

Mendocino-Lake Community College District

*Mendocino College
1000 Hensley Creek Road
Ukiah CA 95482*



Midterm Report For Accreditation

Submitted to:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

March 10, 2011

Mendocino-Lake Community College District

*Mendocino College
1000 Hensley Creek Road
Ukiah, CA 95482*

Midterm Report for Accreditation

March 10, 2011

Table of Contents

STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION	2
RESPONSE TO TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS and COMMISSION ACTION LETTER.....	3
RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION #1.....	4
RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION #2.....	11
RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION #3.....	13
RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION #4.....	20
RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION #5.....	22
RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION #6.....	23
RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION #7.....	24
RESPONSE TO SELF-IDENTIFIED ISSUES (PLANNING AGENDA).....	26
UPDATED ON SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE PROPOSALS	42
EXHIBITS 1-45	

Statement on Report Preparation

Since the last full accreditation team visit in March 2008 and since receiving the official Commission Action Letter in June 2008, most issues mentioned in the recommendations have been integrated into daily work of committees, such as SLOs, planning, student success and budget allocation. The Vice President of Education and Student Services, who serves as the college's Accreditation Liaison Officer, participates in key college governance and planning committees, and over the last three years, has been responsible to remind other college personnel about the recommendations from the team report in 2008. In some cases, agendas of different committees reflect the need to address the requirements of the midterm report (see Exhibit 1 for an example of a Planning and Budgeting Committee agenda item addressing the progress of one of the planning documents).

To prepare the written Midterm Report, the following steps were taken:

- In Spring and Fall 2010, the Accreditation Liaison Officer began gathering the information needed for the report and advising various committees that the report would be due in March 2011.
- Since Spring 2010 and through Fall 2010, the Board of Trustees has been kept apprised of the progress of the written report.
- In Fall 2010, the Academic Senate assigned a senator to work with the Accreditation Liaison Officer to gather any feedback from faculty and also review an early draft of the report.
- In January 2011, a draft of the Midterm Report was distributed to the college community for feedback.
- Through February 2011, various college committees placed the draft on their agendas for review and comment. It was presented to the Planning and Budgeting Committee and discussed at the meeting on February 10, 2011. (Exhibit 2)
- Feedback was incorporated into the final version of the report after consultation between the Accreditation Liaison Officer and the Superintendent/President.
- The Academic Senate formally approved the Midterm Report on February 24, 2011. (Exhibit 3)
- Members of the Board of Trustees received a copy of the draft report in February 2011 and formally approved the report on March 2, 2011. (Exhibit 4)

Given that Recommendations 1, 2 and 3 were addressed in Follow-Up Reports in 2009 and 2010, responses to those recommendations in the Midterm Report reiterate and update the Follow-Up Reports.

Kathryn G. Lehner, Superintendent/President

John Koetzner, President, Academic Senate

Response to Team Recommendations and Commission Action Letter

The College had its team visit in March 2008 and received its team Evaluation Report in May 2008. This report included the following seven specific recommendations, some of which contain subparts:

1. *As noted in recommendations 1,3,4 and 7 contained in the 2002 Accreditation Evaluation Report, the team recommends that the college:*
 - *Complete the reorganization of committees and planning structure to improve the planning process;*
 - *Make effective use of program review data and incorporate an assessment of student learning outcomes in all areas; and*
 - *Engage in dialogue for assessing institutional effectiveness and student success.*

The college should move immediately to:

 - *Develop an educational master plan, a strategic plan, facilities plan and a technology plan;*
 - *Develop and use measurable objectives to benchmark program and college goals; and*
 - *Link planning to the budget allocation process (Standards I.A.4, I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6, I.B.7, II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.B.1, II.B.3, II.B.4, II.C.1, II.C.2, III.A.1, III.A.4, III.A.5, III.A.6, III.B.1, III.B.2, III.C.1, III.C.2, III.D.1, III.D.2, III.D.3, IV.A.1, IV.A.5, IV.B.1, IV.B.2, including various subsections).*
2. *To comply with recommendation 4 contained in the 2002 Accreditation Evaluation Report, the team recommends that the College complete the development of student learning outcomes for all courses, programs, and services, that it develop methods of assessing attainment of those outcomes, and then use the assessment results as part of a continuous effort of improvement (Standards I.B.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.h, II.A.3, II.A.6, II.B.4, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.2, III.D, IV.A.5, IV.B.2.b).*
3. *In order to improve, the team recommends that the college complete installation of the Integrated Information System and maximize its potential for reporting, accountability, and assessment of institutional effectiveness, student learning and student success. (Standards I.B.5, I.B.6., I.B.7)*
4. *As was noted in recommendation 6 contained in the 2002 Accreditation Evaluation Report, the team recommends that the college comply with this standard by completing evaluations for all managers by June 2008, and ensure that the systematic process for monitoring completion of evaluations for all personnel is adhered to in accordance with college policies and procedures. (Standard III.A.1.b)*
5. *In order to meet Standard III.A.3.d, the team recommends that the college develop and institute a written code of ethics for all personnel. (Standard III.A.4.d)*

6. *In order to come into compliance with Accrediting Commission's Substantive Change Policy, the college should immediately work with WASC to obtain substantive change approval for its nursing program and for programs leading to an associate degree that are being offered at the Lake Center. (Standard IV.A.4, ER 21)*
7. *In order to meet Standard IV.B.1.h, the team recommends that the college board of trustees adopt a clearly defined policy that addresses violation of its code of ethics.*

In June 2008, the Superintendent/President and Accreditation Liaison Officer met with the Commission to address the recommendations that had been implemented since the team visit in March 2008. Specifically, the College had already taken action on Recommendations 4 and 7. Subsequent to this meeting, the College received full reaccreditation.

The Commission Action Letter, received in July 2008, directed the College to report on two of the recommendations (Recommendations 1 and 2) in a Follow-Up Report dated March 2009 and a third recommendation (Recommendation 3) in a second Follow-Up Report dated March 2010. Both Follow-Up Reports were submitted on time and accepted by the Commission without comment. This report reiterates some of the information in those Follow-Up Reports while updating them to the present moment.

Recommendation 1: *As noted in recommendations 1, 3, 4 and 7 contained in the 2002 Accreditation Evaluation Report, the team recommends that the College:*

- *Complete the reorganization of committees and planning structure to improve the planning process*

In 2009, the College completed the committee reorganization that it had explained to the visiting team in March 2008 and discussed with the Commission in June 2008. The highlight of this reorganization is a Planning and Budgeting Committee (PBC) with representation from all employee groups. This committee is responsible for making all budget recommendations to the Superintendent/President and ensuring that college resources are used to support planning goals.

Other new components of the revised committee structure are a Facilities Committee, which has produced a Facilities Plan, and a Staffing Committee, which made its first recommendations to the Planning and Budgeting Committee on December 5, 2008. These recommendations were ratified by PBC and the Superintendent/President moved to fill the first five positions on the list. As important, the removal of staffing recommendations from the Educational Action Plan Committee (EAP) has allowed EAP to concentrate its efforts on the development and assessment of educational programs. EAP completed an Educational Master Plan (EMP) that is

critical for the college's planning effort in 2009. The current version of this plan was approved by the Board of Trustees on February 3, 2010, and is included as Exhibit 5. EAP will conduct its first comprehensive revision of the EMP in Spring 2011.

A chart of the current committee structure is attached as Exhibit 6. Committees were designed to correspond to different components of the college's Program Review document, which itself has been revised to better guide respondents in their planning. Thus, for example, the Facilities Committee receives all facilities requests made through Program Review; analyzes them in conjunction with the Facilities Master Plan; prioritizes them and recommends to PBC where funds should be spent; and revises the overall college Facility Plan accordingly. The other committees make similar recommendations to PBC based on information gathered from Program Review and other sources. The College envisioned a lively and iterative process resulting from the committee and planning restructure. This has come to pass: for example, in Fall 2010, the Staffing Committee forwarded a prioritization list that did not conform to current state directives about priorities in scheduling, resulting in several conversations about the need for PBC to provide better parameters to the Staffing Committee in the future.

In Fall 2010, EAP worked on and submitted to PBC a comprehensive assessment of educational programs (including student services) (Exhibit 7). This marked the College's first attempt to lay some groundwork for program development or elimination, e.g., for allocation of resources to programs based on planning priorities. While still rough, the EAP document used Program Review data to recommend further analysis of programs through Program Advisory Teams or designated programs as adequate and not needing additional resources. In all, 13 programs will continue to be assessed in Spring 2011 by their advisory teams, with possible outcomes being identification of needed resources or recommendation for elimination.

A useful result of the EAP process was a recognition that in some cases, programs and departments do not provide sufficient analysis and long-term planning in their program reviews. Therefore, the college researcher drafted new guidelines for Program Review writers that will be used for the 2011 cycle (Exhibit 8). In addition, workshops to develop Program Reviews will be offered in Spring 2011, prior to the next Program Review deadline in April 2011.

- *Make effective use of program review data and incorporate an assessment of student learning outcomes in all areas*

As the foregoing discussion of the revised committee structure indicated, the planning process is intended to draw directly from Program Reviews prepared by the various units at the College. For several years, the College has required all programs – instructional and administrative – to

complete annual Program Reviews. The data (such as student success and retention rates) gathered from these documents about program objectives and needs have long been used by EAP and other committees to determine funding priorities.

In 2010, the annual Program Review process was changed to a four-year cycle with programs on staggered schedules (Exhibit 9). One third of programs were asked to complete Parts 1 and 2 of the Program Review document in April 2010, while all others completed only Part 1. The intent is to allow reviewers to analyze their data more fully and develop multi-year plans under Part 2. As noted above, however, more training in Program Review development will be necessary before this result becomes common practice.

The current version of the Program Review document specifically requires an assessment and analysis of SLOs for all instructional and educational support programs in Part 1 (Exhibit 10). The specific questions are:

- 1. List all courses and programs for which you have developed SLOs.*
- 2. What assessment methods have you used or are you planning to use?*
- 3. Summarize any evidence you have produced of student learning.*
- 4. Explain how the evidence has influenced you to change your program or to begin discussing changes, if at all.*
- 5. List any resources you feel you may need to assist you with the development and implementation of SLOs for your program.*

The responses to these questions will be considered by EAP in its ongoing planning for educational programs and will inform revisions of the Educational Master Plan. It has already become evident the Educational Master Plan lacks a comprehensive plan for student services; using Program Review data from student services areas, this part of the plan will be drafted in Spring 2011.

- *Engage in dialogue for assessing institutional effectiveness and student success.*

This dialogue has taken place in several different venues at the College, both before the team visit in March 2008 and since that time. The Superintendent/President calls college-wide strategic planning meetings in the fall and spring; the most recent took place in October 2010, and was attended by 40 faculty and staff. Prior to that, at a meeting on September 19, 2008, 50 faculty, staff, and students worked to begin developing measurable objectives for the five institutional goals. Those objectives were finalized in February 2009 (Exhibit 11) and plans were made to measure them over the next 18 months.

At the Student Services Inservice in October 2008, the various student services units finalized the SLOs for their areas and decided upon processes for measuring those outcomes. The results and plans based on those results are included in subsequent Program Review documents.

The Student Learning Outcomes Team (SLOT), led by a faculty member, moved forward with a variety of strategies aimed at helping the College reach the Proficiency Level by 2012 (see Response to Recommendation #2 for more detail). One requirement at the Proficiency Level is engaging in dialogue about SLO assessment (Exhibit 12). To meet this requirement, all full-time faculty continue to meet twice a year at inservice to discuss SLOs, and a newsletter highlighting exemplary results and other progress has been published (Exhibit 13). In Fall 2010, SLOT members organized informal lunch groups with faculty colleagues to discuss SLO assessment on an informal basis.

Several other groups have institutional effectiveness and/or student success as part of their focus. For example, the counselors meet monthly to address student needs and revisions to student support initiatives, such as revisions to the Academic Probation process. The Academic Senate has identified a comprehensive basis skills plan and support of SLO assessment as two of their 2010-2011 goals (Exhibit 14). The Outreach and Marketing Committee meets monthly to coordinate and assess the effectiveness of the various outreach efforts at the College. At Board meetings, the Superintendent/President regularly informs the Board about effectiveness and student success issues, and presents a Year in Review each July; the Vice President of Education and Student Services reports on enrollment and student success data monthly; and ARCC results are discussed annually. All of these conversations recognize the need to enlist the services of the Institutional Research office to gather and assess results.

In Fall 2010, partly due to budget issues and partly due to a growing recognition that student success is often hampered by failure to progress through the math sequence, the Vice President of Education and Student Services convened a group to begin work on a Title III grant proposal. After several conversations and analysis of data, the group chose to focus on intervention with incoming students, particularly counseling and mentoring aimed to increase math success. The grant proposal will be finalized in Spring 2011 to submit in July. This project shows the value of dialogue about student success and the strides the College has made by providing opportunities to engage in such dialogue.

The College should move immediately to:

- *Develop an educational master plan, a strategic plan, facilities plan and a technology plan*

The College takes this recommendation with great seriousness and has made progress on all four plans as detailed below:

Educational Master Plan

The Educational Master Plan (EMP) was finalized in 2009 and approved by the Board on February 3, 2010 (Exhibit 5). It was drafted by the Education Action Plan Committee (EAP), which was at the time co-chaired by the Dean of Instruction-Ukiah and the President of the Academic Senate; members are primarily faculty, along with the Dean of Career and Technical Education, the Dean of Instruction-Centers, Vice President of Education and Student Services, Director of Institutional Research and one classified representative. To prepare, several models from other colleges were reviewed and EAP decided upon a format that suited Mendocino College.

Before submission for Board approval, the five-chapter draft was forwarded to the college community for input as well as key governance committees. It delineates the philosophy of the plan as well as its process of development. Chapter 3: Research and Analysis is the most extensive since all planning will be based upon identified data. The last two chapters outline the directions the College will take over the next 10 years in terms of program development, pedagogy and technology.

Because the College chose to develop the plan entirely in-house, it has taken more time, but has the buy-in of the different constituents and will be an accepted and powerful document that drives planning. The completed EMP has been consulted in development of the Technology Plan and the Facilities Plan.

Strategic Plan

The Strategic Plan (Exhibit 15) has been in development since 2005, which is when the College's Mission, Vision, Core Values and Strategic Goals were first adopted (these were last revised in July 2010) (Exhibit 16). Twice a year, the Superintendent/President convenes a group of college employees representing all constituencies, including students, to continue work on the plan. In February 2009, this group (which included Board members for the first time) identified measurable objectives and timelines linked to the five college goals. These objectives were monitored over the next 18 months, and progress was reported at the two college-wide planning meetings each year. One of the deans was tasked with checking in regularly with the

responsible parties to ensure ongoing progress and a progress report was produced in May 2010. (Exhibit 17)

In October 2010, at the last biannual planning meeting, groups revised the action plans and recommended elimination or modification of some objectives. Emphasis was put on identifying actions that could take place during the academic year. These changes were compiled by the Superintendent/President and used by the college community to guide committee work and budgeting for the year. (Exhibit 18)

The Strategic Plan is integrated with many other planning processes at the College so that it will be a “living document” familiar to staff and students. All printed schedules and catalogs contain the college goals, and many forms, such as the sabbatical leave request (Exhibit 19) and the Program Review form (Exhibit 10), direct respondents to link their responses to college goals and objectives.

Facilities Plan

Following the restructuring of college committees in Fall 2008, the Facilities Committee revised its own structure (it had previously been the Physical Resources Master Plan Committee) and began regular meetings. Currently led by the Director of Auxiliary Services, the committee has been charged with reviewing the annual facilities requests generated through Program Review and making resource allocation recommendations to PBC. In addition, the Facilities Committee gathered all relevant documents and composed the first draft of a Facilities Master Plan, which was completed in February 2009.

After the completion of the EMP and Technology Plan, the Facilities Master Plan was revisited and revised with the assistance of the architects working on college bond projects. The current plan was taken to the Facilities Committee on February 16, 2011, to the Planning and Budgeting Committee on February 22 and the Bond Implementation Planning Committee on February 24, then to the Board of Trustees at their regular meeting on March 2, 2011. (Exhibit 20)

The Facilities Plan will undergo periodic review to dovetail with the Strategic Plan, Technology Plan and the EMP.

Technology Plan

The Technology Committee, chaired by the Director of Computing Services, has met and produced an annual list of priorities for the past several years. However, these lists were not clearly linked to college goals or educational priorities since the Strategic Plan and EMP were not final. At this time, a Technology Plan has been completed and was presented to the Board of Trustees on November 6, 2010 (Exhibit 21).

The Technology Plan consciously incorporated goals from the Educational Master Plan and consistently supports directions found in the EMP. Like the EMP, it will be reviewed and revised on an annual basis.

- *Develop and use measurable objectives to benchmark program and College goals*

To benchmark program goals, a Program Review Task Force has been meeting periodically to refine the Program Review documents. One primary focus has been the assessment of programs using the information generated through Program Review. A proposal under consideration at this time is the development of a “program evaluation matrix” which individuals preparing program reviews can use to assess the vitality of their own programs, and which EAP can use in determining whether any particular program is in need of assistance. This matrix would ask for programs to perform self-assessments and would be used in conjunction with objective criteria such as student completion rates and graduation numbers. Before these instruments are finalized, the Program Review Task Force intends to look at comparable programs at similar colleges to determine realistic benchmarks.

College goals, as identified in the Strategic Plan, received their initial set of measurable objectives in February 2009, following the college-wide planning meeting. The Superintendent/President disseminates these objectives to the appropriate managers and other staff, and the Director of Institutional Research provides assistance in determining methods of assessment. An instructional dean was charged with keeping all responsible parties on task over the ensuing 18 months. As progress is made on goals, the Research Office will develop a “dashboard” or other easily understood report to update the Board, college community and general public about results. The Board of Trustees receives monthly reports from various staff and constituencies that relate to attainment of goals.

- *Link planning to the budget allocation process [citations omitted].*

The new committee governance structure that the College implemented in Fall 2008 was developed to address the need to better integrate planning and budgeting (see Exhibit 22, Integrated Planning Timeline). The pinnacle of the structure is the Planning and Budgeting Committee (PBC), which advises the Superintendent/President on all resource allocation decisions, such as development of programs and hiring staff. PBC itself acts on recommendations from “second-tier” committees, such as the Staffing Committee and the Facilities Committee. These lower-level groups act primarily from annual Program Review requests that are gathered each spring and distributed to the appropriate committees for prioritization based on criteria linked to the college goals. Because individual programs must support their plans (articulated in Program Review) with data, this process ensures a data-driven planning process that will result in transparent and widely-supported resource

allocation. At all steps in the process, the College's strategic goals are paramount; for example, the Program Review document and the sabbatical request form specifically ask respondents to link their plans and resource requests to overall College goals (see Exhibits 10 and 19).

In Fall 2008, the College had its first opportunity to put this new structure to the test. The Staffing Committee met and considered the staffing requests from the previous spring's Program Review, applied its criteria and forwarded a list of recommended hires to PBC. PBC considered the reasons behind the prioritization, then confirmed the top five recommended positions to the Superintendent/President. She accepted the recommendation and searches were commenced. While there is never total acceptance of resource allocation decisions, all groups and individuals involved understood the process, had the opportunity to provide input, and were willing to accept the ultimate results. Staffing lists were produced in a similar way in Fall 2009 and Fall 2010, and PBC discussed the recommendations, forwarded conclusions to the Superintendent/President, and she made the final decisions about staff hiring. This process has been integrated into the structure of the College and has gained acceptance among all constituent groups.

Recommendation 2: *To comply with recommendation 4 contained in the 2002 Accreditation Evaluation Report, the team recommends that the College complete the development of student learning outcomes for all courses, programs, and services, that it develop methods of assessing attainment of those outcomes, and then use the assessment results as part of a continuous effort of improvement [citations omitted].*

The College community is fully aware of the requirement that the institution needs to reach the Proficiency Level on the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness by 2012. With this mandate in mind, the College created a standing Student Learning Outcomes Team (SLOT) in 2003. The SLOT is chaired by a full-time faculty member and includes faculty, instructional deans, the Vice President of Education and Student Services and the Director of Institutional Research. It meets monthly and for the last several years, it has developed inservice activities (one each January and one each August) for faculty that assist them in implementing the SLO mandate. During the year, newsletters are published and other communication, either to all faculty or to individuals, comes from the SLOT to assist faculty in the SLO process.

The major milestones in the SLO process at Mendocino College have been:

- May 2006: Adoption of Institutional Student Learning Outcomes for students completing AA and AS degrees.

- May 2008: Completion of all course-level SLOs. The last of these were submitted to the Curriculum Committee in Fall 2008.
- October 2008: Finalization of SLOs for all student service and educational support programs, along with assessment plans.
- December 2008: All SLOs for instructional programs, aligned with course-level SLOs, were completed and submitted to the Curriculum Committee. In addition, faculty submitted timelines for assessment of individual courses, keeping in mind that full implementation is required by 2012. Therefore, each discipline has identified which courses will be assessed in which semester between 2008 and 2012. These timelines are iterative, in that they comprise a continuous cycle of assessment and improvement planning.
- Spring 2009: Faculty and educational support programs reported SLO assessment results and corresponding improvement plans in Program Review, due on March 2, 2009. Faculty were also asked in January 2009 to align their individual courses with the Institutional SLOs, based on which ISLOs they believed the course supported. These responses were used to create a “crosswalk” between courses and ISLOs (see Exhibit 23).
- Fall 2009: A compilation of all Program Review responses about SLO assessment was presented to SLO and reviewed. This data was used in subsequent inservice presentations to faculty, which typically include “best practices.”
- Spring 2010: Programs once again reported SLO results in Program Reviews, and these were compiled for review by SLO. The College also negotiated payment for participation in the SLO assessment process with part-time faculty and negotiated 12 hours per year (two days) of SLO assessment and Program Review preparation with full-time faculty in exchange for removing two instructional days from the academic year.
- Fall 2010: SLO reviewed most recent program review results and decided to set up meetings with small groups of faculty to offer assistance, particularly to new faculty. A second newsletter was produced.

To summarize, at this time, all course- and program-level SLOs have been completed, submitted to the Curriculum Committee (for instructional programs), and posted on the public website. In addition, full- and part-time faculty are expected to include course-level SLOs in their syllabi and the instructional deans review syllabi for compliance. Full-time faculty are required to participate in the SLO process as part of their core duties and part-time faculty receive additional compensation for participating in course-level assessments (on a less formal basis, many were compensated for participating in the development of SLOs). All disciplines and

educational programs have multi-year assessment cycles in place and report assessment results and improvement plans via Program Review.

In Fall 2010, the College became one of the 15 recipients statewide of the BRIC-TAP grant (Bridging Research and Institutional Culture – Technical Assistance Program). One request from the College was a review of its progress in SLOs and advice about assessing program-level and ISLOs. At a meeting with the technical assistance provider in February 2011, it became apparent that the College needed to accelerate efforts to complete ISLO assessment. Using the ISLO matrix (Exhibit 23), the College currently plans to gather student work from a variety of classes in Spring 2011, identify rubrics for each ISLO and pay up to 10 faculty to assess each ISLO using the student artifacts during early summer 2011. Further discussion about assessment of program-level SLOs will continue through Spring 2011.

Another plan for Spring or Fall 2011 is to begin formal reports to the Board of Trustees from the SLOT. The chairman of the SLOT will prepare a brief presentation and answer any questions the Trustees have.

The College believes it is moving steadily toward the Proficiency level on the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, which the Commission identified in its June 30, 2008 Action Letter as required for the College by 2012. While SLOs and assessment are in place and being used for improvement, full institutional dialogue is in the process of developing and more resources may need to be allocated through the planning and budgeting process. Comprehensive assessment reports are developed from Program Review data and more strategies to raise student awareness of the goals and purposes of courses and programs will be pursued. Assessment results will be gathered and reported to the Board of Trustees and general college community.

Recommendation 3: *In order to improve, the team recommends that the College complete installation of the Integrated Information System and maximize its potential for reporting, accountability, and assessment of institutional effectiveness, student learning, and student success.*

The College gave a full report on this recommendation just one year ago, in its March 2010 Follow-Up report. Therefore, the information below is meant to update that information with any developments over the past year.

A. Installation of the IIS (Datatel)

Mendocino College passed a General Obligation (Prop. 39) bond in November 2006 that included a long list of projects. However, the original impetus for the bond measure was to replace the Legacy information system the College had outgrown. That system was unable to

accommodate online registration, electronic grading or efficient class schedule production. Once the bonds were issued, the College immediately began the selection process for a new system and, after presentations and college-wide discussion, agreed to purchase the Colleague system from Datatel in August 2007.

Implementation began with the formation of a Core Team in Fall 2007 from several departments of the College, including instruction, student services, human resources and fiscal. Critical decisions about budget codes, discipline identification, etc., were made over the first several months. With the assistance of a team of Datatel users from other California community colleges, data were moved into the new system and substantially “cleaned” in the process.

Another part of the implementation was assignment of security levels and access. Existing employees identified information that they used on a regular basis, and the Core Team assigned appropriate security levels to safeguard data in the system. New employees must be assigned a level approved by the Core Team when they are hired (Exhibit 24). This system has been effective in keeping student information confidential by limiting access to only those employees who need it in order to perform their assigned duties.

As of Spring 2011, the Colleague system is fully operational for instruction and student services purposes. Faculty access real-time rosters online (Exhibit 25) and grade students electronically. Students browse class schedules (Exhibit 26), register (Exhibit 27), pay (Exhibit 28) and see their grades and transcripts (Exhibit 29) through WebAdvisor. Financial aid awards are applied to student accounts and checks are generated through the system; refunds are also automatic. Students can also see the progress of their financial aid applications on WebAdvisor, which gives them up-to-date information about any forms that are missing; this has removed a burden from Financial Aid staff, who no longer have to answer multiple questions from students on the phone or in person. As a result, the College closes its Financial Aid Office two afternoons a week to allow staff to catch up on processing applications. In Spring 2011, despite an increase in applicants, the office was caught up on files and awarded \$900,000 in Pell Grants on the first day of the semester (January 24, 2011).

Deans and other administrators can see real-time enrollments in classes and generate a variety of reports concerning scheduling, class costs and efficiency (Exhibit 30). Management Information System (MIS) data for the state is entered and audited throughout a semester by end-users rather than after a semester ends.

Planning continues for other components of the Colleague system, primarily the payroll components (2011) and fiscal services (estimated 2012). College administrators, including the Superintendent/President, meet every six months to review the timeline for implementing

these final pieces of the IIS (Integrated Information System). In the meantime, all Human Resources (HR) and fiscal information continues to be available to the college community through systems supported by the Mendocino County Office of Education.

Some improvements that both the fiscal and HR areas have made due to the Colleague implementation are integration of fiscal services with financial aid, so that Pending Aid can be noted in student accounts and refunds are generated automatically; acceptance of credit cards through the web for registration, community extension classes and library fees; increased accuracy of refunds, even when there are retroactive fee increases; check printing using secure chip signature and security ink; fully automated generation of part-time faculty contracts and payroll spreadsheets; archival scanning/storage of personnel and payroll files; and real-time reporting of faculty workloads. Many of the functions noted above were performed manually prior to the Colleague implementation.

B. Reporting and Accountability Improvements

Improvements to state reporting and more general accountability have taken place in several areas:

- As noted above, the process of migrating data from one system to another required substantial “clean up” of that data. Student records, course details, room capacities, and many other pieces of information were examined and corrected. The “cleaned” data results in fewer issues when it is submitted to the state for MIS purposes. It also facilitates student transactions such as financial aid awards and transcript production.
- Discussions of program development or reduction require accurate data about enrollment, number of graduates, time to completion, etc. With the new system, these data can be generated by end-users in minutes rather than requiring the Information Technology staff to produce special printed reports.
- In instructional areas, deans and faculty can access real-time reports on class efficiency, FTES generation and enrollment trends, all of which are instrumental when making future scheduling decisions. These reports are housed on a Report Server.

Overall, data for reporting are more easily accessible to more employees who can check them for accuracy before submitting MIS reports to the state or federal reports such as IPEDS (Integrated Post-Secondary Education Data System). Data on student retention, success and other factors are also more widely available for reports to the Board or community about student achievement. As an example, just recently the college wanted to pinpoint where enrollments were lost in Spring 2010 due to fewer classes being offered. The institutional

researcher was able to generate a report in approximately one hour using Datatel (Exhibit 31); under the old system, it would have taken 24 to 48 hours. Even more recently, the College has had to examine each academic program to determine number of FTES generated, overall costs and revenues per FTES. A report was generated from Datatel, again in about 48 hours (Exhibit 32).

C. Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness

Many types of data are used to assess effectiveness of the College as a whole. Already noted above are efficiency numbers in various disciplines, student success rates on a course or section level, and student persistence and retention rates. The College plans to generate reports in the following areas to make decisions over the next 18 months and beyond, especially in light of reduced state funding:

- Cost of programs, using information from Colleague as well as the county system
- Improvement rates in basic skills classes, particularly math and English
- Effectiveness of Early Alert system, which involves tracking students who are identified as at-risk by instructors and then contacted by counselors
- Assessment of educational plans, i.e., determining whether students with educational plans complete degrees more quickly and have higher course success rates
- Comparison of instructional programs looking at success rates, retention rates and enrollment trends

Information available through the Colleague system is also linked to Strategic Plan objectives and reports can be generated to monitor progress toward college goals. For instance, under *Goal #1: Ensure student success within a learner-centered environment*, the College plans to increase the number of students who meet their stated goals by 10% by 2014. The information about individual goals in Colleague can be cross-referenced to student transcripts to see quickly and easily if students did meet their stated goals. Under *Goal #2: Improve student access to college programs and services*, one objective is to increase the number of students receiving financial aid. Again, since financial aid information is integrated in Colleague with student information, progress toward this objective is easily determined (see Exhibit 33).

D. Effects on Student Learning and Student Success

Students have received multiple benefits from the new Colleague system that will undoubtedly lead to enhanced retention and success in the coming years. Some prime examples are:

- Student access has increased dramatically with online registration (the College still retains the traditional walk-in option for the time being, but due to the implementation of web registration, it eliminated telephone registration in November 2010).
- Student educational plans are entered and updated through the counseling office, but students have 24/7 access to those plans through WebAdvisor (Exhibit 34).
- Students can see their grades as soon as faculty enter them in the system. In the past, many students never reviewed their grades because they had to ask for a paper record from the Admissions Office. They were then sometimes surprised when they did not meet a pre-requisite or graduation requirement.
- Financial aid awards for students are entered into the system as “Pending Aid,” which allows students to register once they have been approved for aid, but prior to an actual check or other payment. Therefore, students register earlier and can focus on acquiring textbooks and other materials rather than delaying formal registration in classes.
- Soon, when degree audit (an automated system which helps students and counselors track students’ progress toward degrees) is fully implemented, students can participate more fully in educational planning by monitoring their own progress toward completing certificates, degrees or transfer requirements.
- Because faculty have increased access to rosters, they have the contact information for students even when off-campus and can let students know about class time changes or other important class events. They can also contact students who are missing class if they choose.

Implementation of the student portal in late 2011 (which was delayed about one year) will add another dimension to student success. Through the portal, the College will be able to have increased communication ability that can be targeted to individual students or groups of students. For example, all students who have identified psychology as a major can receive a notice about an upcoming event; students who identified transfer as a goal can get updates from the Career and Transfer Center; and all students can receive notification of new policies, budget information, scholarship application deadlines, etc. Lack of success among students can

often be traced to lack of relevant information; the portal and its communication components will greatly reduce chances of “failure” due to an information gap.

Student learning, tracked primarily through SLOs, can be assessed much more effectively through a few components of Datatel. First, all course SLOs are available through CurricUNET (which the College was able to implement in Fall 2009 after the first wave of Datatel implementation) and are accessible on the Internet along with the course outlines. Second, assessment of those SLOs is part of the annual Program Review process and in the future, assessment results will be reported through the program review component of the CurricUNET software. These results are housed in a searchable database that, again, will be accessible by a wide range of employees. Program-level, institution-level and student service SLOs may not have a logical place in the CurricUNET package, but will be posted in publicly-accessible locations, along with their assessment results.

Concerns with Datatel That are Being Addressed

The implementation of Datatel has been mostly trouble-free and has improved services to students, efficiency at the College and ability to use data. Unlike some other colleges, Mendocino has not experienced massive breakdowns that disrupted registration or delayed financial aid processing. The lack of problems can be attributed to assigning Information Technology staff to different parts of the Colleague system – for example, one staff member concentrates on MIS data – and the regular meetings of the Core Group representing the departments (such as Fiscal Services, Financial Aid, Admissions and Registration, and Curriculum) that use Datatel the most. The Core Group is able to identify and address problems before they increase.

However, some problems with the Datatel system did develop. Recently, for example, it was discovered that in rare circumstances students were receiving refunds of certain optional fees which should not have been refunded after the start of classes. Because of communication among Core Group members, the source of the problem was located and fixed. Another problem is that CCCApply, the state’s online application system, was not loading automatically into Datatel. In fact, for more than a year, an Admissions and Records staff member has had to manually load applications individually – sometimes by printing them and re-entering the information. At this point, an outside consultant has been hired to fix the problem and was scheduled to begin meeting with staff in early February 2011. Concerns about the accuracy of some of the reports and MIS information remain, and a variety of employees continue to check and re-check that information to clear up any inaccuracies.

The implementation of Colleague has improved the College’s capacity to access the information that it needs to assess student success and institutional effectiveness. Once the college

community reviews this data and makes changes, Colleague will once again provide the means to gauge whether the changes have been effective. Mendocino College continues to move forward with implementation of the remaining components of the Datatel package, including the payroll and fiscal modules.

Recommendation 4: *As was noted in recommendation 6 contained in the 2002 Accreditation Evaluation Report, the team recommends that the college comply with this standard by completing evaluations for all managers by June 2008, and ensure that the systematic process for monitoring completion of evaluations for all personnel is adhered to in accordance with college policies and procedures.*

When the Superintendent/President and Accreditation Liaison Officer appeared before the Commission in June 2008, they were able to report that all evaluations for managers that were due had been completed. The Human Resources Department is responsible to monitor completion of evaluations for all personnel and send out regular lists of personnel due for evaluation in that semester or year. The results of implementation of systematic processes for completion of all evaluations are reported below.

Evaluation of Superintendent/President

According to Board Policy 212 and Administrative Procedure 212.1 (Exhibit 35), the Superintendent/President receives an annual evaluation from the Board of Trustees on a set timeline. This evaluation takes place in closed session and includes goal-setting for the following year. In the first year of employment and every third year thereafter, college employees are surveyed for feedback, which is reviewed by the Board. The Board of Trustees has adhered to these procedures and timelines since their passage in 2007.

Evaluation of Managers

The College has a clear process of evaluation of managers that includes soliciting feedback from all direct reports and others; a self-evaluation; and goal-setting for the next two years (see Exhibit 36). Most managers are evaluated by one of the two Vice Presidents, and the Vice Presidents are evaluated by the Superintendent/President. Annually in the fall, the Human Resources Office sends lists of all managers and classified who need to be evaluated within that academic year. At the time of this report being submitted, all manager evaluations that are due have been completed and have been filed in Human Resources.

Evaluation of Classified Staff

Like managers, classified staff are evaluated on a regular basis (every two years after the first year of employment) and their supervisors solicit feedback from other employees before completing evaluation forms (see Exhibit 37). The Human Resources Department sends lists to supervisors identifying classified staff who need to be evaluated by June of that year. As of the

time of this report being submitted, all but a few classified evaluations that are due have been completed and have been filed in Human Resources.

Evaluation of Full-time Faculty

Over the last four years, extensive changes to the evaluation procedure for full-time faculty have been negotiated and implemented (Exhibit 38). These changes have resulted in a better process to inform probationary faculty about any concerns so that they have an opportunity to rectify problems. The process includes the requirement that a written remediation plan with clear timelines be given to any probationary faculty who fall below standards and a follow up evaluation be conducted the following semester. This process has been pivotal in helping more than one faculty member improve or, in one case, in supporting the college's decision not to offer any further contracts.

Deans are given a list of faculty due for evaluation that academic year in the fall; the list is generated from Human Resources records. All faculty due for evaluation have been evaluated as of the date of this report, or are in process to have evaluations completed by May 2011 (for tenured faculty).

Evaluation of Part-time Faculty

The evaluation process and timelines for part-time faculty are negotiated by the College and the Mendocino Part-time Faculty Association, and are included in the current contract (Exhibit 39). Evaluations generally take place in the first semester of employment and every six semesters thereafter. The evaluations are conducted by full-time faculty in the discipline, an instructional dean or another relevant administrator assigned by the deans (such as the Distance Education Coordinator).

At the beginning of each semester, Human Resources sends the deans and Vice President of Education and Student Services a list of part-time faculty due for evaluation. Deans contact full-time faculty to determine if they will conduct the evaluations and staff for the deans follow up regularly. Completed evaluations are reviewed and signed by the Vice President of Education and Student Services and President of the Academic Senate (Exhibit 40).

The percentage of part-time faculty evaluations completed in the semester they are due has been steadily rising to approximately 95%. However, due to illness, class cancellation or other factors, not all evaluations due in any given semester can be completed.

Recommendation 5: *In order to meet Standard III.A.3.d, the team recommends that the college develop and institute a written code of ethics for all personnel [citation omitted].*

After receiving this recommendation, the College moved quickly to create and approve a code of ethics. Following the procedure for development of all policies, a draft version was taken to the President's Policy Advisory Committee (PPAC), which has representation from management, faculty, classified staff and students. The draft was discussed, distributed to all college personnel for feedback, then any feedback received was discussed at PPAC and any revisions were made before forwarding the policy to the Board of Trustees at its next regular meeting.

On June 4, 2008, the Board of Trustees approved the District Code of Conduct (Board Policy 308), which reads:

DISTRICT CODE OF CONDUCT

The Mendocino-Lake Community College District (District) is committed to maintaining a positive, healthy, and respectful environment for board members, employees, students, visitors and all other parties who conduct business or interact with the District. Creating a climate of respect and trust is a responsibility shared by all.

Board members, employees and students of Mendocino College are expected to adhere to all rules of conduct as established by state and federal law. Additionally, this code of conduct seeks to articulate commonly held values that are central to the culture of the District. All board members, employees and students at Mendocino College are expected to demonstrate and advocate the following:

- **Integrity** – *Act with honesty and integrity, avoid actual or apparent conflicts of interest between personal and professional relationships, respect differences of opinion and make best efforts to resolve those differences in an ethical and professional manner.*
- **Civility** – *Act in a courteous and respectful manner, refraining from inappropriate language and unprofessional behavior when interacting and communicating with others.*
- **Individual Responsibility** – *Act in good faith; act responsibly; and exercise due care, competence, and diligence, without misrepresenting material facts.*
- **Confidentiality** – *Respect the confidentiality of information acquired in the course of one's work, except when authorized or otherwise legally obligated to disclose. Confidential information acquired in the course of one's work shall not be used for personal advantage.*
- **Accountability** – *Comply with current rules and regulations of federal, state and local governments, and other appropriate private and public regulatory agencies.*
- **Knowledge** – *Share knowledge and maintain skills important and relevant to the needs of those we serve.*

- **Accuracy** – Provide information that is accurate, complete, objective, relevant, timely, and understandable.
- **Professional Standards of Conduct** – Proactively promote professional standards of conduct as a responsible partner among peers, in the work environment, and in the community.
- **Appropriate Use of Resources** – Achieve responsible use of and control over all assets and resources employed or entrusted.

This policy has been posted on the college website. It has been helpful in resolving disputes between employees as well as supplementing the Student Code of Conduct in some cases involving student discipline.

Recommendation 6: *In order to come into compliance with Accrediting Commission's Substantive Change Policy, the college should immediately work with WASC to obtain substantive change approval for its nursing program and for programs leading to an associate degree that are being offered at the Lake Center.*

Nursing Program

During the team visit in March 2008, team members were made aware that the nursing program, which began in 2003, had never been reviewed as a substantive change. After conferring with the Commission, team members conducted interviews with staff and obtained additional information about the nursing program that satisfied any concerns. In subsequent communications between Superintendent/President Lehner and the Commission, the College was informed that it would not have to submit a substantive change proposal for the program (see Exhibit 41).

The Mendocino College nursing program is the highlight of the College's occupational programs. In 2010, it ranked in the top 16% of all RN programs nationally, with a 96% NCLEX pass rate. The College has continued to support the program with human resources; currently, there are four full-time nursing faculty for an entering class of 18 students (and second-year class of 24, when the LVN bridge students join). The program recently moved to another section of the main campus and secured an additional space for a dedicated computer lab in the process. The community provides several student scholarships for nursing students and recently, the three main hospitals in the college district committed to support the cost of the fourth faculty position with close to \$100,000 a year. The nursing faculty receive extremely high ratings on student evaluations (for an example, see Exhibit 42).

Lake Center

The College addresses this recommendation under the section of this report detailing planned substantive change proposals.

Distance Education

While not addressed by the visiting team in 2008, the College proactively submitted a Substantive Change Proposal for Distance Education Programs in late spring 2010. The College made an effort to identify all programs likely to be offered 50% or more through distance education (almost exclusively online) in the next three to five years. This proposal was reviewed and approved by the Commission on July 19, 2010 (Exhibit 43), confirmation that the College has provided appropriate support and quality assurance for its distance education program.

Recommendation 7: *In order to meet Standard IV.B.1.h, the team recommends that the college board of trustees adopt a clearly defined policy that addresses violation of its code of ethics.*

The College has addressed this recommendation fully and completely by revising Board Policy 208 to include the following language:

Violation of the Law and/or the Board's Code of Ethics:

The Superintendent/President and Board President are authorized to consult with legal counsel when they become aware of or are informed about actual or perceived violations of pertinent laws and regulations, including but not limited to conflict of interest, open and public meetings, confidentiality of closed session information, and use of public resources. Violations of law may be referred to the District Attorney or Attorney General as provided for in law.

Violations of the Board's Code of Ethics policy will be addressed by the President of the Board, who will first discuss the violation with the Trustee to reach a resolution. If resolution is not achieved and further action is deemed necessary, the Board President may appoint an ad hoc committee to examine the matter and recommend further courses of action to the Board. Sanctions will be determined by the Board President (or committee) and may include a recommendation to the Board to censure the Trustee. Censure is an official expression of disapproval passed by the Board. If the President of the Board is perceived to have violated the code, the Vice President of the Board is authorized to pursue resolution.

If illegal or unethical behavior occurs during a Board meeting (such as remaining at the Board table when the trustee has a conflict of interest, engaging in debate or discussion with audience members on topics not on the agenda, attacking a speaker or staff member or not following the Board's meeting procedures), the President of the Board can state what the expectations and standards are of Board behavior and/or state that the behavior or violation does not meet Board policy.

Reference: Accreditation Standard IV.B.1.a, e, & h.

The revised policy was approved on May 7, 2008; a complete version is attached as Exhibit 44. This policy is available on the College's website.

Planning Agenda Updates

Mendocino College		
Standard	Planning Summary	Summary
I.A.1	The College will continue to refine its criteria for developing programs and services so that the Mission Statement is paramount.	A major theme echoed throughout Program Review is the advancement of the College's mission. Part 1 (Annual) of Program Review has been completely restructured and its major components align directly with the College's revised committee structure. Chairs of these Committees provided input into the restructuring of the Program Review documents so that their committees will receive the type of information which will allow them to make informed planning and allocation decisions. Part 2 of Program Review, where programs focus upon evaluation and planning, has been greatly expanded. Instead of an annual review, programs conduct a much more in-depth review every four years, according to the published rotation. These reviews reflect analysis of quantitative data provided by Institutional research as well as qualitative self assessment of goal attainment. These in-depth reviews will be reviewed by the Educational Action Plan Committee (EAP) as part of their work. In addition, EAP has begun to refine the Guidelines for Program Management and is in the process of incorporating the College Mission Statement into the criteria for developing new programs and services.
I.A.1	The Program Review directions and cycle will be reviewed for maximum effectiveness and alignment with the college mission.	The College has revised the Program Review documents and timeline, and had recommended the purchase of Program Review software which will be implemented in late 2011. The next Program Review deadline is April 15, 2011, by which time the software will be implemented. All programs have been moved to a three-year cycle for Part 2; they will continue to complete Part 1 every year.
I.A.2	The College will research ways to communicate the mission statement to students more effectively.	This plan was accomplished by adding the mission statement to all catalogs and printed class schedules. It was also included in a Student Handbook first distributed in Fall 2010 and large signs with the current Mission Statement have been posted in Ukiah and at the two centers.
I.A.4	The institution plans to revise its committee structure to better integrate budgeting with planning at the top decision-making level and ensure more college-wide involvement.	This has been accomplished and was explained in the Follow-Up Report of March 15, 2009. Further explanation is contained in the Midterm Report.

I.B.1	Encourage each of the campus committees to use the college website more effectively as a means for communications.	More committees now use the website to post agendas and minutes than at the time of the team visit in March 2008. Some examples are Curriculum Committee, Staffing Committee, Associated Students of Mendocino College, the SLO Team, and the Educational Master Plan Task Force. Work is underway to make the college website more accessible. In addition, the Portal, currently being implemented, will be another electronic location for each committee to use.
I.B.2	Determine means of assessing the college goals and develop timeline for measurement and dissemination of results.	This has been accomplished and was explained in the Follow-Up Report of March 15, 2009. Further explanation is contained in the Midterm Report.
I.B.2	Continue to work on the Educational Master Plan and make it and the Facilities Resources Master Plan more available to the college community.	The Facilities Master Plan and Technology Plan are available on the college website. The Educational Action Plan (EAP) Committee has completed the Educational Master Plan. The Board approved the plan at its regular meeting on February 3, 2010. The Educational Master Plan document has been posted on the College's website. Additionally, the EMP was made available to both Facilities and Computing Services for reference as they completed the Facilities and Technology Master Plans respectively..
I.B.3	Disseminate research data more widely and provide workshops to explain data.	Currently, research data is posted on the staff intranet and periodically, reports are made to appropriate committees and the Board of Trustees. As part of Program Review, workshops are scheduled with faculty to review program data to increase their understanding and use of data to plan their programs. Research data is presented regularly to various committees across campus. Research findings are generally included as part of the presentation at campus "in-service" days to keep faculty informed of major trends. Data is prepared and disseminated in support of our on-going Strategic Planning effort. Institutional Research also is a regular participant in Board of Trustee workshops. Annually, IR analyzes and presents the Accountability Reporting for Community Colleges (ARCC) findings to the Board of Trustees. The Institutional Research web page has been revised and is regularly updated each semester. Institutional Research also develops and provided program information for Program Review. Workshops reviewing these spreadsheets have been held for faculty tasked with conducting Program Review as well as with members of EAP, which will be assessing program review information. Institutional Research, working with the Fiscal Services Office, prepares integrated enrollment and budget evaluations to assist the College's Planning and Budget Committee (PDC) in developing staffing recommendations. Institutional Research also responds to a growing amount of ad hoc requests for data and analysis from both internal and external clients. The College is currently a participant in the BRIC-TAP effort, which provides outside consultants to help campuses disseminate and interpret research data.
I.B.3	Move to revised committee structure that better integrates budgeting and planning.	The revised committee structure that was proposed in Spring 2008 was implemented in Fall 2008.

I.B.4	Discuss with faculty and staff the importance of their involvement in shared governance and the need for a wider representation on committees, particularly "planning committees."	The Academic Senate conducted a survey in Fall 2008 to determine committee participation and is working with administrators to encourage better involvement. As of Spring 2011, faculty and staff participation in shared governance was greatly improved.
I.B.4	Continue to encourage students to participate in ASMC and serve on committees.	In 2009-2010, all positions on ASMC were filled and students filled slots on almost all committees with a designated student seat. Participation has fallen off slightly in 2010-2011.
I.B.4	Investigate ways to sustain grant-seeking and grant-writing at the College.	Discussions are continuing about increasing grant applications, particularly in the CTE area. The CTE Dean develops quite a few applications, and the College has an ad hoc committee working on a Title III grant at the moment.
I.B.5	Improve the accessibility of the Public Relations and Research webpages and update their content.	<p>The "Fast Facts" page is maintained and the web page for Institutional Research is updated regularly. This page includes current and previous semester data, copies of research reports, and links to external research sites.</p> <p>At the direction of the Superintendent/President, a Web Task Force, comprised of faculty, staff (both IT and non-IT) and students was composed and met in Fall 2009 and Spring 2010. The Task Force evaluated the current website, reviewed a number of other college websites to determine best practices and features. The Task Force submitted its report to the Superintendent/President in Spring 2010.</p> <p>Implementation of a new public web site has been incorporated as Objective 4 under Strategic Goal 1 in the Technology Action Plan (See Technology Action Plan) with proposed implementation in Fall 2011-Spring 2012. Bond funding has been identified to make this happen.</p>
I.B.5	If departmental newsletters are to be published, make them accessible via the appropriate links on the college website.	Several newsletters, including the Bond newsletter, SLO newsletter and Student Services newsletter, are available online, and more are being posted.
I.B.5	Formulate a plan to assess effectiveness of communications to the public about institutional quality.	Communications about educational quality occur primarily through periodic press releases, a duty that continues to be assigned to various managers in lieu of a designated PIO. However, a comprehensive plan has not been developed.
I.B.6	The College needs to fully integrate the allocation of resources with its planning procedures.	This task is continuing and was addressed in the Follow-Up Report of March 15, 2009. Further explanation is contained in the Midterm Report.
I.B.6	The College will begin to collect data relative to its progress in meeting its identified goals.	This task is continuing and was addressed in the Follow-Up Report of March 15, 2009. Two managers assigned to collect data relative to the Strategic Action Plan and compiled their findings for analysis in late Spring 2010. These data were reviewed in October 2010 to help revise

		the Strategic Plan.
I.B.7	Within College committees, continue regular evaluation of assessment mechanisms and criteria for program success.	Both EAP and the Program Review Task Force are reviewing criteria used to evaluate programs. The Educational Action Plan Committee has begun to refine the Guidelines for Program Management, particularly criteria for assessing program health and for making recommendations to the Planning and Budget Committee. "Anchor" programs have been chosen to represent healthy programs as well as programs which are in need of assistance. Guidelines for creating Program Assistance Teams (PATs) have already been developed. EAP has also worked with the Program Review Task Force to coordinate its review of program health with the four-year Program Review cycle.
I.B.7	Complete SLO identification, assessment and response cycle.	SLOs have been identified for all courses and student service programs, and many have been assessed as of Spring 2011; assessment results are incorporated into annual Program Review documents. All instructional programs have also completed an assessment plan to complete assessment of individual courses by Spring 2012, and almost all have developed program-level SLOs. The SLO Team began assessment of institution-level SLOs in Spring 2010, and will complete the first cycle by 2012.
II.A.1.b	Through the Director of Distance Education, assess online course quality and create policies and guidelines to ensure effectiveness of online courses.	<p>In Fall 2008, the Distance Education Committee proposed a policy on DE course quality, including "regular effective contact." This policy was approved by the Board. The committee is currently working on procedures related to that policy. In addition, the DE Director has been directly involved in evaluating online courses, with faculty consent. The Distance Education committee has worked on the following program-level Student Learning Outcomes and began the assessment cycle in Spring 2010.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Demonstrate substantive interaction by students with other students taking the course through the use of discussion boards and other communication methods.</i> • <i>Maintain consistent and effective interaction between students and instructors through the exchange of emails, comments on discussion boards, feedback on assignments, etc.</i> • <i>Demonstrate the study habits of self-discipline necessary to succeed in distance education classes.</i> <p>These SLOs should help in evaluating the overall program. Additionally, the Student Evaluation of an Instructor survey instrument has been adjusted for online courses, with the substitution of specific questions about online course delivery. This change was recommended by the Director of Distance Education and included in the most recent faculty contract. Finally, ACCJC approved the College's substantive change report for distance education in Fall 2010.</p>
II.A.1.b	Systematically assess need for courses in outlying areas as well as bilingual courses.	Upon review of the ESL courses District-wide, the Lakeport Center has been identified as the campus with the most urgent need. The full-time ESL faculty from the Ukiah campus has been working with part-time faculty at the Lakeport campus as well as with bilingual counselors to expand and further develop ESL course offerings. Two new ESL sections have been added to the Lake Center schedule for Spring 2011. The full-time ESL instructor from the Ukiah campus has also offered one ESL

		<p>class at the Lake Center to more fully understand emerging community needs in the Lake community. Assessment of other needs is ongoing, including gathering data about need for and success in online courses.</p> <p>To replace current leased instructional and student support facilities in the city of Lakeport, acquisition of real estate for the purpose of developing a permanent Lake Center facility has been completed. Programs and courses have been systematically reviewed for the purpose of planning the new facility in a 3-phase format. No new programs have been identified or planned for Phase 1. Classroom facilities will be improved for existing programs and services, particularly in student learning support. Architectural design will be completed in 2011 with construction projected for 2012-13. Additional course planning will occur as Phase 1 completion continues.</p> <p>To replace current leased instructional and student support facilities in the city of Willits, acquisition of real estate for the purpose of developing a permanent Willits Center facility is in progress and expected for March 2011. Programs and courses will be systematically reviewed for the purpose of planning the new facility in a 3-phase format. No new programs have been identified or planned for Phase 1. Classroom facilities will be improved for existing programs and services, particularly in student learning support. Architectural design will be completed in 2011-12 with construction projected for 2013. Additional course planning will occur as Phase 1 completion continues.</p>
II.A.1.b	Work toward a comprehensive professional development plan for faculty with pedagogy as a focus.	<p>As part of the Basic Skills Initiative self-study, the Foundation Skills Teaching and Learning Community (FSTLC) has created a professional development plan to provide faculty with a means for focusing on pedagogy and classroom improvement. The FSTLC continues to sponsor bi-annual teacher institutes, which are led by exemplary faculty members and have focused on areas such as the use of technology in the classroom, creating and facilitating collaborative learning, understanding classroom interaction and moving beyond PowerPoint to create interactive classrooms. The FSTLC sponsored the campus's second mini-conference in February 2010, which focused on faculty-led discussions in break-out sessions on topics such as developing college-level literacy among students and serving specific student populations, including Generation 1.5 students. A third-annual mini-conference is planned for March 2011, which will focus on supporting teachers as researchers. The College continues to partner with local secondary instructors and four year partners through these mini-conferences. The Academic Senate has identified a comprehensive professional development plan as a priority.</p>
II.A.1.c	Complete program and institution level student learning outcomes, as well as appropriate assessment plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional-level student learning outcomes have been developed. The Student Learning Outcomes Team has worked in Fall 2009 to link course-level SLOs with institutional-level SLOs. The SLO team is currently discussing ways to assess institutional SLOs. • Most program-level SLOs have been completed.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty in all disciplines have created schedules for assessing course-level SLOs. • Faculty are currently reporting on the assessment of course-level SLOs in their program review documents. All course-level SLOs for active courses have been completed.
II.A.1.c	Once SLOs at each of these levels have been implemented, gather assessment results and use them for improvement of student learning.	Assessments of course-level SLOs are currently gathered by department and reported in program review documents. Departments have also been summarizing their findings in these documents and making recommendations for instructional improvement at the course level based on these findings. Assessment of program- and institution-level SLOs is planned for 2010-2011.
II.A.2.a	Continue developing specific Student Learning Outcomes for all courses/programs and guide faculty in assessing these.	All course-level SLOs have been developed and are housed in the course outlines (through CurricUNET). Program-level SLOs are almost completed. Student service unit SLOs have been completed and are being assessed.
II.A.2.b	Continue to follow SLO timeline and identify faculty leads for disciplines without full-time faculty.	Timelines are being met and faculty have been identified to lead disciplines without full-time faculty. In addition, the college negotiated payment to adjunct faculty for SLO assessment.
II.A.2.b	Incorporate SLO assessment into the program review process and use results to improve programs.	SLO assessment is fully incorporated in the annual Program Review documents.
II.A.2.c	Develop a comprehensive faculty professional development plan.	A plan has been developed through completion of the self-study for the Basic Skills Initiative. The plan will be further developed through the staff development committee. Individual faculty will continue to attend conferences and other events in their own disciplines.
II.A.2.d	Continue to plan and implement meaningful staff development opportunities, particularly in the area of learning communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Foundational Skills Teaching and Learning Community focused on the development of learning communities during the '09-'10 year. Curriculum is being developed to allow for students to enroll in one learning community section (LCOM) which will then automatically place them in the linked courses for their specific community. As of the Spring 2011 semester, stipends will be available for instructors to develop learning communities at the basic skills level as well as the transfer level. • At the Teacher Institute that focused on collaborative learning, learning communities were explored with a key group of faculty. Two learning communities were offered in Fall 2010, but more research is needed into identifying students likely to succeed.
II.A.2.d	Continue to provide faculty with an opportunity to learn new technology, particularly ETUDES training.	The DE Director continues to schedule periodic workshops for faculty interested in learning ETUDES. In addition, she meets with faculty individually and also refers them to online ETUDES training. This is an ongoing item with workshops available once each semester as well as individual assistance for faculty as needed. An outside speaker will come to the College in late February 2011 to address best practices in online instruction.

II.A.2.e	SLOs will be completed and incorporated into program reviews.	This has been accomplished and was explained in the Follow-Up Report of March 15, 2009. Further explanation is contained in the Midterm Report.
II.A.2.f	Evaluate any SLO assessment information from course-level reporting in 2008 program review.	This has been accomplished and was explained in the Follow-Up Report of March 15, 2009.
II.A.2.f	Assess program-level SLOs in fall 2008 for reporting in 2009 program review.	This has been accomplished and was explained in the Follow-Up Report of March 15, 2009.
II.A.2.h	Develop a process to measure the College's effectiveness towards matching credit awarded and student achievement of the course's stated learning outcomes.	This has been accomplished and was explained in the Follow-Up Report of March 15, 2009. Further explanation is contained in the Midterm Report.
II.A.2.i	Discipline faculty will develop Student Learning Outcomes in each major, and these will be widely distributed to students and to counselors to use in the advising function.	All SLOs are posted on the public website and incorporated into course outlines and syllabi. Counselors have access to all course-level SLOs through the website or CurricUNET.
II.A.3.a	Student Learning Outcomes for all general education courses need to be fully implemented with assessment plans.	This has been accomplished and was explained in the Follow-Up Report of March 15, 2009.
II.A.3.c	The College will begin assessing course-level SLOs in 2008, which include general education (IGETC/UC/AA level) courses and those meeting the Cross Cultural requirement.	This has been accomplished and was explained in the Follow-Up Report of March 15, 2009.
II.A.4	Develop and publish course and program level SLOs for faculty, counselor, administration, and student access.	All SLOs are posted on the public website and incorporated into course outlines and syllabi. Course-level SLOs are also available through CurricUNET.

II.A.6.a	Revise the catalog, schedule, and web to provide information to students on the practice of granting credit for transfer work and/or experience.	This information is currently available on the web and in the catalog. Transfer of Credit Policies and Practices: A review of the location of information on the web, the catalog, and the schedule shows that the information is on the web and in the catalog, but needs to be grouped and labeled more effectively. It has been determined that the best location for transfer of credit information on the web is under Admission. The information is being re-written and will be uploaded by the end of the Fall 2010 term. The catalog information needs to be grouped together. This recommendation is being forwarded to the Instruction Office for the next catalog or addendum to the catalog publication. The schedule of classes does not have any information on transfer of credit; a short statement of what, where, and how will be added to the next available schedule for publication.
II.A.6.a	Explore the development of other non-traditional learning experiences that can grant college credit to eligible students.	The College accepts military training and education as the only currently official non-traditional learning for transfer credit that is common. CLEP exams may be submitted to the faculty for evaluation and recommendation. Transfer credit for life experiences has not had a discussion within the disciplines at this time. Focus groups are being developed for faculty participation in this possible transfer credit arena. A pilot process has begun with Art faculty who view the portfolio and make course equivalent recommendations.
II.A.6.a	Institutionalize review of AP exams and publish accepted AP scores on the website for student accessibility.	The matrix of AP exam credit is available on the college website. A review of the number of units awarded took place with faculty through the Academic Senate. As new AP Exams become available, they are sent to the Director of Admissions and Records. The faculty of the discipline are then sent the packet and invited by the director to review and recommend course equivalency and unit value. Recent exams, within the last five years, have been granted only the current unit value of the MC course. Previous exams granted the College Board recommended six (6) units; the faculty are currently reviewed this early practice and made decisions about unit values that are recorded in a matrix.
II.A.6.b	Investigate improved methods of notifying all relevant staff of program modifications.	Program modifications are available online and in the catalogs and addenda. With the newly implemented CurricUNET, all current and modified programs are now available online to staff, faculty, students, and the general public.
II.A.7.a	Add Academic Freedom Policy to full-time and part-time Faculty handbooks.	Full-time faculty will no longer have a handbook in the future, so will receive this information upon hire. The policy has been added to the part-time faculty handbook.
II.A.7.b	Identify more effective ways to prevent plagiarism through student notification or other means.	A plagiarism policy was disseminated to all full-time and adjunct faculty in Fall 2008 for inclusion in syllabi and is available to faculty on an on-going basis through the College website and through the faculty handbook. At each inservice for adjunct faculty, this policy is discussed and faculty are reminded to discuss plagiarism with their students. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty have been given sample language to include in their syllabi regarding plagiarism. • Plagiarism is addressed in the faculty orientations • The Librarian leads workshops for students on research and using internet sources effectively. • Writing Workshops have been developed for students to provide support with using MLA and other types of citation.

II.B.2	More widely disseminate academic freedom and other relevant policies such as sexual harassment not currently in the catalog or schedule.	These policies were added to the 2010-2011 catalog.
II.B.3.a	Develop more comprehensive support services for online students.	Currently the Distance Education committee is evaluating other college programs to determine how others provide services for online students. This is the main committee emphasis for the 2010-2011 year.
II.B.3.b	Pursue ways to recognize students' civic achievements and involvement.	When possible, press releases have been prepared and the Board of Trustees sends congratulations to students.
II.B.3.b	Develop strategies for increased involvement of students in campus and student government.	Students received more invitations to participate in government, committees and other activities in 2009-2010, with a resulting increased participation rate. Participation has dropped off in 2010-2011, but is still good.
II.B.3.c	Provide some measure of training for faculty on advising in their particular disciplines.	This has not taken place.
II.B.4	Continue to integrate data into evaluation of student services, including SLO assessment.	Student Service units report on results of SLO assessment in annual program reviews, using data gathered throughout the previous year. IR provides additional research as requested.
II.C.1	The Head Librarian will work on a new survey for faculty, students and staff that better defines their library/media needs	Faculty were surveyed in Fall 2009 regarding a new general database, because the interface changed in Infotrac's Expanded Academic ASAP. The result was that the college is moving to EBSCO's Academic Elite database. Additionally, faculty are surveyed on library materials about every two weeks. Students can make requests through the web site and through a clipboard at the circulation desk. The Library typically fills a couple of requests for students and faculty every week.
II.C.1	Library staff will develop new online delivery of tutorials for library services.	Library tutorials have been developed in Captivate software, which uses flash videos. These are linked to the Library's home page. With the move to a new database, these have been updated as of January 2010.
II.C.1	Library staff will work toward developing and implementing a half-unit, basic information competency course.	The Head Librarian is working on development of this course and should submit it to the Curriculum Committee in Spring 2011. The current one-unit course is being offered online in Spring 2011, with full enrollment.
II.C.1	Library staff will begin scheduling regular workshops beyond library orientations and one-on-one instruction.	Five workshops took place on the Ukiah campus and two at the Lake Center in Fall 2008. Several more took place in Spring 2009 and Fall 2009 at all these locations as well as Willits. The workshops were advertised through the website, poster and faculty announcements.
II.C.1	Offer online tutoring to accommodate distance education students.	A pilot program is planned for Fall 2011 that would use the college's course management system combined with enrollment in EDU 500 to provide tutorial assistance to online students.

II.C.1	Encourage more group tutoring, especially in problem-based courses.	The Learning Center, as part of the Basic Skills Initiative, has hired more professional tutors and is offering a variety of tutoring options, including group tutoring. Summer and Winter Math Institutes have been expanded to serve more students. Reading and Writing workshops (WREAD) have been developed to assist students with reading strategies, the writing process, grammar issues and research issues.
III.A.1.a	Continue to periodically evaluate the selection procedure to support the employment of qualified personnel.	An updated version of the College's selection procedure for regular employees was presented to the President's Policy Advisory Committee and revised in February 2009. Because the accompanying policy was not changed, Board approval was not needed.
III.A.1.b	Through the collective bargaining process, the evaluation of online instruction needs to be refined, particularly regarding the privacy of students returning Student Evaluation Forms. Both the student and peer forms need to be customized to reflect the uniqueness of online learning.	A revision to the evaluation process for online instruction was negotiated with both MCFT and MPFA in May 2009. Forms were revised to reflect the uniqueness of online learning and the process was amended to protect the privacy of students returning the Student Evaluation Forms.
III.A.1.c	The College plans to have a summary of this ongoing reflection-with-course-improvement cycle incorporated into program review documents.	Starting with the 2008 Program Review document, a section was added which asks programs to update and discuss SLO activity and assessment as well as plans to improve courses based on assessment results.
III.A.1.d	The District should propose a written code of ethics through the shared governance and collective bargaining processes, possibly utilizing a work group representing various employee groups to draft language.	The Board of Trustees adopted Policy 302: District Code of Conduct on June 4, 2008. Further explanation is contained in the Midterm Report.
III.A.2	Continue to research the application of minimum qualifications for faculty and work with the Academic Senate to refine the application of equivalency.	In October 2008, the Director of Human Resources and the Academic Senate met to review the application of minimum qualifications and the College's equivalency policy. It was mutually agreed that a revision to the equivalency policy was not needed.

III.A.3.a	As College technology permits, personnel policies and procedures will be made more readily accessible through the college website.	The Human Resources Intranet and college website include collective bargaining agreements, handbooks, health benefit information, salary schedules, and HR forms used by staff. An alternative to employee look-up of sick leave and vacation leave balances is being developed because there wasn't an effective solution through Datatel.
III.A.4.a	Update the Equal Employment Opportunity Plan pursuant to the guidelines set forth by the Chancellor's Office.	The Director of Human Resources attended the annual California Community College HR conference and received training from legal counsel and the Chancellor's Office staff regarding proposed revised Title 5 EEO and non-discrimination regulations. The Chancellor's Office estimates that a system directive will be distributed once the Board of Governors adopts revisions to Title V which is currently in process. It is anticipated that updated EEO plans will be due one year after the notice is sent.
III.A.5.a	The Flex Committee should consider producing an annual report which summarizes and evaluates the professional development of full-time faculty.	The Human Resources Department summarized flex activities completed by full-time and part-time faculty for the past year, as well as the conferences and workshops attended and District sponsored on-campus training activities for all faculty and staff. This information is shared annually with the Professional Development Committee, the Superintendent/President and the Board. The annual Professional Development report now summarizes the flex activities completed by full-time faculty.
III.A.5.b	The Professional Development Committee should look more globally at identifying and assessing training needs, as well as reporting the annual professional development activities which have occurred.	The Professional Development committee, which includes representatives of all employee groups, meets each Fall Semester to review the Professional Development report for the prior year which includes the staffing development activities completed. Professional development needs and training plans for the subsequent semester and year are then identified and planned, often by surveying constituent groups.
III.B.1.a	The College should improve staff input during the planning and development stages of new facilities, particularly in regard to staffing needs created by new facilities.	Staff input, including all constituent groups, has been an essential component of bond planning. Staffing needs created by new facilities will be considered by the Planning and Budgeting Committee after the latest Program Reviews are completed and collated.
III.B.1.a	The College should create more adequate upgrade, replacement and maintenance plans.	Utilizing the online FUSION program, a five-year maintenance plan has been established and maintained over the past years. The newly established Facilities Committee has been charged with addressing upgrade, replacement and maintenance plans.
III.B.1.b	A computerized tracking system for service requests should be instituted with an automatic acknowledgment of repair requests and flexibility in prioritizing requests.	An ad hoc committee has reviewed ADA modifications needed and the first phase addressing these issues was completed in August 2009. The final phase has been award as a part of the LLRC building project. All other items were complete as a part of the maintenance building and building relocation projects.

III.B.1.b	The College should continue to improve safety and security on the Ukiah Campus and at each of the Centers by, for example, providing better lighting at strategic locations.	Several projects have been completed, such as the installation of interior door locks on the Ukiah Campus. In addition, a consultant has reviewed the Ukiah Campus to determine how video cameras could be used to increase security. Lighting will be addressed through the Measure W bond over the next 18 months, and work will begin on safety issues at the Centers.
III.B.1.b	The College should provide first aid materials and emergency response training.	This plan is being addressed in several ways. First, NIM/ICS 300 and 400 emergency management training was provided to several managers in December 2008. Second, the emergency preparedness plan is being reviewed and updated. Finally, the Student Crisis Management Team (now renamed the Assessment and Care Team for Students) has been meeting regularly to plan trainings for staff and issued crisis intervention guidelines in February 2009 to assist staff in assessing and responding to crisis situations.
III.B.1.b	Any remaining ADA issues will be addressed as bond related projects are completed.	An ad hoc committee has reviewed ADA modifications needed and the first phase addressing these issues was completed in August 2009.
III.C.1.a	The Technology Committee will work with the Disability Resource Center to ensure that appropriate ADA access is achieved.	Through work on the Technology Plan, the needs of students with disabilities will be addressed. The Disability Resource Center Counselor/Coordinator is a member of the Technology Committee who educates and informs the committee on appropriate ADA access at the District.
III.C.1.a	Technology support, possibly including student help desk workers, for wireless and laptop users need to be considered before these services continue to expand.	Wireless access has been implemented at the District and laptop use continues to expand. The District Technology Plan has an objective of working on technology support for these services and other new technology projects.
III.C.1.b	Computing Services should establish more in-depth trainings after the initial offerings utilizing the new training facility.	With the implementation of Datatel, extensive training was provided for front line staff. Unfortunately, the new training facility was disassembled when the implementation concluded. A new facility needs to be established with the new Library building and indepth Datatel training needs to be integral to training new staff or updating current staff on new functions of Datatel. The training facility can be used for other training such as upgrades to Microsoft Office or other technical programs used on the campus.
III.C.1.c	The 15 additional classrooms plus any created by bond projects will continue to be upgraded over the next three to five years.	All existing classrooms, including those at the Centers, have been outfitted with overhead projectors, SMART panels, podia and internet access. The Technology Committee keeps an inventory of the labs and classrooms. The goal is to aim for a four year refresh for computers. Virtual Computing will also be explored as a way to reduce costs and keep up to date in labs and classrooms.

III.C.1.c	Implement Datatel according to the goals of the Project Charter and look at long term support of the Datatel software system as computer equipment ages.	The student component of Datatel was implemented in Spring of 2009. The Director of IT will report to the Technology Committee and other planning committees about the age and reasonable expectations for keeping servers up to date. Virtual computing will also be explored as a way to reduce costs but continue to stay current.
III.C.1.d	Continue to monitor advances in technology and adapt to these changes as necessary.	The Technology Plan and regular meetings of the Technology Committee address changes needed at the College.
III.C.2	Continue to survey users of the systems to ensure that all technology continues to be effective in the future.	The Technology Committee will survey the District in the 2010-2011 timeframe.
III.D.1.a	Collegially consult with the Academic Senate and other constituent groups on the budget development process and timeline.	Per the Integrated Planning Timeline, the Superintendent/President and Vice President of Administrative Services present budget information to classified, faculty and management employee groups and give them the opportunity to ask questions during the fall of each year. The Superintendent/President has scheduled additional meetings with constituent groups over the past year as the budget has deteriorated statewide.
III.D.1.a	Clarify and communicate the budget development process to be utilized in the development of the 2008-2009 budget and document the relationship between budget allocation and institutional planning.	The Integrated Planning Timeline documents the budget development process and is communicated to all constituents through the Planning and Budgeting Committee.
III.D.1.b	Continue developing enrollment management and marketing plans.	An Enrollment Management Committee consisting of the VP, deans and faculty began meeting weekly in Fall 2009 to respond to changing directives and enrollment trends. Guidelines were written and disseminated to the college community. A team has been appointed to develop a marketing plan and began meeting in Spring 2010.
III.D.1.c	Update the current actuarial study.	The District's second GASB 45 actuarial study was completed in April 2008, and the unfunded liability amount identified in that report was included in college financial statements beginning on June 30, 2008. The next actuarial study for Retiree Health Liabilities required by GASB 45 would be due Spring 2011.
III.D.1.d	Continue to assess the effectiveness of the integrated planning timeline and refine as appropriate.	The Integrated Planning Timeline is assessed and revised on an annual basis.
III.D.2.c	In light of the recent tragedy at Virginia Tech, the College should focus increased attention on safety, security, and	Staff have attended several emergency preparedness trainings and a Student Crisis Management Team (now the Assessment and Care Team for Students) meets regularly to plan for emergency situations. This team distributed crisis intervention guidelines to all faculty and staff in February 2009. Other issues tackled by the committee have been

	emergency preparedness.	preventing suicide and creating safe spaces for LGBTQ students. Also, interior locks were installed on all classroom doors.
IV.A.1	Make changes to integrated timeline in order to fully integrate all important activities.	The Integrated Planning Timeline is reviewed annually and as needed.
IV.A.1	Continue to monitor involvement of all constituencies and create incentives for participation.	All planning and budgeting committees have established positions for staff, faculty and managers. Many committees also have positions for students. For 2010-11, all major committee positions are filled.
IV.A.2.a.	The College needs to continue its work to make changes to the Program Review forms, including information on Student Learning Outcomes.	<p>As part of an 18 month long process, the Program Review Task Force conducted a thorough review and revision of Program review at Mendocino College. Recommendations from the Task force to the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) have been accepted and were implemented in Spring 2010. As part of that process, questions in Part 1, the Annual Review, have been aligned to the College's revised planning committee structure. Further refinement occurred prior to the 2011 cycle.</p> <p>Within the annual review, academic programs are asked to provide an update on course-level SLOs that they have assessed in the previous year. Specifically, the documentation asks the following:</p> <p><i>G. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES</i> <i>All course-level student learning outcomes for all courses (excluding special topics), program-level student learning outcomes, and course-level assessment schedules must be completed by the time your program review is submitted. (See Program Review Guidelines for example).</i> <i>For each course in your program that was assessed in the past year, please complete the following grid of questions:</i> <i>Course assessed this year: Course Number (e.g. PHT01)</i> <i>Specific SLO Assessed this year: Describe the specific course outcome that was assessed (e.g. "Students completing PHT01 will be able to demonstrate proper focus and depth of field in composing photographs.")</i> <i>Assessment Tool: Describe the assessment tool used (e.g., test questions, holistic grading rubrics, portfolios, in-class presentations, etc.). Also, please note if the assessment was formative or summative.</i> <i>For example, in our fictional PHT01 course, the instructor may review student portfolios of five photographs done by students to demonstrate certain techniques.</i> <i>Findings: What percentage of students actually met the objective? What evidence of student learning did you find? Were there any issues with the assessment process that arose? What did you, as the instructor, learn from the SLO assessment results?</i> <i>Conclusions: Discuss how the information you gathered from the assessment process has influenced you to make changes in the</i></p>

		<p><i>course/program or begin the discussion to make changes. What changes in the SLO process (e.g., the SLO itself, assessment tool, teaching, expectations of for student learning) do you foresee? Use additional rows for more SLOs if necessary.</i></p> <p><i>Course Assessed This Year Specific SLO Assessed Assessment Technique(s) Findings Conclusions</i></p> <p><i>In the box below, please list any resources (not otherwise identified in any other section of Part 1) that you feel you need to assist you with the implementation of SLOs for your program.</i></p>
IV.A.3.	Provide support to campus groups desiring an internet or intranet presence.	In Fall of 2010; the District began the portal project to strengthen communication with campus constituencies. The portal will be live for staff in Spring 2011 and live for students in Fall 2011. The District website needs a major revamping and it is planned to release an RFP in Spring 2011. A staff member has been identified to provide increased support to groups using the Internet.
IV.B.1.a.	The Board should continue to govern by policy and keep in touch with the public it serves.	The Board Subcommittee on Policy Revision met in April 2008 and in August 2008 to review all policies in the Board's bylaws. The Board continues to review and revise all policies as well as write new ones as needed. In 2009 and 2010, the Board of Trustees developed, reviewed, revised, and/or deleted 12 Board policies. These policies were discussed and approved at open board meetings and once approved were shared with district staff via email. All staff have an opportunity to offer comments on policies through the President Policy Advisory Committee prior to being placed on an agenda for Board approval. The Board continues an organized process of reviewing all policies.
IV.B.1.b.	Post all Board policies and administrative regulations on the college website.	The entire Board policy manual was recently reorganized and policies were renumbered in order to simplify the use of the policy manual. All policies are available on the public website.
IV.B.1.b.	Investigate ways to better disseminate information about Board actions and policies.	Board agendas and minutes are posted on the College's website. Revised policies are also distributed to all staff through District Announcements.
IV.B.1.c.	Post policy revisions and decisions by the Board on the college website.	The entire Board policy manual was recently reorganized and policies were renumbered in order to simplify the use of the policy manual. All policies are available on the public website.
IV.B.1.d.	Copies of bylaws and policies should be published and maintained online, readily available to faculty, staff and the general public.	The entire Board policy manual was recently reorganized and policies were renumbered in order to simplify the use of the policy manual. All policies are available on the public website.

IV.B.1.e.	The Board should continue to evaluate itself, make modifications as warranted, and inform the college community and public of any changes.	The Board presented its semi-annual Self-Evaluation at the December 10, 2008 open public Board meeting. The Self-Evaluation document was part of the Board Agenda packet that was posted on the website and shared with all staff through District Announcements. The Board thoroughly reviewed all responses in the self-evaluation document in a Board workshop on February 11, 2009. A Board subcommittee is currently working to review and possibly revise the process. A board subcommittee recommended revisions to the process and evaluation instrument which were adopted by the Board. The Board presented its bi-annual evaluation at the November, 2010 open public Board meeting. The self-evaluation document was part of the board packet that was posted on the website and shared with all staff through District Announcements. Employees who regularly attend board meetings were invited to complete the evaluation document and a summary of those evaluations was included.
IV.B.1.g.	The Board should take steps to ensure that its self-evaluation activities include measurable outcomes that are clearly communicated throughout the college community.	The self-evaluation process was revised by the Board and used in its bi-annual evaluation in the fall of 2010. The District's Institutional Researcher did an analysis of the Board's responses which was shared with Board members. The Board will use this information when developing their annual goals and objectives. These become part of the board packet and are posted on the district website and shared with all staff through District Announcements.
IV.B.1.h.	The Board should develop "a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code."	The Board of Trustees revised its policy on ethics to address consequences for violation and adopted the revision on May 7, 2008.
IV.B.1.i.	The Board should establish a policy on accreditation, including its own involvement in the accreditation process.	The Board of Trustees adopted an accreditation policy (Policy 316) on November 5, 2008.

March 10, 2011

Update on Substantive Change Proposals in Progress, Pending or Planned

As noted above, Recommendation 6 addressed the College's compliance with Substantive Change Policy and noted two areas:

6. *In order to come into compliance with Accrediting Commission's Substantive Change Policy, the college should immediately work with WASC to obtain substantive change approval for its nursing program and for programs leading to an associate degree that are being offered at the Lake Center.*

The nursing program is addressed earlier in this Midterm Report.

Planned -- Lake Center

While the College's Lake Center has been in existence for more than 20 years and is an approved Center on the Chancellor's Office list, it has been in transition over the last five years. In 2006, the College passed a general obligation bond that committed to building a permanent center in Lakeport (the current one occupies rented facilities). When the accreditation team arrived in 2008, discussions were just beginning about the program mix at the Lake Center when the permanent center is built. Since then, the College finalized a purchase of land in 2010 and it is currently working with staff and the community on the design of the center (Exhibit 45) as well as program offerings.

After the team recommendations were received, a list of associate degree programs for which 50% or more of the units could be taken at the Lake Center was compiled. At the same time, planning for the new permanent center in Lake – which will lead to program changes – was also underway. The College decided to delay a substantive change request until more clarity about program offerings over the next several years emerged.

At this point, the College plans to submit a substantive change proposal for the Lake Center in Fall 2011, including projected programs for the next three to five years.