

Follow-Up Report

*Submitted to the Accrediting Commission
For Community and Junior Colleges,
Western Association of Schools &
Colleges on October 15, 2009*

College of the Redwoods

7351 Tompkins Hill Road
Eureka, CA 95501-9300



Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Statement on Response Preparation	ii.
Abstract	iii.
<u>Section I: Introduction and Overview</u>	1
<u>Section II: Response to Recommendation 1 (2008)</u>	2
Section II.A Determine a Template for Student Achievement Data	2
Section II.B Use Data Analyses to Guide College Discussions about Student Success	5
Section II.C Student Success Analyses Becoming Part of the Culture and Practice of the Institution	7
<u>Section III: Response to Recommendation 1 (2009)</u>	8
Section III.A Background	8
Section III.B Undergo a Review of Roles and Responsibilities of Each Constituent Group	11
Section III.C Develop a Means by which Trust Can Be Enhanced and Respect Increased	12
<u>Section IV: Conclusion</u>	13
<u>Appendix</u>	14

Statement on Response Preparation

College of the Redwoods is pleased to submit this Follow-Up Response of progress in addressing the deficiencies noted in the June 30, 2009 notification letter from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. This report was prepared by a four-member team consisting of Dr. Marjorie Carson, Accreditation Liaison Officer/ Vice-President of Instruction (ALO/VPI); Dr. Justine Shaw, Anthropology Professor; Dr. Michael Dennis, Economics/ Business Assistant Professor; and Roxanne Metz, Assistant to the President. The Academic Senate critiqued various editions of the draft. Accreditation-related documents were distributed via e-mail to staff and faculty, through the CR webpage, and at various public meetings in August, September, and the first week of October. As work in addressing the recommendations progressed, drafts were circulated to College faculty, students, staff, and CR Board of Trustees for feedback. Membership lists of the governing groups listed in this statement are provided in the index of this report.

Abstract:

Recommendation 1 (2008): College of the Redwoods is conducting program review for the third year, and the program review process is accepted as a part of the culture and practice of the institution. The program review process has been refined each year to improve the ability of program reviews to capture student achievement data, incorporate assessment of student learning, and better link program review data to institutional planning.

All 2009-2010 program reviews now include a template for reporting the results of assessment based on the Nichols and Cabrillo College models. Although most but not every course or section is being assessed, those that are not yet being assessed now have bench-marked student learning outcomes upon which assessment will be conducted in 2010-2011.

Program learning outcomes (PLOs) have been developed for programs, including General Education PLOs for all AA degrees, distinct PLOs for the 7 different areas of emphasis within the Liberal Arts AA degree, and PLOs for various Student Services.

IR now populates all 2009-2010 program review forms with data on “pass rates” down to the course level, including cross-tabulations of how pass rates vary by basic skills level. The College is providing further professional development in authentic assessment for faculty and staff. The College has also committed resources to support faculty in providing professional development assistance in authentic assessment for their faculty colleagues.

In the College’s newly revised and IR data populated 2009-2010 program review template, faculty are prompted to use the results of their assessment to plan both improvements to their assessment methods and substantive improvements to their programs. Student Services has used its assessment results to build a 2009-2012 enrollment management plan.

As the College “closes the loop” between program review, integrated planning, and the actual decisions the College makes, gains in creating an evidence-based culture of assessment will be established.

Recommendation 1 (2009): While the district’s cultural history has been a significant barrier to resolving issues and developing effective planning, the College recognizes this recommendation as an institutional wake-up call. Following the 2009 April recommendation the organization has committed to realigning itself for the future. This is evidenced by:

- Direct acknowledgement of the leadership and governance issues facing the College by the President of CR’s Board of Trustees, George Truett, during his 2009 Convocation Welcome and Dr. Jeff Marsee’s Convocation Address;
- Full implementation of a refined administrative structure, combined with extensive orientation and professional development activities to ensure a knowledgeable, cohesive senior leadership team;
- Hosting of a joint visit on September 28th and 29th by Dr. Jane Patton, President of the Statewide Academic Senate, and Scott Lay, J.D., CEO of the Community College League

to provide advisory assistance to the College regarding leadership and governance issues; improved lines of communication including the invitation extended by the Academic Senate to the President and Vice President for Instruction to the Senate Retreat on August 22, regular meetings between the Vice President for Instruction and the Academic Senate co-presidents, a regular open-door “President’s Hour,” monthly newsletters sent to the College and community, and “Dear Colleague” e-mails sent to faculty and staff regarding important issues; and

- A forum in College Council with a constituency membership across the College district in which issues of district-wide importance are discussed and deliberated.

The district continues to struggle with issues related to operational decision-making versus policy development and implementation, evidenced by concerns raised regarding the development of new instructional sites, adoption of new learning management systems, and course scheduling. However, with a strong and committed Board of Trustees, an experienced and well-trained administrative team, and talented, professional faculty and staff dedicated to serving students, efforts to develop and improve collaborative working relationships are becoming successful. Real progress will be further demonstrated as the College implements its new planning model, using information from program reviews as the foundation of its integrated planning.

Follow-Up Report

College of the Redwoods

Section I: Introduction and Overview

At its meeting on June 9-11, 2009, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, reviewed the spring 2009 Follow-Up Report submitted by the College of the Redwoods and the report of the evaluation team which visited Friday, April 17, 2009. The Commission took action to accept the report, issued a warning and directed College of the Redwoods to correct the deficiencies noted. This warning was based on the Commission finding that the College had pursued a course of action that deviated from the Commission's eligibility criteria, standards of accreditation, or policies to an extent that raised a concern regarding the ability of the institution to meet accreditation standards. The College recognizes that this response will be followed by a visit of Commission representatives to validate and evaluate its contents.

The College was directed to demonstrate resolution of two recommendations. The 2008 recommendation related to demonstrating the systematic collection, analyses, and use of student achievement data as a regular part of CR's culture and practice. The 2009 recommendation involved improving communication and the roles of constituent groups in the operations of the College ([Evidence 1](#)).

Section II: Response to Recommendation 1 (2008)

Recommendation 1 (2008) stated “The College should determine a template for student achievement data and related analyses that is to be included in all program reviews, and should use the institutional research staff and others knowledgeable about data analyses to guide the faculty and ultimately the college in discussions of what these data show about student success; these discussions should become part of the culture and practice of the institution. (Standards II.A.1.a and c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.e)”

Section II.A Determine a Template for Student Achievement Data

During the fall of 2007, College of the Redwoods faculty began a massive effort to thoroughly revise out-of-date curriculum, including creating student learning outcomes (SLOs) for each course. This process has continued through the present, with only one active course outline document out of 770 not containing CLOs/SLOs ([Evidence 2](#)). However, there are still at least 32 course outlines written in the 1980s whose CLOs/ SLOs are still in need of revision, as they would be difficult to directly assess. Also in the fall of 2007, the Curriculum Committee established a procedure and calendar whereby all course outlines are being updated on a five-year cycle so that any SLOs being assessed remain current and relevant to the discipline ([Evidence 3](#)).

In 2007-2008, annual and comprehensive program reviews were also revived for the first time since the 1997-1998 academic year. This stands in contrast to the 1998-2007 period when some programs were not reviewed at all and others examined through a variety of formal and informal mechanisms, including national and regional program accreditation processes. Without established Institutional Research (IR) and program review procedures, there were no assessment mechanisms and subsequently little data to inform the College’s decisions.

In January of 2008, an Assessment Team was formed; it included Faculty, Student Services staff, and IR staff from the College of the Redwoods district. Throughout the spring, Team members met regularly to determine assessment priorities and review assessment models used by a variety of community colleges. Initially lacking training, the Team experienced a slow start as it sought to clarify its charge and identify appropriate action and an associated timeline. During the summer of 2008, lead members of the Team attended the International Assessment and Retention Conference, co-sponsored by NASPA (Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education) and ICSSIA (International Center for Student Success and Institutional Accountability), in Phoenix, Arizona. Immediately prior to the start of the fall 2008 semester, Dr. Fred Trapp provided professional development for faculty and staff in the assessment of class sections, degrees, and programs. Dr. Trapp’s presentation included a variety of models for the Team to consider ([Evidence 4](#)). Information from the workshop remains available through the College’s internal website <http://inside.redwoods.edu/Assessment/trapp.asp>.

In January 2009 the Assessment Team became a faculty committee focused upon a more detailed review of assessment models and templates. The Team also invited Dr. Trapp for another day-long workshop in March; all faculty were invited to attend, and the Team made a concerted effort to include representatives of disciplines not yet familiar with the assessment process. Team members also attended the League for Innovation Conference in March 2009 that included an extended workshop on the Johnson County Community College General Education assessment model. Throughout the spring of 2009, CR faculty attended a flex workshop and other meetings; these resulted in the development of AA Liberal Arts Degree and General Education Learning Outcomes ([Evidence 5](#)).

After reviewing various assessment models, including those developed by Cabrillo College; Johnson County Community College; Kern District, Bakersfield College; and Long Beach Community College, the Assessment Team created templates based upon both the Nichols and Cabrillo College models. The templates were designed for reporting the assessment of individual class sections and entire courses. The class section template was designed for internal use by departments, while the course assessment form was included in the redesigned program review forms being used in 2009-2010 ([Evidence 6](#)).

Although more assessment work remained to be done, during the spring of 2009, the Assessment Team's future was not clear. At that time, it was difficult to commit resources and organize support for the upcoming 2009-2010 academic year. Senior administrative personnel were in short supply, comprised of only the president and one vice-president responsible for the entire district, and a memorandum of understanding (MOU) for faculty division chairs and area coordinators was expiring. A new vice-president and new deans were still being hired in late spring and early summer, with their budget resources and responsibilities not yet fully allocated. Other new initiatives such as the Education Master Plan; Facilities Master Plan; Program Review; increasing enrollment; the piloting of a year-long schedule; and recruiting and hiring new faculty, counselors, and academic advisors dominated the time of available administrators.

Throughout the 2008-2009 academic year, the Assessment Team requested additional resources (in the form of support staff, funding, and increased faculty release time) to more broadly implement their efforts. Given changes described in the above paragraph and the fiscal realities of the upcoming 2009-2010 year, the funding necessary to meet these demands could not be realistically allocated in the spring of 2009. At the end of the 2008-2009 academic year the Assessment Team signaled that without the stated needs being met, it would disband. Thus the Assessment Team came to an end in May 2009 ([Evidence 7](#)).

In this 2009-2010 academic year, the College is demonstrating its continued and ongoing commitment to the assessment process by allocating stipends to the two faculty members directing this initial fall session and 4.5 TLUs of reassigned time for the assessment coordinator position starting in spring 2010. Those who attend the October 30th workshop on program assessment will then serve as trainers for other faculty as departments become more engaged in assessment activities. Even after area coordinators are fully trained, the College will continue

to provide resources to support the vital function of assessment; the resources necessary to support the assessment coordinator position, and the responsibilities of that position, will be re-evaluated after its first year.

In addition to the assessment done by faculty in 2008-2009, Student Services personnel continued to devote themselves to assessment. In the prior academic year, an in-house student survey was developed using Title III funding and an ongoing program of entering student surveys was initiated. Additionally, SLOs and PLOs were identified. The next academic year, 2008-2009, course assessments focused upon EOPS and DSPS (Evidence 8). In the fall of 2008 in an effort to inform the PLOs, Student Services underwent a 20-step self-test. The results were used to build a 2009-2012 enrollment management plan. Each Student Services area was able to incorporate their individual tactics and strategies from this plan to inform the annual planning updates (program reviews). Student Services will administer a new student satisfaction survey in November 2009 that will inform the 2009-2010 comprehensive review (Evidence 9).

Throughout 2008-2009 academic year, the Program Review Committee (PRC), composed of part-time and full-time faculty, staff, and administrators, met in a series of long sessions to completely revamp the program review forms to make them more user-friendly and better include a variety of datasets, including the products of assessment. At the close of the 2008-2009 academic year, based upon feedback from various constituent groups earlier in that academic year, as well as feedback from Dr. Trapp, the Program Review Committee (PRC) completed the work of designing new Program Review templates. In addition to the refined forms to report assessment outcomes, these forms now incorporate both program planning and resource allocation needs to enable them to serve as the centerpiece for institution-wide integrated planning (Evidence 10). SLOs and SLO assessment, and Program Learning Outcomes and Program Learning Assessment as well as Basic Skills Data were included in the newly revised and IR-populated program review templates. These program review templates, unanimously approved by the Academic Senate, were also more consistent with the District's planning documents since they were designed to serve as the centerpiece for integrated planning efforts (Evidences 11 and 12). Throughout the summer, additional work was done to further refine the forms in preparation for their use by Instruction in fall, 2009 (Evidence 16).

An August 2009 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the administration and College of the Redwoods Faculty Organization (CRFO) designated area coordinator duties and reassigned time and/ or stipends. In addition to their other duties, area coordinators were given the responsibility for “[c]oordinating the development and implementation of student learning outcomes and assessment at the course, discipline, and program levels” (Evidence 13). Area coordinators and other faculty interested in taking a leadership role in assessment are being supported in this responsibility through training by an expert provided by the State Academic Senate, Robert Pacheco, as well as a CR faculty assessment coordinator to start in the spring of 2010. The Academic Senate has identified two faculty who had served on the 2008-2009 Assessment Team to provide a question and answer session on assessment for area coordinators and other faculty on October 30, 2009, as part of the day devoted to Robert

Pacheco's workshop. Robert Pacheco's training will focus upon assessing program learning outcomes, while the faculty-led session will cover course-level assessments.

The 2009-2010 Curriculum Committee chair, ALO/VPI, and the Dean of Academic Affairs attended the State Academic Senate-sponsored conference on SLOs, assessment, and curriculum in July, 2009. The conference provided extensive training on how these concepts could best be included in program review ([Evidence 14](#)). Information from that training was incorporated in the August 15, 2009 pre-convocation Adjunct Faculty Training and New Faculty Orientation and was also added to Flex Training options college wide ([Evidence 15](#)).

Section II.B Use Data Analyses to Guide College Discussions about Student Success

In prior academic years, the authors of program review documents had been responsible for mining various internal and public sources for the data to populate their program review forms. This consumed a great deal of time and potentially introduced errors as individuals unfamiliar with such extensive datasets extracted, manipulated, and synthesized information to produce the tables needed to answer questions on the forms. Another challenge was that data from program reviews were not consistently used in College Integrated Planning. As a result, some authors became disenchanted and did not see the functional value of the program review process for their programs or the institution. There was also an inconsistency in the quality and, therefore, usefulness of these initial program reviews.

For the 2009-2010 program review cycle, IR has populated each document with program-specific data such as student enrollment by class start time; course success rates; course retention rates; course success by English and Math level; and faculty load distributions ([Evidence 11](#)). Each populated program review form was posted on the public IR website so that authors could readily access their own customized forms and community members could see the data that the College uses for planning. Additionally, other program review components were made easier to fill out and more representative of program needs. The fall 2009 convocation included a series of hour-long flex activity trainings on program review. These workshops were presented by faculty and administrators, including the Director of Institutional Research.

The PRC continues to address issues that arise, including the need for additional professional development, the creation of forms for specific components of the program review process, and continuing improvements to the forms to be incorporated in 2010-2011 ([Evidence 12](#)). The PRC meets on a weekly basis, with more frequent subcommittee meetings, in such areas as budget, assessment, technology, facilities, and trends to continue to evaluate and recommend edits for the forms and review completed program review documents. The PRC will direct sections of the completed program review documents to appropriate Integrated Planning committees to continue the review and evaluation processes October through April ([Evidence 17](#)). The Program Review Subcommittees were designed to include representatives of varied constituent groups ([Evidence 18](#)).

Completed program review forms are submitted to the PRC after they have been circulated to faculty and staff throughout the district for feedback. Area coordinators submit electronic versions of the document using the MyCR system. Following this, members of each subcommittee fill out an evaluation form in MyCR to indicate the degree to which each part of the form has been completed and provide comments to authors. Authors may then be asked to revise and resubmit portions of the form where the subcommittee feels more information is needed. The finalized program review form then returns to the entire PRC. Annual and comprehensive program reviews are sent to the Planning Support Team and individual “tear-out” pieces are sent to the appropriate integrated planning committee. Each integrated planning committee uses this information to recommend prioritizations for the following year. According to the Integrated Planning Flowchart, the PRC is charged with reviewing, validating, and commenting upon program reviews and working with the Coordinated Planning Council (CPC) to evaluate program review and planning processes ([Evidence 12](#)).

The Academic Senate is appointing faculty to planning committees, including faculty co-chairs in many cases. Each subcommittee faculty member reports back to the Academic Senate, which then provides one of the communication links back to the faculty as a whole. In addition, the Administrative chairs hold the responsibility for the official communication back from the committee to the Coordinated Planning Council and Program Review Committee. Numerous meetings involving members of various constituency groups continue to refine the integrated planning model.

CR is committed to the purpose of integrated planning based upon program review to continue to improve student success, starting with the assessment of student learning. The Biology program review provides a good example of how the program review process prompts authors to analyze student success data ([Evidence 19](#)). They have well designed assessments of course level SLOs that were fully reported on the program review form. The internal discussions within the Biology department, prompted by the new assessment forms and program review process, have resulted in modifications to teaching methodologies, as well as requests for resources and a greater emphasis on basic skills preparation. The information generated through this assessment has made it possible to move to a culture of data-informed decision making and planning.

Recognizing that sufficient access to education is a necessary part of student success, data are increasingly being used in designing the schedules for upcoming semesters. Institutional Research has made ever more fine-grained enrollment data (<http://www.redwoods.edu/district/ir/>) available that includes a variety of variables with information updated on a daily basis. Some of these data are also being used to evaluate the utility of the Accuplacer in placing students to maximize their success ([Evidence 20](#)). Faculty and student services staff are regularly contributing to annual and/ or comprehensive program reviews.

For years, faculty and staff have been anecdotally aware that the College was not adequately meeting the needs of underprepared students and students for whom English is not their first language. In 2003, and later in 2008-2009, data were gathered by the IR-supported Basic Skills Committee and an English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) study was conducted by consultants Dr. Dara Shaw and Dr. Helen Huntley (Evidences 21 and 22). The goal of the two studies was to more systemically investigate these students' needs and how they could be better served. Prompted by the Basic Skills study, for the first time, 2009-2010 program reviews also provide authors with data on student success relative to their Basic Skills (Evidence 11). This will permit programs to better identify prerequisites and recommended preparations, as well as to plan and implement new coursework and instructional modes when student needs are not being adequately served.

Section II.C Student Success Analyses Becoming Part of the Culture and Practice of the Institution

CR is very aware that enhancing student success requires a comprehensive enrollment management approach that emerges from the culture of the College and that enrollment management is far more than attracting students to the College; it is also about retaining and graduating those students. As a part of that comprehensive approach, President Marsee has instituted a series of collaborative meetings with K-12 superintendents throughout the CR District to further identify and improve articulation to meet the needs of underprepared students entering CR. While much more must be done to address this significant need, particularly the numbers of underprepared students in math and English, there is a coordinated effort by educational leaders from throughout the district to identify and implement quality improvements.

At CR, effective enrollment management is a shared responsibility for integrated institutional planning and the implementation of key performance indicators. As discussed earlier, this also includes ongoing assessment and subsequent changes to improve the program. Enrollment management is at the core of the College because it is about enhancing the quality of the education of students. Student Services completed a twenty step self diagnostic test of the College's enrollment management program. Student services completed the diagnostic on a 5 point scale (1 = not implemented; 2 = planning but not implemented; 3 = implemented but no results noted; 4 = positive results reflecting successful implementation; 5 = goals met or exceeded) and used the results of the self-test to build an enrollment management plan based on the self-test scale (Evidence 9).

Section III: Response to Recommendation 1 (2009)

Recommendation 1 (2009): In order to meet the Standard and improve both communication and operations of the college, the team recommends that the college undergo a review of roles and responsibilities of each constituent group. In so doing, the college should develop means by which trust can be enhanced and respect increased among the constituent groups to create an environment that supports empowerment, innovation and leads to institutional excellence. (Standard IV.A.1 2a, b, 3, 5)

Section III.A Background

In the past decade, College of the Redwoods has had a tremendous amount of administrative turnover; in the last four years alone, four presidents have headed the district. The administrative structure, from the number and titles of vice-presidents to the arrangement of divisions, shifted frequently. With administrators implementing different policies and practices, the line between administrative and faculty responsibilities became blurred, plans were made and then abandoned, and some systems devolved into work-arounds based upon individual personalities.

When President Jeff Marsee arrived in July 2008, only one of the four previous vice-presidential cabinet members remained at the College; Dr. Keith Snow-Flamer was serving as the Vice-President of both Student Services and Academic Affairs, also known as the Vice-President of Learning and Student Development. No administrators of any kind existed between faculty division chairs and Dr. Snow-Flamer, leaving him with 33 direct reports (Evidence 23). This extremely flat organization created an inevitable inability to respond to the daily demands of the College while also adequately addressing institutional planning needs and meeting accreditation standards. Faculty stepped into this administrative void to help maintain information flow, accomplish a massive amount of work, and keep the College operating.

Although the College had begun to grow in 2007-2008, a tremendous enrollment increase was needed in 2008-2009 to fully recover the state funding for its prior level of FTES. This deadline created a great sense of urgency. Combined with an economic downturn requiring expansion to increase access, many administrative decisions related to pursuing the five goals in the Strategic Plan were made rapidly and without the customary amount of consultation with all constituent groups. Reaching the required enrollment mark in 2008-2009 provided CR with \$2.5 million that it would have otherwise lost. In addition, the College was able to establish a base funding level 9% higher than the previous year. This funding enabled CR to serve the increased demand for education including the increased demand from both recently unemployed workers and students who could not access the UC and CSU systems under recent enrollment caps made necessary by state budget cuts.

Initiatives were undertaken to better serve a 10,000-square-mile district. These have included the development of a new site in McKinleyville, a relocation of the Arcata site, and a possible

new site in Garberville to improve student access. The number of sections at the Klamath-Trinity (Hoopa) site was substantially increased. Divisions were directed to increase their late afternoon, evening, and weekend offerings, and there was an increased emphasis on distance education for this same reason. Outreach activities, such as the Academy of the Redwoods, a Career and Technical Education Day, Bridgeway (foster care program), and CR-plus (seniors), were undertaken to encourage underrepresented groups to attend CR.

The administration is also actively involved in writing grants to fund additional initiatives, such as new programs of study that will provide better paying jobs for our students. For example, new fire technology and water technology programs are being planned. In addition, the district is seeking to enhance the productivity of the College district local workforce by developing a contract education program and other workforce development initiatives.

CR has sought to improve its performance on various metrics measured by the Accountability Report for Community Colleges (ARCC): student progress and achievement; students earning 30+ units; persistence, vocational course success; basic skills course success; basic skills improvement rates; and ESL improvement rate. Given that 80% of CR's incoming students place in basic skills in English or math, much of the focus thus far has been on the basic skills improvement rate ([Evidence 21](#)).

The institutional culture created by the years of instability soon came into conflict with a newly formed administration with numerous initiatives to better connect the College with the community. However, the rationale behind these changes was not always well understood throughout the institution and relations reached a nadir in the spring of 2009 ([Evidences 24 and 25](#)). The resultant discord was clearly reflected in the ACCJC's June 30, 2009 letter stating "[t]he Commission notes that while the College of the Redwoods had appeared to make substantial progress resolving its deficiencies in the fall semester, 2008, the College appears to have slowed or reversed its direction." With all parties recognizing that this situation was not in the best interest of the College, a number of steps are being taken to clarify administrative and faculty roles and develop means by which trust can be enhanced and respect increased among the constituent groups.

From mid-April through July 2009, several administrative positions were filled to ameliorate this situation. These positions included the Vice-President of Instruction, the Vice-President of Student Services, the Vice-President of Administrative Services, a Dean of Academic Affairs, a Dean of Distance Education, a Dean of Student Development, a Dean of Career and Technical Education, and a Director of Human Resources. The senior leadership team manages the College's operations and facilitates long-term strategic planning.

Even so, some points of friction have continued to emerge. One of those areas of controversy was the decision in the summer to adopt Sakai (MyCR) as a Learning Management System (LMS) replacing Blackboard, to be used by both distance education classes and the online portions of traditional classroom sections. During the 2008-2009 academic year, the Distance Education Work Group, composed of faculty, staff, and administrators from throughout the

district, created a plan to evaluate LMSs and test-pilot alternate course management software in the fall of 2009 (Evidence 26). The Administration initially endorsed this recommendation. However, during the summer, it was announced that CR's license to its established Blackboard LMS would expire before the end of the fall semester. The Cabinet made the decision to switch to Sakai (Evidence 26). The change to Sakai, known as MyCR at the College, was announced to faculty via a July 9 e-mail. When they learned of the change, many faculty expressed concern that they were not given adequate time or training to make the adjustment and that they were not consulted about something that would impact their pedagogical techniques. In response, more faculty training sessions were scheduled (Evidence 27).

Important lessons were learned about decision-making and building consensus; more planning time is required, greater inclusion of interested partners is critical, and there is an essential need for more effective faculty participation in decision-making throughout the full calendar year.

Another area of concern involved scheduling of courses and the development of new sites of instruction. To realign the course schedule to better meet the needs of the community, the schedule was expanded to increase evening and weekend sections and to begin to offer courses at new sites. These and other administrative directives were perceived by faculty to be problematic based upon their knowledge of institutional history and the needs of particular programs. Concerns included insufficient infrastructure to support offerings at innovative times and locations, as well as potential scheduling conflicts that could impede the ability of students to graduate in a timely manner. In spite of these reservations, faculty worked diligently to make the schedule changes and staff the newly scheduled course times.

While the processes and timing of these changes created stress within the organization, the goals were mutually achieved by the faculty and administration. In the course of working through these and other issues, there is evidence that the organization is maturing and developing an ability to embrace open, effective debate and a willingness of constituency compromise.

Further evidence of collaborative problem solving includes the revision of the faculty evaluation process to the satisfaction of the critical partners. Prior to fall 2007, there were no formal associate faculty evaluations. From 2007-2009, an intensive, multi-step process for evaluating all associate faculty was in place; while this had the benefit of providing guidance to faculty seeking to improve their teaching, it proved to be impractical. An MOU streamlining and clarifying the associate faculty evaluation process was approved for fall 2009 (Evidence 39). It maintains the same two-faculty evaluation committee process originally created in fall 2007 for new faculty and those who could benefit from continued mentoring. However, it streamlines the process for more experienced faculty. This new evaluation process provides for strong quality controls while still permitting area coordinators to fulfill their other duties.

All constituents agree that an adversarial culture is not in the best interest of the institution and the students and community that it serves. The commitment of faculty, staff, and

administrators to improving this culture is seen in the interest in, and attendance at, forums jointly provided by the State Academic Senate and the Community College League of California (see following section); this dedication is also seen in numerous frank and lengthy e-mail threads in which opinions are expressed and decisions are reconsidered. A wide variety of modes and venues are being used as faculty, staff, and administrators re-examine roles and processes.

Section III.B Undergo a Review of Roles and Responsibilities of Each Constituent Group

The College's new Cabinet which includes the President, Vice-President of Instruction, Vice-President of Student Services, Vice-President of Administrative Services, and the Director of Human Resources, has published an organizational chart reflecting the reporting and responsibility structure ([Evidence 28](#)). This chart provides a foundation for building a strong organization. A rigorous training schedule for administrators has helped to orient these individuals to the district's needs and opportunities ([Evidence 29](#)).

The Cabinet also initiated a draft of the current Integrated Planning Timeline, which was modified from the prior year's version to refine deadlines and clarify which entities are responsible for each step of planning processes. Additionally, an Integrated Planning Flow Chart has been created ([Evidence 12](#)). These new processes are currently being used. However, they will continue to be modified as drafts of the documents circulate through key groups such as the Program Review Committee, the Academic Senate, the Planning Support Team, the Integrated Planning Functional Committees, College Planning Council, the College Council, and the Cabinet as well as through meetings with direct reports at levels represented throughout the College organizational chart.

All annual and comprehensive program reviews contain sections that authors complete to address course and program assessment, technology needs, facilities needs, and budgetary requirements to maintain and/or improve the curricular integrity of each course and program offered at CR. These individual components of the Program Reviews are sent to the Integrated Planning functional committees, each of which addresses and recommends prioritization of college-wide needs in a particular functional area. As described earlier in this report, the communication loop is of critical importance college wide and is of particular concern to the college community.

Dr. Jane Patton, President of the Statewide Academic Senate, and Scott Lay, J.D., CEO of the Community College League assisted in clarifying the various roles, and also provided guidelines for how College roles can better complement each other to address issues. They agreed to come to CR on September 28 and 29, 2009 in the Forum Theater to provide a formal presentation of the purpose of their visit with a question and answer period ([Evidence 30](#)). Dr. Patton and Mr. Lay met with each constituency group, including administrators, staff, students, faculty, and Board members. Following individual group sessions, Dr. Patton and Mr. Lay provided summary closing comments in an open forum. Those not able to attend the open

forums in person are able to view the presentations at <http://www.redwoods.edu/Accreditation/governance.asp>. The College expects a written response including recommendations in mid-October and additional return visits by either or both facilitators.

To further clarify roles of each constituent group, existing Board Policies and Administrative Procedures related to decision making and responsibilities will be reviewed through an ad hoc committee on board-related policy (Evidence 31). At the August 4, 2009 regular meeting of the Board, the Board president created the ad hoc committee, which will engage all constituency groups as it proposes a process for reviewing and revising Board-related policies and administrative procedures in Chapter 1, "The District," and Chapter 2, "The Board of Trustees" (Evidence 32).

At the end of the spring 2009 semester, the MOU providing for faculty division chair positions expired. At the start of the fall 2009 semester, CRFO and the administration agreed on an MOU detailing expanded area coordinator responsibilities. With a new administrative structure, including deans instead of faculty division chairs, area coordinators were given more responsibility for coordinating a number of important processes including generating the initial class schedule proposals; recruiting and mentoring associate faculty; coordinating program review; resolving faculty/student issues; coordinating the production of division class schedules including room assignments; coordinating the development and implementation of student learning outcomes and assessment; evaluating associate faculty; and other area-related duties (Evidence 13).

Section III.C Develop a Means by which Trust Can Be Enhanced and Respect Increased

Board of Trustees President George Truett opened the fall 2009 convocation ceremony with a welcome address built upon the themes of friendship and understanding in CR's Book of the Year *Three Cups of Tea* by Greg Mortenson and David Oliver Relin (<http://www.redwoods.edu/events/book-year/>) (Evidence 33). The President's conversational convocation address continued in the same vein, honoring the hard work that faculty and staff had done during the past year and highlighting both the institution's accomplishments and its continuing challenges. President Marsee's speech was focused along three talking points (Evidence 34). Following President Marsee's address, four constituency groups (mid-level management and confidential employees; faculty; classified staff; and students) were invited to pose anonymous questions on cards. Leaders from each group selected key questions, which were then answered by a panel of the President and senior administrators. Those questions that could not be answered at the event were distributed to administrators for follow-up; all have been provided with written responses posted on the President's website (<http://www.redwoods.edu/district/president/>) and distributed to everyone with a CR e-mail (Evidence 35).

The September Academic Senate brief stated that removing the College from sanction “will require a meaningful, mutual effort from faculty and administrators that will both improve and sustain the institution for the long haul” (Evidence 36).

Dr. Marsee continues to be available to interested parties through regular open door President’s Hour (Evidence 37). Throughout 2008-2009 and now in 2009-2010, the President has been issuing monthly newsletters to inform the college and the community of events and activities that impact college programs. Also, the President sends out periodic “Dear Colleagues” messages about special issues. Last year, the President held faculty small group breakfasts weekly for the purpose of becoming acquainted with the faculty and listening to their ideas. Additionally, the President, the VPI/ALO, and the Academic Senate Co-Presidents have worked together to establish biweekly meetings. The President also chairs the bi-monthly College Council that is comprised of representatives of all district employee groups and students.

The CR Academic Senate has also made a concerted effort to help improve the culture of the institution, with a new level of commitment to working collaboratively with the administration (Evidence 36). The President and the VPI/ ALO were invited to speak at the Academic Senate retreat prior to the fall 2009 semester. The Academic Senate Co-Presidents visited individual administrators to establish good working relationships and rapport. Administrators and the Senate have worked together to appoint faculty to serve on committees and work on projects important to the institution, including the writing of this document and the upcoming self-study accreditation team (Evidence 38). The Academic Senate Co-Presidents have been meeting with the VPI/ ALO on a regular basis and the VPI, in turn, briefs the entire Academic Senate at its bi-monthly meetings.

Section IV: Conclusion

Individuals, constituency groups and the College as a whole are demonstrating their determination to acknowledge the College’s unmet needs and address them proactively and collaboratively. The College is engaging in a campus-wide dialogue so that all constituency groups can develop a shared understanding of new developments and best practices in higher education; particular areas of emphasis include accreditation, assessment, student achievement, the use of institutional research, program review, budgeting, integrated planning, and shared governance roles and responsibilities. Ideas about opportunities and concerns about issues are being exchanged in a climate of increased civility.

APPENDIX

College of the Redwoods Follow-Up Report Evidence

- Evidence No. 1** June 30, 2009 Letter from the ACCJC
- Evidence No. 2** Inventory of Active Course Outlines with Curriculum Committee Approval
- Evidence No. 3** Curriculum “stoplight” Database
- Evidence No. 4** Assessment Training Documents from Dr. Fred Trapp
- Evidence No. 5** AA Liberal Arts Degree Student Learning Outcomes; Academic Senate Documents Related to General Education Student Learning Outcomes
- Evidence No. 6** Assessment Templates for Course Sections and Departments; Directions for Assessment Forms; Sample Course Section and Department Forms
- Evidence No. 7** Spring 2009 Assessment Team Report
- Evidence No. 8** DSPS Summaries for Eureka and Mendocino Campuses
- Evidence No. 9** 20-point Self-Study Assessment of Enrollment Management; Enrollment Management Plan 2009-2012; Student Services 2009 Special Programs Annual Planning Update
- Evidence No. 10** April 2009 Program Review Workshop Minutes
- Evidence No. 11** Sample Populated 2009-2010 Program Review Forms (Annual, Comprehensive) for Academic Programs (Art, Early Childhood Education, Anthropology/ NAS/ Sociology) and Student Services
- Evidence No. 12** Integrated Planning Timeline; Integrated Planning Flow Chart Draft; BP No. 122 and AR No. 122.01
- Evidence No. 13** Fall 2009 Area Coordinator MOU; List of 2009-2010 Area Coordinators
- Evidence No. 14** July, 2009 State-Wide Academic Training Conference Training
- Evidence No. 15** CR Associate Faculty Orientation SLO Presentation
- Evidence No. 16** 2009 Program Review Committee Summary for the Academic Senate

- Evidence No. 17** PRC Calendar for Fall 2009; PRC/ CPC Calendar
- Evidence No. 18** Minutes from Program Review Committee Meetings
- Evidence No. 19** Assessment Portion of Biology Program Review
- Evidence No. 20** Selected Samples of Institutional Research Data
- Evidence No. 21** Basic Skills Initiative 2008-2009 End of Year Report; The State of Basic Skills at College of the Redwoods as of June 2009
- Evidence No. 22** ESOL Program Narrative; ESOL Scope of Work; Reports from ESOL Consultants
- Evidence No. 23** 2008-2009 Administrative Organization Chart
- Evidence No. 24** Senate Letter to ACCJC on April 9, 2009; April 2009 Senate Brief
- Evidence No. 25** President's April 9, 2009 Response to Senate Letter to ACCJC
- Evidence No. 26** Comparison of Learning Management Systems
- Evidence No. 27** Schedule of MyCR Training Sessions
- Evidence No. 28** Organizational Charts for 2009/10 (9/30/09 versions)
- Evidence No. 29** Calendar of Administrative Training Sessions
- Evidence No. 30** Request for Actions from State Academic Senate to support the College's efforts to clarify roles and codify them in revised board policies and administrative procedures; 9/28-9/29 League Senate Training Packet; E-mail Announcement of CCLC/ Academic Senate Technical Assistance; Agenda for CCLC/ASCCC Technical Assistance
- Evidence No. 31** Board Policies and Administrative Procedures Related to Decision-Making and Responsibilities (BP/AP 2510, AP 2511, AP2512, BP203)
- Evidence No. 32** Minutes of September 14, 2009 Board of Trustees Meeting
- Evidence No. 33** Board of Trustees President George Truett's Convocation Address
- Evidence No. 34** Dr. Marsee's Talking Points for Fall 2009 Convocation Address

- Evidence No. 35** Convocation Questions and Answers
- Evidence No. 36** Senate Brief for September 2009
- Evidence No. 37** E-mail Announcement of President's Hour (Open Door Time)
- Evidence No. 38** Senate Brief for October 2009; Senate Agendas Including Discussion of Accreditation Response Draft
- Evidence No. 39** Fall 2009 Associate Faculty Evaluation MOU