They Came, They Saw,... They Recommended Accreditation Follow-Up Report
A quick review...

- Comprehensive team evaluation in fall 2015
- Team report for review
- Commission action letter, February 5, 2016
Commission Action Letter
February 5, 2016

Two Recommendations and Two Commission Concerns

References: Two Eligibility Requirements and five Standards

- ER 20, II.B.2.c
- ER 21, I.A.3, I.B.3, IV.A.4, I.B.2
What is the Follow-Up Report?

- A Follow-Up Report is required when an institution must provide evidence that demonstrates it has addressed recommendations, resolved deficiencies identified in the evaluation team report, and meets Commission’s Standards.
Timeline
of actions since the fall 2015 site visit

Fall 2015

- Review and reflection on content from exit meeting
- Survey of Accreditation Standards Co-leads
- Supplemental material sent to the Commission
- Early work on anticipated recommendations
Timeline
Spring 2016

- Receipt and review of Commission action letter
- Contextual analysis of recommendations, report, ERs, and Standards
- Institution-set standards reviewed and agreed to
- ACCJC annual reports filed
Discussed Commission recommendations and emerging responses with constituent groups
Collected materials and evidence
Drafted report
College forum December 1, 2016
Timeline

Winter, Spring 2017

- Edited, revised report
- Posted report for public comment
- Board of Trustees first reading January 17
- Final report to Board of Trustees February 7
- Flex day report and breakout session
- Send report to the Commission March 15
- Annual report to Commission
What do we address in the Follow-Up Report?
Recommendation #1:
Integrity in Communications with the Public:

In order to meet the Eligibility Requirement 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 #1 topics of concern:

Eligibility Requirement 20: “The institution provides a print or electronic catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information”

Standard II.B.2.c: “Catalog provides … precise accurate, and current information … major policies affecting students…”
Grievances and Complaints, Sexual harassment

Actions and Evidence:

- Separated grievance procedure from complaint process
- Updated grievance and complaint information in Catalog, both print and online (pages 257-258)
- Updated webpage and forms posted online
- Sexual harassment information in Catalog, both print and online (pages 258-259)
Recommendation #2 topics of concern:

Standard I.A.3:

“Using the institution’s governance and decision-making processes, the institution reviews its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary.”
Recommendation #2 topics of concern:

Standard I.B.3:
“The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data.”
Recommendation #2 topics of concern:

Standard IV.A.4:
“The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission Standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self study and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.”
Action: ER 21
Team Report Assessment

- Public Notification of an Evaluation Team Visit and Third Party Comment: **Not met**
- Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement: *Addressed in ISER and met*
- Credits, Program Length, and Tuition: Not addressed in ISER, but met
- Transfer Policies: **Not addressed in ISER, but met**
- Distance Education and Correspondence Education: **Not addressed, but met**
- Student Complaints: **Met, but follow-up is recommended**
- Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials: **Not addressed in ISER, but met**
- Title IV Compliance: **Not addressed in ISER, but met**
Action: ER 21

- Cross-checked lists of polices in team report, U.S.D.E checklist, manuals
- Addressed identified policies
- Clarified compliance with policies and College’s commitment to integrity in relations with the Commission
Action: I.A.3

Clarified 5 year cycle for mission review as linked to Strategic Plan and other major plans

Evidence:
Integrated Planning Manual
Strategic Plan, 2016 – 2021
BP 1200
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Strategic Plan</th>
<th>Educational &amp; Facilities Master Plan</th>
<th>Program Review</th>
<th>Technology Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>revisit and review</td>
<td>Year 5; finalize the new plan</td>
<td>Year 5; midterm review and status check</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>new plan Year 1</td>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>Year 5; develop new plan in line with Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>Year 1 – Assessment &amp; Planning</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>Year 9; start planning the new plan</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>revisit and review</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>Year 10; finish the new plan</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td>new plan Year 1</td>
<td>new plan Year 1</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>Year 5; develop new plan in line with Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Citrus College

Action: I.B.3
Institution-set standards

Student achievement:
- IEC discussions of data, historical experience, IEPI requirements
- Adjusted standards in 2016 annual report
- Embedded standards in Strategic Plan
  - Intermediate metrics
  - Annual Evaluation Reports

Exam pass rates, job placement rates:
- Included related objectives in Strategic Plan, 2016 – 2021
**Action: I.B.3**

Successful student course completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As reported in...</th>
<th>Institution-set Standard</th>
<th>Actual Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 Annual Report</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>69.2%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Annual Report</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Annual Report</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The commission was notified about the correction in 2015.*
## Action: I.B.3

### Number of students achieved completion of degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As reported in...</th>
<th>Institution-set Standard</th>
<th>Actual Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 Annual Report</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>1,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Annual Report</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>1,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Annual Report</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>1,254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Action: I.B.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As reported in...</th>
<th>Institution-set Standard</th>
<th>Actual Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 Annual Report</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Annual Report</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Annual Report</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>1,127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Action: I.B.3

#### Number of students transferred to 4-year colleges or universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As reported in...</th>
<th>Institution-set Standard</th>
<th>Actual Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 Annual Report</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Annual Report</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>1,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Annual Report</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>1,234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Action: I.B.3
Institution-set standards

Job Placement Rates
- Minimum levels set by CCCCCO
- Citrus core indicators targets negotiated

Exam Pass Rates
- Discuss pass rates at the program level
- Consider adjustments for 2017 Annual Report

Evidence
- Strategic Plan, Perkins submissions
Action: IV.A.4

Centralized listing of accrediting agencies and other external agencies with agreements, MOUs, contracts

Evidence:
Updated webpage
Recommendation #2:
Integrity in its Relations with the Accrediting Commission

In order to meet the Eligibility Requirement 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).
Recommendation #2 topics of concern:

Eligibility Requirement 21:
“The institution provides assurance that it adheres to the Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards and policies of the Commission, describes itself in identical terms to all its accrediting agencies, communicates any changes in its accredited status, and agrees to disclose information required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities. The institution will comply with Commission requests, directives, decisions and policies, and will make complete, accurate, and honest disclosure.”
Commission Concern #1:

The Institutional Self Evaluation Report was disappointing, particularly with respect to providing access to evidence and including all of the required information in the team report. The Commission notes that evaluation team also stated that Citrus College did not provide the evidence of its own excellent performance with respect to some of the Standards, and therefore the College may not have developed an accurate assessment of its own quality, as is the purpose of the self-evaluation process.
Commission Concern #1: continued

The Commission urges Citrus College to develop a different approach to its next report to the Commission – one that provides for broader college input, more careful attention to presenting the factual evidence of the College’s performance with respect to standards, and more careful review of the report before finalizing it.
Actions on Concern #1

- Analyzed team co-leads survey data
- Revised duties of accreditation co-chair to address increased training
- Served on two visiting teams to assure currency in Standards, ERs, policies, and practices
- Developed objectives for improved continuous engagement in Accreditation matters
Commission Concern #2:

The Commission discussed the institution-set standards established by Citrus College, and like the team, believes that they are set low. The College should review and consider resetting those standards to a more rigorous level. (Standard I.B.2)
Commission Concern #2:

**Standard I.B.2:** “The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institutional members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.” (2012)
Actions on Concern #2
Institution-set standards

Adjusted Standards:
- Successful student course completion
- Number of students completing degrees
- Number of students completing certificates
- Number of students transferring to 4-year colleges or universities
Other Accreditation Matters

- Interim President
- January actions
  - On Institutions
  - On Policies
  - Posted for public comment
The Accreditation Horizon

- **Spring 2017**
  - Assess and review institution-set standards
  - Provide updates and training
    - Commission Standards, policies, leadership
    - Analysis of Commission actions

- **June 2017**
  - Commission response to Follow-Up Report

- **Fall 2018**
  - Public Forum
Please feel free to suggest ways to increase engagement in accreditation matters.
Citrus College