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Part A: History and Background of the College

Overview

Cerro Coso Community College was established in 1973 as one of three colleges within the Kern Community College District (KCCD). Cerro Coso provides educational services to a population of about 145,000 distributed over a service area of over 18,000 square miles – the largest community college service area in California. Such a large area requires multiple sites in order to provide quality learning. Each year Cerro Coso offers instruction to approximately 9,000 students at six “brick and mortar” campus locations and generates FTES of about 3,000.

The 320-acre Indian Wells Valley Campus, at Ridgecrest, California, is located in the upper Mojave Desert, 160 miles northeast of Los Angeles and 120 miles east of Bakersfield. Ridgecrest is the largest single municipality in the service area with a population of approximately 28,000. This campus serves about half of the student population of the College and houses most of the college administration. The Eastern Sierra College Center is north of the IWV campus and serves the communities of Inyo and Mono counties. The center operates two campuses, one in Bishop, 120 miles north of Ridgecrest, and the other in Mammoth Lakes which is an additional forty miles to the northwest. Forty-five miles west of the Indian Wells Valley is the Kern River Valley campus. This site serves the incorporated and unincorporated communities near Lake Isabella. The East Kern campus is seventy miles south of the Indian Wells Valley and is housed on Edwards Air Force Base. This center provides educational services to military and civilian personnel on the base and to the residents of nearby communities.

In 1998, in the effort to respond to the needs of students who cannot attend classes at any of the physical locations, the College established CC-Online as a virtual, sixth campus. At CC-Online, students can choose from over 50 programs, including entire transfer degrees or lower-unit certificates and awards. Each semester, CC-Online offers over 125 courses in 175 sections with complete online support services, including assessment, advising, registration, textbook purchasing, and education plan development. This comprehensive program was the first of its kind in California and has been recognized and imitated by many community colleges.

In spring 2013, it was determined that the mountain town of Tehachapi, 40 miles east of Bakersfield, which had not been directly provided classes by KCCD for several years, should be served by Cerro Coso Community College. The College strengthened partnerships with local businesses and educational organizations, completed a needs assessment, and secured facilities agreements. In fall 2014, the Tehachapi campus offered its first classes. In fall 2015, it moved into its present location at the Tehachapi Education Center. By fall 2017, it was serving 194 enrollments in 16 sections. A substantive change proposal was submitted to and accepted by ACCJC, including a site visit, to make this an official campus location of the College.
Significant Developments Since the Last Institutional Self-Evaluation

Enrollment Changes

Enrollment at Cerro Coso Community College has varied significantly over the last six years. As the chart below indicates, a decline of FTES in the first three years has been followed up by an increase in the following two years (2017-18 has yet to close out, but the numbers are projected to continue the increase):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sections</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>1,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollments</td>
<td>24,459</td>
<td>24,683</td>
<td>23,412</td>
<td>23,886</td>
<td>25,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>2,941.4</td>
<td>2,912.2</td>
<td>2,720.0</td>
<td>2,801.0</td>
<td>2,847.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ODS Data Warehouse

This down-and-up trend is not just a return of the same FTES. Since the last comprehensive evaluation in 2012, the College has seen an expanding percentage of FTES in dual enrollment instruction and prison instruction. While it had always worked with local high schools in this rural service area to provide access to higher education, a quantum leap took place with legislative changes in 2014 and 2015, and dual enrollment partnerships have expanded from two sections a semester to over 30. Similarly, education for incarcerated students has grown rapidly in the last three years, starting from offering a single section in fall 2015 to now offering 20 sections per semester at two prisons within the service area. At the same time, the College is serving many more law enforcement students through in-service training. On the negative side enrollments have decidedly declined at brick and mortar campuses, particularly the main campus where construction has been ongoing to the main building since 2015. Online instruction has remained flat.

This changing enrollment pattern has impacted resources at the College to meet demands of the expanding non-traditional populations. More efforts are going into promoting dual enrollment opportunities through open houses and information nights, working closely with high school partners to maintain high quality instruction, and processing considerable amounts of paperwork. For incarcerated students, more efforts are going into providing access to the college services—such as assessment, advising, education planning, registration, textbook services, and library research—which cannot be done through traditional means.

East Kern Area Growth

As noted above, the College’s East Kern area has seen tremendous growth since 2012. The College was cleared to start serving Tehachapi, a municipality larger than Ridgecrest, where the main campus is housed. Dual enrollment sections are now taught in all five of the area’s local high schools. Incarcerated student education has been established in both correctional institutions that house a combined population of 7,000. In 2013-14, the East Kern area generated a total of 13.4 FTES; in 2016-17, it generated 236.3, and is expected to double that amount in 2017-18. Keeping ahead of this wave has required significant human, physical, technological, and financial adjustments. Staffing at East Kern has increased from a single campus manager
in 2013-14 to five full-time positions, including a campus manager, an education advisor, a department assistant, and two faculty members. Administrative oversight was reviewed in 2015, and a director position created to oversee both the Kern River Valley and East Kern areas. Equitable services have been provided for with the hiring of part-time faculty for tutoring, proctoring, and library functions. Additional services are provided on an as-needed basis by personnel from Ridgecrest—for example, deans traveling to attend information nights for high school parents, EOPS staff traveling to serve qualified incarcerated students, IT technicians traveling to service printers, librarians providing prison instructors with research materials, and print shop personnel making copies of open educational course materials to be brought by instructors to prison class on the first day.

Massive Categorical Funding

In this same space in the last Institutional Self-Evaluation Report, the subheading was “Categorical Reductions,” and the development was the multiple cycles of funding reductions the College had had to weather from 2009. Like a lot of other California Community Colleges, Cerro Coso had put a large portion of labor on categorical budgets. The College and the District provided some resources to backfill a percentage of the losses, which helped to provide some stability for these programs, but layoffs were still required and made worse by the bumping scenarios in a multi-college district.

The significant development in 2017 is the exact opposite. Down from the state over the last four years has come piles of money: money for student success and support, money for student equity, money for strong workforce, money for guided pathways. This has been a boon to the College in terms of providing much needed funds to offset the categorical reductions it spoke of last time. But it has been a challenge as well to find the most effective way to spend the money—particularly in a way that achieves the goals of the categorical grants but also avoids putting the College in the same position it was six years ago in having to reduce services through layoffs. Feast and famine is not a good operating model.

Progress on the Institutional Research Function

At the time of the last comprehensive evaluation, the College had hired a research analyst to work with administrators, classified staff, faculty chairs, and individual faculty members to improve data design and collection. At the same time, key components of institutional research had been consolidated at the district office, with the result of more consistent MIS submissions and better federal and state compliance reporting. The hope was that all the ingredients for a data-driven culture had finally arrived, and a true change in how Cerro Coso Community College used data was around the corner. But early in 2013, all research functions were relocated at the district office, including the College’s own research analyst. And while the district group made tremendous strides in standardizing data-generation and reporting, the office was never big enough to handle the smaller college-specific projects. This proved unsatisfactory, so in 2015-16 the colleges were given the green light to go ahead and hire research staff of their own at the college level who would work primarily on local projects and in coordination with district personnel.
Since Cerro Coso had little history, no experienced personnel, and no effective past practice to draw from, the President decided to apply for technical assistance from the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) division at the California Community College Chancellor’s Office. An IEPI team visited the College in March 2017 and helped it develop a plan to establish a research office, which included the hiring of personnel, the setting of priorities for the first six months and first year, and budgeting for equipment, software, and professional development. As strange as it is to say, the College is in almost exactly the same state of mind about data that it was six years ago at the cusp of the last visit. This time, though, it has behind it six years of experience with uniform and consistent data sets having been delivered by the district IR office and has gotten familiar with a multitude of aggregated and disaggregated reports on student performance and achievement—not to mention with a seasoned integrated planning effort that was just getting off the ground in 2012. Now it has all the pieces in place to put its own research office to very specific use. Developing that capacity is key to the action projects discussed in the Quality Focus Essay.
# Part B: Student Achievement Data and Institution-Set Standards

## Institution-Set Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>Standards Set in 2015</th>
<th>2015 Results</th>
<th>2016 Results</th>
<th>2017 Results</th>
<th>Standards Set in 2018</th>
<th>Aspirational Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful course completion</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic skills course success</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online course success</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Exam Pass Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exam Pass Rates</th>
<th>Standards Set in 2018</th>
<th>2015 Results</th>
<th>2016 Results</th>
<th>2017 Results</th>
<th>Aspirational Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Vocational Nurse</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Technician</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Nursing Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Medical Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Medical Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Job Placement Rates*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Placement Rates*</th>
<th>Standards Set in 2018</th>
<th>2015 Results</th>
<th>2016 Results</th>
<th>2017 Results</th>
<th>Aspirational Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Office Technology</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Design</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Information Systems</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welding Technology</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Service Area Information

In the following tables, the following area abbreviations are used:
- IWV - Ridgecrest, Indian Wells Valley area
- BIS - Bishop
- MAM - Mammoth Lakes
- EDW - Edwards AFB
- TEH - Tehachapi
- KRV - Lake Isabella, Kern River Valley area

#### Households by Income, CC Service Areas, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IWV</th>
<th>BIS</th>
<th>MAM</th>
<th>EDW</th>
<th>TEH</th>
<th>KRV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$56,783</td>
<td>$50,933</td>
<td>$69,137</td>
<td>$46,381</td>
<td>$54,963</td>
<td>$35,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Income</td>
<td>$73,476</td>
<td>$65,375</td>
<td>$85,198</td>
<td>$58,742</td>
<td>$77,749</td>
<td>$51,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>$29,083</td>
<td>$28,312</td>
<td>$34,374</td>
<td>$21,556</td>
<td>$26,685</td>
<td>$24,055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ESRI/MAAS Companies

#### Population by Age, CC Service Areas, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>IWV</th>
<th>BIS</th>
<th>MAM</th>
<th>EDW</th>
<th>TEH</th>
<th>KRV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Age Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>IWV</th>
<th>BIS</th>
<th>MAM</th>
<th>EDW</th>
<th>TEH</th>
<th>KRV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: ESRI/MAAS Companies*

### Population by Race/Ethnicity, CC Service Areas, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>IWV</th>
<th>BIS</th>
<th>MAM</th>
<th>EDW</th>
<th>TEH</th>
<th>KRV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Origin</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: ESRI/MAAS Companies*

### Educational Attainment Level, CC Service Areas, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attainment</th>
<th>IWV</th>
<th>BIS</th>
<th>MAM</th>
<th>EDW</th>
<th>TEH</th>
<th>KRV</th>
<th>State-wide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less Than 9th Grade</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th-12th, No Diploma</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED/Alternative</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College, No Degree</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: ESRI/MAAS Companies*
### Workforce Distribution, CC Service Areas, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Sector</th>
<th>IWV</th>
<th>BIS</th>
<th>MAM</th>
<th>EDW</th>
<th>TEH</th>
<th>KRV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture/Mining</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Utilities</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/Insurance/Real Estate</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ESRI/MAAS Companies

### Fastest Growing Occupations, Bakersfield Metro/Kern County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laborers and Freight, Stock, and Material Movers</td>
<td>6,140</td>
<td>8,070</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Care Aides</td>
<td>4,120</td>
<td>5,960</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Assistants</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooks, Restaurants</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Machinery Mechanics</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Assistants</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Secretaries</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Health Aides</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecom Equipment Installers and Repairers, Except Line Installers</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Assistants</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drywall and Ceiling Tile Installers</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement Masons and Concrete Finishers</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Line Supervisors of Helpers, Laborers, Material Movers</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Occupation Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Painters, Construction, and Maintenance</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Hygienists</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Counselors</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Records and Health Information Technicians</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical and Clinical Lab Technicians</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phlebotomists</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Employment Development Department/MAAS Companies

### Student Demographics

#### All Students by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>2012-13 (8,756)</th>
<th>2013-14 (8,491)</th>
<th>2014-15 (8,083)</th>
<th>2015-16 (8,447)</th>
<th>2016-17 (8,989)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Fil/Pacific Isl.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2017-18 Annual Program Review CC Collegewide
**All Students by Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2012-13 (8,756)</th>
<th>2013-14 (8,491)</th>
<th>2014-15 (8,083)</th>
<th>2015-16 (8,447)</th>
<th>2016-17 (8,989)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2017-18 Annual Program Review CC Collegewide

**All Students by Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2012-13 (8,756)</th>
<th>2013-14 (8,491)</th>
<th>2014-15 (8,083)</th>
<th>2015-16 (8,447)</th>
<th>2016-17 (8,989)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 &amp; Younger</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 &amp; Older</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2017-18 Annual Program Review CC Collegewide
Financial Aid Awarded, First Time Degree Seeking Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Financial Aid</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2017-18 Annual Program Review CC Collegewide

Full-Time/Part-Time Status, First Time Degree Seeking Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time/Part Time Status</th>
<th>2012-13 (598)</th>
<th>2013-14 (866)</th>
<th>2014-15 (854)</th>
<th>2015-16 (945)</th>
<th>2016-17 (612)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrew/Non-Credit</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2017-18 Annual Program Review CC Collegewide

Census Day Enrollments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>9,370</td>
<td>15,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>9,118</td>
<td>15,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>9,658</td>
<td>13,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>9,546</td>
<td>14,341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Unduplicated Headcount by Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Unduplicated Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>8,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>8,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>8,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>8,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>8,989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2017-18 Annual Program Review CC Collegewide

### Annual FTES and FTEF by Academic Year

Source: 2017-18 Annual Program Review CC Collegewide
Remedial Placement

% Remedial Placement, First Time Degree Seeking Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placed in Remedial Math</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placed in Remedial English</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Strategic Plan Common Measures 2017

Remedial Placement by Age, 2012-13 through 2016-17

Source: 2017-18 Elements of Student Success Report/ODS

Remedial Placement by Gender, 2012-13 through 2016-17

Source: 2017-18 Elements of Student Success Report/ODS
Remedial Math Placement by Ethnicity, 2012-13 through 2016-17

![Bar chart showing remedial math placement by ethnicity for 2012-13 through 2016-17](chart)

Source: 2017-18 Elements of Student Success Report/ODS

Remedial English Placement by Ethnicity, 2012-13 through 2016-17

![Bar chart showing remedial English placement by ethnicity for 2012-13 through 2016-17](chart)

Source: 2017-18 Elements of Student Success Report/ODS

Course Completion, Retention, and Success

Course Completion Rates, Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Retention</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Success</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing course completion rates](chart)

Source: 2017-18 Annual Program Review CC Collegewide
Course Completion by Gender, 2012-13 through 2016-17

Source: 2017-18 Annual Program Review CC Collegewide

Course Completion by Age, 2012-13 through 2016-17

Source: 2017-18 Annual Program Review CC Collegewide

Course Retention by Ethnicity, 2012-13 through 2016-17

Source: 2017-18 Annual Program Review CC Collegewide

Course Success by Ethnicity, 2012-13 through 2016-17

Source: 2017-18 Annual Program Review CC Collegewide
Course Retention by Delivery Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Ed</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2017-18 Annual Program Review CC Collegewide

Course Success by Delivery Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Ed</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2017-18 Annual Program Review CC Collegewide

CTE Course Success Rate, All Students

Source: 2017-18 CTE Success Report/ODS
CTE Course Success Rate, 2012-13 through 2016-17, by Age

Source: 2017-18 CTE Success Report/ODS

CTE Course Success Rate, 2012-13 through 2016-17, by Gender

Source: 2017-18 CTE Success Report/ODS

CTE Course Success Rate, 2012-13 through 2016-17, by Ethnicity

Source: 2017-18 CTE Success Report/ODS

Transfer Course Success Rate, All Students

Source: 2017-18 Transfer Success Report/ODS
**Transfer Course Success Rate, 2012-13 through 2016-17, by Age**

![Age Success Rate Chart]

Source: 2017-18 Transfer Success Report/ODS

**Transfer Course Success Rate, 2012-13 through 2016-17, by Gender**

![Gender Success Rate Chart]

Source: 2017-18 Transfer Success Report/ODS

**Transfer Course Success Rate, 2012-13 through 2016-17, by Ethnicity**

![Ethnicity Success Rate Chart]

Source: 2017-18 Transfer Success Report/ODS

**Basic Skills Course Success Rate, All Students**

![Basic Skills Success Rate Chart]

Source: 2017-18 Basic Skills Report/ODS
Basic Skills Course Success Rate, 2012-13 through 2016-17, by Age

Source: 2017-18 Basic Skills Report/ODS

Basic Skills Course Success Rate, 2012-13 through 2016-17, by Gender

Source: 2017-18 Basic Skills Report/ODS

Basic Skills Course Success Rate, 2012-13 through 2016-17, by Ethnicity

Source: 2017-18 Basic Skills Report/ODS

Persistence Rates, First Time Degree Seeking Cohorts

Fall to Spring and Fall to Fall, Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall to Spring</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall to Fall</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2017-18 Elements of Student Success Report/ODS
**Fall to Spring and Fall to Fall, by Gender**

![Bar chart showing Fall-to-Spring and Fall-to-Fall persistence by gender.](image)

Source: 2017-18 Elements of Student Success Report/ODS

**Fall to Spring and Fall to Fall, by Age**

![Bar chart showing Fall-to-Spring and Fall-to-Fall persistence by age group.](image)

Source: 2017-18 Elements of Student Success Report/ODS

**Fall to Spring, by Ethnicity**

![Bar chart showing Fall-to-Spring persistence by ethnicity.](image)

Source: 2017-18 Elements of Student Success Report/ODS

**Fall to Fall, by Ethnicity**

![Bar chart showing Fall-to-Fall persistence by ethnicity.](image)

Source: 2017-18 Elements of Student Success Report/ODS
Awards

Award Attainment by Award Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA/AS Degree</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA-T/AS-T Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Achievement</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Skills Certificate</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2017-18 Award Type with Demos/ODS

Average Units Earned by Associate Degree Recipients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA/AS Degree</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA-T/AS-T Degree</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** denotes small sample size of less than 30

Source: Awards w Avg Units Earned Report/ODS
**Percentage of AA/AS Degree Recipients Who Take Extra Terms to Complete**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On Time</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Extra Term</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Extra Terms</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Extra Terms</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ Extra Terms</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Awards w Avg Units Earned Report/ODS*

**Award Distribution by Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2012-13 (365)</th>
<th>2013-14 (334)</th>
<th>2014-15 (400)</th>
<th>2015-16 (304)</th>
<th>2016-17 (319)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 2017-18 Award Type with Demos/ODS*
Award Distribution by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2012-13 (365)</th>
<th>2013-14 (334)</th>
<th>2014-15 (400)</th>
<th>2015-16 (304)</th>
<th>2016-17 (319)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 &amp; Younger</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 &amp; Older</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2017-18 Award Type with Demos/ODS

Award Distribution by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Fil/Pacific Isl.</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2017-18 Award Type with Demos/ODS
**Transfers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to UC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to CSU</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to In-State Private</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Out-of-State</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: CC Summary College Transfer ALL 10Yr*

**Employee Demographics, Fall 2016**

*Ethnicity by Employee Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Contract Faculty</th>
<th>Adjunct Faculty</th>
<th>Classified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Fil/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: CC Employee Profile*

*Gender by Employee Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Contract Faculty</th>
<th>Adjunct Faculty</th>
<th>Classified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: CC Employee Profile*
### Age by Employee Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Contract Faculty</th>
<th>Adjunct Faculty</th>
<th>Classified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 40</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-54</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 &amp; Older</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CC Employee Profile

### Percentage of Full-time Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Full-Time Faculty</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Strategic Plan Common Measures 2017
Part C: Organization of the Self-Evaluation Process

Process

The 2018 comprehensive institutional self-evaluation process began in fall 2016. In August, the Accreditation Steering Committee had its first orientation session, followed by a second meeting to establish co-chairs and determine the logistics of writing the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER), followed by a third meeting to train committee members on the structure of the institutional analysis, expectations surrounding content and evidence (dialogue, assessment measures, continuous improvement), unique character at Cerro Coso (multiple campuses, distance education), nature and selection of evidence, and a style sheet. During this time, committee members were asked to complete ACCJC’s online training.

In spring 2017, the committee met to finalize the timeline and establish ground rules for the co-chairs in writing their Standard drafts, which were due December 8, 2017 (last day of fall semester).

For preparing the Standards, the College used this same approach it used in 2012. Instead of convening large groups of 6-8 volunteers to write each Standard, the committee opted again for the concept of 2-3 main writers who gather input directly from the committees, units, or work groups who have the most campus experience with the Standard. For example, the writers of Standard III.C (Information Technology) got targeted feedback from the College’s Technology Resource Team, the writers of Standard II.B (Library and Learning Support Services) from the library and learning assistance center staff. Co-chairs were encouraged to either solicit input first and then draft, or present a completed draft and then get input.

The following chart indicates the standards, the co-chairs and their positions, and the groups consulted and when.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Faculty and Management Co-chairs</th>
<th>Group Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.A</td>
<td>Corey Marvin, Vice President, Instruction Yihfen Chen, Mathematics Faculty</td>
<td>College Council, April 5, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B</td>
<td>Corey Marvin, Vice President, Instruction Suzanne Ama, Digital Media Arts Faculty and Program Review Coordinator Vivian Baker, Child Development Faculty and Outcomes Assessment Coordinator</td>
<td>Outcomes Assessment Committee, November 7, 2017 Institutional Effectiveness Committee, November 13, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.C</td>
<td>Corey Marvin, Vice President, Instruction Laura Vasquez, English Faculty</td>
<td>Administrative Cabinet, April 23, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Faculty and Management Co-chairs</td>
<td>Group Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| II.A     | Michael Kane, Dean of Career and Technical Education  
Rebecca Pang, Director of Distance Education  
Suzanne Ama, Digital Media Arts Faculty and Program Review Coordinator  
Vivian Baker, Child Development Faculty and Outcomes Assessment Coordinator  
Benjamin Beshwate, History Faculty and Curriculum and Instruction Council Chair | Outcomes Assessment Committee, November 7, 2017  
Curriculum and Instruction Council, November 17, 2017  
Pedagogy and Technology Committee, April 6, 2018 |
| II.B     | Chad Houck, Dean of Letters and Sciences  
Julie Cornett, Library Faculty | Library and Learning Assistance Center faculty and staff, November 21, 2017 |
| II.C     | Christine Small, Director of Counseling  
Melissa Gross, Counseling Faculty | Counseling staff meeting, May 2, 2018  
Student Success and Support Council, November 8, 2017 |
| III.A    | Resa Hess, Human Resources Manager  
Matthew Crow, English Faculty | Faculty Chairs, November 27, 2017 |
| III.B    | John Daly, Maintenance and Operations Manager  
Norman Stephens, Economics Faculty | Facilities Committee, April 9, 2018 |
| III.C    | Michael Campbell, Director of Information Technology  
Scott Cameron, Physical Sciences Faculty | Technology Resource Team, October 24, 2017 |
| III.D    | Lisa Couch, Vice President of Finance and Administrative Services  
Matthew Jones, Political Science and History Faculty | Budget Development Committee, November 6, 2017 |
| IV.A     | Deanna Campbell, Director of the Eastern Sierra College Center  
Jan Moline, Counseling Faculty and Academic Senate President | College Council, April 19, 2018 |
| IV.B     | Deanna Campbell, Director of the Eastern Sierra College Center  
Jan Moline, Counseling Faculty and Academic Senate President | President’s Cabinet, April 16, 2018 |
| IV.C     | Deanna Campbell, Director of the Eastern Sierra College Center  
Jan Moline, Counseling Faculty and Academic Senate President | College Council, April 19, 2018 |
Once drafts were submitted in December, a concentrated period of review and editing took place to norm the document and standardize the content and style. It was communicated at this time also that the subcommittee of the board of trustees had certain deadlines for review—February 26 for Standard I, March 26 for Standards II and III, and March 31 for Standard IV and the rest of the document—and that the board was requiring two readings instead of one. This established a deadline of May 4, 2018 for the fully formatted, hyperlinked, and completed document.

The Quality Focus Action Projects were decided on in January and February through a broad-based inquiry process inclusive of all employee groups. The process is described more at length in Part H – Quality Focus Essay. Once the essay was drafted, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and the Student Success and Support Council provided feedback and input.

Once the document was approved by the board of trustees for a second reading, the document was put on the college website for third-party comments as required by Commission policy.

**ISER Timeline**

**Preparation:** September 2016 – December 2016
- Accreditation Steering Committee organizational meeting held
- Accreditation Steering Committee training held
- Co-Chairs determined by Accreditation Steering Committee
- Writing the Standards training held for co-chairs

**Drafting the Standards:** January 2017 – December 2017
- Accreditation Steering Committee SharePoint created
- Preliminary drafts of Standards written
- Preliminary drafts Standards presented to focus groups
- Feedback from focus groups incorporated
- Final drafts of Standards delivered by December 8, 2017

**Finalizing the Document:** January 2018 – May 2018
- Final draft of Standards compiled, formatted, and edited
- Input solicited on Quality Focus action projects, projects decided on by IEC, essay drafted, feedback generated, final revisions made
- Review by sub-committee of the board of trustees
- Final edits to the ISER completed
- ISER formatted, evidence compiled and labeled, website created

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Faculty and Management Co-chairs</th>
<th>Group Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV.D</td>
<td>Deanna Campbell, Director of the Eastern Sierra College Center Jan Moline, Counseling Faculty and Academic Senate President</td>
<td>College Council, April 19, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QFE</td>
<td>Corey Marvin, Vice President, Instruction Heather Ostash, Vice President, Student Services</td>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness Committee, April 16, 2018 Student Success and Support Council, April 25, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Document submitted May 4, 2018 for first reading by the board of trustees

Preparing for the Visit: June 2018 – October 2018
  • First reading of board of trustees, June 14, 2018
  • Second reading of board of trustees and approval, July 12, 2018
  • ISER posted for public comment
  • USB flash drive with the ISER, evidence, current catalog, and link to most recent class schedule sent to each member of the team and to ACCJC
  • Preliminary meeting with the Team Chair held
  • Preparations made for the team’s visit
  • Evaluation team hosted, Monday, October 1 through Thursday, October 4, 2018
Part D: Organizational Charts

Cerro Coso Organization Charts
**Research and Reporting**

**Function:**

State/Federal Reporting (ARCC, IPEDS): Decentralized to the Colleges with coordination by the Colleges and District Office

**Service Providers:**

- District Office: Director, Research Analysis and Reporting
- Bakersfield College: Director of Institutional Research and Planning
- Cerro Coso Community College: Institutional Research Analyst
- Porterville College: Institutional Researcher

**Function:**

Reporting and Analysis for District-wide Reports; Data Definitions and Decision Support: Centralized at the District Office with coordination by the Colleges
Service Providers:
- District Office: Director, Research Analysis and Reporting
- Bakersfield College: Director of Institutional Research and Planning
- Cerro Coso Community College: Institutional Research Analyst
- Porterville College: Institutional Researcher

Function:

Research Projects (Methodology and Library): Decentralized to the Colleges with coordination by the District Office

Service Providers:
- District Office: Director, Research Analysis and Reporting
- Bakersfield College: Director of Institutional Research and Planning
- Cerro Coso Community College: Institutional Research Analyst
- Porterville College: Institutional Researcher

Function:
Data Integrity Standards and Training: Centralized at the District Office with coordination by the Colleges

Service Providers:
- District Office: Director, Research Analysis and Reporting; Vice Chancellor, Operations
- Bakersfield College: Director of Institutional Research and Planning; Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs/Student Services; Associate Vice President, Student Services
- Cerro Coso Community College: Institutional Research Analyst; Vice President, Academic Affairs; Vice President, Student Services
- Porterville College: Institutional Researcher; Vice President, Academic Affairs; Vice President, Student Services

Government and External Relations

Function:
Legislative Advocacy: Centralized at the District Office with coordination with the College Presidents

Service Providers:
- District Office: Associate Vice Chancellor, Governmental and External Relations
- Bakersfield College: Director, Marketing and Public Relations
- Cerro Coso Community College: Public Relations, Marketing and Development Manager
- Porterville College: Public Information Officer

Function:
External Relations: Centralized at the District Office with coordination with Chancellor’s Cabinet and College Presidents
Service Providers:
- District Office: Associate Vice Chancellor, Governmental and External Relations
- Bakersfield College: President and management team
- Cerro Coso Community College: President and management team
- Porterville College: President and management team

Function:
Public Information: Decentralized to the College

Service Providers:
- Bakersfield College: Director, Marketing and Public Relations
- Cerro Coso Community College: Public Relations, Marketing and Development Manager
- Porterville College: Public Information Officer

Function:
Leadership Academy: Centralized at the District Office with coordination with Chancellor’s Cabinet and College Presidents

Service Providers:
- District Office: Associate Vice Chancellor, Governmental and External Relations
- Bakersfield College: President
- Cerro Coso Community College: President
- Porterville College: President
**Business Services and Facilities Functional Mapping for Decision-Making**

---

**Budget Development/Business Services**

**Function:**

Budget Development/Business Services: Decentralized with coordination from District Office

**Service Providers:**

- District Office: Chief Financial Officer
- Bakersfield College: Executive Director, Administrative Services
- Cerro Coso Community College: Director, Administrative Services
- Porterville College: Director, Administrative Services

**Finance**

**Functions:**

- Debt Management: Centralized
- Economic Analysis: Decentralized
• Cash Flow Analysis: Decentralized

**Service Providers:**
• District Office: Chief Financial Officer
• Bakersfield College: Executive Director, Administrative Services
• Cerro Coso Community College: Director, Administrative Services
• Porterville College: Director, Administrative Services

**Business Services**

**Function:**
Accounting: Centralized at District Office

**Service Providers:**
• District Office: Chief Financial Officer; Director, Accounting Services

**Function:**
Fiscal Reporting: Centralized at District Office

**Service Providers:**
• District Office: Chief Financial Officer; Director, Accounting Services

**Function:**
Purchasing: Decentralized with coordination from District office

**Service Providers:**
• District Office: Chief Financial Officer
• Bakersfield College: Executive Director, Administrative Services
• Cerro Coso Community College: Director, Administrative Services
• Porterville College: Director, Administrative Services

**Maintenance and Operations**

**Functions:**
Custodial, Grounds, and Trades: Decentralized

**Service Providers:**
• District Office: Building Facility Manager
• Bakersfield College: Executive Director, Administrative Services
• Cerro Coso Community College: Director, Administrative Services
• Porterville College: Director, Administrative Services

**Risk Management**

**Function:**
General Liability: Centralized
Service Providers:
  • District Office: Chief Financial Officer

Facilities Planning and Construction

Functions:
New Construction, Modernizations, Energy Management, Scheduled Maintenance ($30,000 or more): Centralized at District Office in coordination with Colleges

Service Providers:
  • District Office: Chief Financial Officer
  • Bakersfield College: Executive Director, Administrative Services
  • Cerro Coso Community College: Director, Administrative Services
  • Porterville College: Director, Administrative Services

Auxiliary Services

Function:
Bookstore: Outsourced

Service Providers:
  • District Office: Chief Financial Officer
  • Bakersfield College: Executive Director, Administrative Services
  • Cerro Coso Community College: Director, Administrative Services
  • Porterville College: Director, Administrative Services

Function:
Food Services Outsourced at Porterville College, decentralized at Bakersfield College and Cerro Coso Community College, with audit and financial from Chief Financial Officer

Service Providers:
  • District Office: Chief Financial Officer
  • Bakersfield College: Executive Director, Administrative Services
  • Cerro Coso Community College: Director, Administrative Services
  • Porterville College: Director, Administrative Services

Foundation

Function:
Foundation: Decentralized with audit services from Chief Financial Officer

Service Providers:
  • District Office: Chief Financial Officer
  • Bakersfield College: Director, Foundation and Institutional Development
  • Cerro Coso Community College: Director, Public Information Officer, Marketing and Development
• Porterville College: Executive Director (Interim)

**Graphic Design/Duplicating**

**Function:**

Foundation: Decentralized

**Service Providers:**

• Bakersfield College: Executive Director, Administrative Services
• Cerro Coso Community College: Director, Administrative Services and Publications Coordinator
• Porterville College: Graphic Designer/Web Site Coordinator

**Educational Services Functional Mapping for Decision Making**

**Educational Affairs**

**Function:**

Accreditation – District Liaison Officer: Decentralized with compliance oversight from District Office
Service Providers:
- District Office: Vice Chancellor, Educational Services
- Bakersfield College: Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs and Student Services
- Cerro Coso Community College: Vice President, Academic Affairs; Vice President, Student Services
- Porterville College: Vice President, Academic Affairs

Function:
Career and Technical Programs: Decentralized with facilitation from Educational Services

Service Providers:
- District Office: Vice Chancellor, Educational Services; Associate Chancellor, Economic and Workforce Development
- Bakersfield College: Dean, Career and Technical Education
- Cerro Coso Community College: Dean, Career and Technical Education
- Porterville College: Dean, Career and Technical Education

Function:
Catalog Development: Decentralized with review for compliance with District-wide standards

Service Providers:
- District Office: Vice Chancellor, Educational Services
- Bakersfield College: Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs and Student Services
- Cerro Coso Community College: Vice President, Academic Affairs
- Porterville College: Vice President, Academic Affairs

Function:
Child Development Centers: Decentralized with compliance oversight from District Office of Educational Services

Service Providers:
- District Office: Vice Chancellor, Educational Services
- Bakersfield College: Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs and Student Services
- Cerro Coso Community College: Vice President, Student Services
- Porterville College: Vice President, Student Services

Functions:
Curriculum
- Not for Credit: Decentralized to the Colleges and District Office with review by Educational Services
- For Credit and Non-Credit Decentralized to the Colleges with review by Educational Services

Service Providers:
- District Office: Vice Chancellor, Educational Services
- Bakersfield College: Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs and Student Services
- Cerro Coso Community College: Vice President, Academic Affairs
- Porterville College: Vice President, Academic Affairs

Function:

Faculty Evaluation: Decentralized with oversight for compliance and consistency from District Office

Service Providers:
- District Office: Vice Chancellor, Educational Services
- Bakersfield College: Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs and Student Services
- Cerro Coso Community College: Vice President, Academic Affairs
- Porterville College: Vice President, Academic Affairs

Function:

Grant Development: Decentralized to the Colleges and District Office with review from the District Office. Program/Finance monitoring is decentralized; Fiscal reporting is centralized.

Service Providers:
- District Office: Vice Chancellor, Educational Services
- Bakersfield College: Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs and Student Services
- Cerro Coso Community College: Vice President, Academic Affairs; Vice President, Student Services
- Porterville College: Vice President, Academic Affairs

Function:

Library/Learning Resources: Decentralized

Service Providers:
- Bakersfield College: Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs and Student Services
- Cerro Coso Community College: Vice President, Student Services
- Porterville College: Vice President, Student Services

Functions:

Program Development and Review:
- New Program Development: Decentralized to the Colleges with review by Educational Services
- Program Review: Decentralized to the Colleges
- Vocational Program Reviews: Decentralized to the Colleges with review from Educational Services

Service Providers:
- District Office: Vice Chancellor, Educational Services
- Bakersfield College: Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs and Student Services
• Cerro Coso Community College: Vice President, Academic Affairs; Vice President, Student Services
• Porterville College: Vice President, Academic Affairs

Function:

Schedule:
• Decentralized with review for compliance with District-wide standards

Service Providers:
• District Office: Vice Chancellor, Educational Services
• Bakersfield College: Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs and Student Services
• Cerro Coso Community College: Vice President, Academic Affairs
• Porterville College: Vice President, Academic Affairs

Function:

Schedule Development:
• Centralized at Educational Services in collaboration with Colleges

Service Providers:
• District Office: Vice Chancellor, Educational Services; Associate Chancellor, Economic and Workforce Development
• Bakersfield College: Dean, Career and Technical Education
• Cerro Coso Community College: Dean, Career and Technical Education
• Porterville College: Vice President, Student Services

Function:

Strategic Planning:
• Strategic Planning-District-wide: Centralized at Educational Services in collaboration with Colleges
• College specific strategic planning: decentralized

Service Providers:
• District Office: Vice Chancellor, Educational Services; Associate Chancellor, Economic and Workforce Development
• Bakersfield College: Dean, Career and Technical Education
• Cerro Coso Community College: Dean, Career and Technical Education
• Porterville College: Vice President, Student Services

Function:

Student Services: Decentralized operations with policies and related procedures coordinated by Educational Services

Service Providers:
• District Office: Vice Chancellor, Educational Services
• Bakersfield College: Associate Vice President, Student Services
• Cerro Coso Community College: Vice President, Student Services
• Porterville College: Vice President, Student Services

Function:

Tech Prep: Centralized at Educational Services in collaboration with Colleges

Service Providers:
• District Office: Vice Chancellor, Educational Services; Associate Chancellor, Economic and Workforce Development
• Bakersfield College: Dean, Career and Technical Education
• Cerro Coso Community College: Dean, Career and Technical Education
• Porterville College: Dean, Career and Technical Education

Function:

VTEA: Decentralized with facilitated planning and review by Educational Services

Service Providers:
• District Office: Vice Chancellor, Educational Services; Associate Chancellor, Economic and Workforce Development
• Bakersfield College: Dean, Career and Technical Education
• Cerro Coso Community College: Dean, Career and Technical Education
• Porterville College: Dean, Career and Technical Education

Function:

Workforce/Economic Development: Decentralized with facilitated planning and review by Educational Services

Service Providers:
• District Office: Vice Chancellor, Educational Services; Associate Chancellor, Economic and Workforce Development
• Bakersfield College: Dean, Career and Technical Education
• Cerro Coso Community College: Dean, Career and Technical Education
• Porterville College: Dean, Career and Technical Education
Human Resources Functional Mapping for Decision Making

Human Resources and Risk Management

Function:

Human Resources and Payroll: Centralized at District Office in coordination with Colleges

- Recruitment
- Screening & Employment
- Evaluations
- HR Information Systems
- Custodians of Personnel Files

Service Providers:

- District Office: Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
- Bakersfield College: Human Resources Manager
- Cerro Coso Community College: Human Resources Manager
- Porterville College: Human Resources Manager
Function:

Prioritizing, allocation and placement of staff at appropriate location: Centralized function initiated by Colleges and supported by District Office

Service Providers:
- District Office: Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
- Bakersfield College: Human Resources Manager
- Cerro Coso Community College: Human Resources Manager
- Porterville College: Human Resources Manager

Function:

Collective Bargaining: Centralized
- Negotiations
- Implement Contract
- Compliance
- Enforce Grievance Procedure and Implementation
- Layoffs

Service Providers:
- District Office: Vice Chancellor, Human Resources

Function:

Compensation and Payroll Coordination: Centralized
- Supervise and Direct District Payroll
- Worker’s Compensation
- Benefit Operations and Programs

Service Providers:
- District Office: Vice Chancellor, Human Resources

Function:

Risk Management, Employee Safety, Security, and Employee Benefits, Worker’s Compensation, Health and Welfare: Centralized at District Office in coordination with Colleges
- Confer with General Counsel
- Staff Development

Service Providers:
- District Office: Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
- Bakersfield College: Human Resources Manager
- Cerro Coso Community College: Human Resources Manager
- Porterville College: Human Resources Manager
Operations Management Functional Mapping for Decision Making

Information Technology

Function:

Application/Systems Support Services: Transitioning to Centralized with coordination from the Colleges

- Database Administration
- In-house system
- Third-party systems

Service Providers:

- District Office: Assistant Director, Information Technology
- Bakersfield College: Director, Information Technology Services
- Cerro Coso Community College: Director, Information Technology
- Porterville College: Director, Information Technology

Function:

Infrastructure Service: Transitioning to Centralized with input from the Colleges

- Network Management
• Server Management
• Video Technology Management

**Service Providers:**
- District Office: Assistant Director, Information Technology (Infrastructure)
- Bakersfield College: Director, Information Technology Services
- Cerro Coso Community College: Director, Information Technology
- Porterville College: Director, Information Technology

**Function:**

Internet/Email Services: Centralized with input from the Colleges

**Service Providers:**
- District Office: Assistant Director, Information Technology (Infrastructure)

**Function:**

Technology Support Services: Decentralized with support from District Office
- Desktop Support
- Classroom and Computer Lab Support Training

**Service Providers:**
- District Office: Assistant Director, Information Technology
- Bakersfield College: Director, Information Technology Services
- Cerro Coso Community College: Director, Information Technology
- Porterville College: Director, Information Technology

**Function:**

Telecommunications: Centralized with support from the Colleges

**Service Providers:**
- District Office: Assistant Director, Information Technology (Infrastructure)

**System Operation**

**Function:**

Banner and Related Systems (Information Access and Reporting): Centralized at District Office with input from the Colleges

**Service Providers:**
- District Office: Vice Chancellor, Operations Management
Part E: Certification of Continued Institutional Compliance with Eligibility Requirements

Eligibility Requirements

1. Authority

Cerro Coso Community College is authorized to operate as a degree granting institution by all appropriate governmental organizations and agencies as required by each of the jurisdictions in which it operates. The College is accredited by ACCJC/WASC and is part of the California Community College system. The inclusion of online course offerings from the College is within the scope of this authorization (ER.1).

2. Operational Status

Cerro Coso Community College is operational, with students actively pursuing degree programs, including those comprised of courses in traditional and distance education modes, as evidenced by the institution-set standards and student learning and achievement data presented in Part B. Its Schedule of Classes, application, and registration processes are active (ER.2).

3. Degrees

Cerro Coso Community College offers 16 Associate degrees and 10 AS-T and AA-T degrees, as shown on its Degrees and Certificates page, with one degree pending approval at the California Community College Chancellor’s Office at the time of the writing of this document. Since the general education pattern at Cerro Coso can be satisfied entirely in distance education mode, a high number of these degrees are 50% or more in distance education mode. A substantial portion of Cerro Coso Community College’s 372 educational offerings lead to degrees (ER.3).

4. Chief Executive Officer

A Chief Executive Officer (CEO), who has a full-time responsibility to the institution, is appointed by the KCCD board of trustees. The current CEO and Cerro Coso Community College president is Ms. Jill Board, approved by the Board in May 2011. As the college leader, the President is responsible for maintaining policies, rules, and regulations as set forth by the Chancellor, the Board of Trustees, the California Education Code, the Board of Governors of California Community Colleges, and the general laws of California and of the United States. (ER.4, ER.5).
5. **Financial Accountability**

The Kern Community College District annually undergoes and makes available an external financial audit by a certified public accountant on each of the colleges within the district. The audit is posted for viewing by internal and external constituents on its Business Services Annual Reports page. *(ER.6)*

**List of Evidence**

- **ER.1** ACCJC letters February 2015 and February 2016 showing reaffirmation of accredited status and continued compliance with standards
- **ER.2** Schedule of Classes page, application page, and registration page
- **ER.3** 2018-2019 Cerro Coso Community College Catalog, pgs. 55-103.
- **ER.4** Name, address, and biographical information about the College President.
- **ER.5** Certification of the CEO’s full-time responsibility to the institution signed by the CEO and the governing board
- **ER.6** Sample KCCD External Audit Reports
Part F: Certification of Continued Institutional Compliance with Commission Policies

Public Notification of an Evaluation Team Visit and Third Party Comment Evaluation Items

- The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of a comprehensive evaluation visit.
- The institution cooperates with the evaluation team in any necessary follow-up related to the third party comment.
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions as to third party comment.

At the time of the team evaluation, the College will provide evidence that the college president adhered to Commission requirements by notifying the campus community and the public of the opportunity for submission of third-party comments and the process for doing so. This is planned to be done after the time the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report is approved by the board of trustees and achieves its final form. The College will provide evidence that all third-party comments are provided to the Commission for consideration no later than five weeks before the evaluation team visit.

Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement

- The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance across the institution, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. Course completion is included as one of these elements of student achievement. Other elements of student achievement performance for measurement have been determined as appropriate to the institution’s mission.
- The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance within each instructional program, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. The defined elements include, but are not limited to, job placement rates for program completers, and for programs in fields where licensure is required, the licensure examination passage rates for program completers.
- The institution-set standards for programs and across the institution are relevant to guide self-evaluation and institutional improvement; the defined elements and expected performance levels are appropriate within higher education; the results are reported regularly across the campus; and the definition of elements and results are used in program-level and institution-wide planning to evaluate how well the institution fulfills its mission, to determine needed changes, to allocating resources, and to make improvements.
• The institution analyzes its performance as to the institution-set standards and as to student achievement, and takes appropriate measures in areas where its performance is not at the expected level.

This Commission policy is addressed in **Standard I.B.2**.

**Credits, Program Length, and Tuition**

• Credit hour assignments and degree program lengths are within the range of good practice in higher education (in policy and procedure).
• The assignment of credit hours and degree program lengths is verified by the institution, and is reliable and accurate across classroom based courses, laboratory classes, distance education classes, and for courses that involve clinical practice (if applicable to the institution).
• Tuition is consistent across degree programs (or there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition).
• Any clock hour conversions to credit hours adhere to the Department of Education’s conversion formula, both in policy and procedure, and in practice.
• The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits.

Policy statements on credits and program length are addressed in **Standard II.A.9** and **Standard II.A.6**. Tuition is addressed in **Standard I.C.2** and **Standard I.C.7**. As the 2018-2019 catalog makes clear, tuition for all credit and degree programs cost are a consistent $46 per unit for state residents and $212 per unit for out-of-state residents.

**Transfer Policies**

• Transfer policies are appropriately disclosed to students and to the public.
• Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to accept credits for transfer.
• The institution complies with the Commission Policy on Transfer of Credit.

This Commission policy is addressed in **Standard II.A.10** and **Standard I.C.2**.

**Distance Education and Correspondence Education**

• The institution has policies and procedures for defining and classifying a course as offered by distance education or correspondence education, in alignment with USDE definitions.
• There is an accurate and consistent application of the policies and procedures for determining if a course is offered by distance education (with regular and substantive interaction with the instructor, initiated by the instructor, and online activities are included as part of a student’s grade) or correspondence education (online activities are primarily “paperwork related,” including reading posted materials, posting homework and completing examinations, and interaction with the instructor is initiated by the student as needed).
• The institution has appropriate means and consistently applies those means for verifying the identity of a student who participates in a distance education or correspondence education course or program, and for ensuring that student information is protected.
• The technology infrastructure is sufficient to maintain and sustain the distance education and correspondence education offerings.
• The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education.

This Commission policy is addressed in Standard II.A.2. The distance education addendum referenced in that Standard prompts the faculty member to describe how instructors are expected to engage in regular and effective contact. As for the institution having the appropriate means to verify the identity of a student in distance education class, this is done primarily through the sign-on system of the InsideCC portal and the Canvas learning-management system. Additional authenticity checks happen on a class-by-class basis through decisions of individual faculty, such as holding one-on-one videoconferences, requiring papers to be submitted through Turnitin.com, or setting up proctored exams that students must do in person or through a program like Proctorio. Security of student information is addressed in Standard III.C.1.

Student Complaints

• The institution has clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, and the current policies and procedures are accessible to students in the college catalog and online.
• The student complaint files for the previous six years (since the last comprehensive evaluation) are available; the files demonstrate accurate implementation of the complaint policies and procedures.
• The team analysis of the student complaint files identifies any issues that may be indicative of the institution’s noncompliance with any Accreditation Standards.
• The institution posts on its website the names of associations, agencies and governmental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the institution and any of its programs, and provides contact information for filing complaints with such entities.
• The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Representation of Accredited Status and the Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions.

Student complaints are archived and housed in the human resources office if their basis is a Title IX or sexual harassment complaint. All other student complaints are archived and housed in the office of instruction. As indicated in Standard I.C.2, the catalog includes a section on student complaints. The information is also readily available on the college website and in hardcopy trifold available at all campus locations. KCCD board procedures 4F9(a) and 4F9(b) outline the student complaint procedures and hearing panel procedures. Disclosure of names of associations and agencies that approve courses and programs and their contact information for student complaints are addressed in Standard I.C.12.
Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials

- The institution provides accurate, timely (current), and appropriately detailed information to students and the public about its programs, locations, and policies.
- The institution complies with the Commission Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status.
- The institution provides required information concerning its accredited status as described above in the section on Student Complaints.


Title IV Compliance

- The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program, including findings from any audits and program or other review activities by the USDE.
- The institution has addressed any issues raised by the USDE as to financial responsibility requirements, program record-keeping, etc. If issues were not timely addressed, the institution demonstrates it has the fiscal and administrative capacity to timely address issues in the future and to retain compliance with Title IV program requirements.
- The institution’s student loan default rates are within the acceptable range defined by the USDE. Remedial efforts have been undertaken when default rates near or meet a level outside the acceptable range.
- Contractual relationships of the institution to offer or receive educational, library, and support services meet the Accreditation Standards and have been approved by the Commission through substantive change if required.
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations and the Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV.

The audit and USDE portion of this Commission policy is addressed in Standard I.C.13. Cerro Coso Community College does not offer student loans. Contractual relationships of the institution for educational and library services meet the Commission’s guidelines for good practices and are not of the kind that require a substantive change proposal.
Part G: Standards

Standard I

Standard I.A: Mission

Mission

I.A.1: The mission describes the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, the types of degrees and other credentials it offers, and its commitments to student learning and student achievement.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Cerro Coso Community College’s mission statement was last reviewed in spring 2018 as part of its regular three-year review cycle. It was approved by College Council, the College’s primary participatory governance committee in March 2018 and by the board of trustees at their April 2018 meeting (I.A.1, item 10.L):

The mission of Cerro Coso Community College is to improve the life of every student it serves. Through traditional and distance delivery, Cerro Coso Community College brings transfer preparation, workforce education, remedial instruction, and learning opportunities that develop ethical and effective citizenry to the rural communities and unincorporated areas of the Eastern Sierra. In doing so, we promise clarity of educational pathways, comprehensive and equitable support services, and a commitment to equity.

As a California community college, Cerro Coso Community College’s mission aligns with the primary charter of California Community Colleges as defined by Article 2, section 66010.4 of California Education Code: to offer academic and vocational instruction at the lower division level—as well as remedial instruction, adult noncredit instruction, and support services that help students succeed at the postsecondary level.

In 2013, the mission statement was significantly revised to make explicit items that had been implicit in the prior mission: that the College’s service area is rural in nature, that the College demonstrates intentionality toward improving student achievement, that learning opportunities address ethical and effective citizenry, and that the College employs distance education in
addition to traditional education as a means for carrying out student learning and achievement. The changes were significant enough that the College submitted a substantive change proposal to the Commission in May 2013, which was approved (I.A.2).

In 2018, during the last three-year review process, the wording of the mission statement was revised for conciseness, and an explicit commitment to clarity of educational pathways and to equity was added.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard. The institution’s mission statement addresses the institution’s educational purpose. The mission defines the student population the institution serves. The institution’s educational purpose is appropriate to an institution of higher learning. The mission statement addresses the types of degrees, credentials, and certificates the institution offers. The mission statement demonstrates the institution’s commitment to student learning and student achievement.

_I.A.2: The institution uses data to determine how effectively it is accomplishing its mission, and whether the mission directs institutional priorities in meeting the educational needs of students._

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The College uses a variety of quantitative and qualitative measures to assess how effectively it is accomplishing its mission. Chief among these is the institution-set standards, which are described in more detail in Standard I.B.3.

In addition, Cerro Coso Community College uses a variety of data sources when assessing aspects of its mission. These include the Chancellor’s Office Scorecard, state-required Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) Targets (I.A.3), the annual Elements of Student Success report developed out of the College’s Achieving the Dream work (I.A.4), annual Program Review Data generated by Kern Community College District (KCCD) institutional research office (I.A.5), and other periodic and ad hoc sources such as the most recent Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSSE) results (I.A.6), local student satisfaction surveys (I.A.7), and others. These sources provide additional snapshots on student learning, student achievement, student satisfaction with services, and operational effectiveness.

The College has structures in place to evaluate how well it is achieving its mission and to set institutional priorities. Once every three years, institutional priorities in the form of strategic goals are assessed as part of the mission review. These strategic goals are tied directly to data points the College tracks as evidenced by the targets and metrics set in the strategic plan (I.A.8). In 2018, performance on these data points were published at the end of the three year period of the strategic plan by means of Progress Report newsletters sent out to the college community and linked on the Progress Report page (I.A.9). These results formed the foundation for the spring 2018 review of the mission, guiding principles, institution-set standards, and strategic goals (I.A.10).
Between the three-year mission and strategic plan reviews, the College carries out a number of shorter term assessments that ensure dialogue at all levels of the institution about how well the College is achieving its mission and making progress on its goals. It evaluates its progress on institution-set standards annually and posts the results publically for internal and external constituents on the Mission and Guiding Principles page of the college website (I.A.11). It annually reviews, makes adjustments to, and publically posts its IEPI results from the IEPI Targets page (I.A.3). And, as described in detail in Standard I.B.9, it annually assesses and posts progress made on institutional priorities in unit, section, and division plans on the Integrated Planning page (I.A.12).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The institution has implemented structures and processes to assess how well it is meeting its mission. The institution uses assessment results to set institutional priorities and improve practices and processes towards meeting its mission.

I.A.3: The institution’s programs and services align with its mission. The mission guides decision-making, planning, and resource allocation and informs institutional goals for student learning and achievement.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Faculty and staff throughout Cerro Coso Community College are acutely aware of its mission to bring higher education to a sparsely populated rural area by means of traditional and innovative delivery modes. Cerro Coso Community College serves an area of over 18,000 square miles – the largest community college service area in California. Yet the population served is 145,000, one of the smallest. Such a large distributed area requires multiple small sites, at which equitable services are not just sustained but committed to as an explicit part of the mission statement.

Awareness of this distributed nature pervades all planning and decision-making at the College. Each campus location, for instance, completes a section plan as part of the annual integrated planning cycle, including distance education (I.A.13). And each division plan, in assessing how well it contributes to the achievement of the mission and institutional priorities, promotes dialogue about its services at all campus locations, including online (I.A.14). The mission’s express commitment to provide comprehensive and equitable support services through traditional and distance delivery is lived every day by employees getting work done. As explained more fully in Standard IV.A.1, the College conducts almost all its governance business through a layered use of video- and teleconferencing systems to bring constituents together from all campuses.

As stated immediately above in Standard I.A.2, all institutional planning is linked directly to the mission statement. The mission statement is the first thing plan writers see when they begin working on their annual plans, which is to review (and revise if necessary) their connection to the mission. In the resulting printed document, it is the first section at the top of the first page, setting a tone and context for those writing the plans as well as for those reading them (I.A.12). The mission statement is front and center in strategic planning. As stated above and evidenced in the most recent Participatory Governance Model Handbook, linked from the Planning.
Documents page, strategic goals are revised on the same three-year cycle and at the same time as the mission, guiding principles, and institution-set standards, ensuring that programs and services are aligned with the College’s purposes and priorities (I.A.15).

The College regularly evaluates how well its employees understand the mission, college goals, and their roles they play in the College’s work. Every two years, a planning survey is distributed to all employees with questions like, “I am familiar with the Cerro Coso Community College mission statement,” “In my experience, the mission statement provides guidance for institutional planning and decision-making at the college,” and “My area or department works to achieve the college’s strategic goals and objectives” (I.A.16).

One improvement that came out of this assessment in 2014 was the determination to do a better job in communicating to constituents what progress has been made toward achieving strategic goals and objectives. The result was the creation of the Progress Reports as noted above, a periodic newsletter to raise awareness about progress being made on a number of key initiatives for student learning and achievement, such as student equity, student success and support program, and strategic planning (I.A.9).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. Planning and decisions are consistently linked to the institution’s mission statement. Personnel, at all levels of the institution, understand how their roles further the mission of the institution. Decision-making bodies are able to demonstrate alignment of all key decisions with student learning and student achievement.

I.A.4: The institution articulates its mission in a widely published statement approved by the governing board. The mission statement is periodically reviewed and updated as necessary.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The mission statement was last approved by the KCCD board of trustees in April 2018 (I.A.1).

The mission is published in numerous places available to both internal and external constituents:

- Annual Integrated Planning Template
- Cerro Coso Community College website
- 2017-2022 Educational Master Plan, linked from the Planning Documents page
- 2018-2019 College Catalog
- 2018-2021 Cerro Community College Strategic Plan
- Annual Community Reports (I.A.17)

The mission statement is also published in print form in these last two documents, which are disseminated to a variety of internal and external stakeholders, such as chambers of commerce, business and educational collaboratives, ad hoc meetings with school district superintendents and principals, and community forums like the most recent Educational Master Plan presentations in fall 2017. In addition, a hard copy of the strategic goals brochure is put into every faculty member’s mailbox every semester, adjunct and full-time, at all campus locations.
One of the findings of the external evaluation team in 2012 was for the College to establish a regular cycle by which to review the mission statement (I.A.18). As indicated in the 2013 Follow up Report to ACCJC and again in the 2015 Midterm Report, linked on the Accreditation site, this cycle has been explicitly established (I.A.19). In 2015, as mentioned above, institution-set standards were added as a component of the mission review cycle. A complete description of the cycle, including how an off-cycle review might be triggered by unforeseen events, is contained in the Participatory Governance Model Handbook (I.A.15).

The cycle has now run twice, once in 2014-2015 and once in 2017-2018. In the most recent iteration, the president called a task force to carry out the review, composed of employees from all constituent groups and campus locations for college-wide input. The group met several times in the fall and spring semesters, reviewed data and assessment results, consulted resources, and discussed the pros and cons of various metrics (I.A.10). A revised set of mission, vision, values, institution-set standards, and strategic goals was delivered to the board of trustees in March 2018 for approval in April. The finalized strategic plan, including a fresh set of targets and metrics for improvement, was completed in May 2018 (I.A.8).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution solicits campus-wide input in its regular review of the mission statement. Data and assessment drive the review process of the mission statement. The institution’s mission is approved by the governing board. The mission is widely publicized.

List of Evidence

| I.A.1  | College Council agenda and minutes March 1, 2018 and BOT minutes April 12, 2018 showing approval of mission, guiding principles, and institution-set standards |
| I.A.2  | Substantive Change Proposal April 2013 and ACCJC Approval Letter May 14, 2013 |
| I.A.3  | IEPI Targets page and 2017 report |
| I.A.4  | KCCD IR Elements Student Success page and 2017 report |
| I.A.5  | KCCD IR Program Review Data page and sample reports |
| I.A.6  | KCCD IR Survey page and Cerro Coso CCSSE Key Findings, 2017 report |
| I.A.7  | 2015 Student Experience Survey |
| I.A.8  | 2018-2021 Cerro Coso Community College Strategic Plan |
| I.A.9  | Progress Reports page and all Progress Reports spring 2018 |
| I.A.10 | Minutes of strategic plan task force, spring 2018 |
| I.A.11 | Our Mission and Guiding Principles page |
| I.A.12 | Integrated Planning page and recent sample AUP, ASP, and ADP showing progress on prior year initiatives |
| I.A.13 | Integrated Planning page showing ASP’s from extension campuses |
| I.A.14 | Sample Academic Affairs ADP showing discussion of extension campus issues |
| I.A.15 | 2018-2021 Participatory Governance Model Handbook, pgs. 15-16 |
| I.A.17 | Mission statement pages of the documents indicated |
| I.A.18 | 2012 External Evaluation Team Report, pgs. 18-19 |
Standard I.B: Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

Academic Quality

I.B.1: The institution demonstrates a sustained, substantive and collegial dialog about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Cerro Coso Community College demonstrates a broad-based, intentional, and inclusive commitment to the components of this Standard.

Student Outcomes

The College maintains an Outcomes Assessment Committee (often referred to informally as the “SLO Committee”) that is a subcommittee of College Council. The committee has a participatory governance structure with representation from all employee groups and is charged with providing oversight for the College’s outcome assessment processes and documents in order to improve student learning and achievement. The committee began as a subcommittee of the academic senate solely focused on student learning outcomes (SLO’s). But in recognition that outcomes assessment is a college-wide effort, the committee’s charge was broadened in fall 2013 to include administrative and classified representation and repositioned under the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) through which it reports to College Council (I.B.1). The committee maintains its faculty emphasis, being the largest representative group, and a faculty member is the committee’s chair. It is a sign of the College’s commitment to supporting and improving student outcomes that faculty leadership carries with it ongoing reassigned time.

Dialogue is substantive, intentional, and inclusive. Outcomes assessment is not just discussed at the committee but also among work groups, in department meetings, and during the program review process. (I.B.2). The annual integrated planning template now prompts all departments and units to identify outcomes assessed, analyze the reason for missed targets, and describe any changes made for the improvement of operational effectiveness and/or student learning and achievement in the prior year (I.B.3). To facilitate dialogue and ready availability of resources, the College maintains an Outcomes Assessment webpage as described in Standard I.B.2. This college-wide dialogue has led to concrete improvements in both instructional and non-instructional units as detailed more fully in Standard I.B.2 and Standard II.A.3.

Student Equity

Cerro Coso Community College supports sustained, substantive, and collegial dialogue about student equity primarily through the Student Success and Support Council (often called the “SSSP Committee,” or just “SSSP”). This group was formed from a combination of the matriculation and the basic skills committees when the College first adopted the Achieving the
Dream approach in 2013-2014. The committee’s charge overall is to blend academic affairs and student services in the service of sustaining and improving best practices in student success and academic quality. In 2015-2016, when student equity became a focus supported by the California Community College Chancellor’s Office (CCCO), the charge and composition of SSSP were revised to reflect its role as a participatory governance committee reporting to College Council, reflecting the belief that improving student success and equity is the business of the entire college (I.B.4). In 2015, the College created a full-time management position in student equity in order to sustain efforts and resources on this focus; the position was hired permanently in 2016 (I.B.5).

Dialogue about equity takes place at several levels. SSSP is the primary institutional body for reviewing equity data, analyzing trends, and guiding improvements. The group meets twice a month during primary terms and reviews disaggregated data such as a discussion about the college’s recent Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) results (I.B.6, I.B.87). At the department and unit levels, specific language was added to the annual integrated plan templates in 2015-2016 requiring analysis of equity data, as evidenced by recent plans linked from the Integrated Planning page (I.B.8). This analysis was supported by the creation of disaggregated student access and performance reports provided annually by KCCD IR known as Program Review Data (I.B.9). Substantive and intentional dialogue about equity has taken place in recent years as part of professional development activities—for example, presentations by Cabrillo professor Diego Navarro in 2014-15 to faculty and classified staff at two faculty flex days, one adjunct professional development day, and a classified staff all-staff meeting (I.B.10), as well as presentations in 2016-2017 on the RP Group’s Six Student Success Factors at faculty flex days, administrative advances, and classified all-staff meetings (I.B.11). In addition, equity-related topics have been the focus of a number of lectures, activities, and outreach events at the College as described in more detail in Standard II.C.4.

Academic Quality

Review, renewal, and improvement of academic quality take place continually throughout the institution. For the purposes of this Standard, the College ensures broad-based and inclusive dialogue on academic matters through a number of committees, such as the SLO Committee, but primarily through SSSP and the Program Review Committee. In addition to serving as the lead for equity dialogue, SSSP is also the primary work group charged with improving student learning and achievement. It is the committee on campus, for example, primarily responsible for guided pathways (I.B.12). In 2016-2017, in keeping with IEC’s goal for the committee to play a more central role in deepening and sustaining dialogue about improving institutional processes for achieve better student engagement and performance (I.B.63, pg. 7 of 41), SSSP initiated the creation of inquiry groups in spring 2017 to research best practices around the Student Success Factors of “Directed,” “Focused,” and “Connected” (I.B.13). These best practices were packaged into three initiatives that were adopted by instructional departments in fall 2017 and spring 2018 as part of a year-long effort to scale up best practices (I.B.14). The efforts were not limited to instructional units. Two of the inquiry groups were comprised of classified staff and management personnel, with the outcome that each of the College’s major campus locations—Ridgecrest, Mammoth, Bishop, Lake Isabella, and Tehachapi—put on successful welcome back barbeques to help students feel more connected (I.B.15).
The Program Review Committee, like the SLO Committee, was originally a subcommittee of the academic senate but was revised into a participatory governance committee when program reviews began being required from all non-instructional as well as instructional units. Its charge is to provide oversight of the College’s program review processes and documents in order to improve student learning and achievement. Like the SLO Committee, Program Review reports up to College Council through the IEC, the majority representation of the committee is faculty, and a faculty member is the committee chair with reassigned time. Dialogue in the Program Review Committee is collegial and substantial, as described in more detail in Standard I.B.5. All instructional program reviews are presented to the academic senate for discussion and acceptance (I.B.16). All program reviews of every kind—instructional, student services, learning support services, and administrative services—are presented at College Council likewise for discussion and acceptance (I.B.17).

Institutional Effectiveness

In this area, Cerro Coso Community College sustains an associated committee that reports directly to College Council providing for broad-based and intentional dialogue. IEC is charged with providing oversight to the planning and assessment processes to develop and maintain sustainable continuous quality improvement (I.B.1). IEC is a participatory governance committee composed partly of elected representatives from constituent groups and partly of specified positions (vice president of instruction, SLO coordinator, etc.) so that dialogue can flow directly in and out to the assessment and program review committees it is directly responsible for. The committee meets several times each semester, evaluates the performance of its subcommittees Outcomes Assessment and Program Review, identifies gaps, and sets goals. The committee has a standing report at College Council (I.B.18), submits an annual College Report Card linked from the Planning Documents page (I.B.63), and also prepares the Progress Report, the institution’s periodic newsletter of all things “institutionally effective” (I.B.19).

Continuous Improvement

The continuous improvement of institutional effectiveness for student learning and achievement is, in the last analysis, the purpose of all collegial dialogue at the institution. As described in Standard I.B.9 below, the College’s integrated planning effort engages institutional dialogue at all levels: departments and units write annual unit plans; sections and divisions review, analyze, and aggregate these grassroots plans; resource committees and groups develop work plans; resources are budgeted; College Council oversees the process. As explained more fully in that Standard, the annual integrated planning cycle at these levels requires substantive and intentional dialogue on the linkages between the college mission, the three-year strategic plan, individual unit mission and goals, student outcome data, equity data, program review, and student performance data.

As described more fully in Standard IV.A.5, the College has a decision-making structure that provides the organizational means for intentional and inclusive dialogue. At the institution’s core, College Council is a conduit for receiving and disseminating information and acts as an advisory committee to the president. The purpose of College Council is to engage in ongoing evaluation and improvement of the College’s mission, vision, participatory process, and institutional planning. It has ultimate responsibility for the strategic direction and institutional priorities of
the College. As discussed in Standard IV.A.2, Standard IV.A.3 and Standard IV.A.4, other groups providing relevant expertise and perspectives to institutional dialogue include the academic senate, classified senate, faculty chairs, student services managers, deans and directors, and students themselves.

All campus locations are intentionally included as part of this dialogue. As mentioned above and explained in more detail in Standard IV.A.1, the College conducts operational and governance business through a video- and teleconferencing systems that brings constituents together from all college sites.

Finally, to ensure coordination of effort and communication, the three chief officers of the College’s major divisions—academic affairs, student services, and finance and administrative services—meet regularly and serve as resources on each other’s steering groups:

• All vice presidents meet once a month with the president in a VP’s meeting
• All chief officers are standing members of College Council
• All chief officers are standing members of IEC
• All chief officers are standing members of the Budget Development Committee
• The vice president of instruction participates on the Student Services Executive Council
• The vice president of student services participates on the faculty chair work group
• Both the vice president of instruction and the vice president of student services sit together on the curriculum committee and on the SSSP committee
• At least one member of the executive team attends each academic senate meeting.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution has a structured dialog on student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement. The dialog occurs on a regular basis and stimulates plans for improvement. The dialog uses the analysis of evidence, data, and research in the evaluation of student learning.

As indicated in the Part A of this self-evaluation report, one of the College’s current initiatives is to establish an Office of Institutional Research (OIR). In the last year, the College has hired personnel; set priorities for the first year; budgeted for equipment, software, and professional development; and tied the OIR function into the integrated planning cycle. Goals for the next three years include stabilizing personnel, establishing a workflow for requests, creating a research agenda, enhancing the OIR research page to be a repository of ad hoc and periodic reports not located elsewhere, offering numerous faculty and staff professional development opportunities to increase institutional literacy, and using data visualization tools to develop a variety of on-demand reports for faculty and staff. This work will greatly enhance the College’s effectiveness with this Standard, as well as be a key component of the Quality Focus Action Projects described in Part H.

During this self-evaluation process, the College realized that while it has a structured dialogue on the components of this Standard, it was lacking a systematic approach to ensure that every group who needs to review certain reports or data sets is reviewing them on a regular cycle. For this reason, in spring 2018 IEC began discussions about developing a chart of reports and data sets.
cross-referenced with the committees or work groups who review them and the frequency of this review. When completed, the chart will be communicated to the committee chairs and included in the Participatory Governance Model Handbook.

**I.B.2: The institution defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Learning outcomes at Cerro Coso Community College are defined and assessed at the course (SLO) and program (PLO) level for all instructional programs and student and learning support services. The College embraces the idea that learning assessment is a natural extension of instruction and student services and that all departments and units have a responsibility to regularly evaluate the knowledge and skills that comprise student learning and student achievement and make adjustments in operations or teaching methodology when students fall short of established targets.

In addition to SLO’s and PLO’s, Cerro Coso Community College also defines and evaluates administrative unit outcomes (AUO’s) for certain student services and learning support units as well as for all administrative units. These are operational metrics more akin to key performance indicators, such as usage and customer satisfaction. All administrative units have defined and assessed AUO’s. Some units, like Counseling or Library, have both AUO’s and learning outcomes (SLO’s/PLO’s).

**Process**

All outcomes are assessed at least once every five years. Many are assessed more often, but the minimum requirement is at least once during each program review cycle. The program review template requires departments and units to complete a chart listing the due dates of each SLO, PLO, and/or AUO during the five year cycle. This grew out of the College’s 2012 comprehensive self-evaluation, which identified the need to develop a schedule creating a cohesive plan connecting SLO and PLO assessment. Starting in 2013, faculty chairs submitted a schedule for each program, illustrating how PLO’s mapped to individual SLO’s. When outcome assessment was expanded college-wide, use of the chart was broadened to include AUO’s when appropriate and was required for all program reviews.

The development, assessment, and analysis of outcomes are the result of college-wide collaborations and dialogue, as described directly above in Standard I.B.1. SLO’s and PLO’s are defined in official curriculum documents and are the result of departmental dialogue guided by advice and feedback from the SLO coordinator and the Outcomes Assessment Committee. The SLO coordinator, who is a faculty member, sits on the curriculum committee and serves in a technical review role to provide feedback on SLO/PLO design during the curriculum approval process. AUO’s of an operational unit are defined by the supervising administrator based on core functions of the department. The SLO coordinator, supervisor, institutional researcher, department staff, and/or other mentoring staff member provide input and assistance to managers defining AUO’s and determining assessment instruments.
For all SLO’s, PLO’s, and AUO’s, the specific assessment instrument is determined when the outcome is defined, as evidenced by course outlines of record and program review documents (I.B.22). For many instructional programs, PLO’s are class assignments or entire SLO’s mapped over from key or capstone classes. For example, the second PLO of the Web Fundamentals certificate—demonstrate technical and creative mastery of the creation of web media, such as graphics, motion graphics, and interactive media—is assessed by a project scored with a rubric in DMA C102. For non-instructional programs, the assessment tool is very often existing surveys or on-demand software reports, such as questions on the Student Experience Survey and helpdesk ticket data for the Information Technology Department.

When outcomes are assessed, the expectation of all SLO’s and PLO’s for instructional programs is that collected data reflects all offerings at all campus locations, including online, and full time/part time faculty. The expectation of AUO’s is that they reflect all campus locations where the unit provides services. The committee maintains an Outcomes Assessment website where SLO resources and data are housed. Formal and informal resources are available for faculty, staff, students, and the public. These resources highlight best practice and effective strategies in learning outcome assessment and can provide guidance for faculty and staff and a context through which to interpret the information for students and the public (I.B.23).

Once assessed, outcomes are aggregated and analyzed to drive improvements in instruction and services. For all SLO’s, PLO’s, and AUO’s, if gaps are detected appropriate remediation is expected to be designed and implemented and the outcomes reassessed at the next cycle or earliest available opportunity. For instructional programs, the College’s old SLO-management system, CurricUNET, prompted faculty to analyze gaps and discuss improvements at the time the results were posted. The new system that the College is currently in the middle of implementing, eLumen, has the same capabilities (I.B.24). In addition, outcome assessment gaps and improvements are discussed in both annual unit plans and the program review documents (I.B.25).

Improvements based on the results of SLO’s and PLO’s for instructional programs are discussed in Standard II.A.3. Improvements based SLO and PLO results for learning support services are discussed in Standard II.B.3. Improvement results for student services programs are discussed in Standard II.C.2.

Publishing

Results of outcome assessments are published on the college website. PLO assessments for every instructional program are linked from the Outcomes Assessment website as well posted in the outcomes section of each program (I.B.26, I.B.27). This process of posting began in 2015, so a number of programs’ PLO results are currently vacant but will be posted as the program reviews are completed in subsequent cycles. AUO assessments for student services, learning support services, and administrative services are published on the Outcomes Assessment website.

Outcome assessment results are also reported out in annual unit plans and in program reviews. As described in more detail in Standard I.B.9, assessment results are directly reported by each department and unit in the annual unit plan (AUP) template in the sections “Outcomes Assessment: Actions Taken,” “Outcomes Assessment: Outcomes Assessed,” and “Outcomes
Assessment: Gaps to Be Addressed.” As described in more detail in Standard I.B.5, in program reviews, they are reported out in the sections “Achievement of Program Learning Outcomes” and “Achievement of Course Student Learning Outcomes” (I.B.25).

In addition, the SLO coordinator prepares an annual report each year of the status of outcomes assessment at the College as part of the College Report Card linked from the Planning Documents page (I.B.28, pgs. 22-31 out of 31).

Institutional Learning Outcomes

Cerro Coso Community College has had institutional outcomes since 2007-2008, when an ad hoc committee developed a list of seven ILO’s. These ILO’s were assessed once in 2011 using results from CCSSE, but the results were felt to be too tenuously connected to the specific ILO’s, making actionable plans for improvement difficult to frame, and a large part of the College’s instruction—online classes—was not captured at all. Not to mention, in spring 2015 the president called an Institutional Set Standard and ILO Task Force, which was charged, in part, with redefining the ILO’s and creating a more direct and meaningful way to assess them rather than relying on CCSSE. The completed task force report, found on the Planning Documents page, recommended the adoption of the four new ILO’s now published on the college website and in the catalog, as well as a set of best practices for mapping outcomes and gathering assessment results (I.B.29). At the time of the writing of this self-evaluation report, every program, defined as a certificate or degree, has completed mapping at least one course-level SLO to each ILO. This map is entered into eLumen, and assessment data will be aggregated from embedded assessments (I.B.30). ILO’s are discussed much more at length in Standard II.A.11.

Evaluation

The outcomes assessment process itself is evaluated both formally and informally. Formally, the committee is evaluated annually by IEC on the following standards:

- Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic, and used for continuous quality improvement
- Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive, and robust
- There is evaluation of student learning outcomes processes
- Evaluation and fine tuning of organizational structure to support student learning are ongoing
- Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college
- Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews (I.B.28, pgs. 22-31)

And once every two years, the committee is additionally assessed by the College Planning Survey which asks employees about their awareness of and satisfaction with outcomes assessment, including such questions as “I have been involved in discussing assessment results” and “I have a clear understanding of how my activities connect to the SLO’s or AUO’s in my area.” The last such survey at the time of the writing of this self-evaluation document was completed in 2016; results showed that a sizeable majority of faculty and staff are aware of outcomes in their areas (86%) but a smaller number believe they have received adequate training
in how to assess them (59%). This was the first time outcomes assessment questions were asked in the survey so no comparison data is available **(I.B.31, pgs. 4-5)**.

Informally, the SLO coordinator, by virtue of frequently meeting with faculty and staff to discuss best practices and being a member of the curriculum committee and IEC, ensures continuous monitoring of outcome assessment practices and is often the first to hear of gaps and suggested revisions to the process for improvement.

Evaluation of the process has led to a number of changes in the outcomes assessment practices in the last few years:

- In 2014, the SLO Committee recognized a gap in the program review process and recommended programs with less than 85% of their courses assessed are not eligible to complete program review. The language was added to the program review template and communicated to faculty chairs starting with the fall 2015 training
- In 2015, as outcomes assessment was expanded to encompass administrative units, the themes were revised to be reflective of learning and administrative unit outcomes
- In 2016, communication about SLO’s and PLO’s was increased among the curriculum committee, the Program Review Committee, and the SLO Committee when faculty presenting courses and programs were specifically asked when was the last time the course/program was assessed and how did the assessment results inform any changes in the SLO or PLO in the course outline.

**Linkages**

As mentioned above, outcome assessment results are linked to program reviews in the section titled “Achievement of Outcomes,” where the appropriate SLO’s, PLO’s, and AUO’s are reported on, analyzed, and serve as the basis of dialogue about change. They are also linked to the integrated planning process in AUP’s where departments and units report out on results from the prior year’s assessments (if any) and actions taken on closing those or other previous gaps identified.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this Standard. Student learning outcomes and assessments are established for all courses and programs, including appropriate student services and learning support services. Learning outcomes assessments are the basis for the regular evaluation of all courses and programs. Improvements to courses and programs have occurred as a result of evaluation. The institution provides for systematic and regular review of its instructional and student support services.

As discussed in the Analysis and Evaluation section of **Standard II.A.11**, the College recognizes that it has yet to fully implement a cycle of assessments surrounding ILO’s. With eLumen, it believes it now has the right infrastructure in place to do that and has established a timeline for engaging and completing that work.
Evidence of Meeting the Standard

As described in detail in Standard I.A.2, the College uses a variety of quantitative and qualitative measures to assess how effectively it accomplishes its mission. Cerro Coso Community College has had institution-set standards since 2014. These were revised once in 2015 and again in 2018. The following chart indicates the standards and the performance on those standards in the years indicated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>Standards Set in 2015</th>
<th>2015 Results</th>
<th>2016 Results</th>
<th>2017 Results</th>
<th>Standards Set in 2018</th>
<th>Aspirational Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful course completion</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic skills course success</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online course success</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exam Pass Rates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Vocational Nurse</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Technician</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Nursing Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Medical Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Medical Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Placement Rates</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Office Technology</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Design</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>Standards Set in 2015</th>
<th>2015 Results</th>
<th>2016 Results</th>
<th>2017 Results</th>
<th>Standards Set in 2018</th>
<th>Aspirational Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Information Systems</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welding Technology</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Assisting</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Vocational Nurse</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Technician</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralegal</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of Justice</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Academies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job placement rates set on VTEA numbers prior to 2018; on Launchboard numbers starting 2018

**Cohort too small, numbers withheld for privacy reasons

The revisions in spring 2015 were conducted by the same task force convened to discuss ILO’s, as mentioned in Standard I.B.2 above. The group considered one vs. two standard deviations and recommended that an institution-set standard meant a “floor” measure that the College would mobilize significant resources for if failing to meet. In addition, basic skills course success and online course success rates were included to better align with the College’s emphasis on remedial instruction and serving students through distance education. And it recommended that a three-year cycle be set for reviewing institution-set standards together with the mission, vision, values, and strategic goals. These recommendations of the task force were discussed and approved by College Council in March 2015 and described in the 2015 ACCJC Annual Report (I.B.32, I.B.33).

In 2018, the institution adopted a different instrument for calculating job placement rates. Before that, the numbers had come through VTEA reports. Beginning in 2017-18, the CCCCIO began providing better and more consistent data through its Launchboard system, the College established its own office of institutional research, and the College joined the Career Technical Education (CTE) Outcome Survey. This resulted in dialogue and agreement within the CTE area to change measures and consequently targets. A second change to the standards in 2018 was to adopt aspirational targets together with standards. This was based on the guidelines communicated from ACCJC and a review of the Standard criteria for evaluation.

The College publishes the institution-set standards on its website on the Mission and Guiding Principles page (I.B.34). While the institution-set standards are not regularly reviewed per se by any committee or work group at the College, the key metrics of course completion, degrees and
certificates earned, transfer preparedness, exam pass rates, and job placement rates are presented and/or discussed in a multitude of groups and venues described in Standard I.B.1.  

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard. The institution has established criteria and processes to determine appropriate, institution-set standards for student achievement, including course completion, program completion, job placement rates, and licensure examination passage rates. The metrics both monitor and challenge institutional performance. There is broad-based understanding of the priorities and actions to achieve and exceed institution-set standards. The institution annually reviews data to assess performance against institution-set standards.

During this self-evaluation process, it was discovered that while the College has data posted in a variety of places for a variety of reasons, it did not have the institution-set standards posted. They are posted now as indicated above, in the same place as the mission, strategic goals, and other guiding principles.

**I.B.4: The institution uses assessment data and organizes its institutional processes to support student learning and student achievement.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The College has formal and informal mechanisms for evaluating its variety of assessment activities. Formally, a systematic review is built into the integrated annual planning cycle for all levels of the institution, from the individual unit and department level to the division level of academic affairs, student services, and administrative services. As explained in more detail in Standard I.B.9, every year units, sections, and divisions develop initiatives to be implemented in the following year. Plan proposers indicate to what extent initiatives are aligned with the College’s strategic goals, one of which is strengthening organizational effectiveness. In this way, individual units, sections, and divisions are continually prompted to make improvements in institutional processes to support student learning and achievement.

Annual planning initiatives are tied to measures of success. Units, sections, and divisions are prompted each year to reference their measures of success when writing concluding reports on their initiatives from the previous year (I.B.35). In 2017, to better track the implementation of the initiatives while they are happening and strengthen the likelihood of success, lead (formative) measures were added to the template. Training was provided to faculty chairs and administrators responsible for operational areas plans (I.B.36).

The College uses a variety of other assessment data to improve its organizational processes. As explained in more detail in Standard I.A.2, the College uses data to measure how well it is achieving its mission and progress on three-year strategic goals. As explained in more detail in Standard I.B.2 and Standard II.A.16, the College assesses SLO’s, PLO’s, AUO’s, and ILO’s. As explained in more detail in Standard I.B.5, the College uses student performance data, student achievement data, operational data, and PLO and AUO data in the program review process. As explained in more detail in Standard IV.A.7, the College uses a variety of mechanisms to assess the effectiveness of its decision-making structure and participatory governance practices.
The following are examples of recent institutional improvements that have taken place as a result of reviewing and analyzing assessment data.

- In 2015-2016, due largely to results of the student satisfaction survey results and to annual unit planning, Financial Aid eliminated a number of institutional barriers to expedite processing of requests and improve success rates of financial aid students (I.B.37).
- In 2016, due largely to responses on its evaluation survey, College Council put a greater effort on formalizing reporting out to and in from constituent groups, as described and evidenced in Standard IV.A.7.
- In 2016-2017, due in large part to the morale expressed in the 2016 KCCD Climate Survey, the president met with members of the classified staff to discuss ways they could more effectively participate in college governance. The result was the separation of staff recognition celebrations from all-staff trainings, the creation of regular “meet and greets” to celebrate staff promotion and longevity in a collegial atmosphere, and the resuscitation of the classified senate with responsibilities clearly distinguished from the classified union (I.B.38).
- In 2017, the Web Professional program made a number of modifications to its instruction with the result, when reassessed, that outcome gaps closed (I.B.39).
- In 2017, due to persistent student equity gaps, the College applied for and was approved to start an Umoja program, as described and evidenced in Standard II.C.4.
- In 2017, due largely to data needs being unmet in program review, strategic planning, and college-level initiatives, the College secured funding to start a college institutional research office (I.B.40).
- In 2018, due largely to persistent student underperformance in basic skills classes, the English and math departments took initial steps to implement a co-requisite model for accelerated learning at levels below transfer (I.B.41).

Evaluation and Analysis

The College meets this Standard. Assessment data drives college planning to improve student learning and student achievement. Institutional processes are organized and implemented to support student learning and student achievement.

Institutional Effectiveness

I.B.5: The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of goals and objectives, student learning outcomes, and student achievement. Quantitative and qualitative data are disaggregated for analysis by program type and mode of delivery.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The College systematically assesses instructional and non-instructional programs through a number of methods, including curriculum review, outcome assessment, and annual integrated planning, but the primary and most comprehensive method is the program review process.
The College has adopted a five-year cycle for instructional program review, with a two-year supplemental review for career technical education programs, as required by California Education Code, § 78016. Non-instructional programs and administrative units also undergo program review so that those also may be continuously and sustainably improved. These programs are also on a five-year cycle. Cycles are staggered so that a consistent number of programs is due each year. The long-term program review cycle is linked from the Program Review page on the College’s website (I.B.42).

Process

The College has developed a year-long timeline to guide departments and units in the writing of program reviews, as evidenced by the Getting Started document posted to the Program Review website (I.B.43). All program reviews are due in May of the appointed year. The process begins in August and September with the gathering and delivery of data and with a training that is offered to all departments completing review that year. During the period of analysis and writing, department faculty and operational units are encouraged to seek input from important stakeholders, such as the supervising administrator, institutional researcher, site directors, and the appropriate advisory committee.

Templates have been designed to facilitate the completion of program reviews. Whether instructional or non-instructional, programs are prompted to address relevance, appropriateness, currency, outcomes assessment, and action plans. Within these five sections are a variety of subsections, such as connection to the college mission, gaps in outcomes assessment, status of resources that might be requested through subsequent annual integrated planning, program strengths, and strategies for improvement. Whether instructional or non-instructional, all programs are expected to respond to the prompts under each individual subsection (I.B.44).

All instructional and non-instructional program reviews require two readings at the Program Review Committee, generally in the spring. As indicated above in Standard I.B.1, non-instructional program reviews go directly to College Council for review and acceptance whereas instructional programs go to the academic senate before going to College Council. Fully accepted documents are published to the Program Review main page for public access (I.B.45).

Data

All program reviews require systematic ongoing evaluation of data, as indicated throughout the templates (I.B.44). Student services program reviews analyze student achievement, student learning outcomes, and service department outcomes. Student needs are analyzed, and usage and satisfaction data are evaluated. Operational units that are purely administrative in function (e.g., Maintenance and Operations) also undergo program review. Like student services program reviews, these evaluate service department outcomes, usage and satisfaction data, and other key performance indicators that are appropriate for the unit. In addition, all program reviews require two- and five-year goals to be written so departments have action plans to directly measure improvements. Progress toward goal completion is discussed in an ongoing cycle through the annual unit plans and reported out on in the next program review. It is an expectation of reviews that they address the program in all delivery modes and at all campus locations.
Instructional program reviews, in addition to the items above, analyze course- and program-specific data, such as student demand, patterns of course offerings, student learning performance, student achievement, Perkins core indicators (for CTE), labor market information (CTE), and assessment of student learning outcomes.

Disaggregated data for student learning and achievement is available for all instructional and student support programs, as explained in more detail immediately below in Standard I.B.6. The Program Review Data provided yearly to departments for integrated planning disaggregates student demand and student performance by age, gender, and ethnicity. Perkins Core Indicators also provide disaggregated data for CTE programs, including gender, non-traditional, displaced homemaker, economically disadvantaged, limited English proficiency, single parent, disability, and technical preparation. In addition, the College provides departments and units with a variety of disaggregated data that makes sense to its own population of students being served, such as disaggregating by campus location, online vs. onsite, and inmate students vs. general population (I.B.46).

Changes as a result of program review are captured annually in the integrated planning process as “Progress on Program Review Goals” is a standing section of the template for all unit, section, and division plans. Here are some examples in recent years of improvements made at the College in non-instructional areas based on program review. Changes in instructional programs resulting from program reviews are described in Standard II.A.16.

- In 2016, information competency became one of the College’s four ILO’s, addressing the goal to “Increase the institutionalization of information competency” in the 2012 Library Program Review (I.B.47).
- In 2016, a study hall for ACCESS students was implemented at both the IWV and KRV campuses, addressing the goal to “Develop a study hall model to address gaps in completion of English and math sequences with low income and disabled students” in the 2014 ACCESS Program Review (completed spring 2016) (I.B.48).
- In 2015, notifications to job applicants were programmed to be automatically sent by the People Admin system, addressing the goal to “Implement improvements to the electronic applicant tracking system for both employees and applicants to navigate within the system” in the 2014 Human Resources Program Review (I.B.49).

Evaluation

The program review process itself is evaluated both formally and informally. Formally, the committee is evaluated annually by the IEC on the following standards:

- Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.
- The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.
- The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning (I.B.28, pgs. 13-21).
And once every two years, the committee is additionally assessed by the same planning survey described in Standard I.B.2, which asks employees about their awareness of, participation in, and satisfaction with program review. Questions in this part of the survey include “My area’s program review is integrated into the college planning process” and “I contributed to the development of the most recent program review.” As indicated above, the last such survey was completed in 2016 with results showing that more than 80% of respondents believing their program review is integrated into college planning but just over 60% feeling that they had contributed. These responses were consistent with those of previous years (I.B.31, pgs. 2-3). The next survey is planned for 2018.

Informally, the committee engages in ongoing review and revision of templates and the process associated with program review based on immediate user feedback at meetings.

Evaluation of the process has led to a number of changes in the program review process in the last few years:

- Outcomes Assessment committee review of SLO’s, PLO’s, and AUO’s and recommendations to the program review committee are now a required part of the process.
- The program review area on the website was updated and provided with “Getting Started” tips.
- The number of reminders, follow ups, nudges, and “what can we do to help” offers have increased to keep writers on track.

**Linkages**

Program review is linked to both the integrated planning process and the outcomes assessment process. It is linked to integrated planning directly through the annual planning templates which require departments and units to report out on actions taken on program review goals in the immediately preceding academic year. This takes place every year. In addition, program review and integrated planning use the same data for analysis and prompt status updates in the same five resource areas of facilities, information technology, marketing, professional development, and staffing. This ensures that integrated planning acts as a yearly update on goals and resource requests coming out of the five-year program review.

It is linked to outcomes assessment, as indicated above, through the routing of program reviews through the Outcomes Assessment Committee for review and feedback. This ensures uniform expectations, particularly for PLO’s and AUO’s, and consistent feedback to departments and units.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard. The College has established and used program review processes that incorporate systematic, ongoing evaluation of programs and services using data on student learning and student achievement. These processes support programmatic improvement, implementation of modifications, and evaluation of the changes for continuous quality improvement. Data assessment and analysis drive college planning to improve student learning.
and student achievement. Data used for assessment and analysis is disaggregated to reflect factors of difference among students, as identified by the institution.

**I.B.6: The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human, fiscal and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Cerro Coso Community College analyzes learning outcomes and other student learning and achievement data in order to identify gaps for subpopulations of students. Program Review Data gathered for the integrated annual planning effort disaggregates student performance by age, gender, and ethnicity. Given the importance of distance education delivery to Cerro Coso Community College, course enrollment information for instructional programs is additionally split out by distance ed vs. traditional (I.B.9). Departments and units use this information in annual planning and program review to find gaps, determine initiatives, and request resources.

In the Elements of Student Success, student performance data that aligns with guided pathways (12 units in first year, course completion, completion of college-level English or math in first year, etc.) is disaggregated by a wide variety of subpopulations including age, gender, ethnicity, full- or part-time, unit load in first term, financial aid awarded, foster youth, veterans, percentage of distance ed within cohort, matriculation components completed, and others (I.B.7). This information is viewed and used by SSSP and IEC, as well as by the equity director and other groups and persons monitoring equity achievement.

A number of regular KCCD institutional research reports provide disaggregation statistics for specific projects. These are used by specific faculty, staff, or departments for local and particular purposes, such as veterans reports, the integrated plan recently required by the CCCCO, strategic planning, and the guided pathway effort:

- **Common Measures (I.B.50)**
- **Awards by Demographics (I.B.51)**
- **Ethnic Distribution of Transfer Students** (I.B.52)
- **Distance Education Activity (I.B.53)**
- **Employee Profiles (I.B.54)**
- **First-Generation Student Profiles** (I.B.55)
- **Veteran’s Report** (I.B.56)
- **Student Success Scorecard, Supplemental Tables** (I.B.57)

In addition to these standing reports, the College institutional research office has provided ad hoc reports with disaggregated data for specific projects, such as looking at the success rates of incarcerated students by ethnicity and by age, or looking at the number of dual and concurrent enrollment students by campus (I.B.58). The Operation Data Store is able to provide student demographic and section enrollment reporting in dozens of ways that are used by the College to assess how well it is achieving its mission:

- By campus
When it comes to outcomes assessment, the College is not currently disaggregating any of its SLO’s, PLO’s, AUO’s, or ILO’s by subpopulations of students. It has not previously had a mechanism to do this but is currently in the process of implementing eLumen and will begin recording outcome results by individual students, allowing reports to be run by demographics. This ensures that units, departments, and programs will be able to analyze outcome assessment data in the same meaningful ways it has been able to examine and analyze student performance and achievement data, including ways that are additionally important to the College, such as by campus and delivery mode.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution disaggregates student learning and achievement data for student subpopulations, as defined by the College. The institution demonstrates that institutional data and evidence, including student achievement data, is used for program review and improvement.

Once eLumen is fully implemented, disaggregation will also be enabled in student learning outcomes assessment. The eLumen system will be ready to receive assessment data beginning fall 2018, and it is expected to take two years to accumulate enough data for analysis at the disaggregated level to be meaningful. Programs, departments, and units will continue to analyze and address disaggregated student learning and achievement data in the integrated planning process and program review.

I.B.7: The institution regularly evaluates its policies and practices across all areas of the institution, including instructional programs, student and learning support services, resource management, and governance processes to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of mission.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

One of the findings of the external evaluation team in 2012 was for the College to further improve and integrate its planning activities, including the development of a clear linkage of planning to college mission, program review, resource allocation, identified goals, and a means to evaluate processes for effectiveness. When the team returned in 2013, they noted that the College had made substantive progress in integrating the planning activities as described, but it had not fully completed the second half of the recommendation: implementing an effective evaluation instrument for planning (I.B.59). As described in the 2014 Follow-Up Report and again in the 2015 Midterm Report, linked from the Accreditation site, a two-part instrument for annually evaluating the College’s planning processes was created and first implemented in spring 2014 (I.B.60).
One part is a comprehensive self-evaluation of each of the College’s three major planning areas carried out by the steering groups responsible for each area: IEC for planning, the Program Review Committee for program review, and the SLO committee for outcomes. This part is an “insider’s” view: an operational and functional assessment from those faculty and staff serving on the committees and having a level of specialized knowledge and institutional history. The second component is a survey of the field. In contrast to the insider’s view, it gauges the college community’s understanding of and satisfaction with institutional planning in the areas of “Mission and Institutional Goals,” “College Planning,” “Budget and Resource Allocation,” and “Outcomes and Assessment.” The self-evaluation is done every year; the survey is done every other year. The results are gathered and discussed by IEC and posted annually as the College Report Card linked from the Planning Documents page (I.B.28, I.B.31).

In addition to this formal yearly evaluation, other assessments are conducted regularly and on an ad hoc basis to improve institutional effectiveness. In the annual integrated planning template, a short two-question survey solicits satisfaction and suggestions for improvements (I.B.61). When IEC set about to revise the planning templates ahead of fall 2017, it asked for input from stakeholders, especially faculty chairs (I.B.62). In 2017-2018, the College invited faculty and staff to take the Institutional Capacity Assessment Tool survey available to Achieving the Dream schools; results were not available at the time of the writing of this report. Input also occurs informally. In spring 2016, faculty chairs expressed a strong desire to see no revisions to the annual unit plan template (it had been revised each of the prior three years), and this wish was discussed at IEC and enshrined as a goal for 2016-2017 (I.B.63, pg 5 of 41).

The result of this input have been continuing improvements to the College’s institutional effectiveness practices and processes. Here are some examples from the last three years, as evidenced in the last three College Report Cards (I.B.63, I.B.64, I.B.28):

- In 2015, the mission, charge, and composition of the SSSP Council was revised to reflect its role as a participatory governance committee
- In 2015, the budget component of the integrated planning cycle was revised to remove redundancy: instead of proposers listing resource needs in tables in the plan and transferring those figures to a separate spreadsheet, the tables were eliminated and the spreadsheets enhanced to include justifications and drop down menu choices.
- In 2015, outcome assessment histories were greatly elaborated in program reviews, including whether outcomes were met and, if not, when they were reassessed.
- In 2015, departments began working on a 5-year cycle indicating when all student learning outcomes (SLO’s) and program learning outcomes (PLO’s) in their areas will be assessed and also a more specific map-over of SLO’s to PLO’s so there is no doubt what specific assessment tool is used when it comes to assessing PLO’s.
- In 2015, a gap was closed in the linkage between curriculum, program review, and SLO’s: When faculty present courses and programs at the curriculum committee, they are now asked when the last time the course was assessed and how the assessment results informed the SLO/PLO and ultimately the course outline of record being presented.
- In 2016, specific language was added to the annual unit plan templates prompting units, sections, and divisions to not just identify gaps in student equity but design improvements.
• In 2016, the periodic newsletter Progress Report was created by the IEC to report out matters of quality assurance regarding student learning and achievement. The newsletter goes out to all employees and has included topics such as accreditation, integrated planning, outcomes assessment, student success and support program, and student equity, and progress on strategic plan goals.

• In 2016, PLO assessments were published on the college webpage. For the first year, only those instructional program that had completed a program review since 2015 were included. As ensuing program reviews are completed, their results will be posted under each program’s PLO page and main information page.

• In 2016, a technical review stage was implemented in the program review process that includes review by manager or dean, department chair and/or department members, advisory committee, and the Outcomes Assessment Committee. This review by the Outcomes Assessment Committee strengthens the linkage between outcomes assessment and program review.

• In 2017, the integrated planning templates were substantially revised to further declutter and streamline input and presentation of information.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The institution regularly reviews and assesses its institutional effectiveness practices and processes, including its cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, and re-evaluation, to determine their efficacy. The institution uses the results from assessment processes to develop and implement plans for improvement.

I.B.8: The institution broadly communicates the results of all of its assessment and evaluation activities so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and sets appropriate priorities.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The College uses a number of formal and informal methods to report out the results of its assessment and evaluation activities. Student outcomes are made public to the community and to current and prospective students in program review documents linked from the College’s Program Review page (I.B.45). Since 2016, PLO results for instructional programs are visibly posted on the individual degree and certificate information pages (I.B.26); since 2018, PLO and AUO results for all programs are posted on the College’s Outcomes Assessment site (I.B.27). The work of the SLO committee is summarized yearly, as has been mentioned, as part of the College Report Card, linked from the master Planning Documents page (I.B.65). In 2017, the College’s SLO status was the subject of one of the Progress Reports distributed by email to all employees (I.B.66).

The equity work the College has done is published in the 2014 and 2015-2016 Student Equity plan and the 2017-2019 Integrated Plan, linked from the Planning Documents page (I.B.65). In addition, annual progress on equity measures are found in the Elements of Student Success reports posted on KCCD IR’s website (I.B.7). In 2017, equity results were directly distributed to all college faculty and staff through a Progress Report (I.B.67).
Quality in academic matters is published in a variety of ways. All program reviews are posted on the Program Review page (I.B.45). The College’s progress on its core academic functions are available to the public on the college website in the form of Institution-Set Standards (I.B.34) and the IEPI Targets (I.B.69). Additional reports are available to the public on the KCCD IR website, such as Common Measures, Program Review Data, Student Success Scorecard, IPEDS, and Student Right to Know (I.B.70).

Evaluation and assessment activities located in planning documents are made public on the Integrated Planning page of the college website. The main page contains links to the regular planning documents the college prepares, archives of prior plans, and a notation when the next plan is due (I.B.65). Links on the navigation bar in the left hand margin lead to the integrated planning subweb, where all unit plans, section plans, division plans, resource request analyses and mid-year progress reports can be viewed. Drop-down menus at the top allow viewers to search by planning unit or by academic year (I.B.71).

These documents are posted on the website and always available for internal and external constituents to view. In the last several years the College has taken strides to bring evaluation results to where stakeholders are. Internally, as noted several times in this Standard, the Progress Report was implemented in 2016 to report out matters of quality assurance in areas such as integrated planning, student equity, outcomes assessment, and progress on strategic plan goals. For the purposes of this Standard, the newsletter is sent directly to all members of the college community through the cc_all listserv and is embedded directly into the email so that it can be seen without additional clicking. In 2018, as the College neared the end of its three-year strategic planning period, several issues of the Progress Report were given over to reporting out performance on the five strategic goals (I.B.72).

Another improvement in communication to the internal community, based on the results the biannual college Planning Survey, was the implementation in 2015 of asking annual unit plan proposers to present their plans at College Council for wider distribution and understanding. In the next year, the vice presidents were asked to start presenting division plans at spring faculty flex days. In 2017, section plan proposers likewise began presenting their plans at College Council. At all these presentations, proposers are asked to summarize results of their prior year goals (I.B.73).

Externally, the College prepares an annual Report to the Community that is distributed to internal and external stakeholders, such as chambers of commerce, business and educational collaboratives, ad hoc meetings with school district superintendents and principals, and community forums (I.B.68). In addition, the College prepares a monthly Coyote Howler that provides information regarding the interesting events and accomplishments that have occurred at the College and that is presented to the board of trustees (I.B.74).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution demonstrates that communication of its assessment and evaluation to internal and external stakeholders occurs regularly. The strengths and weaknesses of the institution as identified by the assessment are clearly communicated to the
college community in a variety of formal and informal methods. The data supported discussion on strengths and weaknesses is used to set institutional priorities.

**I.B.9: The institution engages in continuous, broad based, systematic evaluation and planning. The institution integrates program review, planning, and resource allocation into a comprehensive process that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Institutional planning addresses short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services and for human, physical, technology, and financial resources.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Cerro Coso Community College employs a variety of plans as part of a comprehensive evaluation and planning effort. These plans work together to provide a complete picture of the short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services.

As noted above in Standard I.B.7, one of the findings of the external evaluation team in 2012 was for the College to further improve and integrate its planning activities, including the development of a clear linkage of planning to college mission, program review, resource allocation, and identified goals effectiveness. Before the 2013 Follow Up Report, the cycle, which had been implemented in 2011-2012, had been run another time and a number of changes were made to more strongly integrate the separate components of program review, planning, outcomes assessment, and resource allocation (I.B.75). Since then, the College has run the cycle on an annual basis and made several further improvements.

**Educational Master Plan**

Cerro Coso Community College adheres to Title 5 regulations in producing a comprehensive or master plan once every five years. The purpose of educational master plan is to identify long-range needs of the college and provide a context for decision-making regarding academic affairs, student services, and administrative services, with the outcomes of driving the planning of capital expenditures in the areas of facilities and establishing a vision and projections for more near-term institutional goal-setting. A central component of the plan is an external environmental scan that analyzes the service area’s demographic trends, community profiles, and labor market trends. The most recent Educational Master Plan, linked from the Planning Documents page, was completed in 2017 (I.B.76).

**Strategic Planning**

In this context set by the educational master plan, institutional goals are reviewed and revised once every three years through the strategic planning process. As described more fully in Standard I.A.4 and evidenced in the Participatory Governance Model Handbook, strategic goals are reviewed and revised at the same time and on the same cycle as the institution’s mission, vision, values, and institution-set standards (I.B.77).

The institutional priorities established in the strategic plan are integrated with and based on the mission and the context established by the educational master plan. Goal setting relies on data analysis from the mission review, performance on the institution-set standards, and successful
accomplishment of prior strategic goals as measured by a variety of student learning, student achievement, equity, and operational metrics. The last Strategic Plan was done in spring 2018 (I.B.78).

Program Reviews

A second layer of assessment and planning at the College is carried out simultaneously at the department and unit levels. The most comprehensive of these is the program review, which is completed once every five years. Different from the institutional focus of the educational master plan and strategic plans, program reviews are focused on the long-term assessment and improvement of individual units and departments. At Cerro Coso Community College, program reviews are completed for all instructional degrees and certificates, all student services, and all administrative services operational units. Program reviews are also completed for information technology, marketing and public relations, and college human resources. The program review process is described much more at length in Standard I.B.5.

Outcomes Assessment

Also taking place at the individual department and unit level are the assessments of SLO’s, PLO’s and AUO’s, which are on a set schedule of up to five years. All instructional and non-instructional units are expected to complete all outcomes assessments at least once every five years. Some departments do it sooner. The outcome assessment process is described much more at length in Standard I.B.2.

Annual Planning Process

The annual planning cycle takes place every year and is the shortest-term planning undertaken by the College. It leads directly to department, section, and division initiatives for improvement and, through the development of budget worksheets, to resource allocation. All integrated plans are linked from the Integrated Planning page and can be searched by year and by unit/department (I.B.71).

Unit Plans, due October 15. The cycle begins in the fall semester, as departments and operational units meet to plan for the next academic year (in fall 2018, for instance, planning is being done for academic year 2019-2020). Prior to the beginning of the semester, instructional units are supplied with Program Review Data: student performance and equity data from the previous five years, thus showing current trends and gaps (I.B.9). (Confusingly, what is called “Program Review Data” at the KCCD institutional research website is used primarily at Cerro Coso for integrated planning, not program review. It is generated every year, comes out in August, and plays a large role in annual unit planning. It might also be used by departments for their once-every-five-year review, but that is not its primary purpose at Cerro Coso. Nevertheless, “Program Review Data” is its label district-wide; being part of a district has its down-sides.) Departments and operational units use this student achievement information, as well as progress made on program review goals, outcomes assessment, equity gaps, and prior year initiatives, to identify gaps, dialogue about improvements, plan goals for the following academic year, and propose a budget.
The result, due by October 15th of every year, is the annual unit plan (AUP). The unit plan template requires the department or unit to review and address its connection to the college mission, its progress on equity gaps, its progress on program review goals, its progress on outcomes assessment, and its progress on prior-year initiatives. The completed document contains not only this gap analysis but also initiatives to be attempted for the following year and a comprehensive budget worksheet with requests for staffing, facilities, supplies, equipment, travel, and marketing based on the goals and plans for improved student learning (I.B.79).

Every instructional department completes an AUP. The following non-instructional units also complete AUP’s:

- ACCESS programs
- Admissions and Records
- Athletics
- Counseling
- Equity
- Financial Aid and Veterans’ Affairs
- Honors
- Information Technology
- Maintenance and Operations
- Public Information/External Relations
- Student Activities
- Veteran’s Affairs

Because of the variety of non-instructional units, the data used in the unit planning process for program evaluation mirrors those used by instructional units but varies with what is relevant to that program, such as usage and data statistics and any department data that is specific to its core function, such as percentage of students granted financial aid for the Financial Aid Department or number of student visits and contact hours in the Learning Assistance Center (I.B.80). As with instructional departments, student services and administrative services units reflect on past performance, dialogue about their current status, and plan goals for the next academic year that address the college strategic goals and take into account any noteworthy budget forecasts (I.B.81).

Section and Division Plans, due November 15 and December 1. During the next two months, wider circles of planning are accomplished. In the area of academic affairs, annual section plans (ASP’s) are completed. These are plans for operational entities either comprised of groups of units working together (career and technical education, letters and sciences) or entire campus locations (Eastern Sierra College Center, CC Online, etc.).

The ASP’s provide a functional review at the next level up. Deans and site directors review the AUP’s of the units that comprise or affect their areas, dialogue with unit leaders as appropriate, winnow out untimely or unrealistic requests, and then write plans that capture goals the section can commit to for the following year. A key piece of this review involves resource allocation. Budget requests are scrutinized by the section leaders and steering groups, analyzed in context of the gaps and initiatives identified in the unit plans, and discussed with the unit proposer. The section leader completes a comprehensive budget worksheet, passing along resource
recommendations that he or she can support and declining to pass along recommendations that he or she cannot (I.B.82).

After the ASP’s are the annual division plans (ADP’s), which are the final layer of review at the widest concentric circle. There are only four ADP’s that comprise the College’s functional divisions of instruction, administrative services, student services, and president’s office. The chief officer of each division carries out this final review in the same manner as above: analyzing and synthesizing lower level plans, bringing forth needs in the five resource request areas, and completing final comprehensive budget worksheets of supported expenditures (I.B.83).

Resource Request Analyses, due February 15. By December 1 every year, gaps have been identified in every unit, section, and division, goals set, and resources requested in the areas of facilities, information technology, marketing, professional development, and staffing. At this point, ‘second-level’ plans are written that look at the resources across the college and aggregate them. These resource request analyses have no set template and are completed by the following responsible parties:

- Facilities: director of maintenance and operations
- Information Technology: director of information technology
- Marketing: manager of public relations and institutional advancement
- Professional Development: vice president of instruction and faculty flex coordinator
- Staffing: college president

The purpose of the resource request plans is to look at all the plans together college-wide and determine if trends, commonalities, and trade-offs exist and where efficiencies can be gained. The marketing and professional development plans also identify common threads that are established as priorities for the following year (I.B.84).

Budget, due May 1. The last piece of the integrated cycle is the college budget, which is finalized beginning February 15th. Throughout the cycle, all units, sections, and divisions have completed budget worksheets, all budget requests have been reviewed and prioritized at each successive level of the cycle, and commonalities and trends in the resource areas have been analyzed. The Budget Development Committee reviews the revenue projections for the following year, determines the extent of all budget requests, and makes recommendations on specific line items. If needed, the Budget Development Committee will get additional information from or even meet with plan proposers. They will do this if there is a question about a line-item or there is a failure to come to agreement among unit, section, and/or division plans (I.B.85). The result of this dialogue is a draft of the following year’s tentative budget that is recommended to the president (I.B.86).

As indicated above in Standard I.B.7, this integrated planning and resource allocation process is regularly evaluated as part of the overall assessment of the integrated planning cycle. For the purposes of this Standard, the biannual college Planning Survey asks respondents to rate their experience on such questions as, “My area’s annual plan is integrated into the college’s planning process,” “Planning in my area is the result of collaboration and dialogue,” and “There are clear connections at Cerro Coso between planning, budgeting, and the allocation of resources.” Results in 2016 demonstrated a sizeable majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with these
statements, showing a modest increase on most questions from the prior survey in 2014 (I.B.31, pgs. 2-4).

Here are examples of improvements in the resource allocation process that have come out of these assessments since 2015:

- In 2015, the budget component of the integrated planning cycle was revised to remove redundancy: instead of proposers listing resource needs in tables in the plan and transferring those figures to a separate spreadsheet, the tables were eliminated and the spreadsheets enhanced to include justifications and drop down menu choices.
- In 2016, a ‘one-time’ code added into the budget worksheets to better distinguish program expenditures that are ongoing in nature—instructional supplies, non-instructional supplies, personnel, etc.—from special or unusual costs in any given year that ‘spike’ the budget. This was designed to help smooth out year-to-year budget analysis.
- In 2017, a rubric for prioritizing and analyzing budget requests was developed and piloted. It was first used by the committee in spring 2018 as a guide for discussions about particular line items.

Linkages

Annual integrated planning is linked to program review through the explicit section in the template asking proposers to discuss “Progress Made on Program Review.” Proposers discuss work done on both 2-year and 5-year goals and are therefore kept responsible for making progress on quality improvements.

It is linked to outcomes assessment in the sections “Outcomes Assessment: Actions Taken” and “Outcomes Assessment: Gaps to be Addressed.” This ensures that program review goals as well as outcomes assessment results are kept continually in front of faculty and staff as they set yearly priorities and request resource allocations.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. Cerro Coso Community College has worked very hard over the last six years to design, implement, evaluate and improve a comprehensive planning cycle that is helping it accomplish its mission and improve institutional effectiveness and academic quality. This institutional planning happens on a regular basis, includes wide participation across the college-wide community, uses valid data sources, and follows a consistent processes. Comprehensive planning addresses both short- and long-term needs of the institution.

Changes and Plans Arising out of the Self-Evaluation Process

Changes

I.B.1: During this self-evaluation process, the College realized that while it has a structured dialogue on the components of this Standard, it was lacking a systematic approach to ensure that every group who needs to review certain reports or data sets is reviewing that information on a regular cycle. For this reason, in spring 2018 IEC began discussions about developing a chart of reports and data sets cross-referenced with the committees or work groups who review them and
the frequency of this review. When completed, the chart will be communicated to the different chairs and included in the Participatory Governance Model Handbook.

I.B.4: During the self-evaluation process, it was discovered that while the College has data posted in a variety of places for a variety of reasons, it did not have the institution-set standards posted. They are posted now as indicated above, in the same place as the mission, strategic goals, other guiding principles.

*Future Action Plans*

I.B.1: Continue to build capacity of the College’s Office of Institutional Research by stabilizing personnel, establishing a workflow for requests, creating a research agenda, enhancing the OIR research page, offering numerous faculty and staff professional development opportunities to increase institutional literacy, and using data visualization tools to develop a variety of on-demand reports for faculty and staff. Timeline: Spring 2020. Person Responsible: College Institutional Researcher.

I.B.2: Pending full implementation of eLumen’s capabilities, complete a cycle of assessment for the newly revised ILO’s. Timeline: Spring 2020. Person responsible: Vice President, Instruction. Results will be reviewed by the Outcomes Assessment Committee, IEC, the Student Success and Support Council, and the academic senate. (Note: same action plan listed in II.A.11.)

I.B.6: Pending full implementation of eLumen’s capabilities, produce a first report on disaggregated SLO, PLO, GELO, and ILO outcome data. Timeline: Spring 2020. Person responsible: Vice President, Instruction. Results will be reviewed by the SLO Committee, IEC, SSSP, and the academic senate.

*List of Evidence*

- **I.B.1**: 2018-2021 Participatory Governance Model Handbook, pgs. 27-28, 30, and 31
- **I.B.2**: Sample program review committee and department meeting minutes showing outcomes discussions
- **I.B.3**: AUP template showing outcomes assessment
- **I.B.4**: PGMH, pg. 22
- **I.B.5**: Student equity director job description
- **I.B.6**: Sample SSSP meeting minutes January 31, 2018 showing discussion of CCSSE results
- **I.B.7**: Elements of Student Success page at KCCD IR and 2017 Elements of Student Success report
- **I.B.8**: AUP template showing equity
- **I.B.9**: Program Review Data page and sample reports
- **I.B.10**: Agendas/materials from Diego Navarro’s presentations
- **I.B.11**: Student Success Factors material from flex days, admin advances, and classified all-staffs
- **I.B.12**: Sample SSSP meeting minutes March 14, 2018, showing guided pathways discussions
- **I.B.13**: Sample Student Success Factor inquiry group agendas/minutes/materials
- **I.B.14**: Directed, Focused, Connected initiative packages for instructional departments
I.B.15  Open House/Ridgecrest Rocks materials
I.B.16  Sample AS minutes March 15, 2018 showing acceptance of instructional program reviews
I.B.17  Sample College Council meeting minutes April 5, 2018 showing acceptance of instructional and non-instructional program reviews
I.B.18  Sample College Council meeting minutes showing IEC report-out
I.B.19  Progress Report page and sample Progress Reports
I.B.20  5-year SLO cycle chart in Program Review template and samples from recent program reviews
I.B.21  Sample SLO coordinator input into COR proposals
I.B.22  Sample COR’s and C-NET reports showing outcomes assessment instruments
I.B.23  Outcomes Assessment main page
I.B.24  Sample C-NET SLO pages showing improvements planned when targets were not met
I.B.26  Sample PLO Reporting pages
I.B.27  PLO and AUO results pages on Outcomes Assessment site
I.B.28  2017 College Report Card
I.B.29  ILO and ISS Task Force Report
I.B.30  ILO mapping materials
I.B.32  College Council meeting minutes, March 2015 showing discussion of institution-set standards
I.B.33  2015 ACCJC Annual Report
I.B.34  Our Mission and Guiding Principles page
I.B.35  AUP template showing prior year initiatives
I.B.36  Materials for revised AUP training in August/September 2017
I.B.37  2017-2018 Financial Aid AUP, pgs. 2-3
I.B.38  Sample Meet and Greet announcements/materials, and classified Senate constitution, by-laws, and meeting minutes
I.B.40  IEPI letter of treatment for area of focus for establishing IR office
I.B.41  2018 Basic Skills Program Review
I.B.42  Program Review long-term cycle page
I.B.43  Program Review “Getting Started” document
I.B.44  Program Review templates, instructional and non-instructional
I.B.45  Program Review main page
I.B.46  Examples of reports prepared for program reviews showing disaggregation by campus, delivery mode, incarcerated student populations, etc.
I.B.47  2012 Library Program Review, pg. 32
I.B.48  2015 ACCESS Program Review, pg. 26
I.B.49  2014 Human Resources Program Review, pg. 11
I.B.50  2018 Common Measures
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.B.51</th>
<th>2016-2017 Awards by Demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.B.52</td>
<td>2016-2017 Ethnic Distribution of Transfer Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.53</td>
<td>2016-2017 Distance Education Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.54</td>
<td>2017 Employee Profiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.55</td>
<td>2016 First-Generation Student Profiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.56</td>
<td>2016 Veteran’s Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.57</td>
<td>2017 Student Success Scorecard, Supplemental College Tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.58</td>
<td>Sample reports from Ryan showing disaggregation: incarcerated, dual enrollment students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.59</td>
<td>2013 External Evaluation Report, pgs. 4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.60</td>
<td>2014 Follow-Up Report (all) and 2015 Midterm Report, pgs. 4-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.61</td>
<td>AUP evaluation questions for improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.62</td>
<td>Faculty Chair meeting minutes, May 8, 2017, showing input for AUP revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.63</td>
<td>2016 College Report Card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.64</td>
<td>2015 College Report Card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.65</td>
<td>Planning Documents page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.66</td>
<td>Progress Report on SLO status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.67</td>
<td>Progress Report on Equity Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.68</td>
<td>Reports to the Community page and one sample annual Report to the Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.69</td>
<td>IEPI Targets page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.70</td>
<td>KCCD IR pages mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.71</td>
<td>Integrated Planning page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.72</td>
<td>Progress Report page and sample Progress Report emails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.73</td>
<td>Sample College Council meeting agendas showing planning presentations; flex day agendas showing state-of-the-college presentations; email from vice president instruction, describing what to present on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.74</td>
<td>Coyote Howler page and one sample Coyote Howler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.75</td>
<td>2013 Follow Up Report, pgs. 4-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.76</td>
<td>2017-2022 Cerro Coso Community College Educational Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.77</td>
<td>PGMH, pgs. 15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.78</td>
<td>2018-2021 Cerro Coso Community College Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.79</td>
<td>Sample 2018-2019 Instructional AUP’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.81</td>
<td>Sample 2018-2019 Non-Instructional AUP’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.82</td>
<td>Sample 2018-2019 ASP’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.83</td>
<td>Sample 2018-2019 ADP’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.84</td>
<td>2018-2019 RRA’s (all)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.85</td>
<td>BDC meeting minutes 3/7/2018 and 3/14/2018 showing presentations by proposers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.86</td>
<td>2018-2019 tentative budget to the president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.B.87</td>
<td>CCSSE page at KCCD IR and 2017 CCSSE Key Findings report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard I.C: Institutional Integrity

Institutional Integrity

I.C.1: The institution assures the clarity, accuracy, and integrity of information provided to students and prospective students, personnel, and all persons or organizations related to its mission statement, learning outcomes, educational programs, and student support services. The institution gives accurate information to students and the public about its accreditation status with all of its accreditors.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Cerro Coso Community College clearly and accurately publishes its mission statement on the college website on the Mission and Guiding Principles page that is located directly under the major tab About CCCC (I.C.1). As stated in more detail in Standard I.A.4, the current mission statement is also made available in a variety of other locations in electronic form, such as the College Catalog, the Educational Master Plan (linked from the Planning Documents page), the Strategic Plan, and the annual Report to the Community (I.C.2).

The College publicizes the results of its outcomes assessments to students, personnel and community on the college website primarily through program reviews linked from the Program Review site and through annual unit plans linked from the Integrated Planning page (I.C.3, I.C.4). Beginning in 2014, degrees and certificates going through program review posted results of their program learning outcomes (PLO’s) on each program’s webpage, as well as on the Outcomes Assessment site (I.C.5). In addition, every year the Outcomes Assessment Committee aggregates the results of outcome assessment, analyzes how those results are being used to establish institutional priorities and instructional improvements, and contributes a written summary to the annual College Report Card (I.C.6, pp 22-31 of 31). As explained in more detail in Standard I.B.2, outcomes assessments are regularly reviewed by college stakeholders at a variety of levels.

Information about educational courses and programs are provided through the catalog and on the college website. Each program is linked from the Degrees and Certificates page and includes the program name, description of content, course requirements, PLO’s, program pathways and links to disclosures as appropriate, such as gainful employment (I.C.7). In 2015-2016, in an effort to respond to how students actually use the website, the pages were converted to an accordion-style presentation that works better with mobile devices. The catalog is published annually in the spring after review by faculty, administration, and staff to ensure that it represents the most current information regarding degrees, programs, total course offerings as well as additional policies, procedures, and practices affecting students (I.C.8).

Both learning support services and student support services continually assess their information for clarity, accuracy, and integrity. As explained in more detail in Standard II.C.2 and Standard II.C.5, student services staff are provided ongoing training to ensure understanding and consistent application of policies, procedures, and practices. As explained in Standard II.C.7, admissions policies and practices are reviewed annually by a district-wide committee of Admissions and Records directors. The Library and Learning Assistance Center sites are
continually reviewed for dead links before the start of every semester, MLA trifolds brought current as needed, and math and writing lab schedules updated. The entire LAC page was revamped in 2016-2017 for currency and relevancy (I.C.9).

The institution posts its accredited status on its Accreditation site one click away from the homepage (I.C.10). At this location, students, prospective students, and all other internal and external stakeholders can find the most recent accreditation documents, commission action letters, information how to make student and public complaints to ACCJC, and links to previous evaluations, substantive change proposals, and other documents.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution conducts regular review of its policies and practices to ensure their clarity, accuracy, and integrity. The institution provides current and accurate information on student achievement to the public. Student learning outcomes are publicly posted for courses and programs. The institution posts its accredited status on its website and all relevant documents.

I.C.2: The institution provides a print or online catalog for its students and prospective students with precise, accurate, and current information on all facts, requirements, policies, and procedures listed in the “Catalog Requirements.”

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The Cerro Coso Community College catalog provides students with the most accurate and current information at the time of publication. The catalog and addendum are available to all students and staff from the College Catalog page (I.C.11). The online .pdf version is in a printable format so that a student can print all or part of the catalog should the student require a hard copy. A hard copy is distributed to educational administrators, faculty chairs, members of counseling, and any employee who requests it.

As mentioned directly above in Standard I.C.1, the catalog is published annually after a review by faculty, administration, and staff. It is typically approved by the board of trustees in the spring semester to be available before open enrollment for summer and fall terms of the next academic year (I.C.12). A comprehensive review of the catalog information is coordinated by the vice presidents of instruction (VPI) and student services (VPSS). The VPI coordinates a review by faculty chairs and the curriculum assistant to ensure that course and program information is complete and accurate; the VPI also coordinates a review of names and degrees of administrators and faculty. The VPSS coordinates a review by all student services program directors of the other catalog matter dealing with student information and college policies and procedures. The catalog reflects all changes made in policies, procedures, and practices up to the time it is submitted for approval to the board; it reflects all changes in curriculum approved by the end of the prior fall semester. Any errors or any changes to policies, procedures, practices, or curriculum that takes place afterward are either held until the next catalog or published in an addendum posted on the catalog page (I.C.13).

A number of distance education policies and procedures are described in the college catalog, including definition and expectations (I.C.8, pg. 15), first day drop practices (pg. 21), and active
participation and attendance practices (pgs. 21-22). Programs that are offered online are found on CC Online page on the college website (I.C.14) and in the catalog (I.C.8, pgs. 57-58, 59), and distance education courses that are offered online are identified on each program’s pathway to completion, including semesters they are offered (I.C.15). Kern Community College District (KCCD) Board Policy Manual procedure 4B3 establishes the expected interaction between faculty and students in the online environment, the accessibility of faculty and staff to students online, strategies for ensuring that the student receiving the credit is the same one doing the work, and the expectation that faculty shall provide information about regular and substantive interaction on the syllabus are established in board policy (I.C.16).

The Commission’s catalog requirements are found at the following places in the 2018-19 Cerro Coso Community College Catalog:

1. The General Information
   • Official Name, Address(es), Telephone Number(s), and Website Address of the Institution – page i and back cover
   • Educational Mission – page 1
   • Representation of accredited status with ACCJC, and with programmatic accreditors if any – page 2
   • Course, Program, and Degree Offerings – pages 55-148
   • Student Learning Outcomes for Programs and Degrees – pages 60-103
   • Academic Calendar and Program Length – academic calendar pages 154-55, program length, pages 60-103
   • Academic Freedom Statement – page 3
   • Available Student Financial Aid – pages 24-29
   • Available Learning Resources – pages 35-36
   • Names and Degrees of Administrators and Faculty – pages 149-151
   • Names of Governing Board Members – page v

2. Requirements
   • Admissions – pages 7-21
   • Student Tuition, Fees, and Other Financial Obligations – pages 19-21
   • Degrees, Certificates, Graduation and Transfer – pages 40-54

3. Major Policies and Procedures Affecting Students
   • Academic Regulations, including Academic Honesty – pages 31-35
   • Nondiscrimination – pages 3-5
   • Acceptance and Transfer of Credits – pages 7-14
   • Transcripts – page 34
   • Grievance and Complaint Procedures – page 38
   • Sexual Harassment – page 6
   • Refund of Fees – page 20

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution provides a print and online catalog, which is easily accessible to all interested parties. The institution has established protocols to ensure that the catalog presents accurate, current, and detailed information to the public about its programs,
locations, and policies. The catalog, class syllabi, and other program documents describe the instructional delivery applied in the distance education courses, programs, and degree offerings. Board policy, the catalog, and class syllabi describe the expected interaction between faculty and students and the accessibility of faculty and staff to students.

**I.C.3: The institution uses documented assessment of student learning and evaluation of student achievement to communicate matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies, including current and prospective students and the public.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The ways in which the College broadly communicates results of its assessment and evaluation activities so that the institution has a shared understanding of its strengths and weaknesses are discussed at length in Standard I.B.8. As almost all of these documents and reports are available on the college or district website, they are transparently available for review by current and prospective students and the public.

The documents specifically developed for external consumption that communicate matters of quality assurance about student learning and achievement include:

- **Program reviews**, which discuss outcomes assessment results, equity gaps, and student performance data (I.C.3)
- **Annual unit plans, section plans, and division plans**, which discuss outcomes assessment, equity gaps, and student performance data (I.C.4)
- **Institution-Set Standards**, which presents student performance data (I.C.1)
- **Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiatives Targets**, which presents student performance data (I.C.17)
- **Reports to the Community**, which discuss equity gaps and student performance data (I.C.18)
- Program Learning Outcome assessment results on program pages and on the **Outcomes Assessment site**, which presents outcomes assessment results (I.C.5)
- **Common Measures** at the Kern Community College District (KCCD) Institutional Research (IR) Office webpage, which presents outcomes assessment results, equity gaps, and student performance data (I.C.19)
- **Elements of Student Success**, at the KCCD IR website, which presents equity gaps and student performance data (I.C.20)
- **Program Review Data** by department and program, at the KCCD IR website, which present student performance data (I.C.21)

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard. The institution collects assessment data on student achievement and student learning, and makes determinations regarding their meaning. The institution makes its data and analysis public to internal and external stakeholders.
**I.C.4: The institution describes its degrees and certificates in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected student learning outcomes.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

As evidenced both in the college catalog and linked from the Degrees and Certificates page, all programs at Cerro Coso Community College are described in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, academic requirements, expected learning outcomes, and general education patterns available, when appropriate.

In the college catalog, degrees and certificates are published using the catalog description, purpose, PLO’s, and required courses (I.C.8, pgs. 60-103). On the college website, degrees and certificates are described in more informal language in partitions that are phrased as questions students might ask (“What can I do with this?”). As well, on the college website are available approximate total costs, links to the most recent PLO assessment results, and the pathway to completion. If the program is eligible for federal financial aid, a link is included in the partition “How can I afford it?” (I.C.7).

The College expects course-level student learning outcomes identical to those in the course outline of record to be present in class syllabi handed out by all full- and part-time instructors, as additionally mentioned in Standard II.A.3. The College enforces this practice through a collection of syllabi by the Office of Instruction and through a syllabus review at the time of faculty evaluation (I.C.22). In addition, the first statement on which students rate faculty on the evaluation survey is “instructor’s syllabus explains course objectives and grading criteria” (I.C.23).

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this Standard. The institution clearly describes its certificates and degrees in its catalog. Student learning outcomes are included in descriptions of courses and programs. All course syllabi include student learning outcomes. The institution has processes in place to verify that all students receive a syllabus, including student learning outcomes, for each course.

**I.C.5: The institution regularly reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations of its mission, programs, and services.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Because Cerro Coso Community College is part of a multi-college district, a large number of its institutional policies and procedures are reviewed at a district instead a college level. One of the recommendations coming out of the last comprehensive self-evaluation in 2012 was to review and update board policies on a regular basis and revise as appropriate. As evidenced in the 2015 Midterm Report to ACCJC, linked on the Accreditation site, the District established a process to evaluate one-half of the board policies in odd calendar years and to evaluate the other half in even years as described in more detail in Standard IV.C.7 (I.C.24). The College has input directly into this process through its representatives on the District Consultation Council, where that discussion takes place.
A reviewed policy or procedure might be highlighted at the College level for special discussion, such as a change in the academic freedom language that was discussed by the academic senate and College Council in fall 2016 and a change in delegation of authority to the district chancellor that was discussed by academic senate and College Council in fall 2017 (I.C.25).

In addition to this formal process of board policy review, Cerro Coso Community College personnel keeps up on changes in federal- and state-requirements that impact policy, procedures, and publications through a variety of means. Every year, employees in charge of instructional and non-instructional programs go to state-wide meetings where legislative changes are reviewed and their impact on policy and procedure discussed. The following is a typical but not exhaustive list:

- VPI attends state CIO meetings semi-annually
- VPSS attends state CSSO meetings once a year
- Vice president finances and administrative services attends ACBO semi-annually
- College human resource manager attends ACHRO annually and Title IX trainings periodically
- Campus safety manager attends the annual Campus Safety Conference
- Dean of career technical education attends CCCAOE semi-annually and the regional consortium meetings as calendar permits
- Athletic director attends Central Valley Conference meetings
- Curriculum chair and curriculum technician attend ASCCC curriculum institutes, especially when new to the position

Employees attend a variety of workshops on programs with strong policy implications, like the recent guided pathways trainings, workshops on AB705 and accelerated curriculum, and strong workforce regional meetings. In addition, the VPI participates on CCCCCO advisory committees for distance education and educational technology and for the Online Education Initiative, and the president represents CEO’s on the California Community College Athletic Association and currently sits on the CEO Pathways Committee of the CEO leadership academy.

Finally, as indicated in more detail in Standard I.C.1, keeping information in college publications clear, accurate, and reliable prompts regular review and updating, such as the annual publishing of the college catalog and the semester-by-semester revision of college webpages at the individual department and unit level.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard. The institution reviews and evaluates its policies, procedures, and publications on a regular basis. The institution has clear structures and processes for conducting these reviews.
**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

As mentioned above in Standard I.C.4, Cerro Coso Community College provides students and the public with information about degrees and certificates on the college website. One of the sections of information in the program pages is “How can I afford it?” which provides students with the expected number of semesters for completion, the number of units in the program, the cost per unit, the total cost of tuition and fees, approximate costs of textbooks, and the total cost for completing the program. This is done for both residents and non-residents (I.C.26). If the program is eligible for financial aid, a link at the bottom of the partition prompts students to visit the financial aid website and fill out a FAFSA. If the program is not eligible for financial aid, a note in that location says so.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard. The institution publishes information on the total cost of education, including tuition, fees, and other required expenses, including textbooks and other instructional materials.

---

**I.C.7: In order to assure the academic integrity of the teaching-learning process, the institution uses and makes public governing board-adopted policies on academic freedom and responsibility. These policies make clear the institution’s commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge, and its support for an atmosphere in which intellectual freedom exists for all constituencies, including faculty and students.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Principles of academic freedom are contained in the KCCD Board Policy Manual in the faculty contract article 4A Academic Freedom and in policy 4B11 Controversial Issues in Curriculum (I.C.27).

The board policy language and faculty contract can be viewed any time online. A hard copy of the faculty contract is also available upon request by any faculty member. The faculty contract was last revised in summer 2017. The academic freedom language in board policy was last reviewed by District Consultation Council in fall 2016 as part of its regular review of board policy as mentioned in Standard I.C.5 above. District Consultation Council includes faculty and student representation.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard. Governing board policies on academic freedom and responsibility have been reviewed by appropriate constituency groups with opportunity to provide feedback. These policies are regularly reviewed by the governing board. Policies are published in easily accessible locations.
I.C.8: The institution establishes and publishes clear policies and procedures that promote honesty, responsibility, and integrity. These policies apply to all constituencies and include specifics relative to each, including student behavior, academic honesty, and the consequences for dishonesty.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Expectations for student honesty are stated in the KCCD Board Policy Manual policy 4F Student Conduct, item 11, and procedure 4F7D Definitions of Plagiarism and Cheating (I.C.28).

Board procedure 4B3 Distance Education, states faculty responsibility in selecting and incorporating some combination of student authentication strategies in the online environment (I.C.16). This addresses federal regulations that colleges have processes in place that verify that the student who registers in a course or program is the same one who participates in and completes it and receives the academic credit. In addition, the Cerro Coso Community College faculty online handbook, Faculty 411, contains an entry on Academic Honesty and states the expectation of faculty to report instances of cheating and plagiarism (I.C.29).

Expectations of academic honesty are clearly communicated to students. As mentioned above in Standard I.C.2, the college catalog is posted online, as are the student conduct policies and procedures and the plagiarism policy (I.C.8, pg. 34-35). In addition, plagiarism and cheating are discussed in onground orientations run at all campus locations and in the online orientation available to any student to view at any time (I.C.30). Avoiding plagiarism is a specific student learning outcome of English C101, Freshman Composition and ENGL C102, Critical Thinking Through Literature courses, which are required of all students completing degrees and/or becoming transfer-prepared (I.C.31). It is also an outcome of LIBR C100, Introduction to Library Research and Bibliography required of students completing the local general education pattern (I.C.32). In addition, many faculty include expectations of academic honesty on course syllabi (I.C.33).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution has board approved policies on student academic honesty and student behavior, which are clearly communicated to current and future students. The institution has board approved policies on the faculty’s responsibility on academic honesty and integrity.

I.C.9: Faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views in a discipline. They present data and information fairly and objectively.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

That faculty shall distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views, and that they shall present data and information fairly and objectively are captured in the KCCD Board Policy Manual in the faculty contract article 4A Academic Freedom and in policy 4B11 Controversial Issues in Curriculum (I.C.27).
The faculty evaluation process permits students to rate the degree to which they believe the instructor grades them in a fair and consistent manner (I.C.23). Students who feel an instructor is not fair also have recourse to the student complaint procedure or the grade change procedure (I.C.34).

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this standard. There is a clear expectation that faculty distinguish between personal conviction and professionally accepted views.

---

**I.C.10: Institutions that require conformity to specific codes of conduct of staff, faculty, administrators, or students, or that seek to instill specific beliefs or worldviews, give clear prior notice of such policies, including statements in the catalog and/or appropriate faculty or student handbooks.**

---

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

As a public institution, Cerro Coso does not advocate specific beliefs or worldviews, although the KCCD Board Policy Manual policy 7E Code of Ethics expresses moral, ethical, and spiritual values that are the guiding principles of the institution (I.C.35).

**Analysis and Evaluation**

This Standard does not apply to Cerro Coso Community College.

---

**I.C.11: Institutions operating in foreign locations operate in conformity with the Standards and applicable Commission policies for all students. Institutions must have authorization from the Commission to operate in a foreign location.**

---

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Cerro Coso Community College does not offer any educational or support programs in any foreign locations.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

This Standard does not apply.

---

**I.C.12: The institution agrees to comply with Eligibility Requirements, Accrediting Standards, Commission policies, guidelines, and requirements for public disclosure, institutional reporting, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. When directed to act by the Commission, the institution responds to meet requirements within a time period set by the Commission. It discloses information required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities.**

---

**Evidence of Meeting the Standards**

Cerro Coso Community College complies with all policies, guidelines, and requirements of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. The College addressed all recommendations that came out of the last comprehensive self-evaluation in 2012 directly,
forthrightly, and in the time frames indicated, as evidenced in the 2013 Follow-Up Report and 2014 Follow-Up Report (I.C.36). The 2015 Midterm Report was filed in October 2015 as required by Commission policy and accepted with no further action (I.C.37).

The College has been busy with substantive change proposals, filing over 15 proposals since 2012 (I.C.38). All of these were approved by the Commission, including the proposal in May 2016 to establish programs at two new campus locations, Tehachapi and California City Correctional Facility. The Tehachapi proposal required a site visit, which was carried out in January 2017. The last inquiries about substantive change took place over emails in December 2017 and January 2018 with the result that no proposals were required to be submitted (I.C.39).

Finally, the College has submitted all Annual Reports to the Commission and all special reports as requested, such as the SLO Status Report in 2012 (I.C.40). All documents and correspondence with the Commission are posted on the Accreditation section of the college website.

Cerro Coso Community College complies with all guidelines and requirements for public disclosure:

- The College’s accredited status, on the Accreditation site and in the college catalog (I.C.10, I.C.8, pg. 2).
- Results of the last accreditation review, on the Accreditation site (I.C.10)
- Information about the College’s Accreditors, including the ACCJC and any other specialized or programmatic accrediting bodies and state, tribal, or other authorizing bodies, on the college website and in the college catalog (I.C.41)
- Contact information for filing complaints with ACCJC and with California’s Community College Chancellor’s Office, on the Accreditation site and in the college catalog (I.C.10, I.C.8, pg. 38)
- Information about the current evaluation visit to the institution, on the college website (to be posted prior to the team visit)
- Information about institutional effectiveness in achieving mission, in a variety of places on the college website as described in Standard I.B.8 (I.C.17)

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The institution communicates matters of educational quality and institutional effectiveness to the public. The institution ensures that communications on educational quality and institutional effectiveness are clear and accurate. The institution can demonstrate that it consistently meets all reporting deadlines to the Commission.

During this self-evaluation process, it was discovered that while the College had its external accreditors and approving agencies named in the college catalog, it did not have the names on the college website or the contact information for complaints either in catalog or on the website, as required by Commission policy. These oversights have been rectified as evidenced above.
**I.C.13: The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies, including compliance with regulations and statutes. It describes itself in consistent terms to all of its accrediting agencies and communicates any changes in its accredited status to the Commission, students, and the public.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Cerro Coso Community College complies with all guidelines and regulations in its relationships with the following external agencies:

- Licensed Vocational Nursing is approved by the Board of Vocational Nursing and Psychiatric Technicians (BVNPT) for the state of California. At the time of the writing of this self-evaluation report, the IWV and ESCC Bishop campus sites received approval in 2017 until 2021. The KRV campus site was last approved in 2014 and is due by the end of the year (I.C.42).
- Police Academies, law enforcement perishable skills classes, and continuous professional training courses are approved by the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training, according to California Penal Code 832 and the POST Administrative Manual. All courses are separately approved for delivery by POST to assure that they meet minimum curriculum and course hours and to certify all special topics instructors in accordance with the POST Administrative Manual section 1070. Program audits may be performed at any time without prior notice by POST (I.C.43).
- The Private Security program is approved by the Bureau of Security and Investigative Services. BSIS reviewed the program in 2017 and certified that it met or exceeded minimum curriculum and course hours. Program audits may be performed at any time without prior notice by BSIS.
- The Emergency Medical Technology program is approved by the Kern County Department of Public Health, Emergency Medical Services Division (15-4001). EMS reviews past, current, and proposed course content to confirm it meets or exceeds minimum curriculum and course/clinical hours, clinical provider contracts, and compliance with California state EMS law, Title 22, chapter 9. The program was last reviewed in 2015 and found to be in compliance. Program audits may be performed at any time without prior notice by EMS (I.C.44).

The following individual courses are also authorized by external agencies. All authorizations are current.

- HCRS C055 Certified Nursing Assistant: California Department of Public Health
- HCRS C057 Home Health Aide: California Department of Public Health
- HCRS C075 Principles of Intravenous Therapy and Blood Withdrawal: BVNPT

In intercollegiate athletics, Cerro Coso Community College competes within the Central Valley Conference (CVC) of the California Community College Athletics Association. Membership in the CVC requires the College to maintain compliance in all areas of student-athlete eligibility, gender equity, decorum policy, responsible scheduling, and maintaining high standards of ethics and integrity as an athletic program. As a member institution, it agrees to abide by and maintain compliance to gender equity, responsible scheduling, and all aspects of the governing
constitution and bylaws that define student-athlete eligibility, decorum, and legislative processes. The College also adheres to individual sport supplements that outline member expectations. The athletic director attends monthly meetings and the annual conference to keep up on all issues of compliance and member expectations (I.C.45).

Finally, the College demonstrates honesty and integrity in its dealings with the Department of Education (DOE). Findings from a 2012 audit communicated to the College in spring 2015 were immediately addressed, and a resulting closeout letter was received in fall 2017 (I.C.46). Moreover, the College complies with all DOE regulations for disclosure and public notifications and maintains a Consumer Information page linked from the Financial Aid site with information from FERPA Rights to the Drug and Alcohol Abuse Prevention Program (I.C.47).

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard. The institution’s communications with external agencies are clear and accurate. The institution complies with the USDE’s regulation on public notifications.

---

**I.C.14: The institution ensures that its commitment to high quality education, student achievement and student learning are paramount to other objectives such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.**

---

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

As a California Community College, Cerro Coso Community College does not generate returns for investors or contribute to a related or parent organization or support external interests.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

This Standard does not apply.

**Changes and Plans Arising out of the Self-Evaluation Process**

**Changes**

I.C.12: During this self-evaluation process, it was discovered that while the College had its external accreditors and approving agencies named in the college catalog, it did not have the names on the college website or the contact information for complaints as required by Commission policy. The oversights have been rectified as evidenced above.

**List of Evidence for I.C**

- **I.C.1** Our Mission and Guiding Principles page
- **I.C.2** Sample mission statement locations
- **I.C.3** Program Review main page
- **I.C.4** Integrated Planning page
- **I.C.5** PLO page in Outcomes Assessment and sample PLO reports on program pages
- **I.C.6** 2017 College Report Card, pgs. 22-31
- **I.C.7** Sample program pages
| I.C.8 | 2018-2019 Cerro Coso Community College Catalog |
| I.C.9 | Library and LAC main pages |
| I.C.10 | Accreditation main page |
| I.C.11 | Catalog page |
| I.C.12 | BOT agenda April 11, 2017 showing catalog approval |
| I.C.13 | Sample catalog addenda |
| I.C.14 | CC-Online programs on college website |
| I.C.15 | Sample program pathways showing distance education courses |
| I.C.16 | KCCD board procedure 4B3 |
| I.C.17 | IEPI targets page |
| I.C.18 | Report to the Community page |
| I.C.19 | Common Measures page at KCCD IR |
| I.C.20 | Elements of Student Success page at KCCD IR |
| I.C.21 | Program Review Data page at KCCD IR |
| I.C.22 | Syllabus folders on G drive and Faculty eval forms B and C showing materials review |
| I.C.23 | Student evaluation survey |
| I.C.24 | 2015 Midterm Report, pgs. 24-25 |
| I.C.25 | College Council meeting minutes 10/6/2016, 10/19/2017 and academic senate meeting agenda 10/19/2017 showing board policy review discussions |
| I.C.26 | Sample “How do I afford it?” cost charts on program pages |
| I.C.27 | Faculty contract 4A and KCCD Board Policy 4B11 |
| I.C.28 | KCCD Board Policy 4F, item 11, and Procedure 4F7D |
| I.C.29 | Faculty 411 entry on Academic Honesty |
| I.C.30 | Online orientation materials showing plagiarism and cheating information |
| I.C.31 | COR’s of ENGL C101 and ENGL C102 |
| I.C.32 | COR of LIBR C100 |
| I.C.33 | Samples of syllabi with plagiarism and cheating statements |
| I.C.34 | Student complaint procedure and written request for a grade change procedure |
| I.C.35 | KCCD Board Policy 7E |
| I.C.36 | Letters from ACCJC accepting 2013 and 2014 Follow Up Reports |
| I.C.37 | Letter accepting 2015 Midterm Report |
| I.C.38 | Substantive Change Proposal page on Accreditation site |
| I.C.39 | Emails from ACCJC in December 2017 and January 2018 requiring no substantive change proposals |
| I.C.40 | Other Reports page on Accreditation site |
| I.C.41 | Sample notification of external agencies on program pages |
| I.C.42 | Letters of recent BVNPT approvals for LVN program |
| I.C.43 | Letters of recent POST approvals for academies and in-service courses |
| I.C.44 | Letter of recent Kern County Health approval for EMT program |
| I.C.45 | Meeting agendas/minutes/materials from athletics meetings |
| I.C.46 | Department of Education Closeout Letter, September 25, 2017 |
| I.C.47 | Consumer Information page |
Standard II

Standard II.A: Instructional Programs

Instructional Programs

II.A.1: All instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education, are offered in fields of study consistent with the institution’s mission, are appropriate to higher education, and culminate in student attainment of identified student learning outcomes, and achievement of degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education programs. (ER 9 and ER 11).

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Cerro Coso Community College offers four associate in arts degrees, twelve associate in science degrees, six associate in arts degrees for transfer (AA-T’s), four associate in science degrees for transfer (AS-T’s), 23 certificates of achievement, and two local job skills certificates, as published in the most recent College Catalog (II.A.1). At the time of the writing of this self-evaluation report in spring 2018, one additional program, Nutrition and Dietetics, is awaiting review at the California Community College Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO). As is consistent with Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, all programs 12 units and over have been recommended for approval by the college curriculum committee, formally approved by the governing board, and accepted by the CCCCO. All the programs 12 units and over in the catalog and on the college website appear on the CCCCO’s official curriculum inventory (II.A.2).

Aligning with the college mission, all program offerings lead to degree or certificates in widely recognized fields of study and are either transfer or workforce in nature. All new programs are evaluated by the curriculum committee on their purpose, program learning outcomes, course requirements, and need as demonstrated in the program proposal (II.A.3). Established programs are periodically reviewed for integrity and relation to the mission through the program review process. The program review template requires departments to state how the program’s mission and goals support those of the College (II.A.4). By far, the overwhelming majority of course offerings are directly related to programs by being a core course, a required elective, or a restricted elective. The College maintains very few stand-alone courses that are not part of a degree or certificate, and those it does offer—GED-prep, supervised tutoring, college success, and career planning—are directly related to helping students complete educational goals.

Career technical education (CTE) programs convene advisory committees and use labor market data, advisory committee input, the results of the most recent environmental scan, and patterns of student demand to determine the need for new programs and relation to the mission (II.A.5). All new CTE programs also obtain regional consortium review and comment (II.A.6). New programs in the liberal arts and sciences (LAS) arise from discussion among faculty members, input from counseling services, and review of trends in the field. All new transfer programs
created in LAS in the last five years have been associate degrees for transfer (ADT’s) modeled on the state-wide transfer model curriculum. All new programs offered required to be submitted for substantive change have been approved by ACCJC and posted to the College’s Substantive Change Proposals page (II.A.7).

The College offers a number of degrees and certificates through distance education (DE) in fulfillment of its mission to provide transfer and workforce opportunities to the rural communities and unincorporated areas of its service area. While the College adheres to the regulatory requirement to separately approve courses for online delivery, it does not have a separate formal process for approving DE delivery of programs. It has been the academic senate’s philosophy that since programs are the completion of a sequence of individual courses, any particular program is viable to be proposed in DE mode if its individual courses are approved for DE delivery. Going into the 2018-19 academic year, the College offers 21 degrees and 19 certificates 100% in DE mode and another seven degrees and two certificates in 50% DE or more. All DE programs offered at the College have been approved by ACCJC through substantive change proposals (II.A.7).

All courses and programs at the College are assessed by a variety of methods, including student learning outcomes (SLO’s), program learning outcomes (PLO’s), and program review. CTE programs utilizing federal Perkins funding are also assessed annually on five core indicators that include technical skill attainment, completions, persistence and transfer, employment, and non-traditional student participation and success. All CTE programs utilizing Perkins funding are required to complete a program review analysis every two years (II.A.8). The assessment of outcomes— including the process, documents, and improvements—is explained in more detail in Standard I.B.2 and Standard II.A.3. The assessment of programs through program review— including the criteria of relevance, appropriateness, currency, student achievement (including outcomes), and future needs and plans—is explained in more detail in Standard I.B.5 and Standard II.A.16.

At an institutional level, the College’s sustained, substantive and collegial dialogue about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement is described at length in Standard I.B.1.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. All course and program offerings align with the stated mission of the institution. The institution assesses whether students progress through and complete degrees and certificates, gain employment, and/or transfer to four-year institutions. The institution evaluates student progress and outcomes and uses results for course and program improvements for all locations and means of delivery. All programs are assessed for currency, appropriateness within higher education, teaching and learning strategies, and student learning outcomes.
II.A.2: Faculty, including full time, part time, and adjunct faculty, regularly engage in ensuring that the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations. In exercising collective ownership over the design and improvement of the learning experience, faculty conduct systematic and inclusive program review, using student achievement data, in order to continuously improve instructional courses and programs, thereby ensuring program currency, improving teaching and learning strategies, and promoting student success.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Faculty have the first and foremost role in all curriculum decisions. Course and program creation, revision, inactivation, and deletion is vested in the college’s curriculum committee, the Curriculum and Instruction Council (CIC), as described in the College’s curriculum handbook linked from the CIC site (II.A.9). Guided by California Education Code and the Code of Regulations Title 5, the Kern Community College District (KCCD) board of trustees has chosen to “rely primarily upon” the advice and judgment of the Cerro Coso Community College Academic Senate in all curriculum decisions (II.A.10).

Faculty engage in intentional dialogue about course and program design and improvement in a number of venues. In addition to participating in the college-wide dialogue described in Standard I.B.1, faculty exercise collective ownership of the learning experience primarily through the curriculum process, learning outcomes assessment, program review, and flex day activities. In the curriculum process, faculty ensure that content and methods of instruction meet accepted academic and professional standards and expectations. Course outlines of record (COR’s) adhere to requirements in Title 5 and are modeled on the state-wide academic senate’s best practices for COR’s. This includes basic course information, unit and hour standards, program and general education applicability, student learning outcomes, course content, methods of evaluation, methods of instruction, required text and materials, and minimum qualifications of instructors (II.A.11). The same course outline and process are used for collegiate, developmental, pre-collegiate, non-credit, and CTE courses. Program proposals at Cerro Coso Community College require the same fields required by and described in the CCCCO’s Program and Course Approval Handbook (PCAH) (II.A.3).

Course and program proposals are generally initiated by full-time faculty although part-time faculty are invited to participate, mostly through email or in-person department meetings or discussion boards on department Canvas sites. When a part-timer is the only content expert in a discipline or field who can properly create the course proposal, such as happened recently with certain cyber-security courses, the College has a practice of compensating the adjunct for curriculum development (II.A.12).

Curriculum is reviewed by a technical review team made up of the curriculum technician, dean, and faculty experts in outcomes assessment and articulation (II.A.13). It then passes to CIC to discuss and approve. CIC ensures that the detailed topical outline has the breadth and depth necessary for a student to achieve the stated outcomes. It ensures that courses that are transferable to UC or CSU meet the standards of the course identification numbering system (C-ID) for articulation. It ensures that appropriate higher-level cognitive domains are used and
that methods of instruction and evaluation are adequately challenging. It ensures that synthesis of 
learning is taking place by verifying the links between the SLO’s and detailed topical outline and 
between the SLO’s and methods of assessment. And it ensures that the workload is appropriate 
to the unit values and hours assigned and that the awarding of credit is consistent with accepted 
standards like the Carnegie Unit. In all these areas, CIC is guided by the PCAH, and every year it 
is trained on course and program approval in compliance with title 5 regulations (II.A.14).

Courses seeking approval for DE delivery are approved with a DE addendum, as required by 
Title 5. The DE addendum includes a rigor statement discussing instructor-student contact, 
software and equipment, accessibility, special conditions such as how one-on-one lab contact is 
to be carried out, and class size (II.A.15). In addition, the KCCD Board Policy Manual requires 
in procedure 4B3 that a faculty member teaching any course with an online component shall, in 
accordance with federal regulations, engage in regular and effective student contact and employ 
strategies to verify that the student receiving the credit is the student doing the work. The Cerro 
Coso Community College Academic Senate just recently reaffirmed these guidelines in spring 
2018 (II.A.16).

Curriculum committee dialogue is captured at each stage by the curriculum management 
system. At the time of the writing of this self-evaluation report, the College is in the middle of 
transitioning from CurricUNET to eLumen, but both systems have enabled users and reviewers 
to enter comments about questions, concerns, or suggestions that are discussed at curriculum 
meetings. While CIC meetings take place only at Ridgecrest, the committee composition requires 
at least one faculty member from an extension site, and meetings are conducted through Zoom 
(II.A.17).

In addition to curriculum review, outcomes assessment and program reviews are other avenues 
through which faculty are encouraged to monitor instructional effectiveness and dialogue about 
 improvement. Outcome results are analyzed by faculty in department meetings, two of which are 
required each semester, or through a department Canvas shell (II.A.18). The integrated planning 
process requires all departments including instructional departments to report out annually on 
outcomes assessed, targets missed, and plans for improvement. The outcomes assessment process 
college-wide is described in detail in Standard I.B.3. The outcomes assessment process in terms 
of faculty roles and specific examples of improvement that have come about through the process 
are provided directly below in Standard II.A.3.

The program review process, as a “ten plus one” issue, is entirely faculty-owned and approved, 
and the completion of the program review documents themselves is the responsibility of 
faculty chairs. It is an explicit expectation of the process that faculty chairs engage a variety 
of stakeholders so the document is not written in a vacuum: other department faculty, 
administration, and advisory committees. The program review process college-wide is described 
in detail in Standard I.B.5. The program review process in terms of faculty roles and specific 
examples of improvements that have come about through the process are provided in Standard 
II.A.16 below.

Finally, a major venue for faculty to discuss teaching methodologies and student performance 
is faculty flex days. The College has three such flex days each year: two in the fall, one in the 
spring. Each “opening day” in the fall is reserved for general sessions specifically related to the
roles of faculty and instructional improvement. The Friday flex days in the fall and in the spring are generally reserved for more focused workshops, table-top exercises, and breakout sessions (II.A.19). Every November the College additionally holds an Adjunct Professional Development Day for adjuncts and faculty chairs, and for department faculty who would like to attend. Over the last three years topics have ranged from best practices for teaching first-generation students, to keeping safe during an active shooter response to helping students stay directed, connected, and focused (II.A.20).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. Faculty are encouraged to discuss the relationship between teaching methodologies and student performance on a regular basis. Criteria used in program review include relevancy, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and planning for the future. The program review process is consistently followed for all college programs, regardless of the type of program and modality. The results of program review are used in institutional planning. Program improvements have occurred as a result of the consideration of program review.

II.A.3: The institution identifies and regularly assesses learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates, and degrees using established institutional procedures. The institution has officially approved and current course outlines that include student learning outcomes from the institutions officially approved course outline.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

As discussed in detail in Standard I.B.2, SLO assessment is crucial to Cerro Coso Community College’s mission. SLO’s are defined, assessed, and used for planning and improvement for courses, programs, general education, and the institution as a whole. Cerro Coso Community College has defined and assessed learning outcomes for all courses and programs. The term “program” includes degrees and certificates, as well as sequences or groups of courses that allow students to achieve an academic objective, such as the general education pattern, basic skills improvement to the associate level work, and the honors program.

Faculty members are central to the process for all instructional courses and programs. Within each program/department, faculty members collaboratively develop course-level SLO’s and also PLO’s using measurable action verbs to clearly identify the skills, knowledge, and abilities students will obtain upon successfully completing a course and program.

Learning outcomes reside in COR’s for courses and in program proposals for programs (II.A.3, II.A.11). PLO’s are also published in the college catalog and linked from the Outcomes Assessment site (II.A.21). As mentioned immediately above in Standard II.A.2, both SLO’s and PLO’s are evaluated and approved by the curriculum committee when curriculum is new and also when it is brought back through the committee at least once every five years for renewal. All courses in a program are mapped to program learning outcomes and also to applicable institutional outcomes (ILO’s) (II.A.22). This matrix resides in eLumen and is a useful resource for departmental dialogue about on-going program planning.
Definition and assessment of learning outcomes is a faculty-driven process. In addition to department faculty members using expertise in their discipline area to determine the most authentic methods for assessing outcomes, the SLO coordinator and Outcome Assessment Committee members are available to support faculty on writing SLO’s, PLO’s, and general educational learning outcomes (GELO’s), and determining meaningful assessment strategies. The SLO coordinator is a member of CIC and reviews all SLO’s and PLO’s during the technical review portion of a course or program proposal (II.A.23). When faculty present courses and programs in CIC, they are asked: “When was the course/program last assessed? How did the assessment results inform the SLO/PLO and ultimately the COR/Program being presented?” This not only ensures continuous monitoring of quality and consistency from identification of learning outcomes in course and program outlines through the assessment cycle, but also increases dialogue how assessment data are actively and intentionally used to improve student learning and success. The outcomes assessment process is discussed in depth in Standard I.B.2.

Pertinent to this Standard, some examples of demonstrated instructional changes and planned changes made through SLO and PLO assessment are the following.

- **English:** In English, the assessment process revealed undesired redundancies and gaps in the basic skill level courses, resulting in revision of course content and student learning outcomes, to make them articulate more effectively with each other and increase the reading and grammar emphases in both classes (II.A.24).
- **Child Development:** Based on assessment results, the Child Development Department realized that while the importance of SLO’s had been communicated to adjunct instructors, not everyone included the assessment tools in their classes. The department held a summit in spring 2015 that trained adjunct faculty on expectations and developed better assessment tools to meet everyone’s needs and more accurately capture students’ learning (II.A.25).
- **Kinesiology:** Analysis of assessment results revealed the need for a common vocabulary and consistent set of expectations across activity courses; this led to revised assessment tools and rubrics across the Kinesiology Department (II.A.26).
- **Counseling:** In Counseling, the assessment process revealed a need to develop common assessments and rubrics for COUN and PDEV courses. The counseling faculty met several times during the 2015-2016 academic year to discuss and refine assessments and instructional techniques, an outcome that helped orient new faculty to the department’s practices related to learning outcomes and create a normed assessment process for the department’s courses (II.A.27).
- **Library:** Dialogue about assessment results in LIBR C100 led the department to adopt more video instruction for complex database searching, a practice of mid-week check-ins with students to ensure supervision of lab activities, and more timely feedback (II.A.28).
- **Faculty have increasingly used assessment to identify the need to alter or refine teaching techniques or change course content. Here are examples:**
  - **SOCI C220 Perspectives on Race, Class, and Gender** (now SOCI C151), assessed in 2012-2013: “The average for questions on race, ethnicity, and gender was 72%, whereas the average for questions on social class was 55%. This suggests that we need to increase the time spent teaching this topic to make sure the concepts are fully understood” (II.A.29).
• PDEV C131 Making Transfer Easy, assessed in 2014-2015: “Students are able to identify the benefits of attending and completing degrees within each system, however struggle more with identifying the challenges. Plan to have a discussion forum so students can share their ideas regarding the benefits and challenges of completing degrees within each system. Assignment will then be given along with a rubric so that students have a better understanding of the assignment” (II.A.30).
• MATH C050 Elementary Algebra, assessed in 2015-2016: “Beginning in spring 2016, the department will require a minimum of one additional linear graphing assignment, that will need to be completed in the math lab with assistance/tutoring/advising from math lab faculty in all on-ground sections of Math C050 at IWV” (II.A.31).
• ENGL C241 American Literature I, assessed in 2016-2017: “Students achieved success on this SLO at a rate of 52%, well below the target of 70% success. The plan for improvement is to include a review of the writing process and MLA in subsequent offerings” (II.A.32).

The expectation that all full-time and part-time faculty include SLOs on syllabi is expressed in the college catalog; reiterated every semester by the vice president of instruction in beginning-of-the-semester emails; discussed in Faculty 411, the electronic faculty handbook; and modeled by sample syllabi (II.A.33). The College enforces this practice by collecting syllabi from all faculty every semester, which are reviewed by the deans, and by making the presence of SLO’s on the syllabus a checkbox during the faculty evaluation process (II.A.34).

Analysis and Evaluation

Cerro Coso Community College meets the Standard. Assessment results for learning outcomes, for all courses and programs inclusive of all modalities, are used in course and program review. All syllabi include student learning outcomes. The institution has structures in place to verify all students receive a course syllabus.

II.A.4: If the institution offers pre-collegiate level curriculum, it distinguishes that curriculum from college level curriculum and directly supports students in learning the knowledge and skills necessary to advance to and succeed in college level curriculum.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Cerro Coso Community College’s catalog indicates that pre-collegiate courses are those with course numbers 49 and below and any course numbered with an S (for “supplemental”). In the catalog descriptions, pre-collegiate level courses are identified with the letter “P” for preparatory courses which do not carry degree-level credit and by inclusion in the charts of English and mathematics sequences that show their position prior to college- and transfer-level courses (II.A.35).

Until very recently, each pre-collegiate course has been on a traditional ladder of prerequisites to build the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in English and math at the college- and transfer-levels. Each pre-collegiate course has been reviewed and approved by the curriculum committee and must meet the same standards for approval, as well as undergo the same dialogue
about the relation between teaching methodologies and student performance (II.A.36). The lowest level math and English courses were never approved for DE delivery because the faculty did not believe students at that level of preparation had an equitable chance to be successful online. Aside from non-credit GED Prep and supervised tutoring courses, the College does not offer any other forms of pre-collegiate instruction—for example, English as a Second Language courses or community service classes.

Students in pre-collegiate courses on this traditional ladder are supported by math and writing labs that are established at each campus site. These labs were planned for and added in 2016 to the existing various forms of tutoring services that are available at each campus location. Faculty members and peer tutors staff the labs and are available by appointment and through drop in. Tutoring services and math and writing labs are discussed in more detail in Standard II.B.1.

However, Cerro Coso Community College has recently adapted its approach to basic skills to align with changing state law. With the passage of AB 86 in 2013 establishing the Adult Education Block Grant, the College partnered with adult schools throughout the service area to avoid duplication of effort; as a result, in 2015-2016 the College discontinued its lowest level math and English courses, MATH C020 Basic Arithmetic Skills and ENGL C030 Basic Writing Skills, referring students to the local adult schools instead.

With the passage of AB 705 in 2017 requiring recent high school graduates with transfer as a goal to be directly placed into transfer-level courses, the College has begun the process of adopting the co-requisite model for basic skills instruction. Over the last year, English and math full- and part-time faculty, together with the faculty learning center coordinator and area administrators have attended numerous workshops and trainings on accelerated learning (II.A.37). While curriculum had been developed in English to allow all students placed below ENGL C101 Freshman Composition to enter directly into ENGL C070 Introductory Composition, it has since been communicated by the CCCCO to the field that the intent of the legislation is transfer level, not college level (II.A.38). The College is therefore moving forward with intent to implement English co-requisite classes in spring 2019 and math co-requisite classes in fall 2019.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. Criteria and processes have been developed and are used for decision-making in regards to offering pre-collegiate education. The institution has a process for establishing and evaluating each type of course and program. The college has a process and criteria for determining the appropriate credit type, delivery mode, and location of its courses and programs. It communicates this information to current and prospective students. There is alignment between pre-collegiate level curriculum and college level curriculum in order to ensure clear and efficient pathways for students.
II.A.5: The institution’s degrees and programs follow practices common to American higher education, including appropriate length, breadth, depth, rigor, course sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning. The institution ensures that minimum degree requirements are 60 semester credits or equivalent at the associate level, and 120 credits or equivalent at the baccalaureate level. (ER 12)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Breadth, depth, rigor and synthesis of learning are captured in the official outlines for all courses and programs. Program proposals align with requirements by the CCCCO and require faculty to discuss PLO’s and specific assessment instruments, conditions of enrollment, course relevance, course sequencing, and a number of planning items such as enrollment, completer projections, estimated FTE faculty workload, place of program in the curriculum, similar programs in the service area, and, for CTE programs, labor market analysis, advisory committee members, and employer surveys (II.A.3, II.A.11). Prerequisites, co-requisites, and advisories help to establish appropriate rigor for courses as well as assist in course sequencing. For programs proposed to be offered 100% or 50% in DE format, the DE addendum for individual courses includes specific sections on rigor as well as effective student-instructor contact (II.A.15).

Each associate degree at Cerro Coso Community College requires a minimum of 60 semester credits. The College adheres to standards set by the PCAH and the Carnegie unit for the appropriate amount of work inside and outside the classroom. Each lecture hour requires between two hours of outside reading, writing, research, or other self-monitored activity. No outside hours are required for laboratory hours. These credit-hour calculations are aligned with accepted standards of higher education, required by the CCCCO, and hardwired in the COR template within eLumen (II.A.39).

Sequencing and time to completion are established for each program in the program pathways to enable students to reliably anticipate course offerings and complete their program of study in a timely manner, as explained in more detail immediately below in Standard II.A.6. In the CTE areas, advisory committees provide input about course sequencing, required skills, and quickest time to completion (II.A.40). This is especially important for students who receive funding from the Employment Development Department for retraining and who must complete training within two semesters. The College complies with the gainful employment legislation, reinforcing the development of program paths and course sequencing with an eye to completion of all programs (II.A.41).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution demonstrates the quality of its instruction by following practices common to American higher education and has policies and procedures in place to define these practices. The college follows established criteria to decide the breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning of each program it offers.
II.A.6: The institution schedules courses in a manner that allows students to complete certificate and degree programs within a period of time consistent with established expectations in higher education. (ER 9)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Faculty chairs, in consultation with department faculty and area deans, recommend a schedule of classes to the vice president of instruction, who is responsible for the class offerings at all campus locations. The College’s mission, student demand, block schedules at the different sites, and available resources are taken into account as the schedule is developed.

To facilitate degree and certificate completion as well as improve regular scheduling of courses, the College utilizes program pathways (II.A.42). Each pathway is a matrix showing a program’s required courses and electives over the next two-year, or four-semester, period. Program pathways are built to ensure that each program can be completed at its associated campus. Incoming students embarking on a program can know what courses are to be taken when and in what order to complete the degree or certificate within a two-year period and thus stay on track for timely completion. The benefit of pathways is their use as a de facto scheduling tool for the institution because it identifies what courses are to be scheduled in what semesters at what locations (II.A.43). Consistent with its mission to bring higher education opportunities to its rural area, Cerro Coso Community College cannot offer all classes in each of its locations every semester. Program pathways allow faculty chairs, department faculty, counselors, and administrators to be aligned on course offerings. Program pathways are available to students, staff, and faculty via the College’s internal web resources and are printed out and distributed in hardcopy to students in advisement sessions.

The College evaluates program pathways formally by tracking completions, and since the pathways went into effect in 2011-2012, the College has seen a significant rise in the number of degrees and certificates awarded—from 311 in 2011-2012 to 529 in 2016-17, a 70 percentage point increase—even while enrollments and headcounts have declined, as evidenced in the institutional data in Part B of this self-evaluation report. Informally, program pathways are revisited annually as departments undergo scheduling. Proposed changes to pathways are brought to area instructional deans by faculty chairs for discussion and analysis in the spring semesters. Recommendations for changes are forwarded to the vice president instruction for final discussion and approval.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution schedules classes in alignment with student needs and program pathways, allowing students to complete programs within a reasonable period of time. The institution uses data to evaluate the degree to which scheduling facilitates completion for their diverse students’ needs.
II.A.7: The institution effectively uses delivery modes, teaching methodologies and learning support services that reflect the diverse and changing needs of its students, in support of equity in success for all students.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

This year marks the 20th year that Cerro Coso Community College has been providing online education. As evidenced by the substantive change proposals submitted to ACCJC over the years, the College has done this as a mechanism to achieve its mission to bring higher education options to students in the widely dispersed rural communities in its service area. The College even revised its mission statement in 2013 to explicitly include DE delivery as a critical component of its identity and culture (II.A.44).

First-time online instructors are required to take the College’s in-house online training course, which covers best practices in course design, accessibility, learning theory, regular and substantive interaction, developing multimedia, authentication strategies to ensure the student doing the work is the one receiving the credit, assessment rigor, and the College's adopted learning management system, Canvas (II.A.45). Since the adoption of the Canvas in summer 2016 and changes to Section 508 in January 2017, all faculty have completed required training in Canvas and been offered numerous training opportunities in accessibility and best practices in course design in order to update their knowledge of technology and pedagogy (II.A.46). Additional articles and videos about best practices in teaching are sent to faculty throughout the semester by the DE office (II.A.47).

Student needs in the online environment are gathered in a number of ways. The Student Experience Survey that is described in Standard II.C.1 asks a handful of questions about students’ online course taking patterns and preferences, including the reasons they take online classes and how they would like to access information and services (II.A.48). In addition to the experience survey, the College also gathers needs and preferences through an online preparedness module linked to online courses that generates feedback (II.A.49). It reviews the variety of student profile, demand, and performance data described more fully in Standard I.B.1, which is split out online vs. onsite and evidenced, for example, in the Program Review Data provided to departments once a year to base their annual planning on (II.A.50). The DE department regularly generates statistics on student and faculty activity, which it shares with faculty chairs (II.A.51). When faculty are evaluated who are teaching in the online environment, deans and peers review online-specific student evaluation questions like, “The course webpages are easy to navigate” and “The instructor answered my questions in a timely manner” (II.A.52). And this year the Pedagogy and Technology Committee, the academic senate’s advisory committee for all matters relating to instructional technology, reviewed the CCCC state-wide distance education survey that was completed in 2017, comparing the College’s results to those state-wide (II.A.53).

These needs-assessments and evaluations have led to a number of changes and improvements in the ways the College serves students online, such as starting the embedded librarian project and adopting an online proctoring service, both more fully described in Standard II.B.1; creating and posting a variety of Canvas tutorials to help students get a strong start to their classes; and
increasingly adopting open educational resources (OER’s) to reduce barriers with textbook purchasing. In spring 2018, the academic senate endorsed the College entering the Online Education Initiative (OEI), and a requirement of that was adoption of OEI’s course design rubric, which details a number of strategies and best practices for developing and teaching effective online courses (II.A.54). A perennially popular breakout session at flex days is new tricks and tools in the online environment led by faculty first-adopters, such as a recent session on giving feedback by video (II.A.19).

In the traditional classroom, faculty regularly use a variety of teaching methodologies such as group activities, hands-on simulations, computer lab assignments, and online research, as evidenced by examples drawn from the methods of instruction, assignments, and methods of evaluation sections in COR’s (II.A.55). More and more faculty are responding to student learning styles through interactive technology to the point it has become a priority to get classrooms college-wide upgraded to smart classrooms, including welding labs and art studio spaces (II.A.56, pp. 5-6). Evaluation forms are distributed to students during the faculty evaluation process asking students to rate instructors on whether “Multiple instructional elements (e.g., lecture, handouts, technology) are used, if appropriate” and “When multiple instructional elements are used, they are effectively integrated” to better assess the effectiveness of this area of faculty instruction (II.A.57).

In terms of student equity, the College has spent time and effort identifying ways to better meet the needs of gap populations, particularly African-American students, Native American students, and students who are socioeconomically disadvantaged. The data gathering and dialogue surrounding student equity is described in more detail in Standard I.B.1; a variety of college-sponsored cultural awareness and outreach events is described in Standard II.C.4; and a recent food-security survey revealing that an astonishing number of Cerro Coso Community College students don’t have enough to eat is described in Standard II.C.1. In this context, the College has been increasingly offering professional development opportunities to address ways to be more culturally responsive to Native American students, to familiarize faculty with the goals and methods of the Umoja program, and to integrate more OER’s into online and onground classes—including pursuing a CCCCO grant (II.A.58).

Finally, in recent years, incarcerated students have become a focus of intentional discussion and dialogue. In spring 2017, a workshop was held for full- and part-time faculty who teach in the prisons to debrief, discuss best practices, and share ideas. In spring 2018, the academic senate recommended the creation of a new College Council subcommittee to discuss and recommend best practices for supporting inmate education (II.A.59). Instructors who teach in the prison have found they need to adapt pedagogy and course materials such as grade hand-written papers, choose open educational resources, and adjust research projects to an environment with no access to the open internet.

Analysis and Evaluation

Cerro Coso Community College meets the Standard. The institution demonstrates it understands and is meeting the needs and learning styles of its students, by identifying students by subpopulations. The institution has established multiple ways of assessing student learning. The institution has established protocols to determine the appropriate delivery modes for its diverse
student populations. Faculty regularly discuss the relationship between teaching methodologies and student performance. The College regularly evaluates the effectiveness of its delivery modes and uses results to guide improvements.

One of the professional development threads that emerged in the 2018-2019 Professional Development Resource Request Analysis was a greater emphasis on best strategies and techniques for culturally responsive teaching and learning (II.A.60). While the College has engaged on a substantial equity related dialogue over the last several years, particularly those mentioned above and in Standard I.B.1, it is now planning for broad-based systematic training at scale for instructional faculty. The resource request analysis identifies the type of strategies, person responsible (director of student equity), and funding amounts requested.

**II.A.8: The institution validates the effectiveness of department-wide course and/or program examinations, where used, including direct assessment of prior learning. The institution ensures that processes are in place to reduce test bias and enhance reliability.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The College does not use any departmental course or program examinations.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

This Standard does not apply.

**II.A.9: The institution awards course credit, degrees and certificates based on student attainment of learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education. If the institution offers courses based on clock hours, it follows Federal standards for clock-to-credit-hour conversions.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

All of Cerro Coso Community College’s degrees and certificates have defined PLO’s, as can be found in any program linked from the Degrees and Certificate page under the section “What Will I Learn?” Achievement of PLO’s is measured by the successful completion of learning outcomes in courses required of the program. As mentioned above in Standard II.A.3, the program outline of record in eLumen contains all PLO’s as well as a matrix linking PLO’s to every course listed in the program. Faculty proposers are required to map the courses, both required courses and restricted electives, to the PLO’s. This is true when new degrees and certificates are proposed and also true every time a degree and certificate comes through for revision. Since Cerro Coso Community College does not have any department or program exams, successful completion of a program is determined by successful completion of the individual courses that make up the program, all of which have undergone review for appropriateness and relevancy during the curriculum process. Dialogue exists in establishing PLO’s. The curriculum process for new and revised courses, as described more fully above in Standard II.A.2, encourages inclusive communication among faculty in the discipline, the curriculum committee, advisory committees for CTE programs, and educational administrators to ensure that the results are a collaborative effort.
The tie between SLO’s and the awarding of course-level credit is established primarily through the curriculum review process. In recommending courses for approval, the curriculum committee ensures that course topics, hours and units, methods of presentation, methods of evaluation, and out of class assignments all center around and contribute to the achievement of the course’s SLO’s, as explained more thoroughly in Standard II.A.2. In addition, the college catalog contains a clear expectation about how the evaluation of student achievement is related to specific course objectives and how the instructor will describe how grades are determined. (II.A.1, pg. 31)

Units of credit are based on the accepted norm of one unit for every 18 hours of lecture instruction. Laboratory and active participation courses assign one unit for every 54 hours. As mentioned above in Standard II.A.5, the amount of work expected of students outside the classroom is based on the Carnegie Unit: two hours of out-of-class work for each hour of lecture. This expectation is formalized in the eLumen template with a section specifically labeled “Out-of-Class Assignments” that displays an hour calculation automatically generated by how many lecture units are entered for the course (II.A.39). This value is reviewed by the curriculum committee when courses come up for creation or revision, together with the appropriateness, rigor, and relevancy of the out-of-class assignments listed.

Completion of required courses for the degree or certificate is affirmed at the time of graduation by means of two processes. The student meets with a counselor in the semester of graduation, the transcript is reviewed, and a Graduation Evaluation and Petition to Graduate application are completed (II.A.61). The application is also reviewed and affirmed by the Admissions and Records Office, which audits each student record individually to ensure all program requirements have been completed.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. Course level learning outcomes are the basis for awarding credit. The institution awards credits consistent with accepted norms in higher education. The achievement of stated programmatic learning outcomes is the basis for awarding degrees and certificates.

**II.A.10: The institution makes available to its students clearly stated transfer-of-credit policies in order to facilitate the mobility of students without penalty. In accepting transfer credits to fulfill degree requirements, the institution certifies that the expected learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable to the learning outcomes of its own courses. Where patterns of student enrollment between institutions are identified, the institution develops articulation agreements as appropriate to its mission.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Transfer of credit policies are stated in the College Catalog in the section titled Credits Transferred from Other Institutions (II.A.1, pgs. 11-14).

The process requires that a student request an evaluation of credit through counseling. The counseling staff use catalogs from other institutions, which are available in published form and electronically, to determine how the incoming classes can be used to complete Cerro Coso Community College graduation requirements. In addition, counselors rely on the ASSIST
website in order to evaluate incoming transcripts. In situations that are not clear-cut, the counseling staff requires the student to provide additional information such as a course outline and may also rely on the academic faculty to make the determination of the class’s applicability. A student who wishes to challenge the decision can appeal to the academic senate’s Petitions Committee (II.A.62).

That section of the catalog also reviews special credit situations such as advanced placement credit, credit by exam, credit through CLEP, military credit, and transfer of credit from the International Baccalaureate Diploma Program. Cerro Coso Community College participates as a Servicemember’s Opportunity College to minimize the loss of credit and avoid duplication of course work (II.A.1, pgs. 43-44).

In terms of transferring credits out, the college catalog has a section on transfer that covers such topics as general education options, associate degrees for transfer, ASSIST, C-ID, and transferring to UC’s, CSU’s, and independent colleges and universities. The College also maintains a comprehensive electronic Transfer Center on its website linking to transfer policies and practices, including a FAQ (II.A.63).

Transfer-of-credit practices are reviewed yearly during the annual compiling of the college catalog. In addition, the college articulation officer participates in the state-wide articulation officer listserv, and the counseling director in the transfer center directors’ listserv to keep up on any changes in this area.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution has approved policies and procedures to address the transfer of classes from and to other institutions, and these policies and procedures are clearly communicated to students. Transfer of coursework policies and procedures are regularly reviewed. The institution has developed, implemented, and evaluated articulation agreements with institutions where patterns of students enrollment have been identified.

II.A.11: The institution includes in all of its programs, student learning outcomes appropriate to the program level in communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, and ability to engage diverse perspectives, and other program-specific learning outcomes.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

As noted in Standard I.B.3, the College recently adopted revised institutional learning outcomes (ILO’s) in 2016 on the recommendation of a task force convened for the purpose of looking at a number of institutional effectiveness measures. The four ILO’s in the areas of communication, information competency, critical thinking, and citizenship, match up with the components of this standard as indicated in the following chart. Every degree and certificate program is required to map to all four of these outcomes (II.A.22) in addition to having its own program-specific PLO’s as required in the curriculum approval process. The ILO recommendations were sent to the college president in April 2016 (II.A.64) and discussed and endorsed through a variety of governance groups. ILO’s are made available to students in the College Catalog (II.A.1, pg. 2):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ILO’s</th>
<th>Sample behaviors</th>
<th>Competencies Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Communication. Students who are completing a program will be able to communicate ideas, perspectives, and values clearly and persuasively while listening to others openly. | Present knowledge orally, visually, or in writing; identify audience and purpose for particular communications; support ideas, perspectives, and values with reasons and evidence; understand and articulate other perspectives on a particular topic; Engage in effective cross-cultural communication | • Communication  
• Ability to engage diverse perspectives |
| Information Competency. Students who are completing a program will be able to access, evaluate, and effectively use information. | State a research question, problem, or issue; analyze and evaluate information; evaluate information and its sources critically and incorporate selected information into one’s own knowledge base; understand the economic, legal, ethical and social issues related to using information. | • Information Competency |
| Critical Thinking. Students who are completing a program will be able to think critically and creatively and apply reasoning. | Reason effectively; think systematically; make informed judgments; problem solve; synthesize; conduct research; articulate one’s own assumptions and those of others; articulate awareness of personal biases and perspectives; demonstrate new ways of doing things based on self-reflection of previous experiences; transform concepts into praxis | • Analytic Inquiry Skills  
• Quantitative competency |
| Citizenship. Students who are completing a program will be prepared to engage in responsible citizenship at various levels. | Demonstrate social perceptiveness, including respect, empathy, cultural awareness, and sensitivity to diversity; understand ethics and ethical inquiry; use effective interpersonal skills; articulate an awareness of social and cultural competencies; articulate an awareness of environmental competencies. | • Ethical Reasoning  
• Ability to engage diverse perspectives |

**Analysis and Evaluation**

Cerro Coso Community College meets the Standard. The institution has adopted programmatic learning outcomes in communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, the ability to engage diverse perspectives, and other program-specific learning outcomes.
While the College believes it meets the Standard in having these requirements, it recognizes that it has not had the chance to systematically assess the new ILO’s. However, two of the necessary components to do this are now in place: every degree and certificate has been mapped to each of the four outcomes, and this mapping has been loaded into eLumen. Once the SLO and PLO results begin to populate in eLumen through department assessment activity, it will be possible to run reports to generate ILO assessments. The Outcomes Assessment Committee expects this to take two years to create enough data in eLumen to make the report meaningful. Results will be reviewed by the Outcomes Assessment Committee, IEC, and the Student Success and Support Council, and the academic senate.

II.A.12: The institution requires of all of its degree programs a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy for both associate and baccalaureate degrees that is clearly stated in its catalog. The institution, relying on faculty expertise, determines the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education curriculum, based upon student learning outcomes and competencies appropriate to the degree level. The learning outcomes include a student’s preparation for and acceptance of responsible participation in civil society, skills for lifelong learning and application of learning, and a broad comprehension of the development of knowledge, practice, and interpretive approaches in the arts and humanities, the sciences, mathematics, and social sciences. (ER 12)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Cerro Coso Community College adheres closely to the requirements for general education (GE) curriculum as stated in Title 5 Regulations § 55063. Faculty have developed a GE philosophy for the College’s local GE requirements that addresses the components of this Standard and that is communicated to prospective and current students in the College Catalog (II.A.1, pgs. 41–42).

Consistent with community colleges across the state, Cerro Coso Community College allows students to choose one of three GE patterns—the local Cerro Coso pattern, the CSU-Breadth, and the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC)—for all degrees except for the associate degrees for transfer, for which students can choose only the CSU-Breadth or IGETC (II.A.1, pgs. 46–51). Faculty determine what courses are in the GE patterns. When a course with GE potential is brought forward to the curriculum committee, faculty proposers work closely with the articulation officer and other technical reviewers as appropriate, such as the SLO coordinator, to determine the appropriate GE category assignment. Discussion ensues in CIC, and newly proposed courses that are accepted for GE articulation with UC’s and CSU’s are listed in the GE charts of the catalog and their catalog descriptions provided with a code (II.A.35).

GE learning outcomes, or GELO’s, are defined for the local Cerro Coso pattern. GELO’s are assessed very similarly to ILO’s: individual course SLO’s are mapped to GELO’s and the whole gathered and assessed periodically. The last program review of the GE program was in 2013 (II.A.65).
Analysis and Evaluation

Cerro Coso meets this Standard. The institution has a faculty developed rationale for general education that serves as the basis for inclusion of courses in general education and is listed in the catalog. The institution has a general education philosophy, which reflects its degree requirements.

Although neither the Standard nor the criteria for evaluation mention assessment, Cerro Coso Community College believes this is an area it can improve for institutional effectiveness. GELO assessment has been in something of a holding pattern since the last program review, largely because the SLO’s were too zealously mapped—often all SLO’s of a course were mapped to a GELO, which vastly increased the difficulty of gathering the assessments when multiplied by dozens of courses. As it is with ILO’s as described in the previous section, the College is looking forward to the capabilities of eLumen to run reports at regular intervals based on data accruing in the system semester by semester and class by class. It will not only vastly simplify the data gathering but make the results more complete and meaningful. A plan and timeline will be addressed in the next program review, due spring 2019.

II.A.13: All degree programs include focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core. The identification of specialized courses in an area of inquiry or interdisciplinary core is based upon student learning outcomes and competencies, and include mastery, at the appropriate degree level, of key theories and practices within the field of study.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

All associate degrees at Cerro Coso require satisfactory completion of at least 18 semester units in a specific area of study. For all non-liberal arts degrees, these 18 units are required in a specific major. For the liberal arts degrees, they are required in an area of emphasis (II.A.1, pgs. 55-103).

All degrees are modeled on recognized competencies and key theories and practices in the field. In the area of workforce training, CTE degrees are developed out of model curriculum, advisory committee input, or both. Associate degrees for transfer are based on transfer model curriculum. This captures the vast majority of degrees at Cerro Coso Community College. Of the remaining degrees, General Sciences is comprised of widely recognized sequences of courses in the areas of biology, chemistry, and physical sciences, and the three liberal arts degrees are comprised of an established interdisciplinary core in science and math, arts and humanities, and social and behavioral sciences. All programs require mastery of outcomes, as described above in Standard II.A.9.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. All programs includes a focused study on one area of inquiry or discipline and includes key theories and practices appropriate for the certificate of achievement or associate’s degree level.
II.A.14: Graduates completing career-technical certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards and other applicable standards and preparation for external licensure and certification.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Cerro Coso Community College prepares students to enter the workforce based on industry standards and requirements including those occupations that require licensure or certification. The College has the following courses and programs which require external licensure following completion: Administration of Justice (Police Academy), Emergency Medical Technology, Certified Nursing Assistant, and Licensed Vocational Nursing, as listed in detail in Standard I.C.13. Licensure exam rates are made public as part of the College’s Institution-set Standards. For those occupations that do not require external licensure or certification, demonstration of technical and professional competencies is based on successful completion of CTE programs. Core employment competencies in program-level student learning outcomes are assessed through such means as certifications, capstone projects, and portfolios and assessed as part of the college’s program review process (II.A.66). Job employment rates are made public as part of the institution-set standards.

Additional evaluation tools include the CCCCO Scorecard, Perkins/Vocational and Technical Education Act (VTEA) Core Indicator reports, CTE Launchboard data and internal data reports (II.A.67). As mentioned in Standard II.A.1, all CTE programs are subject to biennial program reviews as part of CCCCO and Perkins/VTEA requirements (II.A.8). All CTE programs are reviewed each spring as part of the Perkins/VTEA annual application process to identify areas where the programs are below state negotiated levels for core indicators. These areas are then used as a focus for planning and the utilization of the following year’s Perkins/VTEA funding to address these areas; each year progress toward these goals is addressed in the Perkins/VTEA final report submission (II.A.68).

Students demonstrate their technical and professional competencies outside the College when they are employed in industry. CTE programs consistently meet with advisory boards twice a year to ensure that technical and professional competencies meet employment and standards pertinent to their fields. During these bi-annual meetings, employers routinely report back on the preparation of graduates from the programs and of students interning in their areas (II.A.69).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution verifies and maintains currency of employment opportunities and other external factors in all of its career-technical disciplines. The institution determines competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes based upon faculty expertise and input from industry representatives.
II.A.15: When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the institution makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

As demonstrated in the KCCD Board Policy Manual, 4B6 Program Discontinuance is the College’s official policy statement on program elimination (II.A.70). The Cerro Coso Community College Academic Senate has an official program discontinuance practice that was last reviewed and revised in 2012 (II.A.71). Program elimination language is also included in the College Catalog (II.A.1, pg. 55).

The senate’s discontinuance practice addresses student impact and the need for a planned teach-out of students in the program. This is the preferred practice and happened when the Engineering program was discontinued in 2016. The last classes were still offered despite fewer than five students enrolled. When a program is eliminated suddenly or courses cannot be offered, students are called individually and afforded individualized solutions. In spring 2018, as the College is currently planning to discontinue its Industrial Technology program because it cannot continue to offer the requisite machining courses, a counselor and educational advisor are working with the CTE dean and the department to permit the small number of students still in the pipeline to substitute classes from other local programs. In the meantime, counselors and educational advisors are actively advising students into other degrees and certificates. The program is scheduled to be officially deleted in the fall semester.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution has established procedures regarding program elimination, including the process for which enrolled students will be able to complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption. Program elimination procedure is clearly communicated to students.

During the self-evaluation process, the College realized that it did not have program elimination information clearly conveyed to students. While it has had a long-standing process, as described above, the process was not posted anywhere on the college website or integrated into the college catalog. These oversights have been addressed.

II.A.16: The institution regularly evaluates and improves the quality and currency of all instructional programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, pre-collegiate, career-technical, and continuing and community education courses and programs, regardless of delivery mode or location. The institution systematically strives to improve programs and courses to enhance learning outcomes and achievement for students.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The program review process college-wide is described in detail in Standard I.B.5. This once-every-five-year process includes all instructional programs mentioned in the Standard: collegiate, pre-collegiate, CTE, and continuing ed and community ed programs inclusive of all delivery modes and locations (II.A.72).
Faculty members and faculty expertise is central to instructional program reviews. As noted in Standard II.A.2 above, faculty chairs are the persons responsible for completing program reviews and are expected to engage a department faculty and educational administrators in the review process. Intentional dialogue around program reviews include the Program Review Committee, as mentioned in more detail in Standard I.B.1 and Standard I.B.5. Pertinent here is that the composition of the Program Review Committee is majority faculty members representing a variety of perspectives—five to seven from at least four different departments and at least one faculty member with a primary assignment at an extension site. The Program Review chair is always a faculty member with reassigned time who also sits on Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) and the Outcomes Assessment Committee.

As noted in Standard I.B.5, the instructional template for program review is divided into five areas—relevance, appropriateness, currency, outcomes assessment, and action plans—and requires the systematic analysis of data, including disaggregated data. Instructional program reviews are expected to analyze student demand, patterns of course offerings, student performance, student achievement, Perkins core indicators (for CTE), labor market information (CTE), and assessment of student learning outcomes.

Following approval by the Program Review Committee, instructional program reviews are presented to the academic senate, which votes to accept them on a two-thirds vote. They are then presented at College Council as a communication out to the internal community, and the completed review is posted online. As mentioned previously, PLO results are extracted and posted to the program pages and to the Outcomes Assessment site (II.A.21).

As described more fully in Standard I.B.5, the program review results are linked directly to outcomes assessment and to institutional planning, where departments and units report out every year on progress made on program review goals.

For the purposes of this Standard, some examples of demonstrated instructional and programmatic changes made through program review are the following.

- Since 2015, the Honors Program has been working with instructional departments to revise COR’s to make ENGL C070 Introductory Composition a prerequisite for honors classes, to address the goal to establish “consistent prerequisites” in the 2015 Honors Program Review. To date, 17 of 20 classes have been revised. (II.A.73).
- Starting in 2015, the Visual and Performing Arts Department has developed online studio classes, including ART C121 Drawing I (2015) and ART C111 2-D Design (2017), to address the goal of “developing and deploying specific online course offerings” in the 2012 Art Program Review. (II.A.74).
- In 2017, the Math Department revised course outlines of record to distinguish between c-id course objectives and SLO’s and to better align detailed topical outline with c-id descriptors, as well as created a department Canvas shell to house SLO artifacts and results for discussion—all addressing the goal to “define an improved SLO assessment process” in the 2016 Mathematics AS-T Program Review. (II.A.75).
- In 2017, the Public Service Department developed a pre-academy orientation course as a best practice to prepare recruits for the rigorous physical nature and strenuous academic requirements of the academy and stem a 33% average attrition for an intensive
academy, to address the goal “Improve student access, retention, and success” in the 2011 Administration of Justice Program Review. (II.A.76).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The College has a process to regularly evaluate the effectiveness of its courses and programs. The criteria used in program review include relevancy, appropriateness, and achievement of student learning outcomes, currency, and planning for the future. The program review process is consistently followed for all college programs, regardless of the type of program (collegiate, developmental, etc.). The results of program evaluation are used in institutional planning. Changes/improvements in programs have occurred as a result of the consideration of program evaluations and are evaluated for their effectiveness.

Changes and Plans Arising out of the Self-Evaluation Process

Changes

II.A.15: During the self-evaluation process, the College realized that it did not have program elimination information clearly conveyed to students. While it has had a long-standing process, as described above, the process was not posted anywhere on the college website or integrated into the college catalog. These oversights have been addressed.

Future Action Plans

II.A.7: Plan and run broad-based systematic training at scale for instructional faculty on culturally responsive teaching and learning. Timeline: 2018-2019 academic year and forward. Person responsible: Director of Student Equity.

II.A.11: Pending full implementation of eLumen, complete a cycle of assessment for the newly revised ILO's. Timeline: Spring 2020. Person responsible: Vice President, Instruction. Results will be reviewed by the Outcomes Assessment Committee, IEC, the Student Success and Support Council, and the academic senate. (Note: same action plan listed in I.B.6.)

List of Evidence

II.A.1 2018-19 Cerro Coso Community College Catalog
II.A.2 List of active programs on CCCC0 Inventory
II.A.3 Sample recent program proposals from C-NET
II.A.4 Program Review template showing connection to mission
II.A.5 Sample CTE new program proposals showing labor market and advisory committee information
II.A.6 CTE regional consortium approval
II.A.7 Substantive Change Proposals page on Accreditation site
II.A.8 2018 2-year CTE program reviews
II.A.9 2017-2018 Curriculum Handbook
II.A.10 KCCD Board Policy Table of Governance Processes, section 4
II.A.11 Sample COR's
II.A.12 Assignment sheet for part-time faculty member showing curriculum development
II.A.13 eLumen workflow
II.A.14 Curriculum committee training materials
II.A.15 Sample DE Addendum
II.A.16 KCCD board procedure 4B3 and AS meeting minutes February 15, 2018 showing vote to approve modified REC guidelines
II.A.17 AS by-laws for CIC showing non-IWV participation
II.A.18 Sample department meeting minutes showing outcomes dialogue
II.A.19 Recent flex day agendas
II.A.20 Recent adjunct professional development day agendas
II.A.21 PLO page on Outcomes Assessment site and sample PLO Assessment reports
II.A.22 Sample matrix mapping of SLO’s to PLO’s and SLO’s to ILO’s in eLumen
II.A.23 Sample SLO Coordinator feedback on COR’s
II.A.24 2015-2016 English and Foreign Languages AUP, pgs. 3-5
II.A.25 2015-2016 Child Development AUP, pg. 3
II.A.26 2015-2016 Kinesiology and Health Science AUP, pg. 3
II.A.27 2017-2018 Counseling AUP, pgs. 1-3
II.A.28 2017-2018 Library AUP, pg. 2
II.A.29 2014-2015 Social Science AUP, pgs. 3-4
II.A.30 2017-2018 Counseling AUP, pg. 6
II.A.31 2016-2017 Mathematics AUP, pg. 2
II.A.32 2018-2019 English and Foreign Languages AUP, pg. 3
II.A.33 Faculty 411 entry on syllabus and sample syllabi showing SLO’s
II.A.34 Syllabus folders on G drive and Faculty eval forms B and C showing materials review
II.A.35 Course Numbering section of catalog, English and math sequence charts, pages 104, 41-42
II.A.36 Sample COR’s of basic skills courses
II.A.37 Agendas/materials from accelerated conferences
II.A.38 ENGL C070S COR
II.A.39 eLumen template showing lecture, activity, and lab hour sections
II.A.40 Sample advisory committee meeting minutes showing input into curriculum design
II.A.41 Sample gainful employment postings
II.A.42 Sample program pathways
II.A.43 Long-term schedule
II.A.44 Substantive Change Proposal to change the mission statement
II.A.45 Online training syllabus/materials
II.A.46 Materials associated with 2016 Canvas training
II.A.47 Sample DE lunch-and-learns
II.A.48 Sample online-related questions form the Student Experience Survey
II.A.49 Data from online preparedness module
II.A.50 Sample Program Review Data showing online vs. onsite
II.A.51 DE Department statistics
II.A.52 Student evaluation forms for online classes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II.A.53</th>
<th>Pedagogy and Technology Committee meeting minutes, April 6, 2018 showing discussion of CCCCO DE survey results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.A.54</td>
<td>Senate proposal to adopt OEI course design rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.55</td>
<td>Sample COR’s showing variety of assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.56</td>
<td>2016-2017 Information Technology Program Review showing smart room upgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.57</td>
<td>Student evaluation forms for onsite classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.58</td>
<td>OER grant materials and reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.59</td>
<td>College Council meeting agenda April 19 showing incarcerated student committee item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.60</td>
<td>2018-2019 Professional Development Resource Request Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.61</td>
<td>Graduation Evaluation forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.62</td>
<td>Sample Academic Petitions Committee minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.63</td>
<td>Transfer Center page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.64</td>
<td>ILO and ISS Task Force Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.65</td>
<td>2013 General Education Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.66</td>
<td>Sample CTE program reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.67</td>
<td>Sample CTE evaluation tools: Scorecard, VTEA CI reports, Launchboard data, AUP data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.68</td>
<td>Sample VTEA planning and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.69</td>
<td>Sample advisory committee minutes showing employers’ assessment of grads’ preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.70</td>
<td>KCCD Board Policy 4B6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.71</td>
<td>CCCC AS Program Discontinuance Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.72</td>
<td>Program Review page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.73</td>
<td>2015 Honors Program Review and sample honors COR’s showing English 70 as prerequisite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.74</td>
<td>2012 Art Program Review and Cognos report showing online studio class offerings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.75</td>
<td>2016 Math Program Review and canvas shell to house SLO artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.A.76</td>
<td>2011 Administration of Justice Program Review and COR for C140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard II.B: Library and Learning Support Services

Library and Learning Support Services

II.B.1: The institution supports student learning and achievement by providing library and other learning support services to students and to personnel responsible for student learning and support. These services are sufficient in quantity, currency, depth, and variety to support educational programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education. Learning support services include, but are not limited to, library collections, tutoring, learning centers, computer laboratories, learning technology, and ongoing instruction for users of library and other learning support services.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Cerro Coso Community College's Learning Resource Center (LRC) provides several campus learning support services to support student success, including computer labs. It is composed organizationally of two units: the library and learning assistance center.

Library Collections

The primary goal of the Cerro Coso Community College Library is to provide “a well-rounded resource collection of high quality materials which primarily supports the instructional programs of Cerro Coso Community College at all sites” (II.B.1, pg. 4). The collection at the main LRC at the Ridgecrest Indian Wells Valley campus (IWV) consists of 27,329 print volumes, 28,245 eBooks, 629 catalogued reserve items, one print periodical subscription, and over 1,260 audiovisual resources (II.B.2). All library eResources are accessible from networked computers on any of the College’s campuses as well as through the web to students and staff with a current ID number. The main campus library has 10 laptops and five iPads for checkout to students, increasing access to collections and technology in the library, and also for checkout to instructional faculty to optimize powerful applications such as the Human Anatomy Atlas.

Although the library maintains services at the Eastern Sierra College Center (ESCC) at both Bishop and Mammoth Lakes, the Kern River Valley outreach (KRV) in Lake Isabella, the Tehachapi Education Center, and the two prisons currently served by the College, only the ESCC campus at Bishop has specifically designated library space. Bishop has 900+ volumes, including a special collection of Eastern Sierra local history/interest books. At Mammoth Lakes, students have access to leisure reading collections at the public, joint-use library, as indicated in more detail in Standard II.B.4. At the other campuses, the collections are limited by facilities to only a small reserve collection.

At all campus locations, including online, students can access 36 databases, which provide access to over 6 million full-text periodical articles, primary source materials, films, and audiovisual clips (II.B.3). The library website has been designed to help students easily find library materials in specific formats which can be accessed at any college site as well as remotely (II.B.4). In addition, the main library collection is expanded through distance delivery and interlibrary loan services. Students at the distant sites or taking classes online can request any circulating book to be delivered to their local campus, free of charge, using an online form, and the library will
process an interlibrary loan. Policies on document delivery and interlibrary loan are located on the library website (II.B.5).

Many of the library’s database subscriptions have built-in accessibility components that meet the needs of students with diverse learning styles and needs. Audio, reading level, translation, font options, and visual components are included features in most databases. In 2017, the librarians worked with the College’s distance education department to develop a Library Services page anchored to the navigation bar in every online class in the Canvas learning management system, providing an additional access point to library services and collections for students taking online classes (II.B.6).

The library collection is built and maintained in conjunction with instructional faculty. The library’s Collection Development Guidelines ensure equal support to all instructional programs and stress the importance of the faculty role in subject-specific collection development (II.B.7). Several times each semester full- and part-time faculty members are invited to recommend material through a web-entry form (II.B.8). Faculty are notified of new purchases via the “New Materials” link on the library website, the LibLink Faculty Newsletter published each semester (II.B.9), and email to specific faculty once their recommendations arrive.

In order to ensure sufficient quantity, currency, depth and variety of library resources, the library uses various metrics to inform collection development and maintenance, such as perusing review journals, using student feedback, tracking recommendations from library consortia, and viewing circulation usage statistics to make selections on new acquisitions and decisions about weeding. In addition, a librarian is a required representative on the College’s curriculum committee, ensuring that the collection can support the new curriculum. As part of the regular curriculum review process, librarians must be consulted when courses and programs are revised or proposed to ensure that adequate materials are available to support the course or program (II.B.10). Dynix Horizon, the library management system that facilitates cataloging and circulation functions, makes statistics reports available on the quantity, variety, and use of the collection (II.B.11).

The library is subject to on-going quality reviews by students and faculty as part of outcomes assessment, as explained in more detail below in Standard II.B.2. The library publishes an annual “Snapshot” linked on the library web site that provides data on library and resource services usage as well as data on additions to the library collections. This report provides insight on the quantity, quality, depth and variety of library resources (II.B.12).

Tutoring

Tutors are available online (across sites online) and at IWV, KRV, and Tehachapi (II.B.13). Peer tutoring is offered in various formats such as one-to-one, small-group, embedded, and drop-in. Tutoring has also been available at the California City Correctional Facility since spring 2017. Tutoring at ESCC has been predominantly provided by an adjunct faculty member, but starting in spring 2018, peer tutors were recruited and the campus intends to maintain three writing tutors at ESCC’s Bishop campus and one at the Mammoth Lakes campus with as much availability as possible. Instructional and LAC personnel work together to develop and maintain tutoring services. Tutors are recommended by faculty members (II.B.14). Although the College no longer
seeks College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA) certification, all peer tutors continue to be trained in accordance with CRLA guidelines (II.B.15).

Math and writing labs were established in 2015-2016 as a strategy to support basic skills students. Math and writing labs are drop-in spaces where students can study with other students and receive support from subject-matter faculty. Many faculty have made lab visits a component of coursework, fostering strong study habits and introducing students to resources on campus. These math and writing labs have been established at IWV, KR, and both ESCC sites (II.B.16). In addition, a math lab was recently established at Tehachapi while the College continues to look for a faculty member to staff a writing lab at this location.

In addition to general population tutoring, the College also supports special student populations. In fall 2016, the LAC and ACCESS programs developed study halls for ACCESS students. The LAC supports this initiative by assigning peer tutors to work with students in study hall. The ACCESS program study hall provides 6-8 hours per week of drop-in assistance to student who need support in English and math courses (II.B.17). During the 2016-2017 year, the LAC partnered with athletics to develop a study hall for student athletes that provided access to LAC services and tracked attendance (II.B.18). Athletes are required to attend 2 hours of individual time and 2 hours of team study. Athletes may fulfill their required time by visiting math and writing labs or by attending an appointment with a peer tutor.

Learning Assistance Centers

The Learning Assistance Center (LAC) aims to provide a variety of learning support services to students, traditional and distance, to promote and demonstrate learner success by teaching learning skills applicable to college environments and to future employment (II.B.13, pg. 3). It is an explicit part of the College’s mission and of the vision of the LAC to provide equitable services to students at each campus and at a distance. Although the personnel and location of services varies from campus to campus—the IWV LAC is staffed with a coordinator, an office supervisor, and an LAC technician while the LAC’s at Bishop and Mammoth Lakes are staffed with adjunct faculty members, and proctoring happens in the LAC at KR but within the general open office space at Tehachapi—all campus locations provide core LAC functions.

Online students are served through the LAC website, which is directly linked to each online course through the customized Canvas “Services” tab (II.B.19). On the tutoring and proctoring pages, students can find information about tutoring services and proctoring guidelines as well as links to online tutoring request forms for on-ground and online students as well as tutoring referral forms for faculty (II.B.20). Proctorio, an automated proctorless software, has been integrated with Canvas to allow students to take quizzes and exams from any computer with a webcam. In online classes that do not use Proctorio, the LAC has used face-to-face technologies (Cranium Café or Zoom) to proctor students in remote areas where testing facilities are not available. All learning support information is posted both in Canvas (student side and faculty side) and on the College website (II.B.21).

Computer Laboratories

The IWV campus has a mixture of open labs and instructional computer labs. Eighty-two computers dedicated for open lab use are located in the LRC along with ten checkout laptops and
four open-network student-use printers, including one color printer. IWV has two instructional computer lab classrooms as well as one lab designated for test proctoring. All these labs seat 30. In addition, the campus hosts a 30-unit laptop cart assigned to the science lab, a 30-unit laptop cart assigned to an ITV room, and a 15-unit laptop cart assigned to the nursing lab.

The ESCC Bishop campus has a computer lab classroom with 30 seats and an open LRC lab space with 15 seats, both with networked printers for student use. At ESCC Mammoth, an open computer lab has 16 available seats, a combination computer lab and classroom has 30 seats, and both have networked printers for student use. The KRV campus has one open lab in the LAC with 10 available seats, a seven-seat proctoring lab, a 25-unit laptop cart that is used for instruction, and a networked printer for student use. At the East Kern office located at Edwards Air Force Base, there are five computers and a printer for student use. At the Tehachapi site there is an eight seat lab and a printer. The College does not currently provide any computers or instructional technology to either of the prison facilities.

All computer laboratories use a LAN for internet access, printing, user authentication, and access to local campus resources. The LAN includes both wired and wireless access. The computer hardware in all college open and classroom labs across the college are part of a standard suite recommended by the College’s Technology Resource Team. The computers are replaced every seven years as part of the College’s hardware replacement plan described in Standard III.C.2. The computers are up to date and have the latest instructional software that is identified each semester through faculty requests (II.B.22).

Classroom Learning Technology

Cerro Coso Community College maintains three types of technology-enhanced classrooms. Basic presentation rooms contain a ceiling mounted projector, a computer with internet connectivity, a pull-down screen and/or whiteboard, and desktop audio. Smart classrooms have all the same equipment as a basic room but upgraded with short-throw interactive projectors, a document camera, DVD/VCR, overhead sound, and a podium with touch panel Exton controls and switching equipment. Some of these rooms also include large ceiling mounted displays to provide enhanced visibility.

And iTV classrooms utilize Polycom codecs and controllers with AMX touch panels. They contain ceiling hanging microphones and two cameras for the instructor and the students. Monitors and/or projectors are positioned at the front and rear of the classrooms. At the front of each room is a podium with a DVD/VCR player, computer, and document camera. All iTV classrooms have telephone and data connections. Multi-site interactive classes are controlled by a video bridge with scheduling software from Polycom. All iTV classroom equipment including the bridge gets the latest software updates as they are released. All equipment is covered by a full maintenance contract that includes on-site service (II.B.23). This maintenance contract is paid for by and housed at the KCCD District Office and is renewed every year.

The East Kern Tehachapi campus, which the College leases rather than owns, is equipped with portable multimedia carts that can be transported to any standard classroom.
Library Instruction

In addition to providing quality resources and materials, the library staff also engages in instructional programming at several points of service. Library instruction orientations are available at all sites, excluding the prisons, and are taught by full-time librarians and adjunct librarians. Faculty are encouraged to schedule these sessions in which they collaborate with the librarians on hands-on research activities to teach students how to use the library and to promote information literacy (II.B.24).

The College offers the course LIBR C100, Introduction to Library Research and Bibliography, a 2-unit graduation requirement for the local Associate degree that teaches students skills like identifying and developing a research topic, finding and accessing information in a variety of formats, evaluating information sources, and properly documenting sources (II.B.25). The course is currently offered at the KRV and IWV campus locations, as well as online each semester.

Because almost half of the College’s enrollments have been historically online, the library has developed an embedded librarian program, in which librarians join online classes as co-instructors to moderate discussion forums, research activities, answer reference questions, curate reading lists, create citation and research tutorials, and assess student learning and program outcomes (II.B.26). For developing this innovative program, library staff was recognized with the national John and Suanne Roueche Excellence Award in 2014 (II.B.27). Online students are also served through synchronous technologies that have recently been added to the existing 24/7 “Ask A Librarian” service, in which designated librarians provide regularly scheduled reference services to students at the ESCC campuses in the absence of on-site librarian coverage (II.B.28).

In addition to being a portal for accessing the 24/7 catalog and database collections, the library website features citation guides and links to learn about policies, procedures, and library staff. The website features a 24/7 “Chat with a Librarian” widget on the library web page, a service that expands library reference services to all students regardless of location. Reference questions can be submitted and answered via chat with a live librarian, or students can choose to email or phone the librarian with a reference question.

For the College’s two prison facilities, the challenge of providing equitable library resources and services is being tackled by in-person orientations, printed guides, and “old-school” reference assistance: librarians printing out articles and sending materials on topics requested by students using a reference form (II.B.29).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this standard. Instructional and library resources personnel work together to develop and maintain appropriate library resources. The institution assesses the effectiveness of its own library and learning support services in terms of quantity, quality, depth and variety. The institution has an established evaluation process to determine it has sufficient depth and variety of library materials, including technology support, to meet the learning needs of its students. All campus locations, all types of students, and all college instructional programs are equally supported by library services and accessibility.
Going forward, the College will continue to find ways to serve the rapidly expanding inmate education program and to standardize LRC services across all college sites. The non-electronic format of prison instruction and the inability to use the open internet and library databases for research have required adjustment on the part of library and support staff that is ongoing. In spring 2018, the academic senate passed a resolution to propose the creation of a standing advisory committee to College Council on incarcerated student education. This group will be instrumental in developing operating procedures and best practices for serving incarcerated students, including learning support services.

II.B.2: Relying on appropriate expertise of faculty, including librarians and other learning support services professionals, the institution selects and maintains educational equipment and materials to support student learning and enhance the achievement of the mission.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Library

As noted directly above in Standard II.B.1 and explained there in more detail, one of the primary responsibilities of the librarians is to select materials in conjunction with instructional faculty. In addition, library staff contact textbook publishers directly to request desk copies of texts to be placed on reserve. In addition to working with faculty on selection, materials are also selected based on standard review sources, with subscriptions to full-text periodical databases being made upon recommendations from the Community College Librarian Consortium. Collections standards defined by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) and in Title 5 are also used as benchmarks by the librarians to ensure quality and depth of collections. Starting in 2015, the text reserve collection was dramatically expanded across all sites as part of a department and college initiative to address equity gaps (II.B.30). Funding continues to be allocated for this important collection, which has expanded in 2017 to include OpenStax. In 2016, the College was a recipient of a California Community College Chancellor’s Office grant to increase the number of open educational resources available to students; the grant was managed by one of the College’s librarians, who consulted extensively with faculty members to choose and adopt low- to zero-cost textbooks in 22 sections across the College (II.B.31).

Learning Assistance Centers

The proctoring lab at IWV utilizes technology to address students with disabilities, including Kurzweil 3000, Zoomtext, KeysUSee Keyboard, and Magnifier. Additionally, the proctoring lab provides access to calculators and Bose acoustic noise cancelling headsets. In the proctoring lab, NetSupport School software provides the proctor with access to testers’ monitors during exams. All student proctoring data is now collected using SARS with the exception of exams being proctored using Proctorio. Webcams are now available at each site for students who do not own computers or webcams to facilitate Proctorio exams.

Computer Labs

Each year at the end of the spring semester the College’s director of information technology sends out an email to the faculty chairs requesting software needs for the next academic year (II.B.22). This results in the development of a standard image over the intersession, which
is then replicated through all open lab and classroom lab software before the semester. This process allows for the software to be purchased, installed, and tested prior to the start of the next academic term.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this Standard. Instructional and library personnel work together to inform the selection of educational equipment and materials to support student learning. The institution has an established evaluation process to determine it has sufficient depth and variety of materials to meet the learning needs of its students.

### II.B.3: The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Both the library and the LAC are considered separate units for college evaluation and planning. Each is required to submit an annual unit plan every year as part of the College’s integrated planning cycle—linked from the Integrated Planning page—and to complete a comprehensive program review once every five years, as posted on the Program Review page.

As a college unit that straddles instruction and support services, the library regularly assesses its effectiveness through both administrative unit outcomes (AUO’s) and student learning outcomes (SLO’s). The library’s three AUO’s are assessed through a combination of student and faculty survey responses. Student satisfaction is measured through the institution’s Student Experience Survey that is administered once every two years (2013 and 2015 but not until 2018 due to a conflict with another large survey). Students are asked a series of questions about library collections, materials, learning environment, and services (II.B.32). In addition, similar questions are also distributed to faculty by the department in order to measure the same outcomes from a faculty perspective (II.B.33).

Library instruction is measured in a variety of ways. The research instruction sessions, embedded librarian sessions, and one-on-one reference transactions are assessed using short surveys, post-tests, and rubrics, as evidenced in the most recent program review (II.B.1, pgs. 32-33). Virtual reference offered via 24/7 Questionpoint platform is assessed with surveys (II.B.34).

LIBR C100 is evaluated by means of a standard set of SLO’s that are assessed on a regular cycle, results analyzed, improvements made, and the course reassessed. SLO results and analysis are reported out both in the annual unit plans (II.B.35) and in the program review (II.B.1, pgs. 34-35). And also, because LIBR C100 is a credit-bearing course, it also generates student performance data that is presented every year as part of the Program Review Data made available before the start of the annual planning cycle. This information is analyzed and reported out yearly in the annual unit plans (II.B.36).

Results of these outcome assessments are reviewed and analyzed by the department to improve teaching and by other college review committees including Outcomes Assessment and CIC to
ensure the department is striving for continuous quality improvement. The last Library Program Review was completed in spring 2018 and includes an extensive analysis of course-level and department-level outcomes assessment (II.B.1). Examples of improvements made as a result of assessment include devoting more time to teaching effective citation formatting in the LIBR C100 course and promoting iTV as an innovative modality to extending library instruction sessions to faculty teaching at our remote sites.

Learning Assistance Centers

The LAC also assesses its effectiveness through a combination of AUO’s and SLO’s. The SLO’s are associated with the only course the department now teaches, EDUC C005, GED Preparation (II.B.37). The three AUO’s were not developed until 2017, but they mirror those of the library in order to create a consistent set of measures used by the LRC as a whole (II.B.13, pgs. 16-18). Like the library, the LAC plans to assess the outcomes through both the Student Experience Survey and also a direct department- emailed survey to faculty.

In addition to these outcomes, the LAC collects data on a variety of services including student visits to learning assistance programs, courses served, and student success in the course(s) for which they have received services. Data for each learning support service (peer tutoring, faculty math and writing labs, and drop-in tutoring) is evaluated separately to determine the efficacy of each program (II.B.38). In addition, the department sends satisfaction surveys to all students who have participated in some form of LAC service to assess student attitudes toward the services and the accessibility of the service (II.B.39). Math and writing labs are also assessed quantitatively and qualitatively. Using the same method as tutoring services, data is collected and analyzed to develop understanding of student attitudes and accessibility of the service.

Beyond tracking the general population, the LAC disaggregates the data to better understand how various populations of students who use the LAC’s services are performing in their courses and their usage. This disaggregation allows the LAC to select for ACCESS programs students, ethnicities, age, economic status, etc. This process also allows the LAC to track student athlete participation in LAC services and monitor team study hall participation (II.B.38).

Assessment and evaluation data feed into the department’s annual unit plans (AUPs) and program review, linked from the Integrated Planning page and Program Review page, respectively. The last program review was completed in Spring 2016 (II.B.13). Results from this comprehensive reflection served as catalyst to multiple departmental improvements, including the recent implementation of data collection mechanisms at each campus location to measure effectiveness of learning support services across sites as well as updated course SLO assessment tools in EDUC C005 to adequately assess student learning.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution uses a variety of methods to evaluate its library and other learning support services. The evaluation assesses use, access, and relationship of the services to intended student learning. The evaluation includes input by faculty, staff and students.
II.B.4: When the institution relies on or collaborates with other institutions or other sources for library and other learning support services for its instructional programs, it documents that formal agreements exist and that such resources and services are adequate for the institution’s intended purposes, are easily accessible, and utilized. The performance of these services is evaluated on a regular basis. The institution takes responsibility for and assures the reliability of all services provided either directly or through contractual arrangement.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Library

As a member of the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC), the library participates in an interlibrary loan service, both borrowing and lending resources. The Community College Library Consortium (CCLC) provides group purchases of bibliographic databases and other services for all of California’s community colleges, including Cerro Coso Community College. Database usage is monitored by librarians through the individual platforms. The library purchases fifteen databases through the consortium. The library is also an institutional member of the Council of Chief Librarians (CCL). Database subscriptions are renewed on a biannual basis and require KCCD board of trustees’ approval (II.B.40).

Monthly statistics of interlibrary loan requests and eResource usage are collected to show the performance of these services and help in evaluating these services on a regular basis (II.B.41). Additionally, the student and faculty surveys mentioned above ask recipients to rate how well these resources are meeting student learning needs, and the regular library program reviews analyze the results of this data (II.B.1, pgs. 17 and 30).

The Kern County Law Library has established an electronic law library in the library. The Law Library underwrites subscriptions to two major legal databases as well as providing telephone reference services and a small collection of print resources (II.B.42). This partnership is reviewed by the librarians as well as subject-area faculty to ensure continued reliability and effectiveness. For example, in the last 3 years, patron usage of the Law Library legal databases declined sharply from 27 in 2015 to 2 in 2017 due to the fact that the Cerro Coso Community College Library started a subscription to LexisNexis two years ago to support the College’s paralegal program, which serves mostly online students. The small print reference collection is housed in a designated shelving unit; since those materials don’t circulate, usage data is not collected.

KCCD entered into an agreement with the Mono County Office of Education in November 2005 resulting in a joint-use library shared by the residents of Mono County and Cerro Coso Community College students attending at ESCC (II.B.43). Efforts to evaluate this partnership are undertaken by a joint-use committee, comprised of the college librarians, the Mono County public library director, the ESCC director, and the dean of instruction (II.B.44).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. Collaboration with other institutions or other sources for library and learning support services are evaluated for quality assurance, including services that are
formalized through contractual agreements. The institution gathers information to assess whether the services are being used and are effective.

The scope of the partnership with the Mono County Office of Education has changed over the years due to staffing, purpose, and collection trends. Currently, with the exception of some weekend proctoring, the joint-use library is only meeting personal enrichment needs and not the research needs of Cerro Coso students at ESCC. The College’s small academic reference collection was extensively weeded in 2015 due to a joint decision about spacing and usage. Training was provided the same year to better market the college’s eCollections to the public library patrons and to instruct library staff on assisting college students; however, the library’s collections do not support the academic programs offered at the college and the library is not staffed by an academic librarian. The partnership will be revisited in 2018-2019.

Changes and Plans Arising out of the Self-Evaluation Process

Future Action Plans

II.B.1: Develop a set of operating procedures and best practices for providing equitable library and learning assistance services to incarcerated students. Timeline: 2018-2019 academic year. Persons responsible: Dean of Letters and Sciences and Director of East Kern Center and Kern River Valley.

List of Evidence

| II.B.1   | 2018 Library Program Review |
| II.B.2   | Horizon collection snapshot from October 2017 |
| II.B.3   | Databases page |
| II.B.4   | Library main page |
| II.B.5   | Interlibrary loan page |
| II.B.6   | Canvas integration |
| II.B.7   | Library Collection Development Guidelines |
| II.B.8   | Sample invites for faculty to recommend library material |
| II.B.9   | Sample LibLink Faculty newsletters showing new material announcements |
| II.B.10  | Sample program proposals showing library fields |
| II.B.11  | Sample Dynix reports |
| II.B.12  | Sample Library Snapshot |
| II.B.13  | 2016 Learning Assistance Center Program Review |
| II.B.14  | Emails from LAC coordinator soliciting tutors |
| II.B.15  | Tutor training materials |
| II.B.16  | Announcements/emails/flyers showing math and writing labs active at campuses |
| II.B.17  | ACCESS study hall flyer |
| II.B.18  | Tracking of athletes’ study hall attendance |
| II.B.19  | LAC’s Canvas integration |
| II.B.20  | LAC tutoring and LAC proctoring pages |
| II.B.21  | LAC main page |
| II.B.22  | Sample emails of semester software requests |
| II.B.23  | Sample service contract for iTV rooms |
II.B.24 Instruction sign-up form
II.B.25 LIBR C100 COR
II.B.26 Embedded librarian materials and statistics
II.B.27 Howler news article, March 14, 2014
II.B.28 Snapshot Librarian flyer
II.B.29 Example prison research request
II.B.30 Reserve text list
II.B.31 OER grant materials
II.B.32 Library questions on Student Experience Survey and results
II.B.33 Library survey questions sent to faculty and results
II.B.34 Virtual reference evaluation survey
II.B.35 Sample recent AUP showing SLO assessment results
II.B.36 Program Review Data from KCCD IR for LIBR
II.B.37 EDUC C005 COR
II.B.38 LAC evaluation data kept by coordinator: Tutoring by mode and site
II.B.39 LAC fall survey and results
II.B.40 Most recent CCLC board action
II.B.41 Interlibrary loan and eResource usage
II.B.42 Kern County Law Library MOU
II.B.43 Joint Use Agreement with Mono County
II.B.44 Minutes of Joint-Use Committee showing efforts to evaluate the partnership

Standard II.C: Student Support Services

Student Support Services

II.C.1. The institution regularly evaluates the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education, support student learning, and enhance accomplishment of the mission of the institution.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Cerro Coso Community College is committed to ongoing evaluation of student support services.

Annual Integrated Planning

The results of student learning outcomes (SLO’s), program learning outcomes (PLO’s), and administrative learning outcomes (AUO’s) are reported annually through the integrated planning process. The annual integrated planning process begins in the fall semester with the development of annual unit plans (AUP’s), goes through a variety of review and evaluation at successive organizational levels, and culminates in the spring in a budget for the allocation of resources. In student support services, the AUP’s are coordinated by the department manager or director, who facilitates input from staff and faculty.
As explained more fully in Standard I.B.9, units completing AUP’s describe their connection to the institutional mission and align their annual unit initiatives with college strategic goals. AUP’s require an evaluation of data and analysis of gaps in equity, outcomes assessment, progress on program review goals, and progress on prior year initiatives. Student services AUP’s are reviewed and evaluated by the vice president of student services who compiles them into a student services division plan.

In the area of student support services, the following annual plans are completed:

- **Access Programs (II.C.1)**
- **Admissions and Records (II.C.2)**
- **Athletics (II.C.3)**
- **Child Development Center (II.C.4)**
- **Counseling/SSSP (II.C.5)**
- **Financial Aid (II.C.6)**
- **Student Activities/Student Government (II.C.7)**
- **Student Equity (II.C.8)**
- **Student Services Annual Division Plan (II.C.9)**

**Program Review**

In addition to its annual plan, each service area also completes a comprehensive program review once every five years (once every six years until 2013). Student services units adhere to the same systematic program review requirements as all other instructional and non-instructional units at the College, as explained in more detail in Standard I.B.5. In particular, student services program reviews analyze student achievement, SLO’s, and AUO’s, in addition to usage and satisfaction data.

The following student services departments completed program reviews in the last cycle:

- Access Programs, 2014 (II.C.10)
- Admissions and Records, 2015 (II.C.11)
- Athletics, 2018 (II.C.12)
- Counseling/SSSP, 2013 (II.C.13)
- Financial Aid, 2015 (II.C.14)
- Student Activities/Student Government, 2015 (II.C.15)

Student Equity is due to complete its first program review at the end of its first five-year cycle in 2020. Child Development Center’s was due in 2017 but is scheduled for completion in early 2018-2019. Basic Skills resides in the division of instruction instead of student services and completed its most recent program review in 2016 as described in Standard II.A.4. All completed program reviews are posted to the College’s Program Review page.

**State Chancellor’s Office Reporting**

Prior to 2017, the California Community College Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) required separate plans for the Student Success and Support Program (SSSP), Basic Skills Initiative (BSI), and Student Equity. In 2017, these reports were integrated into a single plan that is posted on the
College’s master Planning Documents page (II.C.16). The planning process required analysis of data and development of goals as well as the assessment of College’s efforts in achieving goals outlined in the 2015-16 SSSP, BSI, and student equity plans. Dialogue to develop the integrated plan took place through several multidisciplinary committees (II.C.17). Moreover, goals are integrated into the College’s AUP’s for counseling, equity, and basic skills respectively, where they inform the initiatives for the subsequent level planning documents at the section and division levels.

In addition, the College recently completed a Guided Pathways Self-Assessment for the CCCCO. This document required the College to rate itself on a set of 14 key elements in the areas of inquiry, design, and implementation—most of them in the areas of student services. The College had to place itself at one of four levels of adoption in each of the 14 areas, briefly explain why it selected this rating, describe accomplishments to date on the element, and explain challenges that hinder progress (II.C.18). A more detailed and comprehensive work plan was subsequently submitted in spring 2018 (II.C.19). It is expected that guided pathways will be a multi-year project requiring continued evaluation of progress in these 14 functional areas. As such, it has heavily influenced the College’s quality focus action projects, as discussed in more detail in Part H.

Student Learning and Achievement Data

Through the Program Review Data page posted to the Kern Community College District (KCCD) Office of Institutional Research website, student services managers have access to annual data on student learning and achievement disaggregated by student characteristics such as age, ethnicity, and gender, as well as by such factors as mode of delivery and campus location (II.C.20).

Student Experience Survey

In spring 2013 and again in spring 2015, student services conducted the Student Experience Survey as part of its ongoing evaluation of programs (II.C.21). The survey gathers essential information about students’ perceptions of their experience with student services and satisfaction with the services received. The 2015 survey saw responses from over 500 students and is a key method for generating usage and customer satisfaction levels for dialogue about how well a number of students services are meetings their outcome targets. The most recent survey was conducted in spring 2018.

Other

Additional data points specific to student services are used to evaluate and improve programs and services:

- The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) results, linked from the Survey page at the KCCD IR site, providing a clear picture of institutional practices and student behaviors that are highly correlated with student learning and retention (II.C.22)
- An annual local report of the number of students placing into each level of English and math generated out of the assessment office (II.C.23)
• Orientation surveys and mastery test outcome data (II.C.24)
• Annual reports on the number of students completing the core services of orientation, placement exam, and long-term education plans, including Data Mart report on the number of students completing assessment (II.C.25)
• Graduation exit survey that is completed annually (II.C.26)
• Results of 2017 survey on food security (II.C.27)
• Results of a guided process-mapping facilitated by the Education Advisory Board in order to find the gaps and barriers for onboarding students; this resulted in a number of practice and process changes and informed the development of the Navigate platform (II.C.28) as indicated below in Standard II.C.2.
• Results of 2017 inquiry group that delved into the RP Group’s Student Support (Re) defined study’s “Six Success Factors” to develop institutional initiatives aimed at making the student experience more connected, focused, and directed, as described in more detail in Standard I.B.1.

This information is reviewed within the annual unit planning and program review processes. It is also viewed, discussed, and analyzed by the two main steering groups in the student services areas, the Student Services Executive Committee (SSEC) and the Student Success and Support Council (often called the “SSSP Committee” or just “SSSP”). SSEC is comprised of all directors and managers in student services as well as site directors from the Eastern Sierra College Center (ESCC) and East Kern/Kern River Valley, the vice president of student services, and the vice president of instruction. The group meets twice monthly to review and coordinate services and activities provided through student services departments. Once monthly, the SSEC meeting is coordinated with the deans and directors meeting to ensure cross site collaboration and coordination. Participation by the site directors ensures that student services and instructional services are coordinated across all of the campuses. In the past academic year, the group has discussed issues such as the guided pathways self-assessment and work plan, integrated plan development, the food-security study, and the 2017 inquiry group results (II.C.29).

As described in more detail in Standard I.B.1, the SSSP Committee is the primary college participatory governance body that reviews and analyzes student access and success data to develop priorities for improving student learning and achievement. In the last academic year, the group has discussed the food-security study, CCSSE results, integrated plan development, inquiry group results, development of the quality focus essay, presentation of a data summit, among a host of other issues (II.C.30). It has also been the main group to assess the College’s guided pathways readiness and develop the work plan going forward.

Committee meetings are facilitated via teleconferencing in order to ensure that each site can participate. Since 2017, the College’s has used SharePoint to maintain agendas, minutes, forms, and other committee documents so that staff and faculty participating in these groups from any campus have access to the material at any time (II.C.31). As a participatory governance committee, SSSP agendas and minutes are posted to the Governance page on the college website.
Analysis and Evaluation

Cerro Coso Community College meets this Standard. The institution has evaluation processes in place to measure the quality of its student support services. Evaluation occurs at regular intervals. Student services programs are aligned with the institutional mission.

II.C.2: The institution identifies and assesses learning support outcomes for its student population and provides appropriate student support services and programs to achieve those outcomes. The institution uses assessment data to continuously improve student support programs and services.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

All student services programs have established SLO’s, PLO’s, and/or AUO’s. Outcomes are assessed according to an assessment plan developed and captured in the most recent program review and progress reported out annually in AUP’s during the annual integrated planning cycle (II.C.32). The College’s outcomes assessment process is explained at length in Standard I.B.2.

A number of data sets are used to generate results for SLO’s, PLO’s, and AUO’s for student services areas. These include the student learning and achievement data gathered and presented in the Program Review Data posted to the KCCD IR website, the Student Experience Survey data, and the miscellaneous reports identified in Standard II.C.1 above.

At all levels, once outcome assessments are gathered, they are analyzed by comparing results to targets, identifying gaps in performance, and developing improvement plans as necessary. Results and plans are captured in AUP’s and program review documents as appropriate (II.C.33). The analysis of specific services and activities through the use of assessment has informed decision making and the need for improvements throughout student support services. The following are examples of recent changes that have been made in student services based on the result of outcomes assessment:

- recalibrating multiple measures placement
- changing the information covered within the orientation process
- changing the questions on the mastery test for orientation
- developing a new student online orientation
- revising content on workshops and changing the questions on the pre- and post-test
- development of instructional materials for student service processes (e.g. registration)
- development of instructional videos for college processes that have posed challenges for students (e.g. How to Apply, Managing Your Schedule)
- offering of financial aid videos to assist with the financial aid process (Financial Aid TV)
- changing the follow-up process for early alert and pursuing a new early alert system
- changing probation and disqualification support services
- adopting Get Focused, Stay Focused Career Choices curriculum
- increasing the number of outreach events such as open houses, parent nights, transfer trips, career days, events with middle and high school students, and other community partners throughout the year at all sites
Outcome and other evaluation results have also driven a number of broader college initiatives and activities. Four years ago, the College began a partnership with the Educational Advisory Board (EAB) to implement the student onboarding platform Navigate that streamlines the potentially confusing process of becoming a college student. Once students apply to Cerro Coso Community College, they are brought into the Navigate platform that guides them through a process of determining their interests, selecting a major, building a long-term education plan, and registering for classes (II.C.34). Through Navigate, students are placed on a customized pathway that directs them to various resources, provides reminders and nudges, and communicates and engages with students at various points (II.C.35). Because it is an online program, Navigate is available to students at all sites and those served through distance education.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution has developed assessment methods to ascertain the effectiveness of student support services. The institution uses evaluation results to improve student services

**II.C.3: The institution assures equitable access to all of its students by providing appropriate, comprehensive, and reliable services to students regardless of service location or delivery method.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The College’s student services programs directly address the college mission by supporting students through all phases of their college experience from pre-enrollment through to completion. A number of programs specialize in more specific aspects of student support and life at the College. Services such as Admissions & Records, Financial Aid, Student Activities, Extended Opportunity Program and Services (EOPS), Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education (CARE), CalWorks, Disabled Student Programs and Services (DSPS), International Students, Foster Youth, Veteran’s Resources, and Hunger Free Campus support students’ personal needs (II.C.36, II.C.37, II.C.38, II.C.39). Counseling, Umoja, the Honors Program, support students in their academic development (II.C.40, II.C.41, II.C.42). And the Transfer Center and Job Development/Career Center services assist students as they prepare to transition to higher level academic work or the workforce (II.C.43).

Student services programs are highly coordinated across programs and campus locations, including online. Site directors are included on SSEC, which allows participation in implementing plans to increase student success at each site. As indicated above in Standard II.C.1 and in more detail in Standard IV.A.1, student services department and program meetings are conducted face-to-face, via teleconference, and by phone, which allows for participation from faculty and staff at all campus sites. Moreover, student services staffing is organized to provide student contact at all sites and online throughout the year. For example, when the ESCC and Kern River Valley (KRV) sites are closed in July, students are able to access online counseling or live phone appointments through the Ridgecrest Indian Wells Valley (IWV) campus staff.

Students are guided in the admissions process through a comprehensive Admissions and Records website and instructional videos (II.C.36). These includes detailed steps to becoming a student
at the College (II.C.44). Students complete the admissions application and update form entirely online, and staff are available at each site to assist students as needed. Admissions and records services can be completed at a distance via online information, services, and forms, and through email and telephone interaction. The forms necessary to conduct business with the College are available online in .pdf, Word, or web formats (II.C.45). Once students have completed their application, they are directed to the Navigate platform to select their major, search for classes, build schedules, register for classes, and identify resources and student support services. The College Catalog and Schedule of Classes pages are available online, so students have constant access to procedures, policies, and schedules (II.C.46).

Orientation is provided at the individual campus locations and online. The College has offered an online orientation for several years but recently worked with a vendor to create a more interactive and accessible orientation that not only fosters a cohesive understanding of the College but also highlights the unique features of each campus location (II.C.47). At the completion of the orientation, students take a quiz to assess their understanding and retention of the information provided. Students must pass the mastery test in order to complete the online orientation.

In addition to the comprehensive on-campus and online orientations, the College offers extended orientation courses:

- COUN C101 Tools for College Success
- PDEV C052 Becoming a Successful Online Student
- PDEV C100 Career Choices
- PDEV C101 Becoming a Master Student (II.C.48)

As a consequence of its increased partnerships with high schools in offering dual enrollment classes, the College has recently developed and begun offering targeted sections of PDEV C100 Career Choices that is intended for early college and career exploration and is recommended for high school freshman.

The College uses Accuplacer for assessment testing that is administered regularly at all sites. Assessment testing dates are advertised on the college Assessment page, as well as through local media; testing is also provided to local feeder high school students preparing to enroll at the College (II.C.49). Students at a distance are able to take the Accuplacer with an approved proctor who can administer the online version of the assessment in a secure environment to ensure student authentication. Once students complete Accuplacer either on campus, with a proctor, or at high school, they are able to review their results with a counselor or educational advisor who uses the same cut-scores regardless of method of assessment. Since 2015, students are highly encouraged to prepare for the Accuplacer ahead of taking the test and are given preparation materials to assist them, including sample questions if they visit a campus location (II.C.50).

In order to maximize placement, ensure equitable access for disproportionately impacted groups, and adhere to existing research protocols, the College has aligned the assessment and placement process to the recommendations from the Multiple Measures Assessment Project (MMAP) for use of evidence based measures in placement. The College has adopted both the multiple
measures and the decision trees recommended. Using these recommendations, the counseling, math, and English departments developed a Multiple Measures Guide (II.C.51).

For students intending to take online classes, Cerro Coso Community College provides a series of resources to evaluate their preparedness for learning in the online environment posted to a For Prospective Online Students page. These include videos that show faculty input regarding online classes, self-assessment tools for both student and technical skills, and an online orientation that includes information about online learning, tips for success, and support services (II.C.52). As indicated above, the College also offers the extended orientation course PDEV C052 Becoming a Successful Online Student designed to prepare new students for taking classes online.

The College offers counseling and advising services at all sites and online through its Counseling Department (II.C.40). Distance students access these services by calling to schedule a phone appointment with a counselor or advisor, or by submitting the online counseling intake form (II.C.53). Students at a distance are given equal priority in accessing counseling and advising services. Previous transcripts are emailed, mailed, or faxed for inclusion in course evaluations. Cerro Coso Community College supports several online major and career exploration tools, as well as transfer preparation information (II.C.54). Student education plans are developed as pdf documents and are sent to students’ college email accounts (II.C.55).

Financial aid staff provide direct assistance to onsite and online students through individual appointments and workshops, as well as presentations to community groups, high schools, student clubs, classes, and at campus outreach activities. The staff members work with local high schools to raise awareness about financial aid and to ensure accurate completion of the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA). Through the college Financial Aid website, students can access financial aid information and complete the applications for FAFSA, Board of Governors Fee Waiver, scholarships, and VA benefits (II.C.37). Students can also complete their FAFSA at any Cerro Coso Community College campus Learning Resource Center. Students also have access to online videos through Financial Aid TV that are available at all hours every day of the week to help answer financial aid questions. The videos include captions, and several are in Spanish (II.C.56).

Faculty are able to provide early feedback to all students using an online early alert system, which is available through the College’s web-enabled management information system (II.C.57). This is a communication tool sent directly to the student and includes concerns about the student’s performance, as well as referrals to support services. The alerts can be sent by any faculty member teaching onsite or online, and a designated counselor follows up with each student to discuss the alert and provide referrals to resources (II.C.58).

Inmate education has grown rapidly at the College in the last two years. Courses are now offered at the California City Correctional Facility in California City and the California Correctional Institution in Tehachapi, both all-male institutions. In addition to instructional support such as textbook reserves, students receive comprehensive student support services including orientation, counseling, education planning, assessment, EOPS, workshops, and guest speakers. Many services and supports have required modification and additional steps due to limitations on access. For example, all application processes are completed through paper processing, such as the admission application, assessment testing, class add and withdrawal requests, and the
application for EOPS (II.C.59). All student services staff and faculty providing services in the prison are required to participate in specific training covering prison processes and procedures, general safety practices and guidelines for interacting with incarcerated students (II.C.60). Providing equitable and effective services to incarcerated students is time intensive due to travel requirements, limitations on technology and processes for access.

When a student gets ready to graduate, all steps and required forms for the graduation application process are available online and through the counseling and admissions and records offices at each campus location (II.C.61). All students at all campus sites, including online, are invited to participate in the graduation ceremony (II.C.62). To complete the process, students are required to complete an online Graduation Exit Survey (II.C.26).

Cerro Coso Community College uses a variety of communication tools to keep its online and onsite students informed of updates regarding college policies, procedures, and activities. These include the portal system, GradGuru (an app students can opt into), Navigate and an alert system which is programmed to send messages to students via email, telephone, and text (II.C.63). Students taking online classes are required to access the course through the InsideCC portal, which also serves as a venue for communication to distance education students (II.C.64).

Professional development and training is an ongoing focus in student services. Units such as A&R, financial aid, and counseling conduct semi-monthly meetings via ITV to include all sites in training, maintaining currency and professional development topics, such as mental health, crisis management, transcript evaluation, transfer and technology enhancements (II.C.65). Twice a year, student services conducts an all-staff professional development day. The most recent was held at the Bishop campus and focused on student attrition, retention and achievement data and the application of the RP Group’s Six Success Factors (II.C.66). Unit directors participate in monthly meetings at the district level to coordinate maintaining currency, effectiveness and efficiency in process and systems shared across the district (II.C.67). Faculty and staff are heavily engaged in state and professional organization trainings and conferences—for example, directors attend appropriate professional organization and CCCCO conferences for each program annually—that they attend on a regular rotation, bringing information and training materials on return. The specific training of counselors and advising staff is described in more detail in Standard II.C.5 below.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution demonstrates that it assesses student needs for services regardless of location or mode of delivery, and allocates resources to provide for those services.

While online counseling has been improved in recent years, the College recognizes its online services should be more interactive. The disaggregated responses to recent Student Experience Surveys indicate the need for greater access through a variety of modes to counseling and advising at a distance. Comments indicated a desire for greater interactivity and personal connection. The College is working toward expanding online counseling services through the use of video-based computer programs. Additional training will be required and provided for counseling staff through these programs. The College has been actively engaged in the Online
Education Initiative (OEI) and is working toward full implementation of the standards for counseling/advising and student services. In addition to online transfer tools, the College offers transfer workshops and also a course online specifically geared for transfer (PDEV C131 Making Transfer Easy) which it may or may not keep pending evaluation.

**II.C.4: Co-curricular programs and athletics programs are suited to the institution’s mission and contribute to the social and cultural dimensions of the educational experience of its students. If the institution offers co-curricular or athletic programs, they are conducted with sound educational policy and standards of integrity. The institution has responsibility for the control of these programs, including their finances.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Cerro Coso Community College offers a variety of athletic and co-curricular programs at the main campus and other campus locations in support of the College’s mission to provide appropriate and equitable programs across its rural service area.

As captured in the most recent program review, the College engages in intercollegiate athletics primarily to enhance the education of those who participate and to provide a platform from which students can attain their highest potential (II.C.12, pg. 3). The Athletics program offered to the students at Cerro Coso Community College include men’s baseball, men’s basketball, women’s soccer, women’s softball, and women’s volleyball (II.C.68). By offering a variety of sports teams, the College is working within the compliance measures of Title IX as well as meeting the athletic interests of the community. The chosen programs of three women’s and two men’s sports offer equitable student-athlete roster opportunity for male and female competition. Each sport offered is provided as an intercollegiate class taught on ground at the Ridgecrest campus. The sports courses offered by the College are authorized by the board of trustees and meet academic standards as outlined in the official course outlines of record (II.C.69). The courses place a strong academic emphasis on proper instruction of the sport.

The College strictly adheres to compliance with the California Community College Athletic Association (CCCAA) constitution and by-laws. Designated staff and faculty in athletics, counseling, financial aid, and the Learning Assistance Center are specifically trained in compliance with CCCAA rules and in supporting the academic needs of student athletes. All staff, faculty and administration with any association with athletics complete the CCCAA compliance exam annually. Athletic eligibility according to these standards is consistently reviewed and enforced as the College provides and monitors the following support services for student athletes, including required scheduled meetings with athletic counselor and advisor, weekly eligibility checks, completion of long-term education plans, minimum two grade checks per semester, and required minimum four hours study hall per week (II.C.70).

In addition to athletics, Cerro Coso Community College offers an active and vigorous Student Activities program at all campus locations (II.C.38). The program’s purpose is to provide students with an environment in which to enhance affinity, connection, and engagement with the College, facilitate the completion of educational goals, and exercise self-governance and participate in co-curricular and extra-curricular activities (II.C.15, pg. 3).
Student Activities contributes to enriching the social and cultural dimensions of the College by arranging and promoting various speaking events and campus activities. Recent examples are Breaking Barriers motivational speaker Kathy Buckley, Ari Kohn’s Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, Leadership and Diversity speaker Odell Bizzell, Pizza and Politics, SGCC’s Thirsty Thursdays, Constitution Day, Phi Theta Kappa (PTK) discussion panels on Biological Sex vs. Gender Identity, and the movie Hidden Figures (II.C.71). Many of these activities, as well as club and monthly meetings of the Student Government of Cerro Coso (SGCC), are offered through live-streaming, interactive television, and teleconference in order to be inclusive of all college locations (II.C.72).

In addition, the Student Equity department provides opportunities for students, faculty, and staff at all locations. An application was developed to allow faculty and staff the opportunity to apply for funding for equity-related activities with appropriate learning outcomes, and regular emails go out encouraging applications (II.C.73). At ESCC, the department has supported a number of cultural outreach events for the American Indian student population including the Native American Education Summit, 5th and 8th grade College and Career Day for Inyo County, and the College and Career Motivational Day at the Bishop Indian Education Center (II.C.74). Activities at other campuses have included trips to the Manzanar Relocation Center, Olvera Street, and a student conference for the LGBTQ Summit at University of California, Riverside. Students are encouraged to participate in culturally focused professional development opportunities, including the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU) Conference, African American Male Education Network Development (A2MEND) Conference, and the California Conference on American Indian Education (II.C.75).

The College’s Student Clubs page shows the multiple club options student have for participation including Latinos Unidos, International Club, Rainbow Club, Student Services United, Phi Theta Kappa, Kinesiology Club, IWV Human Services, KRV Human Services and Community Outreach Club, and KRV Student Club (II.C.76). Each club requires an educational advisor and each abides by a treasurer’s handbook, a club constitution, and club bylaws (II.C.77). While clubs and activities are open to all students, the College follows Ed Code and the KCCD Board Policy manual article 4F2C requiring club officers to be enrolled in a minimum of 5 units and maintain a 2.0 grade point average (II.C.78).

A key component to student activities is the Student Ambassadors program, a service-learning experience for students volunteering to serve as emissaries for the College (II.C.38). By joining and becoming student ambassadors, students demonstrate their willingness to share the College’s goals and vision with visitors, new students, and the community, and in this way develop citizenship skills and an ability to engage diverse perspectives. The student ambassador program involves an application and interview process.

The Umoja program that Cerro Coso Community College launched in 2017 has a strong co-curricular component (II.C.41). A primary goal of this program is to improve success rates for African Americans and other underrepresented student populations at the College. The program engages these student populations by incorporating culturally relevant practices into the classroom and as into extracurricular activities. The students involved in the Umoja program
participate in campus events and outreach in the community, and entry into the program also requires an application and interview process.

The College is solely responsible for all fiscal matters related to the athletic and co-curricular programs including financial control, which is managed by Cerro Coso Community College’s Business Services Department. Many student and co-curricular activities are funded through the college Student Development Fund generated annually through a portion of bookstore revenues. An application process is announced each semester so faculty and staff can apply for funds to initiate activities and events, the same application used to apply for student equity funds (II.C.73). The College’s Boosters’ Program fundraises and provides supplemental funding for athletics. All funding sources comply with KCCD accounting purchasing and accounting processes, control mechanisms, and effective oversight as described in Standard III.D, particularly Standard III.D.5 and Standard III.D.10.

Student co-curricular programs and athletics programs are evaluated in the variety of ways as indicated above in Standard II.C.1 and Standard II.C.2, including program review, annual unit plans, outcomes assessment and assessment of individual events and activities. For athletics, the College additionally submits required CCCAA forms for athletic reporting, and the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) reporting is completed to ensure the college’s commitment to providing equitable opportunities in our programs (II.C.79).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution determines what co-curricular programs are appropriate to its mission and students. The institution evaluates the quality and effectiveness of its co-curricular programs on a regularly basis. The institution has policies and/or procedures in place to oversee the effective operation of athletic and co-curricular programs.

II.C.5: The institution provides counseling and/or academic advising programs to support student development and success and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function. Counseling and advising programs orient students to ensure they understand the requirements related to their programs of study and receive timely, useful, and accurate information about relevant academic requirements, including graduation and transfer policies.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The goal of the Counseling Department at the College is to provide assistance to each student in planning an academic program of studies for graduation, for transfer or for personal interest (II.C.40). The counseling staff is committed to providing quality services and meeting the changing needs of the College’s diverse student populations at all sites by continued involvement in college-wide activities, outreach programs in the community, and new strategies that focus on increasing student retention and success.

Counseling services include the core services of orientation, assessment, and student education plan development, as well as follow-up including early alert and referral. All faculty counselors are qualified to assist students with determining a career focus, choosing a major, developing long-term education plans, evaluating academic progress, and managing personal concerns.
Educational advisors provide support through academic planning, scheduling classes, initial evaluation of courses, abbreviated student education plans, advising on course placement, and outreach.

Counseling programs orient students to the requirements related to their programs of study, as well as information about academic policies, graduation requirements, and transfer information through on-campus open houses at all sites which include orientation, placement exams, course selection, and abbreviated education plans. Counselors also provide parent nights, outreach to high schools and other community partners, transfer workshops, career events, presentations on demand, and numerous other activities to support the College’s mission towards student success and completion (II.C.80).

The Counseling Department has been working diligently to expand services for students at a distance or who cannot access a campus easily. A new online intake form has been developed to streamline the intake process (II.C.53). A new online orientation was developed with participation from students, faculty, and staff and recently launched in summer 2017 (II.C.47). In addition to this more interactive online orientation for both new and returning students, the College worked with the same vendor to develop instructional videos that support students through some of the more difficult processes at the College (II.C.44). The new orientation includes slides, instructional videos, and video quizzes. The orientation reviews programs and resources offered at each campus, including the online campus. The College regularly updates the orientation to reflect current requirements.

As mentioned above in Standard II.C.2, the partnership with EAB and the implementation of the Navigate platform has enabled the College to put into place a single responsive system that takes students from the point of orientation through completion. Students are placed on a customized pathway that details each step and prompts them when to take action (II.C.35). Students are able to choose classes and use “one-click registration” through Navigate. The College advertises pertinent graduation, transfer, and academic requirements through Navigate.

To assist students in choosing classes to stay on educational plans, the College has implemented a pathway approach to all majors and programs, as described in some detail in Standard II.A.6. The courses required to meet a program are mapped out on a semester-by-semester basis in a four-semester sequence so that students know in which order to take courses (II.C.81). The College has committed to these pathways and has aligned its working long term schedule accordingly, and the pathways have been integrated into Navigate (II.C.82). This has been helpful for counselors and advisors in assisting students with education planning that is timely and accurate. Students know in which term each course is offered and the order in which they should be taking the courses for their program of study. The Student Education Plan page also includes general education patterns and major sheets (II.C.83).

There are a variety of inreach and outreach activities provided by counselors and advisors to support students’ understanding of academic programs, graduation, and transfer requirements. In the Class-to-Career program, counselors are embedded directly in instructional classes providing two to three class presentations per semester. In these workshops, counselors review career planning, long-term education plans, provide information to connect courses to a career field, and focus on college resources. These workshops are provided on-campus and online
(II.C.84) Each October, the counseling staff provide transfer awareness activities which include application workshops, transfer GPA calculation workshops, UC personal insight questions workshops, and more (II.C.85).

The sufficiency of counseling staffing is continually evaluated through the annual integrated planning process described more at length in Standard I.B.9 and Standard III.A.1. In recent years, the College has hired staff to expand services based on identified need in annual unit planning, such as an educational advisor at the ESCC to assist the counseling faculty to serve the Bishop and Mammoth campuses on alternating days (II.C.86) and a counselor, educational advisor, and A&R technician at Tehachapi to better serve the growing dual enrollment and incarcerated student populations (II.C.87). In accordance with the process described in Standard I.B.9, these staffing requests were reviewed and approved by senior management and subject to the staffing resource request analysis (II.C.88).

Counselors and educational advisors are trained during regular counseling staff meetings and professional development meetings. Staff members have the opportunity to attend annual program conferences for EOPS/CARE, DSPS, CalWORKs, SSSP, as well as conferences and workshops focused on best practices, student success, CSU and UC transfer, Basic Skills support and Veterans’ services. The director of counseling and SSSP provides training and support at all the sites through regular staff meetings to ensure that staff and faculty are trained in a uniform manner and also provides individualized training for services when necessary that may be unique to specific site locations (II.C.89). In addition, the Counseling Department invites academic departments to attend counseling staff meetings in an effort to improve communication, partnerships, and the completion of core services (II.C.90).

Analysis and Evaluation

Cerro Coso Community College meets this Standard. The institution develops, implements, and evaluates counseling and/or academic advising services. The evaluation of counseling and academic advising includes how these services enhance student development and success. The institution has structures in place to verify all pertinent information on academic requirements is accurate and disseminated in a timely manner. Professional development is provided to prepare counselors and ed advisors for their advising roles.

Since the last comprehensive evaluation in 2012, the counseling department at the College has spent considerable time and effort identifying gaps and improving the onboarding process to ensure that students have all the pertinent information they need on academic requirements. In 2013, the College became an Achieving the Dream school, in 2013 it began addressing the Student Success and Support Program, and in 2014 it began its partnership with the EAB. These initiatives have led to a number of practice and service delivery changes and informed a number of program improvements, including the development of Navigate 2.0 in 2018 with an enhanced advisor dashboard and early alert system. This will allow counselors and advisors to obtain student-specific information when they are meeting with them face-to-face, by phone, or online. The information provided through the dashboard will help counseling staff provide relevant information based on a student’s identified areas of interest, academic programs, resources requests, and much more.
II.C.6: The institution has adopted and adheres to admission policies consistent with its mission that specify the qualifications of students appropriate for its programs. The institution defines and advises students on clear pathways to complete degrees, certificate and transfer goals.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The A&R Office at Cerro Coso Community College is responsible for implementing processes that adhere to Title 5 regulations, KCCD board policy and procedures, and best practices. Admissions policies are contained in KCCD Board Policy Manual sections 4A Admissions and Registration and 4B Programs/Instruction (II.C.91).

Cerro Coso Community College admits graduates of accredited high schools, holders of CHSPE or GED certificates, and persons 18 years of age or older who are able to benefit from the College’s instructional programs. Additionally, specified criteria for special admission of students in the ninth through twelfth grades is located on the website on a Admissions for Concurrent High School Students page, attached to all concurrent enrollment forms, and provided to local area high schools and to parents and special admission students upon request (II.C.92).

In the last several years, the College has embarked on an evaluation of the student experience from first point of contact through to goal completion. As gaps and barriers have been identified, changes were implemented to improve processes for students in getting started—for example, the development of an instructional video that walks students step-by-step through the admissions process since CCCApply can be complicated and confusing (II.C.44), the development of a video that provides important information for high school students and parents about concurrent and dual enrollment (II.C.44), and the creation of onsite and online instructional forms that guide students through the process of enrollment (II.C.44, II.C.45).

Through Navigate, students are led through a process for major selection. Students first take a survey and provide information on their goals and priorities (II.C.93). This results in the student being placed into a meta-major category (interest areas). After additional input, the student receives a list of recommended majors specific to Cerro Coso Community College that map to their interest areas. With each major, the student is given key information such as number of units, time to completion, cost of completion, local employment, and income data for jobs associated with the major (II.C.94).

Once the student has declared a major, the student is placed on the pathway for their program. Students are led through a long-term education planning (LTEP) process to develop a personal pathway to complete general education and major requirements in a timely manner. While based on the program pathways described above, the LTEP is individualized for each student and is completed with a counselor either in-person, by phone, or online. In addition to outlining each class a student needs to take and when it can be taken, the LTEP incorporates transfer units and goals (II.C.95).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution has governing board approved admission policies that are consistent with its mission. The policies specify the qualifications of students
appropriate for its programs. The institution advises students on clear pathways to obtain their educational goals.

With the implementation of Navigate 2.0, counselors will have access to an advisor dashboard with the student’s pathway information. This information helps inform their education planning appointments and allows the students to be an informed participant in the process.

**II.C.7: The institution regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The College regularly evaluates its admissions instruments and practices to ensure their effectiveness and minimize bias. A student’s admission with previously earned credits is granted upon evidence of official transcripts from a regionally accredited postsecondary institution. The College’s admissions policies and practices are reviewed continually by a district-wide committee of A&R directors to ensure compliance with the state’s admissions and residency requirements (II.C.67).

Accuplacer is on the CCCCO’s list of approved instruments for placement. As noted above in Standard II.C.3, the College has aligned the assessment and placement process to the recommendations from the MMAP. As noted in Standard II.C.5, counselors and educational advisors receive regular training, on topics such as placement, and are kept up to date with changes.

The College enforces prerequisite and co-requisite requirements through the use of its database management enrollment system. Students are blocked from enrolling in courses for which they have not met the prerequisite or co-requisite requirement. The College has established procedures by which any student who does not meet a prerequisite or co-requisite or who is not permitted to enroll due to a limitation on enrollment, may seek entry into the class according to a challenge process. A student may challenge any prerequisite or co-requisite (II.C.96). Students are informed through the catalog, on a Prerequisites and Co-requisites page on the college website, and during orientation and counseling, of both the reasons for challenging a prerequisite or co-requisite and the process for doing so.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this Standard. The institution has established processes to evaluate the effectiveness of practices and tools of admissions and placement. Evaluations of placement processes are used to ensure their consistency and effectiveness.

Up to this point, student services has not been analyzing local data on the use of multiple measures. But it is ready to do so now in partnership with the College’s Office of Institutional Research together with the math and English departments. The College began collecting data to track placements in spring 2017 and has been waiting for the creation of the local IR office to begin working with the institutional researcher to evaluate that data. This data will help inform decisions about appropriateness of cut scores, placement recommendations, and the use of multiple measures.
II.C.8: The institution maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially, with provision for secure backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. The institution publishes and follows established policies for release of student records.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The College maintains and retains student records according to the guidelines of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, the American Association for Counseling and Development, the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (FERPA), Title 5, and the KCCD Board Policy Manual, particularly policy and procedures contained in section 3D3 Retention and Destruction of Records.

Electronic records and files are backed up continuously as described in Standard III.C.1, ensuring integrity of data and protection of student records. Permanent record cards and transcripts from other institutions are scanned into the College’s imaging program for staff access. The security of this imaging program is maintained through an administrative module that tracks access and is monitored by the director of admissions and records and veterans’ affairs (II.C.97). The server is located in a secure area. The scanner is located in A&R, which is secured. Access to student records is limited to the student and those employees who have the “need to know” and is managed by the district security officer. No information contained in their educational records may be released without their consent except those agencies or individuals authorized by FERPA. The district FERPA training for new employees and continuing employees in regards to the appropriate release of student records and the controls used to monitor possible violations are discussed in Standard III.C.1.

Current and former students are given the right to inspect, review, and challenge the contents of all educational records related to them. Release of student records procedures are published on the college website and in the catalog and on the college website (II.C.98).

The district committee of admissions and records directors coordinates the revision and updates to these procedures, which are consistent district-wide.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution has an established process to maintain student records permanently, securely, and confidentially, with a provision for secure backup of all files, regardless of the form in which those files are maintained. The institution publishes and follows its established policies for release of student records.

Changes and Plans Arising out of the Self-Evaluation Process

Future Action Plans

II.C.7: Complete local processes to evaluate the effectiveness of practices and tools for admissions and placement; use evaluations of placement processes to ensure their consistency and effectiveness in minimizing bias. Timeline: 2018-2019 academic year. Director of Counseling and SSSP.
**Evidence List**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II.C.1</th>
<th>2018-2019 Access Programs Annual Unit Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.C.2</td>
<td>2018-2019 Admissions and Records Program Annual Unit Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.3</td>
<td>2018-2019 Athletics Annual Unit Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.4</td>
<td>2018-2019 Child Development Center Annual Unit Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.5</td>
<td>2018-2019 Counseling/SSSP Annual Unit Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.6</td>
<td>2018-2019 Financial Aid Annual Unit Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.7</td>
<td>2018-2019 Student Activities/Student Government Annual Unit Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.8</td>
<td>2018-2019 Student Equity Annual Unit Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.9</td>
<td>2018-2019 Student Services Annual Division Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.10</td>
<td>2014 Access Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.11</td>
<td>2015 Admissions and Records Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.12</td>
<td>2018 Athletics Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.13</td>
<td>2013 Counseling Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.14</td>
<td>2015 Financial Aid Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.15</td>
<td>2015 Student Activities/Student Government Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.16</td>
<td>2018 SSSP/Equity/Basic Skills Integrated Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.17</td>
<td>Sample committee meeting minutes showing review of Integrated Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.18</td>
<td>Guided Pathways Self-Assessment, November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.19</td>
<td>Guided Pathways Work Plan, March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.20</td>
<td>Program Review Data page for student services and sample data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.21</td>
<td>Student Experience Survey Results, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.22</td>
<td>CCSSE Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.23</td>
<td>Annual report on placement results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.24</td>
<td>2018 orientation surveys and mastery test results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.25</td>
<td>Sample ODS Report showing number of students receiving core services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.26</td>
<td>Graduation Exit Survey and recent results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.27</td>
<td>Food security survey results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.28</td>
<td>EAB guided process-mapping results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.29</td>
<td>SSEC meeting minutes, October 5, November 16, February 15, March 1 showing discussions of various college initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.30</td>
<td>SSSP meeting minutes, 9/28/17, 10/4/17, 1/31, and 4/25, showing discussions of various college initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.31</td>
<td>SharePoint locations for SSEC and SSSP agendas and meeting materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.32</td>
<td>Sample outcome assessment plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.33</td>
<td>Counseling 2018-19 AUP pg. 4-5 and ACCESS PR pg. 19-20 showing gaps to be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.34</td>
<td>Sample pages of Navigate features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.35</td>
<td>Sample Navigate nudges and communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.36</td>
<td>Admissions and Records main page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.37</td>
<td>Financial Aid main page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.38</td>
<td>Campus Life main page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.39</td>
<td>Homepages for EOPS, CARE, CalWorks, DSPS, International Students, Foster Youth, Veteran’s Resources, and Hunger Free Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.40</td>
<td>Counseling main page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.41</td>
<td>Umoja main page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.42</td>
<td>Honors Program main page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.43</td>
<td>Transfer Center and Career Center main pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.44</td>
<td>Sample A&amp;R pages with videos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.45</td>
<td>Sample admissions forms in .pdf, Word, and web formats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.46</td>
<td>Catalog and Schedule of Classes pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.47</td>
<td>Orientation page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.48</td>
<td>COR’s of COUN C101, PDEV C052, PDEV C100, and PDEV C101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.49</td>
<td>Schedule of Accuplacer assessment dates; samples of promotion/advertisement of Accuplacer sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.50</td>
<td>Sample Accuplacer questions given to students who visit a campus location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.51</td>
<td>Multiple Measures Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.52</td>
<td>DE preparedness materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.53</td>
<td>Counseling Intake form for DE students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.54</td>
<td>Major and career exploration tools available to students in Navigate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.55</td>
<td>Student brief education plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.56</td>
<td>Financial Aid TV videos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.57</td>
<td>Early Alert materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.58</td>
<td>Sample Early Alert follow up referrals and emails to students and faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.59</td>
<td>Sample paper forms used with incarcerated students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.60</td>
<td>Inmate Education MOU showing required trainings; training materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.61</td>
<td>Grad eval forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.62</td>
<td>Sample invite to participate in the graduation ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.63</td>
<td>Sample communications to students through Grad Guru and Navigate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.64</td>
<td>Sample communications to students through Canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.65</td>
<td>Sample agendas of A&amp;R and counseling staff meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.66</td>
<td>Agendas and materials from all-staff day at Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.67</td>
<td>Sample monthly district-wide directors meeting minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.68</td>
<td>Homepages of each sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.69</td>
<td>COR’s of PHED C161, C171, C173, C180, and C181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.70</td>
<td>Materials showing athlete obligations listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.71</td>
<td>Sample announcements of student activities events listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.72</td>
<td>Sample announcement of events live-streamed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.73</td>
<td>Application for applying for funding-related activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.74</td>
<td>Announcements of diversity events at ESCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.75</td>
<td>Announcements/evidence of students attending culturally focused PD opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.76</td>
<td>Student Clubs page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.77</td>
<td>SGCC Treasurer Guidelines for Clubs &amp; Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.78</td>
<td>KCCD Board Policy section 4F2C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.79</td>
<td>Sample CCCAA reporting forms, Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.80</td>
<td>Material open houses, parent nights, outreach to high schools, transfer workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.81</td>
<td>Sample program pathways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.82</td>
<td>Long-term schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.C.83</td>
<td>Student Education Plan page</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II.C.84  Sample Class-to-Career materials, both onsite and online
II.C.85  Transfer Awareness month materials and activities
II.C.86  2015-2016 ESCC ASP, pgs. 6-7
II.C.87  2017-2018 EK ASP, pgs. 8-16
II.C.88  Staffing RRA’s of the years indicated in evidence 87 and 88
II.C.89  Sample agendas/minutes/materials from counseling staff meetings and other trainings
II.C.90  Samples of academic departments on counseling staff meeting agendas
II.C.91  KCCD Board Policy 4A and 4B
II.C.92  Admissions for Concurrent High School Students page
II.C.93  Navigate pages showing field of interests and choosing a major
II.C.94  Navigate pages showing results of the major selection process
II.C.95  LTEP template and sample LTEP’s
II.C.96  Requisite challenge petition
II.C.97  Material showing administrative monitoring of imaging program in A&R
II.C.98  2018-2019 Cerro Coso Community College Catalog, pgs. 5-6
Standard III

Standard III.A: Human Resources

Human Resources

**III.A.1: The institution assures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing administrators, faculty and staff who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support these programs and services. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated and address the needs of the institution in serving its student population. Job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals and accurately reflect position duties, responsibilities, and authority.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The Kern Community College District (KCCD) employs qualified administrators, faculty and staff who provide support for all programs and services in a multi-college environment. All district-wide human resources (HR) functions are administered from the KCCD district office with direct on-site HR management support services at Bakersfield College, Cerro Coso Community College, and Porterville College (**III.A.1**).

The comprehensive hiring process for all employee groups and classifications assure that hiring procedures are consistently applied. The College adheres closely to language within California Code of Regulations, Title 5, § 53021, the California State Chancellor’s Minimum Qualifications Handbook and the KCCD Board Policy Manual in the following policies:

- Article 5G – Faculty Hiring
- Article 5H – Adjunct Employment
- Article 6B – Confidential and Management Employment Policies
- California School Employee Association CSEA Contract, Article 13, section 1 – Hiring (**III.A.2**).

At the start of the hiring process, the college HR manager attends the first screening committee meeting to present information regarding the screening process, Equal Employment Opportunity requirements, and confidentiality compliance (**III.A.3**).

HR advertises positions in-house and to the public, depending on the classification. All open positions are listed on the KCCD careers website that is linked from the Cerro Coso Community College Human Resources webpage as well as the KCCD homepage (**III.A.4**). Positions are advertised in several areas with focused advertising to attract a diverse workforce (**III.A.5**). In addition to advertising in local publications, all positions are also advertised in the following places:
District HR initially verifies minimum qualifications through application documents that include cover letter, resume or curriculum vitae, and transcripts or certificates. The applicants that are moved forward as either meeting minimum qualifications or equivalency are then reviewed by a screening committee. Ratings are completed by committee members and interviewees determined based on overall rankings and qualifications. The interview process includes an oral interview and may include a skills test or a teaching demonstration.

Position criteria, minimum qualification and selection processes are defined within pre-drafted job descriptions and recruitment postings for administrative and staff positions (III.A.6). In fall 2015, district HR initiated a review of classified staff positions with strict minimum qualifications, specifically targeting positions that were difficult to fill at the colleges (III.A.7). By removing unnecessary technical requirements, applicant pools of well-qualified candidates were expanded without jeopardizing the integrity of the department and institutional need.

Faculty applicants must meet minimum qualifications published by the California Community College Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) or equivalent requirements verified through the equivalency process of the Cerro Coso Community College Academic Senate (III.A.8). As evidenced in board policy section 5G1A Philosophy, faculty candidates are evaluated on the basis of subject area knowledge, effective teaching, ability to enhance overall college effectiveness, and sensitivity to racial and cultural diversity of the district adult community (III.A.2). Steps to ensure faculty members have knowledge of their subject matter include a review of previous experience and transcripts, interviews, teaching demonstrations, and reference checks.
Hiring decisions at the college level are based on programmatic needs. All requests for new faculty, management, and staff hires are identified in planning documents. Staffing sufficiency is a required section of the comprehensive program review, which is completed on a five-year cycle (III.A.9). During the annual integrated planning cycle, unit plans (AUP’s), section plans (ASP’s), and division plans (ADP’s) further call out staffing needs between the program review cycles. As detailed more fully in Standard I.B.9, the annual integrated planning cycle is the mechanism by which departments, units, sections, and division address how well they are supporting the mission of the College, what gaps in service are in evidence, what improvement actions are planned for the upcoming year, and what resources are required. Staffing is one of those resources. In Cerro Coso Community College’s planning cycle, requests identified in lower level plans (AUP’s) are reviewed and analyzed in upper level plans (ASPs and ADPs) and either supported or not supported going forward for inclusion in the annual budget (III.A.10).

An annual staffing resource request analysis (RRA) is developed out of the planning requests which includes all faculty, classified and management positions (III.A.11). This report is shared with Administrative Cabinet and College Council and used to write justifications to fill new or refill existing positions. It is also used as justification to the college president and district chancellor should there be a need for re-organization within a particular area. It is posted together with all the other annual plans on the College’s Integrated Planning page.

Dialogue and discussion are a part of every new faculty hiring decision. Faculty position proposals from the planning cycle are reviewed by the academic senate executive council, which discusses and prioritizes them according to a ranking system. The prioritized list is presented by the academic senate president to the academic senate for further discussion (III.A.12). The final prioritized list is forwarded to the college president, who reviews the information contained in the annual unit plans, discusses the prioritization with the vice presidents, seeks additional information from faculty chairs as needed, and makes the final college recommendation to the KCCD chancellor. The chancellor makes a final determination based on a review of prioritized lists, discussions with the three college presidents, and consideration of the district’s faculty obligation number as outlined in California Code of Regulations, Title 5, § 51025 and described in more detail in Standard III.A.7 below.

Part-time faculty are hired with each new semester to fill instructional vacancies. Selections are made out of a discipline-specific pool that is maintained by faculty chairs together with HR. Part-time instructors are approved into the pools through a consultative process involving faculty, the area’s educational administrator, and HR, as described in board policy section 5H Adjunct Employment (III.A.2).

Part-time instructors teaching dual enrollment courses and in the prison setting must go through the same processes as stated above for part-time faculty although faculty in dual enrollment courses must be already employed by the high school at which the dual enrollment class is offered and faculty in the prisons must undergo an additional background check. Each is required to meet the same minimum qualifications or equivalency as outlined by the CCCCO.
Analysis and Evaluation

Cerro Coso Community College meets the Standard. The institution demonstrates that it has developed appropriate hiring criteria. The institution advertises open positions using appropriate venues to attract quality candidates. The institution demonstrates it has a process to verify the qualifications of applicants and newly hired personnel. The institution uses methods to ensure that qualifications for each position are closely matched to specific programmatic needs and that duties, responsibilities, and authority are clearly delineated. The institution demonstrates that all job descriptions are directly related to the institutional mission. The institution employs safeguards to ensure that hiring procedures are consistently followed.

**III.A.2: Faculty qualifications include knowledge of the subject matter and requisite skills for the service to be performed. Factors of qualification include appropriate degrees, professional experience, discipline expertise, level of assignment, teaching skills, scholarly activities, and potential to contribute to the mission of the institution. Faculty job descriptions include development and review of curriculum as well as assessment of learning. (ER 14)**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Faculty applicants must meet minimum qualifications published by the CCCCO or equivalent requirements verified through the equivalency process of the college academic senate. As described immediately above, minimum qualifications are verified by district HR through application documents which include cover letter, resume showing history of work experience, and transcripts.

The process for equivalency review begins with the applicant completing an Equivalency Request form. The department chair reviews the application and designates discipline experts to review the qualifications. Once the designated experts complete the review, the academic senate’s equivalency committee reviews the packet to ensure process was followed. If approved, request is signed by the equivalency committee chair and then final certification is done by the academic senate president. If the equivalency request is denied, the applicant is not moved forward in the recruitment process (III.A.8).

Faculty candidates are evaluated on the basis of subject area knowledge, effective teaching, ability to enhance overall college effectiveness, and sensitivity to racial and cultural diversity of the district adult community. Steps to ensure faculty members have knowledge of their subject matter include a review of the application, interviews, and teaching demonstrations, as described in the KCCD Board Policy Manual section 5G6 Selection Committees (III.A.2). Interview questions allow candidates to describe their experience in promoting student learning. Teaching demonstrations provide verification of skill. Per board policy 5G6A, the selection committees consist of at least a majority of faculty (III.A.2). Reference checks verify the applicants’ previous experience.

Educational verification is provided through transcripts, credentials and other evidence of minimum qualifications. Official transcripts are required of all new faculty as part of the onboarding process. Applicants with foreign transcripts are required to work with a foreign
transcript agency during the application process to provide the equivalency of foreign credentials (III.A.13).

Faculty recruitment postings detail the basic function of the position. The postings include functions unique to the discipline and language relating to curriculum and assessment of learning (III.A.6). An example of other duties include the following:

- Holding office hours;
- Maintaining subject matter currency;
- Using computer and multimedia technology for increased student engagement;
- Attending department and college meetings, and participating in institutional activities.

Examples of institutional activities are assisting with student outreach and recruitment; participating in articulation events with high schools and four-year schools as appropriate;

- Developing and maintain community connections;
- Working with department and division colleagues to address student equity gaps;
- Defining, assessing, and analyzing student learning outcomes;
- Collegially participating in departmental, college and discipline-specific professional activities.

Analysis and Evaluation

College meets the Standard. The institution demonstrates that it has a consistent process to verify that faculty selected for hire have adequate and appropriate knowledge of their subject matter. The College has a formal process for vetting credentials, and other forms of preparation, to ensure that qualified faculty are selected for hire. Checks are conducted on applications regarding the equivalency of degrees from non-U.S. institutions. All faculty job descriptions include the responsibility for curriculum oversight and student learning outcomes assessment.

III.A.3: Administrators and other employees responsible for educational programs and services possess qualifications necessary to perform duties required to sustain institutional effectiveness and academic quality.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The College is consistent with hiring processes for educational administrators and ensures selected applicants are well-qualified for institutional positions. As stated in the KCCD Board Policy Manual, policy 6B1A requires that all confidential and management employees are appointed by the board in accordance with provision of the Education Code (III.A.2). In addition, candidates for educational administrator positions must meet minimum qualifications as set forth in the California Code of Regulations, Title 5, § 53420, which requires a minimum of a Master’s Degree and one year of formal training, internship, or leadership experience reasonably related to the administrator’s administrative assignment. Job descriptions and position announcements clearly identify at least the minimum qualifications required, along with an example of duties to meet the specific criteria of the position (III.A.6).
As mentioned above, district HR initially verifies minimum qualifications through application documents which include cover letter, resume showing history of work experience, and transcripts. After minimum qualifications are verified, the application packets are forwarded to a joint screening committee. As outlined in board policy 6B3I, the committee composition includes the college president or designee as chair with an equal number of faculty and management (III.A.2). Classified staff and/or a student representative may also be involved in the screening process at the discretion of the college president.

Like with faculty, the interview process includes an oral interview as well as a presentation and may also include a skills or written test. The committee recommends finalists for second level interview with the president. In addition, reference and background checks are completed to assist in the decision-making process. After all factors are considered, the president makes the final hiring decision.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

College meets the Standard. The institution demonstrates that it has a process to determine if administrators and other employees responsible for educational programs and services possess the qualifications necessary to perform duties required to sustain institutional effectiveness and academic quality.

**III.A.4: Required degrees held by faculty, administrators and other employees are from institutions accredited by recognized U.S. accrediting agencies. Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are recognized only if equivalence has been established.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

As required by California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Section §53406C, district HR confirms that educational degrees are from accredited institutions. If foreign transcripts are included in the application packet, district HR requires that they are translated for equivalency by an established agency. This foreign transcript and equivalency requirement is posted on every recruitment announcement regardless of position classification (III.A.13).

During the recruitment process, unofficial transcripts are accepted. Upon hire, official transcripts must be submitted as part of the pre-employment process.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this Standard. The institution demonstrates that it verifies the qualifications of applicants and newly hired personnel. Degrees from non-U.S. institutions are validated for equivalency.
III.A.5: The institution assures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. The institution establishes written criteria for evaluating all personnel, including performance of assigned duties and participation in institutional responsibilities and other activities appropriate to their expertise. Evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Actions taken following evaluations are formal, timely, and documented.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Faculty evaluations are handled in accordance with procedures outlined in the KCCD Board Policy Manual in the collective bargaining agreement between KCCD and the Community College Association (CCA) (III.A.14). Article 6 addresses evaluation and tenure of full-time faculty. The intent of the evaluation process is to ensure excellent teaching standards, so the process focuses on growth, faculty service activities, objectives, and facilitation of the learning environment. The process includes classroom observation by administration and colleagues, student evaluations, instructional materials review, professional responsibilities review and, when applicable, evaluation of non-instructional assignments (III.A.15).

Probationary faculty are evaluated every year for the first four years according to the “Mode A” process. In article 6C2, the contract specifies the requirements for the evaluation packets during each year of the probationary period. In article 6C3, the evaluation ratings are explained. Should a probationary faculty receive a “needs to improve,” a remediation plan with recommendations for improvement are provided. The employee is terminated should they receive an “unsatisfactory” rating during year one (1), two (2), or four (4). In year three (3), an “unsatisfactory” rating requires a remediation plan with a developed timeline for improvement.

Tenured faculty are evaluated on a three-year cycle, using the “Mode B Brief” evaluation. As described in article 6C, a Brief evaluation is comprised of a review of the evaluation packet, student evaluations, and an administrative assessment. The portfolio contains goals, accomplishments, syllabi for the current semester, and a brief narrative summarizing assessment of student learning outcomes in classes or service area. The inclusion of a teaching philosophy is optional for Brief evaluations.

A “Mode B Comprehensive” evaluation is employed if requested by the individual faculty being evaluated or if a Brief results in a “needs to improve” rating, as described in article 6G. In addition to what is required by the Brief, the Comprehensive additionally requires peer and administrative observations. A Comprehensive evaluation moves to a “Mode B Remediation” evaluation if a Comprehensive results in a less than satisfactory rating. The Remediation evaluation may be used if deficiencies may be corrected prior to the beginning of the next semester. Otherwise, the evaluation moves to “Mode C.” As described in article 6H, the college president can call a Mode C evaluation in the event of a “needs to improve” or “unsatisfactory” rating during the Mode B Comprehensive or if the president feels circumstances justify the evaluation outside the normal cycle.

Article 7 of the CCA contract addresses part-time the evaluation, security, and seniority of adjunct faculty (III.A.16). Evaluations are to be conducted during the first semester upon hire and every three years thereafter. Ratings for “needs to improve” require recommendations for
improvement and results in a follow-up evaluation the following semester. Should an adjunct receive an “unsatisfactory” rating in any evaluation, he or she is not eligible for rehire.

Classified evaluations are completed as per the written agreement between KCCD and California School Employees Association (CSEA) (III.A.17). Evaluations are to be based on job-related criteria and conducted timely within the employment cycle (III.A.18). Article 13, Section 2 of the CSEA contract addresses the probationary period of newly hired employees. Probationary employees are evaluated at 3, 6 and 11 months, with the 11-month evaluation allowing for a final recommendation of permanency. Monthly probationary reports may be required should there be unsatisfactory performance during this time period.

Article 13, Section 3 of the CSEA contract addresses permanent employee evaluations. After passing the probationary period, the employee is evaluated annually on the employees’ anniversary date. A required component of the evaluation is goal-setting to be measured in the next cycle. Specific recommendations for improvement along with a remediation plan must be given for any areas within the evaluation that is marked less than satisfactory. At their discretion based on the nature of the “needs to improve,” supervisors may schedule off-cycle evaluations for follow up.

Board policy 6E addresses confidential and management evaluation. Confidential and management employees are evaluated annually the first two years of employment and every two years after (III.A.19). The process includes a written evaluation completed by the supervisor, an evaluation survey that includes a 360 degree input, the job description and a written self-assessment (III.A.20). Confidential and management employees are evaluated on performance of assigned duties as well as participation in institutional responsibilities. If an evaluation results in a rating of “needs to improve,” board policy provides that goals for improvement and an appropriate timeline shall be established for demonstrated improvement to occur. At the end of the timeline a follow-up evaluation shall occur.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard. The institution has a process in place to ensure that evaluations lead to improvement of job performance. The College demonstrates that performance evaluations are completed on a regular basis. Evaluation criteria accurately measure the effectiveness of personnel in performing their duties.

Evaluating instructors teaching dual enrollment classes under instructional service agreements with local-area high schools continues to be a work in progress. This is a multi-faceted issue because employed K-12 teachers have their own bargaining units and rules for evaluation. District HR and CCA have developed a taskforce to address evaluations of class rigor. A legal opinion is pending on evaluation of dual enrollment instruction as the district looks at accountability with the dual enrollment program.
III.A.7: The institution maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty, which includes full-time faculty and may include part-time and adjunct faculty, to assure the fulfillment of faculty responsibilities essential to the quality of educational programs and services to achieve institutional mission and purposes.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Faculty hiring decisions are guided by the full-time faculty obligation number (FON) as outlined in California Code of Regulations, Title 5, § 51025 and programmatic needs. The district-wide FON requirement is determined by KCCD’s chief financial officer. The FON is a district wide obligation and each college is allocated a portion. Once the FON has been calculated, the chancellor and college president discuss the college FON allotment for the next academic year. Dialogue identifies which disciplines to hire in order to meet the educational needs of the institution. As indicated in Standard III.A.1, staffing proposals from the AUP’s are put through the review process for final college recommendation. Upon finalization of the review process, the chancellor makes the final decision of the disciplines that will be put through to recruitment.

The District often sets a target that exceeds the FON obligation requirement. In fall 2016, Cerro Coso Community College’s portion of the district identified target was met, with 59 full time faculty. In fall 2017, the College’s portion of the district identified target was 60 full time faculty. Although a failed search resulted in the College successfully reaching only 59 full time faculty, the District overall still met its FON obligation. Adjunct faculty remained the same in fall 2016 and fall 2017, with 104 total each year (III.A.21, III.A.22).

Sufficiency of part-time faculty is based on scheduling for student needs. As described in more detail in Standard II.A.6, schedules at each campus location, including courses and numbers of sections, are guided by the College’s long-term schedule, which is itself guided by program pathways. When multiple sections of a class are being considered at any campus location, past enrollments and demand trends are analyzed as well as special factors such as prison cohorts.

Analysis and Evaluation

College meets the Standard. The institution demonstrates that it has the appropriate staffing levels for each program and service.

III.A.8: An institution with part time and adjunct faculty has employment policies and practices which provide for their orientation, oversight, evaluation, and professional development. The institution provides opportunities for integration of part time and adjunct faculty into the life of the institution.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Adjunct faculty are integrated into the institution in multiple ways. New adjunct instructors are added to a Microsoft Exchange distribution group to ensure they are receiving announcements and information from the college community. Per the CCA contract, linked on the KCCD Board Policy Manual page, faculty chairs are responsible for recruiting and selecting adjunct faculty as well as coordinating the department or division orientation of adjunct faculty—for example, about syllabus requirements, grade submissions, and absences and leave reporting (III.A.23).
The College also maintains an online faculty handbook called Faculty 411 with guidelines and sample documentation for new faculty, including adjuncts (III.A.24). At the beginning of each semester, the vice president of instruction sends out a series of guidelines and directions about college policies, procedures, and practices (III.A.25). In spring 2018, the new dean of letters and sciences sent out a hard copy welcome letter to all adjunct instructors in the area as well as an electronic communication connecting them to the Faculty 411 resource; this action was well received and is to be duplicated by the career technical education (CTE) area in the fall (III.A.26). Informally, adjunct instructors at sites other than the main campus are welcomed and oriented by the local site directors and campus managers.

Adjunct instructors are invited to all faculty flex day activities as well as to such ongoing professional development opportunities as “lunch-and-learns” put on by the distance education department (III.A.27). At the Eastern Sierra College Center (Bishop and Mammoth Lakes), adjunct instructors are included on the campus listserv and invited to monthly lunch-and-learns, monthly “coffee breaks” with staff and students, and the annual all-campus welcome dinner and barbeque (III.A.28). Each year the College hosts an annual adjunct professional development day dedicated to adjuncts that include faculty sharing sessions, department meetings, and service recognition (III.A.29).

Oversight for adjunct instructors is provided formally by the dean of letters and sciences for all disciplines in letters and sciences, by the CTE dean for all disciplines in CTE, and by the director of counseling and student services support programs for the disciplines of counseling and personal development. Informally, the site directors at the centers and outreaches, including the distance education director for online courses, provide local guidance, help, and assistance. As described more fully in Standard III.A.5 above, adjunct faculty are evaluated according to the CCA contract. Per the contract, adjunct faculty are encouraged to be active participants within the College (III.A.30), and recruitment pools list collegial participation in department and college and discipline-specific professional activities as duties of the position (III.A.31).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The institution has policies and practices demonstrating that part-time and adjunct faculty have opportunities for professional development, are appropriately oriented to the institution and its student populations, and are engaged in key academic processes.

III.A.9: The institution has a sufficient number of staff with appropriate qualifications to support the effective educational, technological, physical, and administrative operations of the institution. (ER 8)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

As treated more fully in Standard III.A.1, hiring decisions at Cerro Coso Community College are based on programmatic needs. All requests for staff hires, like they are for faculty and management, are first stated in a department’s or unit’s annual unit plan, which is continued through the integrated cycle and, if supported through successive layers, addressed in the yearly staffing RRA (III.A.11). From there, they are considered by the Budget Development Committee.
in the recommendation of the annual tentative budget. The president is the final decision-maker to act on the recommendations.

The recruitment process in place ensures positions are filled by applicants with qualifications necessary to serve the operations of the college, as described in Article 13 of the CSEA contract linked from the KCCD Board Policy Manual page (III.A.2). Position criteria, minimum qualifications, and selection processes are defined within the recruitment postings for all staff positions, so the public has an understanding of duties and expectations when applying. As with faculty and educational administrators, minimum qualifications are verified through application documents which include cover letter, resume, and transcripts. The selection process for staff follows very closely the selection process for faculty and management. The applicants that are moved forward are reviewed by a screening committee who verify minimum qualifications through the same application documents. During this review, it is determined who will be invited to interview. The interview process includes an oral interview which may include a skills test. Finalists are invited to a second level interview. Prior to a final offer of employment, reference and criminal background checks are completed.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard. The institution has policies and practices to determine the appropriate number and qualifications for support personnel.

**III.A.10: The institution maintains a sufficient number of administrators with appropriate preparation and expertise to provide continuity and effective administrative leadership and services that support the institution’s mission and purposes. (ER 8)**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

As with all classifications, hiring decisions for administrative positions are based on programmatic needs, as described in Standard III.A.1. Mostly, administrative positions tend to come out of the higher-level section and division plans (III.A.32). As with the other classifications, requests are either supported or not supported at the division level before being included in the staffing RRA for budget consideration and presidential decision-making. A frequent consideration with hiring administrators is the impact on 50%-law compliance. The role of the president in ensuring the sufficient size and structure of management personnel to meet organizational need is discussed in Standard IV.B.2.

The College is consistent with hiring processes for educational and non-educational administrative positions as outlined in board policy 6B of the KCCD Board Policy Manual to ensure a fair and equitable recruitment process (III.A.2). The hiring process of minimum qualification verification, selection for interview, recommendation of finalists, reference and background checks, and final decision-making by the president is consistent with all other employee classifications.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard. The institution has policies and practices to determine the appropriate number, qualifications, and organization of administrators.
III.A.11: The institution establishes, publishes, and adheres to written personnel policies and procedures that are available for information and review. Such policies and procedures are fair and equitably and consistently administered.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

As part of KCCD, Cerro Coso Community College follows written and established guidelines to ensure fair and equitable treatment of all employees. New employees are given the following documents with acknowledgement showing receipt related to ethical behavior as part of the new hire paperwork (III.A.33):

- A Reaffirmation of the Kern Community College District’s Non-Discrimination/Equal Employment Policy
- Drug-Free Workplace Policy
- Computing and Network Use Agreement
- The Department of Fair Employment and Housing Pamphlets
  - Sexual Harassment
  - Discrimination is Against the Law

The KCCD Board Policy Manual and bargaining unit contracts are available for all employees online via the district website. Employees are given links to important informational areas during the new hire orientation.

The district regularly reviews its personnel policies. The Reaffirmation of the Kern Community College District’s Non-Discrimination/Equal Employment Policy is revised annually and posted on the district website (III.A.34). Board policy sections are regularly reviewed and revised if necessary as discussed in detail in Standard IV.C.7. As revisions are made, email notifications are sent to ensure these changes are communicated out (III.A.35). The CCA and CSEA contracts are negotiated on three-year alternating terms. The current CCA contract runs through June 2020 with negotiations commencing during the same academic year. The current CSEA contract runs through June 2018, with the negotiations process beginning in Spring 2018. After ratification, new contracts are available online with hard copies distributed to individuals upon request.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The institution ensures that it administers its personnel policies and procedures consistently and equitably. The institution regularly reviews and, if necessary, revises its personnel policies. The institution publicizes its personnel policies.

III.A.12: Through its policies and practices, the institution creates and maintains appropriate programs, practices, and services that support its diverse personnel. The institution regularly assesses its record in employment equity and diversity consistent with its mission.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

In April 2014, the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) and Staff Diversity Plan was approved by the board of trustees (III.A.36). This plan lists strategies to promote a diverse workforce and provides specific plans and procedures for ensuring EEO. Also outlined is the reestablishment
of the district-wide Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee (EEOAC). This committee plays a proactive role in working to enhance and promote diversity and cultural competence in the district. Staff development programs will also ensure screening committees are in compliance with Title 5 regulations.

The College confirms its practices in supporting, recruiting and retaining its diverse personnel. The District’s EEO statement can be found on the KCCD Careers website (III.A.37). During the recruitment process, the college HR manager attends the first screening committee meeting to present information regarding the screening process, EEO policy, and confidentiality compliance, as evidenced in the hiring binders distributed to all screening committee members (III.A.3). During the application process, applicants have the option of completing an EEO survey. Reports can then be generated to evaluate how well the College and District is doing in employing diverse personnel. In addition, as required by the Department of Education, employee diversity statistics are collected in a series of federally-mandated surveys in fall, winter, and spring (III.A.38).

In keeping with its mission of equity and diversity, the College supports diversity topics throughout the year, including flex day and professional development activities. During the 2015-2016 academic year, faculty inquiry groups were developed with the focus of supporting students over 40 and supporting students from under-represented groups. (III.A.39). In addition, the College plans and offers an ongoing calendar of diversity-supportive activities for students and staff every year, as described in more detail in Standard II.C.4.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The institution’s policies and practices promote an understanding of equity and diversity. The institution regularly evaluates these policies and practices to assure they are effective. The institution has methods to determine the kinds of support its personnel need and regularly evaluates the effectiveness of these programs and services. The institution tracks and analyzes its employment equity record. The institution ensures that its personnel and students are treated fairly.

### III.A.13: The institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel, including consequences for violation.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Ethical standards and consequences for failing to adhere to board policy are clearly defined in the KCCD Board Policy Manual article 7 General Personnel Administration. The faculty collective bargaining agreement between KCCD and the CCA outline professional expectations within Article 4. The agreement between the District and the CSEA provides guidelines under article 13, section 10 Progressive Discipline, which includes a list of violations including unethical or disgraceful conduct (III.A.40).

In 2010, the District adopted EthicsPoint, a web-based system to anonymously and confidentially report activities that may involve violations of KCCD ethics policy or even criminal behavior (III.A.41).
Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The institution has an approved ethics policy for all of its personnel, which delineates consequences for violation.

III.A.14: The institution plans for and provides all personnel with appropriate opportunities for continued professional development, consistent with the institutional mission and based on evolving pedagogy, technology, and learning needs. The institution systematically evaluates professional development programs and uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The College has planned professional development activities for faculty and staff. Professional development at Cerro Coso Community College is overseen by the Professional Development Committee, a participatory governance group and associated committee of College Council composed of faculty, administrators, classified personnel, and students. This committee meets regularly throughout the year with the charge of facilitating the expansion of knowledge, understanding, and creative expression for the professional development of all Cerro Coso Community College staff (III.A.42). In practice, the committee has the responsibility for determining professional development needs among faculty, staff, and administration; develops a comprehensive plan for staff development; annually evaluates the effectiveness of conducted activities; maintain records as required by law; and acts as the advisory committee for the flexible calendar program.

Professional development is considered one of the five major resources tracked through the annual integrated planning process, as described more fully in Standard I.B.9. Every February, the Professional Development Committee completes an RRA that pulls together the common threads from the unit, section, and division plans and proposes a set of themes and activities college-wide for faculty, staff, and management for the ensuing year (III.A.43). The College maintains a Professional Development subsite on its website, and the annual RRA’s are posted to the Integrated Planning website.

The College is on a flex calendar and has three flex days a year, two in the fall and one in the spring. Flex day presentations provide a blend of workshops and department meetings together with one general session for topics of importance to the faculty community. Examples of past topics include updates on curriculum, best practices for engaging students in distance education courses, and best practices for student learning outcomes assessment. Guest speakers have been invited to present on Title IX and diversity issues (III.A.44). As indicated in both Standard III.A.8 and Standard II.A.2, the College also runs an annual adjunct professional development day dedicated to adjuncts that include department meetings, faculty sharing sessions, and service recognition. To evaluate the success of flex day workshops, attendees of faculty flex day and adjunct professional development day attendees complete a feedback survey after each day, and the PD committee reviews the quantitative and qualitative data collected through these surveys to plan for future events. (III.A.45)
In addition to flex day activities, workshops and trainings are offered to all staff throughout the academic year. These range from conferences, brown bag seminars (lunch-n-learns), individual and group trainings, and inquiry groups (III.A.46). The College also maintains a Faculty 411 webpage with guidelines and sample documentation for new faculty, including adjuncts. The institution offers online training to new faculty or faculty new to online teaching, as described in more detail in Standard II.A.7. In Fall 2016 a new web-based training program instituted by the District’s insurance group provides training in the areas of employee safety, loss control, property and liability issues, and human resources (III.A.47). Two classified staff in-service days are scheduled each year for the purpose of developing skills and improving uniformity and consistency of institutional knowledge (III.A.48). And all employees have access to training on Lynda.com in areas applicable to teaching and software (III.A.49).

Professional development is encouraged for all employee groups to further their education. Classified and management staff have the opportunity to receive a stipend for every 15 semester units completed, with a maximum of four professional development plans. Faculty members are encouraged to continue their education by applying and receiving approval for salary progression (III.A.50). In spring 2016, the classified staff and the president convened an ad hoc staff engagement committee to improve ways classified staff could feel more connected with the institution, and one of the outcomes of that work was the development of a mentoring program for new classified employees (III.A.51). For their efforts, the group received the College’s Excellence in Education award in 2018 as model innovators (III.A.52).

After three years of employment, permanent staff are eligible to apply, and if selected, participate in the KCCD Leadership Academy. The purpose of the academy is to provide a venue for staff development for potential leaders at all levels and locations within the District (III.A.53). Cerro Coso Community College has been well represented in the Leadership Academy, furnishing future leaders over the years from all employee groups and from all campus locations.

Each faculty flex day, classified appreciation day, and employee in-service day is evaluated for the purpose of using the feedback for the basis of improvement. Most survey results are reviewed informally by the manager or presenter; starting in the 2017-2018 academic year, the Professional Development Committee more formally reviewed flex day evaluation results (III.A.54). Faculty fulfilling flex obligations at the end of the year are asked how the professional development opportunities they recorded supported progress towards identified professional goals from their last evaluation (III.A.56). Finally, one of the sections of the regular Climate Survey administered to all KCCD employees involves professional development, asking questions like, “I have been provided adequate training to do my work” and “The college/district provides encouragement and support for professional growth and development” (III.A.55, pp. 33-36). These questions were used also as metrics for the 2015-2018 Cerro Coso Community College Strategic Plan that had an objective of providing effective professional development opportunities to support its goal of strengthening organizational effectiveness. Results from the last survey in 2016 show the college remains at about 80% of respondents who agree or strongly agree with those statements, consistent with previous years.
Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution offers professional development programs consistent with its mission. The institution has methods to identify professional development needs of its faculty and other personnel. The College engages in meaningful evaluation of professional development activities and uses results for improvement. The College measures the impact of professional development activities on the improvement of teaching and learning.

III.A.15: The institution makes provision for the security and confidentiality of personnel records. Each employee has access to his/her personnel records in accordance with law.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Official personnel files for Cerro Coso Community College are maintained at the district HR office. Human Resources Operational Guidelines, the CCA Contract, and the CSEA Contract list the access requirement for these records (III.A.57).

Unofficial files and documents are kept in secure file cabinets in the college HR office. Full access to these file cabinets are limited to HR staff. File cabinets are kept locked unless the staff is actively in the office and able to observe surrounding activity. The cabinets and main office door are locked before HR personnel exit the office. Door keys for the HR office are limited to the HR staff, Maintenance and Operations, and the college president, in the event of an emergency.

Access to the college- and district-wide employee and student database system, Banner, requires administrative approval. Formal training to Banner is required before access can be granted. Query access is the most common type of access approved for most employees. Maintenance access is strictly limited. As an additional safeguard, no single manager can approve access to the total database. To protect confidentiality, KCCD has a policy that employees shall not share logins and passwords, which is emphasized with the receipt and acknowledgement of the Computing and Network Use Policy, part of the pre-employment paperwork given to all new employees (III.A.58). When Banner access is requested, the employee must go through Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) training (III.A.59).

For added security, generated ID numbers have been used for many years in place of social security numbers as identifiers on campus and district forms, in reports, and throughout the database system.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The institution has provisions for keeping personnel records secure and confidential. The institution provides employees access to their records.
Changes and Plans Arising out of the Self-Evaluation Process

Future Action Plans


List of Evidence

III.A.1 District Human Resources organizational chart
III.A.2 KCCD Board Policy 5G, 5H, and 6B, and article 13.1 of the CSEA contract
III.A.3 Sample screening committee binder information
III.A.4 KCCD Careers website
III.A.5 Invoice, Job Elephant (advertising vendor)
III.A.6 Samples of recruitment materials for classified staff, faculty, management
III.A.7 Example of previous and revised position description
III.A.8 Academic senate equivalency process
III.A.9 Program review template highlighting staffing currency
III.A.10 2018-2019 Academic Affairs ADP, pgs. 12-13; 2017-2018 Administrative Services ADP, pgs. 3-4
III.A.11 2018-2019 Staffing Resource Request Analysis
III.A.12 Academic senate meeting minutes January 18, 2018, showing discussion of faculty prioritization
III.A.13 Guidance to applicants with foreign transcripts
III.A.14 KCCD Board Policy CCA contract, Article 6
III.A.15 Faculty evaluation forms A and B
III.A.16 KCCD Board Policy CCA contract, Article 7
III.A.17 KCCD Board Policy CSEA contract, Article 13, section 2 and 3
III.A.18 Classified evaluation form
III.A.19 KCCD Board Policy 6E
III.A.20 Management evaluation materials: cover sheet and survey
III.A.21 FON Letter
III.A.22 FON Report
III.A.23 KCCD Board Policy CCA contract, articles 5D3a and b
III.A.24 Faculty 411 homepage
III.A.25 Sample beginning-of-the-semester emails from VPI
III.A.26 Dean of instruction’s welcome to faculty, spring 2018
III.A.27 Sample lunch-n-learn invitations from director of distance education
III.A.28 Sample ESCC invitations to lunch and learns, open houses, etc.
III.A.29 Sample recent adjunct professional development day agenda
III.A.30 KCCD Board Policy CCA Contract, Article 4C17
III.A.31 Sample adjunct recruitment posting
III.A.32 Sample ADP’s showing management staffing requests
III.A.33 Ethical behavior forms
III.A.34 Sample annual notification of EEO policy emailed to all staff
Standard III.B: Physical Resources

Physical Resources

III.B.1: The institution assures that safe and sufficient physical resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and learning support services. They are constructed and maintained to assure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The Maintenance and Operations (M&O) Department ensures that all Cerro Coso Community College sites are accessible and secure, with safety being the top priority. The Kern Community College District (KCCD) Facilities Planning and Construction Department (DFP CD) complies with the Americans with Disability Act (ADA) and Division of State Architects (DSA)
requirements for constructing college facilities. Guided by the 2013 ADA Transition Plan and by DSA, existing structures are modernized to current code requirements. All newly constructed buildings do not receive DSA close out until they are in strict compliance with all building and public accessibility codes (III.B.1).

The College has structures for addressing both planned and unplanned concerns about safety and sufficiency of physical resources. The College makes for intentional improvements to safety and sufficiency through the annual integrated planning cycle. As explained in more detail in Standard I.B.9 and also directly below in Standard III.B.2, physical safety and sufficiency concerns are identified at unit, section, and division plan levels. These are gathered in a facilities resource request analysis (RRA) that examines feasibility, identifies costs, and prioritizes resource requests in preparation for annual budget building (III.B.2). While all requests are gathered and analyzed—from signage to furniture needs—safety and sufficiency are predominant criteria for prioritization.

Unplanned safety concerns come up by a number of routes to M&O, management, or the Safety and Security Committee. Safety incidents that happen at any of the College’s six physical campus locations are communicated through the Incident/Accident Reporting Form directly on the college website through a Security Assistance and Information page. Clicking the Submit button routes the form to the Safety and Security program manager as well as the vice president of finance and administrative services for review and action (III.B.3).

The Security and Assistance page indicates how faculty, staff, students, and the public can report various types of security assistance and which type of form is to be used by which group for what purpose (III.B.4). Safety concerns may also be submitted through the SchoolDude reporting program and through the safety suggestion boxes located in each building at the main campus and at each center and outreach site. One of the recommendations of the 2012 comprehensive self-evaluation was for the College to develop and implement a process that allows the public, students, and employees to report safety conditions and other issues of physical resources disrepair. As indicated in the 2013 Follow up Report and again in the 2015 Midterm Report linked from the Accreditation site, this process was implemented through the adoption of the SchoolDude reporting system (III.B.5). Some of the “problem types” employees may choose when submitting a work order are safety related, such as Health/Safety, Fire Protection, and ADA Accommodations. (III.B.6). SchoolDude is reachable to employees and students through the Quick Links page on the College’s portal and to anyone—the public, employees, and students—from the Security and Assistance Information page on the college website.

Through planned and unplanned safety reporting, a number of improvements in safety and security have been undertaken at the College in recent semesters, from the large to the small:

- In 2016, recognizing the need for more comprehensive leadership in safety and emergency preparedness, the vice president of finance and administrative services requested the expansion of the safety and security program manager from part- to full-time, as evidenced in the 2017-2018 annual division plan and included in the Staffing Resource Request Analysis of that year (III.B.7).
• In 2016-2017, the College undertook an access and security door project that, in the case of an emergency, allows instructors to secure the classroom by turning a thumb latch and administrators to lock down the campus centrally by pushing a button. At the time of the writing of this self-evaluation report, the project is undergoing final inspections and testing at all campus sites it owns.

• In 2017, loss of power during construction compromised chemicals stored in a science department refrigerator in the main building: the issue was communicated by a faculty member to the dean who worked with District’s executive director of risk assessment and management to consult an industrial hygienist; a company was recommended for cleanup, and the issue was resolved.

• To ensure the physical safety of students and employees at all times, the College contracts for security officer services at the Ridgecrest Indian Wells Valley (IWV) campus, the Lake Isabella Kern River Valley campus (KRV) and the Tehachapi Education Center campus. Cameras and monitoring services are in place at the IWV, Eastern Sierra College Center (ESCC) Bishop, and ESCC Mammoth Lakes campuses. All facilities have alarm systems that are monitored by external agencies. At ESCC Bishop, ESCC Mammoth Lakes, KRV, and Tehachapi—all single-building locations—the staff additionally monitor access, security, and safety when open to the public.

The College publishes its Clery Report annually in compliance with federal regulations, listing all crime occurring on campus and timely warning notices provided by local law enforcement agencies (III.B.8). Statistics for the report are compiled using college incident reports and local law enforcement statistics when available. The report is linked from the Security Assistance and Information page and also in the footer of every page of the college website, always only one click away (III.B.9).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The institution ensures that all facilities are safe. The institution regularly evaluates whether it has sufficient physical resources at all locations. The institution has a process by which all personnel and students can report unsafe physical facilities.

III.B.2: The institution plans, acquires or builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources including facilities, equipment, land and other asset, in a manner that assures effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services and achieve its mission.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

In order to provide for the physical resources in such a large service area, Cerro Coso Community College has established five physical sites with 254,966 gross square footage to serve students, staff, and faculty:

• IWV campus located in Ridgecrest with 135,480 assignable square footage (ASF) and 193,966 outside square footage (OGSF)
• ESCC Bishop 21,053 ASF / 32,037 OGSF
• ESCC Mammoth Lakes 12,382 ASF / 20,128 OGSF
The College uses a variety of short- and long-term planning to assure effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and services and achieve its mission. On the long term, the College completes a comprehensive educational master plan once every five years that starts with the mission, presents an environmental scan together with an internal scan of programs and services, and sets future educational goals. The last educational master plan was completed in 2017 and is linked from the Planning Documents page.

A key component of the educational master plan is a space usage study and projections for long-term facility needs (III.B.19). This drives a corresponding facilities master plan that guides the physical development of the College for the next five years and is also completed once every five years, as stated in the KCCD Board Policy Manual article 3B3A Capital Construction (III.B.20). At the time of the writing of this report, a new facilities master plan driven by the 2017 educational master plan has not been completed but is expected to be completed by December 2018; the most recent plan is posted to the Facility Reports page of the KCCD website.

At the individual department and unit level, long-range plans for physical resources are captured in comprehensive program reviews, which are required once every five years of all instructional and non-instructional programs as demonstrated in the templates linked from the College’s Program Review site. In the section on “Currency,” programs are prompted to describe the
state of facilities and equipment used by the department, explain by what criteria and with what process the department evaluates its facilities and equipment, and assess to what degree facilities are safe and sufficient, access is assured, equipment adequate, and physical resources sufficiently modernized (III.B.21).

In addition to that captured in long-term planning, the sufficiency of physical resources to support programs and services is evaluated every year as part of the annual integrated planning cycle. As explained more thoroughly in Standard I.B.9, this planning cycle begins with the writing of annual unit plans (AUP’s) at the level of departments and service units where individual departments and units identify facilities and equipment needs (III.B.22). These requests are further considered at increasing levels in the section and division plans, where they are either supported or not (III.B.23). All unit, section, and division plans have fields for the specific analysis of physical resources. Since all plans set their analysis in context of the college mission by reviewing their connection to the mission at the top of the document, and since all draw a link between their goals and the college strategic goals for institutional improvement, this firmly ties all physical resources planning to college mission and institutional priorities.

After the highest level of aggregation have been completed in the division plans in December, a facilities RRA is written and submitted in February that analyzes all physical resource requests that have come up through the planning cycle (III.B.2). This work is accomplished by the director of M&O with feedback from the Facilities Committee and the Safety and Security Committee, depending on the nature of the request. The groups review and analyze the needs and requests and submit their recommendations prior to decisions made about resource allocation that takes place during budget building in March and April. As evidenced by the most recent Participatory Governance Model Handbook linked from the Planning Documents page, both committees are participatory governance groups and subcommittees of College Council, assuring the widest possible representation from all perspectives (III.B.24). Annual plans and resource request analyses are posted to the College’s Integrated Planning site.

In addition to its work on preparing recommendations for the yearly budget, the Facilities Committee ensures that all stakeholders have a voice in planning. As just described, the committee engages in dialogue and discussions with various entities throughout the campuses to develop a recommendation for the allocation of resources during the budget-building process. The committee has a regular report-out at each College Council meeting (III.B.25). Team members work with various district- and college-wide groups to develop plans to identify, prioritize, integrate, acquire, and maintain the facilities and infrastructure for the college. The committee takes into account Safety and Repair Improvement District (SRID) bond funds, Measure C bond funds, Measure J bond funds, Measure G bond funds, scheduled maintenance funds, and grants and balances them with technology requirements and the needs of the communities Cerro Coso Community College serves (III.B.26).

The committee also works closely with the DFPCD, which is the district entity responsible for working with the Colleges to coordinate the development of plans for facilities, land, and equipment required for initial utilization of buildings. The DFPCD coordinates the implementation of construction projects as well as the compiling of a district-wide capital outlay plan, a document produced annually that addresses facilities and construction for the district as
As indicated directly above in Standard III.B.1, DFPCD is the group that coordinates construction-related compliance with ADA updates and DSA closeout of all facility projects. Building modernizations are coordinated through the DFPCD, as well as energy management and scheduled maintenance of $45,000 or more. And DFPCD is responsible for maintaining accurate data within the state chancellor’s office Facilities Utilization, Space Inventory Options Net (FUSION) program. Populating the facilities planning module coordinates the deferred or scheduled maintenance planning with the colleges and incorporates these plans into the FUSION program database.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The institution ensures that the needs of programs and services are considered when planning its buildings. Facilities’ planning is aligned with the institutional mission. The institution ensures that program and service needs determine equipment replacement and maintenance.

III.B.3: To assure the feasibility and effectiveness of physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services, the institution plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Cerro Coso Community College assesses its physical resources primarily through the planning cycle described above. The established planning process supports the mission and the goals of the institution. Any gaps or needed changes or modifications to allocations for facilities and equipment are determined through the process by the departments and units that are closest to the users.

The following are some examples of large and small facilities and equipment improvements that have emerged from the planning process in the last three years:

- In 2015, to address increase in welding enrollments, the occupational lab was upgraded and a new electrical welding lab created by using existing vacant space that once housed the College’s discontinued machine tool program. The new lab consists of 30 working stations; each station has direct exhaust, welding equipment, and various other related equipment. This request was first identified in the 2012-13 Industrial Arts AUP and captured in the 2012-13 Facilities RRA (III.B.27).
- In summer of 2016, the 3M security gates of the main campus’s library were replaced after getting to end-of-life and having undergone an expensive repair the year before. The replacement was planned for in the 2015-16 Library AUP and captured in the 2015-16 Letters and Sciences section plan, and 2015-16 Facilities RRA (III.B.28).
- In 2017, to increase the science offerings that have lab components, the student laboratory at the ESCC-Mammoth campus was enlarged to accommodate 32-35 students from the previous 24. This request was first identified in the 2014-15 ESCC section plan, and then captured subsequently in the 2015-16 Science and Engineering AUP and the 2016-17 Letters and Sciences section plan (III.B.29).
In addition to these yearly assessments, M&O itself goes through two levels of periodic evaluation. Once every five years, it completes a comprehensive program review that assesses its effectiveness in the four areas of relevance, appropriateness, currency, and achievement of administrative unit outcomes (AUO’s). For non-instructional units like M&O, AUO’s are the unit’s key performance indicators; for M&O, they focus on maintaining student and staff satisfaction with Cerro Coso Community College facilities, completing work orders in a timely manner, and providing a satisfactory level of safety and security training. The last review, including analysis of outcomes assessment, was completed in spring 2018 (III.B.30).

The second level of periodic evaluation for M&O is completing an annual unit plan itself. In doing so, it assesses what progress it made on closing equity gaps, outcomes assessment, program review goals, and the prior year’s AUP goals (III.B.31).

Improvements that have recently come out of these self-assessments include the following:

- Progress made on water conservation. As described in the 2017-2018 AUP, a new variable speed drive pump system was purchased at IWV, the drip irrigation systems was converted to hard pipe to keep wildlife from eating the drip lines, electric valves and timers were added, and all of the irrigation along the main parking lot islands and tree areas were repiped (III.B.32).
- Progress made on the installation of a mass notification system. As described in the 2018-2019 AUP, the mass notification system is out of the engineering phase and prepared to go out to bid with an estimated start date of February 2018 (III.B.31, pg. 1).
- Increased use of the SchoolDude program to track action on facilities requests. While this is something of a “meta” improvement (not improvement in facilities but rather in organizational effectiveness around facilities), the 2018 program review indicates M&O is more consistently using SchoolDude reporting to monitor performance (III.B.30, pp. 8-9).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution regularly assesses the use of its facilities. And the institution uses the results of the evaluation to improve facilities or equipment.

**III.B.4: Long-range capital plans support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

As described in detail in Standard III.B.2 above, Cerro Coso Community College has established planning processes that support the mission of the institution on the short- and long-term. Through the educational master plan, the facilities master plan, the program review process, and the annual integrated planning cycle, long-range capital projects are planned in support of the mission and institutional goals. Program reviews and annual unit plans assess the effectiveness of this planning by prompting departments and units to regularly evaluate gaps and measure progress.
Selection of new or replacement of old equipment is made by the department requiring the equipment, by the department that specializes in maintaining the equipment, or both. Equipment is maintained by and repaired by college personnel, by district personnel, or through contracted service. Technicians and faculty in those areas routinely care for equipment in campus laboratories and shops. Maintenance and repair of equipment that is out of the technicians’ area of expertise may be contracted with outside vendors (III.B.33).

During the inventory process, new equipment over $5,000 is required to have a fixed asset tag attached to it; after the tag is issued, all information for the product is sent to the district office. Surplus equipment is collected by M&O and stored in a designated location on campus until the disposition is determined. These items are logged as being surplus, obsolete or broken. The disposition of the equipment donated, sold, or scrapped once the board of trustees deems it surplus.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. Long-range capital projects are linked to institutional planning. The institution has identified elements which comprise the total cost of ownership that the institution uses when making decisions about facilities and equipment. Planning processes ensure that capital projects support college goals. The institution assesses the effectiveness that long-range capital planning has in advancing the College’s improvement goals.
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Standard III.C: Technology Resources

Technology Resources

III.C.1: Technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are appropriate and adequate to support the institution’s management and operational functions, academic programs, teaching and learning, and support services.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The Information Technology (IT) Department at Cerro Coso Community College provides technology and technology support services that are designed for direct support of student learning and achievement. Since Cerro Coso Community College is part of a multi-college district, the many services, components, and resources that make up technology resources are a mix of decentralized services provided by the College, centralized services provided by the Kern Community College District (KCCD) and outsourced services provided by third-party vendors.

Technology Services

Core technology services include desktop computers, laptops, printers, tablets, software, phones, wireless and WAN (wide area network) access, ITV (interactive television) classrooms, smart classrooms, and audio-visual services. These services are available at all campus locations and maintained by the college IT department that keep them current, secure, and reliable.

Professional Support

The department uses a helpdesk ticketing system to manage the work load of the department and to monitor quality of the technology. My Service Center is an outsourced helpdesk system that provides 24x7 phone support for staff, faculty, and students as well as an Online Support Center with a searchable knowledge base for such issues as password resets or accessing the network with a personal device. Staff and students access the platform through an icon present on the desktop whenever they are logged into their network account (III.C.1). My Service Center also...
allows users to submit work requests online for follow up by IT personnel. The department uses this helpdesk ticket data to monitor time taken to resolve issues, repeating issues, and the volume of requests for services (III.C.2).

Facilities

The college IT department designs, manages, and installs all enhanced classrooms. There are currently 45 technology-enhanced classrooms across the five physical locations of Indian Wells Valley/main campus (IWV), Eastern Sierra College Center (ESCC) Bishop, ESCC Mammoth Lakes, Kern River Valley (KRV) outreach, and Tehachapi. Each site also has a main distribution frame (MDF) built and maintained by the IT department except for Tehachapi, where it is maintained by the Tehachapi Unified School District from whom the College leases the facility. Each building at each campus location except Tehachapi has one or more intermediate distribution frames (IDF’s) to house local switches for computers and printers and phones. The number of IDF’s is determined by the size of the building at each campus location—the main building at IWV, for instance, has six. All of the College’s MDF’s and IDF’’s are in secure areas with battery backup. Access is controlled and monitored with electronic locks.

Hardware

One shared goal of technology services district-wide is to standardize and centralize hardware and software to the extent possible so that devices and systems are limited for the purpose of better understanding, easier development of expertise, and better customer service. To that extent, the College employs a mix of centralized and decentralized hardware:

- Centralized Hardware
  - Management Information System (Banner)
  - Staff email
  - Network
  - Phone system
  - iTV
- Decentralized Hardware
  - Desktop and laptop computers for staff and labs
  - iPads and tablets
  - Printers & scanners
  - Phones & fax machines
  - Instructional technology: projectors, sound systems, podiums, audio visual switching equipment, document cameras, and iTV systems
  - Audio visual equipment for events: microphones, speakers, camcorders, livestreaming hardware, projectors, screens, and mixers
  - Network equipment: edge switches, routers, hubs, wireless access points, racks and enclosures, and battery backup
  - Servers for the local sites.

Software

Like hardware, software is also either centralized or decentralized:
• Centralized Software
  • Learning Management System (Canvas) – cloud-hosted by the California Community College Chancellor’s Office
  • Helpdesk – outsourced to Blackboard
  • Microsoft volume license software (Windows and Office)

• Decentralized Software
  • SARS
  • Adobe DC
  • Laserfiche
  • Kurzweil
  • Pearson View testing
  • Windows and Microsoft Office installation and configuration.

The safety, reliability, and privacy of these services are achieved in a variety of ways. The KCCD IT team provides security and tools for testing and monitoring vulnerabilities of the core network and common core services that include Banner, email, webservers, data storage, and virtual servers (III.C.3). This layered approach includes a firewall, server penetration testing, virtual local area networks, access control lists, and the use of private IP addresses. As explained in more detail in Standard III.C.5 below, the College requires all students, staff, faculty, and administration to use assigned credentials when accessing campus computers and wireless networks. The general use of the community account by students and employees is restricted.

Reliability of the campus network and main information system is assured by redundancy and a disaster recovery plan. The College has redundant fiber locally and across the wide area network using the Digital 395 fiber as the primary access and a circuit provided by AT&T as a backup. Banner, email, and internet connectivity, hosted in Bakersfield, are replicated continuously to Porterville College. Maintenance agreements are purchased and maintained as needed for mission critical services such as core network equipment, phone system, desktop software, and data systems. These maintenance agreements often provide expedited support both via telephone and onsite service when available and necessary (III.C.4). Reliability of computers and printers are supported with warranties, and continued support is provided by knowledgeable IT support staff after end-of-date (III.C.5).

Student and employee privacy is managed by a variety of methods. Only employees with an approved need to have access are granted permissions to student data in Banner (III.C.6). All employees sign a FERPA statement upon being granted Internet Native Banner access, and since 2017 this Banner login requires a periodic acknowledgement of FERPA obligations before the user can continue (III.C.7). In addition, KCCD has a process and programs in place for scanning webservers for potential FERPA and HIPAA violations to ensure that the College and District remain in compliance (III.C.8).

The decision-making process about technology services, facilities, hardware, and software includes input from all stakeholders. As evidenced in the institution’s Participatory Governance Model Handbook linked from the Planning Documents page, the main college workgroup that makes recommendations about technology resources is the Technology Resource Team (TRT) (III.C.9). TRT is a participatory governance committee with representatives from faculty,
staff, management, and students whose purpose is to advise College Council on technology practices, procedures, and standards in the areas of instruction and information. When it comes to technology that has a specific impact on students and the learning environment, TRT is advised in turn by the Pedagogy and Technology Committee, a standing committee of the academic senate (III.C.10). This structure of TRT advised by Pedagogy and Technology, with each committee reporting to their broader constituent groups, ensures technology decisions at the Cerro Coso Community College are subject to inclusive dialogue, broadly communicated, and in service of student learning.

In addition, college IT committees and services have a close working relationship with IT committees and services at the district level. KCCD has established an oversight committee, the District Information Technology Managers Group, to identify the collective technology needs of each college and where they can be enhanced by collaboration and centralization. The District’s chief technology officer oversees this group, which includes the IT directors from all three colleges working together with key system and network directors from the district office. The group discusses technology needs of the colleges and solutions, as well as solutions to needs that have been brought forward by other district-wide committees (III.C.11).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The institution ensures that its various types of technology needs are identified. The institution demonstrates its decision-making process about technology services, facilities, hardware, and software includes input from faculty, staff, and students. There are provisions for reliability, disaster recovery, privacy, and security, whether technology is provided directly by the institution or through a contractual arrangement.

III.C.2: The institution consistently plans for, updates and replaces technology to ensure its technological infrastructure, quality and capacity are adequate to support its mission, operations, programs, and services.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Just as it does with physical resources, the College uses a variety of short- and long-term planning to evaluate and improve technical infrastructure, quality, and capacity. On the long-term, the College completes a comprehensive educational master plan once every five years that sets future educational goals. While not focused on technology to the same extent as facilities, the educational master plan sets a context and direction that has considerable consequences for technology resources, such as calling for expanding equitable student and learning support services college-wide (III.C.12). The last educational master plan was completed in 2017 and is linked from the Planning Documents page.

At the individual department and unit level, long-range plans for physical resources are captured in comprehensive program reviews, which are required once every five years of all instructional and non-instructional programs as demonstrated in the templates linked from the College’s Program Review site. In the section on “Currency,” programs are prompted to describe the state of technology resources used by the department, explain by what criteria and with what processes the department evaluates its technology resources and how it makes decisions about
technology needs, explain how staff receives training in the effective application of technology required by the department, and evaluate the sufficiency of technology resources and training (III.C.13).

In addition to that captured in long-term planning, the sufficiency of technology resources to support programs and services is evaluated every year as part of the annual integrated planning cycle. As explained more thoroughly in Standard I.B.9, this planning cycle begins with the writing of annual unit plans (AUP’s) at the level of departments and service units. It is at this point that individual departments and units identify technology needs (III.C.14). These requests are further considered at increasing levels in the section and division plans, where they are either supported or not (III.C.15). Just like with facilities, all unit, section, and division plans have fields for the specific analysis of technology resources, and, just like with facilities, the template sets this discussion in context of the college mission and links it directly to college strategic goals.

Once the College’s unit plans, section plans, and division plans are completed in December, the IT department and TRT review all requests for technology in the plans and submit a resource request analysis by February 15. The analysis includes checking for duplicate requests, determining the supportability and feasibility of the requests, and determining how the technology requests fit within the College’s current technology environment (III.C.16). The result is a document that establishes recommendations of resource allocation for the budget building process that takes place in April and May. Annual plans and resource request analyses, including those of IT, are posted to the College’s Integrated Planning site.

In addition to basing its technology recommendations on the documented results of program and service evaluation, the IT department also ensures that a robust, sustainable, and secure technical infrastructure is maintained through its own two-level planning process. Once every five years, it completes its own comprehensive program review that assesses its effectiveness in the four areas of relevance, appropriateness, currency, and achievement of administrative unit outcomes. The last review was completed in 2016 and is posted on the Program Review page (III.C.17).

The second level of periodic evaluation for IT is completing an annual unit plan itself. In doing so, it assesses what progress it made on closing equity gaps, outcomes assessment, program review goals, and the prior year’s AUP goals (III.C.18).

Improvements that have recently come out of these self-assessments include

- In 2016, audiovisual equipment in the three East Wing classrooms were upgraded, included new interactive short-throw projectors, classroom sound, and instructor stations with computers and multimedia (III.C.19).
- In 2016, all campus network infrastructure was upgraded and battery packs systems were replaced at all campus locations for which the College is responsible for the network (KRV, IWV, and ESCC), including the replacement of a second core network switch. The last of the battery backup units (at ESCC Bishop) was replaced during the 2016-2017 academic year as planned for in the 2016-2017 Information Technology AUP (III.C.20).
• In 2017, the College moved from a 5 year replacement plan to a 7 year plan in order to maximize the value of the technology purchase while maintaining adequate technology to remain current (III.C.21).
• Starting fall 2017, the College’s director of information technology began sharing monthly security videos at Administrative Cabinet meetings and TRT meetings as standing agenda items in order to raise awareness of security risks and mitigation strategies (III.C.22).

Computer upgrades and replacements at all sites occur on a regularly scheduled rotation, with priority given to student labs and faculty computers. As mentioned directly above, the College has a hardware replacement plan that was recently moved from a 5-year cycle to a 7-year cycle. In 2015, KCCD purchased a KACE 1000 inventory system to track when each of the College’s 575 desktops and laptops was purchased, who it is assigned to, what software is installed, and what the computer’s hardware specifications are. The replacement plan also includes the replacement of lab printers, classroom projectors, and network switches.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution has established provisions to ensure a robust, current, sustainable, and secure technical infrastructure is maintained that provides maximum reliability for students and faculty. The institution makes decisions about use and distribution of its technology resources. The institution bases its technology decisions on the results of evaluation of program and service needs. The institution has developed a process to prioritize needs when making decisions about technology purchases.

III.C.3: The institution assures that technology resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and services are implemented and maintained to assure reliable access, safety, and security.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

All campus sites are directly supported with IT personnel based either on campus (Indian Wells Valley, Bishop, and Mammoth), scheduled for a weekly number of hours (Kern River Valley), or on-call for troubleshooting visits (East Kern and Tehachapi). As mentioned above, helpdesk requests can be submitted to My Service Center through an icon present on the desktop by all employees at any campus location (III.C.1). In addition, district IT services such as email, network storage, Banner, and network connectivity are available to all sites, campuses, and colleges district wide.

Computer upgrades and replacements at all sites occur on a regularly scheduled rotation, with priority given to student labs and faculty computers. All sites are included as part of the hardware replacement plan, which is reviewed by IT staff and TRT before being approved by College Council (III.C.23). At Tehachapi, the only facility the College does not own or have the agreement with to install its own classroom technology, faculty are provided with mobile media carts with desktop computing units, internet access, and projection capability.

The data center and network distribution closets at each site are physically secured, and access is highly restricted to only IT staff and key administrators. The locations of the data centers and
networks are protected with electronic locks, which were part of the College’s door hardware replacement program that was completed over the summer of 2017. These electronic locks also allow the IT department to monitor when the data centers and networks are physically accessed.

As part of the College’s security system, each of the campus locations has security cameras. These cameras can be accessed and managed using the system’s Avigilon software. The cameras are connected to the College’s fiber network, which allows them to be viewed live from any Avigilon software client. The content from the cameras is also recorded for later viewing.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this Standard. The institution allocates resources at all campus locations for the management, maintenance, and operation of its technological infrastructure and equipment.

---

**III.C.4: The institution provides appropriate instruction and support for faculty, staff, students, and administrators in the effective use of technology and technology systems related to its programs, services, and institutional operations.**

---

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Training for faculty and staff is provided when new applications, systems, and hardware are introduced and after significant technology upgrades. This training is provided by the College’s IT staff, faculty trainers, and/or vendors and is delivered face-to-face or online. A train-the-trainer model is often used when upgrading any of the College’s and District’s core systems.

In the recent upgrading to Banner 9, a test environment was first implemented, functional users who test the upgrade were introduced to the test environment, and they then trained their peers ([III.C.24]). Another recent college-wide training was the change from Moodle learning management system to Canvas over the summer of 2016. Before the change, faculty were given multiple options for Canvas training through @One (sponsored by the Online Education Initiative) and through Canvas itself. During the change, one-on-one support was provided by the Distance Education Department, who then made tutorials and best practices available to faculty through emails ([III.C.25]). Internal staff training within the IT department itself—for example, Windows 10—is carried out by district workgroups, webinars, conferences, vendor offered training, and IT staff meetings.

More informally, training needs emerge from the program reviews and annual unit plans when a device or application is planned for purchase and support is required. Needs may also arise at any time when a solution to a problem turns out to be a technical one, such as when Adobe Signature was adopted in 2018 to streamline the routing of the College’s event planning forms: training was provided by the director of IT directly to administrative assistants ([III.C.26]). Another major way IT assesses needs is by reviewing helpdesk tickets, which are sent to all members of the team when submitted, including the director. Significant repeated issues are discussed at staff meetings and solutions determined, such when the helpdesk was receiving a significant number of calls in 2016 about students having difficulty logging into campus computers. The background screen of campus computers was changed to provide students with better information about how to log in, and the result was fewer helpdesk calls ([III.C.27]).
Technology training for students takes a variety of forms, such as tutorials on how to use Canvas made available to students online (III.C.28). Each semester several sections of the online student success course PDEV C052 How to Be a Successful Online Student are offered, which provides a broad-based introduction to Canvas as well as to knowledge and techniques to become a successful online learner (III.C.29). Direct technical training is provided through the My Service Center, which includes the Online Support Center for questions about user account management to library services (III.C.30).

The success of direct training is measured by interactions with students, staff, and faculty. Although individual training evaluations have been tried periodically to gauge faculty, staff, and student satisfaction, response rates were underwhelming. The best method has been the tried and true one of tracking helpdesk calls before and after a training to see if an issue persists. However, the most recent IT program review has identified “Staff and faculty will report that the training provided by IT was effective and timely” as an administrative unit outcome to be measured for future program reviews (III.C.17, pp10-12).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution assesses the need for information technology training for students and personnel. The institution allocates resources for information technology training for faculty, students, and staff. The institution regularly evaluates the training and technical support it provides for faculty and staff to ensure these programs are appropriate and effective.

III.C.5 The institution has policies and procedures that guide the appropriate use of technology in the teaching and learning processes.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Cerro Coso Community College has policy and procedures in place to guide the appropriate use of technology in the teaching and learning environment. The college computers and their network are governed by the KCCD Board Policy Manual in the following policies and procedures. All users are required to read and accept the computer use policy before accessing campus computers.

- Computing and Network Use - BP 3E1,
- Computing and Network Use Prohibitions - Procedure 3E1C(a)
- Computer Software Use Procedures - Procedure 3E1C(b)
- College Computing and Network Use Procedures – Procedure 3E1F (III.C.31)

In addition, board policy also has policy and procedure on the following topics that guide decisions about appropriate use and distribution of technology resources:

- Attaching Outside Agencies to the District Wide Area Network (WAN) – BP 3E2, Procedure 3E2E
- Electronic Mail Policy – BP 3E3, Procedure 3E3
- Security Policy – BP 3E4
Students are presented with a summary of the computer use policy when they login, and this summary is accessible on the College’s public website (III.C.33).

Analysis and Evaluation

Cerro Coso Community College meets this Standard. The institution has established processes to make decisions about the appropriate use and distribution of its technology resources. The institution publicizes these policies and processes.

List of Evidence

III.C.1 Helpdesk icon on the desktop
III.C.2 Sample helpdesk ticket data
III.C.3 KCCD Information Technology tools for monitoring vulnerabilities
III.C.4 Sample maintenance agreements
III.C.5 Dell Pro Support warranty
III.C.6 Banner request form
III.C.7 Banner FERPA agreement
III.C.8 ComplianceSheriff program
III.C.9 2018-2021 Participatory Governance Model Handbook, pg. 21
III.C.10 Academic Senate by-laws, showing Pedagogy and Technology Committee
III.C.11 Sample IT managers’ group meeting minutes
III.C.12 Educational Master Plan, pgs 146-149
III.C.13 Program review template, showing “Currency” section
III.C.14 2018-19 Library AUP, pg. 8; 2018-19 ACCESS programs AUP, pg. 8; and 2018-19 Allied Health AUP, pg. 5
III.C.15 2018-2019 Academic Affairs ADP, pg. 11; 2018-2019 Administrative Services ADP, pg. 3; 2018-2019 President’s Office ADP, pg. 6
III.C.16 2018-2019 Technology RRA
III.C.17 2017 Information Technology Program Review
III.C.18 2018-2019 IT AUP
III.C.19 2015-16 IT AUP, pg. 3
III.C.20 2016-17 IT AUP, pgs. 4-5
III.C.21 7-year hardware replacement plan
III.C.22 Sample Administrative Cabinet agenda December 11, 2017, and TRT minutes February 14, 2018, showing presentation of security videos
III.C.23 TRT minutes February 14, 2018 and College Council minutes February 15, 2018 showing discussion of hardware replacement plan
III.C.24 Banner 9 training calendar
III.C.25 Canvas training materials
III.C.26 Event form training materials
III.C.27 Campus computer background screens
III.C.28 Canvas tutorials for students
III.C.29 PDEV C052 COR
III.C.30 Helpdesk knowledge base
III.C.31 KCCD Board Policy 3E1 and Procedures 3E1C(a)-(b) and 3E1F
III.C.32 KCCD Board Policy 3E2-5 and Procedures 3E2E, 3E3, and 3E5
III.C.33  Student computing use policy pop-up

Standard III.D: Financial Resources

Planning

III.D.1: Financial resources are sufficient to support and sustain student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. The distribution of resources supports the development, maintenance, allocation and reallocation, and enhancement of programs and services. The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity and in a manner that ensures financial stability. (ER 18)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The Kern Community College District (KCCD) distributes the majority of its unrestricted financial resources based upon an internally developed allocation model that is posted on the District’s Budget Allocation Model site as “Budget Allocation Funding Model Narrative Final” (III.D.1). This distribution mirrors the allocation model utilized by the California Community College Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO), which was a result of SB 361. Available revenue is allocated to the individual colleges as base funding plus per-FTES funding. Allocation of funds related to enrollment growth are allocated in the year following the growth. This avoids allocating funds that may not actually materialize. The colleges are then charged back for district-wide expenses based on each college’s proportion of funded FTES generated in the previous year. Conceptually, in growth periods, the monies follow where FTES is generated, providing the funding for program and institutional improvements based on identified need.

All three colleges have been able to provide program offerings that have maximized the allowable funded FTES for the District since the inception of the model. The District’s model allows the colleges to maintain any unused funding. This has allowed the colleges to build up sufficient reserves. These reserves are being utilized to 1) stabilize operations during periods of significant funding reductions by the state, 2) fund unfunded liabilities (i.e. vacation accruals, banked load etc.) and 3) set aside funding for deferred capital maintenance projects.

Categorical and other funds are allocated based upon their designated purpose. Cerro Coso Community College pursues additional grant funding opportunities when the funding supports activities that support the College’s mission and goals.

Cerro Coso Community College has implemented an integrated planning process leading to resource allocation, as explained in Standard I.B.9 and evidenced in the Participatory Governance Model Handbook (PGMH) linked from the college Planning Documents page (III.D.2). This process includes the development of unit, section, and division plans that support the college mission and three-year institutional priorities, or strategic goals. All college departments and units participate in this process through either a unit, section, or division plan. The plans include budget requests both at the level of day-to-day costs and more long-term and special one-time expenditures. From the unit, section, and division plans, additional resources requests are developed for facilities, marketing, information technology and professional
development through the resource requests analyses. All requests for resources coming up through the planning process are considered when the budget is developed by the Budget Development Committee in March and April each year (III.D.3).

Cerro Coso Community College had a general unrestricted budget allocation of $20,098,827 for the 2016-17 year plus locally generated revenue (III.D.4). As one college in a multi-college district, $3,399,812 of this allocation was set aside to fund district-wide operations. The net allocation was used to fund all six of the College’s campus locations. Any unspent funds from the allocation are held in reserve at the College for use as indicated above. From 2012-13 to 2015-16, the college reserve at Cerro Coso Community College increased from $3,532,719 to $4,995,451.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution has sufficient revenues to support educational improvement and innovation. The institution’s finances are managed with integrity in a manner that ensures financial stability. The institution’s resource allocation process provides a means for setting priorities for funding institutional improvements. Institutional resources are sufficient to ensure financial solvency. Funds are allocated in a manner that realistically achieves the institution’s stated goals for student learning.

### III.D.2: The institution’s mission and goals are the foundation for financial planning, and financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning. The institution has policies and procedures to ensure sound financial practices and financial stability. Appropriate financial information is disseminated throughout the institution in a timely manner.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

As indicated immediately above, Cerro Coso Community College’s annual integrated planning process is linked directly to the college mission and strategic goals. The mission, institution-set standards, strategic goals, and other guiding principles are revised every three years, as described in the PGMH (III.D.5). As noted in Standard I.A.4, the last review of the college mission, institution-set standards, guiding principles, and strategic goals was in spring 2018; this regular review ensures that goals for institutional improvement are kept updated for every annual budget cycle to guide decision making about resource allocation.

As explained in more detail in Standard I.B.9, the building of the yearly budget takes place between February and April after the writing of unit, section, and division plans, and the completion of resource request analyses. At this point, expenditures have been identified and either supported or not supported at section and division levels and subjected to further analysis through the resource request analyses of facilities, information technology, marketing, professional development, and staffing. For the building of a tentative budget, the Budget Development Committee takes over to complete the process. The Budget Development Committee is a participatory governance committee composed of management, faculty, classified, and student representatives with the charge of annually recommending a tentative budget to College Council (III.D.6).
Consideration of funding when competing needs exist includes how well the request supports the college mission and strategic plan, historical expenditures, level of explanation in the unit/section/division plan, progress on previous initiatives, and the availability of other funding sources. In April, the college budget recommendation is submitted to College Council for review (III.D.7). If endorsed by College Council, the president submits the recommendation to the KCCD board of trustees for adoption. Ultimate authority for approval of the budget, at the college level, lies with the president. In June of every year, each college presents a preliminary budget to the board (III.D.8). In August or September, the District provides the colleges with their final allocation, adjustments are made, and the final college budget is presented to the board for approval (III.D.9).

Upon approval by the KCCD board of trustees, preliminary budget information is distributed back to budget managers and faculty chairs (III.D.10). Every month financial reports are electronically issued to managers of assigned budget responsibility (III.D.11). The report distribution mirrors the electronic approval process. These reports give detailed variance analysis between budgeted, expended, and encumbered funds indicating remaining budget balance by account. Training for budget monitoring in the MIS system is provided to all new managers and is also available on an as-needed basis. In addition, there are high level reports by for the use by the chancellor, presidents, administrative directors, vice presidents and the KCCD chief financial officer (CFO) (III.D.12). Budget managers also have access to review their area budgets at any time through the District’s management information system (MIS).

As stated above, Cerro Coso Community College has gradually built an unrestricted reserve for the purposes of stabilizing operations, funding unfunded liabilities, and setting aside funding for deferred capital maintenance projects. Additionally, the board of trustees has established minimum level of reserves, district-wide, at 15% of unrestricted expenditures (III.D.13). The current level of reserves held by the District at the time of the writing of this self-evaluation report in spring 2018 is 19.91%.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this Standard. The institution reviews its mission and goals as part of the annual fiscal planning process. The institution identifies goals for achievement in any given budget cycle. The institution establishes priorities among competing needs so that it can predict future funding. Institutional plans exist, and they are clearly linked to financial plans, both short-term and long-range. The financial planning process relies primarily on institutional plans for content and timelines. The institution can provide evidence that past fiscal expenditures have supported achievement of institutional plans. The governing board and other institutional leadership receive information about fiscal planning that demonstrates its links to institutional planning. Funds are allocated in a manner that realistically achieves the institution’s stated goals for student learning.
Evidence of Meeting the Standard

At the district level, KCCD follows the Board Policy Manual section 3A Budget Development in its financial planning and budget development. Each year, following board of trustee approval, the District issues a budget development calendar that identifies key due dates for budget development (III.D.14). Chancellor’s Cabinet and District Consultation Council (DCC) are presented with and given an opportunity for input on the district operations budget prior to submission to the board of trustees. DCC is a district-wide participatory governance committee and includes representation from all constituent groups. Further opportunity for input from constituency groups is afforded at the tentative and adopted budget workshops held immediately prior to their respective budget adoption (III.D.15).

At the college level, as outlined above, Cerro Coso Community College has a defined budget development process in which all constituencies are provided an opportunity to play a role and submit input to the Budget Development Committee ahead of its final recommendations to College Council. Presentations of unit, section, and division plans, including budget requests, are made for College Council, and Budget Development Committee members are encouraged to attend these presentations (III.D.16). The Budget Development Committee, which includes representatives from all employee groups, further reviews the unit, section, and division plans and budget requests before recommending a tentative budget to College Council (III.D.17).

Evaluation of this process for effectiveness is both formal and informal. As explained in more detail in Standard I.B.9, college employees are surveyed once every two years about their understanding of and satisfaction with integrated planning, including the budget process. For the purposes of this Standard, the survey includes questions directly focused on awareness of the budget development process, including “I am familiar with the budget development process” and “In my role, I have had sufficient opportunity to provide input into my area’s budget development and request for resources” (III.D.18). Results from the most recent survey in 2016 show that about half of the respondents say they are familiar with the college budget process (49%) while slightly less than two-thirds (64%) agree or strongly agree they have had opportunity to have input. This information becomes part of the College Report Card for that year linked from the Planning Documents page (III.D.19). The last of these surveys was done in spring 2016 with the next due spring 2018.

In addition to reviewing the results of this formal survey, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and the Budget Development Committee also informally dialogue on a continual basis what is working and what is not and where opportunities exist for improvement. In addition to the modifications noted in Standard I.B.9, other recent modifications out of these formal and informal reviews include the following.

- In 2015, in order to improve college-wide communication of plans and budget requests, faculty chairs and budget managers began presenting unit plans directly to College Council in late fall—Budget Development Committee members being invited to the
meetings—including addressing the expected budgetary impact of requests and proposed initiatives. In 2017 deans and site directors began presenting section plans in the same way. In 2017 vice presidents started presenting division plans at spring faculty flex day (III.D.16).

- In 2017, to address concerns about timely communication, the vice president finance and administrative services began sending preliminary budget information directly back to budget managers and faculty chairs in detailed one-to-one emails. This information is sent after the adoption of the tentative budget and includes not only the budget as it was entered into the Banner system but also how it relates to the original budget request that was submitted the previous fall semester (III.D.10)
- In 2018, to address requests for an easier process, budget worksheets were turned into web-entry forms so plan proposers will be able to complete the plan component and budget component in the same system instead of working back and forth between web and excel documents; this change is to be implemented for the first time in fall 2018 for 2019-2020 planning.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution has established processes for financial planning and budget development, which are made known to college constituents. The College’s mechanisms or processes are used to ensure constituent participation in financial planning and budget development.

Fiscal Responsibility and Stability

**III.D.4: Institutional planning reflects a realistic assessment of financial resource availability, development of financial resources, partnerships, and expenditure requirements.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

To expand on Standard III.D.1: the District distributes the majority of its unrestricted financial resources based upon an internally developed budget allocation model that mirrors the allocation model utilized by the CCCCO (III.D.1). The model was collegially developed with all district stakeholders and has been evaluated regularly since its inception. The model was last evaluated in 2015-2016 (III.D.20). At the time of the writing of this self-evaluation report in spring 2018, the model includes an initial allocation based upon the size of the college and of state-recognized educational centers. The remaining majority of funds are allocated based upon funded FTES generated at each college. District operations costs are budgeted based on required functional service needs and requirements and are charged back to the colleges based upon projected funded FTES (III.D.4).

The district operations that provide centralized services to the colleges develop their budgets based upon their functional service role. The services provided are based upon college-specific functional service needs and requirements in the areas of chancellor’s office, business services, information technology, educational services, human resources, and facilities (III.D.21). As stated above, the colleges provide input into the district operations budget through the Chancellor’s Cabinet and DCC (III.D.22).
At Cerro Coso Community College, permanent labor and benefits, projected adjunct and overload labor, rents, and utilities are determined annually to facilitate the budget development process. Consideration is made for on-going commitments versus one-time costs. Individual departments and units, through discussion and prioritization, develop budget requests, exclusive of these costs, as part of the integrated planning cycle. In its dialogue over budget requests, the Budget Development Committee considers support of institutional priorities, historical expenditures, level of explanation in the unit/section/division plan, progress towards previous initiatives, and other available funding sources. Although the Cerro Coso Community College 2015-16 and 2016-17 budgets were adopted by the board of trustees utilizing college reserves, the College continued to further refine planning throughout the year and ended up in both cases realizing an increase in college reserve rather than a decrease.

Restricted program funds are typically allocated based upon the rules and regulations associated with the specific categorical program, grant requirement, or specific designated purposes. If the funding is designated for allocation by the District, the allocation is usually tied to a metric that best correlates to the program’s objective such as student equity. Campus budget managers monitor changes in budget allocations and ensure balanced budgets. Budget managers for categorical and grant funded programs monitor expenditures to ensure compliance with spending criteria set forth by the funding agency.

When appropriate, Cerro Coso Community College develops partnerships with local K-12 school districts which have provided no or low cost facilities for college course instruction (III.D.23).

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this Standard. Individuals involved in institutional planning receive accurate information about available funds, including the annual budget showing ongoing and anticipated fiscal commitments. The institution establishes funding priorities in a manner that helps the institution achieve its mission and goals.

The District and College take a conservative approach to income allocation during the planning processes, and the College attempts to budget to its allocation. This has been challenging in recent years given the ongoing increases in labor and benefit costs. During the last several years, the College made the decision to utilize college reserve to balance the budget, and even though planning is ongoing to bring expenditures in line with annual available resources, the College recognizes that this is not a sustainable practice. It is actively involved in ongoing discussions related to long term strategies including generating new FTES streams, advocating for revisions to the budget allocation model, seeking efficiencies in utilities and operations, and prioritizing operational expenditures.
III.D.5: To assure the financial integrity of the institution and responsible use of its financial resources, the internal control structure has appropriate control mechanisms and widely disseminates dependable and timely information for sound financial decision making. The institution regularly evaluates its financial management practices and uses the results to improve internal control systems.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The District has established fiscal controls in place for all financial transactions. As stated in KCCD Board Policy Manual policies 3A2 Fiscal Management through 3A12 Auxiliary Organizations outline specific control policies for all district operations (III.D.24).

The controls utilize designated approval processes which primarily correspond to management authority for the various types of transactions (III.D.25). The majority of transactions are primarily processed through electronic approvals utilizing the District’s MIS system. Segregation of duties occurs at both the district office and at the colleges. Bank fund transfers (i.e. electronic wires, ACH, etc.) and check distributions (B-warrants, Payroll-warrants) require written approval and review by the director of security. In addition, a series of electronically generated financial reports support these control processes (III.D.12). Throughout the year, budget managers receive regular (monthly) reports of their area budgets.

Services and supply contracts also require specific approvals and are either approved or ratified based on Board Procedure 3A4(a) Bids and Contracts, which governs district contract administration. Integrity is also addressed by KCCD’s compliance with the Conflict of Interest Code; identified positions must annually complete the Fair Political Practices Commission Form 700. The form discloses any potential conflict of interest and are held on file at the district office (III.D.26).

Improvements in the system occur in a number of ways. The three college vice presidents of finance and administrative services, the district director of accounting services, and the district CFO meet weekly to review current fiscal issues at the colleges and district operation. Once a month, a face-to-face meeting is conducted to review issues in depth (III.D.27). In addition, the district director of accounting services and the three college accounting managers meet weekly to discuss financial matters and also meet monthly face to face (III.D.28). The director of accounting services provides the linkage to the accounting managers’ issues that are identified. Additionally, practices are reviewed whenever situations arise where the needs of the departments or our students are not being met and when writing/updating procedures manuals, such as student athlete per diem in fall 2017.

As described in more detail in Standard III.D.7, the College’s financial records are audited as part of the comprehensive annual KCCD external audit. As a result of these reviews, procedural changes have been implemented to tighten internal controls, such as the inclusion of agendas for travel reimbursements.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The College and District have adequate processes to review financial transactions and processes. The College and District have an adequate internal control
structure and appropriate control mechanisms. Financial management practices are evaluated regularly.

**III.D.6: Financial documents, including the budget, have a high degree of credibility and accuracy, and reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Financial reports accurately reflect allocation and use of financial resources that have been approved through the planning process to improve student learning and support the mission and strategic goals. As described in detail in [Standard I.B.9](#), annual planning documents focus on gaps and outcome assessments, as well as initiatives to improve student learning programs and services. The area budget requests include specific information linked to institutional priorities, including:

- Type of increase (program expansion, planning initiative, absorbing previous initiative/expansion, replacement plan, vendor price increase, or other explanations)
- Frequency (one-time, ongoing annual, or ongoing periodic)
- Planning document or data that supports the rationale (annual unit plan, annual section plan, annual division plan, program review, or other) ([III.D.29](#)).

As explained above in [Standard III.D.2](#), the college Budget Development Committee uses this information to tie resource requests to initiatives and develop an annual budget to recommend to College Council. Also explained in that Standard is how the process is evaluated for constituent understanding and satisfaction.

The allocation of funds can be verified through a variety of reporting options available in the District’s MIS system. The district budget is developed by each college and by the district office and is vetted locally through established college review processes. The district operations budget is developed and vetted through Chancellor’s Cabinet and DCC prior to release of the tentative budget in June. The final budget is adopted by the board of trustees in September and focuses on changes made from the time of the tentative budget ([III.D.9](#)).

The College’s financial records are audited as part of the comprehensive annual KCCD external audit, as explained in more detail immediately below in [Standard III.D.7](#). In addition, KCCD’s external financial reports and 311Q/311A reports document all of the District’s financial transactions and are posted to the Financial Reports site. The 311Q reports are reported to the board of trustees quarterly ([III.D.30](#)). The 311A and the annual external audit are presented to the board in September and December, respectively ([III.D.31](#)). These reports contain a breakdown of all funds (balance sheet and results of operations). In addition, the 311A report includes several key compliance reports (50% Law, Lottery expenditure report, Gann compliance, etc.). The external audit also includes a reconciliation of differences between the 311A report and the final external audit report. The external audit also includes all findings and the District’s response and plan for rectifying those findings.
Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution reviews the effectiveness of its past fiscal planning as part of planning for current and future fiscal needs. The institutional budget is an accurate reflection of institutional spending and it has credibility with constituents. Budget information, including the fiscal condition, financial planning, and audit results, is sufficient in content and timing to support institutional and financial planning and financial management.

III.D.7: Institutional responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The College’s financial records are audited as part of the comprehensive annual KCCD external audit (III.D.32). To the extent that audit recommendations strengthen internal controls and/or improve financial procedures, the College or District implements them if they are feasible, reasonable, and cost effective. Responses to audit findings are provided to the auditors prior to the publication of the annual audit. The College’s responses are included in the publicized financial statements. Recent audits—for example, of 2013-14, 2014-15 and 2015-16—have resulted in no findings.

Annual audit results are shared with the board (III.D.31) and posted on the KCCD website (III.D.33).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. External audits have not warranted a response over the past several years. Audits demonstrate the integrity of financial management practices.

III.D.8: The institution’s financial and internal control systems are evaluated and assessed for validity and effectiveness, and the results of this assessment are used for improvement.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The comprehensive annual audit for KCCD includes evaluation of the financial internal controls related to reporting. As mentioned above, the three vice presidents of finance and administrative services meet regularly to discuss processes, both those internally imposed as well as those imposed by external organizations. The three college accounting managers also meet regularly to discuss processes.

At the college level, at the end of each budget development cycle, as indicated in Standard III.D.3, the Budget Development Committee continually evaluates and annually debriefs the most recent process from the committee perspective. Recommendations are often made to improve the decision making process for the following budget cycles.
Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution reviews its internal control systems on a regular basis. The institution responds to internal control deficiencies identified in the annual audit in a timely manner.

**III.D.9: The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, support strategies for appropriate risk management, and, when necessary, implement contingency plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences.**

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The institution has sufficient cash flows and reserves at the college and district level to maintain stability. KCCD’s goal is to minimize the effect of the fluctuating state budget on its various stakeholders. Since April 2014, the board of trustees has had a goal of maintaining a minimum district-wide reserve (excluding college reserves) of at least 15% (III.D.13). Additionally, each college should maintain a minimum reserve of 3%.

The District’s historical reserve balance, as adopted by the board of trustees is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopted Reserve</td>
<td>11,569,774</td>
<td>14,045,865</td>
<td>27,269,792</td>
<td>26,328,129</td>
<td>27,749,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted Expense</td>
<td>105,528,815</td>
<td>110,831,965</td>
<td>120,664,535</td>
<td>128,131,276</td>
<td>139,504,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve as %</td>
<td>10.96%</td>
<td>12.67%</td>
<td>22.60%</td>
<td>20.55%</td>
<td>19.89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As evidenced by those same documents, Cerro Coso Community College’s historical reserve balance adopted by the board of trustees is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopted Reserve</td>
<td>3,396,398</td>
<td>5,137,355</td>
<td>4,943,923</td>
<td>3,938,584</td>
<td>3,985,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted Expense</td>
<td>19,996,762</td>
<td>19,585,739</td>
<td>20,785,363</td>
<td>21,561,243</td>
<td>22,782,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve as %</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the college and district-wide reserves have been so large, a specific set aside has not been necessary for identification in the annual budget. Cerro Coso Community College has not been intentionally adding to the reserve but continuing to address student learning needs as they have developed through the budget resource allocation process.

The District is part of the Self Insured Schools of California JPA for General Property and Liability Insurance. This program provides proactive strategies to managing risk for school districts. The current level of coverage combined with proactive programs provided by the JPA, minimizes the District’s risk. In addition, the District requires that contractors provide it with appropriate insurance certifications and indemnifications commensurate with the risks associated with the service being provided.

The District also has access to funding it has set aside for future COP and other debt payments. These funds constitute approximately $33.7 million dollars and are available for meeting short term cash flow requirements for general fund operations. In addition, the District has the ability...
to participate in the TRAN (Tax Revenue Anticipation Notes) program to further assist in meeting short term cash flow requirements although this has not been necessary since 2011-12.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard. The institution’s level of unrestricted fiscal reserves is adequate to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences. The ending balance of unrestricted funds for the immediate past three years is sufficient to maintain a reserve needed for emergencies.

**III.D.10: The institution practices effective oversight of finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations or foundations, and institutional investments and assets.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Budget managers continually monitor allocations, income, and expenditures from all internal and external funding sources. All expenditures are approved by the appropriate budget manager via electronic approval in our MIS system. Monthly financial reports are distributed electronically to budget managers based on approval authority. Budget managers also have access to review their area budgets at any time through the District’s MIS system. The College works closely with the district CFO, director of accounting services, accounting department, and internal auditor to assure appropriate recording of financial activity.

The District coordinates with the colleges in overseeing the institutions’ various financial reporting and management obligations. The District is responsible for drawing down and distributing the financial aid funds. Part of this process includes reconciliations between distributions and the awarding process. In addition, for grants, categorical, and other externally funded programs, the District compiles all financial reporting which is directly reconciled to the books of record maintained in the MIS system. These reports are reviewed by the appropriate budget manager before being submitted. This also includes reconciliation to government electronic draw downs and funding distributions.

Policy 3A4B of the KCCD Board Policy Manual requires all contracts to be board-ratified or approved (III.D.24). The District utilizes electronic approvals via BoardDocs to ensure all levels of management have reviewed and approved the contract. In addition, district Business Services and General Counsel offices review contracts for compliance with public contract code, board policy, and other laws and regulations as appropriate. Every contract contains appropriate insurance and indemnification requirements commensurate with the risk associated with the services being provided.

As mentioned above in Standard III.D.5, the district CFO and vice presidents of finance and administrative services meet monthly to review financial and business issues. In addition, the District’s director of accounting services and accounting managers meet monthly to deal with financial accounting matters throughout the District.
District investments are primarily associated with future debt payment of COP’s held by the District. The investments are managed by external investment firms which give regular updates on the status of the investments to the Board Finance Committee and board of trustees.

Auxiliary organizations are governed by Board Policy 3A12 Auxiliary Organizations. The District provides financial services, through a separate financial records system, and guidance for these organizations as well as helps ensure compliance with auxiliary contracts between District and auxiliary organization. Handbooks were developed, specific to Cerro Coso Community College, related to student government treasurer responsibilities and general fundraising guidelines (III.D.34).

District assets are governed by Board Policy 3B Facilities and Equipment (III.D.35). District assets are primarily managed by this policy and college administrators at each of the respective colleges and centers.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution has established processes to assess its use of financial resources. The institution demonstrates compliance with Federal Title IV regulations and requirements. The institution ensures that it assesses its use of financial resources systematically and effectively. As indicated in a number of areas in this Standard, the institution uses results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

Liabilities

III.D.11: The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency. When making short-range financial plans, the institution considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability. The institution clearly identifies, plans, and allocates resources for payment of liabilities and future obligations.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

As part of the budget development process, the district CFO develops high level long-term financial forecasts based upon the release of the California governor’s budget in January. These are typically three-year projections and focus on unrestricted operations. These projections are presented to the Board Finance Committee. In addition a report on the current funded status of the District’s long term liabilities, that are to be funded by unrestricted funds, is presented to the Board Finance Committee. As part of the financial planning process, the district operations budgets contain funding for all required general liability, property, and student insurance as well as all short-term and long term debt costs. The college and district operations are currently setting aside funding to meet their banked load and accrued vacation liabilities. This is reviewed on an annual basis (III.D.36).

The College’s financial planning primarily addresses the short-term operating needs of the institution. The College budgets to cover vacation leave and banked load balances whose value is estimated during the budget development process. The College currently transfers 40% of the estimated value in each year to dedicated funds to cover the full liability. In addition, the colleges are expected to budget for scheduled maintenance projects.
The internal KCCD budget allocation model allows for stability funding for at least one year when enrollments decline or allocation reductions result in a decline to a college’s allocation. This allows sufficient time for the impacted college to evaluate their process and make adjustments. As indicated above, the district board has a goal of maintaining a minimum district-wide reserve (excluding college reserves) of at least 15%, with each college should maintaining a minimum reserve of 3%. As described in more detail in Standard IV.D.3, the Districtwide Budget Development Committee has been charged with studying the current approach to stabilization in regard to long term increasing costs not within the control of the colleges. At the time of the writing of this self-evaluation, that group has not completed its work.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this Standard. The institution has a process to conduct short-term and long-term fiscal planning and develop priorities. The institution has plans for payments of long-term liabilities and obligations, including debt, health benefits, insurance costs, building maintenance costs, etc. This information is used in short-term or annual budget and other fiscal planning

**III.D.12: The institution plans for and allocates appropriate resources for the payment of liabilities and future obligations, including Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB), compensated absences, and other employee related obligations. The actuarial plan to determine Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) is current and prepared as required by appropriate accounting standards.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The District follows the employer rates that have been statutorily set for STRS and PERS. At June 30, 2016, the District’s proportionate share of net pension liability was $51.7 million for STRS and $29.4 million for PERS, for a total net pension liability of $81.1 million.

The District provides post-employment healthcare benefits for eligible employees who retire with CalSTRS or CalPERS pension benefits upon termination of employment from the District through the KCCD Postretirement Health Benefits Plan (the “Plan”). The Plan is a single employer OPEB plan and obligations of the Plan members and the District are based on negotiated contracts with the various bargaining units of the District.

Actuarial studies are performed every two years. The most recent actuarial study for post-retirement benefits was performed in November 2016 and updated in February 2018 to reflect the amount that should be accumulated under the requirements of GASB 74-75. The District’s long-term liability was estimated at $87.7 million.

In order to reduce the overall cost to the District, and to assist with the funding of the obligation, in 2008 the District issued $85,880,000 in OPEB bonds for the partial funding of that liability and established revocable and irrevocable trust funds.

As a means of supplementing the accrued amount required under GASB 74-75, the annual required contribution (ARC) is assessed as an employer expense of 0.98 percent on each full-time employee payroll dollar. This fringe benefit rate is assessed to all eligible employees’ salaries in all funds, including categorical, grants and contracts, and auxiliary services.
Vacation leave for classified and management employees are capped at a maximum accrual of 240 hours per employee. Load bank activities for certificated employees also have a maximum balance based on the collective bargaining agreement. The District reviews and has fully accrued obligations for employees relating to compensated absences and load banking.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this Standard. The institution allocates resources to the payment of its liabilities and funds/reserves to address long-term obligations. Resources are directed to actuarially developed plans for Other Post-Employment Benefit (OPEB) obligations. The institution fully funds its annual OPEB obligation.

**III.D.13: On an annual basis, the institution assesses and allocates resources for the repayment of any locally incurred debt instruments that can affect the financial condition of the institution.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The Kern Community College Safety, Repair and Improvement District (SRID) was formed following a public hearing in August 2002. Measure G was placed on the ballot for November 2002 and the electors of the Improvement District approved $180 million for the construction and rehabilitation of facilities.

The Kern Community College District Facilities Improvement District No. 1 (the “Improvement District”) includes all portions of the District located in Kern, San Bernardino, and Tulare Counties. Measure J was placed on the ballot for November 2016 and the electors of the Improvement District approved $502,821,000 for the construction and rehabilitation of facilities.

In accordance with Education Code Section 15278, a Citizens’ Oversight Committee was established to inform the public concerning the District’s expenditure of bond proceeds. The committee has oversight for both Measure G and Measure J funds. The committee provides oversight ensuring that 1) bond revenues are expended only for the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation or replacement of college facilities, including the furnishing and equipping of college facilities or the acquisition or lease of real property for college facilities, and 2) no bond revenues are expended for any teacher or administrative salaries or other college operating expenses. This committee reports annually to the board of trustees (III.D.37).

Both Measure G and J are repaid through property taxes collected from taxpayers.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this Standard. The institution determines the level of locally incurred debt and makes appropriate plans to address the debt. The institution ensures that locally incurred debt repayment schedule does not have an adverse impact on meeting all current fiscal obligations. The institution has an annual assessment of debt repayment obligations, and resources are allocated in a manner that ensures stable finances.
III.D.14: **All financial resources, including short- and long-term debt instruments (such as bonds and Certificates of Participation), auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and grants, are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the funding source.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

As stated immediately above, a Citizens’ Oversight Committee was established to inform the public concerning the District’s expenditure of bond proceeds. The committee has oversight for both Measure G and Measure J funds.

Auxiliary activities support the programs and services of the College. Funds from student activities and clubs are kept separate from the general fund and processed through the associate student body fund. The contract and community education programs support the identified needs of the community outside the scope of credit courses. Although part of the general fund, fiscal activity of these programs is tracked using separate fund codes, and the programs are self-supporting.

The Cerro Coso Community College Foundation is an auxiliary organization of the College with its own board of directors. Its fundraising efforts provide scholarships and general support for students and college programs. The foundation has appropriate checks and balances to ensure the funds are both raised and allocated appropriately. The foundation is subject to an annual external audit. The agreement for the establishment of the foundation indicates that the foundation will abide by the District’s board policies (III.D.38).

The bookstore operation, which is operated through a district-wide contract with Barnes & Noble, supports the college student development program, which provides opportunities that benefit the general student body. The contract with Barnes & Noble specifies specific percentages of commissionable sales and a minimum annual guarantee level, across the District (III.D.39).

Policy 3A2A5 of the KCCD Board Policy Manual outlines the process for applying for new/renewal grants. These processes include identify additional needed resources, and require campus and district approval. Due to a significant increase in the size of grants awarded to the District and colleges, the District has increased staffing in its grant accounting area to assist grant directors and managers in complying with ongoing fiscal monitoring and other administrative requirements of these grants. District accounting services coordinates and compiles all fiscal reporting to the various agencies administering financial aid, categorical, and grant funding (III.D.40).

All fiscal expenditures must go through a compliance review independent of budget manager approval. This compliance review is completed to ensure that the expenditures are consistent with the District’s accounting requirements and with board policies governing expenditures. All expenditures are approved by the appropriate budget manager via electronic approval in the MIS system.
Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution ensures that the financial operations of all auxiliary activities are appropriately monitored.

**III.D.15: The institution monitors and manages student loan default rates, revenue streams, and assets to ensure compliance with federal requirements, including Title IV of the Higher Education Act, and comes into compliance when the federal government identifies deficiencies.**

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Cerro Coso Community College does not offer student loans.

Analysis and Evaluation

This Standard does not apply.

Contractual Agreements

**III.D.16: Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution and the quality of its programs, services, and operations.**

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

All agreements that the institution enters into are reviewed by college and district management for appropriateness. This review determines if the agreement is consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, or whether the relationship would negatively affect the integrity of the institution. All agreements can only be executed by the district CFO, per KCCD Board Policy Manual section 3A4A (III.D.24). Board policy sections 3A4A through 3A4F and board procedure 3A4A address contractual agreements. The District requires that all contracts be board-ratified or approved. The District utilizes electronic approvals via BoardDocs which summarizes the contract terms and indicates the income/expense related to the contract. All contracts must meet the requirements of the public contract code. Every contract contains appropriate insurance and indemnification requirements commensurate with the risk associated with services being provided. In addition, all contracts must go through KCCD Business Services for compliance review with the public contract code and board policy. To assist the colleges and District with contract management the District has developed a contract check list of items to be included in each contract. Following approval of contracts through the district office, campuses can prepare purchase orders to procure services.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. Contractual agreements are consistent with institutional mission and goals. The institution has appropriate control over these contracts. KCCD requires that contracts contain termination language that allows for termination of contracts. All contracts are managed in a manner to ensure that Public Contract Code requirements are met.
Changes and Plans Arising out of the Self-Evaluation Process

Future Action Plans

III.D.11: During the 2015 budget allocation model review, recommendations were made related to the reserves and stabilization mechanism, as discussed in more detail in Standard IV.D.3. A new Districtwide Budget Development Committee was charged in 2017-18 with reviewing the current approach to stabilization to address concerns regarding long term increasing costs not within the control of the college. At the time of the writing of this document, that task force had not fully completed its work.

List of Evidence

| III.D.1  | KCCD Budget Allocation Model Narrative Final |
| III.D.2  | Participatory Governance Model Handbook, pgs. 16-17 |
| III.D.3  | Budget Committee binder |
| III.D.4  | 2016-2017 KCCD Adopted Budget |
| III.D.5  | Participatory Governance Model Handbook, pgs. 15-16 |
| III.D.6  | PGMH, pg. 24 |
| III.D.7  | College Council minutes April 27, 2017 showing review of budget |
| III.D.8  | BOT meeting minutes June 8, 2017 showing presentation of tentative budget, item 7.3 |
| III.D.9  | BOT meeting minutes September 14, 2017 showing presentation of adopted budget |
| III.D.10 | Distribution of budget information |
| III.D.11 | Sample monthly budget information distribution |
| III.D.12 | Sample high-level reports of purchasing |
| III.D.13 | KCCD Board Policy 3A1A6 |
| III.D.14 | Sample BOT meeting minutes June 2017 showing approval of budget calendar, item 6.J |
| III.D.15 | Sample BOT meeting minutes June 2017 and September 2017 showing work study sessions on budget, item 6.1 |
| III.D.16 | College Council agenda October 30, 2017, and November 2, 2017, showing unit plan presentations, College Council agendas December 7, 2017, showing section plan presentations, flex day agendas January 12, 2018 showing division plan presentations |
| III.D.17 | Sample Budget Development Committee agendas and minutes, spring 2018 |
| III.D.18 | College Planning Survey instrument |
| III.D.19 | 2016 planning survey, pgs. 3-4, of the 2016 College Report Card |
| III.D.21 | District Operations – Centralized Services as indicated in the 2018 KCCD Adopted Budget, pages 55-56 |
| III.D.22 | Recent District Consultation Council minutes April 24, 2018, showing input into DO operations budget |
| III.D.23 | Facilities use agreements with Tehachapi Unified School District and Sierra Sands Unified School District |
III.D.24  KCCD Board Policy 3A2 through 3A12, and procedure 3A4A
III.D.25  Approval Queue Structure and Organization Chart
III.D.26  Conflict of Interest Form 700 Request
III.D.27  Sample Vice President Finance and Administrative Services meeting agendas and minutes
III.D.28  Sample Accounting Managers Meeting Agendas
III.D.29  Sample budget request worksheets
III.D.30  Sample BOT meeting minutes April 12, 2018, showing presentation of 311Q, item 6.9
III.D.31  Sample BOT meeting minutes September 14, 2017 showing presentation of Annual Audit and 311A, item 4.G
III.D.32  Sample KCCD External Audit Reports
III.D.33  Annual Reports page on the KCCD website
III.D.34  Handbook for student government treasurer responsibilities and general fundraising guidelines
III.D.35  KCCD Board Policy 3B
III.D.36  Budget Premise Document
III.D.37  Sample BOT meeting minutes June 8, 2017, showing presentation from Bond Oversight, item 5.10
III.D.38  Agreement with Cerro Coso Community College Foundation
III.D.39  Agreement with Barnes & Noble
III.D.40  Grant Reporting Calendar
Standard IV

Standard IV.A: Decision-Making Roles and Processes

Decision-Making Roles and Processes

IV.A.1: Institutional leaders create and encourage innovation leading to institutional excellence. They support administrators, faculty, staff, and students, no matter what their official titles, in taking initiative for improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective planning and implementation.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Faculty, classified, administration, and students are continually encouraged to give input into improving educational opportunities and services at Cerro Coso Community College’s several campuses. As described more fully throughout the rest of this Standard, the College has a robust participative process. As a small college that is further subdivided into smaller campuses, the participation of each employee from every location is crucial to the smooth running and the continuous improvement of the institution.

All voices are essential to improving the institution regardless of employee group or campus location. The College conducts governance business through a layered use of video- and teleconferencing systems that brings constituents together from all campuses. Conference rooms at each campus location are outfitted with monitors, microphones, and videoconference software. It is not unusual for a committee meeting to include a handful of attendees at Ridgecrest, two or three in videoconference rooms at extension campuses, and three or four more on the phone (IV.A.1). Discussion materials are posted to committee SharePoint sites or sent by email so all participants have access to the evidence, data, and research for analysis and discussion. Many committees and workgroups specifically call out for at least one extension site representative (IV.A.2).

Ideas from all employee groups are encouraged. When the College formed inquiry groups in spring 2017 to research, identify, and implement best strategies for making students feel more connected, directed, and focused, two of the four groups consisted of classified staff and administrators working together (IV.A.3). The groups not only developed a set of adoptable practices, but the idea of the “welcome barbeque” was put into effect right away, led at all campuses by classified staff working closely with faculty and administrators (IV.A.4). Out of the same impulse, one of the College’s major projects since 2017, led by the president with classified leaders, has been the resuscitation of the classified senate as a clearly defined and effective voice for the concerns of classified staff in governance (IV.A.5). Guided pathways work calling for cross-functional teams has been an easy fit for the College: attendance at a spring 2018
conference included two vice presidents, two administrators, two faculty members, two classified staff members, and the college institutional researcher.

The College recognizes the outstanding work of all employee groups by the annual awarding of the Cerro Coso Community College Excellence in Education Award. The winners in the past three years have been an administrator and faculty member, an administrator and classified staff member, and four classified staff members for their pioneering and innovative work (IV.A.6).

For developing leadership, the Kern Community College District (KCCD) has an annual leadership-training program that brings together employees from the three colleges and the district office to work together and develop leadership skills. Candidates are nominated by supervising administrators and come from all employee groups. Part of that development process is the encouragement to share differences and develop an understanding of innovative ways to improve instruction and services (IV.A.7). Student government leaders are also encouraged to participate in the larger California Association of Student Councils, returning with ideas and practices regarding academic and learning environments shared by students from other colleges.

Formally, all employee groups are invited and expected to participate in the annual integrated planning process at the unit, section, or division levels, as described more fully in Standard I.B.9. And all employee groups are expected to be involved in dialogue about program planning through the comprehensive program review process as noted in Standard I.B.5. As noted in both those Standards, when the College evaluates its effectiveness in these areas, it randomly samples all employee groups for their level of understanding, contribution, and satisfaction.

More informally, constituent groups have the opportunity to provide input and suggestions through their respective forms of governance, be it the faculty senate, the student governance process, in administrative meetings, through the classified union, and with the various participatory governance committees and groups identified in the participatory governance structure. The management team has an open door policy and regularly solicits input and ideas from students and employees at all levels.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

Cerro Coso meets this Standard. The institution has formal and informal practices and procedures that encourage individuals, no matter their role, to bring forward ideas for institutional improvement. The institution has established systems and participative processes for effective planning and implementation for program and institutional improvement.
IV.A.2: The institution establishes and implements policy and procedures authorizing administrator, faculty, and staff participation in decision-making processes. The policy makes provisions for student participation and consideration of student views in those matters in which students have a direct and reasonable interest. Policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose committees.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Cerro Coso Community College’s Participatory Governance Model Handbook (PGMH), linked from the Planning Documents page, specifies the manner in which students, staff, confidential management, and administrators work together through the appropriate committees toward continuous improvement (IV.A.8). The document contains sections on the value of participatory governance, the structure of participatory governance, College Council, college constituencies, the college decision-making process, procedures for College Council and its committees, the institutional planning process, the mission review process, the budget process, and appendices on the purpose, charge, composition, and evaluation of all participatory governance committees.

The document demonstrates the College’s commitment to a broad solicitation of voices and perspectives. The appendices that list participatory governance committees shows intentional inclusion of representation from extension sites, as well as student participation. Expectations regarding student participation in governance and decision-making are located throughout the document but particularly in the section on Student Government. As explained in the 2015 Midterm Report to the Commission, linked on the Accreditation site, the College implemented a plan to address the pattern of student non-representation on governance committees, including College Council. To ensure student representation, at the beginning of each semester, the student government advisor works with the student government to place students on committees in an area of interest and at a mutual time that meets their schedule and that of the committee (IV.A.9, pg. 45).

The evaluation of this participatory decision-making process and the improvements that have come about as a result of it are described in more detail below in Standard IV.A.7.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. Institutional policies and procedures describe the roles for each group in decision-making processes. These policies and procedures encourage student participation in matters which concern them, and take into consideration the student perspective when making decisions. The institution regularly evaluates the extent to which these policies and procedures are functioning effectively.
IV.A.3: Administrators and faculty, through policy and procedures, have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The KCCD Board Policy Manual describes the role of the College’s academic senate in institutional governance in section 5:

5A – Recognition of the Academic Senates  
5B – Responsibilities of the College Academic Senates  
5C – Recommendation and Consultation  
5D – Scope  
5E – Implementation  
5F – Review and Revision (IV.A.10)

In all “ten plus one” academic and professional matters, KCCD relies primarily upon the advice and judgment of the academic senate for collegial consultation, with the single exception of 6B4 and 6B5 Administrative Retreat Rights to Faculty Status, which is a matter for mutual agreement. Each section of board policy identifies what type of collegial consultation applies, if any (IV.A.11).

Opportunity for input by administrators and faculty in district-level decision making takes place primarily at the KCCD District Consultation Council, as explained in the KCCD Elements of Decision-Making document linked from the KCCD Chancellor’s Office main page (IV.A.12). This group is the district’s top collegial consultative body designed to help make informed district-wide decisions. Members from the College include the college president and the academic senate president. The role of the academic senates in district-wide decision making is described in the document, as is the role of district-wide committees that many faculty members and administrators from the College sit on (IV.A.13). Sample minutes from District Consultation Council demonstrate the policies and procedures are being following (IV.A.14).

At the college level, the PGMH codifies the established and implemented decision-making processes carried out by the institution and clearly defines the substantive roles administrators and faculty exercise in all areas of decision-making. This includes institutional planning and budgeting related to areas of responsibility (IV.A.8, pp. 14-16). College Council serves as the main entity for participatory decision-making at the College and is co-chaired by the college president and the academic senate president. As evidenced in the PGMH, the associated and reporting committees charged with institutional policies, planning, and budget and that report up to College Council—for example, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Budget Development Committee, and the Safety and Security Committee—contain a mix of administrators and faculty members (IV.A.8, pp. 17-29). Sample minutes from a variety of committees demonstrate active participation from both groups (IV.A.15).

Analysis and Evaluation

Cerro Coso meets the Standard. Institutional policies and procedures describe the roles for each group in governance, including planning and budget development.
Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The KCCD Board Policy Manual clearly outlines the role of the academic senate in curriculum development and student learning programs and services in the following articles of sections 4 and 5:

- 4B1 – Educational Programs
- 4B2 – Courses
- 4B3 – Distance Education
- 4B4 – Programs
- 4B5 – Program Review
- 4B6 – Program Discontinuance
- 4B7 – Articulation
- 5A – Recognition of Academic Senates
- 5B – Responsibilities of the College Academic Senates
- 5C – Recommendation and Consultation (IV.A.10, IV.A.16)

At the college level, both educational administrators and faculty have responsibility for recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services. As explained in more detail in Standard II.A.2, The College’s curriculum committee, the Curriculum and Instruction Council, has primary responsibility for the review and recommendation of courses and programs to be approved by the KCCD board of trustees, and for the processes by which such approval occurs. The vice president of instruction is a resource to ensure compliance with Ed Code, Title 5, and KCCD board policy, as contained in the Curriculum Committee Handbook (IV.A.17). Board policy 4B2D establishes that the vice president of instruction and the college president play a role in recommending course approvals to the board. And Cerro Coso Community College adheres to the California Community College Chancellor’s Office operating procedure that the vice president of instruction, president, academic senate president, and curriculum chair annually certify that course and programs submitted to the Chancellor’s Office for approval follow guidelines established in the Program and Course Approval Handbook (IV.A.18).

In addition to its curriculum committee, the Cerro Coso Community College Academic Senate maintains a number of standing committees with respect to student learning programs and services, as evidence in its bylaws and standing rules (IV.A.2). Sample minutes show these committees active:

- The Petitions Committee receives and acts upon petitions from students seeking waivers, course substitutions, and other actions (IV.A.19).
- The Honors Committee assists the Honors Program coordinator in making decisions about offerings, activities, recruitment, and scholarships (IV.A.20).
• The Pedagogy and Technology Committee makes recommendations about instructional technology and distance education and other technological decisions related to curriculum, teaching, and learning for the college (IV.A.21).

In addition, as evidenced in the PGMH, the associated and reporting committees and their subcommittees charged with curriculum and student learning programs and services—for example, the Outcomes Assessment Committee, Professional Development Committee, and Student Success and Support Council—contain a mix of administrators and faculty members (IV.A.8, pp. 17-29). Sample minutes from a variety of committees demonstrate that the participation from both employee groups (IV.A.22).

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard. Institutional policies and procedures describe the official responsibilities and authority of the faculty and of academic administrators in curricular and other educational matters.

**IV.A.5: Through its system of board and institutional governance, the institution ensures the appropriate consideration of relevant perspectives; decision-making aligned with expertise and responsibility; and timely action on institutional plans, policies, curricular change, and other key considerations.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The PGMH provides an overview of the participatory governance process, which links the decision-making process to the various constituent groups. The PGMH demonstrates how the constituent groups’ items and issues of concern are brought forward as recommendations to the college president, primarily through College Council, so that all parties are heard and represented. The composition of College Council ensures that decision-making is aligned with expertise and responsibility (IV.A.8, pp.4-9, 11). College Council representative members are comprised of a combination of staff, faculty, student and administrative experts, and positions with administrative responsibility. It is an explicit responsibility of all College Council representatives to seek input from their respective constituents to share at each College Council meeting and to report back to constituents information shared at College Council (pgs. 3-4).

The focus of this dialogue is to facilitate the development of college-wide recommendations for institutional improvement. An example in recent years is the effort to more adequately address campus safety and security. Not only was a staffing recommendation made by the group to hire at first a part-time and then, starting in 2016, a full-time director of safety and security, but the committee also recommended the creation of a behavioral intervention team to help prevent and reduce incidents of disruptive and dangerous behavior on campus (IV.A.23).

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this Standard. Staff and students are well informed of their respective roles. The various groups collaborate on behalf of institutional improvements. The result of this effort results in documented institutional improvement. The College has developed structures of communication that demonstrate that it values diverse perspectives. The College demonstrates
that consideration of diverse perspectives leads to setting institutional priorities and timely action.

**IV.A.6: The processes for decision-making and the resulting decisions are documented and widely communicated across the institution.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

All decision-making processes are well documented in the PGMH, as described in preceding Standards. Decisions made are widely communicated by representatives in the College’s administrative cabinet, faculty chair workgroup, student services executive council, academic senate, classified senate, faculty union, classified union, and student government. These are the groups with representatives on the committee. The academic senate, for instance, has a standing agenda item to report out of College Council (IV.A.24).

All College Council minutes are posted on the College’s Participatory Governance page (still often called “the governance tab”). This page was created following College Council’s first effectiveness review as indicated in the 2015 Midterm Report and described more fully immediately below in Standard IV.A.7 (IV.A.25). In addition to doing a better job of formalizing constituent feedback into and out of the committee, College Council committed to putting all minutes of governance and decision-making committees at a central location for ease of reference. Other avenues for “getting the word out” to the college community about governance recommendations and results include the president’s CC Chronicles, the Progress Report, and the Coyote Howler (IV.A.26).

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this Standard. The College has processes to document and communicate decisions across the institution. Faculty, staff, and students know essential information about institutional efforts to achieve goals and improve learning.

**IV.A.7: Leadership roles and the institution’s governance and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses as the basis for improvement.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The practices and processes in the PGMH are reviewed once every three years by College Council, which consists of representatives from all constituent groups. As part of the review, College Council evaluates the effectiveness of its participatory governance process and recommends changes to improve integrity and effectiveness. In 2015, the PGMH was revised to include the mission statement review process that was developed after the College’s 2012 accreditation visit. In 2018, it was revised to ensure that each associated and reporting committee identified an evaluation method to determine its effectiveness (IV.A.8).

In addition, College Council, as the College’s primary decision-making structure, regularly assesses itself and implements changes in response to those assessments in order to assure its
integrity and effectiveness. The assessment is conducted through annual College Council self-evaluation surveys administered to College Council membership and to all college constituents (IV.A.27). Results of the survey are posted and committee discussion is captured in College Council agendas and minutes for all to see (IV.A.28).

When feedback suggests areas for improvement, the committee discusses the results, analyzes the problem, and designs and implements an improvement plan. The 2015 self-evaluation surveys indicated a need for a central location to post all governance decisions; the result was the creation of the governance tab that included meeting materials for all associated and reporting committees (IV.A.29). In 2016, in an effort to improve efficiency, associated and reporting committee reports were located first on the agenda to ensure priority of communication (IV.A.30). In 2017, in order to improve transparency, meeting dates of all committees of College Council are now posted to the governance tab at the very beginning of the year so constituents know when meetings are being held, draft College Council minutes are emailed to members as soon as possible after the meeting (target: 24 hours) in order to facilitate communication with constituents, and input was sought from representatives on how to further improve communication and transparency (IV.A.31).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution regularly evaluates its governance and decision-making structures. The results of these evaluations are communicated within the campus community. The institution uses the results of these evaluations to identify weaknesses and to make needed improvements.

List of Evidence

**IV.A.1** Sample meeting minutes from a variety of committees and work groups showing participation from all sites

**IV.A.2** Examples of PGMH and AS By-laws calling for extension site participants

**IV.A.3** Sample minutes from faculty and staff inquiry groups

**IV.A.4** Ridgecrest Rocks materials

**IV.A.5** Classified senate minutes showing by-laws adopted OR classified engagement committee

**IV.A.6** News articles on last three Excellence in Education awards

**IV.A.7** KCCD Leadership Institute materials

**IV.A.8** 2018-2021 Participatory Governance Model Handbook

**IV.A.9** 2015 Midterm Report for ACCJC

**IV.A.10** KCCD Board Policy 5A through 5F

**IV.A.11** KCCD board policy statements of governance processes relative to collegial consultation with academic senates

**IV.A.12** Elements of Decision Making, pgs. 8-9 and 12

**IV.A.13** Elements of Decision Making, pgs. 9-10

**IV.A.14** Sample Consultation Council minutes showing administrative and academic senate participation

**IV.A.15** Sample minutes from IEC and Budget Development showing faculty participation

**IV.A.16** KCCD Board Policy 4B1 through 4B7
Standard IV.B: Chief Executive Officer

Chief Executive Officer

IV.B.1: The institutional chief executive officer (CEO) has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution. The CEO provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The president meets monthly with her executive advisory team, called the President’s Cabinet, which is composed of the vice presidents of instruction, student services, and finance and administrative services; the College’s human resources manager; the director of information technology; and the director of public relations and institutional advancement. This team discusses and advises the president on strategic topics such as state-wide developments, Kern Community College District (KCCD) Chancellor’s Cabinet items, board actions, advocacy efforts, administrative oversight, and best practices for developing a cohesive workplace environment across the College’s various divisions, as evidenced by sample President’s Cabinet meeting agendas (IV.B.1).

In addition, the president meets once a month with the entire administrative team, called Administrative Cabinet. This working group is the place to discuss more tactical topics such as best practices for employee evaluation and development, expectations of annual integrated planning and budgeting, safety awareness and security protocols, and the role and expectations of administrators in college governance (IV.B.2).
The president guides both sets of administrative teams in leadership development, often during administrative advances. Since the last institutional self-evaluation in 2012, the president has led administrative groups through videos and readings pertinent to its work such as a number Terry O’Banion presentations, Thomas Freidman’s presentation on his book “That Used to Be Us,” a collection of articles found in “Focus on Learning” co-edited by Terry O’Banion and Cynthia Wilson, and articles in “Facing Change in the Community College: Leadership Issues and Challenges,” edited by George Boggs. Since 2014, president’s cabinet has read and discussed “The Tipping Point” by Malcolm Gladwell, “Who Killed Change,” “The Four Disciplines of Execution,” “Leadership 101: What Every Leader Needs to Know,” and, most recently, “The Advantage” by Patrick Lencioni.

College wide, the president provides leadership in achieving the college mission to improve student learning and achievement through a variety of other activities, including co-chairing College Council, co-chairing the Cerro Coso Foundation, meeting weekly with the academic senate president, making every hiring decision whether personally doing finalist interviews or debriefing with the administrator who does, emceeing Meet and Greets, providing state-of-the-college presentations at faculty flex days, and informally having an open door policy for every Cerro Coso Community College employee. One of the most important roles the president plays is serving on the College’s Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) and engaging directly in dialogue about the structure and effectiveness of college operations, including the annual integrated planning and resource allocation processes, which role is described in more detail in Standard IV.B.3 below.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The CEO regularly communicates institutional values, goals, institution-set standards, and other relevant information, to internal and external stakeholders. The CEO communicates the importance of a culture of evidence and a focus on student learning. The institution has mechanisms in place to link institutional research, particularly research on student learning, to institutional planning processes, and resource allocation processes, which has been driven by the CEO.

**IV.B.2:** The CEO plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution’s purposes, size, and complexity. The CEO delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

While assessment of the College’s administrative structure takes place continually through observation, reflection, and discussion in such groups as Administrative Cabinet and President’s Cabinet, it is formalized through the planning and budget cycle. As explained in much more detail in Standard I.B.9, staffing is one of the resources specifically prompted in unit, section, and division plans. Cases made for staffing change come up through the planning process and are reviewed at successive levels, and this is just as true for administrative positions as for staff and faculty positions, as evidenced by a variety of managerial positions that have come forward in recent plans (**IV.B.3**). Staffing is one of the resource request analyses that is completed in February based on an entire review of all plans completed and all positions asked, an analysis of
the work to get done, and the likely budget situation (IV.B.4). The president is the author of this staffing resource request every February, as linked from the Integrated Planning page; this yearly document is completed after consultation with vice presidents and with Administrative Cabinet and which is shared with College Council (IV.B.5).

Reorganizations and changes in administrative structure in recent years include:

- In 2015, the upgrading of a two-campus-manager structure at East Kern and Kern River Valley to a director and a campus manager in order to provide uniform oversight and a more streamlined reporting structure for the development of the emerging Tehachapi campus.
- In 2016, the hiring of a full-time director of equity to provide expertise and leadership in this important area of the college mission
- In 2017, the increase of a part-time athletic director to full-time to support the adoption of new athletic teams
- In 2017, the hiring of a dean of letters and sciences to provide support and leadership to the non-CTE academic departments as well as library, learning assistance, honors, basic skills, and adult education
- In 2017, the hiring of a college institutional researcher in response to the direction of Kern Community College District to let the responsibility and work of college-level research flow back to the individual colleges
- In 2018, the hiring of a dual enrollment and incarcerated student program manager (contingent on funding) to support the expanding need for developing processes and workflows in support of both programs in the East Kern area
- In 2018, the split of a student activities and outreach director position into a student government faculty advisor and a full-time outreach management coordinator to better align faculty with student government and provide more focus and direction to the outreach function.

In the KCCD Board Policy Manual, policy 6A5B College President establishes the duties and responsibilities of the executive head of the College and includes such topics as personnel decisions, staff assignments, staff evaluations, advocacy, instructional materials approval, facility requirements, supervision of programs, and others (IV.B.6). Board policy 6A5B1 specifically notes that the president has the authority to delegate areas of responsibility as permitted by law. Board policy 6A5B25 states that the president shall be able to delegate powers and duties but in every instance continue to be responsible to the Chancellor.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution regularly evaluates its administrative structure to assess the effectiveness of its organization and determine if staffing is aligned to the institution’s purposes, size, and complexity. The institution has policies and procedures which provide for the delegation of authority from the CEO to administrators, and others, consistent with their roles and responsibilities.
IV.B.3: Through established policies and procedures, the CEO guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by: establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities; ensuring the college sets institutional performance standards for student achievement; ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis of external and internal conditions; ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and allocation to support student achievement and learning; ensuring that the allocation of resources supports and improves learning and achievement; and establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts to achieve the mission of the institution.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

As mentioned above in Standard IV.B.1, one of the most important roles played by the president is serving as a committee member on the IEC, where she has a shaping influence on the dialogue about planning, budgeting, and evaluation of institutional effectiveness. IEC is the College’s central work group for providing oversight to the planning and assessment processes that drive improvements in the College achieving its mission. It directly takes on the task of ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning, that allocation of resources supports and improves learning and achievement, and that procedures are in place, and used, to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation. The role played by IEC in these areas is described in more detail in Standard I.B.1, Standard I.B.7, and Standard I.B.9. As a voting member of the committee, the president is in the middle of all these conversations.

The processes of institutional review of the mission statement, vision, values, goals, and institution-set standards are described in detail in Standard I.A.4. The president herself called the collegial task force that undertook the last three-year review in spring 2018 and led the meetings (IV.B.7). In her role as co-chair of College Council, she ensured that the results were shared with the entire college community, discussed, and formally recommended to the board of trustees (IV.B.5). Once adopted, her office ensured that copies of the new plan were printed and disseminated, as well as posted to the website.

Finally, this president has had a profound influence on ensuring that the College is being provided with high quality research. As noted directly above in Standard IV.B.2 and touched on in Standard I.B.1, Cerro Coso Community College recently re-established a research office in response to the district’s decentralization of local research functions. The president was the prime mover of this effort, initiating and submitting an IEPI grant application to secure start-up funding for positions, equipment, and professional development (IV.B.8). In addition, she ensured that the new college IR office played a central role in the spring 2018 strategic planning review, helping the task force analyze and develop new targets for strategic goals. Informally, primarily from her work on IEC and her participation in the College’s Achieving the Dream effort, she understands the need for high quality data and has been a strong encourager of a data-informed culture.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The president establishes a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities; ensures the College sets institutional performance standards for student
achievement; ensures that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis of external and internal conditions; ensures that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and allocation to support student achievement and learning; ensures that the allocation of resources supports and improves achievement and learning; and establishes procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts to achieve the mission of the institution.

**IV.B.4: The CEO has the primary leadership role for accreditation, ensuring that the institution meets or exceeds Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies at all times. Faculty, staff, and administrative leaders of the institution also have responsibility for assuring compliance with accreditation requirements.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

While not a sitting member of the College’s accreditation steering committee, the president has the primary leadership role for accreditation at the institution. In her role on IEC, she remains continually aware of the ways the College is identifying gaps in operations and performance and ensuring continuous quality improvement in student learning and achievement. As the primary leader of the administrative team, she has required all administrators to go through ACCJC’s online training … twice … most recently in spring 2018 (IV.B.9). As a college president, she has not only served on external evaluation teams but has functioned as team lead. She submits required reports on time and ensures that her ALO does the same. And since the ALO is the vice president of instruction, there are near-continuous communications in person, by phone, and by email about issues related to accreditation.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this Standard. The CEO takes a lead role in accreditation processes and in creating a culture of commitment to continuous quality improvement. The CEO ensures others on campus also understand accreditation. The CEO collaborates with the institution’s accreditation liaison officer to guide all accreditation efforts.

**IV.B.5: The CEO assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies, including effective control of budget and expenditures.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The role of the president, as stated in the job description, is to “be responsible to the Chancellor of the Kern Community College District, as Chief Administrator of the College. The President maintains polices, rules, and regulations as set forth by the Chancellor, the Board of Trustees, the California Education Code, the Board of Governors of California Community Colleges, and the general laws of California and the United States” (IV.B.10). As stated in the KCCD Board Policy Manual section 6A, the president is delegated the authority and has the responsibility to maintain policies, procedures, rules, and regulations as set forth by the chancellor, the board of trustees, California Education Code, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and the general laws of California and of the United States of America (IV.B.6).
The president assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies primarily through the governance structure evidenced in the Participatory Governance Model Handbook, linked from the Planning Documents page, which relies on College Council as the primary body for recommendations to the president about college governance (IV.B.11). As mentioned in Standard IV.B.3 above, the president plays the primary leadership role in setting the mission, vision, values, institution-set standards, and institutional priorities of the College, as well as in ensuring that resource allocation set through the annual integrated planning process is effective. The president meets frequently with the vice president of finance and administrative services and with the other vice presidents to discuss and review expenditures as a way to ensure that they are appropriate, controlled, and directed to student learning and achievement. While these conversations take place in a variety of circumstances both formal and informal, a good example of a more formal type is the annual labor budget review that takes place every spring during budget building to review every employee position and funding source to catch the need for adjustments or revisions (IV.B.12).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The CEO regularly communicates statutory and compliance expectations to provide for informed decision-making. The CEO ensures that all governance decisions are linked to the institutional mission.

IV.B.6: The CEO works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The president employs multiple strategies to communicate effectively with the communities served by the institution, including eastern Kern, Inyo, Mono, and San Bernardino counties. These include membership in and involvement with community organizations, such as the East Kern Educational Collaborative; regular meetings with educational, governmental, and business entities, such as the periodic meetings with all K-12 superintendents and principals; visits to various communities and campuses in Kern, Inyo, Mono and San Bernardino counties, such as the Chamber of Commerce breakfasts in Tehachapi; and community forums in each of the communities served, such as those done in connection with the Educational Master Plan (IV.B.13). In addition to these personal engagements, the president ensures each year that various reports are prepared and distributed, including the annual Report to the Community, as described in more detail in Standard I.B.8.

In Ridgecrest, the president is a member of the Chamber of Commerce, the China Lake Alliance, and the Ridgecrest Economic Development Committee, and she serves on the board of the Desert Valley Credit Union. She encourages other employees, particularly the site directors and campus managers at centers and outreach locations, to be involved with community organizations in order to communicate information to and from the College. In addition, the President supports and encourages community events on all of the College’s campuses in an effort to enhance engagement between the College and the communities served by the institution.
Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The CEO ensures that communities served by the college are regularly informed about the institution.

List of Evidence

IV.B.1 Sample President Cabinet meeting agendas
IV.B.2 Sample Administrative Cabinet meeting agendas
IV.B.3 2017-2018 East Kern ASP, pgs. 14-15; 2017-2018 LAS ASP, pg. 8-9; 2017-2018 Administrative Services ADP, pg. 4
IV.B.5 College Council minutes, March 1, 2018, showing discussion of staffing plan
IV.B.6 KCCD Board Policy 6A5B
IV.B.7 Strategic Planning Task Force meeting minutes, spring 2018
IV.B.8 IEPI grant letter of interest and letter of treatment of area of focus
IV.B.9 Admin Cabinet agenda and minutes, March 19, 2018, showing call for ACCJC online training
IV.B.10 Cerro Coso Community College President job description
IV.B.11 2018-2021 Participatory Governance Model Handbook
IV.B.12 President’s calendar for Wednesday, March 14, 2018, showing labor budget review
IV.B.13 Sample dates on President’s calendar showing community meetings

Standard IV.C: Governing Board

Governing Board

IV.C.1: The institution has a governing board that has authority over and responsibility for policies to assure the academic quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The Kern Community College District (KCCD) has a board of trustees whose authority is described in the KCCD Board Policy Manual in policy 2A1 Authority (IV.C.1). Board Policy 4B describes policies relating to programs and instruction, policy 4B1 Educational Programs in particular stating the expectations of high quality, relevance to community and student needs, and regular evaluation for quality and currency (IV.C.2). Board Policy 3A2 Fiscal Management establishes guidelines for the fiscal management of the District, including procedures and responsibilities (IV.C.3).

The Board exercises authority and fulfills the responsibilities specified in policy in the conduct of regular business, as evidenced in the complete board packets contained in BoardDocs that includes board meeting calendars, meeting agendas, information packets, reports, and minutes (IV.C.4). The board receives and reviews quarterly financial statements and financial health reports to ensure appropriate responsibility for the financial stability of the institution which
are located within BoardDocs, including the BoardDocs “library” (IV.C.5). The board regularly reviews and approves curriculum, including the development of new student learning programs, revisions to existing programs, course development and revision, and student learning outcomes at all levels, to ensure it is exercising its responsibility for monitoring academic quality, integrity, and effectiveness (IV.C.6).

The regular review of board policies is discussed in Standard IV.C.7 below.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this Standard. The institution has a policy manual or other compilation of policy documents that delineates the governing board’s accountability for academic quality, integrity, the effectiveness of learning programs and services, and institution’s financial stability. The institution’s board policies address quality improvement and adherence to the institution’s mission and vision.

**IV.C.2: The Governing Board acts as a collective entity. Once the board reaches a decision, all board members act in support of the decision.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

As evidenced in the KCCD Board Policy Manual, policy 2B6 Committees establishes that the board shall act as a committee of the whole in all matters (IV.C.7). Board policy 2G1 Standards of Good Practice establishes the board’s belief among others that, in support of effective community college governance, it honestly debates the issues affecting its community and speaks with one voice once a decision is made (IV.C.8). Board policy 2H1 Statement of Ethics outlines the standards of practice for the board of trustees to fulfill their roles, including basing their individual decisions on available facts and upholding the final decisions of the Board (IV.C.9).

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard. Board members, individually, demonstrate their support for board policies and decisions.

**IV.C.3: The Governing Board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the CEO of the college and/or the district/system.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The District has a clearly defined process for selecting the district chancellor as stated in the KCCD Board Policy Manual in policy 2A2 Management of the District in accordance with the responsibilities of the chancellor described in 6A5A Chancellor (IV.C.10, IV.C.11). The process includes the establishment of criteria for a chancellor profile, the appointment of a hiring committee which includes representatives from each internal constituency group and the three colleges. The chancellor is the only employee selected directly by the board even though the board is also involved in the selection of college presidents in conjunction with the chancellor. The board followed these procedures in hiring the District’s new chancellor in January 2017.
The process to evaluate the chancellor is described in the chancellor’s contract and also guided by board policy 2A2 Management of the District, which states that the board shall hold the chancellor responsible for the efficient administration and supervision of the entire system and shall evaluate the chancellor. A complete list of responsibilities of the chancellor, including making an annual report to the board on the condition and progress of the District as well as such other reports as the board may request, is contained in board policy 6A5A. Evaluation on this scope of duties occurs annually. The chancellor was last evaluated in spring 2018 in accordance with the processes and procedures defined in board policy (IV.C.12).

Analysis and Evaluations

The College meets this Standard. The board has an established process for conducting a search and the selection of the chief administrator. The board has an established process in its evaluation of the chief administrator’s performance on implementation of board policies and achievement of institutional goals. The board sets clear expectations for regular reports on institutional performance from the chief administrator.

IV.C.4: The Governing Board is an independent, policy-making body that reflects the public interest in the institution’s educational quality. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or political pressure. (ER 7)

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

In compliance with the Constitution and Acts of the Legislature of the State of California, and the Rules and Regulations of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, the board, per board policy 2B1 of the KCCD Board Policy Manual, is comprised of seven members representing the District on the basis of trustee areas, and each member must be an elector residing in and registered to vote in the area to be represented (IV.C.13). The board is independent as all members are elected by their respective electors. Board policy 2I Conflict of Interest Statement establishes that each member must file a conflict of interest statement and should avoid any situation that may constitute a conflict of interest (IV.C.14). Per board policy 2A1, the board’s primary function is the determination of general policies and is therefore the policy-making body for the District (IV.C.1). Per board policy 2C4 Order of Business, all board meetings shall include a hearing of citizens, and per Board Policy 2C5A2, “the public may place items within the jurisdiction of the board on the agenda,” thereby reflecting the public interest in the institution’s educational quality (IV.C.15). Further, Board Policy 2G1 states the board’s belief that it derives its authority from the community and that it must always act as an advocate on behalf of the entire community and that it endeavors to remain always accountable to the community (IV.C.8).

The board advocates for, defends, and protects the District and the three colleges from undue influence or political pressure. Current board members serve 4-year terms, and elections are staggered to ensure continuity, as evidenced by board policy appendix 2B1(b) (IV.C.16). Four of the board of trustees member seats are up for election in November 2018. Board policy 2B1 also provides for the participation of a non-voting student trustee, elected by the student body, who serves a one-year term, with membership rotated annually by each college (IV.C.13, IV.C.17).
Public interest is also assured by regular and formal communications with the public regarding board activities and decisions through its public meetings. There is a standing item on every regular meeting agenda for public comment, and minutes reflect that members of the public and college community frequently use this as an opportunity to voice their views on issues relevant to the board (IV.C.18). Board policy 2C4 provides that each board meeting agenda contains two opportunities for public comment: one for comment on items from the closed session and one on items not covered as agenda items in the open session as well as the opportunity to submit written comments prior to the board meeting (IV.C.15).

Analysis and Evaluations

The College meets this Standard. The governing board is appropriately representative of the public interest and lacks conflict of interest. The composition of the governing board reflects public interest in the institution

IV.C.5: The Governing Board establishes policies consistent with the college/district/system mission to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them. The Governing Board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity and stability.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The board of trustees takes leadership in developing the mission of the District and district priorities through the KCCD Strategic Plan. The last strategic plan was approved at the July 2015 board meeting (IV.C.19, IV.C.20). All policies and procedures are consistent with the District’s mission to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services. As mentioned above in Standard IV.C.1, the duties and responsibilities of the board of trustees are clearly delineated in board policy 2A1 Authority. The responsibilities include the establishment of policies for comprehensive academic and facilities plans; courses of instruction and educational programs; and academic standards and graduation requirements. They are charged with employing all personnel with established employment practices. They are to determine budget within legal constraints, and the needs for tax and bond elections. They are responsible for the management and control of all district properties. They must ensure the District’s financial stability and sustainability necessary to support student learning programs and services consistent with the District’s mission.

The Board exercises the authority outlined in policy to provide oversight for all college operations, including educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity and stability. Responsibility for educational matters is demonstrated through regular approval of changes to curriculum as well as institutional planning related to program development and discontinuance, approval of student progress goals, academic and student standards, and various college plans. Responsibility for financial integrity and stability is demonstrated regularly at board meetings through discussion and action on financial liabilities including post-employment benefits, and review of financial results and forecasts.

That the board receives regular reports of institutional performance is discussed at length in Standard IV.C.8.
Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The Board has approved policies, institutional goals or other formal statements that describe governing board expectations for quality, integrity and improvement of student learning programs and services. The governing board is aware of results that have led to the improvement of student achievement and learning. The governing board is an independent decision-making body. Its actions are final and not subject to the actions of any other entity.

**IV.C.6: The institution or the Governing Board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.**

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The District publishes the board policies specifying the board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedure on the District’s website (IV.C.21).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. KCCD board bylaws and policies regarding the governing board’s specifications are readily available online.

**IV.C.7: The Governing Board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly assesses its policies and bylaws for their effectiveness to fulfilling the college/district/system mission and revises them as necessary.**

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

KCCD has developed a process for the review of policies on a regular basis. One of the district recommendations from the College’s last comprehensive self-evaluation in 2012 was for the board to establish a process to ensure the board’s policies and procedures are evaluated on a regular basis and revised as appropriate. This concern was addressed with the formal adoption of a systematic two-year review schedule, as described and evidenced in the College’s 2013 Follow Up Report, linked from the College’s Accreditation site (IV.C.22).

Work began in January 2013 to evaluate one-half of the Board policies in odd calendar years and the other half in even calendar years. This included replacing KCCD’s current format with the Community College League of California’s model district policy format. The board has been working on updating board policy with regularly scheduled revisions, as evidenced in district Consultation Council minutes (IV.C.23). A series of reviews included examination of wording, decision-making processes, institutional and budget policies were discussed in Consultation Council. On a regular basis these changes were sent back to the colleges for governance committee discussion and input. Review dates may be found on the board website with the final review and/or revision date noted in the table of contents of each board policy chapter (IV.C.24).

The most recent board review of board policy occurred in fall 2017 (IV.C.25).
Once board policies are approved by the board and procedures by the chancellor, changes are made in the KCCD Board Policy Manual and all district and college employees are alerted of updated policies and procedures by email (IV.C.26).

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this Standard. The governing board has a system for evaluating and revising its policies on a regular basis.

Although the College feels the Standard is met in having a system for evaluating and revising policies, it recognizes that, for increased institutional effectiveness, the process has to come to a complete conclusion and that a plan and timeline must be forthcoming to get this done.

**IV.C.8: To ensure the institution is accomplishing its goals for standard success, the Governing Board regularly reviews key indicators of student learning and achievement and institutional plans for improving academic quality.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The board regularly reviews key indicators of student learning and achievement along with institutional plans for improving academic quality. The KCCD Office of Institutional Research and Reporting prepares three regular reports for the board each year, along with others done on an ad hoc basis or upon request.

The most significant example is the Student Success Scorecard, a state report which the board is mandated to review by state law. KCCD goes significantly beyond state requirements, with the Office of Research and Reporting providing a detailed review of how each of the three colleges are doing on each of the student success measures, trends over time, and disaggregated demographic breakdowns (IV.C.27). The KCCD director of institutional research and reporting provides an oral presentation to the board, along with the written report summarizing the data. Board members ask questions to clarify understanding of the data, including definitions and changes over time. College administration is present to answer questions about policies and practices designed to improve student success (IV.C.28).

Another mandated report is the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Indicator Report. Within this program, the district and colleges establish both short and long-term goals designed to improve institutional effectiveness and student success. These goals are discussed within the college planning processes, presented to the board for approval annually, and posted to each college’s web site (IV.C.29).

The Office of Institutional Research and Reporting also provides an annual report on distance education (DE), including enrollment trends, demographic breakdowns, and student success measures for distance education students, including comparisons between DE students and those taking traditional coursework in course retention and success (IV.C.30).

Other reports are often presented to the board, either based on college or district discussions or upon board request. A recent presentation was a report on trends in dual enrollment, showing
how each of the three college’s dual enrollment programs have grown in recent years and how those programs impact student success (IV.C.31).

The board also engages with student success data through the strategic planning process. The district strategic plan emphasizes student success, with three of the five goals—maximizing student success, advancing student equity, and ensuring student access—being directly student centered (IV.C.19).

In addition to reviewing the district strategic plan, the board also reviews and approves the College’s strategic plan—together with the mission, vision, and values—as described and evidenced in Standard I.A.4.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets the Standard. The governing board regularly reviews data on student performance.

**IV.C.9: The Governing Board has an ongoing training program for board development, including new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The board of trustees participates in a variety of training programs for board development, new member orientation, study sessions, and committees in order to remain familiar with the programs and services provided to students. The board members have participated in a number of training sessions sponsored by the various entities including board study sessions with consultants. The board has an annual retreat to provide additional training, and to set goals for future professional development (IV.C.32). Current board members serve 4-year terms and election is staggered to ensure continuity.

One of the district recommendations from the College’s last comprehensive self-evaluation in 2012 was for the board, working with chancellor, to develop and implement a development program that meets the needs of newer and more experienced board members. This concern was addressed with the adoption of a comprehensive trustee development plan, as described and evidenced in the College’s 2013 Follow Up Report (IV.C.33).

The resulting policy is now in the KCCD Board Policy Manual as policy 2F: Board In-Service Development that addresses new member orientation, annual in-service training, and the biennial development of a program for board development that meets the needs of newer and more experienced members (IV.C.34).

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this Standard. The governing board has a program for development and orientation. The governing board has a formal, written method of providing for leadership continuity and staggered terms of office.
**IV.C.10: Board policies and/or bylaws clearly establish a process for board evaluation. The evaluation assesses the board’s effectiveness in promoting and sustaining academic quality and institutional effectiveness. The Governing Board regularly evaluates its practices and performance, including full participation in board training, and makes public the results. The results are used to improve board performance, academic quality, and institutional effectiveness.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The board of trustees is committed to assess its own performance as a board. In the KCCD Board Policy Manual, board policy 2E Board Self Evaluation states the purpose, the process, and the goals of the evaluation process (**IV.C.35**). This was another of the district recommendations from the College’s last self-evaluation in 2012, for the board to review its self-evaluation process and ensure it met the minimum standards. The result was the adoption of this language in October 2013, described in more detail in the 2013 Follow Up Report (**IV.C.36**).

The governing board uses the results from its self-evaluation to make improvements regarding its role, functioning, and effectiveness. The board’s self-evaluation instrument is provided by the District Office upon request.

**Analysis and Evaluation**

The College meets this Standard. The governing board has a self-evaluation process, as defined in its policies. The governing board uses the results from its self-evaluation to make improvements regarding its role, functioning, and effectiveness.

**IV.C.11: The Governing Board upholds a code of ethics and conflict of interest policy, and individual board members adhere to the code. The board has a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code and implements it when necessary. A majority of the board members have no employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution. Board member interests are disclosed and do not interfere with the impartiality of governing body members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution. (ER 7).**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

Policy 2I Conflict of Interest in the KCCD Board Policy Manual clearly defines the boundaries of board members and their respective financial interests in any contract with the District. Each board member is required to inform the board when a matter under consideration might involve or appear to involve and conflict of interest (**IV.C.14**). The policy requires the board members to file Statements of Economic Interests Conflict of Interest Code – Form 700: Statement of Economic Interests with the District each year.

As indicated above in Standard IV.C.2, board policy 2H contains the statement of ethics (**IV.C.9**). Trustees perform duties in accordance with their oath of office and commit to serving the educational needs of the citizens of the District in both educational and employment environments. Board policy 2H2 provides details about how to proceed if there are violations of the ethical standards (**IV.C.37**).
Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The governing board has a stated process for dealing with board behavior that is unethical.

**IV.C.12: The Governing Board delegates full responsibility and authority to the CEO to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds the CEO accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

In the [KCCD Board Policy Manual](#), policy 2A General Functions establishes the delegation of authority from the board to the chancellor (IV.C.10), as does components of the chancellor’s duties and responsibilities in board policy 6A5A, particularly 6A5A1 through 6A5A4 (IV.C.11). The board and the chancellor set performance targets for the chancellor, based on board annual goals. The chancellor is held responsible through an annual evaluation by the board, as described in more detail in Standard IV.C.3. That the board receives regular reports and other sufficient information on institutional performance from the chancellor is described and evidenced in Standard IV.C.8.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. Board delegation of administrative authority to the chief administrator is defined in policy. Board delegation of administrative authority is clear to all parties. The governing board sets clear expectations for regular reports on institutional performance from the chief administrator. The board sets clear expectations for sufficient information on institutional performance to ensure that it can fulfill its responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.

**IV.C.13: The Governing Board is informed about the Eligibility Requirements, the Accreditation Standards, Commission policies, accreditation processes, and the college’s accredited status, and supports through policy the college’s efforts to improve and excel. The board participates in evaluation of Governing Board roles and functions in the accreditation process.**

**Evidence of Meeting the Standard**

The board members participate in accreditation training through KCCD professional memberships, district-sponsored workshops—for example, on accreditation standards, current and proposed legislation, participatory governance and process—and periodic work-study sessions.

The board participates in self-evaluation of their roles and functions in the colleges’ accreditation process and the various outcomes that may affect the Colleges’ status to serve the students. Board members have participated in training and study sessions regarding the upcoming accreditation of the three college campuses and are supportive of the tasks that the colleges and the District are undertaking in preparing for the upcoming accreditation visit (IV.C.38).
Immediately after the new Commission Standards were adopted in 2014, the new standards were placed at the forefront of BoardDocs. In 2015, the board received and reviewed the colleges’ ACCJC Midterm Reports. In 2017, the board of trustees conducted a presentation to review the accreditation process, and key dates for the submission of the 2018 Institutional Self-Evaluation Reports (ISER’s). During the winter and spring of 2018, the board’s Accreditation Committee reviewed all the draft Standards in detail and provided the full board with monthly reports that included progress updates on the colleges’ ISER’s (IV.C.39).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The governing board receives training about the accreditation process and Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, and Commission policies. The governing board participates appropriately in institutional self-evaluation and planning efforts. Governing board actions indicate a commitment to improvements planned as part of institutional self-evaluation and accreditation processes. The governing board is informed of institutional reports due to the Commission, and of Commission recommendations to the institution.

List of Evidence

IV.C.1 KCCD Board Policy 2A1
IV.C.2 KCCD Board Policy 4B1
IV.C.3 KCCD Board Policy 3A2
IV.C.4 BOT meeting agenda and minutes December 2017 showing typical board meeting
IV.C.5 BOT meeting agenda and minutes April 12, 2018, showing quarterly reports
IV.C.6 BOT meeting agenda, material, and minutes April 12, 2018, items 10B, 10C, 10D, 10F, 10I, and 10L, showing curriculum review and approval
IV.C.7 KCCD Board Policy 2B6
IV.C.8 KCCD Board Policy 2G1
IV.C.9 KCCD Board Policy 2H1
IV.C.10 KCCD Board Policy 2A
IV.C.11 KCCD Board Policy 6A5A
IV.C.12 Minutes from January 22, 2018 board retreat showing chancellor evaluation
IV.C.13 KCCD Board Policy 2B1
IV.C.14 KCCD Board Policy 2I
IV.C.15 KCCD Board Policy 2C4 and 2C5A2
IV.C.16 KCCD Board Policy Appendix 2B1(b)
IV.C.17 Board of Trustees – Student Member
IV.C.18 Sample board agenda items showing public comment
IV.C.19 2015-2018 KCCD Strategic Plan
IV.C.20 BOT meeting minutes June 2015 showing last strategic plan approval
IV.C.21 Board Policy Manual page on KCCD website
IV.C.22 2013 Follow Up Report, pages 18-19
IV.C.23 Sample Consultation Council minutes showing board policy review discussions
IV.C.24 Board Material Due Dates page
IV.C.25 BOT meeting minutes September 2017 and October 2017 showing board policy review
IV.C.26 Sample Suzanne Galindo emails announcing update of board policy manual
IV.C.27 Student Success Scorecard report
IV.C.28 BOT meeting minutes from November 2017, showing Student Success Scorecard presentation
IV.C.29 2017 IEPI Indicator Report and BOT meeting minutes January 2017 showing IEPI presentation
IV.C.30 Distance Education report and BOT meeting minutes August 2016 showing DE report presentation
IV.C.31 Dual Enrollment Report and BOT meeting minutes November 2017 showing dual enrollment presentation
IV.C.32 KCCD Board Development Plan 2015-2018 and BOT meeting minutes of January 2018 Board retreat
IV.C.33 2013 Follow Up Report, pages 20-21
IV.C.34 KCCD Board Policy 2F
IV.C.35 KCCD Board Policy 2E
IV.C.36 2013 Follow Up Report, pages 22-23
IV.C.37 KCCD Board Policy 2H2
IV.C.38 BOT meeting minutes of September 14, 2017, showing accreditation training
IV.C.39 BOT meeting materials - 2018 Accreditation Subcommittee

Standard IV.D: Multi-College Districts or Systems

Multi-College Districts or System

IV.D.1: In multi-college districts or systems, the district/system CEO provides leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the district/system and assures support for the effective operation of the colleges. Working with the colleges, the district/system CEO establishes clearly defined roles, authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district/system.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The Kern Community College District (KCCD) board of trustees communicates the expectation of educational excellence and integrity through goal-setting and the review of each college’s student success measures, such as the annual review of the Student Success Scorecard. As explained in more detail in Standard IV.C.12, the board holds the district chancellor responsible for the educational excellence of the district by delegating full responsibility and authority to the CEO and expecting sufficient information and regular reports on institutional performance. The number and variety of key indicators prepared by the chancellor’s staff and reviewed by the board are described more fully in Standard IV.C.8.

As evidenced in the KCCD Board Policy Manual policy 2A General Functions establishes the administrative organization of KCCD and Section 6A5 Responsibilities of the Chancellor, College Presidents, and Management Staff delineates the authority and responsibilities of the defined roles (IV.D.1). In April 2012 the KCCD board of trustees adopted its decision-making document, Elements of Decision Making, to clarify the delineation of the roles and responsibilities within the district (IV.D.2). This document is reviewed periodically for updates.
to the functional mapping and organizational charts, most recently in spring 2017 (IV.D.3). At the time of the writing of this self-evaluation report, a new review is underway and an updated version routing through Chancellor’s Cabinet and District Consultation Council (DCC) to be approved in summer 2018.

In practice, the chancellor ensures support for the effective operation of the colleges. Functions of human resources, physical resources, technology resources, and financial resources are centralized at the district office (DO) with ancillary services at the colleges. In each category the DO and the three colleges work to maintain an organizational structure that maximizes and balances efficiency and effective services. For example, once a month the directors of information technology at the three colleges meet with the district chief technology officer and key system and network directors to identify collective technology needs and how they can be enhanced by collaboration and centralization (IV.D.4). Similarly, the district director of accounting services and the three college accounting managers meet weekly to discuss financial matters and also meet monthly face to face (IV.D.5). Other groups include district vice presidents, financial aid directors, enrollment services, and institutional researchers.

KCCD maintains three standing participatory committees with college representatives working with district administrators: DCC, the Fringe Benefits Committee, and the Confidential/Management Study Committee.

Ten standing managerial groups, including Chancellor’s Cabinet, serve to advise college and district administrators, comprised of various administrators with the colleges and DO. Membership of the Chancellor’s Cabinet consists of college presidents, the vice chancellors, and other district administrators. The cabinet has the authority to make recommendations of changes to all operational functions. (IV.D.2, pg. 10).

Occasional district-wide standing and ad hoc committees contribute to the effective operation of the district and colleges. Since 2007, the District’s unrestricted fund budget allocation model (BAM) tool has been regularly evaluated by task forces called for that purpose, as evidenced by the evaluation posted on the District’s Budget Allocation Model page. The last such group met throughout the 2016 academic year, and their results are discussed in more detail in Standard IV.C.3 below.

In addition to these established meetings and committee work, the chancellor provides leadership in setting and communicating expectations by making visits to each college to address specific issues and/or answer questions (IV.D.6).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. There are established policies and/or practices which demonstrate the delineation of roles and responsibilities for the District and the colleges. The District is knowledgeable regarding the established policies and/or practices which demonstrate the delineation of roles and responsibilities for the District and the colleges. The delineation of responsibilities is regularly evaluated for effectiveness.
IV.D.2: The district/system CEO clearly delineates, documents, and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district/system from those of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice. The district/system CEO ensures that the colleges receive effective and adequate district/system provided services to support the colleges in achieving their missions. Where a district/system has responsibility for resources, allocation of resources, and planning, it is evaluated against the Standards, and its performance is reflected in the accredited status of the institution.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

The sufficiency of services provided by the DO is measured in a number of ways, including an annual state of the college reports from each president to the board of trustees (IV.D.7), and informal feedback through the Chancellor’s Cabinet, DCC, and the other standing and ad hoc meetings described above.

In spring 2015, the KCCD Office of Institutional Research and Reporting conducted a trust study addressing this low rated item in a comparison between the 2013 and 2015 climate surveys (IV.D.8). This study, which included a series of constituency groups reviews at each college and the DO, resulted in a report with a series of recommendations, discussed at DCC with representatives from the surveyed constituency groups. Satisfaction with DO services is also captured in the biennial KCCD Climate Survey, the most recent in 2016. The KCCD Climate Survey also asks a question about trust, which is pertinent to this Standard: “There is trust between employees at the colleges and the district office” (1.f). Responses in surveys returned in 2016 showed improved trust across the District. (IV.D.9, pgs. 9-10).

In addition, a formal evaluation of district services is completed through district annual unit reviews (District AUR’s) that are accomplished by all units at the DO. The first such reviews began in fall 2014 with a data-gathering process and results were posted to the District Unit Review page in fall 2015. A second round of reviews took place in fall 2016 with results posted in spring 2017 (IV.D.10).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. District /system services are regularly evaluated with regard to their support for institutional missions and functions.

Though it feels it meets the Standard, the College thinks the components of this Standard could be vastly improved for effectiveness, particularly the District AUR process. Improving the District AUR’s was one of the recommendations that came out of the last budget allocation model review in 2016, both forms and process (IV.D.11). The District AUR form includes places for end-user data to get feedback from the end-users at the colleges on the effectiveness of services provided to the colleges by the DO. But no college end-user feedback data was collected for the 2014 District AUR’s at all, and only the Educational Services unit collected college end-user feedback for its 2016 District AUR. In addition, the timing of the submissions of the District AUR’s and how they connect to the colleges’ processes of annual planning, particularly resource allocation, is not clear. One of the recommendations coming out of the new District-Wide Budget Committee in spring 2018 was to reform and renovate the District AUR process (IV.D.12).
Evidence of Meeting the Standard

KCCD Board Policy Manual section 3A details district fiscal policies, including budget, budget income and expenditures, and budget control (IV.D.13). Particular policies relevant to this Standard are BP 3A1A3, that the annual budget shall not exceed estimated revenues for the budget year, and BP 3A1A9, that budget allocations of funds will be made to the colleges and the DO and be reviewed by Chancellor’s Cabinet and DCC and approved by the board.

Board procedure 3A1 provides for the budget preparation guidelines, including a statement of philosophy linking budget planning to institutional goals and other institutional planning, a budget calendar, consultation with appropriate groups, and criteria and institutional guidelines for financial planning and budgeting (IV.D.14).

KCCD has had a formal BAM since 2007 that serves as an established process for distributing resources to the institution and the district office (IV.D.15). As indicated above in Standard IV.C.1, the model is posted on KCCD’s Budget Allocation Model page and regularly evaluated, including in 2010 and 2016. The 2016 BAM evaluation task force made seven recommendations, including two that recommended no change to particular parts of the BAM (IV.D.16). The chancellor accepted all the recommendations but deferred some to later implementation. One recommendation accepted immediately was the creation of a Districtwide Budget Committee, which was formed in July 2017, with the charge of proposing recommendations for district-wide budget development processes, reviewing the DO provision of services, review the annual budget development premises, review long-term trends, and evaluate and propose recommendations for the DO operational budget. Two of the committee’s first action items were to study the implications of the current reserve level policy and to make recommendations for a revised District AUR process (IV.D.12, IV.D.17).

As described in more detail through Standard III.D—particularly in Standard III.D.7 and Standard III.D.8—the College has sufficient financial and internal control systems, which are regularly evaluated and assessed for validity and effectiveness, and recent audits have resulted in no findings.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The District’s has an established policy for distributing resources to its institutions. The policy is well-understood across the District. The District’s resource distribution method is data-driven. The distribution method reflects the needs and priorities of the colleges. The institution’s most recent annual independent audit reports and audited financial statements demonstrate the district reviews and controls system-wide expenditures.
IV.D.4: The CEO of the district or system delegates full responsibility and authority to the CEOs of the colleges to implement and administer delegated district/system policies without interference and holds college CEO’s accountable for the operation of the colleges.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

As mentioned above, board policy 2A of the Board Policy Manual provides for authority and management of the district. The particular policy of this section relevant to this Standard is 2A2, that the board shall determine the administrative organization necessary to execute district policies and elect a chancellor and such other officers as may be required.

Board policy 6A delineates responsibilities of the chancellor and the college presidents. Board policy 6A5B states that the president is the executive head of the college and enumerates areas of authority such as employment of personnel, supervision of programs and services, appointment of faculty chairs, development of rules for facilities administration of conduct, and financial oversight. The president has the authority to delegate areas of responsibility as permitted by law and subject to approval of the chancellor.

In practice, the college president demonstrates she has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution and providing effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness, as described and evidenced throughout Standard IV.B.

The college president is held accountable through the yearly state of the college presentation to the board of trustees (IV.D.7) and through an annual evaluation performed by the chancellor in writing, as described in the president’s negotiated employment agreement (IV.D.18). The president’s last evaluation was in the 2017-2018 academic year.

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets this Standard. The institution has policies and practices that demonstrate delegation of authority to the college CEO.

IV.D.5: District/system planning and evaluation are integrated with college planning and evaluation to improve student learning and achievement and institutional effectiveness.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

At the time of the writing of this self-evaluation report in spring 2018, work has been delayed on the development of the most recent KCCD strategic plan. In 2015, when KCCD adopted its current strategic plan, it did so using a three-step process (IV.D.19, pg. 3). A district-wide taskforce with representation from the three colleges plus the DO updated the high level goals and key objectives to align with the KCCD mission, vision, and values. Metrics were then chosen to evaluate the objectives, and targets were set. The plan was completed in spring 2015, approved by the board in July 2015, and posted to the KCCD Strategic Plan page (IV.D.20). In that year, the district strategic plan was completed prior to the completion of the college plans in order to provide a general direction and overarching framework for college planning.
In the next iteration in 2018, the process has been somewhat reversed. In January 2018, The board of trustees first established their 2017-2019 Board of Trustees Goals, aligned with the chancellor’s objectives and associated measurements, on the then-current (2015) strategic goals (IV.D.21). These were communicated to the colleges in early spring, who then started their separate strategic planning processes. Cerro Coso Community College completed that task in March 2018. At the time of the writing of this self evaluation report, it is the intention that KCCD will follow in fall 2018 with its strategic plan—in this case, the district planning effort following rather than leading the colleges’ effort.

Either way, district goals are integrated with college goals, measured by regularly collected data on student learning and achievement, and pegged to targets. The Office of Institutional Research and Reports annually prepares the document Common Measures, a set of 46 metrics tied to the goals established in the 2015 KCCD Strategic Plan and updated yearly (IV.D.22).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The District and the colleges engage in an integrated planning and evaluation process. The District and the colleges determine the effectiveness of the integrated planning through an established process.

IV.D.6: Communication between colleges and districts/systems ensures effective operations of the colleges and should be timely, accurate, and complete in order for the colleges to make decisions effectively.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

As indicated in some detail in Standard IV.C.1 and as evidenced by the Elements of Decision Making document, the district has a variety of avenues to ensure that communication is timely, accurate, and complete.

Communication between the colleges and the DO is addressed in the KCCD Climate Survey. Questions 4.a, 4.l, and 4.m address precisely communication within the District. Recent results show that district-wide communication and decision-making district-wide are judged to be less effective by the colleges than the DO. However, recent surveys show some improvement on these district-wide questions (IV.D.9, pgs. 22-26). The KCCD board of trustees approved in December 2016 the hiring of its fifth chancellor, who has publicly identified the improvement of services and communication as a goal that was incorporated into the chancellor’s objectives, and approved with the board’s goals for 2017-2019 (IV.D.23).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The District and the colleges have an established communication protocol to ensure effective operations of the colleges are timely, accurate and complete. The colleges are well informed about district issues, governing board actions and interests that have an impact on operations, educational quality, stability or the ability to provide high quality education.
IV.D.7: The district/system CEO regularly evaluates district/system and college role delineations, governance and decision-making processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals for student achievement and learning. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

As mentioned above, a major mechanism used by the chancellor to evaluate role delineations, governance, and decision-making processes is the KCCD Climate Survey, which goes out regularly once every three years. The next scheduled survey time is fall 2018. As mentioned above in Standard IV.D.1, Elements of Decision Making is also reviewed regularly on a three-year cycle and is undergoing a review in spring 2018.

In addition to this formal review of roles, authority, and functional mapping, the Chancellor evaluates the components of this Standard informally through the District AUR’s, the climate survey, and interactions at DCC, Chancellor’s Cabinet, district Administrative Cabinet, monthly meetings with the presidents, and site visits to the colleges.

Numerous improvements have come out of these formal and informal evaluations. For example, in February 2016, the decision-making flowchart in the Elements of Decision-Making was revised to incorporate feedback loops in the decision-making process (IV.D.2, pg. 12). In 2017, the vice presidents were added to Chancellor’s Cabinet in an advisory role to broaden the expertise of college-level operations at the table (IV.D.24).

Results of these evaluations are communicated widely. The District AUR’s are posted on the District Unit Review page of the KCCD website. The Climate Survey results are shared at DCC, Chancellor’s Cabinet, and then posted on the KCCD website. Through the decision making process, The new Elements of Decision-Making document is being vetted at Chancellor’s Cabinet and DCC, and will be presented to the board in summer of 2018 prior to being posted to the KCCD website under the Chancellor’s Office page (IV.D.25).

Analysis and Evaluation

The College meets the Standard. The District and the colleges have a robust evaluation process on college role delineations, governance and decision-making processes which ensure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting their goals. The evaluation process is conducted regularly and results of such evaluations are widely communicated. Improvements are made as a result of these evaluations.

Changes and Plans Arising out of the Self-Evaluation Process

Future Action Plans

List of Evidence

IV.D.1  KCCD Board Policy 2A and 6A
IV.D.2  Elements of Decision Making
IV.D.3  District Consultation Council minutes February 23, 2016, showing review of Elements of Decision Making
IV.D.4  Sample IT Managers meeting minutes
IV.D.5  Sample Budget Managers meeting agendas
IV.D.6  President’s Brief, February 13, 2017, and College Council minutes February 16, 2017 showing visit
IV.D.7  BOT meeting minutes showing January 2018 State of the College reports
IV.D.8  Spring 2015 Improving Trust Report, follow-up to the 2013 climate
IV.D.9  KCCD Climate Survey Results, 2016
IV.D.10 District Unit Review page and Sample District AUR’s
IV.D.12 Districtwide Budget Committee recommendation to revise District AUR process
IV.D.13 KCCD Board Policy 3A
IV.D.14 KCCD Board Procedure 3A1
IV.D.15 BAM webpage and Budget Allocation Narrative Final
IV.D.17 Districtwide Budget Committee recommendation to revise reserve policy
IV.D.18 Cerro Coso President Employment Agreement 2015-2018, pgs. 2-3
IV.D.19 2015-2018 KCCD Strategic Plan
IV.D.20 BOT meeting minutes July 9, 2015, showing approval of 2015-2018 KCCD Strategic Plan
IV.D.21 Board of Trustees 2017-2019 Goals
IV.D.22 2018 Common Measures
IV.D.23 Chancellor Priorities, approved by the board
IV.D.24 Sample Chancellor’s Cabinet meeting agenda showing VP involvement
IV.D.25 DCC meeting minutes April 24, 2018, showing discussion of EDD
Part H: Quality Focus Essay

Introduction

After the initial drafting and compiling of the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER) in December 2017, the College’s Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) met in January 2018 to determine the process for deciding on the Quality Focus Action Projects (AP’s). IEC was chosen as the college committee to do this rather than the Accreditation Steering Committee because of the implications for multi-year college planning and assessment.

The committee determined that the best way to get broad-based input on the AP’s was to present the idea of the Quality Focus Essay at a variety of college committees and workgroups, discuss some of the initial analysis that came out of the draft ISER, and listen to suggestions for projects or even just for areas of improvement that could be turned into projects. The groups engaged in this dialogue and the dates were

- College Council, January 18, 2018
- Academic senate, January 18, 2018
- Classified senate, January 24, 2018
- Administrative Cabinet, February 5, 2018
- Student Success and Support Council, January 31, 2018
- Faculty Chairs, January 22, 2018

IEC reconvened in February with a list of 10 topics, considered the input, combined some suggestions and reworked others, and decided on the following two AP’s:

- Improve Onboarding of Students
- Improve Completion of Students’ End Goals

The table below identifies the two AP’s and the Standards associated with them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Project</th>
<th>Standards Related to Action Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve Onboarding of Students</td>
<td>I.B, II.A, II.C, III.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Completion of Students’ End Goals</td>
<td>I.B, II.A, II.B, II.C, III.A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Action Project One: Improve Onboarding of Students

Identification of the Problem

Cerro Coso Community College has been focused on strategies for improving the student experience since it joined the Achieving the Dream in 2013. As part of that effort, the College took its first concrete steps toward a data-informed approach to student success, training data coaches, generating disaggregated student success data, and developing a participatory governance committee (the Student Success and Support Council, or “SSSP Committee”) whose
charge was to analyze data for patterns and trends in student success and lead institutional change for improved student learning and achievement. In 2014, the College began its partnership with the Educational Advisory Board, one of the first activities of which was to audit the College’s onboarding processes from a student perspective. This led to a number of improvements in practices and service delivery, such as rewriting the welcome letter to give students very clear direction on next steps. The College’s work with EAB has led it to be a Beta school for the implementation of the Navigate platform that is described in more detail in Standard II.C.2. This platform provides a clearer structure for students, leading them through career interest, major exploration, and registration; it also gives students notifications and nudges along the process. This has resulted in the College’s application conversion rate, the number of students applying vs. the number actually registering, climbing from 44.7% in 2015-2016 to 57.9% in 2017-2018, a 30% increase.

Nevertheless, substantial work remains to be done. Guided pathways has come along at the right time for Cerro Coso Community College in terms of providing it with best practices, a structure, and funds for continuing its work on improving the onboarding experience of students. The College has continued to identify multiple points of attrition and loss starting with first enrollment through to census. For example, even though numbers have been better in recent semesters, the College still loses 10%-15% more online students than onsite students from first day to census day.

**Desired Goals/Outcomes**

The goal of this AP is to focus on retaining students from pre-enrollment to census day. Students quit or walk away from education for a variety of reasons that cannot be helped. The focus of this AP is to make sure the College is not the reason, that it is doing everything it can to remove barriers, streamline processes, provide areas of interest, connect students early to programs, and be a welcoming environment for a strong start to educational plans. Critical to this effort is cross-functional inquiry to analyze the College’s onboarding experience and clarity of program and pathway information for students—especially important for a College with numerous physical campuses, a strong online program, and a variety of non-traditional student populations. For that reason, it is important and necessary to develop strategies for ensuring input and applicable implementation for all sites and delivery modes. A clear charge for will need to be developed for each cross-functional team that backward-maps from the intended outcome.

**Actions/Steps to be Implemented**

- Develop infrastructure for cross-functional inquiry work of the institution, including the development of protocols processes and procedures, such as those concerned with initiating, scheduling and organization, structure and membership, incorporating the student voice, requesting and using resources, reporting, and acting on outcomes.
- Develop the charge for the two cross-functional teams:
  - Onboarding Inquiry- while the complete charge and approach to this inquiry will still need to be fully developed, the SSSP Committee has mapped out the following elements of the student experience to focus on improvement in onboarding: pre-
enrollment, application, core services, registration, and interim communications leading to first day and census
• Program/Pathway Information Inquiry- while the complete charge and approach of this inquiry will still need to be fully developed, SSSP has mapped out the following elements of the student experience related to pathways and clarity of program requirements: presentation and clarity of pathways online and in print, education planning’s connection to the pathway and to fields of interest, and general education mapping for pathways and fields.
• Develop a timeline and matrix for the action items to come out of the cross-functional inquiry groups. Action items are expected to address some or all of the following:
  • Key communication points
  • Marketing and outreach strategies
  • The Cerro Coso College Promise program
  • Evidenced-based placement
  • Technology solutions
  • Cultural responsiveness training for front-line staff
  • Culturally responsive teaching and learning strategies for faculty
  • Establishment of key performance indicators, development of new data gathering instruments (e.g., survey) as necessary, identification of baseline data
  • Data literacy across the institution
  • Counseling/advising dashboard
  • Professional development opportunities that support items in this AP
• Implement action items based on a timeline reviewed by key governance committees, workgroups, and constituents

Responsible Parties

The SSSP Committee will be the main steering committee for all actions to be implemented. But it will be supported by a number of other committees, work groups, and units, such as the Student Services Executive Committee, the faculty chairs workgroup, and the Cerro Coso Office of Institutional Research.

The responsible administrator will be the vice president of student services. But again, it will be a team effort with other administrators, particularly the vice president of instruction, the student services directors and site directors that make up SSEC, the equity director, director of information technology, instructional deans, and others.

Resources

A variety of resources will be needed for this AP. To support the action items in this AP as well as the second AP, the College expects to focus or refocus the work of both existing and new personnel. For example, the College anticipates it will need an additional research analyst to help develop the tools needed to track onboarding data. Resources will also be needed for professional development activities, such as training of data coaches to assist departments and units in gathering and analyzing data, training of faculty and staff in cultural sensitivity for customer service and culturally responsive teaching, and training in best practices in communication and
marketing. It is expected that the vast majority of resources will be in personnel and professional development.

As this AP covers services in both student services and instruction, funding is expected to come from a variety of sources in addition to the general fund, such as Guided Pathways, SSSP, Student Equity, the Basic Skills Initiative, an IEPI grant the College secured in 2017, the College Promise grant Strong Workforce Program, and VTEA.

**Assessment**

Evaluation of the progress and success of this AP will be measured by the completion of specific tasks as well as improvements in key performance indicators.

Sample tasks include

- Development of a well-mapped student experience
- Identification of gaps and improvements that are student informed
- Revised meta-majors mapped to active degrees and certificates
- Development of a comprehensive communication plan
- Identification of general education pathways onsite, online, and in the prisons
- Professional development activities planned and run for cultural sensitivity training
- Professional development activities planned and run for culturally responsive teaching and learning
- Development of baseline performance data and usage data
- Automation of the application of multiple-measures according to the MMAP Measures and decision trees
- Completion of data tracking to evaluate multiple-measures placement process

Improvements expected include

- Application Conversion Rate
- Attrition Rate (= loss of students from first day to census)
- Retention Rate (= students kept till end of term)
- Core Service Completion
- Number of students with accurately declared major
- Percentage of College Promise students
- Attempted 12+ college credits in first term
- Attempted 15+ college credits in first term

**Action Project Two: Improve Completion of Students’ End Goals**

**Identification of the Problem**

This AP is the companion and complement of the first AP. Whereas that one focused on improving the student experience from first contact to successfully starting the student’s first semester, this one takes it from there, focusing on the rest of the student experience to the
completion of the student’s education plan, whether a short-term CTE certificate or a 60-unit transfer degree.

The scope of the problem in this area for Cerro Coso Community College is revealed by its completion statistics. The most recent CCCCO Scorecard rate for completion of degrees and certificates shows the College at 38%, ten points below the state average. CTE completion rates hover at 40%, well below the state average of 54%. And the College’s own in-house report on student learning and achievement, Elements of Student Success, shows the five-year average of students completing 30 units in their first year as 1.9%, which is consistent with the other two schools in the district but unacceptable.

The College has identified a number of areas of focus in connection with that this problem. One is the very large percentage of part-time students it serves. All indications are the longer a student works on an educational plan without completing, the more time there is for life to intervene and the less likely the student will complete. Data Mart shows that Cerro Coso Community College’s percentage of part-time students in fall 2017 was 84% compared to 71% statewide. Its percentage of students taking 15 units—in other words, on track to complete degrees in two years—is just 3.56%, below half of the state average of 8.37%. This has several consequences for the College, including fewer completers and more load on student and learning support services, who are interacting with more students for less apportionment.

A second area of focus is the College’s large population of non-traditional students served, including dual enrollment and concurrent students, incarcerated students, and online students. Part of the problem with these populations is that the College sometimes doesn’t know what it doesn’t know. For instance, initial indications are that incarcerated students outperform other students in course success, particularly traditionally underperforming subpopulations, but why is that? For students taking both online and onsite classes in the same semester, what guides the decision about what classes to take where—day and time scheduling of onsite courses, offerings in the major, particular instructors?—and do certain decisions lead to better success? While the students who participated in the Success Factors inquiry groups in 2017 reported they wanted greater connection in the online environment, what does this mean? Would students use an online student center? What features would enhance their feeling of connection, what would they not use?

 Desired Goals/Outcomes

The goal of this AP is to arrange college operations and processes so more students are enabled to complete educational plans. In some ways, this means simply getting out of students’ way—for example, making it easier for students to access tutoring help by putting it right in the classroom. In other ways, it means doing more, like reaching out proactively and referring students to support services when students seem to be struggling, or doing a better job “offboarding” students to jobs or transfer. AP #2 works closely AP #1 in being the next logical step toward the same outcome: once students are successfully through the most critical first few weeks, what does the College have to do to help them finish what they started?
Actions/Steps to be Implemented

• Develop the charge for additional new cross-functional teams:
  • Staying on the Path Inquiry - while the complete charge and approach to this inquiry will still need to be fully developed, SSSP has mapped out the following elements of the student experience for improving scheduling patterns and program completion: success in the first semester, success in the first year, completion of program, successful “offboarding” into employment or transfer (or parole)
  • Special Populations Inquiry – the following topics have been developed by SSSP related to staying on the path for particular sub-populations served by the College: the special challenges and needs of part-time students, special challenges and needs of first-generation students, special challenges and needs of incarcerated students, special challenges and needs of special admit students, and special challenges and needs of online students.
• Develop a timeline and matrix for the action items to come out of the cross-functional inquiry groups. Action items are expected to address some or all of the following:
  • Days and hours services are open
  • Open educational resources (OER’s), onsite, in the prison, and online
  • Institutional literacy for all staff for seamless and proactive referral to support services
  • Cultural responsiveness training for front-line staff
  • Culturally responsive teaching and learning strategies for faculty
  • Corequisite remedial education and embedded tutoring
  • Online teaching engagement tools
  • Online student center
  • Student-informed scheduling
  • Milestone recognitions
  • Offboarding strategies for employment and transfer
  • Establishment of key performance indicators, development of new data gathering instruments (e.g., survey) as necessary, identification of baseline data
  • Data literacy across the institution
  • Instructional faculty dashboard
  • Professional development opportunities that support items in this AP
• Implement action items based on a timeline reviewed by key governance committees, workgroups and constituents

Responsible Parties

Similar to AP #1, the SSSP Committee will be the main steering committee for all actions implemented in this action plan to be supported by a number of other College committees work groups. For this AP, the responsible administrator will be the vice president of instruction, supported in turn by the vice president of student services and a team of directors, deans, managers, faculty chairs, faculty, and classified staff.
Resources

Resource needs will be similar to AP #1. As indicated above, the personnel-related nature of the action plans establishes hiring, directing and redirecting of work, and professional development as the highest priorities. Aside from the professional development items enumerated above, of which there is significant crossover, additional activities will include adopting OER’s, training in best practices for corequisite instruction, continued training in engagement technologies for online classes, enhancing institutional literacy, and using best practices with incarcerated students, part-time students, and online students. Like AP #1, it is expected that the vast majority of resources will be in personnel and professional development.

Assessment

Sample tasks to be accomplished include:

- Implementation of curriculum to allow students to enter directly into college level math and English at the main campus and online.
- Offering Co-requisite English at scale in spring 2019
- Focus group results of part-time student needs for services onsite and online
- Increased adoption of OER’s
- Professional development activities planned and run for cultural sensitivity training
- Professional development activities planned and run for culturally responsive teaching and learning
- Development of baseline performance data and usage data
- Milestone recognitions/implementation of a recognition system
- Development of an online student center
- Development of a detailed set of offboarding strategies for 1) students who gained employment in their field, 2) students who gained employment not in their field, 3) transfer students.

Sample key performance indicators to see improvement on:

- % students earned 6+ college credits in first term
- % students earned 12+ college credits in first term
- % students earned 15+ college credits in first term
- % students earned 30+ college credits in first year
- % students with completed long-term ed plans
- Average # credits attempted in year one for first-time degree-seeking students
- Average # credits successfully completed in year one first-time degree-seeking students
- Successfully completed transfer-level English in year one
- Successfully completed transfer-level math in year one
- % students persisting from term 1 to term 2
- % students persisting from term 1 to term 3
Part I: Changes and Plans Arising out of the Self-Evaluation Process

Changes

I.B.1: During this self-evaluation process, the College realized that while it has a structured dialogue on the components of this Standard, it was lacking a systematic approach to ensure that every group who needs to review certain reports or data sets is reviewing that information on a regular cycle. For this reason, in spring 2018 IEC began discussions about developing a chart of reports and data sets cross-referenced with the committees or work groups who review them and the frequency of this review. When completed, the chart will be communicated to the different chairs and included in the Participatory Governance Model Handbook.

I.B.4: During the self-evaluation process, it was discovered that while the College has data posted in a variety of places for a variety of reasons, it did not have the institution-set standards posted. They are posted now as indicated above, in the same place as the mission, strategic goals, other guiding principles.

I.C.12: During this self-evaluation process, it was discovered that while the College had its external accreditors and approving agencies named in the college catalog, it did not have the names on the college website or the contact information for complaints either in catalog or on the website, as required by Commission policy. The oversights have been rectified as evidenced above.

II.A.15: During the self-evaluation process, the College realized that it did not have program elimination information clearly conveyed to students. While it has had a long-standing process, as described above, the process was not posted anywhere on the college website or integrated into the college catalog. These oversights have been addressed.

Future Action Plans

I.B.1: Continue to build capacity of the College’s Office of Institutional Research by stabilizing personnel, establishing a workflow for requests, creating a research agenda, enhancing the OIR research page, offering numerous faculty and staff professional development opportunities to increase institutional literacy, and using data visualization tools to develop a variety of on-demand reports for faculty and staff. Timeline: Spring 2020. Person Responsible: College Institutional Researcher.

I.B.2: Pending full implementation of eLumen’s capabilities, complete a cycle of assessment for the newly revised ILO’s. Timeline: Spring 2020. Person responsible: Vice President, Instruction. Results will be reviewed by the Outcomes Assessment Committee, IEC, the Student Success and Support Council, and the academic senate.
I.B.6: Pending full implementation of eLumen’s capabilities, produce a first report on disaggregated SLO, PLO, GELO, and ILO outcome data. Timeline: Spring 2020. Person responsible: Vice President, Instruction. Results will be reviewed by the SLO Committee, IEC, SSSP, and the academic senate.

II.A.7: Plan and run broad-based systematic training at scale for instructional faculty on culturally responsive teaching and learning. Timeline: 2018-2019 academic year and forward. Person responsible: Director of Student Equity.

II.B.1: Develop a set of operating procedures and best practices for providing equitable library and learning assistance services to incarcerated students. Timeline: 2018-2019 academic year. Persons responsible: Dean of Letters and Sciences and Director of East Kern Center and Kern River Valley.

II.C.7: Complete local processes to evaluate the effectiveness of practices and tools for admissions and placement; use evaluations of placement processes to ensure their consistency and effectiveness in minimizing bias. Timeline: 2018-2019 academic year. Director of Counseling and SSSP.

