EVALUATION REPORT

Yuba College

2088 North Beale Road

Marysville, CA 95901

A Confidential Report Prepared for the Accrediting Commission

For Community and Junior Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited

Yuba College on October 22 through October 25, 2012

Dr. Joan E. Smith, Team Chair

Yuba College

Visiting Team Roster

October 2012

Dr. Joan Smith (Chair)
Chancellor
Yosemite Community College District

Ms. Shelley Akiona (Assistant)
Human Resources Operations Manager
Yosemite Community College District

Dr. Norma Ambriz-Galaviz
Vice President of Instruction
Mission College

Dr. Susan Bangasser
Dean, Science Division
San Bernardino Valley College

Ms. Inge Bond
Director of Research, Planning,
Institutional Effectiveness
West Valley College

Dr. Kathleen Burke-Kelly
President
Los Angeles Pierce College

Dr. Linda Lopez Chaparro
Faculty, Psychology
Oxnard College

Dr. Monica Pactol
Dean of Instruction
Folsom Lake College

Mr. Nick Stavrianoudakis (Assistant)
Director of External Affairs
Yosemite Community College District

Dr. Barbara Dunsheath
Trustee
North Orange County CCD

Dr. Caren Hennessy
Associate Professor Business Education
Mt. San Jacinto College

Mr. Russ Lebo
Chief Financial Officer
San Joaquin Valley College

Ms. Sheri Sterner
Administrative Director, Research,
Planning & Institutional Effectiveness
Orange Coast College

Summary of the Evaluation Report

INSTITUTION: Yuba College

DATE OF VISIT: October 22 - October 25, 2012

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Joan E. Smith, Chancellor
                         Yosemite Community College District

A ten member accreditation team, a team chair and two assistants visited Yuba College in mid-October for the purpose of evaluating how well the institution is achieving its stated purposes, analyzing how well the college is meeting the Commission Standards and providing recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the status of the college.

Yuba College was founded in 1927 and opened its doors to students on the site of Marysville High School. The College gained formal independence from Marysville High School in 1937 when it moved to a new location—across the street. The District was originally a single college district with multiple campuses. Woodland Community College earned accreditation in June 2008 and with its accreditation created a multi-college district (Yuba Community College District). Woodland Community College has its main campus in Woodland, CA and operates the Colusa County Outreach Center in Williams. Yuba College currently operates the main campus near Marysville, Clear Lake Campus, Beale Air Force Base Outreach Center, and the new Sutter County Campus, just north of Yuba City.

In preparation for the visit, team members attended an all-day training session on September 14, 2012, conducted by the ACCJC and studied Commission materials prepared for visiting teams. Team members read the college's Self Evaluation Report; including recommendations from the 2005 visiting team, and assessed the evidence provided by the college on flash drives and reviewed data on the college's web site.

Prior to the visit team members completed written evaluations of the Self Evaluation Report and began identifying areas for further investigation and review. On the day before the formal beginning of the visit, Standard IV team members visited the district office and met with the chancellor and members of the district office administrative team. Additionally, the team members spent the afternoon discussing their views of the written report and materials provided by the college, and reviewing evidence and prior reports. However, it is important to note, that during the initial meeting with the chancellor, the Yuba College team members present were informed that the self-study that had been sent to the Commission and to the team members was no longer accurate due to all of the

changes that had occurred both at Yuba College and the District Office. The visiting team spent much of the time in their Monday afternoon meeting with the team chair addressing how they would deal with this new information. It was consistently reported from the chancellor, interim president, interim vice president, and faculty that the Self-Study Report presented did not include much of the current college and district practices. The team chair directed the team to validate all information to the four standards, including all new information and evidence presented/provided.

During the visit, the team met with over 100 faculty, staff, administrators, several Board of Trustees members, and the interim president of the college as well as various administrators both at the college and district. In addition, the team visited two off-campus locations; the Clear Lake Campus (two and a half hours from main campus) and the Sutter County Campus (north of Yuba City). The team also attended two open session meetings to allow for comments from any member of the campus or local community.

The Yuba College staff made every effort to make the visiting team feel welcome and provided a team room that was comfortable. Team requests both before and during the visit were met with a quick response by both college faculty and staff. In addition to the open forums and one-on-one and group interviews, the team had many opportunities to observe Yuba College in action. Information was given freely and candidly in all venues. It needs to be reported that team members were greeted with hospitality and candor in every interaction and were provided with open access to all documents, by the faculty staff, and administrators. Nevertheless, it must be stated again that being told the first day of the visit that the current self-study for Yuba College was 'not completely accurate' by the Yuba College community made this team visit challenging. There was an addendum to the Self Evaluation Report that was provided; however, it did not address the changes that were being noted to the team when they arrived at the college and at the district for the visitation. For example, the team was presented with a "revised model of planning process" while on site that was aimed at clarifying the review and prioritization of resource requests at the college level and their relationship to the district. A new Integrated Planning diagram was provided to the team to show the process in revision, as well as a new Governing Board diagram that was submitted as evidence to demonstrate the relationship of the college's new process to district planning. Further, meeting minutes from the College Leadership of Academic and Student Services provided evidence of these processes being discussed and/or revised during the October 4, 2012 and October 18, 2012 meetings. (The visiting team arrived at Yuba College on October 22, 2012).

Again, the team perceives the college and its community of faculty, staff, students and administrators to be thoughtful, creative, caring, and very optimistic about the future of the college. Specifically, team members noted the following commendations:

1. The team commends the college for the positive campus climate. The team perceived the college community to be thoughtful and very optimistic about the future of the college.

2. The college is to be commended on the dedication and enthusiasm of its administration, faculty and staff toward the teaching and learning process, the students, and the institution.

3. The library faculty and staff are to be commended; while struggling with budgetary and relocation challenges to multiple off campus locations, they continue a heroic effort with success of offering services and innovation of much needed services to students; as well as all other members of the campus community.

4. The culinary arts program is to be commended for its service to the college community.

5. Yuba College serves a wide geographic area, where many of its residents do not have convenient access to higher education opportunities; these are provided through the college's off campus locations; the college is commended for these outreach efforts.

Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2012 Visiting Team

As a result of the October 2012 visit, the team made the following recommendations: five district and eleven college recommendations:

District Recommendation 1

To meet the Standards, the teams recommend that the chancellor develop and implement short term and long term data driven strategic plans. These should be developed in an inclusive manner, be transparent, clearly communicated and inclusive of the planning at the colleges. Particular focus should be in the development, implementation, assessment and evaluation of the following: (I.A.4, I.B.2, I.B.5, II.A.2, II.C, III.B, ER 19)
- A strategic plan guiding the district in integrating its planning processes that result in the district meeting its goals set forth and in line with their vision and mission;
- A planning structure driving allocation of district resources for the district, the colleges, and the off-campus centers; and

- A planning calendar including timelines that are delineated with parties/positions responsible.

District Recommendation 2

To meet the Standards, the teams recommend that the district, in conjunction with the colleges, develop and implement a resource allocation model that is driven by planning and student success. The model should be developed in an inclusive manner, be transparent and clearly communicated and evaluated periodically for effectiveness in supporting the district's and colleges' missions. (I.A.1, I.B, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.2, III.D.4, III.D.1.a-d, III.D.2.b, III.D.3, IV.B.3.c)

District Recommendation 3

To meet the Standard, the teams recommend that the district provide the following:
- Delineation of its functional responsibilities;
- Determination of whether current functions provided by the district office should be centralized or decentralized to better serve the needs of the students; and
- Clarification of the district level process for decision making and the role of the district in college planning and decision making.

The district should clearly identify district committees, perform a regular review of their work, conduct review of the overall effectiveness of district services to the colleges and widely disseminate the results of those reviews. (I.A.4, I.B.1, III.B, IV.A, IV.B.3)

District Recommendation 4

To meet the Standard, the teams recommend human resources planning be integrated with institutional planning and the district and colleges should systematically assess the effective use of human resources and use the results of the evaluation as a basis for improvement and identify needed staff in faculty, classified, and management positions. Further, the teams recommend the systematic evaluation of all personnel at stated intervals with appropriate documentation. For all employee groups, the district should also follow clearly defined appropriate written evaluative processes that are in written terms. (III.A.1.a-b, III.A.6)

District Recommendation 5

2. In order to fully meet the Standard, the teams recommend the district develop policies and procedures that clearly define and follow the process for hiring and evaluating the college presidents. (IV.B.1,IV.B.1.j)

College Recommendations:

1. To meet the Standard, the team recommends that the college develop and follow a process and schedule for reviewing/revising, applying and evaluating its mission statement. (I.A.3.)

2. To meet the Standard, the team recommends that the college regularly set college wide goals, identify measurable objectives, and evaluate progress in achieving those goals. (I.B.2)

3. As recommended in 2005, to meet the Standard, the team recommends, again, that the college strengthen program review to include a comprehensive and meaningful analysis of data with emphasis on disaggregated enrollment, program completion, success trends and instructional delivery mode. Analysis should integrate the achievement of student learning outcomes. (I.B.3, II.A. 1.b, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a-b, II.A.2e, II.C.2.i, II.B.2, II.B.3-4, II.C.2, ER 10, Recommendations 2 and 3 from the 2005 Report)

4. As cited in the 2005 evaluation report and to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the college develop and fully implement a systematic evaluation cycle for its institutional effectiveness, decision-making, and governance processes in order to assess their efficacy, including:
   • Planning
   • Program review
   • Student learning outcomes
   • Committees (practice, procedures and decision-making)

   Results of these analyses and findings should be broadly communicated across the college and used as a basis for improvement. (I.B.6, I.B.7, IV.A.3, IV.A.5, ER 10, ER 19, Recommendations 2 and 3 from the 2005 Report)

5. To meet the Standard, the team recommends that the college implement, evaluate and broadly communicate an integrated planning model that strengthens the linkages among the program review, planning and resource allocation processes, and clearly delineates between college and district responsibilities, with institutional stakeholders made more aware of the criteria for prioritization and the procedures employed. (I.A.4,I.B.2-7, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.2, III.D.4, IV.A.1, ER 19)

6. To meet the Standard, the team recommends that the college fully develop Student Learning Outcomes in courses, programs, support services, certificates and degrees; assess the results, evaluate the processes on a cyclical basis; and incorporate results in to planning, resource allocation and decision making. (II.A, II.B, ER 10)

7. In order to improve, the team recommends the college identify the learning support and counseling/advising needs of its student population and provide appropriate services to address these needs to support student development and success. (II.B.3, II.B.3.c, II.4)

8. As recommended in 2005, to meet the Standard, the team again recommends "the College should ensure that faculty and others directly responsible for progress toward achieving Student Learning Outcomes have, as a component in their evaluations, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes." Further, the team recommends the college ensure that faculty and others directly responsible for progress toward achieving Student Learning Outcomes have, as a stated component in their evaluations, effectiveness in assessing those learning outcomes for continuous quality improvement. (III.A.1.c, ER 10 and Recommendation 11 from 2005 Report)

9. To meet the Standard, the team recommends the college develop and implement a comprehensive and coordinated professional development plan for all employees and systematically evaluate professional development activities. (III.A.5.a and b)

10. As recommended in the 1999 and 2005 evaluation reports and to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the college ensure that custodial, maintenance and grounds staff are adequate to support the existing facilities including the new facilities at Sutter County and Clear Lake Centers and develop a plan to address ongoing staffing needs. (III.B.1, III.A.2)

11. As recommended in the 2005 evaluation report and to meet the Standard, the team recommends the college ensure that local processes for evaluation, dialogue, and planning of technology needs be designed, developed and implemented to interact with integrated planning at both the college and district level for resource allocation and professional development. (III.C.1, III.C.2, III.A.5.a-b and Recommendation 15 of the 2005 evaluation report)

Accreditation Evaluation Report for

Yuba College

October 22-25, 2012

Introduction

Yuba College was founded in 1927 as a single college district. Woodland Community College earned accreditation in June 2008 and with its accreditation created a multi-college district—Yuba Community College District. Yuba College currently operates the main campus near Marysville, and has off-campus locations: Clear Lake Campus, Beale Air Force Base Outreach Center, and the new Sutter County Campus, just north of Yuba City. While the Yuba Community College District serves eight counties, Yuba College primarily serves three counties: Yuba, Sutter and Lake. All three counties are primarily rural and have local economies that are mostly dependent on agriculture and its related services.

While Yuba College has transitioned from being a one college to a two college district since 2005, the college and the district are still in transition. At the time of the visit, the interim president had been in his position less than three months, and was still transitioning into his new role at the college. In addition, the interim vice president of student learning (co-accreditation liaison officer) was also in her position for less than sixty days, as was the faculty co-accreditation liaison officer. These college leaders met the team with a candor that was appreciated. The college community has placed great faith in the new chancellor and the interim president and interim vice president. The chancellor has a vision for ensuring that the president of Yuba College assumes full responsibility and authority for the operation of the college.

At the time of the visit; however, Yuba College was in a process of clarifying roles between the college and the district. Although various plans have been created, they were replaced with new plans and processes without a full cycle of implementation or evaluation. Some of these plans were developed a week prior to the team visit, such as the new drafts of the Governing Board, Mission—Vision—Value –Strategic Goals model dated October 19, 2012. Suffice it to note, the visiting team found it challenging to determine what documents and processes were being followed, those in the Self Evaluation Report and its accompanying evidence or those that were currently being developed.

Another challenge for the visiting team was the review of past college recommendations. It is important to note that in a review of past recommendations, documents and

processes for Yuba College, the team had much to take into consideration. First, in reviewing recommendations from the 2005 Self Evaluation Report, Yuba College was a single college district. Moving forward, even the 2008 Midterm Report for the college reflected a single college district, although it was noted as moving toward a multi-college status.

Yuba College has existed as one college that is part of a two-college district with a newly formed district office, according to reported information, since 2008. The Yuba College visiting team, therefore, reviewed all documents and past recommendations from the point of view that Yuba College was a single college district in 2005 and has been a part of a multi-college district since 2008. *The nineteen recommendations from the previous evaluation team from the 2005 accreditation visitation and those addressed in the Yuba College Midterm Report in 2008 were reviewed as follows:*

Recommendation 1:

The College needs to develop a variety of communication strategies to ensure that all employees are aware of how they can access information regarding the development and implementation of the various planning processes and the results of decisions made through the collegial governance process. (IB, IIA, IIID, IVB)

While there are Board Policies and Administrative Procedures in place to address the structures of collegial consultation and participatory governance, evidence supporting the practical applications of these policies and procedures is weak. While there was evidence at the time of the visit that the college was reviewing and updating the collegial governance processes outlined in the *Yuba College Council Handbook,* these processes should have been evaluated and improved for effectiveness on a sustainable and continuous basis. Additionally, during the visit, the team was provided with a "new draft" of the Governing Board, Mission—Vision—Value—Strategic Goals model dated October 19, 2012 (again, the team arrived October 22, 2012). While the college and district should be applauded for recognizing the need to establish better planning and communication thereof, the current plans appear to be in the awareness stage on the evaluation rubric.

The college has not met this recommendation.

Recommendation 2:

The college needs to strengthen its use of research in support of planning and evaluation so that measures of effectiveness in support of mission, goals, and objectives are more visible, more widely communicated, and more clearly used to improve programs and services. Evidence, both quantitative and qualitative of Student Learning Outcomes and institutional as well as program performance should be an integral part of the College's planning and decision-making processes. (IB, IIA, IIB, IIC, IIA, IIB, IIC)

The college has begun to embrace the larger concept of institutional effectiveness and its components. They are beginning to integrate the use of data and develop a culture of evidence on campus across all constituent groups. Resources allocated to the institutional effectiveness function in terms of staffing and technology has been instrumental in the college making this progress. The college needs to build on this progress and increase the use of data in decision making.

Please note College Recommendations 3 and 4, (page 7) from the Yuba College visiting team's 2012 Evaluation Report. They read:

Recommendation 3: "As Recommended in 2005, the team recommends, again, that the college strengthen program review to include a comprehensive and meaningful analysis of data with emphasis on disaggregated enrollment, program completion, success trends and instructional delivery mode. Analysis should integrate the achievement of student learning outcomes.(I.B.3,II.A.1.b,II.A.1.c,II.A.2.a-b,II.A.2e,II.C.2.i.II.B.2,II.B.3-4,II.C.2, ER 10, Recommendations 2 and 3 from 2005 Study)" and;

Recommendation 4:

"As cited in the 2005 report and in order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the college develop and fully implement a systematic evaluation cycle for its institutional effectiveness, decision-making and governance processes in order to assess the efficacy of these systems and ensure their effectiveness, including:

- *Planning*
- *Program Review*
- *Student Learning Outcomes*
- *Committees (practice, procedures, and decision making)*

Results of these analyses and findings should be broadly communicated across the institution and used as a basis for improvement, as appropriate (I.B.6, I.B.7, IV.A.3, IV.A.5, ER10, ER 19, and Recommendations 2 and 3 from the 2005 Report)"

The college has not fully met these recommendations.

Recommendation 3:

The college needs to ensure that its various program review processes and results, including its assessment of how well student learning outcomes are achieved, are used to improve institutional effectiveness in meeting its mission and goals, in prioritizing its needs, in integrating its various priorities, and in allocating its resources. (I B, II A, II B, II C, II A, II C)

Since its last evaluation, Yuba College has made a concerted effort on identifying student learning outcomes for the institution, programs, degrees, and courses. While various departments and individual faculty have utilized data from SLOs for improvement in teaching/learning and SLOs are incorporated into program review, little use of SLO data is integrated into planning. (See: Recommendation 2 above for 2012 Report Findings/Recommendations)

The college has not fully met this recommendation.

Recommendation 4:

The College needs to develop and implement an evaluation cycle for all of its plans, committees, project teams, and shared decision making processes and use the results of these evaluations to improve these groups and processes. (I.B, II.A, II.B, II.C, III.A, III.C, IV.A)

The college was required to respond to this recommendation in the October 2008 Midterm Report and an October 2009 Follow-Up Report. In the 2009 report, the evaluation process for committees, project teams and shared decision making was still in development. The college tested the process in fall of 2008 on committees selected by the college president. This evaluation process involved a survey that was administered to the members of the selected governance bodies. Survey results were compiled and presented in the Follow-Up Report and through limited discussions at the Yuba College Council from January through April 2009. A summary report was made to the Board of Trustees on March 11, 2009. Following this process, it was determined that the pilot survey process may not have been adequate for measuring committee and decision-making process effectiveness. Beyond the steps taken to prepare the fall 2009 follow-up report, there is little evidence to support that the college refined the fall 2008 evaluation process, or that they undertook any other process to determine the effectiveness of their decision-making. The college has not developed the necessary governance evaluation cycle to fully resolve this recommendation.

The college has not fully met this recommendation.

Recommendation 5:

That the College complete an annual report on the progress of Student Learning Outcomes Continuous Improvement Model. The use of assessment and data analysis to create instructional improvements must be part of this report. (II.A.1, II.A.2, II.A.3)

Recommendation 6:

That the College use completed program reviews as the basis for educational planning. (II.A.1,II.A.2)

Responses to Recommendations 5 and 6 have been combined. According to its October 15, 2012 Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes to ACCJC, "Yuba College has focused on creating real and meaningful dialogue about student learning, rather than putting bureaucratic needs and expedience as the top priorities." In a variety of meetings with faculty, authentic dialogue about SLOs is occurring across the campus and results from course SLO assessments are being used to improve student teaching/learning. It, however, is not evident that the college uses data derived from SLO assessment results for planning, decision making, and resource allocation purposes. The institution does, however, effectively rely on faculty for their expertise in SLOs development.

The college has not fully met recommendations 5 and 6.

Recommendation 7:

The College needs to proceed with the implementation of the process for developing Student Learning Outcomes for student support services programs and the process needs to be enhanced to include broad representation and the addition of data and analysis to document findings and recommendations for action based on the conclusions. (II.B.1,II.B.3,II.B.4)

Student surveys are used to solicit student feedback on satisfaction and outcomes. Yuba College supports its students by offering support learning centers at several off campus locations. However, the college will need to continue SLO development in student support services to fully comply with the proficiency level of the ACCJC Rubric for SLOs. The college will need to fully document this SLO development, widely communicate written processes and assessment results throughout the college and evaluate the processes on a cyclical basis. SLO results will need to be incorporated into planning, resource allocation and decision making.

The college has partially meets recommendation.

Recommendation 8:

The College needs to systematically conduct studies to review the effectiveness of practices used for student placement and to insure that bias in such practices is minimized. (II.B.3)

The Offices of Institutional Planning, Research and Student Success from Yuba College and Woodland Community College conduct reviews of cut score validity on a four-year cycle. The validation study usually occurs in the fall and the results are provided to the relevant district wide faculty participating in the study. The assessment validated the placement effectiveness while paying close attention to cultural and linguistic bias with the instruments and processes.

The college has met this recommendation.

Recommendation 9:

The Library/Learning Resource Center should develop Student Learning Outcomes for students to develop skills in information competency and provide ongoing instruction aimed at achieving those outcomes. (II.C.1)

Recommendation 10:

The Library/Learning Resource Center should develop a regular process of program review, including review of staffing levels, to evaluate the library and other learning resources in order to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs and the results should be used as the basis for improvement (II.C.2)

The responses to Recommendations 9 and 10 has been combined Yuba College has evaluated the Library/LRC offerings through SLOs, student surveys with regard to accessibility, usage, staffing and budget of the AV/Media, College Success Center and student usage of the Writing and Language Development Center including a number of student visits and student hours and comparisons of some English, reading and ESL courses. In addition, a continuous quality improvement survey in fall 2011 was used for evaluation and program improvement. The results of these assessments have been used for improved services at the college.

The college has met recommendations 9 and 10.

Recommendation 11:

The College should ensure that faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving Student Learning Outcomes have, as a component of their evaluations, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes. (II.A.1)

Although SLOs are considered part of the professional responsibilities of a faculty member and this item is a component of the evaluation process, there is no written agreement with the Faculty Association and the District to include this in the evaluation. Furthermore, it is not a written component on the faculty evaluation form. (III.A.1.c)

The college has not met this recommendation.

Recommendation 12:

The College should ensure that custodial, maintenance and grounds staff are adequate to support the existing facilities and should develop a plan to address staffing needs due to anticipated growth in facilities. (III.B.1)

A review of Yuba College's response to this recommendation stated that a Director of Maintenance and Operations was hired, custodial standards were established, and custodians were hired. However, Yuba College comments in the self-evaluation section of Standard III.B.1.b. indicates that this recommendation has not been resolved. The self-study states, "Although many plans for assuring the access, safety, and security are in place for Yuba College, staffing levels and for safety and maintenance departments remains an issue. Within the 2010-2012 Program Review and as part of the Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Model, the Maintenance and Operations (M&O) department asserted that the current level of staffing is far below national standards and the upkeep of facilities at Yuba College has been substandard due to an understaffed department."

A review of the minutes from the 2010-2011 Administrative Services Review (2/9/11) states that the M&O Department is far below that of standard and appropriate staffing levels and, with the increase of additional remote locations, they are "facing an extremely difficult challenge in providing adequate service and upkeep to the infrastructure and educational facilities of Yuba College at both the Marysville and Clear Lake campuses." The planning agenda section of the self-evaluation also stated that staffing and training should be addressed. The visiting team observation concurs with the self-evaluation report.

In addition, it should be noted, that this was also a recommendation from the 1999 site team visitation.

The college has not met this recommendation.

Recommendation 13:

The College should develop a plan that considers the Total Cost of Ownership in its projections of costs for new facilities and equipment. (III.B.2)

A review of the Technology and Telecommunication master plan shows that the college has included the Total Cost of Ownership in their planning documents. The college has also demonstrated the need for detailed and thorough project costs in the planning and implementing of Measure J bond funds.

The college has met this recommendation.

Recommendation 14:

The College should develop a Facilities Master Plan to ensure that facilities appropriately support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. (III.B.1, III.B.2)

A Facilities Master Plan was developed in 2005 with the assistance of the Community College Service Group. A review of the district wide plan showed that it addressed the needs of all locations. Yuba College should continue the work that was started with in the Facilities Master Plan and follow through on what was written in the last paragraph of the executive summary, "The Facilities Master Plan is a tool to manage future decision making. It should be considered a dynamic, "living document" that will be updated to meet the constantly changing facility needs of the District. The Facilities Infrastructure Project Team recommends that the District perform reviews every two years to ensure that the direction of the plan remains consistent with the goals of the District."

The college has met this recommendation.

Recommendation 15:

The College should ensure that quality training in the use of technology is provided for faculty, staff, and students. (III.C.1)

A review of Yuba College's response to this recommendation and to the college's comments in the self-evaluation report section, Standard III.C.1.b demonstrates that this recommendation has not been resolved. It noted, "More general technological training (MyCampus Portal, phone system, Colleague/Datatel, WebAdvisor, Email, smart

classrooms) is poorly communicated and inconsistent with the demand for training workshops, leading to low attendance when such trainings are held." The self-evaluation further noted, "The Yuba Community College District is deficient in this area, and the District and Colleges need to develop and implement a comprehensive technology training plan that allows all users the opportunity to learn about the appropriate technology tools for their position." The college did include the need to improve technology training in their planning agenda (Comprehensive Planning Agenda #5: Technology: service, access and training for YC employees.) The visiting team observation concurs with the self-evaluation report.

The college has not met this recommendation.

Recommendation 16:

The College should review its staffing resources in Information Systems in order to ensure adequate service throughout the district. (III.C.1)

Although the self-study identified needs in technology training and support, the college has hired personnel since 2005 to increase IT services. Help Desk staff provide first-line trouble-shooting support for students and personnel, monitor requests, and delegate unresolved requests to appropriate staff. Students' needs and classroom needs have high priority. The process for campus assessment of technology need and training is addressed in other areas of the standard.

The college has met this recommendation.

Recommendation 17:

The College should implement a plan to identify what the retiree health benefits liability is and determine what funds are necessary to begin to cover these costs. (III.D.1)

Yuba College had an actuarial study completed by Total Compensation Systems on October 21, 2009 and again on November 3, 2011. A review of the audited financial statement demonstrates that Yuba College (and the YCCD) is compliant with GASB Statement No. 45 (requires community colleges to report and recognize postemployment benefits). The YCCD is currently paying the pay-as-you-go portion of this liability and has set aside funds for this future obligation.

The college/district has met this recommendation.

Recommendation 18:

The College should review its governance structures and mechanisms, as well as its process for planning and program review, to ensure that they are clear, that they facilitate the discussion of ideas, and that they promote effective communication among the institution's constituencies. (IV.A.3)

According to the Midterm Report, Yuba College relied on their "Continuous Improvement Cycle" as the means to provide widespread communication about the institution's governance structures and mechanisms. Following discussions with a number of college constituencies, it appears that the Continuous Improvement Cycle was never fully implemented. The process stalled in part as the district went through its transition from a single to a multi-college district in 2008. According to the self-evaluation, there are a number of unresolved issues regarding which operational functions belong to the colleges and which ones belong to the district. Additionally, the program review process should be more robust. Formal cyclical evaluation of program review should occur and results should be integrated into college planning, resource allocation, and decision making. While the college is beginning to address this recommendation during the current academic year, the recommendation was not fully addressed at the time of the comprehensive visit.

The college has not met this recommendation.

Recommendation 19:

The College should provide staff development regarding the definition, meaning, and function of collegial governance in order to help staff and faculty understand their roles in relation to the governance process. (IV.A.1, IV.A.2)

According to the Midterm Report, the primary tool for initial orientation to and training for participation in college governance can be found in the Yuba College Council Handbook. As previously stated, the handbook has not undergone a substantive revision since it was created during the 2007-2008 academic year. In multiple interviews, a renewed sense of optimism and commitment exists at Yuba College from the belief that the current administration will ensure that collegial governance is once again a meaningful process; however, this optimism is in its infancy. In order to meet the standard, and satisfy this recommendation, continued evidence of ongoing constituency participation in college governance is necessary.

The college has not fully met this recommendation.

Eligibility Requirements

1. **Authority**: Yuba College meets the minimum requirement and has the requisite authority.

2. **Mission**: Yuba College has an established mission statement that contains information as specified in the accreditation Eligibility Requirements. This statement was last revised on March 11, 2009, by the YCCD Board of Trustees. The college developed this mission statement in response to the college's new status as part of a multi-college district. The mission was reported to have wide review by all constituency groups.

3. **Governing Board**: The visiting team confirmed that Yuba College has a functioning Governing Board responsible for the quality, integrity, and financial stability of the institution. The Governing Board consists of seven members, elected from seven trustee areas comprising the district. The Governing Board is an independent policy-making body and has and adheres to a conflict of interest policy that assures that a board member does not have a financial interest in actions taken by the board.

4. **Chief Executive Officer**: The visiting team confirmed that Yuba College has a Chief Executive Officer who is appointed by the Governing Board and whose primary responsibility is to the institution.

5. **Administrative Capacity**: The visiting team confirmed that Yuba College has an administrative staff that supports the necessary services for an institution of its size, mission, and purpose.

6. **Operating Status**: The visiting team confirmed that Yuba College is operating with students actively pursuing certificates, associate degrees, and/or transfer to four-year institutions, or have goals that include personal development, career enrichment, or remediation in basic skills.

7. **Degrees**: The visiting team confirmed, that Yuba College offers Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degrees, as well as Certificate of Achievement and Certificate of Training acknowledgements. The College Catalog contains a listing of degrees offered, course credit requirements, and unit length of study for each degree program.

8. **Educational Programs**: The visiting team confirmed that Yuba college's principle degrees are congruent with its mission, are based on recognized higher education fields of study and are sufficient in content and length.

9. **Academic Credit**: Yuba College awards academic credit based on the Carnegie unit standard, California Code of Regulations, Title 5, and on accepted practices of California Community Colleges. Detailed information about academic credit is published in the college catalog.

10. **Student Learning Achievement**: Yuba College defines and publishes the programs of study leading to transfer. The college needs to continue student learning outcome (SLO) development in courses, programs, student support services, certificates and degrees to meet this eligibility requirement. The college needs to fully document SLO development, widely communicate written processes and assessment results throughout the college and evaluate the processes on a cyclical basis. The college does not meet this eligibility requirement. (See: College Recommendations 3 and 6).

11. **General Education**: The visiting team confirmed that Yuba College defines and publishes specific requirements for incorporating into its degree programs a substantial component of general education designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and promote intellectual inquiry.

12. **Academic Freedom**: The visiting team confirmed that Yuba College faculty and students are free to examine and test knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of major study as judged by the academic/educational community. The Yuba Community College District respects that faculty have purview in academic matters. The Board of Trustees recognizes this through Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 4030.

13. **Faculty**: The visiting team confirmed that Yuba College employs full-time faculty that is sufficient in size and experience to support the college's educational programs. Faculty members are qualified to conduct the institution's programs and meet State mandated minimum requirements.

14. **Student Services**: Yuba College provides appropriate student services and develops programs consistent with supporting student learning and development within the context of a California Community College, the mission of the college, and the nature of the student population.

15. **Admissions**: The visiting team confirmed that Yuba College's admissions policies are consistent with its mission.

16. **Information and Learning Resources**: The visiting team confirmed the Yuba College provides specific long-term access to sufficient information and learning resources and services to support its mission and instructional programs regardless of where they are or in what format.

17. **Financial Resources**: The visiting team confirmed that Yuba College documents a funding base, financial resources, and plans for financial development adequate to support student learning programs and services to improve institutional effectiveness and to assure financial stability.

18. **Financial Accountability**: The visiting team confirmed that Yuba College's financial management is evaluated through an annual audit conducted by an independent certified public accounting firm.

19. **Institutional Planning and Development**: The visiting team confirmed that Yuba College has an Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Model with forms the basis for the college's continuous improvement cycle of planning. Planning processes and outcomes; however, need to be integrated, consistent, and evaluated. The college does not meet this eligibility requirement. (See: College Recommendation 4.)

20. **Public Information**: The visiting team confirmed that Yuba College publishes in its catalog, class schedule, and other publications information concerning the college's mission, objectives, admission requirements and procedures, rules and regulations affecting students, degree requirements, et cetera.

21. **Relations with the Accrediting Commission**: The self evaluation assures that the college adheres to the Accrediting Commission's Eligibility Requirements, Standards, and policies. However, the visiting team noted that Eligibility Requirements (ERs) 10 and 19 were not in compliance. As such, until Yuba College fully satisfies ER 10 and 19 this eligibility requirement will not be met.

Evaluation by Standard of the College Using ACCJC Standards and Making Team Recommendations

Standard I - Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

Standard I.A. Mission

General Observations

The college has adopted a mission statement that expresses its commitment to a "student first" priority and focus on transfer, career, and basic skills education for the students it serves. The college's commitment to its mission is evidenced through its educational and student services offerings. However, the mission is not aligned with the college's planning and resource allocation processes.

The college has identified its student population as coming principally from three counties – Yuba County, Lake and Sutter. This is evidenced by the college's student demographic data.

In general the self-evaluation for this standard reflects a college community that is clearly dedicated to its students and its community, but one that has been through the relatively recent transition from single college to multi-college district and a major leadership transition. These conditions are compounded by economic challenges (both in the CCC system and in the college's service area) and have had the effect of leaving the college's workforce overburdened and disorganized, and this has made it difficult for them to enact clear planning processes. Further, the college has been undergoing a great deal of change brought on by leadership changes; the college, at the time of the visit had both an interim president and interim vice president of the college that were in the positions less than 60 days.

Findings and Evidence

The college's intended population is a reasonable match for is location and role in higher education. The college conducts a moderate level of research regarding its programs and services to determine whether it is addressing the needs of students; studies from the college research office include the *Program Growth and Development Report*, the *Community Survey Regarding Occupational Interests*, and the *Rural Opportunities Report*. The college is developing plans to conduct an environmental scan, and has

formed an Enrollment Management Committee to further identify student and service area needs. (I.A.1.)

The team encourages the college to expand its study of its institutional effectiveness with the inclusion of key performance indicators such as program completion, job placement rates, licensure rates, and transfer velocity rates. (I.A.1.)

The college has a mission that defines its educational purposes and intended student population and expresses its commitment to student learning. The mission statement articulates the college's commitment to student learning and services in five areas: transfer, career programs, basic skills, English as a second language, and adult non-credit. (I.A.1.) The college developed this mission statement in 2008/2009 in response to its new status as part of a multi-college district. The mission statement was developed with the review of the Academic Senate, the Clear Lake Site Council, and the Yuba College Council. (I.A.3.) The Board of Trustees approved the mission statement on March 11, 2009. It is available to the college community on the college's website and is displayed in several work areas. (I.A.2.)

The team could not find evidence to verify that the mission statement is central to the college's integrated planning process; the documents and charts that outline the college's planning and budget processes do not explicitly mention the college's mission. The team was not provided with any evidence demonstrating that the mission statement is central to institutional planning or to the choices the college makes. (I.A.4.)

The college's stated review schedule for the mission statement is a 4-year cycle. (I.A.3.) However, with recent leadership changes (including new chancellor and interim president and interim vice president), and in response to increasing financial pressures, both the district and the two colleges are in the process of developing new, more focused mission statements. The team did not find evidence that the college uses its governance and decision-making processes to review its mission statement. (I.A.3.) The decision to write a new mission statement at a time not on the stated 4-year cycle appears to have been made without the input of the institution's stakeholders.

In interviews, the current development of a new mission statement was described as a district-led process, with members of the budget summit, a subgroup of the DC3 team, charged with identifying criteria that should be included in the mission. Those criteria will be presented to the college constituents for feedback; then returned to DC3 and the Board of Trustees, which will develop the actual college mission statements based on the criteria. This approach suggests a partnership of vision between the college and the district, but the team recommends that the college should take the lead on development of its own mission statement, with the district in a support role.

Conclusion

Yuba College meets the standard concerning governing board approval and institutional review. The college does not meet the standard that the mission is central to planning and decision making because the planning process remains incomplete. While the intent certainly exists, the actual linkage between the planning, budget, and resource allocation has not been fully developed.

The institution partially meets this Standard.

Recommendations

College Recommendation 1

To meet the Standard, the team recommends that the college develop and follow a process and schedule for reviewing/revising, applying and evaluating its mission statement. (I.A.3)

College Recommendation 2

To meet the Standard, the team recommends that the college regularly set college wide goals, identify measurable objectives, and evaluate progress in achieving those goals. (I.B.2)

Standard I.B. – Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

In 2008, Yuba College transitioned from a single college to a multi-college district. The college's institutional effectiveness processes cited in the self-evaluation did not clearly delineate the role of the college or district. Planning diagrams did not clearly depict college versus district responsibilities and as a result it appears these responsibilities have not been clearly delineated. The implementation of these processes has resulted in one functioning process, full-time faculty prioritization and hiring, with the other resource areas having incomplete or non-existent linkages between planning and resource allocation. Further, the college's program review process is aligned with the district's strategic priorities and not the goal areas outlined in the college's Educational Master Plan. The goal areas in the master plan are aligned with the district's strategic priorities, but are not clearly articulated as the formal college goals with objectives.

Under the leadership of a new chancellor, the college reports a change in culture that allows them to engage in meaningful discussions about effective planning and resource allocation. Discussions have led to recent revisions that focus on institutionalized processes and their consistent application. Many of these discussions directly preceded the site visit and had been conducted at the college and district level in selected participatory governance committees. These revisions were not included in the self-evaluation report and were mentioned to the team during the site visit.

The college shows a high level of commitment to the program review process and the college has recently improved data provided in instructional program review; however, the process yields inconsistent analysis of student achievement data and no continuous formal link of program review leading to planning and resource allocation. Improvements to the program review process include a built in mechanism for integrating the results of student learning outcomes assessment; however, their course and program SLO assessment and analysis has occurred at a rate below 50%.

Three years ago, the college made a commitment to institutional research and effectiveness with the hiring of the Director of Research, Planning and Success and the implementation of integrated software solutions (e.g., CurricuNet and TracDat) to support institutional effectiveness processes. This has led to increased access to data to better support the usage of data in decision making.

Findings and Evidence

The Self Evaluation Report states the college maintains ongoing self-reflective dialogue through their planning and shared decision making processes and the Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Model which was first developed in 2008-09. The foundation for their IE Model is the program review process where dialogue occurs at the department level. The team found evidence of a functioning program review process across instructional, student services and administrative areas. The Institutional Effectiveness Report 2011-12 states that the IE Model is designed to establish a culture of evidence that leads to data-informed decision making. During the site visit, the team was told that the other planning models cited in the Self Evaluation Report as areas where self-reflective dialog occurred (e.g., the Long Range Planning Model, Continuous Improvement Model and Resource Allocation Model) have been subsumed into the new Integrated Planning Model. The team found a lack of evidence that dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes occurred outside of program reviews (cited within the version of the Institutional Effectiveness Model cited in the Self Evaluation Report) which the team evaluated. Campus interviews with college and district personnel indicated they felt the college's revised Institutional Effectiveness and Integrated

Planning Models, once implemented, will broaden dialog across the components of the IE Model and between the college and district (I.B.1)

The Educational Master Plan 2010-2016 describes areas of emphasis and broad goal statements the college is focusing on and their alignment to the district's strategic priorities. The areas of emphasis and broad goal statements are not clearly articulated college goals and there was no evidence of measurable objectives to indicate the college's achievement of these goal statements related to its intended student population. Interviews with college personnel indicated that the college goal areas were not used for planning; citing evidence that the district strategic planning processes are what program review is aligned with. This assertion was verified by the team. (I.B.2)

The self-evaluation cites that progress towards institutional goals and its resulting decisions is part of their IE model, whose basis is program review. The team did not find evidence that the college assesses its progress towards the institutional goals other than the alignment of district strategic priorities to program review. Progress towards the college areas of emphasis and broad goal statements were not addressed. Additionally, the team found a lack of evidence of institutional improvement stemming from an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation and re-evaluation. (I.B.3)

During the site visit, the team found no consistent application of elements of the planning processes cited in the self-evaluation. Linkages between college and district institutional processes were not evident in the descriptions or models provided nor were the linkage between program review, planning and resource allocation, with the exception of full-time faculty hiring. While the self-evaluation noted an actionable improvement plan to rectify gaps in their planning and resource allocation processes, the team found during interviews with college management and faculty leaders the processes cited in the self-evaluation were deemed not effective, nor consistently implemented and are currently being revised not on the basis of a formal evaluation. Additionally, the processes outlined in the self-evaluation were not widely understood nor disseminated on campus. (I.B.3)

The team was presented with a revised model of a planning process while on site that was aimed at clarifying the review and prioritization of resource requests at the college level and their relationship to the district. A new Integrated Planning diagram was provided to the team to show the process in revision as well as a new Governing Board diagram to show the relationship of the college's new process to district planning. The impetus for the college and district's revision of these processes came from the December 16, 2011 minutes. Minutes from the College Leadership of Academic and Student Services provided evidence of these processes being discussed and/or revised during the October 4, 2012 and October 18, 2012 meetings. The team received mixed responses from the college when trying to determine if the new Integrated Planning diagram replaced any of

the processes outlined in the Self Evaluation Report. The team did not find evidence of an evaluation leading to these changes and this was confirmed in discussions with management and faculty. (I.B.3, I.B.6)

The college showed a strong commitment to its program review process. Constituents are actively engaged in the process and recent improvements include augmented data sets. Program review is conducted in Instruction, Student Services and Administrative Services on a four year cycle with annual updates. The program review structure allows for the integration of the results of SLO assessment; however, the team did not find comprehensive assessment results for each program. The team acknowledges that the lack of comprehensive evidence is mainly due to the college not having a full cycle of SLO assessment completed. (I.B.3, I.B.5, I.B.7)

While the program review process appears to be a solid foundation to the college's planning, completed program reviews did not consistently include a comprehensive and meaningful analysis of the data. The team randomly sampled multiple vocational and transfer program reviews, including those programs with multiple modes of instruction. The team found a cursory analysis of data in many instances and examples of plans not justified by data analysis. This review also indicated limited use of disaggregated data to review the impact of success, completion, modes of instruction, and other central aspects of a program. For example, a program cited the need to offer courses in the evening, but the program review did not include data on course scheduling or any analysis of the need.

The process for validated program reviews was not applied as stated in the self-evaluation. The program review validation process describes a feedback period where management and the Curriculum Committee review and provide feedback. No guidelines for the validation of program reviews were found and the team's review of completed program reviews showed inconsistent quality. During interviews with faculty and management, it was confirmed that program reviews have varying quality and in at least one case faculty included a comment 'to test' if program reviews were evaluated by the college. The comment was included in a program review the site team reviewed. Additionally, where reviews completed by the Curriculum Committee and management indicated poor quality in formal review documents, the site team found that program review was not revised, including justifications for resource allocation. Therefore, the results of program review do not consistently communicate matters of quality assurance to its appropriate constituents. (I.B.3)

The self-evaluation stated that the college's planning process and timelines are outlined in the Yuba College Council handbook. The handbook also defines the roles of committees on campus and their representation. The handbook states "The committee structure, the committee processes, and the outcomes born of these are increasingly looked upon to impact resource allocation" (page 132). During the site visit, it was

reported to the team that the practices outlined in this handbook did not match the processes and committee responsibilities. Examples cited were the Curriculum Committee and College Council. Interviews with all constituent groups indicated: (1) concerns with constituent participation in planning and decision until the past year; (2) a growing culture of participation in these processes through college level committees; and (3) concerns about representation and participation in district level committees. Additionally, as cited in Standard I.B.3, the planning processes outlined in the handbook, with the exception of the program review aspect of the IE model, were inconsistently applied and did not lead to integrated planning comprehensive resource allocation. (I.B.4)

The college has made progress in its use of data in program review with the addition of the institutional research function. While evidence was found showing the college has annually discussed a core set of student achievement indicators (ARCC) and provided student demographics, completion numbers and transfer/retention rates in published reports annually to the college, the team found a lack of evidence of widespread institutional discussion. During interviews with campus personnel, the team found that interviewees could not explain how data was used in decision making at the campus, including use of college data and trends in the college's fact book. The team found that the college had published some of the USDE Regulations for student achievement and success evidentiary requirements for 34 C.F.R. 602.16(a)(I)(i) in their fact book; however, key elements such as college wide course completion rates, licensure pass rates and job placement rates were not found. With the elements published, the team did not find that the college had set institution standards for satisfactory performance or achievement and have meaningful dialogue on campus. (I.B.5)

The college has also made progress since their last visit in the development and assessment of SLOs; however, limited evidence of achievement of student learning outcomes was found. At the time of the visit, 40% of course SLOs (based on the college expectation of one SLO per course) and 85% of program SLOs had been assessed. The college has developed institutional SLOs and mapped their course SLOs to their institutional SLOs, but has not conducted a comprehensive assessment. (I.B.5)

The college has engaged in improving their institutional effectiveness processes through informal evaluations through dialogue or survey feedback from involved constituents. Based on campus interviews and the evidence provided to the team onsite, such evaluations have occurred at the college level with program review on a regular basis. During interviews with management and faculty, the team inquired about the impetus for the change and evidence of an evaluation citing change was needed. The consistent response was that no evaluation was conducted, but dialogue at the campus led to change as the college knew the process was not working. A district employee indicated that the need for change was determined in discussions about district wide integrated planning at a district wide meeting. Although it appears the college has engaged in much dialogue

within their committee system about what processes are functioning, the team did not find evidence of a formal, systematic college-wide evaluation of the processes and their impact on departments and programs to make improvements. (I.B.6)

Conclusions

The college has begun to embrace the larger concept of institutional effectiveness and its components. They are beginning to integrate the use of data and develop a culture of evidence on campus across all constituent groups. Resources allocated to the institutional effectiveness function in terms of staffing and technology has been instrumental in the college making this progress. The college needs to build on this progress and increase the use of data in decision-making and increase their compliance with USDE evidentiary requirements through setting institutional standards for student achievement and success, and regularly monitor and discuss their progress towards the standards.

The team observed a strong commitment to and campus understanding of the program review process, which is the foundation for their planning and resource allocation processes. However, the college must strengthen the content and analysis within program reviews to effectively support their planning and resource allocation processes. This includes more in-depth analysis of disaggregated data and ensuring that the results of program review and its resulting resource requests are justified through the analyses.

The college had developed planning models cited in the self-evaluation; however, the team determined through evidence gathered that indicated the models were not effectively functioning, not widely understood on campus, and personnel were dissatisfied with the lack of decision-making and resource allocation with the exception of two processes. The college cited numerous times that the full-time faculty hiring process was linked to program review, transparent processes and produced results. This determination was primarily based on: (1) information in the self-evaluation citing recurring issues with technology resources and maintenance and operations staffing; (2) no clear functional linkages between program review and allocation for all resources except full-time faculty hiring and the replacement of computers; (3) blurred pathways between the of the college and district in planning and resource allocation decisions; and (4) the lack of clearly articulated college goals leading the planning process.

The college demonstrated the refinement of certain institutional effectiveness processes through informal evaluations and feedback. The program review and planning processes have undergone considerable dialogue within committees. However, the team did not find evidence of a formal, systematic evaluation cycle that includes all constituents. Finally, until recently college constituents did not feel they had a substantive voice in the

planning and decision making processes. The team encourages the college to continue its momentum in participatory governance in this area.

The college has not met this Standard.

Recommendations

College Recommendation 3

As recommended in 2005, to meet the Standards, the team again recommends that the college strengthen the content of its program review to include a comprehensive and meaningful analysis of data with emphasis on overall and disaggregated enrollment, program completion, retention, and success trends. Analysis should also integrate the achievement of student learning outcomes. Improvements to its programs should be based on these results. (I.B.3., II.A.1.c., II.A.1.c, II.A.2. a-b, II.A.e,II.C.2.i, II.B.2, II.B.3-4,II.C.2, ER 10, and Recommendations 2 and 3 from the 2005 Report)

College Recommendation 4

As cited in the 2005 report and in order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the college develop and fully implement a systematic evaluation cycle for its institutional effectiveness, decision-making and governance processes in order to assess the efficacy of these systems and ensure their effectiveness, including:

- Planning
- Program review
- Student learning outcomes
- Committees (practice, procedures and decision-making)

Results of these analyses and findings should be broadly communicated across the institution and used as a basis for improvement, as appropriate (I.B.6; I.B.7; IV.A.3; IV.A.5, ER 10, ER 19, and Recommendations 2 and 3 from the 2005 Report)

College Recommendation 5

In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the college implement, evaluate, and broadly communicate an integrated planning model that strengthens the linkages among the program review, planning and resource allocation processes, and clearly delineates between college and district responsibilities, with institutional stakeholders made more aware of the criteria for prioritization and the procedures employed. (I.A.4, I.B.2 -7, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.2, III.D.4, IV.A.1, ER 19)

Standard II – Student Learning Programs and Services

Standard II.A. – Instructional Programs

General Observations

Yuba College has experienced a significant amount of change since their last self-study including becoming a two-college district and opening a new college center.

Yuba College offers approximately 65 programs for students ranging from general, vocational education, basic skills including developmental education, English as a second language instruction, and adult non-credit courses. Consequently, students may select multiple degrees and certificates as a means of an outcome for their studies.

The Institutional Self Evaluation Report addresses many of the appropriate items; however, not all statements are supported with evidence. The report does not fully explain how the Distributive Education (DE) program contributes and is incorporated into district's procedures.

Findings and Evidence

Yuba College appears to offer quality instructional programs as evidenced through their program review process and the data provided by the Office of Research publishes data on current and future student enrollment trends, outcomes of degree or certificate completions, transfer rates, and employment placements for Career/Vocational programs. However, interviews with college personnel indicated that the college goal areas were not used for planning; citing evidence that the District strategic planning processes are what program review is aligned with. This assertion was verified by the team. (I. B. 2) Yuba College supports its service areas by offering educational learning centers at several off campus locations, i.e. Beale Air Force Base Outreach Center, Clear Lake Campus, and the new Sutter County Campus. The instructional programs are assessed in order to assure currency, improve teaching and achieve stated learning outcomes. (II.A)

Yuba College's programs include data on enrollment, successful course completion, persistence, and the number of declared majors and completers of program degrees and certificates. The college's website provides catalog information and specific course descriptions separated by Academic divisions. The college's academic program review process is designed to include plans of action, budgetary impact, level of priority, timelines and reported action. The inclusion of these components assists with the evaluation of the quality and quantity of activities. (II.A.1)

The Director of Research, Planning and Student Success compiles information for the college that is used for course and program offerings will typically include;

- High school placement results
- Persistent data
- Outreach information
- Access and Awareness committee information
- TracDat (student learning)
- ARCC

Instructional and Service programs are able to meet the varied educational needs of its students; however, there is concern on the timeliness for student completion. Additionally, the college has active advisory committees that provide information from community stakeholders by including specific updated information and identifying the appropriate learning outcomes associated with their program along with the analysis of their goals. The program review model requires that every program conduct a four-year comprehensive review of its offerings with annual updates that identifies practices and improvements. The model however was not universally utilized. Where the DE program used the process to specifically identify the program's mission, prioritized objectives, specific action plans, project completion dates, and discussions on the future direction of the program; team interviews with staff revealed that the documented program review process was being modified because it was difficult to determine if they partially met the standard. (II.A.1.a)

The most essential student services and library resources are being offered at both the Sutter County and Clear Lake Centers. At each center, the "local" administration works closely with faculty, staff, and students to provide the courses and student services required for success that mirror service and resource needs offered at the Yuba College campus. Although the Program Review process, including site councils, was identified as the process where students, faculty, staff and managers have an opportunity to offer suggestions and input for improvement and identify priorities; as to how that information fits into the college's integrated planning process was not evident. Locally, the Program Review process at the centers is collaborative in addressing needs, allocation recommendations, and local prioritization, but how the information feeds into the integrated planning process is not clear, other than it is "in process" of being developed. (II.A.1, II.A.2)

The college has identified student learning outcomes for courses, programs, and the institution. According to the Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), 81.9% of its courses have identified SLOs and 39.2% have assessed SLOs. 100% of programs have identified SLOs and 85.2 % have assessed them. 63.6% of student

services have identified SLOs and 27.3% have assessed them. Little development with administrative units has been completed. After meeting with the SLO committee and various faculty members, SLO development seems to be working in some areas throughout Yuba College. While some departments and student service units have ongoing assessments and robust dialogue about implementing the findings, other departments are not at the proficiency level of the ACCJC Rubric for SLOs. (II.A.1.c)

The Self Evaluation Report identifies that the college offers instruction and student services in varied delivery systems. The online courses are accessible through the Blackboard system and ITV courses. The Yuba Community College District (YCCD) eLearning website provides resources for students and faculty to aid each in using the system and developing course content. Moreover, the site provides users information on personnel to contact and identifies that eLearning is supported by additional campus sites. However, evidence on the DE course evaluation processes or how DE courses map to the objective of the course or programs was not evident. There is dialogue that the institution is planning on studying and comparing the effectiveness of online and traditional courses, however no evidence of this was provided. It is clear the instruction has administrative personnel in place to administer DE programs and evaluate their effectiveness. Nevertheless, there isn't a separate approval process for DE instruction or the evaluation process on their content, delivery, and student effectiveness. (II.A.1.b.)

Since their last self-evaluation, Yuba College has made a concerted effort on identifying student learning outcomes for the institution, programs, degrees, and courses. The college reported 81.9% of college courses had identified SLOs with 39.2% assessing their SLOs. Additionally, the college identified eight institutional SLOs and 100% of their program SLOs. The college affirmed that they will continue to identify Support Service outcomes for all other departments on campus in order to meet the standard. Yuba College appointed an SLO Coordinator for the implementation of the SLO initiative on campus. While various departments and individual faculty have utilized data from SLOs for improvement in teaching/learning and SLOs are incorporated into program review, little use of SLO data is integrated into planning. (II.A.1.c, II.A.1.f, IIA.2.b, IIA.2.f, IIA.2.g, IIA.2.h)

Yuba College attempts to provide continuous quality improvement through its College Curriculum Committee that all instructional courses and programs offered are reviewed and approved as collegiate, developmental or continuing and community or contract education, regardless of type of credit awarded, or location or delivery mode. Furthermore, the committee evaluates and approves courses/programs based on the strategic direction and student learning outcomes for the college. The Yuba Community College District (YCCD) also appointed members to the District-wide curriculum committee in 2008 when Woodland College was granted accreditation status. (II.A.2)

Faculty expertise is relied upon as outlined in the College's Curriculum Handbook of 2009 and in their Course Review and Approval policy of 9/16/2003. With the adoption and use of CurricuNet the Curriculum Chair intends to update the Curriculum handbook to include the use of CurricuNet and the DE component. Course outlines are developed by faculty and then reviewed by a Division Dean. The course outlines with all required components are maintained in a curriculum database- CurricuNet. The District designed an Institutional Effectiveness (IE) model and the Yuba College Educational Master Plan (EMP) to evaluate its programs for appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, and synthesis of learning as characterized by this Standard. (II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.c)

Yuba Community College has made considerable progress in the development of SLOs. The faculty is to be commended for taking ownership of the SLO process and demonstrating genuine concern for improving student learning. Since 2005, Yuba College has identified an SLO coordinator, formed an SLO committee, purchased TracDat and provided the necessary resources for SLO development. Considerable time has been spent on SLO development during convocation activities and department meetings. (II.A.2.b)

According to its October 15, 2012 Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes to ACCJC, "Yuba College has focused on creating real and meaningful dialogue about student learning, rather than putting bureaucratic needs and expedience as the top priorities." In a variety of meetings with faculty, authentic dialogue about SLOs is occurring across the campus and results from course SLO assessment are being used to improve student teaching/learning. However, it is not evident that the college uses data derived from SLO assessment results for planning, decision making, and resource allocation purposes. The institution does effectively rely on faculty for their expertise in SLO development. (II.A.2.b)

Yuba College communicates SLOs in a variety of ways; however, better communication about SLO development and assessment needs to continue within the college community. Students are informed about SLOs in the college catalog and on course syllabi. Course outlines of record contain SLOs in CurricuNet and as Course Outlines of Record (COR) are updated, SLOs must be recorded; otherwise the course cannot be updated. (II.A.2; II.A.2.a; II.A.6)

The college has designed an evaluation process of Institutional Effectiveness (IE) along with the designation of two committees; Curriculum and Distributive Technology to assess the appropriateness of instructional delivery method. The college evaluates its courses and programs through the college curriculum committee as a means of ongoing and systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes and currency. The college recently implemented CurricuNet as the database for housing course outlines, student learning outcomes, and distance education rationale

for all courses. It is advisable that the colleges formally update the Curriculum Handbook for each college and include the instructions for using CurricuNet. (II.A.2.d, II.A.2.e)

The institution has program review, assessment and evaluation in place for traditional courses; Distance Education (DE) courses are merged with traditional courses. The DE subcommittee is in place to review DE courses; however, there are no established guidelines. The rationale for offering and staffing DE courses are completed at the program level. DE courses are not assessed, rather, the faculty are assessed. The assessment tool used to assess faculty has little reference to the course evaluation, thus limiting the evaluation to the faculty. (II.A.2.e)

In the Self Evaluation Report the college and district assure the utilization of the Board Strategic direction, IE Model, Program Review and the Educational Resource Planning committee to demonstrate the engagement and ongoing systematic evaluation and integrated planning. This was to assure currency and measurement of achievement for student learning outcomes, but has recently decided to change their Board Strategic direction, IE Model, and Program Review model. Hence, the college is unable to meet this Standard. There are practices in place to guide faculty in developing and evaluating Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and SLO's. Additionally, the institution has established a mechanism to track completion of SLOs and PLOs and reports these findings to select committees. Moreover, the institution supports dialogue among stakeholders through Flex activities, retreats, and meetings. (II.A.2.f)

The Office of Institutional Planning, Research and Student Success from Yuba and Woodland Colleges conduct a review of cut score validity on a four-year cycle. The validation study usually occurs in the fall and the results are provided to the relevant district wide faculty participating in the study. The departments participating include English, Reading, Mathematics, and English as a second language. In addition to the study, the faculty compares their evaluation methods to eliminate bias. (A.2.f, II.A.2.g, II.B.3.e)

Yuba College awards credit based on student achievement of the course's stated learning outcomes. It assures that units of credit are consistent with official COR, the college catalog, and institutional policies. The college's curriculum committee is charged with the review and approval of courses and is consistent within regulatory guidelines. Furthermore, the college ensures the necessary training of a Student Services Technician for transcript and graduation evaluation. (II.A.2.h, II.A.2.i)

The College's catalog and website informs students of the specific academic and vocational degree program information including a General Education Philosophy statement and their degrees meet the basic standards of knowledge and include the

humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences. The college's graduation requirements further reinforced the need to acquire written and oral communication skills, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical thinking, ethical principles, civic, and social responsibilities locally, nationally, and globally. (II.A.3, II.A.3.a, II.A.3.b, II.A.3.c)

Although the college is making significant progress with their DE offerings, the institution provides minimal explanation and evidence on learning support services for DE and ITV students. The online support services in place include college orientations, applications, registration, and library services. The institution provides minimal explanation and evidence on how learning support services for DE and ITV students are assessed and how the current assessments are used to improve student services for online students. The college explains how campus-based orientations are administered; however, there was no explanation on how online orientations are administered and no mention on support options for students using online methods. Additionally, there was an absence on how the online support services are assessed and if they are effective. Yuba College did identify that program review data identified poor communication between students and support services which the institution rectified. Moreover, the college does not identify if a systematic and regular review of support services exists. (II. B.3, II.B.4)

The College's degree programs are clearly in one area of study: associate of science (AS) or associate of arts (AA) as outlined in the college catalog and accompanied with certificates of achievement and/or training. The college assures that students are receiving clear and accurate information about educational courses, programs, and transfer policies. Additionally, published information regarding transfer policies, awarding of credit, elimination or program changes, is clear and consistent to incoming students, the public and its college personnel. Yuba College communicates SLOs in a variety of ways; however, better communication about SLO development needs to continue. Students are informed about SLOs in the college catalog and on course syllabi. CORs contain SLOs in CurricuNet. SLOs must be recorded in the COR or the course cannot be updated. (II.A.4, II.A.6, II.A.6a, II.A.6.b, II.A.6.c)

Yuba College is predominately oriented toward offering career technical education fields of study; hence, several these programs required their own competencies examinations or certifications, e.g. National Accrediting Commission of Cosmetology Arts & Sciences, National Restaurant Association Test, Water Treatment and Water Distribution level 1 & level 2, HESI required for some nursing courses. Additionally, Career Technical Education grants are updated annually for Perkins, Tech Prep, SB70 and Contract Education. Over 1,000 students were served with Tech Prep funding during the 2010-11 academic year. (II.A.5)

The college uses its Board policies on academic freedom and responsibility, ethics statement, academic honesty and outlines the consequences to academic dishonesty in its Student Code of Conduct. (II.A.7, II.A.7.a, II.A.7.b, II.A.7.c)

II.A.8 is not applicable to Yuba College.

Conclusions

The Self Study identifies that the college is improving communication and establishing systems and procedures to plan and assess programs. The program review process and the SLO process have established procedures and the college is beginning to use the assessment to improve student success. The Self Evaluation Report summarizes all learning modes into one group and does not discuss the assessment of on-line learning as a separate method of instruction. Furthermore, there was little discussion and evidence presented to support the college's efforts to improve on-line learning methods.

Recommendations

College Recommendation 3

As recommended in 2005, to meet the Standard, the team again recommends that the college strengthen program review to include a comprehensive and meaningful analysis of data with emphasis on disaggregated enrollment, program completion, success trends and instructional delivery mode. Analysis should integrate the achievement of student learning outcomes. (I.B.3, II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a-b, II.A.2e, II.C.2.i, II.B.2, II.B.3-4, II,C.2, ER 10 and Recommendations 2 and 3 from the 2005 Report)

College Recommendation 6

To meet the Standard, the team recommends that the college fully develop Student Learning Outcomes in courses, programs, support services, certificates and degrees; assess the results, evaluate the processes on a cyclical basis; and incorporate results into planning, resource allocation and decision making. (II.A. II.B., ER 10)

Standard II – Student Learning Programs and Services

Standard II.B Student Support Services

General Observations

Yuba College supports the learning and success of its students by offering an array of student services that are delivered through various programs and departments on campus and their off-site centers to students. The college excels in offering student support services to students with special needs through numerous pathways and programs that assist with outreach, admissions and registration, placement testing, orientation, academic advising, personal and career counseling, financial aid, and transfer and career advisement.

The various programs that are in place are staffed with dedicated personnel for student success from Admissions and Records, EOP&S, Financial Aid, DSPS, CalWORKs, CARE, MESA, Veterans, Career and Transfer Center, Student Health Center and Counseling. There is sensitivity to serving the Limited English Speaking student population; hence, the college employs bilingual personnel. Furthermore, enhanced academic support programs are available through the College Success Center, Writing Center, and the Hard Math Café.

Due to recent budgetary constraints, the college has implemented some limited services and had to make staffing reductions. Specifically noted was the Counseling Staff was severely depleted from 7 to approximately 4 (load) resulting in fewer counseling hours for students. Students Services currently has only one interim Dean to represent all of Student Services and the college is undergoing a re-evaluation of all student services to determine if any of services or programs should be assumed by District Services. To support student success efforts, the college will need to design a plan to reinstate certificated or classified personnel based on an integrated program review and resource allocation model.

Findings and Evidence

Yuba College's website provides a directory for Board policies and administrative procedures for the general public and its students. The college publishes a schedule of classes and college catalog for its constituencies with accurate and current general information, admissions requirements, and major policies affecting students as outlined within the Standard. Students can easily access information via a hard copy of annual catalog or utilizing the college's website for the same information. This includes such

general information as the college's mission, address, programs, courses, student services available, admissions, academic regulations to specific student policies and procedures on academic honesty, nondiscrimination, grievance and sexual harassment. (II.B.2.a, II.B.2.b, II.B.2.c, II.B.2.d.)

At Clear Lake, the full array of student services is offered with a staff of two full-time and one full-time library technician, the latter taking the lead staff role. The Clear Lake library services expanded in August 2012 as a result of the bond measure, therefore coverage may need to be assessed at Clear Lake in the library. Currently, student assistants provide staff back up for both library and student services at Clear Lake. (II.B.1, II.C1, II.C2)

At the Sutter location there is one full-time student services staff and one full-time library technician. Two areas of student services, CalWorks and EOP&S, were identified as needs. In addition, evening classes are being added and some adjustments to student services hours to accommodate the new scheduling are planned. The Sutter bookstore, which is operable during the first two weeks of the semester, satisfies textbook needs during that time period, but does not satisfy student needs for ongoing supplies such as blue books, scantrons, etc. Because Sutter is a new center, these issues are being addressed as they come up. The college needs to follow more formal planning processes to determine the need at the new Sutter location. Because of limited staffing at Sutter, student services and library resources "shut down" if staff is absent. There is no other coverage, other than student workers. However, there are plans to add a line item for additional staffing help. (II.B.1, II.C1, II.C.2)

The college maintains copies of student records in the registrar's office. Records can only be accessed by college personnel and their staff is informed and aware of the FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act) regulations. (II.B.2.d.)

The college promotes student activities under the direction of a lead person that provides training and supervision for the many clubs, activities, and student government. There is an appreciation of student involvement and inclusion to a variety of educational and social interests that recognizes the diversity of the student population. (II.B.3.c)

The Offices of Institutional Planning, Research and Student Success from Yuba and Woodland Colleges conduct reviews of cut score validity on a four-year cycle. The validation study usually occurs in the fall and the results are provided to the relevant district wide faculty participating in the study. The assessment validated the placement effectiveness while paying close attention to cultural and linguistic bias with the instruments and processes. (II.B.3.e.)

Student Services offers quality support learning services programs as evidenced through their program review process. The data is collected by the Office of Research and the

various departments. Student surveys are used to solicit student feedback on satisfaction and outcomes. However, it was noted that 63.6% of student services areas have SLOs and of the only 27.3% have assessed them. Yuba College supports its students by offering support learning centers at several off campus locations, i.e. Beale Air Force Base Outreach Center, Clear Lake Campus, and the new Sutter County Campus. The instructional programs are assessed in order to assure currency, improve teaching and achieve stated learning outcomes. (II.B.4)

Conclusions

The visiting team was impressed with the counseling staff's commitment to providing counseling/advising needs for their student population with the limited number of personnel available for students. The culture and climate of the viable team that focused on student success was apparent to the visiting team. Students commented on the positive experience they have had from special programs and services. However, the college needs to continue SLO development in student support services to fully comply with the proficiency level of the ACCJC Rubric for SLOs. This was a recommendation in 2005 Evaluation Report where the visiting team stated, "The College needs to proceed with the implementation of the process for developing Student Learning Outcomes for student support service programs and the process needs to be enhanced to include broad representation and the addition of data and analysis to document findings and recommendations for action based on the conclusions." This is most likely a challenge for the student services areas with limited staffing. Nevertheless, the Standard calls for SLOs to be developed, assessed, etc. in this area.

The college does not meet the Standard.

Recommendations

College Recommendation 6

To meet the Standard, the college needs to continue SLO development in courses, programs, student support services, certificates and degrees to fully comply with the proficiency level of the ACCJC Rubric for SLOs. The college needs to fully document SLO development, widely communicate written processes and assessment results throughout the college and evaluate the processes on a cyclical basis. SLO results need to be incorporated into planning, resource allocation and decision making. (II.A, II.B, ER 10)

College Recommendation 7

In order to meet the standard, the college must identify the learning support and counseling/advising needs of its student population and provide appropriate services to address these needs to support student development and success. (II.B.3, II.B.3.c, II.B.4)

Standard II – Student Learning Programs and Services

Standard II.C. Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

The college is currently experiencing renovations of several facilities. The Yuba College District Educational Master Plan provides for evaluating, planning and building resources for the college, coordinated with institutional policy. In 2006, Measure J was approved by the local community. This bond provided $190 million for the college (and district) to renovate and construct facilities pursuant to the college code. The Yuba College District Facilities Master Plan provides directives for Yuba College to support student learning opportunities and provide a professional learning and working environment.(II.C) Seven facilities have been renovated and six, including the Learning Resources Center (LRC) are undergoing improvements. Due to these renovations, the LRC is in temporary quarters, so services are temporarily inconvenienced, albeit still being offered. The Library is scheduled to reopen in spring, 2013.

The Yuba College District Educational Master Plan provides for evaluating, planning and building resources for the college, coordinated with institutional policy. These changes have come as a result of findings from surveys of student needs, Library Program Review and Media Services Administrative review. (II.C, II.C.1, II.C.1.a, II.C.1.c)

Findings and Evidence

During this time, Yuba College has evaluated itself through SLO's, QOTM (Question of the Month Survey) and student surveys with regards to accessibility, usage, staffing and budget of the AV/Media, College Success Center and student usage of the Writing and Language Development Center including number of student visits and student hours and comparisons of some English, Reading, and ESL courses. In addition, a continuous quality improvement survey in Fall, 2011 as part of the Institutional Efficiency (IE) Model, Program Review and other meetings, data from the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) for 2008, Media Services Administrative Review, Accutrack and Datatel were used for evaluation and program improvement. The results of these assessments have been used for improved services at the college. (II.C, II.C.1.c, II.C.2)

An achievement by the college is that despite temporary inconvenience and relocation of services, the library and tutoring are ranked second and third most helpful resources on

campus related to student success as noted in a continuous quality improvement survey (IE evaluation). (II.C, II.C.1, II.C.1.a, II.C.2)

Library Program Review indicated a need for greater availability of many resources. These include financial, staffing, resources, technology, IT support, security and maintenance. Regarding the issue of staffing, there are also some areas remaining to be addressed. These include several. There is only 1.24 Library (faculty) time available. Consequently, the availability of this service is stretched. This is especially evident during peak hours of library operation, from 10 am to 3 pm, Mondays through Thursdays. Also, both students and faculty have regularly asked for the library to extend hours into the evening, weekends and summer. (II.C, II.C.1, II.C.1.a)

Staffing shortages notwithstanding, Library orientations are generally available which include information competency. The training consists of in class orientations, one unit Library Science course on basic research skills and a weekly blog which advises faculty, staff and students to additions and modifications in the library. A library support link is available to every Distributive Education course shell to for easy online access to library services. (II.C) Availability of these services has been hindered by limited staff during this period. However, formal evaluation of the services are provided by way of anonymous surveys with faculty, staff, and students in classroom instruction and learning resources where information competency is taught. (II.C)

The LRC Media Services is in need of increased support staff to provide AV training, help desk support, classroom repairs, and creation of a Media Services website. In addition, there is lack of clarity in the division of labor between campus and district IT staff. Because of this, needed repairs to equipment are often not addressed in a timely fashion. (II.C, II.C.1.a, II.C.2)

A conundrum in the College Success Center exists: there is a 60% increase in demand for services but simultaneously a 28% reduction in funding. This and other issues have resulted in the Measure J funding. However, some issues have not been addressed by the funding. As an example, a fulltime tutoring specialist position lost in 2011-2011 will not be replaced. These needs and others have been seen in the Program Review and Institutional Model for planning. (IIC, IIC1, IIC1a)

At the Writing and Language Development Center (WLDC), a need for IT support staff is also noted. Similarly, at the Open Media Lab, hours of availability during the regular school year are 55.25 hours per week and 36 hours during summer. Students regularly request longer hours and weekend availability. Often, students cannot receive assistance with computer related issues. (IIC, IIC1)

Program Review revealed a need for greater availability of e-sources. In response, the about 40,000 e books from Net Library and e-brary were purchased for distance education students. Also, the number of online databases (as requested by faculty, staff and students) increased by 500% (2005-2006) and 20 more databases were later added (2010-2011). (IIC1a) Unfortunately, a clerical support position (one of three) was eliminated during this time (2011-2011). (IIC, IIC1c) Based on recommendations of the Math Department Program Review, a recommendation for a Hard Math Café Annex was funded in 2008 and 2009 and continues very successfully to this day. In addition, in 2008, after the Basic Skills Initiative Committee studied success rates of developmental students, the Yuba College Writing and Language Development Center (WLDC) was developed to address reading, writing and language acquisition needs across the curriculum. Follow up studies of the program are used to improve and provide workshops. It was found to be so successful in helping students that it has been incorporated in the renovation project of the LRC. (IIC, IIC1a, IIC1b, IIC2)

Evaluation of educational materials (from the National Center for Educational Statistics) reveals that Yuba College funds for its collections is subpar to the established measure of 25%. This is complicated by the fact that the college lost its state provided Telecommunications and Technology Infrastructure Funding (TTIP) in 2009. Subsequently, this loss has been funded by the college at $50,000 for online databases. Program Review annual updates are used to refine and improve program practices to improve student achievement. (II.C, II.C.1.a, II.C.2) To augment its services, the Library has contracts with outside database vendors. These include the Integrated Library System, Blackboard, Turnitin, and OCLC Cataloging First Search. Through membership in the Council of Chief Librarians (CCL) it is able to purchase databases at discount. These are evaluated in Program Review. (II.C.1.e) Outdated and unused materials are purged based on suggestions of faculty and staff. (II.C.1.a)

Maintenance and security have been also been effected by the economic issues. Support of Institutional Technology is found wanting and the college acknowledges the need for evaluating maintenance services. (II.C.2.d)

Improvements forthcoming in the renovation of Measure J came about as a result of Library Program Review and Media Services Administrative Review and student surveys. They will include making the LRC fully compliant with the American with Disabilities Act (ADA), to provide universal wireless internet access and small group study rooms (IIC, IIC1, IIC2). Other improvements to be addressed include added computers (over 100), added seating, group study rooms, Internet connectivity, workstations for laptops (IIC).

Conclusions

The college is operating under challenging circumstances. The visiting team commends the librarians, the library, and LRC staff for doing its best in spite of tight budget and additional demands upon them with stretched resources.

College Commendation 3

The library faculty and staff are to be commended; while struggling with budgetary and relocation challenges to multiple off campus locations, they continue a heroic effort with success of offering services and innovation of much needed services to students; as well as all other members of the campus community.

The college has met this Standard.

Standard III – Resources

General Observations (Overall)

The self evaluation addresses Standard III in a thorough fashion. Numerous handbooks, policies and procedures, planning documents, and examples of committees' reflect the college's awareness of and adherence to the resource requirements within Standard III. A wealth of information was provided in the evidence section for each Standard (by major subcategory). The self evaluation is descriptive and reflective of the challenges and opportunities the colleges face with the declining state budget and going to a multi-college district. The descriptive summary sections demonstrate their knowledge of best practices and incorporated program review and learning outcomes throughout this section. The self evaluation sections frequently note opportunities for improvement and the realities of current college life as a result of the changes mentioned above.

Recent and ongoing state budget issues have impacted each of the four areas of Standard III as well as the transition to a multi-campus district. The student learning impact of Measure J funds, personnel reductions, job responsibility changes (impact of district office), and equipment repairs/replacement capabilities were addressed in the Self Evaluation Report and evidence and interviews support the identified concerns. Institutional planning has been consolidated with the District Consultation and Communication Council (DC3) and has charged three teams with: 1) planning and resource allocation process, 2) collaborative capacity and systems, and 3) communication strategies to ensure use of the program review process as an integrated institutional effectiveness model and ensure that these results are fully utilized in both the planning

agenda and budget preparation throughout the district. Ongoing plans and processes, designed to respond to the dynamic and challenging state budget, will likely prompt additional discussions. Yuba College and the district struggle with the processes for communicating college need or incorporating college planning into District plans and budgetary models.

Standard III.A. - Human Resources

General Observations

The team reviewed several documents provided by the College and District. The team also reviewed board policies and administrative procedures on planning, recruitment and hiring, and evaluations. Interviews with the District Human Resources Development and Personnel Services Department confirmed they are responsible for generating and revising hiring policies and procedures through consultation with appropriate groups, and they work with hiring committees to ensure the integrity of the existing process and that procedures are followed. The college shows a value and commitment to diversity which is exhibited in the Diversity Plan. (III.A.)

Findings and Evidence

YCCD has several processes in place to ensure that the criteria, qualifications, and procedures utilized for selecting personnel are clearly and publicly stated, that job descriptions are directly related to the District's and College's Mission Statements and goals, and that all appropriate measures of capability are evaluated. A review of board policies shows that at the district level, the Board of Trustees delegate authority to the Chancellor to authorize employment. The Director of Human Resources Development and Personnel Services is delegated responsibility from the Chancellor to develop job responsibilities, perform other personnel actions provided that all federal and state laws and regulations, and that board policies, and administrative procedures are followed. All candidates considered must meet the minimum qualifications required for the position and must have the required education, training, and/or experience. (III.A.1.a)

The decision to hire faculty goes through the Faculty Staffing Committee. The process for hiring faculty is described in the Academic Hiring Manual. The Academic Senate oversees the equivalency procedure for those who do not specifically meet minimum qualifications. The hiring committees include at least faculty, a manager, and an EEO representative. A second level interview is conducted by the President. Background checks are done by the two co-chairs of the screening committee. (III.A.1.c)

The team could not find any documented evidence of a process for identifying classified staff and management positions for hire. The hiring procedure for classified staff is described in the Classified Hiring Procedures document. The team was unable to identify hiring procedures for managers other than procedures related to minimum qualifications and hiring the college president. The team suggests the development of written hiring procedures for managers. (III.A.1a)

The team reviewed board policies, administrative procedures, collective bargaining agreements, evaluation forms, and district evaluation monitoring systems. Evidence of evaluation monitoring of classified staff, fulltime faculty, and adjunct faculty was reviewed. Some of classified evaluations were not completed in a timely manner. Evidence of monitoring management evaluations was not provided. (III.A.1.b)

Tenured faculty members are evaluated on a three-year cycle and non-tenure track faculty are evaluated annually for four years until they reach tenure status. The Academic Senate reviews all fourth-year evaluations and deliberates on tenure recommendations to the Board of Trustees. Adjunct faculty evaluations are conducted for three semesters of consecutive teaching, and they may be evaluated by a full time faculty member rather than a dean or director. Components of faculty evaluations include student feedback and classroom observations. (III.A.1.b)

Management and classified staff are evaluated on an annual basis by immediate supervisors. Feedback from the college community may be included in the management evaluations. However, based on interviews this feedback is rarely included in the evaluation. The team suggests that input from peers and subordinates be included in management evaluations. The team could not find evidence of a documented process for evaluating the college president. (III.A.1.b)

The review of faculty performance reviews and collective bargaining agreements showed that SLO responsibilities are not clearly defined or stated criteria of the evaluation. Although SLO's are considered part of the professional responsibilities of a faculty member and this item is a component of the evaluation process, there is no written agreement with the Faculty Association and the District to include this in the evaluation. Furthermore, it is not a written component on the faculty evaluation form. (III.A.1.c)

A review of Administrative Procedure 3050, Institutional Code of Ethics, and the Academic Senate Faculty Ethics Statement supports that the institution upholds a written code of professional ethics for all of its personnel. The guidelines cover, with respect to: 1) students, 2) colleagues and staff, and 3) the Board of Trustees. The faculty ethics statement states, "Contractual obligations require faculty to meet classes, keep office hours, and perhaps to serve on committees. These are ethical as well as contractual

obligations. Less obvious is the responsibility to exercise due diligence in monitoring the integrity of the institution as is applies to the condition of their workplace."(III.A.1.d)

As indicated in the self evaluation, due to the state-wide budget constraints, the staffing needs have not been realized since they were developed in preparation for the multi-college transition. Further complicating the situation is the opening of the Sutter Educational Center in 2012. Instead, duties have been stretched and redistributed among managers and classified staff to support the programs and services offered by the college with limited personnel. As a result, the College is working with the District to reorganize functions and centralize administrative structures and services. The staffing issues in Maintenance and Operations have not been resolved. Reliance on integrated planning processes to review and allocate the appropriate staffing to support their mission and assure the integrity and quality of its programs and services is encouraged. (III.A.2 and III.B.1)

A review of policies confirmed that YCCD utilizes the Policies and Procedures Model generated by the Community College League of California to review, update, and redevelop a comprehensive District Board Policy and Administrative Procedures Manual. The Manual is comprised of seven categories: 1) District Affairs, 2) The District and Board of Trustees, 3) General Institution, 4) Academic Affairs, 5) Student Services, 6) Business and Fiscal Services, and 7) Human Resources. The personnel policies and procedures are available for review on the District website. (III.A.3.a)

Personnel files are securely maintained and kept in locked files in a separately locked room within the office of Human Resources Department and Personnel Services. Files are available for inspection to the employee upon request and made available to appropriate management employees when necessary in the administration of the institutions affairs or supervision of the employee. (III.A.3.b)

Yuba College presented many documents supporting diversity effort including board policies, administrative procedures, diversity committee minutes, and diversity plans. The Diversity Committee tasked with developing the Diversity Plan outlines various strategies to create an inclusive climate; including recruit and retain faculty, staff, and students of diverse backgrounds; develop curricula to promote understanding of diversity; design programs and services to support new and diverse populations, and to create a system of commitment and accountability in support of diversity. A review of the above documents and meeting minutes demonstrate that Yuba College has an appropriate understanding of diversity and has programs that attempt to support a diverse group of employees. (III.A.4.a)

A review of board policies, the Administrative Services Review Process, and Equal Employment Opportunity Plan indicates that the district assesses it record in equity and

diversity. The Equal Employment Opportunity Plan developed in 2009 incorporates several components related to employment diversity although that data was not included in the plan. The team suggests that the data be updated and communicated to the institution. (III.A.4.b)

A review of board policies and administrative procedures, collective bargaining agreements, and the Management Handbook shows that the College and District has guidelines that promote fair treatment of its employees and students including policies and procedures address hiring, sexual harassment, and equal employment opportunities. Employee agreements with various employee units include a grievance process and the Yuba College Catalog describes the process for students to file a grievance or complaint. Additionally, the Management Handbook provides management with a process for dealing with conflict resolution. (III.A.4.c)

The Yuba College Flex Committee is under the auspices of the Academic Senate to further enhance professional development activities related to teaching and learning. Confirmation of the budget shows that professional development funding district wide includes $20,000 that is available annually for conference travel. The funding is split between Yuba College ($14000) and Woodland College ($6000) based on an agreement between both college's Academic Senates. A review of the flex activities schedule indicates opportunities for fulltime and adjunct faculty to meet their professional development responsibility throughout the year. Faculty professional development is monitored using TracDat. Professional development evaluation includes written feedback post presentation.

The District Staff Development Committee provides and monitors mandated training for managers, new employee orientations, and the district faculty diversity internship program. Little evidence of training evaluation was found. The team found no evidence of planned professional development opportunities including assessment, monitoring, and evaluation of professional development for classified staff. Technology training has been provided by various groups and individuals. However, the lack of technology training was cited as a need by all employee groups. (III.A.5 a and b; III.C.1)

Multiple times in the self evaluation planning agenda sections Yuba College states that while there are processes and procedures in place to ensure a systematic planning process, there is a common sentiment that the process stops with the submission of program reviews and it is not fully incorporated into the budget process. Yuba College should continue to evaluate the human resources necessary to support academic programs and administrative functions and incorporate them their institutional planning processes. (III.A.6)

Conclusions

The college has not complied with a recommendation from the 2005 Evaluation Report with respect to faculty evaluations and the inclusion of a component in faculty evaluations to assess the effectiveness in producing SLOs. Additionally, Yuba College was unable to demonstrate that it had any comprehensive or coordinated professional development plan for its employees.

The college partially meets this standard.

Recommendations

College Recommendation 8

As recommended in 2005, to meet the standard, the team again recommends "the College should ensure that faculty and others directly responsible for progress toward achieving Student Learning Outcomes have, as a stated component in their evaluation, effectiveness in assessing those learning outcomes." ~~Further, the team recommends the college ensure that faculty and others directly responsible for progress toward achieving Student Learning Outcomes have, as a stated component in their evaluations, effectiveness in assessing those learning outcomes for continuous quality improvement.~~ (III.A.1.c, Recommendation 11 from the 2005 Report).

College Recommendation 9

To meet the Standard, the team recommends the college develop and implement a comprehensive and coordinated professional development plan for all employees and systematically evaluate professional development activities. (III.A.5.a and b)

Standard III.B. - Physical Resources

General Observations

YCCD spans eight counties and nearly 4,200 square miles of territory in rural, north-central California. With the opening of a second community college, Woodland, in 2008, a District office was established. Yuba College offers degrees, certificates and transfer curricula at a college campus in Marysville, an educational center in Clear Lake which is over 80 miles away, a the Sutter Center Campus, a site located about 10 miles distance, and outreach operations in Williams and on Beale Air Force Base. The Sutter Center, which opened in fall, 2012, is a 55,000 sq. ft. educational center. The new 40,000 sq. ft. Health and Public Safety Training Center on the Marysville campus opened in 2011-12, and new facilities have been constructed at as part of the District's $190 million facilities Measure J bond passed in 2006. The growth of facilities, multiple locations for sites including one at a great distance, coupled with years of budget cuts has taxed the college's integrated planning systems and its operations, particularly the Maintenance and Operations (M&O) staff.

Findings and Evidence

The District Facilities Master Plan (DFMP), developed in 2005, served as a District framework for physical resource planning. An excerpt from the self-study states that, "The Facilities Master Plan (FMP) is a well-documented plan that serves as a guide for both short-term and long-term planning." This document should be periodically reviewed to assess changing facilities conditions and to assess the impact of these changes on student learning. The details of the DFMP were developed by a subcommittee/work group of the Facilities Infrastructure Project Team comprised of (1) staff from the Community College Service Group (Sacramento), (2) the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services, (3) the team leader of the Facilities Infrastructure Project Team, (4) the Public Information Director and (5) the Administrative Assistant to the Vice Chancellor Administrative Services. A licensed professional architect provided estimates for new building construction that were funded by the Measure J bond. Upon review, the team found the plans to have played an important role during the Measure J bond funded projects. However, with the available bond monies spent the plans will need an ongoing process of review, update, and prioritization.

Safety is addressed by the college Safety Committee, training programs, and the campus police. The findings of the team on safety practices are described in section III.B.1.b.

III.B.1.a - The Yuba College Self Evaluation Report indicates that Measure J funding has facilitated the renovation of several Yuba College buildings at the Marysville and Clear Lake campuses and upgraded the Central Plant and installed a photovoltaic project. Additionally, the completion of a new 55,000 foot Sutter County Education Center occurred in 2012. These projects are a major undertaking and according to annual program reviews performed by the M&O Department, the current levels of staffing are stretched to address the needs for maintaining the steadily increased workload supplied by these renovation projects in addition to maintaining the current facilities.

A campus tour of facilities confirmed that Measure J funds are meeting the current needs of Yuba College. A review of the Measure J audited financial statements and the measure J audited performance statements show that funds are being spent as planned and accounted for correctly. A review of minutes of the Facilities Master Plan committee confirms that this is an ongoing committee and will address the items in the planning agenda for the planning of future renovation projects. (III.B.1, III.B.1.a)

The team reviewed the facilities, documentation, and interviewed persons at the College and District to verify the concern expressed that level of M&O staffing was inadequate for current needs. (III.B.1.a) The number of custodial staff has been diminished since one custodial staff was assigned to the Sutter Campus. In the meantime, the M&O team is committed to their responsibilities, but may not get everything accomplished as quickly. The district has not demonstrated commitment to staffing for the maintenance and upkeep of campus facilities, as required in the Standard.

The Institutional Excellence Model, which incorporates program review, provides a tool for the college to identify campus needs. However, the district planning process did not appear to integrate the college's plans evolving from the program review of Administrative Services, particularly M&O, with the funding process. In the program review process, M&O was identified as not having adequate staffing or training. Evaluation at the site visit confirmed that M&O and custodial staff are struggling to cover the expanding number of facilities.

III.B.1.b - A campus tour confirmed that Yuba College has proactively addressed safety and security issues. Recent safety innovations include the upgrade of exterior and interior lighting, rerouting of vehicle traffic, installation of emergency campus communication boxes, and classrooms are OSHA compliant and have emergency operations plans, evacuation maps, and emergency preparedness handbooks. (III.B.1) Safety training is provided although not on a routine schedule. Some safety training is on-line through a consultant. Safety plans are in place including Hazardous Materials and

Chemical Hygiene. M&O staff report receiving professional training on a variety of lifts, such as fork lift and single man lift. (III.B.1)

In addition, the campus has 24/7 Campus police and a Mobile Alert System is available where students can sign up to receive emergency notifications texts from Yuba College. A review of the crime statistics, required under the Cleary Act, shows that crime at the Marysville location has increased from 3 incidents in 2008 to 6 in 2009 to 13 in 2010. The Clear Lake Center had 1 incident in 2008 and 2 in 2010. Yuba College publishes the Campus Police annual report which lists the reported crimes and crime log within the district as well as policies and guidelines for employees and students. (III.B.1.b)

III.B.2.a - The Self Evaluation Report stated that the District Facilities Master Plan is serving as the plan for the construction of bond funded facilities, so institutional needs are supported. Sustainability is part of the plan which will serve the college well in the future.

There is a concern expressed in the self evaluation that the proper planning and resources for maintaining these new facilities is lacking due to substandard levels of staffing in the Yuba College Maintenance and Operations Department, which has a number of unfilled vacancies. Additionally, the current staff are receiving training; but it is inconsistent.

III.B.2.b - The self evaluation expressed concern with the planning process. Specifically, "while the program reviews and annual updates form a strong base for identifying physical resources needs and institutional planning, these program review recommendations are not always integrated with other parts of the campus, such as academic departments and student services, for the overall budget prioritization process." The College expressed in the planning agenda that facilities planning will be part of the Strategic Planning Team Three, as part of the DC3 committee, part of the Comprehensive Planning Agenda #3: planning needs to connect with budget allocation, and Comprehensive Planning Agenda #8: budget development: following our process or reinventing a new one.

The findings of the accreditation team conclude that although there are multiple plans, some are old and need revisiting; the integration of these plans is not apparent.

Conclusions

As noted in the 1999 Evaluation Report Recommendation and again, in the 2005 Evaluation Report Recommendation, the college must ensure that custodial, maintenance and grounds staff are adequate to support the existing facilities. The college is mindful of the importance of maintaining a safe and clean campus environment; yet, new structures continue to come online without addressing this recommendation from 1999. There is no evidence that these staffing and planning requests are integrated at the college level. It was also reported during the time of the team visit that M&O would now be moving to a reporting structure to the district office, under the Vice Chancellor of Educational Services. Regardless where this department ultimately reports, the issue of appropriate staffing for M&O needs to be addressed; as it has been an outstanding recommendation for approximately 13 years.

The college partially meets this Standard.

Recommendation

College Recommendation 10

As recommended in the 1999 and 2005 evaluation reports and to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the college ensure that custodial, maintenance and grounds staff are adequate to support the existing facilities including the new facilities at Sutter County and Clear Lake Centers and develop a plan to address ongoing staffing needs. (III.B1, IIIA.2 and Recommendation 12 of the 2005 Report)

Standard III.C. – Technology Resources

General Observations

A Distributive Education (DE) and Media Services Department at Yuba College is responsible for training, daily operation of DE, and campus Audio Visual. Evidence for decision making processes is included in the Yuba College Technology and Telecommunication Master Plan. Additionally, a District Level Information Technology Department is responsible for computer and network support. The college reported a fragmented and decentralized approach to technology acquisition and support. Training is sufficient for Blackboard and newly implemented technologies although continual training may be needed. The team reviewed evidence and interviewed appropriate

personnel to determine if the claims in the self evaluation of inadequate training, limited opportunities, and infrequent assessment of training needs, were accurate. (III.C.1)

Findings and Evidence

As outlined in Yuba College Self Evaluation Report, the college demonstrated commitment to technology and to Distributive Education. Several plans have been developed to support their commitment, such as the District Technology and Telecommunication Master Plan, and the Yuba College Educational Master Plan. (III.C)

Commitment to technology was shown through recent upgrades of the district network and enhancements to educational technologies. Measure J funds were also allocated for technology/telecoms/security systems and district-wide technology equipment. (III.C.1.a)

The self evaluation and a review of recent employee surveys showed an overall perception regarding the widespread deficiencies in technological equipment, training, staffing, and computer support. Further, there is no centralized Yuba College Technology Committee. The self-evaluation section states that YCCD and Yuba College are committed to technology and that technology leadership and support have been transferred to the District offices. The team reviewed evidence that demonstrates that some training is occurring and plans are in place for computer support, although not all needs are met. Both communication and integrated planning that includes identifying the needs of all personnel including classified staff is lacking.

As verified through interviews and meeting minutes, YCCD and Yuba College are working through the DC3 committee and the Yuba College Council to review staffing and develop a clear delineation of responsibilities to serve as the planning agenda for clarifying college and district roles. Team #2 of the DC3 will lead in creating recommendations for communication systems and collaborative technologies. Yuba College has created the Comprehensive Planning Agenda #5: technology for essential elements to be included in the planning agenda for technology service, access, and training for Yuba College employees. (III.C.1.a)

The team toured the technology facilities and concludes that Yuba College takes pride in their infrastructure and has adequate facilities which have climate control, redundant power supplies, tape and offsite storage, and backup systems. (III.C. 1.a)

Technology training is available. However, due to budget cuts, trainings are restricted due to limited funding, staffing, and class offerings. Some training was offered through the Distributed Education and Media Services department for Blackboard and more general technology training (portal, phone system, Colleague/Datatel, etc.). However,

offerings are poorly communicated and inconsistent with the demand for training workshops, leading to low attendance when such training exercises are held. The college planning agenda admits there is a need to improve the technology training for all employees. The DC3 committee and the IT department are planning to survey and prioritize a list of training needs for Yuba College employees. (III.C.1.b)

The team reviewed evidence and interviewed faculty, classified staff, and appropriate administrators and determined that training is provided through the Flex program, the District IT department, and individuals. The training for faculty was well developed but still may not meet their ongoing need. Based on interviews, more frequent training on identified needs for all employees, including classified staff, is indicated. Processes for identification of technology needs for all employees should be strengthened.

The YCCD technology planning structure is comprised of district-wide plans, the YCCD District Technology Committee, and district-wide design standards. Technology plans are defined with the YCCD Information Technology and Telecommunication Master Plan. The Technology Master Plan highlights projects and commitments for technology upgrades and enhancements. Under the ongoing projects section of the master plan, bullet points describe the PC replacement for faculty. The Self Evaluation Report presents concerns that the YCCD plans are developed in isolation leading to perceived confusion and a lack of communication with college-level personnel. Planning recommendations include the need for non-Measure J budgeting, staffing, training issues, and the need for a yearly survey on services, support, and needs. The Comprehensive Planning Agenda #5: Technology presented a strategy on how YCCD and Yuba College will address these issues. (III.C.1.c) The team identified a need for Yuba College to organize its own voice with prioritized identified needs based on planning models that incorporate campus involvement and dissemination of information.

The visiting team reviewed the YCCD Technology and Telecommunication Master Plan 2009 – 2012 (updated August 2010) that outlined accomplishments, plans, and ongoing projects demonstrating YCCD and Yuba College's commitment to technology. However, the self evaluation descriptive summary, self-evaluation, and planning agenda portions of Standard III.C emphasized the need to improve communication, training, and planning in all areas information technology. (III.C.1.d, III.C.2)

Plans are in place through the District Technology Committee and the new DC3, Team 2, is addressing technology needs. The self evaluation reports that the technology plans are not integrated into institutional planning. The team found that there are plans in place for computer replacement that are not well communicated and dependent on available funding. A communication gap is noted between the District Technology Committee and the College. With the creation of a District with two colleges and several sites, the local processes at Yuba College have been moved to the district level leaving the college to

feel unrecognized having lost ownership of the committee. A local technology committee with strong communication to the district committee will provide Yuba College with a voice and a pathway to address their technological needs. (III.C.2)

All aspects of the Comprehensive Planning Agenda #5: Technology, service, access and training for YC employees should be implemented. Essential elements that were identified include:

- Ensure appropriate training for faculty and staff – develop a plan for communication related to changes in technology
- Develop a place for College – level technology leadership – define district role in technology/IT department – clarity of College-level roles for IT and DE
- Create purchasing review and standards, replacement schedule for all employees and computer labs
- Create expectations and rules for the use of technology (role of portal, email, website)
- Develop a plan for technology integration into daily operations: technology trainer, instructional technology specialist, Division/Department representation in technology decisions
- Include other technology aspects outside of instruction
- College input to District as to the level of technology necessary to support teaching
- Appropriate staffing levels to support technology
- Develop College wide availability for students to access to laboratories and technology

Conclusions

The college does not meet fully meet this Standard as it does not provide necessary training in technology that is needed/required to college personnel. Further, technology planning is not integrated with institutional planning; as such the institution has not systematically assessed the effective use of technology resources.

The college partially meets the Standard.

Recommendation

College Recommendation 11

As recommended in the 2005 evaluation report and to meet the Standard, the team recommends the College ensure local processes for evaluation, dialogue, and planning of technology needs be designed, developed, and implemented that interact with integrated planning at both the College and District level for resource allocation and professional development. (III.C.1, III.C.2, III.A.5.a-b and Recommendation 15 of the 2005 Report)

Standard III.D. – Fiscal Resources

General Observations

A review of board polices, administrative procedures, and the resource allocation model describe the principles of budget development that have been used in the past. Current budget practices consist of the YCCD determining the total computable revenue (state, property tax, and local funds) and allocating a portion of these funds to Yuba College and a portion to Woodland Community College. A review of the audited financial statements demonstrates that YCCD has adequate levels of financial resources to support student learning programs and services at current levels. They are managing the CA budget shortfalls over the past few years and a review of the current budget presents budget scenario's based on the likelihood of Proposition 30 passing (Fall 2012) and also anticipating additional shortfalls in future years while monitoring the impact on student services. (III.D.1)

Multiple times in the self-evaluation planning agenda sections, Yuba College states that while there are processes and procedures in place to ensure a systematic planning process, there is a common sentiment that the process stops with the submission of program reviews and it is not fully incorporated into the budget process. Interviews with employees (e.g. academic senate, faculty) confirmed that program review is not fully integrated in the planning process. They did confirm that program review is used to identify resource needs and determine funding levels in staffing. The change in the budget process over the past few years has caused frustration, mistrust, and a lack of transparency. Yuba College and YCCD need to agree on a working budget development process. (III.D.1.a, III.D.1.b)

Yuba College's planning process is now coordinated through the District Consultation and Communication Council (DC3) and has charged three teams with: 1) planning and resource allocation process, 2) collaborative capacity and systems, and 3) communication strategies. DC3 members include the Chancellor, Academic Senate Representative, College Academic Administrator, Vice Chancellor, Researcher, and Classified user of program planning/resource allocation system. (III.D.1.d. III.D.4)

In addition to the program review process, the college spent a significant amount of time evaluating the needs of the campus and created a maintenance project schedule that was used to help pass the Measure J bond. This planning process included an independent assessment by outside consultants and a review of all projects yielded a priority list. The institution has complied with Proposition 39 requirements and created a bond oversight committee with information provided on their website. In 2005, the YCCD also developed a long range Educational Master Plan and Facilities Master plan and major maintenance projects in the Measure J bond. A review of the annual Measure J Bond financial statement with independent audit report and the annual Proposition 39 and Measure J Bond Performance Audit shows that funds are being accounted for in a timely and accurate manner. (III.D.1.a, III.D.1.c, III.D.1.d, III.D.2.d, III.D.2.e, III.D.3.a, III.D.3.g)

The financial management system has appropriate control mechanisms and provides dependable and timely information as demonstrated by the unqualified opinions in their annual financial statements audits. Financial statements show appropriate allocation and expenditures to support institutional services and programs. Effective oversight of finances, including financial aid, externally funded programs, auxiliary organizations and other accounts are properly managed. The independent audit presents internal control weaknesses that are addressed and followed up by the Chief Business Officer, Chancellor and the Board as demonstrated by the auditor opinion matrix. Previous year's audit findings are addressed by YC and resolution is recorded in the current year's audit report. (III.D.2, III.D.2.a, III.D.2.b, III.D.3.f, III.D.3.h)

The college uses the Datatel's Colleague system and their website to disseminate financial information. A review of budget presentations on the College website and board minutes demonstrate that meetings are held throughout the year that includes budget updates. (III.D.2.c)

The foundation for Yuba College, a non-profit organization, undertakes fundraising efforts in order to provide financial support for various college-related programs, student scholarships, equipment and capital improvements, and faculty research and teaching activities. The foundation engages its own independent auditor for the preparation of annual financial statements. The visiting team reviewed the audited financial statements and the external audit reported presented an unqualified opinion. (III.D.2.d, III.D.3.b)

The team's review of the budget, fund balance information, annual reports, independent audits, actuarial reports, and interviews with the Chief Business Officer and the Yuba College Fiscal Analyst confirm that Yuba College is fully aware of its future obligations and that there are adequate financial resources to support the college and student services at current levels. A review of Yuba College's restricted and unrestricted general fund balance shows they currently have sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability

and to meet the current portion of long term obligations (other post-employment benefits). Yuba College needs to continue to monitor long-term debt obligations and include them in their budgeting process and maintain adequate reserves. (III.D.1.c, III.D.2.c, III.D.3.b, III.D.3.c, III.D.3.d, III.D.3.e)

External auditors express an opinion on the financial statements, as well as supplementary information, internal controls, and compliance with federal and state requirements. The team reviewed the audited financial statements for the past three years and the audit reports reflect an unqualified opinion. Each year the school has had audit findings in financial statements, federal awards, and state awards. The audit team looks at internal control weakness, material weakness, and a significant deficiency identified was not considered to be a material weakness. Interviews with the Chancellor, Chief Business Officer, and review of Board minutes demonstrate that Yuba College has addressed, resolved, and are in progress of resolving these weaknesses and deficiencies. Audit findings relating to financial aid programs were reported to the U.S. Department of Education as required by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) (page 50 of annual audit). (III.D.2, III.D.2.a, III.D.2.b)

Conclusions

Institutional planning has been consolidated with the District Consultation and Communication Council (DC3) and has charged three teams with 1) planning and resource allocation processes, 2) collaborative capacity and systems, and 3) communication strategies to ensure use of the program review process as an integrated institutional effectiveness model and ensure that these results are fully utilized in both the both the planning agenda and budget preparation throughout the district. Yuba College and the district are currently struggling with the processes for communicating college need or incorporating college planning into district plans and budgetary models.

The college partially meets this Standard.

Recommendation

College Recommendation 5

To meet the standard, the team recommends that the college implement, evaluate and broadly communicate an integrated planning model that strengthens the linkages among program review, planning and resource allocation processes, and clearly delineates college and district responsibilities, with institutional stakeholders made more aware of the criteria for prioritization and the procedures employed. (I.A.4, I.B.2-7, III.A.6, III.B.2b, III.C.2, III.D.4, IV.A.1, ER 19)

STANDARD IV – LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

Standard IV. A. –Decision Making Role

General Observations

Since the last comprehensive visit, the district transitioned from a single to a multi-college institution. Through this process, the college selected a president as the former district chief executive officer moved from superintendent/president to district chancellor. The college defined and strengthened its commitment to participatory governance by writing its own *Yuba College Council Handbook*, which includes the charters and constituency participants for each governance committee. However, once the handbook was created, it was not substantively revised and evaluated. During the 2010-2011 academic year the district adopted its own handbook; the *Planning and Shared Decision Making Process Handbook*. The current governing board acts as a whole in setting policy for the district and supports the chancellor and the college presidents in their specific areas of responsibility and authority.

Despite these outward signs of commitment to participation and shared decision-making, there are a number of areas that lack clear delineation of duties between the college and district services. In order to meet the standards required of a multi-college district, the college should work with the district to complete a clear and effective process for delineation of authority and responsibility. (IV.A)

Findings and Evidence

Each constituency group is represented by an appropriately defined and recognized organization. Ongoing opportunities for participation in institution-wide planning and improvements are available through the Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Model, which was adopted by the Board of Trustees in 2006. This five-component effectiveness model includes program review for academic and student services programs and administrative services unit reviews. Committee charters and constituency representatives are defined in the *Yuba College Council Handbook*, which was introduced in 2007-2008. The committee membership is reviewed and revised, if necessary, annually. While all of the structures are in place to ensure constituent participation in college governance, it was reported during the visit that the practice fell short of the published structure. With the recent changes in college leadership, there is a renewed enthusiasm and hope that

meaningful constituency participation in governance will again begin to flourish at the college. (IV.A.1)

In 2002-2003, the district formalized shared decision-making through a participatory process. These efforts resulted in Board Policy 2510 (BP 2510), Participation in Local Decision-Making Model, which was adopted in 2004 and revised in 2010. The policy defines the role of the faculty through the Academic Senate, affirming that the district relies primarily on the Academic Senate in curriculum, degree and certificate requirements, and grading policies. Participation in governance by administrators, staff members, and students is also defined in BP 2510. The policy affirms that these groups shall have an opportunity to participate in the formation and development of policies and procedures that have a significant impact on each respective group. In addition to BP 2510, the role of students in policy development and decision-making is reflected in Board Policy 2015 (BP 2015), which defines the role of two student trustees, one from Yuba College and one from Woodland Community College. This policy was adopted in 2004, and it was last revised on June 13, 2012. Both board policies have corresponding administrative procedures (AP) that detail the operational aspects of the policies. AP 2015 was adopted in 2004 and last revised on June 13, 2012; AP 2510 was adopted in 2004 and last revised in 2009. (IV.A.2.a)

Board Policies (BP) 2510, 2015, 4020, and 4021 reflect the Board's commitment to collegial consultation. The college commitment to governance is reflected in the Yuba College Council 2011-2012 Purpose Statement. This document defines the purpose of the council, its guidelines, parameters and resources, meeting schedule, specific membership, responsibilities for communicating the work of the group, and to whom council recommendations are forwarded. The College Council, which is co-chaired by the vice president of Academic and Student Services and the Academic Senate president, was originally designed to function as an advisory body to the college president. This committee has representation from faculty, staff, students, and administration.

The Clear Lake Campus has a similarly configured representative council that is co-chaired by the campus' executive dean. College faculty and staff report that over the last three years, the Yuba College Council largely functioned as the president's and vice president's information dissemination group for decisions that were made for the college at the district level rather than a vibrant and engaged recommending body. Typically, council agendas were created in the president's office and distributed on the day of the meeting rather than in advance. At the start of the fall 2012 semester, the council has undertaken a review of the statement of purpose included in the 2011-2012 *Yuba College Council Handbook*. As part of their repurposing of the council, they developed a "you minus one" consensus model for voting. Council members explain that the goal of this consensus building model is to avoid having recommendations forwarded to the president that do not have substantial buy-in from all of the major constituencies. This desire to

develop broad consensus is not intended to allow any two council members to have a pocket veto. The model includes the possibility of sending recommendations forward with majority and minority opinions. (IV.A.3)

Board Policy 3200, adopted in 2004, details the formal relationship between the district's Board and the Accrediting Commission. This policy was most recently reviewed and revised in 2010. The 2008 midterm report and a 2009 follow-up report were submitted in a timely manner as required. The Accrediting Commission granted the district multi-college status in 2008 when it awarded initial accreditation to Woodland Community College as a separate institution from Yuba College. In addition, Yuba College submitted and received approval to grant degrees in its Distributive Education Program in 2008. In addition to the Accrediting Commission, the college complies with and participates in other external evaluations, including the Board of Registered Nursing (BRN); American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) for their Veterinary Technology Program; the National Accrediting Commission of Cosmetology Arts & Sciences (NACCAS), which granted initial accreditation for three years in 2011; the Board of Vocational Nursing and Psychiatric Technicians for the Psychiatric Technology program; and, the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology. (IV.A.4)

In 2007-2008, the college created the *Yuba College Council Handbook*. The self-evaluation states that the handbook is updated annually; however, committee and council minutes do not support that assertion. While a 2011-2012 version of the *Yuba College Council Handbook* was created, it appears that the only updated information in the document was the committee membership. Beginning in fall 2012, there is evidence that the college has initiated a process to review the role of decision-making processes at Yuba College. It was reported that the Curriculum Committee has reviewed and substantially revised the committee purpose statement included in the handbook. While it is admirable that the college constituencies have begun to revitalize their participatory governance processes and procedures, Recommendation 4 from the 2005 evaluation report required the college "to develop and implement an evaluation cycle for all of its plans, committees, project teams, and shared decision-making processes and use the results of these evaluations to improve these groups and processes." The college did not fully resolve this recommendation. (IV.A.5).

Yuba Community College District (YCCD) has a responsible and independently elected seven-member board representing seven districts. Their elections are staggered with either three seats or four seats being open for election in the fall of even years. The Board is commended for switching, in 2012, to trustee election by area to better comply with state and federal law as reflected in Board Policy 2010. Board Policy 2015 establishes the process for student trustee elections. The Board establishes policies and assures the quality, integrity and effectiveness of the student learning programs. Board duties and responsibilities are codified in Board Policy 2200 however, after interviews with board

members, the Board is encouraged to assert its written authority in providing vision and policy direction for the district .(IV.B.1,IV.B.1.a; IV.B.1.f)

Board Policies 2200 and 2015 ensure that the governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement that: represent the public interest; provide vision and policy direction for the district; establish policies that define the institutional mission and set prudent, ethical, and legal standards for college operation; delegate power and authority to the chancellor to effectively lead the district; assure fiscal health and stability; and, monitor institutional performance and educational quality. (IV.B.1.b; IV.B.1.c). The bylaws and board policies are readily available on the district website. The governing board upholds and evaluates these policies as evidenced by adoption dates on each of the posted policies. (IV.B.1.d; IV.B.1.e)

Board Policy 2740 clarifies board education. The board demonstrates continuous self-improvement. In July 2012, the Board adopted their *Self-Assessment Objectives* that included creating a program for board development and new member orientation. The chancellor has written a detailed new member orientation to be implemented in 2013 that is intended to replace previous new trustee orientations that, according to interviews, consisted of attending California League of Community Colleges' Trustee conferences. The self-evaluation indicated that in fall 2010, three new trustees received a variety of information about the District and trustee responsibilities following their election to the governing board. While the Board of Trustees meets the Standard regarding new trustee orientation, because this new process has recently (within a week of the accreditation visit) been written by the chancellor and not yet fully vetted by the Board, it should be reviewed, implemented and evaluated by the Board. (IV. B.1.f)

Board Policy 2745 defines the governing board's self-evaluation process. In 2012, YCCD's Board of Trustees completed a robust self-evaluation of 54 questions. Results of this evaluation indicate a strong board performance of 90%, favorable Board/CEO relations of 94 %, and individual board member effectiveness at 64%. A follow-up *Self-Assessment Objectives* outlines areas for continuous improvement of the board. (IV.B.1.g)

Board Policy 2715 describes YCCD's Board of Trustees code of ethics and includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code. The College meets the Standard. (IV.B.1.h) Board Policy 2710 forbids conflicts of interest for board members. (IV.B.1.h) As evidenced in minutes of board meetings and the self-evaluation, the governing board receives information regarding accreditation from multiple sources including board updates, rough draft editions, and the Yuba College newsletter *FOCUS*. (IV.B.1.i)

Through Board Policies 2430, 2431, 2432, 2435, 2436, the board established clear lines of evaluating and delegating authority to the chancellor. The Board Policy for selection of the chancellor is a brief two sentences statement which states: "In the case of a Chancellor vacancy, the Board shall establish a search process to fill the vacancy. The process shall be fair and open and comply with relevant regulations." In 2011, the chancellor selection process was initially challenged by the Yuba College Academic Senate because the written policy does not require constituency participation. In multiple interviews, it was affirmed that the chancellor selection process in 2011 involved district-wide input from constituent groups, some sources voiced concern that the previous chancellor may have influenced the process. To ensure improvement in the chancellor selection process, the board is encouraged to strengthen the written language of their board policy to guarantee input from constituent groups in order to align with Board Policy 2510 and to develop a process for evaluating the chancellor selection process. (IV.B.1.j)

Yuba College has 17-18 academic and support services administrative positions defined. Due to the recent departures of the college president and vice president of Academic and Student Services, and the affirmative decision to leave three deans positions unfilled, six of these positions are currently vacant. The district completed a ten-year analysis of management positions covering the academic years from 2000-2001 through 2009-2010. While the overall number of administrators grew during this period from a total of 41 to 46.63 administrative positions, the growth was largely covered through restricted funds. During this same period, the total number of administrators supported by the general fund went from 38 in 2001 to 37 in 2010. The self evaluation acknowledges the impact that the recent difficult fiscal years have had on the college, which includes the decision not to replace three deans/administrators who retired.

Administrators are evaluated annually solely by their immediate supervisor. In order to improve performance, written policies and procedures should be developed to ensure that the various constituency groups have an appropriate opportunity to provide input into the evaluations of administrators at all levels of the college and the district. If the board and/or the chancellor decide to implement revised performance evaluation procedures, an appropriate assessment of the process should be undertaken to ensure its effectiveness.

Board Policy 7110 defines the delegated authority to the chancellor. According to the position announcement for the Yuba College president in 2009, the president of the college reports directly to the chancellor, and has the powers and the duties delegated to the position by the chancellor and the Board of Trustees. According to the self-evaluation, the former college president delegated authority to administrators and others consistent with their job responsibilities. An example of this delegation of authority is the Yuba College Directors and Deans (D&D) group. (IV.B.2.a)

Through its application of the district-wide Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Model, particularly program review, the college president guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment. Academic, and student and administrative services program reviews, are conducted every four years for each unit. In non-program review years, units complete an annual plan. These processes facilitate the development of department goals and priorities. The main components of academic program review are curriculum, staffing, equipment, and facilities. In 2009, standard data sets were provided for each department. Improvement in the data was provided in 2010 to include more demographical data. In 2011, the process was enhanced by combining the formats for comprehensive program review and annual planning, creating a common handbook to cover the three institutional program review processes, and by placing the materials into a TracDat common database.

Although the college has not integrated planning with resource allocation, there are a few examples of an integrated process in some key areas. According to the self-evaluation, requests for new or replacement faculty must be documented either in the comprehensive program review or annual update. Request for Perkins Funding must demonstrate a need for the resources through program review. In order to fully meet the Standard, the college should complete the process of fully integrating planning and resource requests. (IV.B.2.b)

The president assures the implementation of Yuba Community College District Board Policies (BP) and Administrative Procedures (AP) as well as statutes and other regulations, including those policies and procedures directly related to general education statutes, record retention and destruction, equal employment opportunity, and program discontinuance. (IV.B.2.c)

The president is responsible for controlling college expenditures from the budget allocated to it by the district. Administrative Procedure (AP) 6305 requires that the district maintain a fund balance of 6% of prior year expenditures. In addition, AP 6305 encourages 2% be budgeted annually for campus enhancements. The Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 actual ending balance was $9.7 million on a total unrestricted general fund budget of $44.9 million. The fund balance represented 21.7% of the total unrestricted general fund. The actual budget for FY 2012 had a fund balance of $6.1 million representing 13.2% of the district's annual unrestricted general fund budget. The adopted budget for FY 2013 projects a $4.8% fund balance on an unrestricted general fund of $44.5 million representing a 10.9% fund balance. Despite the recent difficult fiscal years, the district has managed its cash flow and reserves well maintaining an annual fund balance in excess of the 6% required by AP 6305. Although the ending balances have been steadily decreasing as a percentage of the overall unrestricted general fund, the fund balance continues to be projected above the AP 6305 goal. While the college meets the Standard, it was reported during the visit that the former college president largely implemented a

top-down budget that was allocated to the college by the district. Faculty and staff did not perceive the president to be a strong advocate for the needs of Yuba College. As the district and the colleges move forward, they need to clarify and strengthen the role of the college president in his or her ability to meaningfully link planning with the college's resources. (IV.B.2.d)

The former president, who accepted a position in another state beginning in fall 2012, was engaged in several local community organizations including: The Yuba City Economic Development Commission and the Board of Directors of the Yuba-Sutter Chamber of Commerce. In addition, she met with both local and countywide superintendents of surrounding school districts. At the college, the former president used the College Council, the college portal and website; a monthly newsletter, *Focus*; and all college emails to communicate with faculty, staff, and students. Additionally, she was a regular attendee of Yuba College Council and the Clear Lake Campus Site Council. The current president has served in an interim position since August 2012. He has not been in the office long enough to have developed a network of college-wide and broader community communication. The college has demonstrated its appreciation of the interim college president's involvement in community activities and participation in college committees and activities. (IV.B.2.e)

While Yuba College has transitioned from being a one college to a two college district since 2008, much work remains in delineating functional responsibilities, allocating resources and integrating planning between the college and the district. The recently strengthened District Communication and Consultation Council (DC3) provides a conduit for discussion and input between the district and college. Overwhelmingly, the college community has placed great faith in the new chancellor and the interim president and vice president. Continued work needs to be done to establish sufficient resources for Yuba College so that it will be able to adequately support effective operations especially as it relates to staffing levels in library and counseling, and to support increased technology training. The district needs to establish a resource allocation process that effectively distributes all resources between the district and the colleges. (IV.B.3 a; IV.B.3.b; IV.B.3.c)

The chancellor has a vision for ensuring that that president of Yuba College assumes full responsibility and authority for the operation of the college. At the time of the visit, the interim college president had been in the position for less than three months, and he was still transitioning into his new role at the college. Prior to accepting this new leadership position, the interim president served as the Dean of Physical Education and the Athletic Director at Yuba College. (IV.B.3.e)

The district acts as a liaison between the Board of Trustees and the colleges as diagramed in the Annual Planning Cycle and governing board minutes. BP 2510 recognizes the

YCCD's Board of Trustees ultimate authority in decision making and its commitment to participation in the decision making process. (IV.B.3.f)

Yuba College has attempted to clarify roles between the college and the district; however, various plans have been created, and then replaced with new plans and processes without a full cycle of implementation or evaluation. According to the self-evaluation, DC3 created a goal to "improve current procedures to create an integrated, participatory and evidenced-based district wide decision process" (p. 317). During the visit, the team was provided with a new draft of the Governing Board, Mission – Vision – Value – Strategic Goals model dated October 19, 2012. While the college and district should be applauded for recognizing the need to establish better planning, the current plans appear to be in the awareness stage on the ACCJC evaluation rubric. Significant work remains for the college to fully comply with the Standard. Once a process is fully implemented that delineates operational responsibilities and functions of the district from those of the college, the process needs to be evaluated for its effectiveness. (IV.B.3.a; IV.B.3.g)

Conclusions

There are Board Policies and Administrative Procedures in place to address the structures of collegial consultation and participatory governance; however, evidence supporting the practical application of these policies and procedures is weak. While there was evidence at the time of the visit that the college is reviewing and updating the collegial governance processes outlined in the *Yuba College Council Handbook*, these processes should have been evaluated and improved for effectiveness on a sustainable and continuous basis.

In addition to the issues related to collegial consultation, there is significant concern about the college being a separate and distinct entity from the district. In order to meet the Standards, the college should assume and define its role and develop an independent voice in advocating for its priorities within the district wide structure and operations.

The college does not meet the Standard.

Recommendations

District Recommendation 3

To meet the Standard, the teams recommend that the district provide the following:

- delineation of its functional responsibilities;

- determination of whether current functions provided by the district office should be centralized or decentralized to better serve the needs of the students; and
- clarification of the district level process for decision making and the role of the district in college planning and decision making.

The district should clearly identify district committees, perform a regular review of their work, conduct review of the overall effectiveness of district services to the colleges and widely disseminate the results of those reviews. (IV.B.3, I. A.4; I.B.1, III.B; IV.A)

College Recommendation 4

As cited in the 2005 evaluation report and to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the college develop and fully implement a systematic evaluation cycle for its institutional effectiveness, decision-making, and governance processes in order to assess their efficacy, including:
- Planning
- Program review
- Student learning outcomes
- Committees (practice, procedures and decision-making)

Results of these analyses and findings should be broadly communicated across the college and used as a basis for improvement. (I.B.6, I.B.7, IV.A.3, IV.A.5, ER 10, ER 19, Recommendations 2 and 3 from the 2005 Report)

College Recommendation 5

To meet the standard, the team recommends that the college implement, evaluate and broadly communicate an integrated planning model that strengthens the linkages among program review, planning and resource allocation processes, and clearly delineates college and district responsibilities, with institutional stakeholders made more aware of the criteria for prioritization and the procedures employed. (I.A.4, I.B.2-7, III.A.6, III.B.2b, III.C.2, III.D.4, IV.A.1, ER 19)

ADDENDUM

Required Evidentiary Documents for Financial Review

Supplemental Guidelines for Standard III.D

1. **Has Yuba College (YC) received any qualified or adverse opinions in audit report in the last 3 years from district, state or federal program**s? No – last three years audited financial statements have unqualified opinion.

2. **Has YC implemented all audit recommendations?** Yes. The annual financial audit provides a schedule of findings in three sections, 1) internal control over financial reporting, 2) internal control over major programs (federal awards), and 3) internal control over state programs - reviewed explanatory matrix of auditor opinion and annual audits. YC has resolved previous audit findings or are making progress in resolving these issues.

   Have there been the same recommendations for more than one year? Yes. Cash handling and separation of duties was identified in finding 08-01, 09-01, and 10-01. This finding was not found in the 2011 audit. Other repeat findings were in fixed asset accounting (08-07 & 11-04) and issues with concurrent enrollments (10-05 & 11-09). Preliminary reports from the 2012 financial audit indicate that YC will receive another repeat finding in fixed asset accounting.

   What is the auditor's response to the management actions taken? Audit reports have an "actions taken" section in the summary schedule for prior audit findings. When the deficiency is corrected, the audit reports "fully implemented". A review of the audited financial statements shows that YC and YCCD address all audit findings. An interview with the Chief Business Officer (CBO) confirmed that Yuba Community College District (YCCD) has established an audit committee that reports updates and actions taken to the board.

3. **What is YC's unrestricted fund balance and reserves and how has it changed over the last three years?** The unrestricted fund balance for 2011 was $9.8 million (21.9%), 2010 - $4.5 million (10.3%), and 2009 - $2.5 million (5.2%). Interviews with the CBO and review of the budget confirmed that the unrestricted fund balance for 2012 was $7.4 million (16.3%) and the anticipated fund balance for 2013 is $5.7 million (12.4%).

4. **Has the State Chancellors Office had to intervene regarding fiscal stability or compliance?** No

5. **Does YC have long term debt financing?** As of 6/30/11, the long term debt financing was general obligations bonds ($92M) and qualified energy conversation bonds ($21M)[1]

6. **Does YC have an obligation for post-retirement health benefits (OPEB), compensated absences, and other employee related obligations?** Yes

   If yes, has it done the actuarial study and identified the liability? Yes, YC had an actuarial study completed by Total Compensation Systems on November 3, 2011. The 2011 audited financial statements present a $3M noncurrent liability for Other Postretirement Benefits.[2]

   Is there a plan for funding it? The 2011 annual audits states, "GASB has issued Statement No. 45 which requires governmental agencies, including community colleges, to recognize other postemployment benefits (OPEB). The District implemented GASB Statement No. 45 to accrue the OPEB liability beginning in 2008-09. The District has accrued a liability of $3.46 million since 2008-09. An actuarial student completed on October 21, 2009, stated the District's unfunded retiree health benefits liability at $34.72 million. The District's annual contribution (ARC) is $2.75 million. The District is currently paying the pay-as-you-go portion, which was $1.87 million. As of June 30, 2011, the District set aside $2.52 million in the Retiree Health Benefit Fund to meet this obligation."[3] This was verified through an interview with the CBO. The November 3, 2011 actuarial report estimates the actuarial accrued liability to be $39.43 million. The CBO stated that YCCD is working on plan on how YCCD will continue to meet this future obligation.

7. **Does YC have limits on accrual of unused vacation time? Compensatory time? Is YC enforcing its policy on limits?** Yes. All employees have limits which are in the Management handbook and collective bargaining agreements. A review of accrual documents show that limits are being enforced by Human Resources.

8. **Is YC self-insured for health benefits, workers compensation, and unemployment?** No. The District participates in joint ventures under joint powers agreements with the following joint powers authorities: Schools Excess Liability Fund, Tri-County Schools Insurance Group, Northern California Community Colleges Self insurance Authority, California Asset Management Program, and Community College League of California.

   How are the reserves level set? N/A

---

[1] Note 7, 2011 audited financial statements
[2] Page 17, 2011 audited financial statements
[3] Page 8, 2001 audited financial statements.

9. **Does YC have obligations for future total compensation expenditures driven by collective bargaining agreements or other agreements (corporate buy outs, management/employee agreements, etc?)** Yes - based on the required salary increases in collective bargaining agreements and the summary schedule is updated by the CBO.

   If so, what are they?

   - CSEA – California School Employee Association (contract 7/1/11 – 6/30/14) - 80% of state funded community college COLA containing in the adopted state budget.

   - ESA – Educational Supervisors Association (7/1/11 – 6/30/14) – salary based on range and steps

   - YC-AFT – American Federation of Teachers (7/1/11 – 6/30/14) – salary schedule will be adjusted by the state provided COLA less the salary-driven mandated benefits of 8.175%

   - YCCD-POA – Police Officers Association (7/1/09 – 6/30/12).[4]

   - YCFA – Faculty Association (7/1/10 – 6/30/13) - 80% of state funded community college COLA containing in the adopted state budget.

   Of what significance are they? All are limited by step and column pay increases and/or by COLA

   What is the plan for funding these future obligations? Part of general obligation expenditures

10. **Does YC and the foundation have an agreement/contract on the role of the foundation?** Yes, the MOU between YC Foundation and the YCCD was reviewed. The foundation functions include fundraising, receiving gifts, bequests and donations for the benefit and advancement of YC, funding scholarships for current, prospective and transferring students at YC and providing alumni activities and public relations programs.[5]

    Does it require that the foundation have an independent audit? Yes.

11. **Does the college or district have a prop 39 bond fund?** Yes, YCCD passed Measure J in 2006. YCCD has a Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee and has annual Financial Statement audits by an outside accounting firm as well as annual performance audits by the same outside firm.

---

[4] As of the time of the team visit this contract was still being negotiated
[5] Section 1.3 of YCCD Foundation Memo of Understanding, 1/23/2008

12. **Does the college have policies and procedures regarding purchasing? Are they being followed?** Yes, Purchasing Handbook (dated May 2012) and Board Policies BP6100 – delegation of authority, BP6150 – designation of authorized signatures, BP6330 – purchasing, and BP6340 – Bids and contracts. They also have Administrative Procedures AP6150 – designation of authorized signatures, AP6330 – purchasing, AP6340 – bids and contracts, and AP6390 – procurement cards. Purchasing procedures were reviewed and validated through interviews during team visit.

13. **Will additional buildings be opened in the next 2-3 years?** Yes. The Sutter County Campus was opened in fall 2012.

    Is there a plan to fund staff, utilities and operating expenses associated with additional facilities coming on-line within the next 2-3 years? The current plan is to use unrestricted funds from operations as well as unrestricted fund reserves. Additional state funding will be requested once the Sutter County Campus reaches the target of 1000 FTES.

14. **Is there evidence that planning integrates fiscal and other resources?** As documented in the self-study, Yuba College has been having difficulties in this area. The new Chancellor is working with YCCD staff and YC staff to develop strategic plans utilizing information from program review. Currently, the budget process is based on a revenue allocation approach. Total computable revenue is calculated by YCCD and 78% of this amount was used for the YC budget. YC college council and YCCD executive team prioritized spending.