



**ACCREDITING
COMMISSION
for COMMUNITY and
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

10 COMMERCIAL BOULEVARD
SUITE 204
NOVATO, CA 94949
TELEPHONE: (415) 506-0234
FAX: (415) 506-0238
E-MAIL: accjc@accjc.org
www.accjc.org

Chairperson
JOSEPH L. RICHEY
Public Member

Vice Chairperson
E. JAN KEHOE
Long Beach City College

President
BARBARA A. BENO

Vice President
DEBORAH G. BLUE

Vice President
GARMAN JACK POND

Associate Vice President
LILY OWYANG

Business Officer
BARBARA DUNHAM

ITAS
TOM LANE

MEMO TO: Dr. Anthony Tricoli
Superintendent-President
West Hills College Coalinga
300 Cherry Lane
Coalinga, CA 93210

RECEIVED
MAY 12 2006
PRES. OFFICE

FROM: Barbara A. Beno, President

Barbara A. Beno

DATE: May 9, 2006

SUBJECT: Enclosed Report of the Evaluation Team

Previously, the chairperson of the evaluation team sent you a draft report affording you the opportunity to correct errors of fact. We assume you have responded to the team chair. The Commission now has a final version of the report.

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges follows a policy of providing a copy of the final evaluation visit report to the chief executive officer of the visited institution prior to consideration by the Commission. Please examine the enclosed report.

- If you believe that the report contains inaccuracies, you are invited to call them to the attention of the Commission. To do so, a letter stating recommended corrections should be directed to the ACCJC President and signed by the chief executive officer of the institution. The letter should arrive at the Commission office one week prior to the Commission meeting in order to be included in Commission materials.
- ACCJC policy provides that, if desired, the chief administrator may request an appearance before the Commission to discuss the evaluation report. The Commission requires that the institution notify the Commission office by May 24, 2006 or earlier of its intent to attend the meeting. This enables the Commission to invite the team chair to attend. The next meeting of the Accrediting Commission will be held on June 7-9, 2006 at the San Francisco Airport Westin Hotel. The enclosure, *What To Expect When Attending A Commission Meeting* addresses the protocol of such appearances.

Please note that the Commission will not consider the institution as being indifferent if its chief administrator does not choose to appear before the Commission. If the institution does request to be heard at the Commission meeting, the chairperson of the evaluation team will also be asked to be present to explain the reasons for statements in the team report. Both parties will be allowed brief testimony before the Commission deliberates in private.

The enclosed report should be considered confidential and not given general distribution until it has been acted upon by the Accrediting Commission and you have been notified by letter of the action taken.

BAB/tl

Enclosure

cc: Dr. Frank Gornick, Chancellor, West Hills CCD
Mr. Carlos Diniz, Accreditation Liaison Officer (w/o enclosure)

Progress Visit Report

**West Hills College Coalinga
300 Cherry Lane
Coalinga, Ca 93210**

**A Confidential Report Prepared for the Accrediting Commission
for Community and Junior Colleges**

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited

West Hills College Coalinga

on

March 27, 2006

Dr. Shirley J. Kelly

President

College of San Mateo

Dr. Monte Perez

**Vice President,
Student Services**

Golden West College

DATE: March 29, 2006

TO: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

FROM: Team Chair

SUBJECT: Report of Progress Visit
West Hills College Coalinga, March 27, 2006

Introduction:

A comprehensive visit was conducted to West Hills College Coalinga in March, 2005. At its meeting of June 8 – 10, 2005, the Commission acted to require of West Hills College Coalinga a Progress Report and visit. The visiting team, Dr. Shirley J. Kelly and Dr. Monte Perez, conducted the site visit to West Hills College Coalinga on March 27, 2006. The purpose of the visit was to validate the Progress Report prepared by the college and to determine if sustained, continuous, and positive movement toward institutional good practice had occurred.

The team found that the college had prepared well for the visit by arranging for meetings with the individuals agreed upon earlier with the team chair and by assembling appropriate documents in the team room. In addition, on the day of the visit all staff were available for meetings as needed and additional documents were provided upon request. The team met with the district chancellor; college president; interim dean of student learning; interim associate dean of student learning; vice chancellor of business services; district director of institutional effectiveness, planning, and web services; district interim director of financial aid; president of the Board Of Trustees; and the president of the Academic Senate.

The Progress Report and visit were expected to document improvement in the following areas:

Recommendation 2: The team recommends that the college identify those academic programs that it is no longer offering due to a lack of resources, and either develop the resources needed to provide the programs or remove them from the college catalog and other college sources of information provided to potential students. (Standard II.A.1.)

Recommendation 3: The team recommends that the college complete an assessment of the accessibility of its online services – especially initial application to the college and availability of the college catalog and schedule of classes – in view of the varying levels of computer literacy and availability of computer resources within the service communities of the college. (Standard II. B.3.e)

Recommendation 5: The team recommends that the Board of Trustees and the chancellor, in consultation with the leadership of the college campuses, develop a transparent process

for resolving some of the remaining significant issues raised by the decision to become a multi-college district, namely:

1. The clarification and delineation, in both policy and practice, of the roles and responsibilities of the chancellor and the college president in decision-making which directly affects college operations (Standard IV.B.3 and IV.B.3g),
2. The development and implementation of an appropriate and clearly communicated process for allocating faculty and staff positions between the college campuses (Standard III.A.2 and Standard IV.B.3.c),
3. The development and implementation of a clearly communicated process for regularly reviewing the appropriateness of the assignment of various functions and staff to the district office or to the college campuses (Standard IV.B.3.a and IV B.3.g),
4. The development and implementation of an appropriate and clearly communicated process for distributing fiscal resources among the college campuses and the district office (Standard IV.B.3.c),
5. The development and implementation of a formal and regularly evaluated district strategic planning process that both acknowledges input from the college campuses and serves as a guide for the strategic planning at the college level (Standard I.B.3 and Standard IV.B.3.g).

Recommendation 6: The team recommends that the Board of Trustees, the chancellor, and the college president work together to address the concern, identified in the self-study and validated through numerous team interviews, that a significant portion of the campus community is unclear regarding the reasoning behind decisions made by the Board and the Chancellor's Cabinet that affect programming, staffing, and resources at the college level. Participation by each of the three parties in an appropriate training program may prove beneficial (Standard IV.B.3.f.).

In addition, the team addressed the college's compliance with the following Eligibility Requirements:

Requirement 17: Financial Resources. The institution documents a funding base, financial resources, and plans for financial development adequate to support student learning programs and services, to improve institutional effectiveness, and to assure financial stability.

Requirement 20: Public Information. The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information.

College Responses to the Team Recommendations:

Recommendation 2: The team recommends that the college identify those academic programs that it is no longer offering due to a lack of resources, and either develop the resources needed to provide the programs or remove them from the college catalog and other college sources of information provided to potential students. (Standard II.A.1.)

Requirement 20: Public Information. The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information.

The team recognized that both recommendation 2 and, in part, eligibility requirement 20 dealt with the college's inclusion of inactive courses and programs in the college catalog.

The Chief Instructional Officer and the Academic Senate President requested the assistance of faculty in the review of all course offerings. A team reviewed each course and developed a list of courses and programs to be inactivated or deleted. These changes were approved by the Curriculum Committee on May 13, 2005. At its meeting of June 28, 2005, the West Hills Community College District (WHCCD) Board of Trustees approved 32 course inactivations, two course deletions, and two program deletions. In August, 2005, the college formed a committee to address remaining issues related to this recommendation. Specifically, the committee was to complete the process of inactivating courses not offered in recent history. The committee developed lists, solicited input from faculty and administrators to identify additional courses, and reviewed the catalog. After considerable discussion, an additional 27 courses were recommended for inactivation. Ultimately, the Board of Trustees, at its meeting of January 24, 2006, approved this second list for inactivation.

The team reviewed the minutes of the Curriculum subcommittee charged with compiling all the inactive courses as well as the first and second inactivation lists. Board of Trustees minutes were investigated to make sure the deletions were properly approved. Finally, evidence of the deletion of Chemistry and Physical Education programs was reviewed. The team confirmed that these courses and programs have been removed from the online and printed catalogs.

Conclusion: The team concludes that the college has fulfilled the requirements of this recommendation.

Recommendation 3: The team recommends that the college complete an assessment of the accessibility of its online services – especially initial application to the college and availability of the college catalog and schedule of classes – in view of the varying levels of computer literacy and availability of computer resources within the service communities of the college. (Standard II. B.3.e)

Requirement 20: Public Information. The institution provides a catalog for its constituencies with precise, accurate, and current information.

The team recognized that both recommendation 3 and, in part, eligibility requirement 20 dealt with the college's exclusive use of an online catalog, schedule, and application process.

In September, 2005, the President charged a committee with developing a survey instrument which would measure accessibility of the college's online services. With the participation of the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, Planning and Web Services, a draft survey was developed. The draft was widely disseminated and the recommendations received were approved. The college retained Media Specialists, a professional consulting corporation with experience in conducting surveys for higher education, to conduct the survey. The survey was conducted in October of 2005. The survey results provided a snapshot of the availability of technology to the district's various constituencies. When grouped by community, the results showed that the availability of computers in the home varied from a high of 75% in Lemoore to a low of 49% in Avenal. Furthermore, when queried as to whether it was preferable to complete an application online or using a paper form, only Lemoore had a preference for online that exceeded 50%. As a result of this information, the college determined that service to students would be greatly enhanced by implementing both online and paper versions of the class schedule, catalog and application for admission.

The spring 2006 schedule were delivered to all the communities in the college's service area. The catalog was available for distribution during the first week of February, 2006. The team also confirmed that the catalog includes the elements required for Eligibility Requirement 20.

Conclusion: The team concludes that the college has fulfilled the requirements of this recommendation.

Recommendation 5: The team recommends that the Board of Trustees and the chancellor, in consultation with the leadership of the college campuses, develop a transparent process for resolving some of the remaining significant issues raised by the decision to become a multi-college district, namely:

- 1. The clarification and delineation, in both policy and practice, of the roles and responsibilities of the chancellor and the college president in decision-making which directly affects college operations (Standard IV.B.3 and IV.B.3g),**
- 2. The development and implementation of an appropriate and clearly communicated process for allocating faculty and staff positions between the college campuses (Standard III.A.2 and Standard IV.B.3.c),**

3. **The development and implementation of a clearly communicated process for regularly reviewing the appropriateness of the assignment of various functions and staff to the district office or to the college campuses (Standard IV.B.3.a and IV B.3.g),**
4. **The development and implementation of an appropriate and clearly communicated process for distributing fiscal resources among the college campuses and the district office (Standard IV.B.3.c),**
5. **The development and implementation of a formal and regularly evaluated district strategic planning process that both acknowledges input from the college campuses and serves as a guide for the strategic planning at the college level (Standard I.B.3 and Standard IV.B.3.g).**

Requirement 17: Financial Resources. The institution documents a funding base, financial resources, and plans for financial development adequate to support student learning programs and services, to improve institutional effectiveness, and to assure financial stability.

The team recognized that recommendation 5, in part, and eligibility requirement 17 both dealt with distribution, allocation and adequacy of resources.

5.1 - After a draft was widely circulated at both West Hills College Coalinga and West Hills College Lemoore, the West Hills Community College District Board of Trustees approved Board Policy 2431- Delineation of Authority to College Presidents and District Chancellor – on November 15, 2005. The policy states in part that “The Chancellor’s powers and duties shall be initiatory and executionary.” and “Authority flows from the Governing Board through the Chancellor to the College Presidents. Each College President is responsible for carrying out the district policies. Each college President’s administrative organization shall be the established authority on campus. The College President is the final authority at the college level.” Furthermore, the Administrative Procedure 2431 states in part “It is the role and responsibility of the President to provide leadership of campus level discussion and the shared governance process. The President leads decision making at the college level which directly affects the operation of the college.”

On December 6, 2005, after campus and district review, the WHCCD Board of Trustees approved job descriptions for the chancellor and president. Job descriptions for the president states that the Board of Trustees delegates authority to the president to manage and lead the college. The team found that the implementation of the new policy and administrative procedure provided clarification of roles and responsibilities.

5.2 – Funds are allocated to the colleges according to the Resource Allocation Model adopted by the Board of Trustees on November 15, 2005. Each of the two colleges in the WHCCD is responsible for determining its individual staffing needs. West Hills College Coalinga has developed a process that incorporates recommendations from the Academic

Senate, the Dean of Student Learning, and the Instructional Services Council. The president develops a priority list in collaboration with the deans.

One final, collaborative, prioritized list is presented to the chancellor who works with the college presidents to determine whether any positions can be shared. Both the chancellor and the president stated that the process is working well.

5.3 – West Hills Community College District implemented in Fall 2005 a program review process for district functions to clarify and delineate the appropriateness and assignment of these functions. Several district programs, including Library/Learning Resources, Information Technology Services, Grants, and Child Development are scheduled for completion this year. The review provides an evaluation of the department's purpose and services through supporting data, assesses institutional support, and specifies the communication process for the review results. All WHCCD organizational charts were updated to show dotted-line reporting of the district leadership to the college president.

As a result of a Strategic Planning Retreat, the district Mapping Document was updated. This assisted in the clarification of which functions are centralized at the district office and which are decentralized at the colleges. Staff cited the planned centralization of VTEA as evidence that the mapping document coupled with program review allow and encourage refinements in the delineation of functions. The college president indicated that the college plans to develop its own mapping document.

A survey conducted in 2005 showed a large increase in responses indicating knowledge of who has responsibility for various functions over a similar survey conducted in 2003.

The team found the mapping document to be clear. The team also found that staff have become more aware of how functions are distributed and assessed.

5.4 – On August 25, 2005, in a collaborative effort across the district, the WHCCD developed a process for distributing fiscal resources among the colleges and the district office. The description of the process was widely circulated, and the resulting document was approved as Administrative Procedure 6225- Resource Allocation – by the Board of Trustees on November 15, 2005. The model requires that, first, the district maintain a 5% reserve, then all increases in mandated expenses such as utilities, step increases, etc. are funded. Growth funds are allocated to the two colleges based on each college's contribution to the actual growth. Each college and the district office receive a base allocation based on prior year's expenditures, the state's ability to fund growth, and, for the colleges, the ability to achieve their FTE goals. The district's allocation is also based on the program review.

The college president stated that allocation model works and is fair. Other staff stated that the document allows the process of allocating funds to be more transparent and increases trust. The process is widely felt to be more open and honest.

The team concludes that the college and district have addressed this recommendation.

5.5 – The WHCCD convened a two day Strategic Planning Retreat in September, 2005. The thirty-nine participants included administrators, faculty, staff and members of the Board of Trustees. At this planning retreat, a consultant led the team through the strategic planning process which resulted in revised mission and vision statements as well as goals which guide the college through the on-going strategic planning process. The group developed three flow charts to visually illustrate the district decision-making and planning process. In October, the group reviewed the documents and sent them to the colleges, the community, and the trustees for additional review and input. On December 6, 2005, the Board of Trustees approved Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 3250 – District Strategic Planning. These documents delineate the specific plans to be developed, including a District Strategic Plan; name the constituencies to be included in the planning process; assign responsibility for implementation; and establish a Strategic Planning Committee, which is required to meet three times each academic year. On January 24, 2006, the trustees adopted the strategic planning document.

The team found that the college and district made substantial progress in the area of strategic planning.

Conclusion: The team found that the college and the district have either met or made substantial progress toward meeting all parts of this recommendation.

Recommendation 6: The team recommends that the Board of Trustees, the chancellor, and the college president work together to address the concern, identified in the self-study and validated through numerous team interviews, that a significant portion of the campus community is unclear regarding the reasoning behind decisions made by the Board and the Chancellor’s Cabinet that affect programming, staffing, and resources at the college level. Participation by each of the three parties in an appropriate training program may prove beneficial (Standard IV.B.3.f.).

In order to begin meeting this recommendation, the presidents of West Hills College Coalinga and West Hills College Lemoore attended the American Association of Community Colleges Presidents Academy Summer Institute Training. The training included workshops focused on communication, staff relations, leadership, resource development, and management. On December 6, 2005, a consultant led a workshop of members of the Board of Trustees, the chancellor, presidents, and many faculty and staff. Prior to the workshop, a survey and open forums were used to solicit information from the college and district staff and faculty regarding communication between the colleges and the district. The information obtained was used to develop the appropriate training for the needs of the district. The topics included communications between the WHCCD Board of Trustees and Chancellor with the colleges and the district office. The training was focused on the responsibilities of the college and district leadership in decision-making, communications, and dissemination of information among the WHCCD Board of Trustees, chancellor, presidents, colleges and the district office. On January 13, 2006,

the consultant returned to update district staff and faculty on the work and accomplishments in strengthening communication in the new multi-college district.

According to all the individuals interviewed by the team, communication in the district is greatly improved. Several individuals indicated that a division between the college and the district has been decreased and people “are on the same page.”

Conclusion: The team concludes that the college and district have met the requirements of this recommendation.