

# **ACCREDITATION FOLLOW-UP VISIT REPORT**

**NOV 26 2012**

**Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint Community College District  
Redding, California**

**A confidential report prepared for  
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges  
Western Association of Schools and Colleges**

**This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that  
visited Shasta College on November 8, 2012**

**Thom M. Armstrong, Ph.D.  
Chair**

## SHASTA COLLEGE

### Accreditation Follow-Up Visit Report

November 8, 2012

The team that conducted a Follow-Up Visit to Shasta College was comprised of Dr. Danika Bowen, Senior Director of Academic Affairs for Carrington College, Dr. Jerry Buckley, Vice President of Instruction for San Diego Miramar College, Dr. Thom M. Armstrong, President/Superintendent of Barstow Community College, who served as team chair, and Ms Michelle Henderson, Executive Assistant to the President/Superintendent at Barstow Community College, who served as team assistant. Prior to its arrival, the team was in regular communication with Mr. Joe Wyse, Superintendent/President, Ms Meridith Randall, Vice President of Academic Affairs and Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), and Ms Theresa Markword, Administrative Assistant to the superintendent/president. Each of these individuals was responsive to team requests.

The team arrived in Redding in the early afternoon of November 7, 2012. Accommodations arranged by Shasta College for the team were pleasant and comfortable. Prior to its arrival, each team member had received a copy of the Shasta College Follow-Up Report of October 2012, which had been submitted to the Commission in response to the Commission's Action Letter dated February 1, 2012. Team members had also received a flash drive containing evidence used in compiling the Follow-Up Report, and team members had access to additional evidence through the college's website. Upon arrival at the hotel in Redding where the team was staying, the team had an opportunity to meet and review its impressions of the documents and evidence provided by Shasta College, and to re-confirm its schedule of meetings with Shasta personnel for the next day. The team proceeded to dinner at a local restaurant that it had previously enjoyed a year ago while the comprehensive evaluation process was undertaken at Shasta College.

The team arrived at Shasta College at 8:00 a.m., on November 8, 2012. After first assembling in the team room, where hard copies of all documents pertaining to Shasta College's Follow-Up Report of October 2012 were also made available for the team's use, the team then commenced to meet with the college president. This meeting was followed by a series of interviews of approximately forty-five minutes each with faculty, classified staff, administrators, board members, and students that had been scheduled in advance by Shasta College staff. The team greatly appreciated the willingness of Shasta College staff to make adjustments to the interview schedule in order to better expedite and make more efficient the process so as to accommodate the time constraints of the team. The team was overwhelmingly impressed with the spirit of

cooperation, collegiality and optimism that seems to characterize Shasta College at this time. Various comments were made by faculty, staff and administrators that the superintendent/president of Shasta College had done much to promote a positive and productive climate on campus, as well as a sense that “culture” change has occurred with respect to the use of data and assessment in order to promote continuous quality improvement. All interviews were cordial, and left the impression upon the team, as was verified by the body of evidence, that all college constituents had worked extremely hard since the last team visit, and the subsequent Action Letter, to address and correct the deficiencies noted by the Commission in Recommendations 2, 3 and 4, and Eligibility Requirements 17 and 19, and to continue to address resolution of Recommendation 1, which was first noted by the 2005 evaluation team.

#### Recommendation #1

---

*As was noted in the 2005 evaluation team report, and in the 2008 ACCJC Follow-up Visit Report, in order to meet the Standards and Eligibility Requirement #19, the college must establish an integrated, comprehensive and linked planning process that ensures an ongoing, systematic, and cyclical process to include evaluation, planning, resource allocation, implementation, re-evaluation, and one that ties fiscal planning to the college's Strategic Plan and Educational Master Plan. Critical to this planning process is expediting completion of the Educational Master Plan (I.A.4, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.7, III.A.2, III.B.2.a, III.B.2.b, III.C.2, III.D.1, III.D.1.c, III.D.3, and Eligibility Requirement #19).*

#### **Findings and Evidence:**

Since fall 2011, Shasta College has completed an extensive and detailed Educational Master Plan which links directly with their Strategic Plan and annual integrated planning system, including their program review process and assessment of student learning outcomes. The Strategic Plan and annual area planning processes include outcome measurements, or metrics, to determine the success of the college’s planning initiatives. The College Council and Budget Committee have designed a rubric and weighting system to evaluate the relative importance of annual program and area initiatives, compared to the college’s planning priorities, which allows resource allocation to effectively support student learning.

The implementation of an automated document tracking system (TracDat) has allowed Shasta College to demonstrate effective integration of their long-term and operational planning. Although recently implemented, this new system also allows the college to utilize student learning and service outcome data in the annual area and program planning process, and provided useful reports of all related activities, including committee actions and student achievement outcomes. The college is to be commended for the excellent supporting documentation, including an integrated planning manual, as well as a manual that supports assessment of student learning and service outcomes. According to interviews with college

faculty and staff, the emphasis on developing effective processes and appropriate support materials has resulted in a significant reduction in comments on campus such as: “I don’t know how things get done around here.” Recent employee survey data (2012) has, in fact, demonstrated a significant increase in faculty and staff knowledge of planning, budgeting, resource allocation methods and assessment activities. In 2012, 84% believe that the planning cycle is complete and comprehensive, compared to 51% from the survey conducted in 2010.

### **Conclusion:**

Although Shasta College has not yet completed a full cycle of integrated planning utilizing its newly designed system, there is evidence within its planning and assessment manuals, and within its strategic plan, that the college has satisfied the criteria to be considered at a sustainable level of integrated planning. These observations are supported by individual interviews with faculty, staff and administration that independently confirm that a method of assessing institutional effectiveness is in place, and will be applied annually. The visiting team therefore finds that the college is now in compliance with Recommendation #1 and with the Commission rubric addressing evaluation of institutional effectiveness.

### **Recommendation #2**

---

*In order for the college to attain proficiency and meet Standards on student learning outcomes by the Commission's 2012 deadline, the team recommends that the college identify student learning outcomes for all courses, programs, certificates, and degrees, assess student attainment of the intended outcomes, use assessment results to plan and implement course/program/service improvements, and assess student attainment of intended outcomes to evaluate the effectiveness of those improvements (I.B.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.g, II.A.2.h, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.A.1).*

### **Findings and Evidence:**

The visiting team verified that the college has identified student learning and service outcomes for all courses and programs, and has automated the tracking of learning outcomes and assessments using TracDat, an information management system. Additionally, the faculty coordinating student learning outcomes have created a user’s manual that guides faculty and staff through creation and analysis of outcome assessments. As of spring 2012, all active courses, except one, had been assessed.

Program learning outcomes have been identified and placed in the 2012-13 college catalogue. General education outcomes have been established within the college curriculum, along with seven institutional outcomes. A systematic method has also been established to assess and record these assessments and provide reflective discussions each semester. Student learning and

service outcomes are now included in Shasta College's annual integrated planning process and lead to continuous improvement of learning. Survey results from September 2012 show that 78% of adjunct faculty felt that they had the opportunity to participate in the SLO process, compared to 62% in 2010, while more than 75% of both adjunct and full time faculty groups reported they were adequately prepared to document student learning outcomes. As noted in the chart below progress has been made in all areas of outcome assessment.

<i>Type of Assessment</i>	<i>2011</i>	<i>2012</i>
Course Level SLO Assessment	78%	83%
Program Level Outcomes Assessment	18%	50%
Service Area Outcomes	100%	100%
Institutional Student Learning Outcomes	revised	30%

### **Conclusion:**

The visiting team finds that the college has complied with Recommendation #2 and has met the rubric for proficiency in assessing student learning outcomes.

### **Recommendation #3**

---

*In order to achieve Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement level in Program Review, the college should complete the development of its new Program Review process and implement a cycle of review for all areas of the college in order to adequately assess and improve learning and achievement, and institutional effectiveness (I.B.3, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.2, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.e).*

### **Findings and Evidence:**

Shasta College has improved its integrated planning and program review processes, including implementation of a resource allocation methodology that utilizes a rubric and weighting system to evaluate annual area planning initiatives and allocate available resources. A beta test of several programs within the college over the past six months has proven the viability of this new process, and allowed for improvements prior to full implementation during fall 2012. A college planning manual provides end users with clear, detailed instructions that allow faculty and staff to implement initiatives using a new information management system (TracDat). The College Council and Budget Committee have guided the implementation of this new process, and although the college has not completed a full cycle of planning and evaluation, there are metrics built into the college strategic plan and required of planning initiatives that will allow evaluating their impact on institutional effectiveness. The college's integrated planning manual clearly delineates categories of information to be used in assessment of institutional planning. At the completion of one complete program review cycle, the college will be able to apply both

quantitative and qualitative data to evaluate changes in institutional effectiveness related to their planning initiatives.

**Conclusion:**

The visiting team has determined that the college has addressed the requirements of Recommendation #3 to develop the new Program Review Process and implement a cycle of review for all areas of the college, and to address and improve learning, achievement, and institutional effectiveness. Shasta College should provide examples of institutional effectiveness reporting as part of its Midterm Report.

**Recommendation #4**

---

*In order to improve upon the integrated institutional planning and participatory governance processes, the college should undertake a review of its governance committee structure and functions and communicate to all college constituents the results of this review (IV.A.1, IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2.b, IV.A.3, IV.A.5).*

**Findings and Evidence:**

The visiting team received documentation of changes to the college's governance structure that simplify reporting relationships and support college recommendations to the superintendent/president. The new governance structure also has been institutionalized in the college's 2012-15 strategic plan. The visiting team heard testimony that a decision to support development of a participatory governance manual is currently under development by the College Council, and viewed the October 2012 college climate survey results that support interviews by the visiting team with faculty, staff, and administration indicating that communication across the campus has been greatly enhanced and knowledge of planning and resource allocation methodologies are widely known. In interviews with key college personnel, including the president, the team was informed that a conscious decision was made to focus on responding in a quality fashion to those recommendations that were most critical and pressing in order to meet the Commission's October 15, 2012, deadline for a Follow-Up Report, and leave Recommendation #4 to be fully addressed throughout the 2012-13 academic year.

**Conclusion:**

The visiting team finds that the college has taken initial steps toward addressing Recommendation #4, based upon documentation of improvements in the college's governance committee structure, an increase in the number of well-informed faculty and staff, and a general observation of satisfaction among the college constituencies that institutional planning and participatory governance processes are working. The team believes that completion of the

college's participatory governance manual in the relatively near future will more fully clarify governance roles and processes for all constituent groups, thus further improving upon the planning and governance processes at Shasta College.

#### Eligibility Requirement 17 Financial Resources

---

*The institution's financial planning is not thoroughly integrated with other planning activities of the College.*

#### **Findings, Evidence, and Conclusions:**

Shasta College is in compliance with Eligibility Requirement 17 based upon statements that appear above in Recommendations #1 and #3. The college's Budget Committee has implemented a resource allocation process that is fully integrated with the college's integrated planning and program review processes. Annual planning initiatives are evaluated based upon a rubric and weighting system to determine their rank against college planning priorities and are allocated financial resources, when needed, based upon these criteria and their match with college strategic goals and objectives.

#### Eligibility Requirement 19 Institutional Planning and Evaluation

---

*While Shasta College engages in institutional planning and assessment, the process is not yet fully integrated, comprehensive, or linked. Critical to this process is the completion of an Educational Master Plan.*

#### **Findings, Evidence, and Conclusions:**

Shasta College is in full compliance with Eligibility Requirement 19, as evidenced by facts presented above for Recommendations #1 and #3. The college has written and begun implementation of a well-researched and appropriately structured Educational Master Plan, driving the college's Strategic Plan, which in turn has been designed with measurable outcomes associated with each strategic goal and objective, such that determination of institutional effectiveness is available each year.