

Follow-Up Visit Report

Yuba College
2088 North Beale Road,
Marysville, CA 95901

This Report represents the findings of the External Evaluation Team that visited
Yuba College on November 6, 2014

Submitted to:
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Submitted by:

Sheri Sterner	Administrative Director, Institutional Effectiveness	Orange Coast College
<i>Name of Team Chair</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Institution</i>

Dr. Norma Ambriz-Galaviz	President	Merritt College
<i>Name of Team Member</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Institution</i>

Dr. Linda Chaparro	Psychology Faculty	Oxnard College
<i>Name of Team Member</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Institution</i>

Follow-Up Visit Report

DATE: November 25, 2014

TO: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

FROM: Sheri Sterner, Team Chair

SUBJECT: Report of Follow-Up Visit Team to Yuba College, November 6, 2014

Introduction:

An External Evaluation team visit was conducted to Yuba College in November 2014. At its meeting of January 8-10, 2014, the Commission acted to require Yuba College to submit a Follow-Up Report followed by a visit. The visiting team, Ms. Sheri Sterner, Dr. Norma Ambriz-Galaviz and Dr. Linda Chaparro, conducted the site visit to Yuba College on November 6, 2014. The purpose of the team visit was to verify that the Follow-Up Report prepared by the College was accurate through examination of evidence, to determine if sustained, continuous, and positive improvements had been made at the institution, and that the institution has addressed the recommendations made by the External Evaluation Team, resolved the deficiencies noted in those recommendations, and meets the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards and Commission policies.

In general, the team found that the College had prepared well for the visit by arranging for meetings with the individuals and groups agreed upon earlier with the Team Chair and by assembling appropriate documents in the meeting room used by the team. Over the course of the day, the team met with the President of the College, the Accreditation Liaison Officer, the Academic Senate President, and over 30 members of the management, faculty and staff. The team's impression of the college is that significant progress has been made over the past year in not only developing and implementing processes and procedures to address deficiencies, but also in a college climate change embracing continuous improvement and improved college - district relations.

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)

College Recommendation 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. I.B, II.A.I.c, II.A.2.a-b, II.A.2e, II.B.2, II.B.3-4, II.C.2, II.C.2.i, ER 10, Recommendations 2 and 3 from the 2005 Report)

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 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)

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 in to planning, resource allocation and decision making. (II.A, II.B, ER 10)

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)

College Responses to the 2012 External Evaluation Team Recommendation

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)

Findings and Evidence:

In order to meet this standard, Yuba College was asked to establish college wide goals. The college charged their College Council with the task of drafting college goals derived from the college's mission. The goals were formally adopted on March 15, 2013. These goals are widely published on campus documents including their updated *Educational Master Plan, 2013-2019*, College's website - Office of the President, *College Catalog, 2014-15* and on the various committee templates.

The college created a committee specifically to monitor and assist in the development of measurable objectives and alignment to college mission for each committee and/or council. This committee is referred to as College Effectiveness and Accreditation Committee (CEAC). This committee is also charged with administering the continuous quality improvement of the college through its integrated planning model. The evidence documented their extensive work from March 4, 2013 to the present. The higher level of accountability is displayed in their program review documents that reference the department and/or program objectives and are linked to college's goals.

The evaluation of objectives and goals are accounted through the submission of committee self-assessment reports as well as the program review and update documents. The CEAC compiles all the committee objective reports and self-assessment reports and provides a summary of short/long term goals and their status toward completion. Additionally, the CEAC produces annual comprehensive report for the academic year and includes an evaluation and recommendations for improvement.

Yuba College is utilizing its college goals for planning as evidenced in their recent update to the Educational Master plan. The program review pilot template was first utilized on September 2013, and clearly outlines the question on how Department/Program goals align with Yuba College goals. Each year, Yuba's College Council derives from the objectives a summarized collection of department/program objectives with college goals and estimated cost or action required. The Yuba College Annual Action Plan is incorporated into the District Annual Action Plan (DAAP). The leadership of the Faculty and Classified are representatives to the District and serve as a sub-team of the District Consultation and Coordination Council (DC3). This allows for greater explanation of prioritization to the College Planning and Budget committee and the District (DC3) work group.

During the site visit, various committee representatives acknowledged the shift of practice at the college and district toward participatory governance. Committee members have gained a greater sense of ownership and valuable involvement with increased communication. During the site visit, the team noted the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the college's Institutional Effectiveness Model. The report and various submitted documents are accessible and published on the college's website to promote increased communication within and outside the college community.

Conclusion:

Yuba College has developed college goals that are integrated into the college's naturally planning processes. The college has gained an appreciation to goal-setting and evaluation of its application to the college's operations and planning. The various work groups are engaged and are assessing their newly identified procedures for efficacy of the Institutional Effectiveness model. This will require continuous evaluation of their evidence based decision-making for student success, which is currently built into their model. The college has resolved this recommendation and meets the standards.

College Recommendation 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. I.B, II.A.I.c, II.A.2.a-b, II.A.2e, II.B.2, II.B.3-4, II.C.2, II.C.2.i, ER 10, Recommendations 2 and 3 from the 2005 Report)

Findings and Evidence:

During the follow-up visit in 2013, the college was in the process of implementing its revised program review process. The process, under the aegis of the Curriculum Committee, was further strengthened by the hiring of an interim Dean to enhance the disaggregation and The college is in process of hiring a research position to replace an earlier vacated position which the college states will support the sustainability of data and its analysis for program review.

The result was enhanced program review data in a more suitable format which also incorporated the results from SLO assessment. Data included required elements, including performance outcomes and disaggregated data by race/ethnicity, age and gender for programs and across the college. Programs receive support, including from management and the Program Review Committee for their analysis.

During the site visit, various college members indicated it was a challenging effort and learning opportunity for the campus. During the past year, there were numerous issues and obstacles encountered. These challenges included the following: a major learning curve across the campus due to the new process; initial problems with data collection; the program review database (TracDat) did not conform to the new program requirements; and the need for training in the analysis of the enhanced program review data. Although these issues initially stalled the process, the college was able to organize, evaluate and regroup to move the processes forward. For example, they learned to streamline their program review processes by scheduling a biennial program review with updates instead of an annual comprehensive program review.

In addition to program review, all instructional programs also participate in district initiated process, the District Program and Service Vitality review (PSV), which began in 2013-14. This process allows programs to reflect on their programs, including program completion and productivity. In 2013-14, the college elected to run this process parallel with program review. For the upcoming year, to avoid redundancy with program review, there are ongoing discussions to streamline and avoid any overlap between the two processes.

The results of program review are included in the annual Institution Effectiveness Report to ensure all members of the campus are aware of the results. Program review processes are evaluated through multiple means. The Program Review Task Force (a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee) is responsible for a campus-wide user survey. Furthermore, this group was charged with evaluating the quality of completed Program Reviews and providing feedback. The College Effectiveness and Accreditation Committee (CEAC) also conducted an "after action report" to evaluate the process. All evaluative information was reviewed by the task force, who also reviews the content and format of the process. From the evaluations in the past year, the main issue was with the programming of the TracDat system as well as the availability of data and data analysis support for staff and faculty. The issue with the programming of the Tracdat system is being addressed this year through cooperative efforts between Yuba College and Woodland Community College administration and the college's newly formed Program Review Taskforce. The issue with the availability of data and data analysis support is being addressed this year by assigned duties to an interim academic dean and by a posted position of research analyst, who will assume those duties upon hire later this academic year.

Conclusion:

Yuba College has completed a full cycle of its revised program review process with enhanced program review data. The college has also evaluated this process through multiple measures and is in a continuous process of implementation and evaluation. Over the past year, the college has tackled a number of issues and developed solutions for the sustainability of the process. Ongoing issues appear to be with technical issues with TracDat and access to and analysis of data, which the college intends to transition from an interim dean to a newly hired research position for long-term sustainability. The team encourages the college to continue its evaluation efforts on the impact of the process on not only those who participate in the process, but all that it affects. The college has resolved this recommendation and meets the standards.

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)

Findings and Evidence:

Over the past year, Yuba College's systematic evaluation cycle for institutional effectiveness, as described in *A Guide to Integrated Planning and Institutional Effectiveness at Yuba College*, has completed its first year and is in process of its second year. Yuba College continues to use the institutional effectiveness "toolbox" which allows the college to measure

the efficacy of these processes. Since the follow-up team's visit in 2013, the tools that continued to be used for evaluation are the shared governance survey, Yuba College Committee/Project Team Objectives Report (COR) and Committee Self-Assessment (CSAR) reports. After action reports occur as needed when issues arise within processes by committees. These tools provide information related to the planning process, program review, and committees.

Two evaluation tools that were added in the last year include the broadly disseminated program review and student learning outcomes survey. These surveys provided an external feedback to the effectiveness of the processes. The college provided evidence that they surveys were conducted, discussed and relevant changes were made. As the college has matured its processes, it has added other tools to evaluate its processes and ensure quality. One example is the newly developed rubric for evaluating completed program reviews. The college continues to include its assessment results to the campus community through inclusion in the *Yuba College Institutional Effectiveness report*.

Another enhancement to the college's process evaluations is for the Technology planning process. The newly added process entails synthesizing feedback from program review about the quality of technology services at the college. The result is feedback to the Technology Committee on how the average employee is experiencing technology services. The result is the development of strategies in consultation with the Professional Development Committee. The college has resolved this recommendation and meets the standards.

Conclusion:

Yuba College has developed a suite of evaluation tools that solicit both internal and external feedback for the college's institutional effectiveness processes. The inclusion of the program review and student learning outcomes surveys provide invaluable external feedback to the processes. The college has deliberately thought out and developed evaluation tools that fit within their college and committee culture. The team encourages the college to continue to refine its evaluation tools as their processes mature to further integrate the external perspective to evaluate the impact of each process. The college has resolved this recommendation and meets the standards.

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 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)

Findings and Evidence:

During the follow up team visit in 2013, the college was in its first year of its integrated planning model. Since that time, the college has completed the year and evaluated the process. The college continues to make refinements to their integrated planning process and is currently in their second year. Over the past year the college has used a variety of evaluation data to mature their processes. After the follow-up team visited in 2013, a District Program and Service Vitality review (PSV) was implemented. The college continued its

established processes and implemented the process parallel. The PSV process includes clear criteria for the prioritization of resources by program. The prioritization and data supporting it are given to both the College Planning and Budget Committee and District DC3 PSV work group. This information is further integrated into the college's Annual Action Plan and directly influences resource allocation at the college and district level. The Annual Operational Planning and Budget cycle clearly shows where prioritization occurs and how it flows through the college and district processes.

In 2014, the college conducted a process evaluation on the PSV, program review and planning processes to understand the redundancies and process considerations. As a result, the college's College Effectiveness and Accreditation Committee (CEAC) committee made recommendations to the College Council to revise the program review process and the integration points between the PSV, program review and action plans (college planning). Representatives of resource committees felt that the college's processes are working and the refinements made for 2014-15 (including the alignment of the PSV process) supported their work. There are clear linkages from program review to annual action plans, its integration with district plans and either college or district funding. The college's Committee/Project Team Objectives Report (COR) and Committee Self-Assessment (CSAR) evaluation processes allow the college (via CEAC) to evaluate its annual and cumulative progress towards the college goals. Planning models and evaluation results are published annually in the *Yuba College Institutional Effectiveness report*.

The college also conducted a survey, the Budget and Allocation survey, to evaluate the effectiveness of resource allocation. This survey has been completed and its results are in the process of being evaluated by the CEAC committee. In an effort to clarify its planning and resource allocation processes, the Annual Operational Planning and Budget cycle was developed and widely discussed with stakeholders in fall 2014. The college's Annual Operational Planning and Budget cycle clearly delineates between the college and district planning processes as well as showing the integration point between the two. Interviews during the site visit with college and district employees showed that the cycle is well understood by all stakeholders.

Conclusion:

Yuba College has established and implemented an integrated planning process. In its second year, the college has already evaluated the first year and made refinements to the process. The college's evaluation processes were developed as part of naturally occurring processes and appear to be part of the process rather than an external part of the process. The college is committed to its published processes. Interviews during the site team visit indicated various stakeholders are knowledgeable and comfortable with the processes. The implementation of the district's PSV process was viewed as a complement to the college's process and did not detract the college from completing its integrated planning for the year. After the process was complete, the college set about evaluating both processes, in conjunction with the district, to streamline for redundancies. The team encourages the college to continue maturing and refining its integrated planning processes through the use of internal and external evaluation. The college has resolved this recommendation and meets the standards.

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 in to planning, resource allocation and decision making. (II.A, II.B, ER 10)

Findings and Evidence:

Since the follow-up visit in 2013, the Yuba College has continued their progress on Student Learning Outcomes (SLO). During this period, there has been remarkable progress toward completing assessment, refining the processes and developing an infrastructure to support ongoing activities. To institutionalize the college's work, a dedicated Dean has been assigned to assure SLO compliance: directing, collecting, presenting and administering a database to collect SLO information (TracDat). Further, the college is in process of hiring a research position to replace an earlier vacated position which the college states will further facilitate and support the sustainability of their processes.

As of the team visit, all courses, programs, student services, certificates and degree programs and administrative units have developed SLO's and have assessed them. There is now a proliferation of data which has been made available due to the Dean who is responsible for SLO's. The Dean, in conjunction with the YCC SLO Committee, has engaged in proactive activity to monitor the completion and quality of SLO assessment. For example, the committee has provided training. It has also worked with administrative units to develop a cycle of Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUO). For sustainability, the committee has developed an assessment and annual evaluation plan for the SLO Process. It has also been discussing a proposed ISLO rotation and developed an implementation schedule.

To evaluate the process, the committee has engaged in a dual pronged effort. Added to the above mentioned annual evaluation plan, the committee conducted a broadly disseminated 2013-2014 SLO Survey. To disseminate the survey, the committee enlisted the help of the Academic Senate, College Council, College Effectiveness and Accreditation Committee. The results were published in the annual *Yuba College Institutional Effectiveness Report*.

The campus also has included SLO results into planning, resource allocation and decision making. The SLO Coordinator is included in the College Effectiveness and Accreditation Committee to include SLO's in Institutional Planning and College Effectiveness. In addition, SLO's have been incorporated into the Integrated Planning Model Timeline and Narrative of 2012-13 Academic year.

Conclusion:

The college has done significant work on defining and assessing student learning outcomes in all courses and programs across the campus. In addition to an intense focus on completing their first cycle of assessment, the college has built sustainable processes that include a linkage to decision making and continued evaluation as well as an infrastructure to support ongoing assessment. The college has resolved this recommendation and meets the standards.

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)

Findings and Evidence:

Yuba College has made significant strides to address this recommendation within past two years. The initial Evaluation Team from October 2012, cited Yuba College for their lack of providing a comprehensive staff development plan inclusive of all college contingencies. Since the Commission's February 2013 letter, the College has created and implemented a comprehensive and coordinated professional development plan for all employees. This was evident with the creation of the College Staff Development Committee (SDC) which includes representative from faculty, classified and administration. By April 2013, the committee had adopted their purpose, goals, and schedule. The first year consisted of identifying "Best Practices" for professional development by visiting other community colleges, collaborating with District IT, securing the needed resources, identifying short and long-term objectives, planning for the College's convocation professional development activities. This also included the creation of both a needs assessment and evaluation instrument(s) for professional development activities.

Based on the feedback obtained from college personnel regarding their interest for professional development, SDC has made Technology an integral part of training activities. Additionally, SDC is working closely with representatives from IT to ensure access and increase frequency of training opportunities. The committee recognized integrated planning with the college resource allocation and district services therefore SDC members serve on designated committees; Flex & Basic Skills, and Technology. Members of the SDC expressed their positive insights to the development process of designing a plan which includes all the segments of the college as well as assessing the effectiveness of their plan. The committee consolidates feedback from electronic surveys as means of reducing the manual processes. The committee has been designated 10 hours per week of clerical support to maintain travel request and reconciles budget expenses.

The college's comprehensive staff development plan was fully realized this academic year of 2014 - 2015. The college is in the process of hiring a research analyst that will complement the current contribution made from an instructional dean who provides the committee with the needed data for their planning. During the follow-up visit, SDC was finalizing their workshops for spring convocation of January, 2015. Additional evidence was provided during the visit, which demonstrated SDC integrated assessment tools for the workshops and professional activities within their comprehensive plan.

Conclusion:

The members of the Staff Development Committee demonstrate total ownership for professional development for the college. The benefits gained with the creation of inclusive professional development offerings increased their appreciation among colleagues and their contributions to the college and student success. As the college's comprehensive plan expands, additional support staff and/or funding will also need to increase. The college has resolved this recommendation and meets the standards.

District Recommendation #1 (Strategic Planning)

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)

- 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.

Findings and Evidence:

Preceded by local planning and prioritization at the college and district offices as well as the identification of strategic initiatives, emerging trends, and other external factors, the Yuba Community College District initiated its annual Integrated Planning and Evaluation Cycle for 2013-14.

In fall 2013, the colleges and district services updated their respective Educational Master Plans. Academic Program Reviews, Student Services Reviews (SSR), and Administrative Services Reviews (ASR) as well as Student Learning Outcome (SLO), and Administrative Unit Outcome (AUO) assessments were submitted in October 2013. Reviews included requests for curriculum development, staffing, technology, equipment, and facilities. Teams at all sites were charged with Program Review validation and prioritization of requests. This was followed by budget and administrative review and further prioritization at the local level. Taken together, these processes resulted in Annual Action Plan Objectives for each site along with prioritized lists of requests reflective of Program and Services Vitality criteria (PSV). The Annual Action Plans from the three entities were compiled into the District Annual Action Plan.

District planning began in the spring of 2014. The District Consultation and Coordination Council charged three standing committees (District Annual Action Plan Team, Budget Advisory Team and the Institutional Effectiveness Review Team) and two work groups (Program and Service Vitality Prioritization workgroups) with oversight of the four components of the annual planning process. All committees and workgroups were inclusive and representative of the different constituent groups as well as colleges, district services, and centers. The PSV workgroups and the Chancellor's Executive Team prepared a master list of ranked resource requests that eventually drove budget development and allocation of one-time augmentation funding. The tentative budget was presented to the Board of Trustees in June for adoption.

The Institutional Effectiveness Review (IER) team designed the Board of Trustees IER Report, which included: 2013-14 goal achievement outcomes; SLO and Program Review themes; key performance indicator results; participatory decision-making assessments; and results of planning and budget process evaluations. Evaluations of the process used data from a survey administered to all District employees in fall 2014. In addition, committee feedback on the process was solicited. Among others, recommendations implemented for 2015-16 planning included: the addition of differing budget scenarios (e.g., budget reduction or stability as

opposed to augmentation funding); modification of the Program and Service Vitality Prioritization process in order to demarcate it from site-specific decision-making processes; additional training on the District integrated annual planning, budget and evaluation cycle; and changes in communication to ensure broad dissemination and knowledge of the process.

After reviewing the Colleges' Educational Master Plans, the District Services Master Plan, the Facilities Master Plan, the Human Resources Master Plan draft, and the District Technology Plan, long-range district goals were created and distributed for dialogue and feedback. Each of the goals included measurable objectives and strategies. These strategic goals were approved by the Board of Trustees in November 2014.

Lastly, the YCCD developed several diagrams to illustrate the Annual Integrated Planning, Budget and Evaluation Cycle timeline and strategic planning protocol. These charts were distributed widely throughout the district. Indeed, communication about the strategic planning process utilized several different venues and modalities (e.g., open-forums; convocations; monthly newsletters and emails; strategic planning websites).

Conclusion:

YCCD has a well-defined ongoing process for integrated planning that is inclusive, transparent, and broadly communicated across the district. The process integrates all components of planning at the colleges and district services. The process allows planning to drive resource allocations, based on collaborative prioritization and well-defined roles, responsibilities, and timelines. Long-term district-wide goals with measurable objectives have been established and will inform the 2014-15 planning cycle. A complete cycle of the integrated planning model has been fully implemented, assessed, and modified with robust dialogue in accordance to the principles of sustainable continuous quality improvement. The district and the colleges have developed recurring cycles with annual timelines that align across sites. The college has documented progress toward achieving its educational goals over time (using longitudinal data and analyses) and has communicated matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies. The college has resolved this recommendation and meets the standards.

District Recommendation #2 (Resource Allocation)

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, III.D.1.b, III.D.1.C, III.D.1.d, III.D.2.b, III.D.3, IV.B

Findings and Evidence:

After the District Consultation and Coordination Council (DC3) adopted the strategic planning protocol and program services vitality criteria (PSV) these were utilized in the 2013-14 planning cycle. Local planning at each college included information from program reviews, analyses of student learning outcomes, and college prioritization of resource requests fed into the district planning process. In February of 2014, the DC3 charged three standing committees and two work groups with oversight of the annual planning process. These groups were the District Annual Action Plan Team (DAAPT), Program and Service Vitality work groups, Budget

Advisory Team (BAT) and the Institutional Effectiveness Review Team (IERT). The District's Annual Action Plan Team made resource allocation recommendations and the BAT allocated resources to the highest priorities. The IERT designed and administered a survey instrument sent to all district employees to evaluate the effectiveness of the integrated planning process. Following analysis of the survey results, there were several modifications made to the planning and resource allocation process. These modifications centered around the need for additional training about the process, broader communication and clarification of the interface between college and district planning steps, and simplification of the process. In addition, modifications will be made to the evaluation instrument.

The district has charged BAT and IERT to move toward a longer-term planning and budgeting cycle that will enable a more stable and predictable environment for the colleges to identify strategic areas of need and to plan funding to meet those needs.

Conclusion:

The colleges and district have now completed a cycle of inclusive planning, budget development and resource allocation. The resource allocation model has been evaluated with input from all constituents groups across the district and results of this evaluation have been used for sustainable continuous quality improvement. The college has resolved this recommendation and meets the standards.

District Recommendation #3 (Delineation of Functional Responsibilities)

To meet the Standards, the teams recommend that the District provide the following:

- Delineation of its functional responsibilities;
- Determination of whether current functions provided by the District offices 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)

Findings and Evidence:

Representatives of Woodland College, Yuba College and the District have continued to work through the delineation of functional responsibilities. District services implemented an annual evaluation schedule to assess the level to which centralized services in the district are meeting the goals of providing effective and efficient support to the colleges. The College Leadership in Academic and Student Services (CLASS) established college expectations of district provided services through a series of meetings in spring 2013.

An annual evaluation of district functions was developed by CLASS based upon the college expectations for services and implemented in October 2013. The results were posted and modifications were made (based upon the assessment) to business services technology, the implementation of an open access technology training site, new employee orientation, and access to documentation and training materials from human resources.

On July 23, 2014, a gathering of district representatives met to review the newly created functional map in response to the evaluations of district services and college expectations for services about which functions should be centralized or decentralized. As a result of this retreat, seven specific responsibility matrices were developed to communicate the current state of roles and responsibilities. The DE responsibility matrix developed by Distance Education Committee, which had reduced some of the concern at Woodland College related to DE responsibilities, served as a model for identifying additional functions with shared roles and responsibilities. For example, a separate responsibility matrix was also created for information technology and media services. Additional work on the delineation of technology responsibilities for Yuba Community College District was addressed collaboratively by the District Technology Committee and the colleges.

Conclusion:

Over this past year, the district has worked to communicate broadly college and district functions, assess the effectiveness of centralized functions and make modifications as needed based upon assessment results. There appears to be an infrastructure and process in place for evaluating and improving district provided services in support of the colleges. The college has resolved this recommendation and meets the standards.

District Recommendation #4 (Human Resources Planning)

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)

Findings and Evidence:

Working with the colleges, the district has integrated human resource planning into both college and district-wide planning. Program reviews conducted at each site (both colleges and district services) yield information that is used for prioritization at each site of human resource (and other) needs. Site prioritization remains intact as the broader district-wide prioritization of needs is considered. The Human Resources Master Plan, inclusively developed in 2013-14, comprehensively addresses all of the human resources services and functions, including the staffing planning, performance management (evaluation), and professional development needs of the college and district. As part of this plan, there is a series of metrics displaying current levels of faculty, classified staff and administrators at each of the colleges and centers for the baseline year 2013-14 and projections for the 2014-15 year. This plan was developed to provide predictability and direction to appropriate staffing levels, greater accountability between sites, efficiency in human resource planning and greater communication and collaboration across the sites regarding human resource planning.

Conclusion:

As a result of the work done over the past two years, the college and the district have implemented timely and consistent evaluation processes and a systematic approach to human resource planning that is integrated into the overall college and district planning processes. There is also evidence of ongoing assessments of human resources planning and processes that is used for sustainable continuous quality improvement. The college has resolved this recommendation and meets the standards.