

EVALUATION REPORT

Citrus College Glendora, California

A confidential report prepared for
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that
visited Citrus College in Glendora, CA from September 28 – October 1, 2015

Douglas B. Houston, Ed.D.
Chair

**Citrus College
Visiting Team Roster
September-October 2015**

Dr. Douglas B. Houston (Chair)
Chancellor
Yuba CCD

Ms. Cathy Richter (Team Assistant)
Executive Assistant to the Chancellor
Yuba CCD

Dr. Ron Oxford
Librarian
West Hills College Lemoore

Dr. Ann Wright
Professor of Biological Sciences
Hartnell College

Dr. Lisa Allen
Professor Art History
Irvine Valley College

Dr. Albert Taccone
Dean School of Career and Technical
Education
MiraCosta College

Dr. Kathleen Welch
Vice President of Instruction
Cabrillo College

Ms. Karen Daar
Vice President of Academic Affairs
Los Angeles Valley College

Ms. Vivian Varela
Assistant Professor of Sociology/DE
Coordinator
Mendocino College

Ms. Jill Stearns
President
Modesto Junior College

Mr. Douglas Roberts
Senior Vice President, Finance and
Administrative Services
Santa Rosa Junior College

Dr. John Hernandez
Vice President of Student Services
Santiago Canyon College

Mr. Henry Gee
Vice President, Student Services
Rio Hondo College

Dr. Daniel Martinez
Director, Institutional Research
College of the Desert

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION REPORT

INSTITUTION: Citrus College

DATES OF VISIT: September 28 – October 1, 2015

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Douglas B. Houston, Chancellor, Yuba CCD

A fourteen-member accreditation team visited Citrus College from September 28 – October 1, 2015, for the purposes of evaluating how well the institution is achieving its stated purposes, analyzing how well the College is meeting the Commission Standards, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement.

In preparation for the visit, team members attended an all-day training session on September 1, 2015, conducted by the ACCJC and studied Commission materials prepared for visiting teams. Team members read the College's self-evaluation report, including the recommendations from the 2009 visiting team, and assessed the various forms of evidence provided by the institution. Prior to the visit, team members completed written evaluations of the institution's self-evaluation report and began identifying areas for further investigation. On the day before the formal beginning of the visit, the team members spent the afternoon discussing their views of the written materials and evidence provided by the institution as well as the Midterm Report completed by the institution on June 5, 2015, and other materials submitted to the Commission since its last comprehensive visit.

During the visit, the team met with approximately 110 institution faculty, staff, administrators, and students. Team members also met with the College superintendent/president and members of the Board of Trustees. The team also attended two open meetings scheduled with the College to allow for comments from faculty and staff and two confidential "drop-in" sessions to hear confidentially from any College stakeholder. The institution provided outstanding support to the team prior to and during the site visit. All members of the Citrus College community were welcoming, hospitable and gracious.

The team found that the self-evaluation report was substantially incomplete both in terms of required components that were missing entirely and in terms of depth of research, reflection and analysis that are the cornerstone of the self-evaluation process. The team noted that Citrus College failed to follow the Manual for Institutional Self Evaluation in the preparation of its self-evaluation report, and a number of key components were omitted entirely from the report. The team was concerned with the lack of in-depth reflection by the institution. The evidence cited was often ambiguous and simply not on point. Moreover, there was little analysis and reflection on the evidence to support the College's assertions regarding whether institutional practices conformed to Accreditation Standards.

Once on site, the team was able to determine, through interviews and additional evidence requested of the college, that the College's practices were demonstrative of standards of higher education practice. From these findings, the team was able to engage in the analysis and reflection to evaluate those practices against the Standards, but in many instances the team felt

that it had done the College's work for it. The team suggests that the institution master the ACCJC Guide to Evaluating Institutions. This is the guiding document for evaluating teams and for colleges undertaking self-evaluation, and it provides great insight for institutions in preparation for accreditation reports and visits.

Again, during the site visit, the team was able to find ample documentation and evidence to support the team's findings that the College's practices largely meet standards; the team is particularly concerned that the institution did not include or consider this evidence in its self evaluation process. The team found this additional evidence by searching the College's website and online repositories, by simply asking college leaders during interviews. The College's self-evaluation process would have greatly benefited from more aggressive research, deeper reflection and wider discussion, which are the expected activities of Institutional Self Evaluation in preparation for external team evaluation, both parts of an accreditation review.

In terms of general institutional effectiveness the team determined that Citrus College is generally at a level of sustainable continuous quality improvement with respect to program review and to planning; with several exceptions, it is at the level of proficiency in the assessment of student learning outcomes and perhaps on the verge of sustainable continuous quality improvement in the assessment of course, program, and certificate learning outcomes. In terms of meeting Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards the team provides several recommendations for the College.

The team wishes to express its deep appreciation to Citrus College. Team members have developed an abiding respect for the institution, its faculty and staff, its mission, its commitment to the students the College serves and the College's focus on student success and outcomes. The team is confident that the College can leverage that very focus to accomplish the work of evaluating and improving practices in order to meet ACCJC Standards.

Major Findings and Recommendations of the 2015 Visiting Team

Team Recommendations:

As a result of the September-October 2015 visit, the team made two recommendations to meet the Standards:

Recommendation #1

Integrity in Communications with the Public: In order to meet the Eligibility Requirements and the Standard, and to comply with Federal Regulations, the team recommends the College include precise, accurate, and current information concerning grievance and complaint procedures and sexual harassment in its print or electronic catalog for its constituencies (ER 20, II.B.2.c).

Recommendation #2

Integrity in its Relations with the Accrediting Commission: In order to meet the Eligibility Requirements and the Standards, the team recommends the college comply with Commission requests, directives, decisions and policies, and make complete, accurate, and honest disclosure (ER 21, I.A.3, I.B.3, IV.A.4).

Team Commendations:

During the visit, the team also recognized numerous noteworthy aspects of the institution:

Commendation #1:

With only a few exceptions, the team commends Citrus College on the general level of data literacy that seems pervasive to the college's culture; it is organic and authentic. Faculty, staff and college leaders exhibit a high degree of empirical decision-making. If Citrus College leverages this culture of evidence in accreditation preparation, it will be positioned to transition to the 2014 Accreditation Standards.

Commendation #2:

The team commends the faculty, staff and administrators of the Student Services area for the thoroughness of their program review process. The area's annual retreat and subsequent report is an effective way of assessing and ensuring continued quality improvement.

Commendation #3:

The team commends the Citrus College Library Staff for the extensive and well-developed collection of LibGuides designed to support the curriculum, showcase services, and provide information competency instruction to the college community regardless of location.

Commendation #4

The team commends the College and particularly the maintenance and operations staff for the quality of the College landscaping and grounds; they are particularly attractive, well maintained, and sustainable, this particularly in light of the numerous construction projects that would otherwise detract from the beauty of the campus. Clearly, the Grounds staff takes great pride in their work.

Commendation #5

The team commends the College on providing a safe environment campus for students, staff and faculty; the 2014 Citrus College Annual Security Report particularly highlights campus safety.

Commendation #6

The College is to be commended for the level to which it has addressed future liabilities, including especially the Other Post-Employment Benefits. This will provide considerable stability for the future of Citrus College.

ACCREDITATION EVALUATION REPORT FOR CITRUS COLLEGE

Introduction

Citrus Community College District (“Citrus College”) is a single-college district with no satellite campuses or sites. The college serves the communities of Azusa, Bradbury, Claremont, Duarte, Glendora, and Monrovia.

Citrus College is the oldest community college in Los Angeles County and the fifth oldest in California. Founded in 1915, the College opened with 27 students, six faculty members and a curriculum that emphasized advanced college preparatory studies. Today, the college grants fifteen associate degrees in 46 subject areas. Enrollment is again growing following the recession-based declines from 2010 through 2012. As of the publication of the 2015 self evaluation report, the College reported serving more than 13,000 students each semester. In March 2004, Citrus Community College District voters passed a \$121 million general obligation bond and in 2006 the College began a series of new building projects and infrastructure improvements designed to meet the needs of students and the community. These improvement projects were continuing during the Site Visit.

The College reports that the ethnic composition of the student body has gradually become more diverse over time. Currently the student population is 20 percent white non-Hispanic and 59 percent Hispanic; as a result the College is a designated Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI). As an HSI, Citrus College has received several Department of Education grants to assist Hispanic and other students who can benefit from enhanced services and programs. A \$3 Million HSI cooperative grant in 2005 funded the Center for Teacher Excellence, a teacher preparation partnership with the University of La Verne. In fall 2008, Citrus College received its first STEM grant to increase the number and success rate of first-generation, low-income, and underrepresented college students in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields (STEM). In 2009, the College received a \$2.1 Million HSI grant that established College Success, a program that offers resources to students who perform at the pre-collegiate level in math, English, or reading.

Evaluation of Institutional Responses to Previous Recommendations

Team Recommendation 1 (2009):

Over the last two years, the College has collected a significant amount of data for review and planning. In order to fully meet this Standard, the team recommends that the College build upon its existing processes and better integrate the use of data in program review, planning, budgeting, and decision making (I.B.3, I.B.5, I.B.6.).

The College formalized the program review process by establishing a Program Review Committee in 2012. The Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness (OIRPE) created data packets for instructional programs and provides pre-populated templates to assist in the process. Student Services areas prepare, capture and present data for their activities through different resources, such as CCCApply, SurveyMonkey, and other office-specific sources. Recommendations from program review are funneled to the deans and vice-presidents and then sent to the appropriate committee – Faculty Needs Identification Committee, Financial Resources Committee or President’s Cabinet – for prioritization.

The use of data for program review, planning, and decision making has clearly permeated the college. The Program Review Committee uses the data for planning and prioritization and uses the information from their self-evaluation to improve their processes. Student Services creates SLOs for their areas, creates ways to collect data, reflects on the information, and makes appropriate changes such as the FAQ for transcripts and the Transfer Center Workshops on Associate Degrees for Transfer. Planning efforts link to each other in a way that is understood by various constituents of the college. Of special note was the Student Services Program Review. The Student Services faculty and staff’s use of data and reflection on data as well as their integration of the Student Services Program Review with other planning processes was all exemplary.

The team concludes that the College has met this recommendation.

Team Recommendation 2 (2009).

Recognizing the progress the College has made in developing SLOs at the course level, the team recommends that, in order to meet the Standards by the Commission’s 2012 deadline, the College complete the development and use of Student Learning Outcomes at the course and program levels and include SLOs in all course syllabi, including distance education (II.A.1.c, II.A.2, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.i, II.A.6).

The College has met this recommendation and has demonstrated using the outcome assessment process as a basis for improvement. Student learning outcomes are in place for all courses, certificates, and degrees. The College maintains an electronic depository of syllabi for each scheduled section during a session regardless of modality. In fall 2015, 82 percent of the instructors submitted their syllabus to the online database. In reviewing a representative sample of submitted syllabi, all included course-level outcomes. Course-level outcomes and accompanying assessments are also listed in the course outlines of record, the college website, and even the college Catalog. Certificate and degree-level learning outcomes are included both in the catalog and on the college website. Faculty develop these outcomes, and track

improvements through the college's program review processes. The college offers a fast-track curriculum process to endorse new and revised learning outcomes and assessments. Course-level outcomes are mapped to program-level outcomes, and are documented in the program review's year-four supplemental reports. Faculty have demonstrated using course-level and program-level assessment results to inform pedagogy, instructional practices, curriculum changes, and resource requests through comprehensive and annual program reviews. Dialog about program-level assessment for basic skills, career-technical, and general education courses and programs is evident.

The team concludes that the College has met this recommendation.

Team Recommendation 3 (2009):

In order to meet the Standards, the team recommends that the College accelerate the program review timeline for student support services that have yet to undergo review and assess the effectiveness of recent program initiatives to student services and ensure that effective practices are maintained in the base budget (II.B.2.c, d, II.B.3.a, II.B.4).

In the follow-up report in 2011 the College addressed what they viewed as two separate concerns: first the timing of the schedule for program review completion in instructional support and institutional support areas and second, assessment of the effectiveness of new grant-funded programs that support students. This does not appear to fully address the recommendation due to the focus on instructional support and not student support services.

In the subsequent midterm report in 2012, the College indicated that the "current table of program review completion reflects that the Student Services division of the college is current in all areas of program review. Additionally, the College stated that it had "assessed the effectiveness of recent program initiatives in order to maintain effective practices in [its] base budget." The midterm report does appear to address the recommendation more directly, as they highlight program review and highlight program initiatives such as STEM, Bridges to Success, Center for Teacher Excellence and RACE to STEM.

The College has instituted a Comprehensive Program Review Cycle for instruction and student services beginning with Year 1 in 2012-2013 and it appears that all student support services areas are up-to-date with their program reviews. The most recent Student Services Program Review and Planning Retreat was from Fall 2015. In addition, the more recent program initiatives have been assessed and there is evidence that the effective practices (i.e. Bridges to Success) will be institutionalized at the end of the grant.

The team concludes that the College has met this recommendation.

Team Recommendation 4 (2009):

The team recommends that the College update all policies with respect to recruitment and hiring documents, including the revisions of the equal opportunity and diversity clauses in the hiring documents and the formalization of all job descriptions (also self-identified actionable improvement plans #2 and #3). Further, the team recommends that the College review all

policies and procedures with respect to evaluation of personnel, including references to the use of student learning outcomes. (II.A.1.a, b, III.A.1.c, III A.3.a)

As described in the midterm report for recommendation #4, Citrus College updated all policies with respect to recruitment and hiring documents, including the revisions of the equal opportunity and diversity clauses in the hiring documents and the formalization of all job descriptions. In addition, Citrus College reviewed all policies and procedures with respect to evaluation of personnel, including references to the use of student learning outcomes. The board policy and administrative procedure concerning the evaluation of full-time faculty specifically requires a faculty member to assess student learning outcomes as part of the faculty member's self-evaluation component of the required evaluation portfolio. In addition, the adjunct evaluation also includes the requirement to include the assessment of student learning outcomes as part of the self-evaluation component of the adjunct faculty required evaluation portfolio. Evidence shows that these updated Board Policies and Administrative Policies were reviewed by constituent leaders and approved by the steering committee and then received board approval. Evidence provided in the midterm report supports the team's conclusion that the recommendation was met and deficiencies resolved. In addition, there is a process in place conducted by the Human Resources Advisory Committee to review these Board Policies and Administrative procedures every three years. This advisory group has broad representation of faculty, classified, managers, and students. Recommendations from this advisory group are sent to the College Steering Committee and any changes in Board policies are sent to the Board for review and approval.

The team concludes that the College has met this recommendation.

Team Recommendation 5 (2009):

In order to meet Standards, the team recommends that the College complete its stated goal in its comprehensive planning agenda to “demonstrate its commitment to continuous quality improvement through the updating and review of the effectiveness of the College’s five major planning documents and be deliberate in using the content with them in budget development.” (III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.2)

The college meets this recommendation. Upon review of the evidence team determined that the College has indeed established a cycle of regularly review and updating of its five major planning documents develops budgets to implement the plans. (Standards III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.2) Program review is the starting point of the budgeting process for facility needs as part of the overall planning process indicated in the Educational and Facilities Master Plan 2011 - 2020 approved by the Board of Trustees in June 2011.

The team concludes that the College has met this recommendation.

Team Recommendation 6 (2009):

The prior team's recommendation, for the College to improve, was that the final budget would be more transparent and easier to understand if it includes a more detailed analysis of the budget assumptions, descriptions of various funds and sources of revenue and an outline of the parameters for decision making (III.D.1.d, III.D.2.a, b, III.D.3).

For 2014-15, the District developed a new format for the adopted budget that includes a tab titled "Development" in which there is a description of all of the funds, a glossary of the common financial and budgetary terms, a budget calendar, the upcoming year's budget development assumptions, a budget flowchart and the budget forum PowerPoint presentation. For 2015-16, the College changed the adopted budget format. Although the document no longer has the aforementioned "Development" tab, all of the recommended budgetary information is still included.

The team concludes that the College has met this recommendation.

Eligibility Requirements

1. Authority

The external evaluation team verified that Citrus College is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. The college is authorized by the State of California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to operate as an educational institution and to offer two-year courses of study leading to certificates and degrees.

2. Mission

The external evaluation team confirmed that Citrus College has a mission statement that defines the broad educational purposes, the intended student population, and the institutional commitment to using student learning outcomes evaluation to support institutional effectiveness. The mission statement is regularly reviewed and revised by the Board of Trustees and is available in a variety of publications and electronic formats.

3. Governing Board

The external evaluation team confirmed that the college operates under the direction of a five-member Board of Trustees. Trustees are elected from service areas defined within the District in staggered elections ensuring that there are always a minimum of two continuing trustees following an election. A non-voting student trustee is elected annually to serve as a representative. Board members have no personal financial interest in the institution. The Board of Trustees is responsible to approve District policy, delegate authority to the superintendent/president, and evaluate the superintendent/president.

4. Chief Executive Officer

The external evaluation team verified that Citrus College has a superintendent/president whose full-time responsibility is to provide overall leadership and direction. The superintendent/president reports directly to the Citrus Community College District Board of Trustees.

5. Administrative Capacity

The external evaluation team verified that the college has adequately prepared and experienced administrative staff sufficient in number to support the college's mission and purpose. The administration supports the scope and purpose of the institution.

6. Operating Status

The external evaluation team confirmed that Citrus College is fully operational with students actively pursuing degrees and certificates. The college has renovated and current facilities to support teaching and learning.

7. Degrees

The external evaluation team confirmed that Citrus College offers a total of 46 associate degrees, 15 associate degrees for transfer, and 48 certificates of achievement and skill awards in career technical programs.

8. Educational Programs

The visiting team verified that Citrus College offers a range of degree and certificate programs consistent with the college mission and congruent with generally accepted practices in degree-granting institutions in higher education. The degree and certificate programs are offered in a manner, and with the-rigor, consistent with higher education standards at the time of the visit.

9. Academic Credit

The external evaluation team confirmed Citrus College awards academic credit in a manner consistent with generally accepted higher education practices. The College adheres to the commonly-accepted practices in determining credit hours for courses. The college clearly distinguishes between non-credit, non-degree applicable, and degree applicable courses.

10. Student Learning and Achievement

The external evaluation team confirmed that Citrus College defines course, program, and institutional learning outcomes, assesses these outcomes, and engages in dialogue about assessment outcomes as part of the cycle of evaluation supporting continuous quality improvement.

11. General Education

The external evaluation team confirmed that Citrus College defines and incorporates into all of its degree programs a substantial component of general education designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and promote intellectual inquiry.

12. Academic Freedom

The external evaluation team verified that Citrus College faculty and students are free to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of major study as judged by the academic community. The CCCD Board of Trustees has adopted BP4030, Academic Freedom which is applicable to both full-time and part-time faculty.

13. Faculty

The external evaluation team confirmed that Citrus College has 157 full-time faculty who are assigned to teach approximately 56% of all sections offered. The college hires qualified adjunct faculty to teach course sections each term. The faculty meet the minimum qualifications as established by the Academic Senate of California Community Colleges. The duties and responsibilities of faculty are outlined in Board policy, the collective bargaining contract, and in the faculty handbook. Faculty are responsible for assessing student learning and assigning grades for students enrolled in their classes.

14. Student Services

The external evaluation team confirmed that Citrus College provides a wide variety of student services to support student learning, development, and completion within the context of the institutional mission and strategic plan. Services are available in multiple formats to serve the needs of a diverse student population. Information regarding student services is available in the catalog, schedule of classes, and on the college website.

15. Admissions

The external evaluation team confirmed that Citrus College has established and follows admission policies consistent with its mission.

16. Information and Learning Resources

Citrus College provides long-term access to sufficient information and learning resources and services to support its mission and instructional programs in whatever format and location they are offered. The external evaluation team confirmed that library and learning support services are provided to all students regardless of instructional modality.

17. Financial Resources

The external evaluation team confirmed that Citrus College has an ongoing funding base, financial resources, and plans for financial development adequate to support student learning programs and services, to improve institutional effectiveness, and to assure financial stability.

18. Financial Accountability

Citrus College engages in an annual financial audit by an independent certified public accounting firm. The audits are certified and exceptions are explained in the annual presentation to the Board of Trustees in public session. Citrus College maintains eligibility for Title IV programs.

19. Institutional Planning and Evaluation

The external evaluation team confirmed that Citrus College systematically evaluates and makes public the results of institutional efforts to accomplish its purpose, including the assessment of student learning outcomes. The college provided evidence of planning for improvement of institutional structures and processes, student achievement of educational goals, and student learning; specifically, in the area of completion.

20. Integrity in Communication with the Public

Citrus College makes its catalog available in both print and online versions. The catalog contains general information about the institution and programs, requirements, and major policies affecting students. The printed catalog, that the College included as evidence in its Self Evaluation Report, did not contain required disclosures regarding sexual misconduct. This may have been due to print deadlines. However, and more to the point, the team was not able to easily find this information on the College's website. It was only after the College provided a hard copy of the appropriate web page that the team was able to navigate to it. In the team's judgement, this information was not readily accessible to students as required by federal legislation.

21. Integrity in Relations with the Accrediting Commission

The external evaluation team confirmed that the college complies with all Commission decisions; however, the 2015 Citrus College Self-Evaluation Report did not include all of the elements delineated in the Manual for Institutional Evaluation August 2014. Specifically, the Citrus College Institutional Self-Evaluation Report did not include the institution's analysis and evidentiary information demonstrating that the institution addresses policies specific to the

college mission and activities. Moreover, the Citrus College Institutional Self-Evaluation did not include a breadth of information and reflective evaluation narrative representative of the high quality practices the external evaluation team determined to exist based on interviews and evidentiary review. Nor did it include a presentation of statements and evidence showing that the College meets Commission policies and federal regulations as required by Commission instructions for the preparation of an Institutional Self Evaluation.

Recommendations:

Recommendation #1

In order to meet the Eligibility Requirements and the Standards, and to comply with Federal Regulations, the team recommends the College include precise, accurate, and current information concerning grievance and complaint procedures and sexual harassment in its print or electronic catalog for its constituencies (ER 20, II.B.2.c).

Recommendation #2

In order to meet the Eligibility Requirements and the Standards, the team recommends the college comply with Commission requests, directives, decisions and policies, and make complete, accurate, and honest disclosure (ER 21, I.A.3, I.B.3, IV.A.4).

Compliance with Commission Policies

Public Notification of an Evaluation Team Visit and Third Party Comment

The policy on Public Notification of an Evaluation Team Visit and Third Party Comment was not addressed in the Citrus College Institutional Self Evaluation Report. There is no notice on the Citrus College website regarding third party comments and the process for submittal. The Commission and external evaluation team for Citrus College received a third party comment prior to the comprehensive visit September 28 – October 1, 2015 (ER 20, II.B).

Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement

The narrative provided in the Citrus College Institutional Self Evaluation and review of evidentiary documents and interviews by the external evaluation team confirm that the institution meets the Commissions requirements to define elements of student achievement and performance, across the institution, within each instructional program. Despite failing to address this in its Institutional Self Evaluation, the College has set institution-set standards. In its evaluation of Standards, the team expresses concern that these standards (i.e. using the “lowest of performance data” as institution-set standards) may not be sufficient to guide self-evaluation and institutional improvement (I.B).

Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

The policy on Credits, Program Length, and Tuition was not addressed in the Citrus College Institutional Self Evaluation Report. The external evaluation team confirmed through review of the Citrus College Catalog that the institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission’s policy and requirements that credit hour assignments and degree program lengths are in the range of good practice in higher education. The team further verified that the College adhered to the Department of Education formulae for reliable and accurate, consistent tuition, clock hour conversions adhere to the Department of Education’s formula (II.A).

Transfer Policies

Transfer Policies were not addressed in the Citrus College Self Evaluation Report. The external evaluation team confirmed through review of the Citrus College Catalog and website that transfer policies are appropriately disclosed to students and the public and that the college complies with the Commission Policy on Transfer of Credit (II.A).

Distance Education and Correspondence Education

The policy on Distance Education and Correspondence and was not addressed in the Citrus College Institutional Self Evaluation Report. The external evaluation team confirmed through review of evidence that the College meets the Commission’s requirements for distance education, including the May 7, 2015, approval of a Distance Education Substantive Change Proposal including 15 associate degrees and one certificate available 50% or more online (ER 21, II.A, IV.A).

Student Complaints

The policy on Student Complaints was not addressed in the Citrus College Institutional Self Evaluation Report. The external evaluation team confirmed through review of evidence that the college only partially meets the Commission’s requirements regarding Student Complaints.

Specifically, the college catalog provided to the team at the time of the site visit, referred only to student grievance procedures; the student complaint process information was not easily accessible to students on the website which instead links directly to the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office complaint form (ER 20, II.B).

Internal Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials

The policy on Institutional Advertising Student Recruitment and Representation of Accredited Status was not addressed in the Citrus College Institutional Self Evaluation report. Through review of the evidence inquiry, the external evaluation team determined that the institution meets the Commission's requirements to provide accurate, timely, and appropriately detailed information to students and the public about its programs, locations, and policies, and required information concerning its accredited status (II.A, IVA).

Title IV Compliance

Title IV Compliance was not addressed in the Citrus College Self Evaluation Report. Through review of the evidence, the team confirmed that the College meets the Commission's requirements to present evidence on the required components of the title IV Program, address issues raised by the USDE as to financial aid responsibility requirements, record-keeping, student loan default rates, contractual relationships to offer or receive educational, library and support services that meet the Accreditation Standards as approved by the Commission through substantive change if required (II.B).

STANDARD I

Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

A. Mission

General Observations:

The institution has a mission statement that identifies the institution's commitment to student learning by providing high quality instruction to a diverse educational community and supporting completion of transfer, career technical education, and basic skills. The educational purposes are appropriate to an institution of higher learning. General observations on the quality of the mission statement and its focused educational purposes are that the comments and assertions do directly address the Standard IA language but do not directly reflect the focus of the current strategic plan and mission objectives.

Findings and Evidence:

Citrus College is committed to student learning through the provision of high quality educational programs and has established such programs and services that are aligned with the three primary purposes identified in the mission statement: transfer, career technical education, and basic skills. The institutional self-evaluation report details four-term schedules that provide balanced opportunities for student enrollment and continuous advancement toward completion. In addition, the report provides evidence on degree and career technical education (CTE) certificate completion, and appropriate transfer assistance in support of the report's claim that the College provided programs aligned with stated purposes. The College's development of basic skills assessment and established best practices advance student retention and completion. Evidence initially provided by the College Success Committee in conjunction with additional evidence provided during the site visit confirms this assertion.

The College self-identified as a "College of Completion," and this 2013 initiative has become a key vehicle for articulating the values that create the institutional character. The College claims continually to assess its programs and services through an integrated process of planning and evaluation that results in "data-driven institutional decision making". The primary evidence for this affirmation is the *2014 Community College Survey of Student Engagement*; however, this documentation only provides a singular generalized response addressing "educational objectives addressed in the mission statement" and does not provide specific well-developed evidence of a process revealing regular and integrated planning. Additional evidence provided during interviews at the site visit have helped to support this claim.

The College's student population is mentioned in the first portion of the *College Mission Statement* and defined by two criteria: students within the trustee-represented districts, and students beyond the traditional geographic boundaries. The latter student population is defined to include both international students and those enrolled in distance education course sections and transfer programs. The College's mission is aligned in four specific areas: distance education, diversity, intercollegiate competition, and cultural and personal enrichment.

The first alignment with student population is that of distance education (DE). This mission alignment was established by reviewing enrollment data that indicated “a strong demand for distance education courses at Citrus College” and demonstrated by the early fill rate in online course sections during the registration process. While the Self Evaluation Report purports to address this identified alignment and boasts of seven associate (AA Emphasis, AS) degrees that can be fully completed online, it provides little direct evidence of instructional support for the modality. In opposition to the declared demand for distance education, the College appears to have made a conscious decision to slow the development of DE offerings which conflicts with the 2014 Mission Statement and its alignment with student population. Review of the *Distance Education Comprehensive Program Review Report* revealed that while there was assessment of student learning outcomes, the team found no evidence of meaningful dialog on the use of those assessment results for quality improvement.

The second alignment with student population addresses support to a diverse student body, and touts multiple successes in this arena through the acquisition of Title V grants that encourage academic opportunity and increase student success. Identified as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI), Citrus College promotes career paths in science, technology, engineering and math (STEM), and is nationally recognized for its support services to military veterans. In addition, the institution provides support for a diverse student population through programs and facilities that assist students with existing social, physical and cultural challenges in order to more effectively promote an academic environment that sponsors student retention and success. The institution provided evidence that these efforts are sound and responsive.

The third alignment with student population promotes student success through intercollegiate activities and events that provide a healthy competitive atmosphere for developing team building, and academic excellence. As well, the campus supports a robust student association and numerous student clubs and societies – both social and academic.

The fourth and final alignment with student population provides the College and surrounding community platforms for cultural and personal enrichment through the creative and performing arts events, and study abroad opportunities. Current capital commitments to new and expanded facilities to house and manage the creative arts programs also are reflective of this commitment to this alignment with student population.

The above-mentioned alignments appear to be reasonable in relation to the College’s location and resources; awarded Title V grants support these focused populations. In its Institutional Self Evaluation, the College identified a need for greater development of support services to support distance education (DE) students through DE program review (I.A.1).

While the *2011-2016 Strategic Plan* was driven by the existing 2009 Mission Statement which was approved again by the governing board August 2012, a later substantial review and revision to the institution’s mission statement was initiated in 2012, completed in 2014 and the updated version was reaffirmed the same year by the governing board and subsequently published (I.A.2).

The College's Self Evaluation Report narrative and the embedded evidence reveals that the program review process and the assessment of student learning outcomes foster a college-wide commitment to student retention and success. While the mission statement does express this commitment, Standard I.A narrative on the cyclical nature of collegial review, revision and implementation of the mission statement does not make clear the integration of planning processes in the development of the current Strategic Plan or the anticipated 2016-2021 Strategic Plan. As the College constituency groups begin the 2016-2021 planning process, they should review and revise the mission statement as necessary. This effort will ensure a better alignment of the College's mission statement with the strategic plan and provide a more effective foundation for program review (three of the five primary planning documents) (I.A.3).

The College Mission Statement drives planning and decision-making processes, and the College's constituency groups participate in the development and assessment of planning protocols that are directed by not only the mission statement, but also by the mission objectives and corresponding value statements. Through the program review process, the mission of the College is reflected, and the resulting measurable outcomes contribute to improved institutional effectiveness and student success (I.A.4).

Conclusions:

The Citrus College Mission Statement defines the institution's broader educational purposes, character and intended population; and promotes successful completion of transfer, career technical education, and basic skills development. The College meets this Standard (I.A1).

The institution's mission statement was most recently approved by the governing board August 2014, and published in major College documents for both internal and external consumption. The College meets this Standard (I.A.2).

Although the Institutional Self Evaluation Report affirms review of the mission statement, the College has not defined a regularized and predictable cycle for review and revision that clearly aligns with the review cycles for other primary planning documents. The College does not meet this Standard (I.A.3).

The mission statement is recognized as the foundation for all college decision making and is an integral component of the College's planning processes. Although the Self Evaluation Report fails to provide some of the necessary evidence that helps to establish direct links between program reviews, student learning outcomes and budget allocations, the narrative does ascertain the role of the mission statement in directing institutional planning and decision-making. The College meets this Standard (I.A.4).

The team concludes that the College does not meet Standard I.A.3.

Recommendations to meet the Standards:

See Recommendation #2

STANDARD I

Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

B. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations:

The College described a planning process that is inclusive and has a broad base of support. Many of the committees and processes have been formalized in the last couple of years. However, the College was engaged in institutional dialogue about student learning and institutional processes prior to the establishment of permanent committees. The creation of the program review committee, the Hot Shots (the College's Student Learning Outcomes committee), and the Institutional Effectiveness committee all point to an institutional commitment to improve their use of data for decision making and to utilize planning processes to clarify and evaluate the college Mission.

There is a common understanding at the College both about the planning processes and the need to establish and evaluate SLOs college-wide. In addition, the evaluation of processes was mentioned by almost every group with whom the team met. The planning processes are familiar to the campus community, and the team observed that among college constituencies, there was a general sense that the processes work well.

The self-evaluation report does not adequately reflect the planning and evaluation efforts of the College. The analysis and evaluation section of the Institutional Self Evaluation report is generally a summary of the evidence section. In addition, the frequent reference to the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) suggests that it is used as part of strategic planning and program review, but references to the CCSSE in those documents could not be found. However, the familiarity with information from those surveys was evident and it appears that the dialogue occurs but is not captured in formal planning documents.

The team reviewed third party comments regarding this Standard.

Findings and Evidence:

The College engages in dialogue around student learning and institutional processes on a regular basis and in multiple committee and workgroup settings. The participation of all constituent groups is engaged, knowledgeable, and collegial. The planning process begins with the Strategic Plan, is operationalized with the Annual Implementation Plan, and is evaluated with both the mid-year and annual progress reports. Program reviews for both instruction and student services make reference to the Strategic Plan (I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.4).

The College regularly assesses outcomes and uses that information to inform and improve their activities. The team observed that the development, measurement, and evaluation of SLOs for instructional services, student services, and administrative services is pervasive; in both formal committee meetings and informal hallway conversations, the assessment cycle, including feedback, is well known. Perhaps more importantly, the sense of the value of the process is clear

in the conversations. The pervasive use of and need for data was noted in multiple venues. Longitudinal data on student success, course completion, degree and certificate completion (which is also disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, age, and course delivery modality) as provided in the self-evaluation report and fact book provide the basis for college wide discussion at both the institutional and program levels.

The College has set goals for student course completion, successful student course completion, number of degrees and certificates, transfer, examination pass rates and job placement rates as reported in the ACCJC Annual Reports. The self-evaluation report noted that a workgroup comprised of administrators, faculty, student learning outcomes coordinators, and others reviewed and discussed historical data “in the last five years” before presenting the data to the Steering Committee in March, 2013. The team notes that minutes from the March 11, 2013, meeting state that “three to four years of data were reviewed to arrive at an average... to establish an initial standard,” but that was subsequently changed by the Steering Committee to “the lowest numbers (sic) in the last six years.” The team found this unreasonable; standards that reflect the lowest historic performance, will not foster institutional reflection on student achievement that will lead to improvement.

The College is expected to assess its progress toward achieving its stated goals and evaluate itself against these standards as evidence of the institution’s accomplishment of their mission. The team did not find evidence of this assessment. Furthermore, the process for the final selection of institutional-set standards appears to be less defensible than an average over several years. In the 2014 and 2015 ACCJC Annual Reports, the college clearly exceeds all of the institutional-set standards as reported. The team could not determine how the College established the institutional-set standards for examination pass rates. The institutional-set standards in the 2015 Annual Report for most of the exams is at least 20% lower than the actual pass rate for most examinations for both the 2014 and 2015 reports. As the institutional-set standards are currently reported and without the College identifying progress toward achieving its stated goals, the team was not able to assess institutional stability and achievement of mission and it is not possible for the team to note strengthened institutional performance (I.B.3).

The link between planning and resource allocation appears to be well known and clearly understood by the college community. The collegiality noted in various committees seems evident in this process as well. Of particular note was the letter from the Financial Resources Committee that was sent to a department or division when a request was funded. The assessment of the planning process itself led the College to develop and implement the “Roadshows” which highlights the work of the Program Review Committee. The roadshows have been well received and help to demonstrate to faculty and staff how their participation in the program review process impacts the overall planning process for the college (I.B.4, I.B.6, I.B.7).

The documentation of assessments, as well as how the assessments are used to improve programs and student learning, is a pervasive part of the culture at the institution. The documentation of these efforts demonstrates the institution’s commitment to quality. This is noteworthy given that the college received a Commission recommendation to improve the use of data in 2009. The CCSSE survey results and the subsequent conversations and activities surrounding the results, including the focus groups with students, is an example of a college-

wide effort to collect and report data on student engagement. However, this effort does not appear to be tied directly to institutional plans. The team also noted that the evidence presented in the self-evaluation report on this Standard regarding the communication with the surrounding community did not pertain to the Standard (I.B.5).

Conclusions:

Citrus College has demonstrated that dialogue is occurring throughout the college regarding student learning and institutional processes. The College meets this Standard (I.B.1).

The planning processes are well understood and the College is committed to the achievement of the goals set out in the Strategic Plan; the various committees understand the process and their role in achieving the College's goals. The College meets this Standard (I.B.2).

Though the College recently developed assessments regarding the effectiveness of their planning processes, the team observed support for the process and how the information was necessary for improvement. The college effectively developed improvements based on data and its analysis and the importance of the use of data is clearly understood.

The College reports data on student success and retention at the institutional level through the fact book and at the program level through the data packets (which includes institutional level outcomes as points of comparison). In its judgement, the team felt that the College's institution set standards, based on lowest historic performance trends, to be unreasonable. Moreover, though the College has reported institution-set goals in the ACCJC Annual Reports, it has not assessed its progress in achieving these goals. The College does not meet this Standard (I.B.3).

The College has made a concerted effort to include all members of the college community in the planning process. The team observed that the resource allocation process is well understood by members of the College. The College meets this Standard (I.B.4).

The College regularly communicates with the college community and the community it serves. The frequent accolades are well known and the college is appropriately proud of their achievements. The pervasive nature of data and analysis as a means to improve college processes ensures the quality of the efforts. The College meets this Standard (I.B.5).

The College has engaged the process of evaluating various planning processes to improve the effectiveness of these processes. The College meets this Standard (I.B.6).

The College has developed a culture of inquiry to evaluate its processes. The College meets this Standard (I.B.7).

The team concludes that the College does not meet Standard I.B.3.

Recommendations to meet the Standard:

See Recommendation #2.

Commendations

Commendation #1:

With only a few exceptions, the team commends Citrus College on the general level of data literacy that seems pervasive to the college's culture; it is organic and authentic. Faculty, staff and college leaders exhibit a high degree of empirical decision-making. If Citrus College leverages this culture of evidence in accreditation preparation, it will be positioned to transition to the 2014 Accreditation Standards.

STANDARD II

Student Learning Programs and Services

A. Instructional Programs

General Observations:

Citrus College grants associate degrees in 46 fields of study, including 15 Associate Degrees for Transfer. The College offers certificates of achievement, certificates of competency, and skill awards in 48 academic and career/technical areas. The College offers many student services and has received accolades for successful programs and faculty achievements. Success rates tend to be a little higher than state averages. Three main goals are addressed within the mission including transfer, career and technical education, and basic skills development. All programs participate in annual and comprehensive program reviews. Dialogue on performance in meeting success and retention rates and program completions takes place in a variety of forums including the Academic Senate, Institutional Effectiveness Committee, and the Steering Committee. Dialogue on the quality of the Distance Education program, including the success and persistence gaps between Distance Education and face-to-face classes, is just beginning. However, the College has committed to not expand the program until it assesses and addresses in faculty training addresses deficiencies. The program review process seems substantially developed and is performed according to schedule. Statements defining effective contact in online classes exist. Evidence is provided for how data are analyzed to determine quality and availability of offerings of general education, career technical and basic skills courses. Board policies are reviewed at least once every three years using participatory governance.

Findings and Evidence:

The Board of Trustees relies primarily on the Academic Senate in regards to curriculum and academic programs. The Program Review Committee and Educational Programs Committee also shepherd new programs through the approval process. Each instructional program goes through both a five-year comprehensive program review cycle with annual reviews focused on core topics. The reviews align with the College mission which is regularly reviewed. The College mission identifies successful completion of transfer, and the College's decision to focus a significant proportion of its Distance Education programming on transfer and general education courses aligns with its current mission. Courses offered through Distance Education undergo a separate review process, and require an addendum which includes how regular and effective contact with students will be performed. Student learning outcomes are assessed at the course, program, and institutional levels regardless of modality, and data reviewed includes success and retention. Continued dialogue at the general education, career technical, and basic skills levels take place to further strengthen programs. The appropriate program faculty for curricular and programmatic changes makes recommendations for improvements. A secure login and proctored exams are provided to Distance Education students (II.A.1).

The Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness provides resources such as the College Fact Book, detailed disaggregated demographic analysis, success and retention in courses, number of degrees and certificates awarded, and enrollment information. The office also

conducts focus groups and studies on special programs (e.g. learning communities, Honors.) Career-technical education programs use labor market analyses and advisory committees to further support the success of their programs. DegreeWorks is used to monitor completions, and faculty and student surveys for Distance Education are provided. Placement results are also reviewed to inform decisions on additional English and math sections needed to ensure students can complete a sequence. Course-level student learning outcomes assessment methodologies are reviewed and discussed at least once in the five-year comprehensive program review cycle. Program assessment is discussed at multiple participatory governance committees. Distance Education attendance guidelines specify participation in a specified list of activities verifying students' "active participation in the class." The policy requires instructors to assign one or more of these activities each week, and to keep a record of assigned activities for at least three years. The College considers itself as meeting "Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement" in regards to Student Learning Outcomes. Learning Outcomes are reflected upon each year through annual program reviews (II.A.1.a).

Face-to-face offerings make up approximately 90 percent of the schedule with roughly ten percent of sections, including hybrid, offered through online instruction using the Blackboard platform. The selected courses to be offered through this delivery mode are determined through annual and comprehensive program reviews, and through regular consultation between division deans and program faculty. The Distance Education Committee is reviewing methods to address gaps in success and retention rates found between Distance Education and face-to-face offerings. Surveys are offered to analyze student and faculty satisfaction with program and teaching methodologies in Distance Education, and student surveys are used to assess satisfaction for study abroad, the honors program, and learning communities. Career-technical education advisory committees analyze and discuss trends in the job market and new technologies. The College also offers noncredit classes and has contracts with two high schools. All courses offered, regardless of location or modality, meet the same student learning outcomes and objectives as listed on the course outlines of record as approved through the College's curriculum process (II.A.1.b).

The College has student learning outcomes in place for all courses, instructional and service support programs, certificates, and degrees. Course-level and program-level outcomes are included in CurricUNET and certificate and degree SLOs are included both in the catalog and on the College website. Faculty develop these outcomes, and they are stored on the College's SharePoint (intranet) system. When faculty modify instruction to elicit better achievement of outcomes, they track improvements on reflection documents. Faculty use course-level SLO assessment results to inform pedagogy, instructional practices, curriculum changes, and resource requests through comprehensive and annual program reviews. Multiple examples of improvements are listed in the self-evaluation narrative and can be seen in multiple program review documents. The Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment (SLOA) Committee (also known as "HotShots") is a standing committee of the College's Steering Committee (the primary participatory decision-making body). The SLOA committee's purpose is to facilitate development, implementation and assessment of student learning outcomes across the campus community (II.A.1.c).

The Board of Trustees relies primarily on the faculty to develop processes related to curriculum and program review as evident through its Administrative Procedures. Ensuring the quality of the curriculum is the purview of the College's Curriculum Committee, and they review course outlines of record at least once every six years. The quality and improvement of each instructional program, regardless of type of credit awarded, delivery mode or location, is performed through the comprehensive program review process during a five-year cycle. The college reviews data related to basic skills, career-technical and general education offerings to ensure no bottlenecks exist when classes are scheduled. Satisfaction surveys are a mechanism to determine quality and meeting need for both online and international education. Academic deans who schedule basic skills courses analyze assessment data to inform planning. Community education and contract education courses are scheduled as needed or to meet demand (II.A.2).

Course-level outcomes are mapped to program-level outcomes and are linked to the College's institutional learning outcomes. Dialogue at the institutional level on instructional courses and programs is particularly evidenced in the general education and basic skills areas. Student learning outcomes are included on all syllabi, and program review is the main mechanism to report student learning outcome results (II.A.2.a).

Program and course-level outcomes are developed by faculty and measured through the program review process. Advisory committees from four-year institutions and career-technical industry groups are able to provide input. All outcomes of any level are categorized into one of six college-determined competencies. Reflection on progress towards achieving outcomes is evident through a sampling of program review reports (II.A.2.b).

The curriculum committee review and approval process is used to ensure programs are of an appropriate breadth, depth and rigor. Faculty analyze course sequencing and patterns, and instructional deans confirm that all programs can be completed in a timely manner. The College tracks the number of students hired in career-technical education fields and the number of transfers, degrees and certificates conferred are generally higher than related peer groups. Citrus College has established institution-set standards for student achievement. That said, as previously noted in Standard I.B, the team is concerned that because the College has selected lowest performance measures as its institution-set standards, it will not be able to engage in meaningful dialog about student achievement and improvement. Dialogue regarding program quality and level occurs during the annual General Education Assessment Dialogue. Annual career-technical education advisory meetings assess the rate of career and transfer at the College. The Educational Programs Committee provides a forum for program representatives to report on training opportunities, program successes, and requests for collaboration and support (II.A.2.c).

The College offers a variety of courses and teaching methodologies to meet the identified needs of its students, including Distance Education, noncredit and contract education, the Honors Program, Study Abroad, and learning communities. For each program, the College tracks success and persistence rates. The College also provides a variety of STEM-related programs where students from these programs have presented research at various forums. The College participates in the Community College Survey of Student Engagement every other year, and shares the results of the survey with the Academic Senate and the Steering Committee to inform faculty and service areas for improvement. Faculty evaluations include at least one online or

hybrid course for those who teach it as part of their post-tenure review every three years to ensure regular and effective contact takes place. The Faculty Learning Institute offers workshops on learning styles (II.A.2.d).

Program review is divided into five-year “Core” reviews. Each core review includes budgetary and resource recommendations. Program review integrates student learning outcomes assessment, curricular review, and resource requests and allocations, as well as links to the College’s mission and major planning documents. These processes are well described in the report and supported by the appropriate evidence. Courses are reviewed during a six-year cycle by the College’s Curriculum Committee. The relevance, appropriateness, future and currency of the course are also reviewed during “Core 2 Reviews” during the five-year program review cycle. Career-technical education programs undergo a comprehensive program review every two years (II.A.2.e).

Master plans are created by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness with contributions from all campus constituencies. Planning documents are reviewed annually by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and the Steering Committee with a full revision every five years. Learning outcomes are reviewed annually, program outcomes at least every five years, and career-technical education programs at least every two years. The College has developed Student Learning Outcomes for all of its courses, certificates, and degrees which are listed in CurricUNET, the course and program management system used by the College.

Course-level, certificate-level, and degree-level outcomes are assessed through the program review process, providing an opportunity for faculty to summarize their findings and identify how assessment results have informed curriculum, delivery of content, and goal development.

Each program review is provided with an extensive data set provided by the Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness Office including disaggregated success and retention data in face-to-face and Distance Education classes. Student surveys gather feedback that may be used in improving the course design and delivery of distance education courses.

Ongoing dialogue on assessment data is evident through program reviews and various minutes from shared governance committees. Student focus groups are regularly conducted, and results are shared with faculty, staff and administrators at various committees and the Academic Senate.

At the institutional level, the annual Strategic Plan Progress Report documents achievements made for the objectives laid out in the corresponding Annual Implementation Plan. The entire planning process is annually evaluated by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee who then examines the alignment of the strategic plan with other major plans, program review, completion rates of the annual program reviews in all categories, and implementation of assessment and usage of learning outcome assessment data in program review.

The purpose of the Educational Programs Committee is to facilitate discussion regarding the comprehensive educational program offered at the College. The committee engages in review and approval of all program reviews, striving to synthesize data and information to maximize impact. The committee evaluates two-year career-technical education program reviews; reviews

career-technical education program applications prior to regional approval; monitors the inventory of approved programs; and assures that certificates are in compliance with state requirements (II.A.2.f).

Faculty use standardized exams across all sections of a course to ensure students are being assessed in an unbiased manner. State and national standardized exams may also be used and are tested externally for non-bias (II.A.2.g).

Learning outcomes are listed on the course outline of record. Curriculum processes are documented in board policies which also state how governance processes guide the development of programs and curricula. Credit for courses follow the guidelines prescribed by the California Community College Chancellor's Office, and the Curriculum Committee ensures that each course outline follows a Carnegie unit standard for awarding college credit (II.A.2.h).

Course work completion in a given degree or certificate is equated to completing the program's outcomes. The alignment of course-level outcomes to program-level outcomes is described in the College's program review during its "Core Four Focus Area." Institutional dialogue is especially evident for general education outcomes (II.A.2.i).

The College offers three general education programs. Two are based on courses accepted for CSU and UC systems, the major systems to which Citrus students transfer. The third is a locally developed 22-unit general education pattern. The philosophy for general education is included in the Catalog and in board policy and administrative procedure (II.A.3).

All three of Citrus College's general education patterns require courses in the humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences. All general education courses have learning outcomes to fit into broad core competencies that reflect the College's general education philosophy and goals (II.A.3.a).

The general education patterns include specific requirements called "core competencies" which provide the appropriate skills (communication, information competency, technological and calculation skills) for students to become life-long learners. College-level courses all have student learning outcomes that address critical thinking skills. General education outcomes and student achievement data are extensively discussed. All degree-applicable courses including those in the general education pattern meet standards for college courses and can be found in the College Catalog (II.A.3.b).

Faculty in each discipline decide which core competencies to focus on, and the Curriculum Committee ensures that major competencies are not overlooked. Ethics and effective citizenship is reflected in the College's global consciousness core competency (II.A.3.c).

The evidence indicates that all degree programs include a focused study in at least one area of inquiry or in an established interdisciplinary core. CurricUNET is the electronic forum in which degrees are discussed, approved, and stored. The College's Curriculum Committee recently reviewed all degrees and deactivated. The Curriculum Committee has also adopted multiple

degrees for transfer, each having a clear focused area of study and providing students with a specified transfer path (II.A.4).

In addition to completing annual program reviews each year and full review of career-technical education every two years, many occupational programs are reviewed regularly by outside agencies. Institution-set standards are established for graduate employment rates and many programs exceed the unique standard set by the discipline. That said, as noted in the team's evaluation of Standard I.B, the team is concerned that these institution-set standards are not reasonable for evaluating or improving student achievement. Data reviewed also included wages gained and licensure pass rates (II.A.5).

Course outlines are searchable via CurricUNET which is linked to the Curriculum Committee webpage. Instructional divisions collect current syllabi for every course each term and intersession. Old syllabi are archived in LiveOak software and can be retrieved as needed. Faculty evaluations, course student learning outcomes assessment, and program review verify that sections are adhering to the course outline of record. The catalog lists student learning outcomes for each active course. Faculty evaluation, course student learning outcomes assessment, and program review are the mechanisms used to ensure all sections are adhering to course objectives and learning outcomes. The College presents clear and accurate information on transfer policies, including the requirements for students transferring to four-year institutions, general education requirements for transfer, and information about transferability of courses in both the catalog and the schedule of classes. The College catalog also includes the policies and allowable credit for students entering the College with credit earned through Advanced Placement, College Level Examination Program (CLEP), or International Baccalaureate examinations (II.A.6).

Stated transfer-of-credit policies are listed in the catalog, schedules of classes, and various office webpages. Administrative regulations delineate policies associated with articulation and credit by exam. The Assist.org website is highlighted on the Articulation webpage. Counselors evaluate transfer credits by analyzing transcripts (II.A.6.a).

Board policies and administrative procedures outline processes for program modification. Viability committees are activated as needed to review the health of a program. Discontinuance is only considered after a struggling program has gone through an intervention to improve its status (II.A.6.b).

The College presents clear, accurate, and consistent information to prospective and current students, the public, and its personnel through a variety of publications, documents, and its webpage. Student achievement data is regularly posted on the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness webpage. Board policies and administrative procedures are reviewed at least once every three years. Minutes for many sites are regularly posted online (II.A.6.c).

Academic freedom and student honesty statements are posted on the College's website and in the catalog (II.A.7).

Board policies concerning academic freedom can be found on the district website and College catalog. The Academic Senate has created a “Faculty Code of Ethical Conduct” policy which identifies faculty responsibilities to their students, discipline, institution, colleagues, and the community at large. New faculty participate in a year-long orientation that includes discussion of best practices that adhere to the faculty code of conduct. Student evaluation forms ask if “The instructor encouraged questions and discussion” and “The instructor was open to viewpoints other than his/her own.” (II.A.7.a).

Board policy describes the college’s academic honesty policy and standards of student behavior. Consequences for dishonesty are enumerated in an accompanying administrative procedure. All policies and administrative procedures are reviewed at least once every three years through the College’s participatory governance processes (II.A.7.b).

The standard of conduct policy is available online and in the catalog. The Academic Freedom policy is clearly stated. The College Catalog lists codes of conduct which outline for students standards of behavior essential to the institution’s mission and campus life, including the prevention of academic dishonesty. The College subscribes to Turnitin.com, and measures are in place to verify the identity of distance education students. The College does not seek to instill specific beliefs (II.A.7.c).

The College does not offer curricula in foreign locations to students other than U.S. nationals (II.A.8.c).

Conclusions:

The College effectively monitors instructional quality through its Academic Senate, Curriculum Committee, Program Review Committee, and Educational Programs Committee. The Office of Research, Planning and Effectiveness provides detailed, disaggregated demographic analysis for each program, and faculty and administrators ensure each program fits within the College’s overall goals and mission. The program review process is the primary vehicle to review data regarding the student population and achievement data regardless of modality. Processes to document and ensure progress toward achieving student learning outcomes are well-developed. The development of new programs is discussed at the Educational Programs Committee which extends the dialogue beyond the discipline. The College meets this Standard (II.A.1.a).

The College utilizes face-to face, online, and hybrid modes of instruction facilitate the needs of its students. ACCJC approved expansion of the College’s distance education program (although the College’s distance education website did not reflect this change,) and the report details how this mode of delivery is appropriate to the current and future needs of the students. The College meets this Standard (II.A.1.b).

The College has student learning outcomes in place for all courses, instructional and service support programs, certificates, and degrees. Course-level assessments are in place and data are gathered by faculty through the assessment process while results are documented during program review. Multiple program reviews show examples of reflection on data and improvements.

Program-level assessment dialog occurs and results are used for program improvements. The College is able to demonstrate that it meets the components required for this level of efficiency. The College meets this Standard (II.A.1.c).

The College has course SLOs in place and assesses these to determine student progress toward achieving these outcomes. There is an established relationship between student learning outcomes and competency levels for degrees, certificates, and courses. Program SLOs are regularly assessed through the program review process, and faculty lead in discussions on effectiveness. The College can demonstrate effectiveness of learning at each level (course, certificate, and degree). The College meets this Standard (II.A.2.a).

The College relies on faculty expertise who develop program and course-level outcomes measured through the program review process, and advisory committees are able to provide input when appropriate. All outcomes are categorized into one of six college-determined competencies. Reflection on progress toward achieving outcomes is evident through a sampling of program review reports. The College meets this Standard (II.A.2.b).

The Board of Trustees relies primarily on the faculty to develop processes related to curriculum and program review. Program and curriculum review serve to assure faculty and administration provide the highest quality educational programs for students, and the review and approval processes is used to ensure programs are of an appropriate breadth depth and rigor, course sequencing, time to completion,. Assessment practices are in place for certificates and degrees to ensure students can demonstrate synthesis of learning at the completion of their programs. The College meets this Standard (II.A.2.c).

The College offers a variety of courses and teaching methodologies to meet the identified needs of its students including Distance Education, noncredit and contract education, the Honors Program, Study Abroad, and learning communities. The College meets this Standard (II.A.2.d).

The College has well-developed program review and curriculum review processes with clear timelines adhered to across the College. Through their integrated processes, the College has engaged in an ongoing systematic review of its programs' and courses' relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency, and future needs and plans. The College meets this Standard (II.A.2.e)

The College engages in ongoing, systematic evaluation and integrated planning to assure currency and measure achievement of student learning outcomes. Ongoing dialogue on assessment data is evident through program reviews and minutes from shared governance committees. At the institutional level, the annual Strategic Plan Progress Report documents achievements made for the objectives in the corresponding Annual Implementation Plan. Program Review results are clearly documented and made available. The College has developed certificate and degree-level outcomes, but may still need clearer processes on how to measure and use data related to institutional learning outcomes achievement. The College meets this Standard (II.A.2.f).

The College uses standard practices to ensure examinations have minimized biases. The College meets this Standard (II.A.2.g).

The College awards credit in a manner that is consistent with its policies, which reflect generally accepted norms or equivalences in higher education. The College meets this Standard (II.A.2.h)

The College awards degrees and certificates based on student achievement of a program's stated learning outcomes. The College meets this Standard (II.A.2.i)

The College's philosophy for general education is included in the catalog and in board policy and administrative procedure. The College meets this Standard (II.A.3).

The College's general education offerings encompass the humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences and offer students opportunity to demonstrate an understanding of the basic content and methodologies of these areas. The College meets this Standard (II.A.3.a).

The general education patterns include specific requirements which provide the appropriate skills, for students to become life-long learners. College-level courses all have student learning outcomes that address critical thinking skills. The College meets this Standard (II.A.3.b).

Faculty in each discipline decide which core competencies to focus on, and the Curriculum Committee ensure that major competencies are not overlooked. Ethics and effective citizenship is reflected in the College's global consciousness core competency. The College meets this Standard (III.A.3.c).

All of the College's degree programs include at least one area of focused study or interdisciplinary core. The College meets this Standard (II.A.4).

As evidenced in career-technical advisory minutes, the College uses academic assessment tools, practical exams, and feedback gained from employers to assess and document student competence in its vocational and occupational programs. The College meets this Standard (II.A.5).

The College provides clear and accurate information on its courses, programs, and applicable credit-transfer policies. The College meets this Standard (II.A.6).

Student mobility is facilitated through appropriate articulation agreements. The College meets this Standard (II.A.6.a)

Discontinuance is only considered after a program has gone through an intervention to improve its status. Board policies and administrative procedures outline processes for program modification. The College meets this Standard (II.A.6.b).

The College has an electronic depository for all syllabi offered during any given session. Instructional deans verify that all syllabi list the course's learning outcomes. The College

represents itself clearly, accurately, and consistently through electronic and print media; and reviews its publication policies and practices and assesses its publications to ensure their integrity. The College meets this Standard (II.A.6.c).

The Academic Senate's "Faculty Code of Ethical Conduct" describes expected standards of behavior towards students that promote the classroom as a free and open exchange of ideas while teaching. The College meets this Standard (II.A.7.a)

The College establishes and publishes clear expectations concerning student academic honesty and the consequences for dishonesty. The College meets this Standard (II.A.7.b).

The College Catalog lists codes of conduct which outline for students standards of behavior essential to the institution's mission and campus life, including the prevention of academic dishonesty. The College meets this Standard (II.A.7.b).

The College gives clear prior notice of policies that require conformity to specific codes of conduct of staff, faculty, administrators, or students that seek to instill specific beliefs or world views in policies, catalog and appropriate faculty handbooks. The College meets this Standard (II.A.7).

Standard II.A.8 does not apply.

The team concludes that the College meets Standard II.A.

Recommendations to meet the Standard:

None.

STANDARD II

Student Learning Programs and Services

B. Student Support Services

General Observations:

Citrus College Student Services demonstrates its commitment to a high level of quality that enhances student learning and achievement. In an effort to support the learning needs of its students, the College offers a wide range of services that are available to students in person and on the College's website through an online orientation in three different formats including English, Spanish, and versions accessible for students with disabilities. In addition to the traditional services provided by Admissions and Records, Counseling, Financial Aid and Assessment, the College has secured resources to fund specialized services to Veterans (Wal-Mart Grant), a Title V HSI RACE to STEM grant, a Center for Teacher Excellence (a cooperative HSI grant with University of La Verne), and a (STEM)²: Strengthening Transfer Education and Matriculation (a multifaceted co-operative project between California State University, Fullerton and three of its feeder community colleges, Citrus College, Cypress College, and Santiago Canyon College).

Findings and Evidence:

Citrus College is committed to meeting the challenges of serving students while holding to the traditional values of access, opportunity, and quality education. Student services, through the entire student pathway, support students and help the College realize its mission. The College regularly analyzes data in order to understand its students and to provide appropriate student services. The College offers a wide variety of appropriate support services including employing several counselors fluent in other languages, an online orientation that has an embedded pre-and post-survey assessing students' confidence related to their ability to use the information covered by the orientation, and a College 101 workshop supported by the Basic Skills Initiative.

The College uses data from student learning outcomes, as evidenced in their annual Student Services Program Review and Planning Retreats, and their program reviews to make decisions that will enhance the learning environment and the support services it provides and ensure that all students benefit from its programs.

The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) has been conducted every other year since 2008, with the last one being conducted in 2014. Although the findings are reported out to the Board and the Academic Senate, it does not appear that the key findings are integrated during the program review process, even though it is a prompt under assessment of outcomes in the program review template (II.B.1).

The College provides a clear, accurate, well-organized, and easily understood catalog for its constituencies. The catalog is reviewed annually to ensure that the information is accurate and that the print and online versions are current. The Citrus College catalog is available in print form in the bookstore and is posted on the Citrus College website. Copies of the catalog are also

available in the library and in all counseling offices. Required information regarding student's rights and responsibilities, student code of conduct, and the Academic Freedom policy is readily accessible through the printed catalog and on the College website. As previously noted, it is difficult to locate the complaint and grievance process in the catalog and on the website; additionally, new federal legislation regarding sexual violence and harassment (i.e. Violence Against Women Act – VAWA) is not available to students or the public (ER21, II.B.2, II.B.2a, II.B.2.b, II.B.2.c, II.B.2.d).

The team finds evidence that Citrus College Student Services is fully committed to serving and meeting the needs of the student population it serves. While the College actively supports all students through its array of student support services, the team suggests that the College should leverage the success experienced with special programs such as Race to STEM and (STEM)² and scale these efforts in order to replicate success rates with an increased number of eligible students of other underrepresented student populations (II.B.3).

Since the last self-evaluation report in 2009, the College has completed a new Student Services Building that houses key student support programs in one location. With online application, online waitlists, ordering transcripts online, social media contacts and online counseling, the College has made a concerted effort to extend its services to all students regardless of location or mode of delivery (II.B.3.a).

The Associated Students of Citrus College (ASCC) promotes intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development and offers students the opportunity to participate in activities that foster personal and civic responsibility. Leadership development is a key component of the ASCC program that includes a required leadership class, workshops, conferences, and seminars. ASCC's diverse cultural and social clubs provide the opportunity for students to develop leadership skills and learn about teamwork. There are study abroad programs, as well as fine and performing arts programs that encourage students to develop an appreciation for intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development (II.B.3.b).

The College designs and maintains services and prepares key personnel in order to support student development. In this regard, the College provides comprehensive counseling/academic advising services through the Counseling and Advisement Center, grant-funded initiatives, and categorical programs and services, such as CalWORKS, EOPS, DSPS, Veterans and STEM, among others. Counseling services are provided to students in person or online. Online services include orientation workshops, probation workshops, and online counseling. The entire counseling services team meets on a monthly basis, and training is a high priority in the division. They participate in professional development activities such as CSU and UC conferences to stay current with transfer requirements. Each counseling program prepares annual program reviews in the spring and participates with the student services annual meeting in the fall where the departments discuss goals and findings (II.B.3.c).

Citrus College's appreciation for diversity is evident as it sought and secured two Title V grants to support their HSI designation. The Center for Teacher Excellence established in 2011 is funded by an HSI Cooperative Grant, partnering Citrus College and the University of La Verne. In 2011, Citrus College applied for and received a solo Title V HSI grant to implement three

components in the RACE to STEM: Get Ready! Additionally, they partnered with California State University, Fullerton, a four-year comprehensive university and an Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) in Orange County, and three of its feeder community colleges, Citrus College, Cypress College and Santiago Canyon College (also HSI's) to receive a Title III cooperative grant to increase the number of Hispanic/Latino and low-income students attaining STEM baccalaureates. In addition, the Associated Students of Citrus College (ASCC) promotes diversity awareness and appreciation through the many clubs of campus. A few of these clubs that promote awareness and celebration of diversity are: Gay-Straight Alliance, HOPE (creates a safe place for undocumented students), Latinos Unidos Student Association Friendship Club, Native American Student Association, Latina Leadership Network and the Veterans Club. Student Life and Leadership sponsors events such as Hispanic Heritage Month, Dia de los Muertos, St. Patrick's Day music and dancers, lectures on homophobia and racism, and Fifty Shades of Gay (II.B.3.d).

Citrus College evaluates its assessment/placement instruments on a regular basis in compliance with the California Community College Chancellor's Office guidelines. The College conducted a disproportionate impact study at the time it adopted Accuplacer. The last study to validate cut scores was completed in 2012 (II.B.3.e).

Citrus College maintains student records permanently, securely, and confidentially with appropriate and secure backup of files. The College's governing board policies (BP 3310) outline the retention and security of student records as mandated by federal regulations and Title V of the California Code of Regulations. The College stores permanent record cards from prior to spring 2004 in a secure facility. All electronic student records are backed up on the College's protected network server each night. Records are also secured offsite on a weekly basis. Students must provide written authorization to release the information before student information is given to a third party. Staff and faculty are informed about and follow the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act; are issued a personal identification number through Banner; and must sign a statement of agreement to adhere to confidential policies (II.B.3.f).

Student Services participates in the five-year program review cycle, created in 2012-13, the "Comprehensive Program Review Cycle." Student Services programs participate in annual program reviews with a comprehensive review being done according to the Comprehensive Program Review Cycle. The Self-Evaluation Report cites two examples, Admissions and Records and School Relations and gives one example of an SLO for each. After review of additionally requested evidence, it is apparent that Student Services uses the results of their program reviews, SLO assessment, and results of the evaluations for the basis of improvement (II.B.4).

Conclusions:

The College offers a variety of quality student support services that enhance student learning and achievement. A wide range of services are available to students in person and online. Core services fulfill the College's mission and values by providing services that enhance student learning. The College uses data from student learning outcomes and program review (as evidenced in their annual Student Services Program Review and Planning Retreat documents) to

make decisions that will enhance the learning environment and the support services it provides. The team suggests that the College integrate the results, assessment, and evaluation from the CCSSE report and have them more closely aligned with the program review process, besides just being a prompt. The College meets this Standard (II.B.1).

The College produces a precise and accurate annual catalog that contains all of the general information including the official name, address(es), telephone number(s), and the website address of the institution; educational mission, courses, programs, and degree offerings; academic calendar and program length; academic freedom statement; available student financial aid; available learning resources; names and degrees of administrators and faculty; and names of governing board members. It also fully describes all student requirements for admission, including residency, acceptance of transfer credits, matriculation, and fees. The College meets this Standard (II.B.2.a).

The College provides recent, precise, and accurate information about requirements students must satisfy in order to qualify for a degree, certificate, graduation, and transfer. Updates to the catalog are coordinated by the Office of External Relations, and the production schedule is designed to accommodate the need to review the catalog for clarity, accuracy, and ease of use. The review takes place in several phases and all departments receive a draft to update during the year, and during the spring, they are invited to review a proof before the catalog goes to print. The Citrus College Curriculum Committee discusses and approves all curriculum changes which are then approved by the Board of Trustees prior to appearing in the catalog. The College meets this Standard (II.B.2.b).

The College catalog also contains information regarding academic regulations, including academic honesty, academic probation, dismissal and reinstatement, the discipline process, and nondiscrimination. There is also information regarding conditions for refund of enrollment fees, student rights and responsibilities and a “Student Right to Know” section that gives information regarding the College’s completion and transfer rate. Grievance and complaint procedures, along with sexual violence and sexual harassment prevention information are difficult to locate and are not located within the defined student section of the College website. New mandated federal legislation language regarding sexual violence and harassment (i.e. Violence Against Women Act-VAWA), is not easily accessible to students or the public. The College does not meet this Standard (II.B.2.c).

The College Catalog serves as one of the primary resources used by students to obtain information about the College and all applicable programs, services and policies. Current and future students can obtain additional and updated information about the College, its services, and all relevant policies and procedures by accessing the College’s website using the link printed on the back cover of the College Catalog. The College meets this Standard (II.B.2.d).

In an effort to support the learning needs of its students, the College provides key support services in one location, the Student Services Building, completed in 2011. The College uses a variety of measures to determine the needs of students including the application and admissions process, assessment, orientation, counseling, the development of a student educational plan, and

surveys developed and administered by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness, such as the CCSSE. The College meets this Standard (II.B.3).

The College supports an online orientation, is developing an online workshop to assist students in the development of an educational plan, and students who are on academic probation are able to complete a workshop online. Students are able to access other technology tools including an online appointment scheduler to update educational plans and online counseling. The College meets this Standard (II.B.3.a).

The Associated Students of Citrus College (ASCC) offers various campus cultural, social, and educational activities in order to promote intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development for all its students. ASCC's diverse cultural and social clubs provide the opportunity for students to develop leadership skills and learn about teamwork. The College meets this Standard (II.B.3.b).

The College provides comprehensive counseling/academic advising services through the Counseling and Advisement Center. Specialized counseling and advising services are also offered in CalWORKs, EOPS, DSPS, and grant-funded initiatives, such as the Center for Teacher Excellence. Counseling services are provided to students in person or online in order to assist all students, including those enrolled in distance education. Orientation is also offered in person or online. The counseling services team meets on a monthly basis, attends UC and CSU workshops and conferences to stay current, and training is provided for special program staff for training as well. The College meets this Standard (II.B.3.c).

The Associated Students of Citrus College demonstrates appreciation for the diversity around them by celebrating and supporting events and clubs that represent diversity. Dia de los Muertos, St. Patrick's Day, and Hispanic Heritage Month are some examples of celebrations hosted on campus by ASCC. The Gay-Straight Alliance, Latinos Unidos Student Association Friendship Club, Native American Student Association, and HOPE (a safe place for undocumented students) are just a few of the student groups available on campus. The College meets this Standard (II.B.3.d).

Citrus College uses CCC-Apply for its application process. The College evaluates its assessment/placement instruments on a regular basis in compliance with the California Community College Chancellor's Office guidelines. The College conducted a disproportionate impact study at the time it adopted Accuplacer. The last study to validate the cut scores was completed in 2012. The College meets this Standard (II.B.3.e).

Board Policy/Administrative Procedure 3310 Records Retention and Destruction outline the retention and security of student records as mandated by federal regulations and Title V of the California Code of Regulations. The College backs-up all electronic student records on the College's protected server each night. Records are also secured offsite on a weekly basis. The College meets this Standard (II.B.3.f).

Citrus College administers surveys designed to identify adequacy in meeting identified student needs. The College participates with CCSSE every two years and has completed four cycles now (the last one being 2014), which affords the College the opportunity to monitor student

usage, satisfaction, and perceived importance of student services over time (note key findings from CCSSE 2014, pgs. 163-4). The CCSSE also allowed Citrus College to compare itself to other like-sized schools to identify areas for improvement. The team suggests that the College integrate the results, assessment, and evaluation from the CCSSE report and align those results more closely with the program review process, besides just being a prompt. After discussions and additional evidence provided (hard copies of 5 years of program reviews), it is clear that Student Services has evaluated and assured that the student needs are being met. Their ongoing annual planning retreats are a strong indicator of the focus regarding the utilization of the results of evaluation from program reviews for the basis of improvement. The program review process has become part of the culture within student services and the ongoing assessment and dialogue is evident in their process. The College meets this Standard (II.B.4).

The team concludes that the College does not meet Standard II.B.2.C.

Recommendations to meet the Standard:

See Recommendation #1

Commendations:

Commendation #2:

The team commends the faculty, staff and administrators of the Student Services area for the thoroughness of their program review process. The area's annual retreat and subsequent report is an effective way of assessing and ensuring continued quality improvement.

STANDARD II

Student Learning Programs and Services

C. Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations:

Overall the general observation is one of differing levels of completeness within Standard II.C. Traditional library statistics gathering and organizational processes appear to be well developed and utilized with several being very well done. The self-evaluation failed to fully document and provide evidence of many aspects of the Standard; however, the team did determine during interviews and document requests that an additional significant amount of quality services and procedures existed and were worthy of note. The self-evaluation report provided evidence of the quality of its library and learning support services and showed there are ample systems and resources available to support student and faculty research.

Findings and Evidence:

Citrus College has created a well-rounded approach to providing Library and Learning Support Services. The library has an atmosphere conducive to research with individual study carrels, quiet study rooms, and a variety of other student services. It is readily apparent that the library staff and faculty truly have a student-centered focus and strive to ensure the very best for their college community.

There is significant evidence that the librarians at Citrus College have developed an abundant system of collection development based on gathering a range of information and input in order to ensure the quality and depth of the collection. Interviews confirmed communication and feedback with faculty in regard to student learning needs is also obtained through the curriculum committee and division meetings. Both full-time and adjunct librarians serve as library liaisons to academic programs based on expertise in the subject area. This expertise, in conjunction with faculty input, serves as a basis for collection development. The curriculum committee representative has an opportunity to make recommendations in regards to library and learning resources for courses, degrees, and certificates that also includes distance education courses (II.C.1.a, II.C.2).

The self-evaluation provides appropriate evidence that comparable services for traditional and distance education students are provided by electronic resources available regardless of location. These resources take the form of eBooks, streaming video, and electronic research databases. The self-evaluation identifies student learning outcomes as an additional evaluation tool to assess resources and the extent in which they are meeting learning needs. The team however, found no evidence in the Self Evaluation Report that student learning outcomes (SLOs) have been developed to a level of proficiency that addresses the learning needs of students within the library program. During the interview process, further evidence was provided in an updated Program Review 2015 that did show improvement in this area. The Self Evaluation Report identifies library instruction sessions as a method of teaching students how to evaluate and incorporate information sources into their research. However, the team found that feedback on the effectiveness of this instruction in meeting identified student learning outcomes is determined

by a single survey response, and there is no further analysis. Reference staff provide guidance to students regarding needed information during the reference interview process. An excellent example of providing reference services to both traditional and online students is the verified addition of virtual reference services. These virtual reference services consist of chat, text messaging, and a social media presence (II.C.1.a, II.C.1.b).

Learning support beyond library services is provided by the Learning Center delivering tutoring services and additional writing support in the Writing Café. The self-evaluation failed to fully articulate the current status of the quantity, currency, depth, and variety of learning support services being offered at Citrus College. However, the team did determine during interviews and document requests that a significant effort to provide a wide range of learning support services beyond what was documented does exist and is noteworthy. Based on interviews, it is apparent faculty and staff expertise is utilized in the selection of learning center software and hardware by interaction between the various committees and the learning center staff who attend them (II.C.1.a).

There is a meaningful effort by the staff at the Hayden Memorial Library to provide comparable resources to both traditional and distance education students. A verified example of this is that everyone has access to online databases, research guides and there is a dedicated distance education website. Reference services are available virtually as well as library instruction sessions online via CCC Confer. Online tutoring is available in the (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) Center and for math, biology, and English in the Learning Center (II.C.1.a).

The self-evaluation provides evidence of developing information competency in students by providing ongoing instruction, including in SLOs, and at the reference desk. Ongoing instruction and interaction at the reference desk was verified as a method of developing information competency. As mentioned previously, there was no evidence that the SLO process contributed to the advancement of student information competency at the time of the Self Evaluation Report writing, but evidence and interviews at the time of the evaluation visit provided necessary evidence. The library has developed a significant number of research guides that support the curriculum and are also used as tools to develop information competency skills, with over ninety research guides having been developed. The quality and breadth of these research guides is commendable. The reference interview at the reference desk or via online reference also is utilized as an opportunity to improve students' information competency skills (II.C.1.b).

In order to accommodate distance education students with information competency instruction, librarians use lecture capture to record library instruction that is then shared online. CCC Confer and lecture capture in the Center for Innovation are both mentioned in the self-evaluation. The library staff notes that CCC Confer is the preferred method utilized by the library and there are other lecture capture systems being evaluated for possible use. Previously mentioned research guides and virtual reference services also are utilized to further information competency (II.C.1.b).

The library has also documented a wide variety of resources that are available electronically 24/7. Additionally as previously-mentioned, the library provides live reference assistance

offered online during open hours. In order to facilitate students with disabilities the library has installed a videophone, assistive technology workstations, and a wheelchair accessible online catalog and copy machine. (II.C.1.c).

The self-evaluation report provides evidence that Citrus College Library has established a security and maintenance system based upon several electronic and personnel based procedures. The library utilizes a security gate and sensitized materials for their collection security and requires a valid Citrus College photo identification card in order to check something out. The library has a door alarm system and digital video surveillance. Secure computer and software programs utilize passwords and secure logins for all campus and distance education students. The Testing Center also requires a valid Citrus College photo identification (II.C.1.d).

Library staff at Citrus College purchases their online resources at reduced prices through the Community College Library Consortium. Evaluation of these resources is determined by usage statistics, and the annual Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) report. Library staff also note the transition to a new integrated library system (ILS) that allows library staff to manage, circulate, locate resources, and report statistical data. The report further details a range of technology involving security gates, online placement instruments, Blackboard, MyMathLab, and others that are evaluated and consulted on within the committee structure at Citrus College as well as with library listservs and the Council of Chief Librarians (II.C.1.e).

The Institutional Self Evaluation report indicates Citrus College evaluates the library and other support services through annual program review and analysis of student learning outcomes. Evidence shows the library program review is based on statistics and surveys. Usage of traditional and online materials as well as student visits appear to be the primary system of evaluation. The team found that there was evidence that the evaluation of library services contributed to the achievement of student learning outcomes (II.C.2).

Conclusions:

Citrus College library has some exemplary systems that have been developed by the library staff. Online virtual reference services are developed and information competency instruction is readily available to both traditional and distance education students regardless of location. Feedback and dialog with faculty in regards to student learning needs is prevalent. The College meets this Standard (II.C.1.a).

Information competency is developed in students by providing workshops and at the reference desk. Student Learning Outcomes are also designed to address information competency concepts. The library has developed a significant amount of research guides (LibGuides) for individual subjects and tutorials on how to use various services that support the curriculum and are also used as tools to develop information competency skills. The reference interview at the reference desk or via online reference also is utilized as an opportunity to improve students' information competency skills. In order to accommodate distance education students with information competency instruction, librarians use lecture capture to record library instruction that is then shared online. The College meets this Standard (II.C.1.b).

The library also documented a wide variety of resources that are available electronically 24/7 regardless of a student's location. To address the service need of students with disabilities the library has installed a videophone, assistive technology workstations, and a wheelchair accessible online catalog and copy machine. The College meets this Standard (II.C.1.c).

Citrus College Library has established a security and maintenance system based upon several electronic and personnel based procedures. The library has a door alarm system and digital video surveillance. Secure computer and software programs utilize passwords and secure logins for all campus and distance education students. The College meets this Standard (II.C.1.d).

Library staff at Citrus College purchase their online resources at reduced prices through the Community College Library Consortium. Citrus College Library utilizes a wide range of technology and other resources from a variety of sources. The College documents the agreements with these sources. The College meets this Standard (II.C.1.e).

Citrus College evaluates the library and other support services through annual program review and analysis of student learning outcomes. Evidence shows the library program review is based on statistics and surveys. The team found that there was evidence that the evaluation of library services contributed to the achievement of student learning outcomes. The College meets this Standard (II.C.2).

The team concludes that the College meets Standard II.C.

Commendations:

Commendation #3:

The team commends the Citrus College Library Staff for the extensive and well-developed collection of LibGuides designed to support the curriculum, showcase services, and provide information competency instruction to the college community regardless of location.

STANDARD III Resources

A. Human Resources

General Observations:

Third party comments were received and thoroughly reviewed and evaluated relative to Standard III.A. The Human Resources section of the institutional self-evaluation reviews a variety of College procedures and policies. Recommendations from the previous comprehensive evaluation were addressed. All policies regarding recruitment and hiring were updated according to established timelines. All policies and procedures regarding evaluation of personnel were also reviewed and updated. The effective use of student learning outcomes is included in evaluations of faculty. The College employs qualified faculty, staff, managers, and administrators. The College meets the requirements of the 50% law and the Faculty Obligation Number (FON). The FON is considered in hiring decision prioritization through the work of the Faculty Needs Identification Committee (FNIC). The College has policies and procedures in place, which are legally sound for identifying the need to hire qualified full-time and adjunct faculty, administrators, managers, and supervisors. The faculty is significantly involved in the selection of new faculty.

Findings and Evidence:

Citrus College hires faculty, staff, and administrators using established criteria and procedures. The College establishes hiring procedures through board policy aligned with state Educational Code. The recruitment and selection process for selecting candidates for positions is effectively communicated to all involved in the hiring processes. Policies have been developed to evaluate the effectiveness of personnel. Goals and objectives are developed for the next review period. The chair of every faculty hiring committee is a faculty member who is also present during the final selection interviews. The Faculty Needs Identification Committee (FNIC) is regarded by the Senate, the academic deans, and the VP of Academic Affairs as a collegial and data-driven task force to rank full-time faculty needs. Program reviews must include documentation demonstrating the need for a new faculty member for a position to be considered by FNIC. The Fact Book documents the achievement of the College with regard to the FON. Citrus College follows AP 7201, Section 3 to ensure that quality instructors are hired who are experts in the subject matter for which they are hired. AP 7202 gives clear guidelines for the selection of qualified adjunct instructors.

Since the last site visit in 2009, Citrus College has developed and implemented a comprehensive plan for the recruitment and selection of academic administrators, managers, and supervisors. AP 7401 delineates this procedure which is established in Board Policy 7501. Requests to fill these positions are reviewed by the Cabinet after prioritization from the department and division level. Each position request must have been included in program review as a priority.

The classified staff hiring process also has been fully reviewed since the last site visit. Classified job descriptions and classified search and selection have also been reviewed and written into

Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 7301. Requests to create a new job classification or fill an additional position within an existing classification must be tied to program review and linked to the College mission. Requests are reviewed by the Superintendent/President's Cabinet (III.A.1.a).

Citrus College Board policies and Administrative procedures provide for systematic evaluation of its faculty, staff, and administrators. Operating within the guidelines of collective bargaining and board policy, the Human Resources Department leads the evaluations processes. Administrative procedures (AP 7203, 7204, 7402, 2502, 7510) clearly define the evaluation process and timeline for each employee group. In addition, Article 6 of the California School Employee Association (CSEA) employment agreement, chapter 101, describes the evaluation process for classified staff. All classified staff should be evaluated in either January or July, depending on date of hire. As a result of questions from a few classified staff members about their evaluation cycle, an internal audit of classified staff evaluations, was initiated by the Director of Human Resources to validate contract compliance.

The 2015 audit determined the percentage of classified evaluations not completed in both January and July of 2015 was not at an acceptable level. In addition, the percentage of non-completion of classified evaluations in July and January of 2010 and 2011 was not at an acceptable level. During the evaluation cycles from 2012 through 2014, the percentage of non-completion for classified evaluations was under ten percent. As a result of this internal audit, the Human Resource Director developed an Internal Operating Procedure for Employee Evaluations to ensure all evaluations will be done as outlined in the administrative procedures and collective bargaining agreements for each employee group. Faculty contracts for full-time and adjunct faculty further define and describe faculty evaluations. There is a provision for faculty teaching distance education classes (III.A.1.b).

In 2011, Citrus College and the Faculty Association reached an agreement to revise the evaluation process of full-time faculty. The new evaluation process added clarity and understanding of the peer evaluation process. In addition, all full-time faculty are required to assess student learning outcomes as part of the faculty member's self-evaluation component of the required evaluation portfolio. In spring 2015, the Adjunct Faculty Federation approved a new collective bargaining agreement. Under this agreement, all adjunct faculty, as part of the evaluation process and their professional growth report, are required to include a narrative describing "How you have incorporated and assessed district-approved learning outcomes in your courses or interaction with students" (III.A.1.b, c).

Citrus College upholds written codes of professional ethics for all of its personnel, including all categories of employees and the Board of Trustees. These codes of professional ethics are described in BP/AP 2715 (Board of Trustees), BP 3050 (Non-faculty Employees), and the faculty code of ethics was developed and approved by the Academic Senate and is in the Citrus College Academic Senate Faculty Code of Ethical Conduct. The Code of Ethics is provided during the orientation of each new employee. In addition, the Director of Human Resources uses the code of professional ethics in trainings for the employee groups. The code for professional ethics is posted on the College website (III.A.1.d).

Citrus College has met or exceeded its full-time faculty obligation number each year since 2004. All faculty meet or exceed the minimum qualifications established for the discipline they teach. As of the 2014-15 academic year, regular and contract faculty are 21.9 percent Hispanic. The Citrus College service area is highly diverse including 41 percent Hispanic, 42 percent White, 10 percent Asian, and 4 percent African American. Classified positions are being added as the College enrollment grows. Requests for classified positions begin with program reviews and are prioritized at the department and division level before going to the Superintendent/President's Cabinet. The College has a commitment to provide available financial resources to support the filling of classified and administrative management positions (III.A.2).

Board policies for human resources and administrative procedures are routinely reviewed and updated at least every three years. The Human Resources Advisory/Staff Diversity Committee reviews and approves any proposed changes before the revised policies are sent out to all of the constituent groups for review or approval if related to bargaining or participatory governance (III.A.3.a).

The Human Resources office includes a filing system that houses all active personnel files. This system is locked using an electronic code. All non-active personnel files are kept in locked file cabinets in a fenced and locked area. The District acts in accordance with legal standards as they relate to student employees. In certain situations, students may be considered college employees with legitimate educational interests, such as when they are performing an official task on behalf of the educational agency or institution (Department of Education's Family Policy Compliance Office (FPCO) decision #18, Letter re: Enforcement of students' rights Middlesex Community College, November 30, 2000). In addition, all student employees sign confidentiality agreements upon hire. Employees are provided easy access to their own personnel file (III.A.3.b).

Over the last several years, Citrus College increased the number of employees hired from traditionally underrepresented groups. All selection committees include an equal employment representative. The Office of Human Resources and the Staff Diversity Committee regularly review diversity data from selection committees to ensure that discriminatory barriers do not exist. Exploration is ongoing for ways in which Citrus College may further its number of faculty and staff from underrepresented groups (III.A.4.a, b).

The collective bargaining agreements provide a working conditions framework that ensures that administration, faculty, staff, and students are treated fairly and with respect. As stated in the self-evaluation and also in an interview with the Director of Human Resources, "The Human Resource office strives to maintain an environment in which employees feel comfortable in addressing their needs through direct discussion with their supervisors." Further discussion with the Director of Human Resources confirmed a commitment to treating every employee complaint seriously and following established Board and Administrative Policies.

An All-Employee survey was conducted spring 2014. The response rate was 43 percent. Of the respondents, 46.6 percent were classified employees, 35.3 percent were faculty, and 6.3 percent were management. Eighty-nine percent of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the College demonstrates a commitment to its mission, vision, and values. Eighty-six percent of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they were satisfied with their current assignment.

Eighty percent strongly agreed or agreed that they were comfortable discussing concerns with their direct supervisor. Seventy-eight percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that Citrus College provides a positive work environment for employees (All-Employee Campus Survey Spring 2014) (III.A.4.c).

The Citrus College Staff Development Advisory Committee, which includes representatives from all employee groups, coordinates staff development opportunities and determines the budget. The Faculty Learning Institute meets monthly to plan staff development to support student learning in coordination with the Strategic Plan. Flex Day planning is a subcommittee that plans workshops for classified employees as well as faculty. Other opportunities come from the Basic Skills Initiative to develop strategies for faculty to help underprepared students. The Center for Teacher Excellence offers additional opportunities for faculty to learn new pedagogy and the latest uses of technology in the classroom. The Classified Staff Committee plans workshops for classified staff. The College also provides an annual classified enrichment program to all interested classified employees (III.A.5.a).

Citrus College collects evaluation data from participants upon completion of professional development programs and activities. Professional development committees review all evaluations and surveys and consider them in future planning for staff development. Feedback on professional development activities has been positive. The evidence suggests that Citrus College has well-attended and defined opportunities for professional development (III.A.5.b).

The planning for new full-time faculty positions is directly linked to recommendations from the Faculty Needs Identification Committee. This committee has participation from faculty and administrators and identifies and plans for additional full-time faculty. All positions to be considered must also be a recommendation in the current year program review. The staffing of classified employees starts with program reviews and managers. If additional classified staff positions are needed, the request for a new position is forwarded to the Superintendent/President's Cabinet for approval (II.A.6).

Conclusions:

The team determined through evidence review that Citrus College updated recruitment and hiring board policies including the revisions of the equal opportunity and diversity clauses in the hiring documents. Citrus College also revised and formalized job descriptions since the last site visit. These policies and procedures demonstrate commitment to ensure alignment with the philosophy, mission, and values of the College. Board and administrative policies as well as collective bargaining agreements outline schedules for regular evaluations utilizing established processes and instruments. The board policy and administrative procedure concerning the evaluation of full-time faculty specifically requires a faculty member to assess student learning outcomes as part of the faculty member's self-evaluation component of the required evaluation portfolio. Evidence shows that these revised board policies and administrative procedures were reviewed by constituent leaders and approved by a steering committee and received board approval. The College meets this Standard (III.A.1, III.A.2, III.A.3).

Citrus College has increased the number of employees hired from traditionally underrepresented groups and is committed to continuing that trend. Search and selection processes are designed to encourage a broad representation of applicants. The Office of Human Resources and the Staff Diversity Committee review diversity data from selection committees to explore ways in which Citrus College can increase its number of faculty and staff from underrepresented groups. The College meets this standard (III.A.4).

The Citrus College Staff Development Advisory Committee, with representatives from all employee groups, coordinates staff development opportunities. All employee groups have opportunities to participate in a variety of workshops and other opportunities for staff development. The College meets this standard (III.A.5).

The Faculty Needs Identification Committee, composed of Academic Senate faculty and administrators, identifies and plans for additional full-time faculty using program review requests. Classified employee staffing also flows from program reviews leading to recommendations by managers and supervisors. The Superintendent/President's Cabinet reviews all requests for classified staff and managers. The College has developed systematic planning processes for the integration of human resources requests into annual planning. The College meets this standard (III.A.6).

The team concludes that the College meets Standard III.A.

Recommendations to Meet the Standard:

None.

STANDARD III Resources

B. Physical Resources

General Observations:

The response to Standard III.B in the Citrus College Institutional Self-Evaluation addresses relevant topics and sub-points. The summary offers the context and the process for planning and the start of the execution of the College's Educational and Facilities Master Plan (EFMP) which was combined in 2011 reflecting and revising the previously separate Facilities Master Plan and Educational Master Plan, both developed in 2001. The Board of Trustees approved the updated all-inclusive EFMP in June 2011. With the initial development of the Educational Master Plan of 2001 and the Facilities Master Plan of 2001, it became evident that Citrus College would require additional resources in the form of a general obligation bond to complete identified projects that would support growth and educational programs proposed by the institution.

In response to this need, the Board of Trustees approved a local general obligation bond to be placed on the ballot in March 2004. Bond Measure G, which voters passed pursuant with Proposition 39 guidelines, provided Citrus College with \$121 Million for modernization and new construction. Upon the passage of Bond Measure G, a committee of college administrators, supervisors, faculty, classified staff, and students developed the Implementation Plan directly derived from the Educational and Facilities Master Plan. Completed in 2004 and updated in 2006 and 2008, the Implementation Plan remains the blueprint that links the building program to the EFMP.

Citrus College constructs and maintains all facilities to ensure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment to support learning and services, regardless of modality, while meeting instructional and institutional goals.

A Technology Plan is written as a five-year plan with annual updates addressing changing technology needs. The current Program Review process allows the College to identify needs in resource areas such as technology, facilities, and equipment.

Construction of the new 37,000 sq. ft. Visual Arts complex began in July 2014 with an anticipated completion date of August 2016. The California Department of Finance approved funding for the Hayden Hall modernization project, and Citrus College is working to procure construction drawings by the architectural team. Future projects include the Campus Center modernization and the Educational Development Center modernization.

Citrus College is committed to ensure effective use of resources for continued support of all campus programs, regardless of modality, with the highest level of quality.

Findings and Evidence:

Upon the passage of Bond Measure G, a committee of College administrators, supervisors, faculty, classified staff, and students developed the Implementation Plan directly derived from the Educational and Facilities Master Plan. Completed in 2004 and updated in 2006 and 2008, the Implementation Plan is the blueprint that links the building program to the EFMP.

Citrus College maintains a proactive Physical Resources Committee that has representation from College constituent groups. This committee oversees issues that impact accessibility, safety, and facility-related items.

The College generates room utilization reports through Fusion for review; it includes all buildings, offices, instructional spaces, and non-instructional spaces. The College reports annually to the state through their Scheduled Maintenance Five-Year Plan and the Five-Year Construction Plan.

The campus grounds are well groomed and show an eye to the future during this time of facility renovation and growth. Buildings are accessible, and pathways are easy to maneuver in spite of the current building projects.

All buildings appear well maintained, and identified needs have followed the decision making and planning processes. As an example of evidence, the College has added multiple access points of Wi-Fi in approximately 110 locations and upgraded the College website to the SharePoint platform. In 2013, Citrus College upgraded the campus-wide telephone system to a voice-over-internet-protocol system, which greatly enhances the communications system and provides better management and archiving of voice data (III.B.1.a).

Citrus College constructs and maintains all facilities to ensure access, safety, security, and a healthful learning and working environment to support learning and services, regardless of modality, while meeting instructional and institutional goals. Buildings at Citrus College are constructed in accordance with state and federal laws.

The Physical Resources Committee is part of the governance structure of Citrus College, and it has developed processes to communicate with faculty, staff, and students in the event of emergency situations that may arise on the campus or to escalate attention to emerging hazards such as those identified in the day-to-day work of maintenance and facilities crews. Employee safety guidelines are well established, and new employees are provided with an Employee Safety Guidelines Handbook that illustrates all campus safety protocols.

Citrus College has an established process for improving the facilities, even those in compliance with established industry standards or guidelines. Currently, the College is in the process of retrofitting all exterior parking lot lighting and pedestrian thoroughfare lighting, providing better illumination and a safer atmosphere. The lighting project began as a request to the Physical Resources Committee. This request for updated lighting followed the College's planning process. Parking lot lighting retrofits were completed in summer of 2014, and the remaining

exterior retrofits are scheduled for completion in 2015 and 2016. This process will greatly improve campus safety regarding potential hazards such as trip and fall issues.

As indicated in the Annual Security Report for 2014, constituents across campus concluded that Citrus College is a safe place for education. Overwhelmingly, 90.2 percent of respondents feel safe on campus, and 87.8 percent state that Campus Safety Officers provide answers to their questions regarding safety and security. Having access to safety and security information is critically important to the College. Respondents to the survey indicate that 88.9 percent believe they have adequate access to information about accident prevention. Continually providing safety enhancements across campus reflects the College's commitment to safety and security. Not only does the College have Campus Safety Officers on patrol, but additionally, safety is enhanced by the presence of the Owl Patrol, a student-based workforce that patrols the site for added safety presence.

The Campus Safety Department, in conjunction with the Facilities Department, conducts active fire drills and building evacuation exercises. Through a self-evaluation the College measures effective use, implementation, and response of all parties involved. During these exercises, all of the campus Emergency Information Officers report to central command and evacuate their respective locations. These exercises familiarize staff and faculty with proper emergency preparedness as outlined in the Emergency Operations Plan (III.B.1.b).

The College has engaged in extensive planning and implementing of its construction and bond program and has used state and local bonds as funding mechanisms. Since the passage of Measure G, the College has invested over \$113 Million in college facilities via modernization projects, upgrading infrastructure, and construction of new buildings. Through monthly meetings of the Physical Resources Committee and quarterly meetings of the Measure G Citizens' Oversight Committee, the College provides detailed updates on current facility issues, construction and modernization projects, and upcoming facility issues that impact the College (III.B.2.a).

The College asserts that physical resource planning is fully integrated with institutional planning. The earlier Citrus College Facilities Master Plan Committee, which was convened in 2000 and included representatives of all constituent groups, assisted in the development of the 2001 Facilities Master Plan. The Facilities Master Plan was integrated with the Educational Master Plan and thus became the Educational and Facilities Master Plan of 2011.

The Implementation Plan is the College's yearly plan of action and implementation for educational and facilities master planning. Construction implementation across the campus is organized in a systematic manner that is a direct response to the educational needs of the College, as identified by program review. This implementation of construction projects occurs via collaborative and cooperative relationships with academic affairs, student services, and the facilities and construction department (III.B.2.b).

Conclusions:

Citrus College provides safe and adequate facilities to support the programs and services for students and staff. The campus is well maintained. The College is inclusive and comprehensive in the planning and development of the campus site which will be completely renovated or built new with the aid of local bond measures. The College reviews and uses classroom and lab utilization information in its planning. The College meets this Standard (III.B.1).

Program review is the starting point of the budgeting process for facility needs as part of the overall planning process. This is delineated in the Educational and Facilities Master Plan 2011-2020 approved by the Board of Trustees in June 2011 (III.B.2.a).

The College has addressed the prior visiting team's recommendation and now meets Standard III.B.2.b. Upon review of the evidence, there is in place a cycle that "demonstrates its commitment to continuous quality improvement through update and review of the effectiveness of the College's five major planning documents and being deliberate in using the content with them in budget development." (Standard III.B.2.b)

The team concludes that the College meets Standard III.B.

Commendations:

Commendation #4

The team commends the College and particularly the maintenance and operations staff for the quality of the College landscaping and grounds; they are particularly attractive, well maintained, and sustainable, this particularly in light of the numerous construction projects that would otherwise detract from the beauty of the campus. Clearly, the Grounds staff takes great pride in their work.

Commendation #5

The team commends the College on providing a safe environment campus for students, staff and faculty; the 2014 Citrus College Annual Security Report particularly highlights campus safety.

STANDARD III Resources

C. Technology Resources

General Observations:

The Standard III.C section of the Citrus College Institutional Self Evaluation Report was complete in all of the responses. The responses include descriptive summaries, self-evaluations, and actionable improvement plans where appropriate. Responses to previous visiting team and/or ACCJC recommendations are woven throughout the narrative of Standard III.C. The College has adequately responded to Standard III.C in regards to planning related to technology resources, and the College appears to be at sustainable continuous quality improvement. The role technology plays in student learning outcomes and assessments is evident in the responses related to planning and the response to previous Recommendation #5. It is evident that program review is an integral part of the College's planning and includes essential aspects of planning for technology resources in accordance with the College's Strategic Plan. The Technology Plan that is revised every five years offers evidence that the College relies on its integrated planning and budget development process to determine technology needs. Evidence that technology resource planning is integrated with strategic planning and master planning is offered throughout the SelfEvaluation Report.

Findings and Evidence:

It was difficult to make general observations related to the Standard due to the lack of specific citations in the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report. Though hyperlinks are included throughout the Self-Evaluation Report, and a list of evidence is included at the end of each Standard and in the flash drive provided, the citations are not included in the body of the Self-Evaluation Report. The College did not support the statement as to whether Standards were met with citations of evidence. Additional evidence reviewed and interviews conducted during the site visit did support what was presented in response to Standard (III.C).

Evidence supports the College's commitment to "deliver high quality instruction to students both within and beyond traditional geographic boundaries" in support of the College's Mission Statement. The College integrates technology planning into the overall planning process per the College's Integrated Planning Manual. The response to this Standard indicates that the Technology Plan is updated annually; however, the response to previous team/ACCJC Recommendation #5 states the Technology Plan is updated every five years. During the site visit the team confirmed that the Technology Plan is reviewed and revised annually to make adjustments, as necessary and to meet potentially quick changing technology needs. The Strategic Plan and Educational and Facilities Master Plan are updated every five years in accordance with the response to this Standard.

The College's Technology Master Plan incorporates objectives from the other institutional plans, and a process exists for the College Information Technology Committee (CITC) to conduct a

strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats analysis to ensure new technology opportunities are included in technology planning.

The evidence supports all aspects of College Governance and Operations being represented in technology planning to ensure needs are met including those directly related to teaching and learning as evidenced in the Technology Plan that is integrated with the integrated planning process of the College (III.C.1).

Evidence supports the response to this Standard in a variety of ways that validate commitment to student learning, student services, instructional programs, and administrative support. The College supports over 1000 student computer workstations and 117 computer enhanced classrooms. Blackboard is the College's learning management system and is utilized by the College for all distance education, hybrid, and on-campus classes. Technology supports student services including student assessment, counseling, and admissions and records. A cross-functional team that includes members of student services, academic affairs, and technology and computer services ensures the student services functions are supported by necessary technology.

The governance committee for student learning outcomes (HotShots) began to review options for using technology to manage course and program level student learning outcomes. As a result of that review, the College now uses PerformanceCloud from Weave. The application was launched in spring 2015, and the use of this technology is not yet mature. Results of this new tool, from a technology standpoint, should be evaluated against student learning outcomes and assessment noted in other Standards more directly related to student learning outcomes.

Evidence supports the College uses technology effectively and in accordance with its mission and integrated planning to meet the needs of instruction, student support services and administrative operations. The external evaluation team confirmed that the Technology and Computer Services Department supports student learning in accordance with integrated planning. Further the Technology and Computer Services Department works cooperatively with the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness to support efforts to provide data essential to making decisions related to student learning outcomes and assessment. This was clearly illustrated in the data provided to program review authors to enhance their program reviews.

Specific evidence related to this Standard was difficult to cull from the Self-Evaluation Report; however, additional evidence reviewed and interviews conducted during the site visit supported what is presented in response to this Standard (III.C.1.a).

Evidence supports that the College provides technology training to students, staff, and faculty by way of multiple methods. Students receive training in courses designed to assist them with using Blackboard. The Distance Education Office conducts this training. Students receive specialized technology training that is course-specific to career and technical education programs in nursing, automotive technology, electronics and design, and recording arts. This training is provided as part of the course requirements for these programs. Students also receive training to successfully access various services such as Disabled Students Programs and Services, admissions and records, financial aid, and matriculation. Faculty and staff are offered training through a variety of methods from multiple offices. Faculty and staff are also offered training on "all aspects of

distance education” and office related tools such as Microsoft Office and Banner. During the visit it was confirmed that faculty are encouraged to complete @One online education training and that efforts to require such training as a prerequisite to being assigned to teach online courses are underway; however, currently the College requires no formal training for faculty in order to be assigned to teach distance education courses.

Specific evidence related to this Standard was difficult to cull from the Self-Evaluation Report; however, additional evidence reviewed and interviews conducted during the site visit supported what was presented in response to this Standard (III.C.1.b).

The College’s Technology and Computer Services (TeCS) department manages the technology infrastructure and equipment for the College. Evidence that the College meets the Standard includes an eight-year replacement cycle for all equipment that started with the 2014-2015 academic year. The College controls costs while ensuring planning, acquiring, maintaining, upgrading and replacing technology infrastructure through having applications share server and data storage equipment. The narrative to this Standard offers evidence that the College supports network and infrastructures, backups, security, and desktop environments systematically through its technology plan and administrative procedures such as AP 3721 that was developed by the College Information Technology Committee. AP 3721 makes providing a secure technology infrastructure a priority.

Evidence validates that decisions regarding technology are made as the result of integration between program review, governance and planning processes that result in a prioritization of technology needs across the College. TeCS implements decisions borne out of the planning process. Evidence supports technology distribution support for academic affairs including distance education, student services and administrative support departments. The College Information Technology Committee (CITC) is the primary governance committee that ensures decision making is participatory. The TeCS department has representation on the various governance committees to ensure all areas of the college are adequately served by the TeCS department.

Specific evidence related to this Standard was difficult to cull from the self-evaluation report; however, additional evidence reviewed and interviews conducted during the site visit supported what is presented in response to this Standard (III.C.1.c, III.C.1.d).

The College’s Information Technology Committee (CITC) develops and monitors the Technology Master Plan in accordance with the College’s Integrated Planning Manual. As a result the Technology Master Plan guides the implementation of technology for the College that includes the development of technology infrastructure, administrative information systems, operations support, and management of web resources.

Specific evidence related to this Standard was difficult to cull from the self-evaluation report; however, additional evidence reviewed and interviews conducted during the site visit supported what was presented in response to this Standard (III.C.2).

Conclusions:

Evidence supports the claim that the College assesses the use and effectiveness of technology by way of program review, surveys, committee reviews, and implementation team analysis. The College's integrated planning process clearly includes planning for technology. The technology master plan is developed through the shared governance Information and Technology Committee (CITC). That committee also monitors the Technology Master Plan and ensures the inclusion of program review results and survey results. The five year Technology Master Plan is updated annually to ensure technology strategies are updated to include new and emerging technology opportunities. The College meets the Standard (III.C.1).

The College evaluates college-wide technology through program review, institutional research and planning, library, and distance education surveys of faculty, staff, and students. In particular the College offers evidence that program reviews include an evaluation of technology in programs, departments and college divisions.

The College systematically assesses the effective use of technology resources and the College uses the results of evaluation as the basis for improvements to technology. Using the ACCJC Rubric for Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness, the team determined that Citrus College is at Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement for technology planning. The College meets the Standard (III.C.2).

The team concludes that the College meets Standard III.C.

Recommendations to Meet the Standard:

None.

Standard III

D. Financial Resources

General Observations:

Although the Financial Resources section of the self-evaluation report is complete, some of the sub-section information was in the wrong place. It was difficult to correlate the numbered document references of the narrative back to the evidence on the thumb drive, as the information was grouped alphabetically, not in reference number sequence. Fortunately, the online version of the Self Evaluation Report, and a later version of the evidence thumb drive, had hot-links directly to many of the referenced documents, which made the review easier. There were links, however, that did not connect to the described document. Fortunately, the College's website contained the documents, and with some searching most of the evidence needed to support the College's financial assertions could be found. The self-evaluation narrative, combined with evidentiary documentation and corroboration from visit interviews, form an adequate analysis of the College's response to Standard III.D.

Findings and Evidence:

Citrus College reviews its Mission, Vision and Values every five years as the first step in the development of its Strategic Plan. In the College Strategic Plan: 2011-16, strong correlation exists between the College's values and the six focus areas of the strategic plan. The focus areas outline the College's institutional goals and strategic objectives, and per the College's Integrated Planning Manual, they direct the College's resource allocations (III.D.1).

One of the College's institutional goals is to ensure the long-term stability of the College by maintaining student enrollment. To meet this goal, in its operating fund the College has developed the concept of fixed costs which are the actual costs of the previous year to reach the College's enrollment targets adjusted for known increases of the upcoming budgetary year. Per the Integrated Planning Manual, resources beyond the fixed and ongoing costs are deemed discretionary. Priority for the use of discretionary funds is given to resource requests that are supported by program reviews, committee recommendations, and overall help to achieve institutional goals and strategic objectives (III.D.1.a).

For its operating fund the College annually develops a written set of budgetary assumptions for the upcoming year that utilizes prior year actual income as the funding base. To this base the College incorporates the funding changes proposed by state during the state's budgetary process. Given that 98.5 percent of the College's operating fund is based on enrollment and state funding formulas, the projections used for revenue resources are extremely realistic. The projections of expenditures also use prior year information as a base and are adjusted for known increases. As 87 percent of operating fund expenditures are for salaries and benefits, and their increases are the subject of negotiations and scheduling, the amounts budgeted for expenditure requirements is also very realistic. The College has a number of grants, contracts, and partnerships for which the expenditures are limited to the program's existing funding. The assumptions used in the budgetary process are reviewed by the College's Financial

Resources Committee and the Steering Committee, presented at the budget forums, and reviewed and approved by the Board as part of budget adoption (III.D.1.b).

The College's financial planning provides a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency. The College prides itself on maintaining a 12-15 percent annual fund balance reserve, which is well above the 5 percent minimum prudent reserve recommended by the state Chancellor's Office. The College budgets conservatively, and except for two years during the recession, the College has managed to keep its ongoing expenditures within its ongoing revenues. Maintaining a long-term planning perspective is one of the College's written budget priorities. The College's three significant liabilities are its obligations for accrued vacations, other post-employment benefits (OPEB), and the repayment for its Measure G Bond Fund. The College annually calculates and sets aside appropriate funding for its accrued vacation and OPEB liabilities. The repayment of the Measure G Bond Funds is an obligation of the College District's taxpayers (III.D.1.c, e, III.D.3.c.)

Board Policy 6200 and Administrative Procedure 6200 provide clear guidelines and timelines with regard to financial planning and budget development. The policy clearly states that the annual budget will be developed in a collaborative environment, supporting the College's goals and guidelines, and be linked to departmental program review. At the departmental level, the College uses prior year allocations as the base allocation for the upcoming year. Requests for additional funding are prioritized based on master planning documents, program reviews, and focus area goals. Requests for additional funds are discussed and reviewed by program and division stakeholders, with recommendations subsequently forwarded to the deans and the appropriate vice presidents. The Financial Resources Committee, a committee comprised of campus-wide representation, and whose agenda and minutes are available on the College's intranet, approves the budget calendar, reviews recommendations regarding one-time and ongoing budget requests, considers funding requests from the program review process, disseminates budget information to its constituencies, and makes recommendations relative to matters of District financial resources. Prior to the presentation and adoption of the budget by the Board, the Vice President of Finance and Administrative Services presents open budget forums to inform the College community of the College's budget (III.D.1.d).

As stated in the College's last three years of financial audits, the College's auditors "...did not identify any deficiencies in internal control that we (the auditors) would consider to be a material weakness." Per the performance audits of the Measure G Bond Fund and expenditure testing of the major state and federal categorical programs, the College was not found to be out of compliance with any expenditure restrictions or program regulations. Additionally, for the same time period the auditors found that the District's financial records were fairly stated and that the College's finances were transacted in accordance with GASB, GAAP, and the Chancellor's Office BAAM, thereby earning the College an "unmodified" (clean) opinion. (III.D.2.e.)

The College has well-defined purchasing policies and through its financial software system, there exists multiple layers of purchase-review and approval. Through its monthly Financial Resources Committee meetings, the dissemination of detailed financial reports via the intranet

to cost center managers, college-wide budget forums, various committee reports including the Bond's Citizen's Oversight Committee, and the quarterly CCFS-311 financial reports submitted for review by the Board prior to submission to the state Chancellor's Office, the College not only widely disseminates dependable and timely financial information for sound decision making, but, as attested to by the auditors, does so in a manner that reflects appropriate use of financial resources (III.D.2, III.D.2.a, c, d, e, III.D.3.b)

In each of the College's last three annual audit reports, the College has been shown to have fully addressed prior year audit findings, having implemented the auditor's recommended corrective actions, which serve to improve the College's internal control structures. The College had no audit findings for 2013-14. Evidence exists that the College conducts periodic assessments of processes and procedures to identify, and implement, improvements. One of the factors that led to the recent decision to implement Banner Finance was to enhance the College's procurement processes (III.D.2.b, e, III.D.3.h).

As previously stated, the College has in place numerous policies and procedures regarding budgeting and the use of resources. The College maintains a fiscal reserve of 12-15 percent, which is well above the state's recommended minimum reserve of 5 percent, and serves as a hedge against financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences. The College budgets conservatively and except during the recession, has maintained its operating fund expenditure outflow within its revenue intake. Because of the College's reliance on state apportionment funding, and given the negative cash flow impact caused, in recent years by the state's use of deferred revenues, Citrus College has developed active cash flow management that includes board-level discussion, and the arrangement of temporary cash borrowing from the County Office of Education.

To reduce risk at the workplace, the College has programs for safe practices, site-safety inspections, and emergency disaster preparedness, all of which are overseen by the College's Environmental Health and Safety Supervisor, and the activities/progress of these programs are reported to the Physical Resources Committee. In accordance with Board Policies and procedures, BP/AP 6540, in order to cover the financial-aspect of risk management, the College belongs to SWACC, a state-wide insurance JPA for property and liability coverage, PIPS, another state-wide insurance JPA for worker's compensation insurance, and contracts with Student Insurance to provide student accident insurance (III.D.3, III.D.3.a).

In addition to the financial oversight outlined in Standard III.D.2, the College practices effective fiscal management and oversight of its foundation, financial aid, investments and contractual relationships. Board Policies and Procedures, BP/AP 6340, require adherence to Public Contract, Government and Education Codes. The College has well-defined purchasing procedures, and all contracts are ratified by the Board of Trustees. The College's financial aid program is audited every year and has been found to be compliant with rules and regulations. For cohort years 2008-09 to 2011-12, student loan default rates have ranged between 10.5 percent and 17.5 percent, well below the maximum default rate of 30 percent. (III.D.3.f.)

College investments that are made through the County Treasurer meet the requirements of Government Code Section 53600 and are monitored by the College's business office. The District has created an irrevocable trust for the investment of its retiree health benefits funds. The funds are invested with Futuris, and the District monitors this fund on a quarterly basis. The Citrus Community College Foundation is a separate 501(c)(3) organization, with its own managerial and board oversight. The Foundation is audited annually, and in its last audit the Foundations financial statements were found to be fairly presented and were in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. The relationship between the College and the Foundation is formally outlined by a master agreement agreed to and signed by the presidents of both organizations (III.D.3.b, f, g).

The College has only two employee-related liabilities/future obligations, both of which are annually reviewed by the District's auditors. One is the fully accrued, liability for accumulated employee vacations. The other is Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB). The College, per Administrative Procedure 7504, limits the amount of accrued vacation that any one employee can have, and over the last three years, the total, funded liability for the College has hovered around \$1.8 Million. The College has contracted with Total Compensation Systems Inc. to perform the actuarial analysis of the College's accrued OPEB liability, which it places at roughly \$14.0 Million as of May 1, 2014. The College has created an irrevocable benefits trust with Futuris, and the accumulated portfolio as of June 30, 2014, is worth \$5.6 Million. The College annually contributes to fund this liability, and on a GASB 45 basis, to date the College has contributed an excess of \$1.9 Million above its required contribution and, as such, enjoys an OPEB asset (III.D.3.c, d, e).

The planning tools that drive financial planning include the Master Plans for Education, Facilities and Technology, the Strategic Plan and the institutional budget priorities. Per the College's Integrated Planning Manual requests for resources are prioritized based upon their support of program review recommendations, and their help in achieving institutional goals and strategic objectives. Annually, the College prepares an implementation plan that addresses those goals and objectives (in the multi-year strategic plan) that the College will address during the upcoming fiscal year. At year end, a progress report is produced that assesses the success made toward those stated goals, and the progress-results help form the basis of the following year's implementation plan. That subsequent year's plan, along with requests from the program review process, in turn help determine the budget requests for the following year (III.D.4).

Conclusions:

The College has sufficient financial resources to support, maintain, and improve its educational programs and services. Using its mission and values as its planning basis, the College clearly defines its planning and budgeting processes, a process that provides all constituency groups with appropriate opportunities to participate in the development of all institutional plans and budgets. The College budgets realistically and manages its financial affairs with both integrity, and in a manner that ensures both short-term and long-term financial stability (III.D, III.D.1, III.D.1.a, b, c, d, III.D.2, III.D.3). The College meets this Standard (III.D.1).

The College's dissemination of financial information is done widely, timely, accurately, and in compliance with reporting and accounting standards. The College is audited annually, having received clean opinions in its last four audits, and responds quickly to correct any internal control or compliance audit findings, of which there were none in its last audit (III.D.2.a, b). The College recognizes and funds its short-term and long-term liabilities and secures appropriate insurance coverage for unforeseen occurrences (III.D.2, III.D.2.a, b, c, d, e, III.D.3.a). The College meets this Standard (III.D.2)

The College has well-developed, sound, fiscal policies and procedures that ensure financial stability, adequate reserves, sufficient cash flow, and appropriate risk management. The College practices effective oversight of all of its finances and financial dealings, as attested to by its audits, and adequately funds both its bond and employee-related obligations which includes its actuarially determined OPEB liability (III.D.3, III.D.3.a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h). The College meets this Standard (III.D.3)

The College follows the process outlined in its integrated planning manual and in doing so integrates institutional planning with resource allocations. The College annually performs program reviews and reviews the progress made towards its annual strategic goals and objectives. These reviews form the basis of the subsequent year's planning and resource allocation (III.D.4). The College meets this Standard (III.D.4)

The team concludes that the College meets Standard III.D

Recommendations to Meet the Standard:

None.

Commendations:

Commendation #6

The College is to be commended for the level to which it has addressed future liabilities, including especially the Other Post-Employment Benefits. This will provide considerable stability for the future of Citrus College.

STANDARD IV

Leadership and Governance

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

General Observations:

The self-evaluation describes an extensive participatory governance structure, overseen by a 27-member Steering Committee, which is chaired by the Superintendent/President. This group makes recommendations to the Board of Trustees, based on planning initiatives, policies and procedures, and actions of standing or ad hoc committees. The Steering Committee consists of representatives from ten standing committees, students, and all employee groups. The report stresses that widespread participation is encouraged. Members of the Academic Senate form a majority on the Steering Committee. Numerous guiding documents such as the Strategic Plans, handbooks, minutes, and other documents are described, all of which are accessible on the Citrus College website (with varying degrees of navigation). Documents appear to be current, and historical versions are also posted. The purpose statement for each committee is reviewed annually.

Program review drives decision making at Citrus College. Extensive interviews indicated that employees universally understood the connection between program review, resource allocation, and continuous improvement. In fact, the College developed, and then implemented, a Program Review Committee (probably more appropriately called a “Program Review Review” Committee) that is charged with ensuring the quality of program reviews prior to scrutiny by decision-making bodies. Praise for the responsiveness and support from the Institutional Research Office was equally universal.

Generally, it appears that the decision-making processes are responsive, well-established, well thought out, and well documented. However, a considerable amount of data mining was required to determine this. On-site interviews revealed high-quality, collaborative decision making that, in some cases, was not even referenced in the report. Additionally, some of the text of the report was repetitious, and analysis was often superficial. Citrus College did not do itself justice in its written self-evaluation.

Findings and Evidence:

The report includes extensive references to widespread knowledge of, and support for, the institutional mission, vision, values, and goals that motivate the work. The first three items are published consistently in governance and planning documents. With a little research, it became clear that institutional goals are defined in the 2011-16 Strategic Plan and Annual Implementation Plans, although these sources were not cited as evidence. Nonetheless, according to the All-Employee survey, a substantial majority of respondents affirm that there is extensive dialogue about, and work toward, institutional goals. Interviewees confirmed that progress toward meeting annual goals is reviewed semiannually and at the end of the period. The progress reports are housed on the Institutional Research website.

Faculty, staff, and students are encouraged to participate in governance, and committee membership requirements are clearly defined in the Organization and Governance Handbook. AP2510 Participation in Local Decision Making, describes the Steering Committee as a “liaison group among all campus constituents.” The Steering Committee is chaired by the Superintendent/President and includes participants from faculty, classified staff, students, and managers. Representatives from the Academic Senate constitute a majority of committee members. Investigation of the website indicates that the Steering Committee meets regularly and meetings are well attended. The constitution of the Steering Committee, included in the Handbook, describes membership and procedures. According to the revision record, the committee has been functioning since the late 1980’s.

The websites of the standing committees are well organized; meeting minutes indicate that some committees are more active than others. Interviewees confirmed that committees evaluate their performance annually and revise their purpose statements as needed. Faculty, classified, and student committee members are appointed by the Academic Senate, CSEA, and Associated Students of Citrus College (ASCC), respectively. Managers, who are appointed by the Superintendent/President, serve on multiple committees. Most committees appear to be longstanding, but a Program Review Committee was formed in the 2013-2014 academic year. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee was also instituted recently; both of these committees were formed for purposes of institutional improvement. All committees are chaired by a member of the management team who is appointed by the Superintendent/President; some committees also have faculty co-chairs.

To guide the governance activity, the College recently revised its Organization and Governance Handbook. This compilation includes relevant board policies and administrative procedures, the integrated planning model and budgeting flowchart, organizational charts, purpose statements of the Steering Committee, Academic Senate, Associated Students, and the standing committees. Membership requirements are clearly defined and contact information provided. The document was originally adopted in 2009.

According to the Integrated Planning Manual, the Steering Committee also oversees the completion of the Strategic Plan and the Educational and Facilities Master Plan. The Steering Committee also receives recommendations regarding various other plans generated through other administrative offices. Generally, the plans require annual review; the report states that ongoing dialogue about institutional improvement is documented in committee minutes (without citation). The composition of the Steering Committee includes standing committee chairs, so dialogue between the different groups is built into the process. Examples are provided that committee discussion and action are tied to strategic objectives.

Much reporting is communicated through the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness. Data about institutional performance are readily available on the College website: Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) survey reports, the Annual Student Success Scorecards, program reviews, and progress reports on the Annual Implementation Plans (AIPs), among others. Many of these documents are cross-referenced on the websites of the different governance groups. These are discussed in committee meetings and distributed through college publications. It is not clear from the report where, or how, informal discussion takes

place (“open forums” are mentioned, but no dates or other information is given). Interviewees confirmed that their review processes are, in fact, intensely data driven.

Program review is widespread and provides, indeed requires, extensive input and analysis. The self-evaluation states that constituents can participate in decision making through a variety of venues beside formal committees, such as campus forums, division meetings, flex activities, and advisory councils. In on-site interviews, college constituents readily provided examples of input ranging from formal resolutions to emails. These respondents also indicated that input was readily accepted and acted upon where appropriate.

Citrus College’s support of program review is noteworthy. While it might seem that the discussion of program review is out of place in this part of the self-evaluation, program review is so pervasive as to be foundational to most of what happens at Citrus College. Extensive interviews revealed a widespread understanding of the process and a sense that revisions to the program review document have not only streamlined the process but made it more informative. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee “reviews and makes recommendations on matters” that improve linkage of program review, integrated planning, and the budgeting and resource allocation process. Agendas from the committee indicate that the committee conducts surveys and engages in various efforts to improve the process. Surveys cited in the report (taken in 2012-2013) indicate that people in instructional and student support areas were supportive, if not particularly enthusiastic, of the effort. Apparently the Program Review Committee was implemented around this time. In interviews, employees asserted that the oversight provided by this group has resulted in higher-quality and more beneficial reviews, contributing to better decision making.

As for the Institutional Self Evaluation report, there are several repetitive statements about available resources that would have benefited from editing. The analysis is mostly a reiteration of the evidence, with few citations. However, it does indicate that feedback was sought regarding program review. For example, the document includes a statement that recommendations regarding wider participation and better communication emanated from the 2014 roadshow. In another example, the discussion of the College of Completion cites the cooperation that brought a student-inspired idea to fruition. On-site interviews revealed widespread discussion and effort to implement the College of Completion project, which was initiated by the student Phi Theta Kappa society. Among other things, the project includes the formation and mentorship of cohorts of incoming freshmen who pledge to complete college, and targeted fundraising efforts by the college foundation (IV.A.1).

The document includes a statement that recommendations regarding wider participation and better communication emanated from the 2014 roadshow. In another example, the discussion of the College of Completion cites the cooperation that brought a student-inspired idea to fruition. On-site interviews revealed widespread discussion and effort to implement the College of Completion project, which was initiated by the student Phi Theta Kappa society. Among other things, the project includes the formation and mentorship of cohorts of incoming freshmen who pledge to complete college, and targeted fundraising efforts by the College foundation (IV.A.1).

Board Policy and Administrative Procedures 3250 assert the participation of faculty, management, classified staff, and students in planning decisions related to human, physical, technology, and financial resources. Decision making is linked to specific planning documents such as the Educational and Facilities Master Plan and the Student Equity Plan, among others.

Participatory governance is codified in Board Policy and Administrative Procedures 2510, Participation in Local Decision Making. The board policy was reviewed most recently in 2013. AP 2510 provides formal, detailed descriptions of the processes and participants. Key decision-making groups include the Steering Committee, its standing committees, the Academic Senate, and the President's Council. Both documents are included, along with the purpose statements and organizational documents, in the college Organization and Governance Handbook. Relevant planning documents are referenced as well. As evidence, survey results indicating that constituents widely agree that they are included in decision-making processes are cited. As described elsewhere, this sentiment is not unanimous, and efforts to improve inclusiveness in decision making are desired. The discussion of the formation of a rubric to explain the budgeting process seems misplaced (IV.A.2.a).

Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 2510 asserts the reliance on the Academic Senate for recommendations in areas of academic and professional matters. The Academic Senate communicates its own work through electronic and physical postings of minutes. By design, Academic Senate members comprise a majority of the Steering Committee. As a standing agenda item, the Academic Senate president makes a presentation at each board meeting. Senate officers meet regularly with administrative leadership in a twice-monthly "Big Five" meeting. The Senate's role appears to be well institutionalized in policy, but few specific examples are provided of how the Senate asserts its leadership (IV.A.2.b).

The governance structure includes well-defined roles for all constituencies on the Steering Committee. Meeting minutes indicate that, as far as can be identified, members of each constituent group attend Steering Committee meetings fairly regularly. The Associated Students of Citrus College appoint at least one student to each standing committee and elect a nonvoting member to the Board of Trustees. CSEA acts similarly to ensure that classified employees are represented and heard. Although classified staff are given reassigned time to attend committee meetings, they state that sometimes it is difficult to actually take advantage of that time. Management team members also participate in governance committees by appointment, and clearly play key roles in operations.

The College website was redesigned in 2014 and is a comprehensive source of information for the College community. The Office of External Relations releases publications such as the *Citrus Bulletin*, *Citrus View*, and the *Citrus College News Magazine*. Members of the External Relations office serve on several committees and have firsthand knowledge of much that they report. The superintendent/president sends updates to the College community via eMemos. The Board of Trustees receives an Annual Implementation Plan at the beginning of the academic year, along with midyear and final reports. The superintendent/president delivers a "State of the College" address on Convocation Day.

In the All-Employee Survey of 2014, a slim majority of respondents agreed that the shared governance process is effective at Citrus College. Presumably in response to this finding, an actionable improvement plan is proposed to support and improve engagement among all constituents. Accordingly, the college launched a multipartite effort to develop the 2016-2021 Strategic Plan. A work group of approximately 25 employees and students collected and analyzed data from various community and governmental sources and conducted a strengths, weakness, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis to identify themes that will inform its “Plan for a College of Completion.” This work is expected to continue through the 2015-2016 academic year, and was detailed in on-site interviews. (IV.A.3)

The ACCJC reaffirmed accreditation of Citrus College after its 2009 report, making six recommendations. Citrus College submitted its midterm report in October 2012, upon which ACCJC determined that all six recommendations had been met; that all actionable improvement plans had been satisfied; and that Citrus College had achieved proficiency in SLO assessment. The College has documented its work on the College’s accreditation web page. Although not cited in the self-evaluation, the ACCJC recently approved Citrus College’s Substantive Change proposal to expand its distance education offerings. As previously noted, the external evaluation team confirmed that Citrus College fails to comply with Eligibility Requirement 21.

The College has adopted an institutional code of ethics, BP 3050. The budget and monthly expenditures are public record, and the College submits to annual audits, the results of which are reported to the Board of Trustees (and thus to the public). The College interacts with granting agencies, both public and private, various advisory boards, and forms partnerships with other agencies such as the San Gabriel Valley Career Technical Education Community Collaborative. Generally, the purpose of these partnerships is to provide learning opportunities for students (Partnership agreements were not included as evidence.) The analysis consists of a brief restatement of the standard as it pertains to the ACCJC (IV.A.4).

As for regular evaluation of structures and processes, the report suggests that this is implicit in setting annual goals and revising manuals, but does not give specific examples of what was revised and why. The Board of Trustees sets annual goals at a retreat and performs an annual self-evaluation. Ready access to minutes of those retreats was not provided, rather, a link to the Trustee Documents Library. In the participatory governance structure, the statement that each committee performs an annual self-evaluation is not supported by evidence or references. However, excavation of committee minutes reveals that self-evaluation does take place. Interviews confirmed that purpose statements are reviewed regularly and updated as needed. A single, specific example, the formation of a Program Review Committee to improve the quality of program reviews, is summarized without any supporting evidence. It may very well be that the integrated planning manual “illustrates the continuous, reflective process that has been implemented to ensure a cycle of constant assessment and improvement,” but no evidence is provided as to how, or by whom, it was done (The quote from the superintendent/president is not even cited! Presumably, it can be found in the preface to the manual.)

Nonetheless, interviews with a wide variety of constituents indicate that assessment and self-evaluation is widely practiced at the College. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee, in particular, frequently develops, performs, and analyzes surveys on a wide variety of events. This

group also reviews the Integrated Planning Manual, which guides the planning functions at Citrus College. According to the self-evaluation, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee will discuss results from a wide-ranging survey in fall 2015 to identify areas for improvement. The survey measures employee satisfaction with access to information, facilities, support for diversity, and institutional integrity, among others. Among the survey items, respondents are consistently the least satisfied with participatory governance and their role in decision making; concern about this finding gave rise to an actionable improvement plan (IV.A.5).

Conclusions:

Citrus College has implemented a participatory governance structure that includes a network of standing committees that make recommendation to a Steering Committee that ultimately reports to the Board of Trustees. The scope and membership of the committees is comprehensive. Two committees are responsible, in different ways, for process improvement. Program review is the foundation for much decision making and is tied specifically to institutional goals and plans; this relationship is understood and articulated by employees across the campus. Ideas are solicited, or volunteered, in various ways, and the governance structure is responsive to them. The College meets this Standard (IV.A and A.1.).

The components of institutional planning and decision making are described in Board policies and administrative procedures. These, in turn, are compiled with other organizational documents into an Organization and Governance Handbook. Thus, the policies, procedures, and roles are gathered into a comprehensive document. The central role of the Academic Senate is clearly recognized and substantiated through majority representation on the Steering Committee. The College meets this Standard (IV.A.2).

The interactions between constituent groups, governance committees, superintendent/ president, and Board of Trustees are clearly delineated in the governance structures at Citrus College. The meeting schedules are well established and agendas, minutes, and/or highlights are readily accessible on the College website. The work is documented in numerous campus publications. Interviews reveal a collegial atmosphere. The College meets this standard (IV.A.3).

The College reports regularly on its interactions with external agencies. It resolved the recommendations from the 2009 site visit team. Its substantive change report on expansion of distance education expansion was approved in May 2015. As noted earlier, the College does not comply with Eligibility Requirement 21. The College does not meet this Standard (IV.A.4).

Self-evaluation is widely practiced at Citrus College. Governance committees perform annual evaluations. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee explicitly conducts surveys and other assessments that evaluate institutional effectiveness. Additionally, the committee oversees the linkage of institutional planning and integrated planning. The College meets this Standard (IV.A.5).

The team concludes that the College does not meet Standard IV.A.4

Recommendations to meet the Standard:

See Recommendation #2.

STANDARD IV

Leadership and Governance

B. Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations:

The governing board for Citrus College is composed of five elected officials representing distinct areas of the District and one annually elected student trustee. Board bylaws and policies are published on the College website, along with Board of Trustees agendas, meeting minutes, and board meeting highlights. This information details the operation of the Board of Trustees, the schedule of meetings, and standards of operations. The Board has both policies and practices in place to ensure ethical conduct, for board education (including orientation for new board members), to assure fiscal stability and to stay informed concerning vital matters relating to the college. The Board has an appropriate policy in place for the selection of a superintendent/president and his/her evaluation. The Board also has an active process, written into policy, for its self-evaluation.

At the College level, the Steering Committee is the major participatory governance body charged with advancing the mission and objectives of the institution through broad-based participation in the decision-making process. The Steering Committee brings together all constituent groups: faculty, students, classified staff, and administrators. The Steering Committee's constitution, agendas and minutes are posted on the College website.

Findings and Evidence:

The mission of Citrus College is identified in Board Policy 1200 and has been reviewed or revised on a regular basis. In part it states, "We are dedicated to fostering a diverse educational community and learning environment by providing an open and welcoming culture that supports successful completion of transfer, career/technical education, and basic skills development." Board Policy 2000 identifies the procedures for adopting or changing Board Policies and Administrative Procedures; and Administrative Procedure 2000 identifies a three-year cycle for the review of all board policies and administrative procedures. Review of the evidence confirmed an ongoing and regular review cycle. The governing board has an established procedure for the hiring of a superintendent/president, BP 2431, although the College has not had to initiate a search since the current superintendent/president was hired in 2008 (IV.B.1, IV.B.1.b, IV.B.1.e, IV.B.1.j).

Information regarding board members, board bylaws and policies, agendas and minutes are published on the College website. This information details the operation of the board, the schedule of meetings, and standards of operations. Board Policy 2200 describes the responsibilities and duties of the Board of Trustees, including policy establishment, monitoring institutional performance and educational quality, the hiring and evaluation of the superintendent/president, financial and educational oversight, and delegation of appropriate powers to the superintendent/president (IV.B.1, IV.B.1.b, IV.B.1.c, IV.B.1.d, IV.B.1.j).

The Board of Trustees relies primarily on the faculty to develop processes related to curriculum and program review as evident through its policies and procedures. Board Policy 4020 describes the governing board's expectations concerning course and curriculum development and board authority over new programs and program deletions (IV.B.1.c).

Board Policy 2010 identifies the board size and Board Policy 2100 outlines the board election process including term of office and trustee areas. Board members are actively engaged in the communities they serve through participation and leadership roles in civic and community organizations, by regularly attending statewide and national legislative summits and conferences for elected board members as well as advocating for the college at the local level through meetings and forums with elected officials. The Board of Trustees is a member of national and statewide associations such as the Association of Community College Trustees, American Association of Community Colleges and the Community College League of California. Regionally, the Board is a member of the Los Angeles County School Trustees Association and a founding member of the San Gabriel/Foothill Association of Community Colleges. The Board hosts luncheons, college tours, and daylong events that bring community members to the College (IV.B.1.a, IV.B.1.d).

The governing board has a code of ethics that clearly state the expectations and responsibilities of board members (BP 2715) and a process to address violations of the code (AP 2715). Board Policy 2710 identifies situations that might create conflicts of interest. Finance and Administrative Services is charged with overseeing that the appropriate conflict of interest and statement of economic interest are completed and filed on behalf of Board members. In addition, the voting record of the Board demonstrates that decisions are usually reached unanimously and an interview with Board members verified that the Board acts as a whole after making a decision (IV.B.1.a, IV.B.1.h).

The Board has a policy for board development and orientation of new members (BP 2740). The Board receives presentations and reports covering all aspects of College operations including annual implementation plans and progress reports, results from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement and the Student Success Scorecard as well as other presentations as outlined and confirmed on the Board calendar. One of the recurring topics of Board education is the accreditation process. Evidence describes an ongoing education of the board members with accreditation through continuous presentations at Board meetings involving these matters (IV.B.1.f, IV.B.1.i).

The Board also has a policy in place for its self-evaluation (BP 2745). The process requires the appointment of an ad-hoc committee to determine the instrument or process to be used. The Board's annual goals are published on the College website and serve as the foundation for the Board's self-evaluation. An external board evaluation survey is also administered to provide feedback to the Board from members of President's Council. Board Policy 2745 requires that a summary of the evaluations be presented and discussed at a Board session; review of board minutes confirms these discussions were held (IV.B.1.g).

The superintendent/president has the executive responsibility for the quality of the institution by administering the policies adopted by the board and executing all decisions of the Board of

Trustees requiring administrative action. Board Policy 2430 grants authority and responsibility to the superintendent/president and authorizes the delegation of powers and duties entrusted to the superintendent/president by the Board of Trustees. The superintendent/president ensures that the College's administrative structure is of appropriate size and complexity in order to support the work of the College. Recent changes to the administrative structure include the hiring of a vice president of student services. This hire reflects the superintendent/president's commitment to maintain an administrative structure that appropriately supports the work of the College. The superintendent/president has seven direct reports each assigned specific areas of operational responsibility and oversight (IV.B.2, IV.B.2.a).

Through review of College planning documents and interviews, the team found evidence that the superintendent/president has been instrumental in establishing a planning culture and has taken an active role in communicating and establishing a framework for a culture of evidence and focus on student learning. The superintendent/president has established the Institutional Effectiveness Committee to evaluate College planning activities and to report to the Steering Committee the results of those planning activities. The superintendent/president regularly updates the Board on institutional planning and implementation efforts. Additionally, the superintendent/president shared with the team samples of mid-year and annual reports on the progress toward achieving institutional goals delineated in the Annual Implementation Plan (IV.B.2.b).

Board Policy 2430 requires the superintendent/president to comply with all relevant laws and regulations and for the timely submission of all required reports. Through interviews the team confirmed that the superintendent/president stays abreast of federal and state statutes and regulations through legislative updates provided by the Community College League of California. The superintendent/president's office tracks and monitors statutory deadlines or requirements; the superintendent/president also relies on the executive leadership team for regular updates (IV.B.2.c).

The superintendent/president works closely with the Vice President of Finance and Administrative Services to monitor the annual budget, expenditures and revenues, and to ensure the College has sufficient resources to support its operations (IV.B.2.d).

The superintendent/president communicates institutional values, goals and directions through a variety of online and print publications, including annual reports to the community; through special speaking engagements and participation in local community forums; and through regular reports to the Board and other campus venues such as her convocation address. The Citrus College All-Employee Survey, administered in spring 2014, states that almost 85 percent of responding employees strongly agree/agree achievement of college goals is regularly shared with campus constituencies (IV.B.2.e).

Conclusions:

The Board of Trustees governs on behalf of the citizens of the District in accordance with the authority granted and duties defined in Education Code Section 70902. Quality, integrity, and effectiveness of student learning programs are all addressed in board policies and/or procedures

for the College. The Board adheres to a three-year cycle for the review of all board policies and administrative procedures; and the board regularly evaluates the superintendent/president and conducts annual self-evaluation. The College meets this Standard (IV.B.1).

The superintendent/president has primary responsibility and provides leadership with institutional planning, budgeting and fiscal oversight, organizational efforts, hiring of personnel, and with the assessment of institutional effectiveness. The College meets this Standard (IV.B.2).

The team concludes that the College meets Standard IVB.

Recommendations to Meet the Standard:

None.

APPENDIX

Compliance with Commission Policies

Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies

The evaluation items detailed in this Checklist are those which fall specifically under federal regulations and related Commission policies, beyond what is articulated in the Accreditation Standards; there may be other evaluation items under ACCJC standards which address the same or similar subject matter. Evaluation teams will evaluate the institution's compliance with standards as well as the specific Checklist elements from federal regulations and related Commission policies noted here.

General Instructions: The form should contain narrative as well as the "check-off."

- a. *The team should place a check mark next to each evaluation item when it has been evaluated.*
- b. *For each subject category (e.g., "Public Notification of an Evaluation Visit and Third Party Comment"), the team should also complete the conclusion check-off.*
- c. *The narrative will cite to the evidence reviewed and team findings related to each of the evaluation items. If some content is discussed in detail elsewhere in the team report, the page(s) of the team report can be cited instead of repeating that portion of the narrative.*
- d. *Any areas of deficiency from the Checklist leading to noncompliance, or areas needing improvement, should be included in the evaluation conclusions section of the team report along with any recommendations.*

This Checklist will become part of the evaluation team report. Institutions may also use this form as a guide for preparing documentation for team review. It is found as an appendix in the team and Institutional Self Evaluation manuals.

Public Notification of an Evaluation Team Visit and Third Party Comment

Evaluation Items:

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

[Regulation citation: 602.23(b).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

Narrative (add space as needed):

The policy on Public Notification of an Evaluation Team Visit and Third Party Comment was not addressed in the Citrus College Institutional Self Evaluation Report. There is no notice on the Citrus College website regarding third party comments and the process for submittal. The Commission and external evaluation team for Citrus College received a third party comment prior to the comprehensive visit September 28 – October 1, 2015 (see page 15)

Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement

Evaluation Items:

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

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(i); 602.17(f); 602.19 (a-e).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative (add space as needed):

The narrative provided in the Citrus College Institutional Self Evaluation and review of evidentiary documents and interviews by the external evaluation team confirm that the institution meets the Commission's requirements. (see page 15)

Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

Evaluation Items:

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

[Regulation citations: 600.2 (definition of credit hour); 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.24(e), (f); 668.2; 668.9.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative (add space as needed):

The policy on Credits, Program Length, and Tuition was not addressed in the Citrus College Institutional Self Evaluation Report. The external evaluation team confirmed through review of the Citrus College Catalog that the institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission’s requirements. (see page 15)

Transfer Policies

Evaluation Items:

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

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.17(a)(3); 602.24(e); 668.43(a)(ii).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

Narrative (add space as needed):

Transfer Policies were not addressed in the Citrus College Institutional Self Evaluation Report. The external evaluation team confirmed through review of the Citrus College Catalog and website that transfer policies are appropriately disclosed to students and the public and that the college complies with the Commission Policy on Transfer of Credit.

Distance Education and Correspondence Education

Evaluation Items:

- The institution has policies and procedures for defining and classifying a course as offered by distance education or correspondence education, in alignment with USDE definitions.
- There is an accurate and consistent application of the policies and procedures for

determining if a course is offered by distance education (with regular and substantive interaction with the instructor, initiated by the instructor, and online activities are included as part of a student's grade) or correspondence education (online activities are primarily "paperwork related," including reading posted materials, posting homework and completing examinations, and interaction with the instructor is initiated by the student as needed).

- The institution has appropriate means and consistently applies those means for verifying the identity of a student who participates in a distance education or correspondence education course or program, and for ensuring that student information is protected.
- The technology infrastructure is sufficient to maintain and sustain the distance education and correspondence education offerings.
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education*.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(iv), (vi); 602.17(g); 668.38.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative (add space as needed):

The policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education was not addressed in the Citrus College Institutional Self Evaluation Report. The external evaluation team confirmed through review of evidence that the institution meets the Commission's requirements for distance education, including the May 7, 2015 approval of a Distance Education Substantive Change Proposal including 15 associate degrees and one certificate available 50% or more online (see page 15).

Student Complaints

Evaluation Items:

- The institution has clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, and the current policies and procedures are accessible to students in the college catalog and online.
- The student complaint files for the previous six years (since the last comprehensive evaluation) are available; the files demonstrate accurate implementation of the complaint

policies and procedures.

- The team analysis of the student complaint files identifies any issues that may be indicative of the institution's noncompliance with any Accreditation Standards.
- The institution posts on its website the names of associations, agencies and governmental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the institution and any of its programs, and provides contact information for filing complaints with such entities.
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Representation of Accredited Status* and the *Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions*.

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(ix); 668.43.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative (add space as needed):

The policy on Student Complaints was not addressed in the Citrus College Institutional Self Evaluation Report. The external evaluation team confirmed through review of evidence that the college only partially meets the Commission's requirements regarding Student Complaints. Specifically, the college catalog refers only to student grievance and the website navigation does not provide access to the college student complaint process, instead it links students directly to the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office complaint form (see page 15).

Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials

Evaluation Items:

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

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(vii); 668.6.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

Narrative (add space as needed):

The policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status was not addressed in the Citrus College Institutional Self Evaluation Report. Through review of the evidence and inquiry, the external evaluation team determined that the institution meets the Commission’s requirements (see page 16).

Title IV Compliance

Evaluation Items:

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

[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(v); 602.16(a)(1)(x); 602.19(b); 668.5; 668.15; 668.16; 668.71 et seq.]

Conclusion Check-Off:

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative (add space as needed):

Title IV Compliance was not addressed in the Citrus College Institutional Self Evaluation Report. Through review of the evidence the external evaluation team confirmed that the college meets the Commission's requirements (see page 16).