held at the end of the spring semester to increase intentional, meaningful dialogue among disciplines. The summit was heavily attended by faculty and staff.
- An online forum was created for recording assessment dialogue. The tool was used at the Assessment Summit and continues to be used by faculty and staff to capture ongoing group dialogue.
Created an Infrastructure to Support Sustainable Assessment Activity

- The Assessment Committee maintained a “stoplight” document to inform the campus about the status of plans and outcomes development for disciplines, degrees, and certificates.

- Assessment reporting software was developed, replacing the MS Word forms. The new software tool promotes the alignment of course learning outcomes with degree/certificate learning outcomes. A closing-the-loop reporting feature was also included in the tool to allow faculty and staff to follow up on the impact of recommendations implemented based on assessment findings.

- During Fall 2011, reports were sent to the Assessment Coordinator to post on MyCR; in Spring 2012, these were archived, now made public via assessment software as pdf files.

- Outcomes, plans, and old reporting forms were centralized from varied public and private web locations to a newly created central assessment website.

- Student Development programs utilized the new software and assessment website to document the past three years of assessment work, including archives of data and assessment reports.

Gained Support from Existing Organizational Structures and Leadership

- The Assessment Committee worked with the Curriculum Committee to centralize documents and data, as well as to plan to streamline work for 2012-2013. The Curriculum Committee is now assisting the Assessment Committee by maintaining degree and certificate learning outcomes. The Curriculum Committee also established a course inactivation form to help track assessment of all active courses.

- Degree/Certificate learning outcomes were added to the upcoming 2012-2013 catalog to heighten student awareness.

- Regular assessment update reports were given to the Academic Senate each semester; in Spring 2012 these were provided at each meeting.

- Starting in Spring 2012, deans oversaw that assessment work was planned and carried out.

- Committee pages were maintained to inform the district about meeting times and topics, as well as recent actions and current progress in assessment work.
Provided Training, Professional Development, and Consultation

- Targeted workshops were held at convocation 2011, and preliminary plans made for Convocation 2012. The Assessment Committee prepared an Assessment Handbook that was distributed in hard copy at Convocation 2011 and via the assessment webpage. The handbook was designed to be annually updated as the software, resources, and plans for assessment evolve. The handbook is provided to all new faculty hires, both full and part time.

- Institutional Research provided four assessment training workshops for Student Development during the months of September, November, and December. As a result of the training, a better understanding of learning outcomes assessment led to revised assessment plans.

- Regular drop-in help times were held by the Assessment Coordinators in Spring 2012. Scheduled help times and feedback sessions were held throughout the district (Eureka, Mendocino, Del Norte, and Klamath-Trinity) in 2011-2012.

- The Assessment Coordinator attended Flex Committee meetings, and spoke at the Associate Faculty Orientations (fall and spring semesters).

- The Assessment Coordinator provided rapid feedback and consultation to faculty and staff, answering countless emails and phone calls on a daily basis.

- Information regarding how to conduct assessment work was migrated from the committee webpage to the new software so that it was easily accessible.

- Closing-the-loop activities were consistently stressed by the Assessment Coordinator and Assessment Committee and leadership at all sessions.

- The Student Development Assessment Group was formed to provide additional training and support for student service areas assessment and coordinate dialogue as needed.

Established Links to the Program Review Process

- Assessment due dates were coordinated with the Program Review dates (plans were due with Needs Addendums in early October; reports were due in spring).

- Feedback was provided to the Program Review Committee regarding assessment progress. The Assessment Coordinator attended Program Review Committee meetings to provide reports on progress for each program, and served as an ad hoc member of the Program Review Committee.

- The Student Development annual program review incorporated Key Performance Indicators to assess program health.

- The Assessment Committee worked with the Program Review Committee to centralize documents and data, as well as to plan to streamline work for 2012-2013.
Progress of the Assessment Committee

- The Assessment Committee met monthly during the regular semesters. They updated their 3-year plan in the fall and at the start and end of the Spring 2012 semester.

- The Assessment Committee created a subcommittee that investigated the best software solution for tracking assessment work, and provided feedback in developing the locally developed tool. They also designed a closing-the-loop (CTL) form developed in Fall 2011; a CTL function is now included in the new software, and they provided thorough feedback on a completer/leaver survey that has been sent to all Career Technical Education program completers.

- A co-coordinator was hired from March—May 2012 to allow the Assessment Coordinator to attend meetings and also provide feedback and support for the increased volume of assessment work.

The college made significant progress towards achieving institutional goals during the 2011-2012 year. The college prepared for the Fall 2011 comprehensive visit from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges by focusing on the planning agenda items identified in the college’s institutional self-study for reaffirmation of accreditation. During the 2011-2012 year the college implemented effective governance principles, established new strategies for student success, developed updated plans, and modified the planning model to ensure integration of institutional plans.

The 2011-2012 academic year was a year of transition because the 2008-2011 Strategic Plan expired and, as a result of the decision by College Council to roll over the existing plan for one more year, institutional goals during the 2011-2012 year were unclear.

Both the Strategic Plan and Education Master Plan were subsequently updated, and implementation will begin in the 2012-2013 year. Most significantly, these plan updates highlight the college’s transition from a mindset of growth to a sustainable no-growth approach.

The college’s Student Equity Plan was in the process of being reviewed and updated during the 2011-2012 year and steps towards implementation have not yet been undertaken. The Student Equity Plan was revised during the 2011-2012 year. Elements of the Student Equity Plan will be considered for inclusion in the college’s annual action plan for 2012-2013, and student equity data will be incorporated into the program review datasets beginning in 2012.

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee monitored the college’s progress towards institutional goals and also monitored adherence to processes, completion of cycles, constituency and stakeholder representation and inclusion in the process of plan development, and the use of data and reliance on institutional dialogue.
Work remains to be done to clarify decision making roles and responsibilities to ensure decisions are made at the appropriate level. For example, during the 2011-2012 year it was determined that some of the needs expressed in program review do not need to be forwarded to institutional committees for ranking. Rather, some resource needs can be addressed at the program level or through the college’s administrative structure. In response to this realization, the integrated planning model was modified to separate operational issues from requests for support for program improvement efforts.

As processes were evaluated, some data discrepancies were noted. These inconsistencies were typically associated with inconsistent data definitions and data sources. In response to this finding, an objective was included in the new Strategic Plan to improve data gathering and utilization to support institutional decision making.

Several major facilities and technology initiatives were begun or completed during the 2011-2012 year to better position the institution to meet future challenges. With regard to technology, initiatives were undertaken to improve operational efficiency and effectiveness. With regard to facilities, projects were undertaken to upgrade classrooms at the Mendocino and Del Norte Education Centers, and facilities on the main Eureka campus were upgraded to reduce the need for portable facilities and to improve safety. These plans are in the process of being revised to ensure alignment with the college’s Strategic and Education Master Plans.

The Distance Education Plan was previously combined with the Technology Plan. This plan is now a stand-alone plan that includes the required elements of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges substantive change policy for distance education.

The college’s Enrollment Management Committee has regularly worked in collaboration with the Budget Planning Committee and the President’s Cabinet to accomplish its scope of work in support of the college’s mission. During the 2011-2012 year both the Student Equity and Basic Skills Plans were updated.

During the 2011-2012 year the Budget Planning Committee adopted an approach to planning that includes consideration of the total cost of ownership for any new initiative.
Planning and Committee Member Survey Report

In March 2012, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, in collaboration with the Institutional Research Director, deployed a Planning and Committee Member Survey to members of the Budget Planning, Enrollment Management, ad hoc Furniture and Equipment, Facilities Planning, Technology Planning, Institutional Effectiveness, Program Review, and Basic Skills Committees as well as to the College Council. The overall results, compared to the results of the 2011 Planning and Committee Member Survey, showed considerable progress. As stated in the survey report prepared by the Office of Institutional Research (IR), the combined percent of Strongly Agree and Agree responses increased, and in most cases substantially, for all questions except one which declined by only 2 percentage points from the previous year.

As stated in IR’s survey report, the top four questions with the strongest agreement ratings related to whether agenda packets were provided electronically prior to committee meetings, whether committee participation was deemed valuable, whether different opinions and values were respected, and whether committee members demonstrated respect to colleague members.

The top four questions with the most ratings not in agreement (neutral, disagree, or strongly disagree) related to whether the college effectively communicated planning and governance process outcomes, whether all members attended regularly, whether the planning process supports an assessment of progress towards the college mission and strategic direction, and whether the integrated planning and budgeting process is clear. For each of these, the combined percentage of responses among neutral, disagree, and disagree strongly were in the minority, ranging from 25.7% disagreement that the integrated planning and budgeting process is clear and 35% disagreement that the college has effectively communicated the outcomes.

Committee Evaluations Vis-à-vis the Developmental Progress Rubric

In March 2012 the Office of Institutional Research (IR) created a rubric for committees to utilize in order to score themselves on a rubric with respect to whether each committee operates under its charge, engages in data-informed decision making, develops recommendations, engages in evaluative processes, and effectively communicates. For each, a rubric identifying the stages of awareness, development, proficiency, and sustainability was utilized. The Enrollment Management Committee, Basic Skills Committee, Budget Planning Committee, ad hoc Furniture and Equipment Committee, Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Program Review Committee, and Technology Planning Committee participated. On all items, among all committee member participants, a majority of members found the committees being scored to be at the proficiency or sustainability stages (with combined scores ranging from 69% agreeing their committee was at proficiency or sustainability in data-informed decision making to 86% agreeing at this level related to whether their committee operates under its charge).
Integrated Planning Summit

On March 24, 2012 all members of the integrated planning committees were invited to a retreat to evaluate the integrated planning process at the college and make suggestions for process improvements. The purpose of the summit was to evaluate the flow of program review information and related resource requests through the various integrated planning committees.

In general, it was determined that the integrated planning work to be conducted by various committees was either completed or in progress. Some general findings related to needed improvements of the integrated planning process include the following:

- It was difficult for some committees to rank requests because related assessment results and justifications were sometimes hard to locate in the documentation (e.g. hyperlinks were not always accurate). Requests were not always forwarded with all the necessary information required for appropriate ranking.
- Some committees lacked representatives from Mendocino and Del Norte.
- Assessment results were not reported in program review and therefore were not available to support resource requests.
- A standard template for service area and administrative reviews was lacking.
- Data required to inform program revitalization and discontinuation processes is not presented in the annual program review template.
- Specific costs were not always included with all resource requests.
- Website upgrades are needed in order to provide a central place for information.
- Standardized feedback mechanisms from planning committees to requesters (and from budget allocation back to the functional committees) are not fully in place.
- Closing-the-loop is not clearly in place. Programs that receive funding, for example, do not evaluate and report the outcomes consistently.
- Data tables are more accurate than in the past, but some data (e.g. basic skills information) are still somewhat inaccurate.
- Emergency requests were not easy to handle because of a lack of a written process and criteria.
- The Program Review Committee’s master executive summary is not always forwarded to all functional committees upon completion.
- Only some committees summarize their work in a way that can be shared with other committees.
- The planning model is not simple or clear enough for all to understand.
- The Enrollment Management Committee needs to better coordinate with the Basic Skills Committee and the Student Equity Committee.
- Some requests were more planning-oriented in nature, and others were clearly operational.
- Communication channels are not clear. Some groups still work in “silos”.

[-cont.]

Institutional Effectiveness Process Evaluation
Integrated Planning Committee Chairs Feedback

On April 2, 2012 the chairs of the integrated planning functional committees as well as the Director of Institutional Research and the Director of Institutional Effectiveness met to discuss the outcomes of the integrated planning summit and develop recommendations for actions to address summit findings. A second meeting was held on April 23, 2012 to continue to develop general agreement on the description of how program review links to planning and budgeting, and how committees within the integrated planning model should conduct their work. The Integrated Planning Committee chairs reviewed the charge of each committee and made specific recommendations for revising committee charges. These recommendations can be found on the IEC’s website.

As a result of these meetings the following suggestions for committee actions were developed:

- Better integrate outcomes assessment into program reviews.
- Update Administrative Procedure 2512 Financial Advisory Committee.
- Ensure the Planning Director has a clear role in monitoring the planning process.
- Separate planning related requests from operational needs, and minimize small dollar amount requests that can be managed by the cost center manager.
- Adjust the program review process so that the program plan (currently developed when comprehensive program reviews are completed) is updated annually.
- Some committees may be consolidated, and others may have their charges realigned to ensure all aspects of integrated planning are accomplished.

Summary of Needs for Improvement

This institutional effectiveness review found a need to further streamline the program review process and associated data templates as well to better clarify the linkages between program review, planning, and budgeting. While college constituents recognize the college’s integrated planning model and the refinements that have been incorporated over the last few cycles, further improvements will ensure these processes continue to improve student learning.
Program Review
1. “Needs addendums” will be renamed as “resource requests” and they will be incorporated into program reviews rather than submitted separately. Resource requests will be categorized as either operational or planning related and routed accordingly.
2. The results of student learning assessment and related plans will be incorporated into program reviews.
3. Templates for service area and administrative reviews will be standardized.
4. Timelines and due dates for program review documents will be adjusted to enable and ensure appropriate dean support for the program review process and review of program reviews prior to submission.
5. Program review templates will be revised to incorporate information useful in identifying programs that may need to be revitalized or discontinued in accordance with AP4021.
6. Programs that have received funding or other institutional support to improve student learning or address institutional plans will be prompted to summarize the outcomes.
7. The program review template will be updated to include a standardized dataset that incorporates some analysis to identify outliers requiring explanation. Student equity data will also be incorporated into the program review data.

Planning
1. The college will adopt an annual plan to prioritize the objectives and initiatives outlined in institutional plans such as the Strategic Plan and Education Master Plan.
2. The Technology and Facilities Plans will be updated in Fall 2012 to ensure alignment with the Education and Strategic Plans.
3. The Planning Director will facilitate a meeting with all planning committee co-chairs in early fall to review the roles, procedures, and boundaries of each committee, orient committee chairs to institutional planning processes, and review (evaluate, distribute, and/or reject) program review resource requests.
4. Program-level plans will be incorporated into the 2012-2013 program reviews.

Student Learning Outcomes
1. Planning is in place to move to a 2-year assessment cycle for all course and degree/certificate SLO assessments in Fall 2012.
2. An MOU has been agreed upon to include assessment responsibilities into the faculty contract requirements.
3. The Assessment Committee will be directly involved in the planning process. They will collate program review data related to assessment, and use that information to facilitate necessary discussions and make recommendations for resources.
4. Deans will be responsible for assuring that assessment activities are carried out.
5. The Assessment Committee will regularly organize dialogue sessions, such as a variety of dialogue and planning sessions at convocation.
6. Version 2.0 of the assessment reporting tool will be rolled out at convocation to include quantitative data for all learning outcomes, explicit indication of course offering modality, pre-populated learning outcomes, and a more intuitive design.
7. The Assessment Committee will summarize institutional themes from the Spring 2012 Assessment Summit to inform college planning.
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**Student Success**

- We put students first, ensuring that student learning and advancement are pivotal to all we do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008–09</th>
<th>2009–10</th>
<th>2010–11</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall-to-Fall Persistence Full-time</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCC Cohort</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills Course Success</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills Improvement</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Success</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Completions</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate Completions</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate [FTFT in 150%]</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to 4-year</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>842</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Access**

- We value all members of our community and strive to create a diverse, nurturing, honest, and open environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008–09</th>
<th>2009–10</th>
<th>2010–11</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>10,195</td>
<td>10,762</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>5,592</td>
<td>5,967</td>
<td>5,386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills Students Served</td>
<td>1,806</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Yield</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CR Experience**

- We strive to create a supportive, problem-solving culture, and we recognize the proven usefulness of an interest-based approach (IBA) for achieving trust, cooperation and effective problem solving.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008–09</th>
<th>2009–10</th>
<th>2010–11</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction Instruction</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support Services</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Learning Enhancement

We are continuously engaged in assessment efforts across academic and student services in an effort to improve student learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 SLO assessed in new tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>61% overall (90% of Courses Spring 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees/Certifications</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SLOs assessed in new tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees/Certifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Ed. Outcomes Assessed</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Institutional Productivity

The college pursues strategies that lead to fiscal and operational sustainability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Full (class sections)</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves as % of unrestricted fund</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>5% minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Ratio</td>
<td>28.15</td>
<td>28.56</td>
<td>30.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/FTES</td>
<td>$2123</td>
<td>$2061</td>
<td>$2097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES: Resident</td>
<td>5419</td>
<td>5799</td>
<td>5202</td>
<td>4972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-resident</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Community Outreach

The college partners with the community to contribute to the economic vitality and lifelong learning needs of its service area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Satisfaction</td>
<td>Data Forthcoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Training Clients</td>
<td>Data Forthcoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Events Supported</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Student Success

Fall to Fall Persistence | Percentage of first-time students who enroll in the fall term and who returned and enrolled in the subsequent fall term. Full-Time – enrolled at first term census in 12 or more units. Part-Time—enrolled at first term census in fewer than twelve units. ARCC Cohort—enrolled at first term census in 6 or more units. Includes CR students who enroll in any community college in the CCC District, resulting in higher percentages.

Retention | The percentage of student enrolled on Census Day who remained enrolled in that course through the last day and received any grade other than a W. Benchmark provides the Statewide 2010 – 2011 retention rate for the California Community Colleges.

Basic Skills Success | Students to complete a credit Basic Skills course with a passing final grade of A, B, C or P. Benchmark provides the 2010-2011 ARCC Basic Skills Course Completion Indicators.

Basic Skills Improvement | Students who successfully completed the initial basic skills course (were followed across three academic years (including the year and term of the initial course). The outcome of interest was that group of students who successfully completed a higher level course in the same discipline within three academic years of completing the first basic skills course. Benchmark provides the 2010-2011 ARCC Basic Skills Improvement Indicator.

Course Success | The percentage of students enrolled in a course on Census Day who complete the course with a successful grade (A, B, C, P, CR). Benchmark provides the Statewide 2010 – 2011 success rate for the California Community Colleges.

Degree & Certificate Completion | The number of students receiving a degree or certificate in the specified year.

Graduation Rate (FTFT in 150%) | The percent of first-time, full-time degree-seeking students, tracked as a freshmen cohort, who graduate in 150 percent of the normal program completion time. Benchmark provides CR’s peer group median comparison identified by IPEDS: Percent of first-time, full-time degree-seeking students who receive a degree or certificate in 150 percent of the normal completion time.

Transfer to 4-year | The number of students who transfer to a 4-year institution in the specified year.

Access

Headcount | The number of unique (unduplicated) students who are enrolled at Census. A single student who enrolls in several courses is counted only once.

Full-time Equivalent Students | One FTES represents the number of class (contact) hours participated by a full-time student over the course of a year. One FTES represents 525 contact hours.

Basic Skills Students Served | The number of unique (unduplicated) students who are enrolled in Basic Skills English, Math, or ESL courses.

High School Yield | Percentage of graduates from a representative set of high schools in CR’s service areas who enrolled at CR in the subsequent fall term. Benchmark provides the percentage of all high school graduates in California who enrolled at a California Community College. Data is from 2009, which is the most recent year available.
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CR Experience

Student Satisfaction | The following questions from the 2009 administration of the Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) were used. Ratings were given using a scale where 1 = not at all satisfied, 4 = neutral, 7 = very satisfied. Instruction question: The quality of instruction I receive in most of my classes is excellent. Student Services question: Academic support services adequately meet the needs of students. Benchmark provides the 2009 average satisfaction ratings from a National comparison group of community colleges provided by Noel-Levitz.

Graduate Satisfaction | The following question from the 2010-2011 Graduate Survey was used. Ratings were given using a scale where 1 = very dissatisfied, 3 = neutral, 5 = very satisfied. “How satisfied are you that your education experience at CR measured up to your expectations?”

Employee Satisfaction | The following question from the 2010 Employee Satisfaction Survey. Ratings were given using a scale where 1 = not at all satisfied, 3 = neutral, 5 = very satisfied. “Rate your overall satisfaction with your employment here so far.”

Learning Enhancement

SLO Assessment | A student learning outcome (SLO) for a course, degree/certificate, or student service area is considered to have been assessed if an assessment report has been submitted into the new online assessment tool for that SLO during the assessment cycle. Percent of courses assessed only takes into consideration courses that were offered during the academic year.

General education outcomes are systematically evaluated within GE courses, but evidence is also gathered in relevant degree/certificate programs.

Community Outreach

Community Satisfaction | To be measured by surveying members of the community.

Contract Training Clients | Community Events supported. The number of community events offered on the campus, tracked through process of acquiring a permit.

Institutional Productivity

% Full (class sections) | Class enrollment divided by class capacity. Commonly referred to as fill rate.

Reserves as % of unrestricted fund | Ending Fund Balance as a percentage of Total Unrestricted General Fund Expenditures reported annually to the Chancellor’s Office on the CCFS 311 Report.

Student-Faculty Ratio | Full-time equivalent students divided by full-time equivalent faculty (FTES/FTEF).

Cost/FTES | Instructional cost per full-time equivalent student. Based on cost per TLU.

Resident and Non-Resident FTES | California residency status is used to categorize full-time equivalent resident and non-resident students.