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CERTIFICATION OF THE MIDTERM REPORT

This Midterm Report is submitted for the purpose of assisting in the determination of the institution's accreditation status.

We certify that there was broad participation by the campus community and that the Midterm Report reflects the status of the recommendations the college has been asked to address.
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Dr. Rachel Rosenthal  
Vice President Instruction/ 
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Management Senate President  
10-12-10

Mr. Matt Darcy  
Classified Senate President  
10-12-10
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Student Association President  
10-12-10
STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION

The Accreditation Liaison Officer prepared the initial draft in consultation with the district’s research office, Academic Senate, staff members in student services, finance and administration, human resources, and the college president. An overall report preparation timeline was prepared to ensure adequate writing time and input from the college’s primary planning committee, Strategic Council, as well as the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Management Senate and executive staff members prior to submission to the Sierra College District Governing Board.

Forty-seven planning agendas were identified by the college as part of the 2007 Self Study. Progress updates have been made annually by the executive staff and the results reviewed by the Executive team for consideration and action as necessary. Current status of each of the planning agenda items is included in this document.

The following individuals were the primary contributing members to this report and provided the input to the recommendations and planning items as well as established the validity of the responses.

Alex Amigo               Chair, Program Review Committee
Kevin Bray               Faculty Coordinator, Research Office
Leo Chavez              President
Mandy Davies             Vice President, Student Services
Matt Daley               Classified Senate President
Gary Guckel              Faculty Researcher, Research Office
Aimee Myers             Student Learning Coordinator
Brook Oliver            Academic Senate President
Rachel Rosenthal       Vice President Instruction, Accreditation Liaison Officer
Luis Sanchez             Management Senate President
Victoria Simmons        Vice President, Human Resources (interim)
Doug Smith              Vice President, Finance and Administration

In August, 2010, a draft of the Midterm Report was distributed to the entire college. Feedback regarding the report was collected from individuals, participatory governance committees, and constituency groups. The final report was submitted to the Strategic Council on October 1, 2010 and was approved for submission to the College President. President Dr. Leo E. Chavez approved the 2010 Midterm Report for submission to the Board of Trustees, who subsequently approved the report at their October 12, 2010 meeting.

Signed: Dr. Leo E. Chavez
Date: 10/12/10
Superintendent/President, Sierra College
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2007 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: Mission Statement
To ensure services and programs offered by Sierra College are meeting its stated purpose, the team recommends that the college amend the mission statement to specifically identify its intended student population and its commitment to achieving student learning. (Standard I.A.1, IV.B.1.b)

In order for the college to ensure an ongoing, systematic, and cyclical process that includes evaluation, planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation, the team recommends the following plan development, implementation, evaluation and improvement steps:

2a Develop a comprehensive, integrated, long-range Strategic Plan including goals that can be used to influence resource allocation decisions. The Strategic Plan should incorporate the priorities established in all of the college’s major plans to include its:
   i.Technology Plan
   ii.Facilities Plan
   iii.Educational Master Plan
   iv.Human Resources Staffing Plan
   (I.A.4, I.B.2, I.B.3, 4, III.A.2, III.B.2.b, III.C.2, III.C.1.d)

2b Modify the budget development process in a manner that will place the college’s strategic plan priorities at the center of its resource allocation decisions (III.D.1, 1.c)

2c Develop and work to implement as appropriate a Human Resources Staffing Plan that will satisfy the college’s long standing expression of need for additional full-time faculty and support personnel to improve student learning. (III.A.2, II.C.1, II.C.1.a, II.C.1.d)

2d Develop mechanisms to regularly evaluate all of the college’s planning and resource allocation processes as the basis for improvement (I.B.6, II.A.2.f, II.B.4, III.D.3, IV.A.5)

Recommendation 3: Student Learning Outcomes
The team recommends that the college identify assessment methods and establish dates for completing student learning outcomes assessments at the institutional level and for all of its courses, programs, and services. This process should also include the development of performance measures to assess and improve institutional effectiveness of all programs and services. The college should disseminate the outcomes widely and use these results in the
strategic planning and resource allocation process. It is further recommended that the
college include effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes as part of its faculty
evaluation process. (II.A.1.a, c, II.A.2.a, h, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.A.1.c)

Recommendation 4: On-line Support Services for Students
The team recommends that a more robust set of on-line support services be developed for
students at Sierra College to effectively serve students in distance education classes as well
as students enrolled in traditional classes at developing Sierra College campus sites. These
services might include but are not limited to tutoring, financial aid advisement, and library
services. (II.B.3.a, II.C.1, II.C.1.c)

Recommendation 5: Plan for Long-Term Debt Financing
The team recommends that the college develop a long term debt financing plan to address
the costs associated with implementation of GASB 45 requirements.

Recommendation 6: Governing Board Evaluation
The team recommends that the Board complete an annual board self evaluation to ensure
that its policies promote quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning
programs and services. (IV.B.1)

2009 COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

The Commission requires the college to improve its program review process to include
analysis of the currency and relevancy of the programmatic curriculum.
PROGRESS TOWARD RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: Mission Statement
To ensure services and programs offered by Sierra College are meeting its stated purpose, the team recommends that the college amend the mission statement to specifically identify its intended student population and its commitment to achieving student learning. (Standard I.A.1, IV.B.1.b)

PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS

Prior to the Team's visit in October 2007, the college’s primary shared governance committee, Strategic Council, had formed a subcommittee to review the mission statement and the Guiding Principles that were scheduled to expire in December 2007. The Evaluation Team’s visit in October 2007 found the working draft still did not “…specifically identify its intended student population and its commitment to achieving student learning.”

A new mission statement, shown below, along with the vision and core values, was subsequently approved by the Board of Trustees on June 24, 2008, and fulfills the recommendation of the visiting team. Our intended student population is identified as “…students having diverse goals, abilities, and needs interested in transfer, career and technical training, and lifelong learning.” Our commitment to student learning is reflected by the statement that the college will “…encourage students to identify and expand their potential” and to “…develop the knowledge, skills and abilities to become engaged and contributing members of the community.” In addition to the mission statement, eight new core values were established to reflect our commitment to student learning, specifically Core Value 1, “Sierra College will support and model excellence in teaching, learning, scholarship, and creativity” and Core Value 7, “Sierra College will recognize that students are active participants in their education.”

Sierra College Mission Statement (adopted June 24, 2008)
Sierra College provides a challenging and supportive learning environment for students having diverse goals, abilities, and needs interested in transfer, career and technical training, and lifelong learning. The College’s programs and services encourage students to identify and to expand their potential. Sierra College students will develop the knowledge, skills and abilities to become engaged and contributing members of the community.

Sierra College Vision Statement
We will challenge ourselves and our community to become fulfilled citizens in a global environment by contributing to and engaging in the thoughtful application of knowledge guided by respect for others and the world in which we live.

Core Values
The following core values will establish our ethical principles and will guide our institutional decision-making. Sierra College will:
1. Support and model excellence in teaching, learning, scholarship, and creativity.
2. Provide the tools for continuing success in an ever-changing world.
3. Provide, and demonstrate the value of, an inclusive community.
4. Demonstrate collaboration in decision making.
5. Foster active citizenship in our community, our nation, and our world.
6. Create and nurture meaningful connections to our community.
7. Recognize that students are active participants in their education.
8. Support and demonstrate the sustainable use of all resources.

The process for reviewing and revising the mission statement, vision statement and core values was comprehensive and inclusive. The 2007 subcommittee formed by Strategic Council was comprised of two representatives from each of the senates (Academic, Classified, Management, and Student), and the Superintendent/President. The members are listed below.

- **Academic Senate Representatives:** Joe Medeiros, Jane Haproff
- **Management Senate Representatives:** Rebecca Bocchicchio, Sue Michaels
- **Classified Senate Representatives:** Ruth Echavarria, Anna Tivol, Anthony Maki-Gill
- **Student Senate Representatives:** Sandra Gallo, Justin Walker, Enrique Manjarrez
- **Superintendent/President:** Dr. Leo E. Chavez
- **President’s Office:** Jeannette Bischoff

As history, the subcommittee met throughout the summer of 2007 and presented the first draft of the mission statement, the new vision statement, and the new set of core values to Strategic Council in August 2007. From August 2007 to June 2008, the subcommittee received and compiled input from the senates and the Board of Trustees, and created subsequent drafts based on that input. Additionally, the mission statement (as part of the 2008-2011 Strategic Master Plan) was presented to a Business and Community Roundtable in May 2008 for feedback with the final version approved by the Board of Trustees on June 24, 2008. *(1.1 BOT June 24, 2008)*

The mission statement, vision statement, and the core values also serve as the guiding principles for the District's new Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan goals and strategies align with and support the mission, vision and core values as shown below. *(1.2 Sierra College Mission, Vision, Core Values)*

Example:

**Goal I – Educational Effectiveness**

**Strategy 1 –** Offer a strategically-focused range of high-quality transfer, certificate and degree programs at the Rocklin campus based upon demographic, social, and economic trends in Placer and Nevada Counties.

This strategy directly supports the section of the mission statement that states:

*Sierra College provides a challenging and supportive learning environment for students having diverse goals, abilities, and needs interested in transfer, career and technical training, and lifelong learning.*

*Sierra College students will develop the knowledge, skills and abilities to become engaged and contributing members of the community.*
Additionally, it supports the following core values:

1. Sierra College will support and model excellence in teaching, learning, scholarship, and creativity.
2. Sierra College will provide the tools for continuing success in an ever-changing world.
3. Sierra College will provide, and demonstrate the value of, an inclusive community.
4. Create and nurture meaningful connections to our community.

**FUTURE PLANS**

In 2011, the Strategic Council will review the college’s mission, vision and core value statements as part of the regular three-year review cycle.

In order for the college to ensure an ongoing, systemic, and cyclical process that includes evaluation, planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation, the team recommends the following plan development, implementation, evaluation and improvement steps:

2a Develop a comprehensive, integrated, long-range Strategic Plan including goals that can be used to influence resource allocation decisions. The Strategic Plan should incorporate the priorities established in all of the college’s major plans to include its:
   i. Technology Plan
   ii. Facilities Plan
   iii. Educational Master Plan
   iv. Human Resources Staffing Plan
   (I.A.4, I.B.2, I.B.3, 4, III.A.2, III.B.2.b, III.C.2, III.C.1.d)

2b Modify the budget development process in a manner that will place the college’s strategic plan priorities at the center of its resource allocation decisions (III.D.1, 1.c)

2c Develop and work to implement as appropriate a Human Resources Staffing Plan that will satisfy the college’s long standing expression of need for additional full-time faculty and support personnel to improve student learning. (III.A.2, II.C.1, II.C.1.a, II.C.1.d)

2d Develop mechanisms to regularly evaluate all of the college’s planning and resource allocation processes as the basis for improvement (I.B.6, II.A.2.f, II.B.4, III.D.3, IV.A.5)

Overview
Sierra College has fulfilled the requirements of Recommendation 2 and has exceeded the Commission’s requirement to be at the Proficiency Level on the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness Part II – Planning and attained the Sustainable Continuous Quality Level. The college has revised and implemented an annual planning and resource allocation cycle that has, as its center, the college’s strategic plan. These efforts support the development, maintenance, and enhancement of programs and services and are facilitated by a shared governance Strategic Council subcommittee, PARAC (Planning and Resource Allocation Committee), which provides a venue for focused dialogue on the improvement of institutional effectiveness to facilitate student success; ensures that all planning efforts are linked to the college’s mission, vision, core values; and annually reviews, prioritizes and recommends district resource needs for staffing, equipment, technology, and facilities as identified in the annual ePAR (electronic Planning and Resource) process and supported by the Program Review process.
In addition, mechanisms are in place to regularly evaluate the college’s ePAR and planning processes, as well as provide evaluation and analysis of longitudinal data with which to assess progress toward stated district goals.

**Recommendation 2a:**

*Develop a comprehensive, integrated, long-range Strategic Plan including goals that can be used to influence resource allocation decisions. The Strategic Plan should incorporate the priorities established in all of the college’s major plans to include its:*

- a. Technology Plan
- b. Facilities Plan
- c. Educational Master Plan
- d. Human Resources Staffing Plan

*(I.A.4, I.B.2, I.B.3, 4, III.A.2, III.B.2.b, III.C.2, III.C.1.d)*

**PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS**

In February 2008, a Strategic Plan 2008-2011 steering committee was established comprised of the Vice President of Instruction, Vice President of Student Services, Director of Finance and Administration, presidents of academic, classified and management senates, research coordinator, and the president of the student association. This committee was responsible for the creation, development, and ongoing dissemination of information to their various constituency groups, Board of Trustees, and the college’s Strategic Council.

The steering committee met frequently during the spring 2008, analyzing and discussing the staff and student data provided by the research office, identifying data from environmental scans of Placer and Nevada Counties, and determining the framework of the plan and strategic priorities for the District. During this period, committee members also made numerous presentations and obtained feedback related to the Strategic Plan from the Executive Council (President and Vice Presidents), Deans’ Council, Administrative Assistants’ group, Strategic Council, and Board of Trustees.

The steering committee held an all-day retreat focused upon refining the Strategic Plan goals and strategies on May 14, 2008, followed by a sharing of the draft plan at a Community Forum on May 29, 2008. The Community Forum was attended by over 25 business and community leaders and was designed to communicate the key tenets of the Strategic Plan to the participants and obtain their feedback regarding the workforce and economic development needs of our service area. An all-day Executive Team planning retreat followed on July 14, 2008, with the first complete draft of the District Strategic Plan presented to the Board of Trustees on July 19 and to Strategic Council on August 29, 2008.

In September 2008, the Strategic Council discussed a revised annual planning and budgeting cycle and the potential role and responsibilities of Strategic Council members in that cycle. The members were directed to vet the draft plan through each of their respective shared governance groups and bring comments and feedback back to Strategic Council in October. Final review and recommendation of approval of the Strategic Plan by Strategic Council to the college
president occurred in December 2008. The Board of Trustees approved the 2008-2011 Strategic Plan on December 9, 2008. (2a.1 BOT December 9, 2008)

The final 2008-2011 Strategic Plan (2a.2 2008-2011 Strategic Plan) includes the following key tenets.

- Four District goals
  - Educational Effectiveness
  - Organizational Effectiveness
  - Focused Access
  - Resource Development
- Strategies for achieving each goal
- Selected District-wide key performance metrics with corresponding 2011 targets
- Revised annual planning and budgeting cycle
- Identification of alignment between and among the Strategic Plan and all other master planning documents

In addition to creating the Strategic Master Plan, the college completed all four of the identified planning documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Plan</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology Master Plan</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>05/13/08</td>
<td>(2a.3 Technology MP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Master Plan</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>05/13/08</td>
<td>(2a.4 Facilities MP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Master Plan</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>12/8/09</td>
<td>(2a.5 Educational MP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Master Plan</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>11/11/08</td>
<td>(2a.6 HR MP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To ensure that Strategic Plan priorities are placed at the center of decisions and resource allocations, the new ePAR process requires every departmental goal and resource request to align with District goals and strategies. And to further emphasize the needed focus upon the Strategic Plan goals, the president requested that the Board of Trustees and Strategic Council agendas be organized by the four primary goals established in the Strategic Master Plan.

The Strategic Plan is now fully implemented and serves as the core of the District’s planning process. Following the first year of implementation of the Strategic Plan goals into the ePAR process in spring 2009, the Research Office analyzed the results and brought several suggested revisions to the Strategic Plan strategies to Strategic Council. The four primary goals remained unchanged, but revisions to the strategies were vetted, approved, and utilized during the spring 2010 planning and resource allocation process for the 2010-2011 academic year.

The District’s Research and Planning Office created, and now administers, a three-year review cycle for all district master plans. They provide continued monitoring and annual reporting of progress toward Strategic Plan goals and strategies, along with all tracking of all other major planning documents. (2a.7 Master Planning Schedule September 2009)

**FUTURE PLANS**

As a result of the three-year review schedule, the 2008-2011 Strategic Plan is scheduled for Strategic Council review during fall of 2010 with the goal of developing the 2011-2014 Strategic Plan.
Recommendaion 2b:

Modify the budget development process in a manner that will place the college’s strategic plan priorities at the center of its resource allocation decisions (III.D.1, 1.c)

PROGRESS and ANALYSIS

The district has redesigned and fully implemented the annual budget development process that is based upon the district’s mission statement and Strategic Plan. *(1.2 Sierra College Mission, Vision, Core Values) (2a.2 2008-2011 Strategic Plan)* What follows is a description of budget development, resource allocation, and planning process, as well as a description of how the process has been implemented, evidence of the results, and future plans for process refinement and improvement.

Budget Development and Planning Process

Any discussion of budget development and planning must first take into account the significance of the “Sierra College Compensation Agreement” *(Sierra College Compensation Agreement)*. This agreement between the district and bargaining units (faculty, classified, and management) dictates the initial distribution of any new, general fund, unrestricted revenues including COLA, equalization, and growth. The formula is complex but in general sets aside 78% of new revenues for “personnel” to pay for employee benefits, step and column increases, additional positions, and overall pay increases. The remaining 22% is available for “operations” including utilities, instructional and operational supplies, maintenance and reserves. The Board policy for a balanced budget is defined as an unrestricted general fund end-of-year balance at a minimum of 8% and a maximum of 12%. *(2b.1 Board Policy BP 6310)*

Keeping in mind the above strictures, the budget development and resource allocation process stages are as follows:

Stage 1: Establish Priorities
Stage 2: Identify Resource Needs
Stage 3: Prioritize Requests
Stage 4: Review Alignment
Stage 5: Allocate Resources
Stage 6: Evaluate Results and Process

Stage 1: Establish Priorities

Each year the Board of Trustees and Strategic Council (the district’s primary shared governance and strategic planning committee) review activities and accomplishments from the prior year, assess the current state of the district, review the goals and strategies set forth in the current Strategic Plan and establish Board goals and budget priorities for the upcoming planning cycle. This process begins at the Board Planning Retreat each July when progress toward Strategic Plan 2011 metrics is presented and the Board determines priorities for the subsequent year’s planning cycle. These priorities are reviewed by Strategic Council the following fall in preparation for the spring planning and resource allocation process.
Stage 2: Identify Resource Needs

Identification of resource needs begins at the departmental level with the annual spring electronic Planning and Resource Request, (ePAR) process in February. Every instructional, student services and operational unit in the district submits an ePAR each February for the next academic/fiscal year. In the ePAR, department chairs or unit leads identify short-term department/unit activities, the related Strategic Plan goals and strategies, and the staffing, equipment, technology and facilities resources needed to support learning based upon Program Review reports and program outcomes assessments. Requests also include dollar amount estimates and whether the expenditure will be one-time or ongoing.

Departments/units write ePARs after review of Program Review findings, current year departmental budget updates, district funding priorities, department planning retreats recommendations, and current year progress toward goals. This activity takes place at the same time as the final information and adjustments to the compensation formula for prior year income/expenditures are completed. The first information about the budget for the next year also becomes available at this time.

Stage 3: Prioritize Requests

Departmental/unit ePAR requests are forwarded to the area manager in March and April. The area manager works with the departments/units to determine which resource (new staff, equipment, technology, and facilities) are most critical to achieving the goals of the department/unit and district. Priorities are identified and classified by resource into Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 requests at the unit/department and instructional division levels. Tier 1 requests are those that the area agrees are most critical and essential, as well as most closely aligned with the Strategic Plan priorities established in Stage 1. Tier 1 items are then rank ordered, but Tier 2 and 3 may or may not be rank ordered.

The “tiered and ranked” requests for each department/unit are then submitted to the appropriate executive, vice president, or director of the six various “branches” of the district: Instruction, Student Services, Information and Instructional Technology, Operations, Human Resources, and President. Each executive level manager is then responsible for working with the area managers to do a second level of tiering and ranking of department/unit Tier One resource requests within their branch to create Executive Branch Tier One requests. The Executive Branch results are then analyzed and evaluated by the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PARAC) on a district-wide basis and posted on the Research and Planning ePAR webpage http://www.sierra.cc.ca.us/AboutUs/research/ePAR.html).

PARAC

PARAC is a subcommittee of Strategic Council. PARAC is comprised of nine members including the presidents of the academic, management, student and

---

1 The college’s previous Program Assessment and Review (PAR) process, which earned a commendation in 2007, was redefined as to its role in the planning process. It was enhanced to include Strategic Plan priorities and transitioned to a web-based software program (TracDat) to improve transparency and facilitate reporting and tracking.
classified senates and the five executive council members (vice presidents of instruction, student services, finance and administration, human resources and the president).

PARAC was established to facilitate and provide clarity, consistency, and openness to the resource allocation process as well as enhance communication throughout the organization. PARAC provides a venue for focused dialogue on the improvement of institutional effectiveness through resource allocation to facilitate student learning and success and ensures that all planning efforts are linked to the college’s mission, vision, and core values. PARAC members have responsibility to communicate to their respective constituency groups the substance of discussions, analysis and information, and to solicit feedback. (2b.3 PARAC Charter July 27, 2009)

PARAC’s evaluation of resource requests are informed by Program Review recommendations, as communicated by the Program Review Committee (PRC). The PRC provides summaries of Program Review findings to PARAC and PRC representatives serve as resources in every PARAC meeting. The PRC also actively shares in discussions and dialogue, participates in the analysis, and offers advice and counsel regarding which of the resource requests are most critical to programmatic health. (2b.4 PRC Executive Report 2009)

Throughout the prioritization process, data and informational reports are provided for use in deliberations. ePAR reports include summaries by resource, cost, tier and rank, relationships to district goals and strategies, and budget type. These reports are distributed widely and most are available to the college community through the college web site or public folders.

Following Program Review and budget presentations, the Executive Branch Tier 1 requests are discussed and debated at PARAC relative to the priorities identified in Stage 1, alignment with the district’s Educational Master Plan, Strategic Plan, and other relevant plans. Following a series of robust, extensive, and complex discussions, a core set of the most critical district resources are identified as District Tier 1 resource needs and submitted as recommendations to Strategic Council.

Stage 4: Review Alignment

Strategic Council is comprised of five representatives from each of the four constituency groups: faculty, classified staff, management, and students. Strategic Council is the college’s primary shared governance planning committee and its members are charged with disseminating and interpreting policy, regulations and procedures to the various segments of the college community. (2b.5 Administrative Procedure 2510)

Stage 5: Allocate Resources

An overview of the final prioritized lists of resource requests are recommended by Strategic Council to the president in May. These lists are then posted on the Research and Planning website for access by all district staff members. The District Tier 1 lists of new staffing, equipment, and facilities, prioritized by Executive Branch, serve to guide the resource allocation decisions made during the year. As varying funding sources becomes available, those resources identified as District Tier 1 receive first priority.
The funding mechanisms differ by resource type. As an example for staffing, if a classified or management position is vacated during the year due to a resignation or retirement, a replacement request is submitted by the area manager to their respective Executive Branch manager and human resources. The vice president of human resources then confers with the appropriate executive vice president and reviews the replacement request relative to the District Tier 1 list of new classified or management positions, Strategic Plan, and Program Review recommendations. The vice president of human resources then makes a recommendation to PARAC as to whether the position is to be replaced in kind or whether the FTE (full time equivalent) transferred to one of the positions listed on the District Tier 1 new staffing list.

Full-time faculty positions are requested in the ePAR by department chairs each February. The following fall, an updated list of all requested new and replacement faculty positions requested is tiered and ranked in a closed meeting by Deans’ Council, with the Academic Senate President and the Program Review chairperson present as full participants. The ranking of positions is then reviewed for alignment with Program Review recommendations and the Strategic Plan by PARAC and Strategic Council prior to their submission to the president and the Board of Trustees in preparation for the traditional spring hiring season. (2b.6 Deans’ Council Recap October 1, 2009) (2b.7 Strategic Council Recollections October 9, 2009)

The remaining resource categories of equipment and facilities follow varying protocols. Following identification as District Tier 1 equipment needs, equipment is purchased as funds allow throughout the year. District Tier 1 facilities requests range from smaller remodeling projects to those more substantial in scope which may require long-term planning efforts such as the passage of a bond measure.

Stage 6: Evaluate Results and Process

Evaluation of the district’s planning and resource allocation process includes measuring progress toward stated goals as well as measuring the effectiveness of the process itself. Process evaluations are conducted in the fall of the year. Results evaluations take place in the late spring, or early summer of the year in preparation for Stage 1 activities. An in-depth assessment of the evaluation process follows in this document as the response to Recommendation 2d.

Although it is anticipated that new funds will be limited or nonexistent in 2010-2011, the district will use the planning process and the identified district Tier 1 resource needs to guide allocation of any new funds received, redirect and reallocate existing resources, and to identify areas for potential partnerships and future resource development.

Despite the current fiscal crisis, Sierra College remains committed to this planning process. As such, the planning priorities were used, and will continue to be used, as benchmarks to guide and direct not only new funds, but areas for potential budget reductions as well.
FUTURE PLANS

Planned Improvements to Planning and Resource Allocation Process

1. Appropriate resource request protocol for short-term versus longer-term resource needs will be clarified
2. Dedicated departmental planning days have been established for flex week of January 2011
3. New and replacement resource requests will continually be evaluated against district Tier 1 prioritized lists
4. Program outcomes, assessments, and proposed program improvements will continue to be collected and tracked longitudinally
5. Major planning documents will be updated regularly to inform, focus and direct department goals and activities
6. Strategic Plan will be reviewed to refine and reduce the number of strategies
7. Improve and increase the longitudinal data used in program review
8. Curriculum Committee to include and consider potential long term resource implications for new courses beginning in fall 2009
9. Expenses for personnel, facilities and equipment from most recent year available will be brought forward to PARAC to provide a context for decisions about resource allocation.

In addition to completing the planning and resource allocation process for 2010-2011, planning for the 2011-2012 academic year has begun. In July of 2010, the Board of Trustees reviewed progress toward strategic plan goals (2b.8 2009-2010 Year End Goals Report), longitudinal data illustrating institutional effectiveness and progress toward the target metrics for 2011 (2b.9 2009-2010 Strategic Plan Update - Key Metrics), and set planning priorities for the 2011-2012 year. The Board established the following priorities for 2011-2012 as noted below with their Strategic Plan reference. These priorities will be reviewed by PARAC and Strategic Council during the fall semester in preparation for the 2011-2012 planning cycle, which will begin in January 2011 with department planning days in preparation for the February ePAR.

Strategic Council makes recommendations to the president regarding the district’s most critical resource needs and conveys any potential budget ramifications.

BOARD PRIORITIES

1) Increase Capital and Resource Development
   (Strategies 2.7, 3.3, 3.4)
   Tactics
   (i) Strengthen legislative and community awareness and understanding of Sierra College’s fiscal plight
   (ii) Increase Legislative visits
   (iii) Increase marketing efforts to the community
   (iv) Develop Facilities Master Plan funding protocol
   (v) Identify key pre-bond strategies
2) Support the development of an Enrollment Management Plan  
   (Strategies 1.1, 4.3)

3) Value staff by providing recognition and encouragement  
   (Goal 2 - Organizational Effectiveness)

4) Support innovative educational delivery  
   (Goal 1 – Educational Effectiveness)

(2b.10 BOT July 10, 2010)
**Recommendation 2c:**

*Develop and work to implement as appropriate a Human Resources Staffing Plan that will satisfy the college’s long standing expression of need for additional full-time faculty and support personnel to improve student learning.* (III.A.2, II.C.1, II.C.1.a, II.C.1.d)

**PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS**

The Board of Trustees, at their September 9, 2008 meeting, approved the three-Year Human Resources Staffing Plan that identified potential new faculty, classified and management positions. Included in this plan was a proposal to increase the number of full-time faculty by shifting the funding distribution from part-time to full-time faculty budgets. The ultimate goal was to improve the District’s full-time/part-time faculty ratio, which was one of the lowest in the state at 44% in fall 2008.

In spring 2009, the district committed to funding two additional FTEF each year above the required faculty obligation number and signed a Memorandum of Understanding (2c.1 SCFA Tentative Agreement 0809-03) with SCFA (Sierra College Faculty Association). In addition, it must be noted that SCFA elected to fund five additional full-time faculty positions beginning in fall 2009. As a result of these two strategies, between fall 2008 and fall 2009 the district’s reported full-time FTEF increased from 213.6 to 221.0.

Unfortunately, the budget crisis impacted the district’s ability to fund the two incremental positions for the 2010-2011 year and SCFA and district agreed that the district’s obligation would be forgiven for the 2010-2011 year. (2c.2 SCFA MOU 0910-03)

Progress towards hiring additional instructional support positions was limited during the 2009-2010 academic year.

**FUTURE PLANS**

The district is committed to continuing to fund the two incremental full-time faculty positions each year, contingent upon available funding. The intent is to continue to utilize Strategic Council and an interest-based bargaining approach to establish the fiscally appropriate strategies necessary to achieve an improved ratio over the next several years.
Recommendation 2d:

*Develop mechanisms to regularly evaluate all of the college’s planning and resource allocation processes as the basis for improvement (I.B.6, II.A.2.f, II.B.4, III.D.3, IV.A.5)*

PROGRESS and ANALYSIS

Evaluation of the college’s planning and resource allocation process includes measuring progress toward stated goals as well as measuring the effectiveness of the process itself.

*Progress Toward Stated Goals*

In terms of evaluating and measuring progress toward stated goals, a set of key metrics was established with the writing of the Strategic Plan in 2008. These key metrics, related to specific strategies, were selected and performance targets for 2011 established. In July of 2009, the first annual report of progress made in 2008-2009 toward the achievement of these metrics was presented to the Board and Strategic Council. (2d.1 2008-2009 Strategic Plan Update - Key Metrics) An annual report is now scheduled as an agenda item at each summer Board retreat and August Strategic Council meeting to provide an overview of activities and accomplishments of the previous year, progress toward targeted metrics, and determination of planning priorities for the subsequent year. As a result, a second annual report was made to the Board in July 2010 and Strategic Council in August regarding the 2009-2010 academic year.

One of the key metrics is program outcomes and assessments. To ensure currency and to measure achievement of student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs and degrees, course and program learning outcomes information has been entered into TracDat software. This software allows for longitudinal tracking and reporting of course, program, and institutional learning outcomes. Student learning outcomes data was incorporated into the formal Program Review process and 100% of programs and services were evaluated for currency in late spring and early summer of 2009. Departments were asked to report and evaluate progress toward developing, assessing, and using results for program improvement. (2d.2 Program Review Templates and Rubric 2009) (2d.3 A. Myers email, “Program Assessment” September 18, 2009)

*Effectiveness of the Allocation Process Itself*

Sierra is committed to systematically reviewing and modifying the planning and resource allocation process. An ongoing loop of documentation, feedback and subsequent revisions are present throughout the ePAR process and during the PARAC resource request, allocation, and recommendation discussions. As issues arose or the need for changes became evident, modifications to the processes or reports were quickly made by the college’s Research and Planning Office. Formal feedback was also solicited by the Research and Planning Office concerning the adequacy of data and ease of use of forms provided for the Program Review and ePAR processes.

To solicit feedback on process improvement for the 2010-2011 planning process, focus group interviews were conducted with program leaders in August and September of 2009. Feedback on the planning process was solicited at the August 18, 2009 PARAC meeting. (2d.4 PARAC recollections August 19, 2009) In addition, suggestions for process improvement for both ePAR
and Program Review were solicited at the August 24, 2009 Department Chair meeting. *(2d.5 Department Chairs feedback August 24, 2009)*

Formal assessment of the planning process occurred in September 2009 when annual surveys were deployed by the Research and Planning Office to all staff related to the ePAR and resource allocation processes. In addition, the Research and Planning Office performed an evaluation of the allocation process, as a whole, prior to the initiation of the 2010-2011 planning cycle in spring 2010. *(2d.6 ePAR Survey September 2009) (2d.7 Program Review Survey October 2009)*

_Evaluation of Long-Term Planning_

A master schedule for the major district plans over the next 15 years has been recommended by Strategic Council to the president, and subsequently adopted. This schedule includes one year for review and the subsequent year targeted for vetting and approval of any revisions to the plan. *(2d.8 Master Planning Schedule September 2009)* The evaluation will include a census of each plan’s distribution as well as an evaluation of its effects on the planning process. The first plan scheduled for review will be the Strategic Plan in fall 2010.

_Evaluation of Program Review_

In order to comprehensively evaluate the efficacy of program review, the Program Review committee surveyed all staff involved in the process. Surveys were created for all constituencies either directly or indirectly involved in program review including: Program Review report authors, PARAC and Strategic Council members, and all staff. As a result, the initial universal Program Review template was redesigned for 2010-2011, with new and improved templates specific to instruction, student services and operations. *(2d.9 2010-2011 Program Review Templates and Rubrics)*

Additional process improvements implemented since the comprehensive visit in fall 2007.

- Program Review results for 100% of all programs and services (instruction, student services and operations) have been shared with departments and appropriate governing bodies and made public on the district website. *(2d.10 Program Review webpage)*
- Results of ePAR resource requests and recommended district resource priorities have been shared with departments and appropriate governing bodies. *(2d.11 ePAR webpage)*
- A master schedule and timeline for updating all major long-term planning documents (Educational Master Plan, Strategic Plan, Facilities Master Plan, Technology Master Plan, and Human Resources Master Plan) has been established. *(2d.8 Master Planning Schedule September 2009)*
- A cycle and timeline for annual planning and resource allocation processes has been established and widely publicized throughout the college. *(2d.12 Resource Request and Allocation Process)*
- Program Review template for instructional, student services and operational programs has been redesigned. *(2d.9 2010-2011 Program Review Templates and Rubrics)*
FUTURE PLANS

- Establish assessments for institutional outcomes, incorporating improvement plans into the Educational Master Plan and Strategic Plan.
- Improve the effectiveness of ePAR and Program Review by refining the institutional definition of “program” and “department”.
- Improve the longitudinal data used in Program Review, particularly for operational and service areas.
- Conduct college and community forums for input into the next Educational Master Plan and Strategic Plan.
Recommendation 3: Student Learning Outcomes
The team recommends that the college identify assessment methods and establish dates for completing student learning outcomes assessments at the institutional level and for all of its courses, programs, and services. This process should also include the development of performance measures to assess and improve institutional effectiveness of all programs and services. The college should disseminate the outcomes widely and use these results in the strategic planning and resource allocation process. It is further recommended that the college include effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes as part of its faculty evaluation process. (II.A.1.a, II.A.2.a, h, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.A.1.c)

PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS

In a process that began in February 2008, members of the Student Learning Committee, an Academic Senate Standing Committee (3.1 Academic Senate, September 24, 2008), developed and introduced plans and processes around student learning outcomes. Especially as reflected in the Institutional Assessment Plan (3.2 IAP December 9, 2009) adopted by the Academic Senate in December 2009, the college is on track to reach the “Proficiency” level of the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part III: Student Learning Outcomes by fall 2012. The college currently uses this rubric as a tool to assess its progress. The bullet-points below mirror the expectations for “proficiency” on the SLO rubric:

- Student learning outcomes and authentic assessment are in place for courses, programs and degrees.

Beginning in spring 2009, programs in student services and instruction identified student learning outcomes (SLOs) for courses, programs, and degrees. By fall 2010, the college has outcomes for 88% of instructional programs, 70% of student services programs, and 75% of courses. Departments are currently working on outcomes for degrees, with a plan to have them uploaded to our Tracdat system in October. Outcomes were developed by programs and linked to courses and degrees. Assessment of outcomes began in spring 2010. Following a schedule linked to a three-year cycle of program review, assessment and analysis of results is now supported by institutional processes. (2d.9 2010-2011 Program Review Templates and Rubrics)

A parallel process has been initiated for the assessment of Institutional Outcomes (IOs). Institutional Outcomes were developed by the Student Learning Committee and adopted by the Academic Senate in spring 2008. (3.3 Institutional Outcomes) A pilot assessment was implemented in spring 2009. A four-year cycle of assessment (communication, technology and information competency, critical and creative thinking, and citizenship) begins with the fall 2010 assessment of student learning in the area of Communication. The Student Learning Committee, with the support of the Office of Research and Planning and reviewed by the Academic Senate, will develop and deploy these assessments. Results are shared with the college, and using the Student Learning Committee, Academic Senate, and Strategic Council plans will be made for improvement of student learning.

- Results of assessment are being used for improvement and further alignment of institution-wide practices.
As programs and the Student Learning Committee move from developing outcomes and assessments to gathering and analyzing results, early evidence is now being utilized to improve student learning in courses and services. Individual programs have revised pedagogical practices, begun changes in curriculum, altered the way services are offered, and revised assessment strategies as a result of their experiences.

- There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results.
- Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward improving student learning.

Institutional dialogue around the development of SLOs and the results of assessments is seen on a variety of levels. Programs utilize department meetings and flex activities (3.4 Fall 2010 Flex Week Schedule) to consider the relationship between assessment and improvement. A standing committee of Academic Senate, the Student Learning Committee, meets regularly and the agenda and minutes are available on the SLO Website. (3.5 SLO Homepage) Academic Senate, the Strategic Council, and PARAC have included discussions on SLOs as a part of their planning processes. Discussions around SLOs also provide more informal opportunities for faculty to discuss the impact of SLOs. (3.6 SLC Annual Report with Supporting Docs)

Based upon this dialogue, discussions about improving student learning also take place throughout the planning process. Most significantly, in the annual planning process (ePAR) and Program Review process, results of assessment allow programs to support long-term goals, strategies, and resource needs.

- Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.

Resources for the assessment of student learning are available to support ongoing development of processes. Beginning in fall 2008, release time through the Office of Instruction allowed faculty to focus on clarifying processes and providing staff development to introduce formal assessment of student learning. While the amount of release time has declined each year, a Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator, who acts as chair of the Student Learning Committee, continues to receive release time. Whether and how to compensate faculty for the increased workload associated with assessing and reporting on SLOs should be considered.

Structures have also been put into place to allocate resources with consideration taken of SLO assessment. As previously discussed, both the ePAR and Program Review process are designed to encourage programs to utilize assessment results.

- Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed on a regular basis.

Reports are generated and progress on assessment tracked using Tracdat, an electronic assessment management system used to store and organizes information on student learning and program assessment (ePAR) at Sierra College. Tracdat allows for the creation of both internal reports and the ACCJC Annual Report on the progress of student learning outcomes. Also utilized for Program Review, Tracdat reports have been a valuable planning tool.
• Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.

Because the college developed its planning process as Tracdat was being implemented, programs can easily develop a relationship between student learning outcomes at both the course and degree level. Rather than viewing each as separate processes, members of programs develop student learning outcomes and then link them to courses, degrees, and certificates. Assessment results then allow programs to see their offerings together, rather than as separate processes. As programs meet to identify their expectations for student learning, they can consider broader discipline or service goals; their relationship to general education, CTE, or basic skills; and connections to the institutional outcomes; and goals and strategies related to the ePAR and Program Review.

• Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.

Instructors are encouraged to include their course objectives on a syllabus or other document shared with the class at the beginning of the semester. (3.7 Sample course syllabus) These syllabi are kept on file in the division offices. As programs develop outcomes for their degrees, certificates, and courses, the Student Learning Committee has considered strategies for better sharing this information with the campus community. Currently the SLO website offers a public forum for sharing outcomes.

FUTURE PLANS

Having begun the process of assessing student learning outcomes, over the next two years, programs have the opportunity to strengthen their practices and utilize results for program improvement. The Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator and Student Learning Committee will use assessment reports to share best practices with the campus and reach out to programs as they need support in identifying student learning outcomes, developing assessment strategies, analyzing results, and improving student learning.

To strengthen the tie between assessment results and institution-wide practices, the Program Review process for 2010-2011 includes evaluation of current practices of SLO development and assessment.

To better enable the college community in general and students in particular to demonstrate awareness of course and program goals, the Student Learning Committee will begin a discussion on including the SLOs developed by programs for their courses, degrees, and certificates in the Sierra College Catalog.
Recommendation 4: On-line Support Services for Students

The team recommends that a more robust set of on-line support services be developed for students at Sierra College to effectively serve students in distance education classes as well as students enrolled in traditional classes at developing Sierra College campus sites. These services might include but are not limited to tutoring, financial aid advisement, and library services. (II.B.3.a, II.C.1, II.C.1.c)

PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS

The college has made significant progress toward improving the level of support services available on-line since the last accreditation site team visit in October 2007.

Purchase and Installation of Banner Administrative Software

Shortly after the visit the college successfully completed its two-year plan to convert to an integrated Banner administrative enterprise system purchased through SunGard Higher Education. The modules that were purchased and implemented included Finance, Student/Instruction, Financial Aid, HR/Payroll, Luminis Web portal, and DegreeWorks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Banner 7 Implementation Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implemented June 1, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR/Payroll:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implemented January, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implemented February, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Instruction:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implemented March, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luminis Web Portal:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implemented March, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banner 8 (all modules)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implemented May, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Works:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Be Implemented November, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The integrated system has drastically improved the reliability and accuracy of institutional data as well as significantly increasing the self-service/on-line functionalities available to students and staff. (4.1 Banner Steering Committee – September 8, 2008)

Student/Instruction On-Line Services

In addition to the on-line services that the college had previously provided such as applications for admissions, ordering of transcripts, and enrollment verifications, the Student/Instruction module provides students the following new features and functionality:

- Real-time schedule of classes with capability to search by course name, location, instructor name, instructional method (e.g. T.V, on-line, on-ground, hybrid), date/ and times, General Education Attribute, and course length (4.2 On-line Schedule of Classes)
- Look up registration appointment times
- Register and pay fees on-line
- Course and section information such as syllabus and learning objectives
- Course and section deadline dates such as add deadline, refund deadline, etc.
- Assessment test results
- Address, major, and educational goal changes
Financial Aid On-Line Services

The conversion for Financial Aid from a standalone product (Powerfaids) to the integrated Banner module provides for real time processing and information sharing that had previously been conducted by the uploading and downloading of files. Information shared between the Student/Instruction, Finance, Accounts Receivable, and Financial Aid modules includes student enrollment status, fees owed, academic standing, name, address, major, account status, and other information essential for financial aid processing. (4.3 mySierra Financial Aid)

The Luminis web portal named “mySierra” provides students with a single point of entry and access to all services at the college. The portal provides informational channels, links, and assistance relevant and specific to their interests and goals. Tabs give access to support services, campus life, and other information pertinent to their successful engagement in the college.

Financial Aid is now able to provide students the following services and information through their mySierra account:

- Estimated cost of attendance
- Amount of financial aid award
- Satisfactory academic progress status
- Financial aid history
- Financial aid holds
- Documents still required for verification purposes
- Statement of accounts: what is owed and what has been paid
- Financial aid awards by annual year totals
- Payment schedule for future aid disbursements
- Loan application status and loan history
- Return to Title 4 calculations and their impact on future financial aid

Sierra College Student Email

Another key development related to support services for students was the college’s decision to provide all students with Sierra College email accounts and to use those accounts as the official mode of communication. Not only do these accounts ensure that the student is the recipient of private and confidential information, but recipients of targeted emails can be selected based on a wide variety of attributes such as enrollment in an on-line class, in a class at an offsite campus, or having completed a certain number of units toward a defined major and/or educational objective. When students log into the mySierra web portal, their emails are automatically displayed on their home page, along with other important announcements to help encourage and direct them to the appropriate services.

Sierra College iTunesU

Another indicator of the college’s efforts to extend on-line services is the development of the Sierra College iTunesU site. This portal provides an institutional resource for access to multimedia experiences in the form of audio and video podcasts to students and the public at
large. Most of the episodes that are downloaded are lectures from televised and on-line courses. The college plans to continue to develop and post more podcasts on the site that can be used to welcome and orient new students, offer podcasts of student success workshops, as well as a variety of presentations and messages. *(4.4 iTunesU sample podcast list)*

**On-Line Academic Support Services**

In spring 2009, using an internet-based appointment scheduling system and the “CCC Confer” conferencing service, the college began providing students individualized, synchronous, and interactive on-line writing assistance. The service was initially piloted to students enrolled in 11 selected on-line courses. Now known as the Sierra College On-line Writing Center (SCOWC), it was expanded to all on-line courses in fall 2009 and all courses in spring 2010. Data from the past three semesters demonstrates that the retention and success rates for students who used the on-line writing assistance increased by 25-35 percentage points. Without such support, roughly 4 in 10 on-line students fail; with such support, 9 in 10 complete their classes with a grade of “C” or better and do so regardless of the students' assessment levels. Unfortunately, this service was discontinued in Fall 2010 because of budget cuts. *(4.5 SCOWC retention and success rates)*

In spring 2010 the methodology and technology was successfully expanded to provide tutoring services in mathematics to students enrolled at the Truckee Campus. Future plans for the 10-11 academic year include expanding the on-line services to include tutoring in all subject matters.

**On-Line Counseling Services**

In 2005-06 a counselor was assigned to provide on-line counseling services through email correspondences. Trend data indicates a steady increase in usage of the on-line counseling services. The number of students receiving counseling services on-line has grown significantly over the past four years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>1,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>2,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>3,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>3,566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the numbers indicate that students have responded positively to this mode of counseling, future plans for the 10-11 year include providing counseling through the same synchronous format as that used in the SCOWC. *(4.6 On-line Counseling)*

**On-Line Orientation**

The college is scheduled to complete its first fully-integrated on-line orientation in October 2010. New students will be able to complete their orientation requirement by watching the video segments, accessing informational links and successfully completing an on-line quiz. Their results will be transmitted into the Banner system and automatically clear them for a counseling appointment and/or registration. *(4.7 On-line Orientation)*
On-Line Library Services

The college’s library offers a variety of on-line databases from which students may search and order books and periodicals available from Sierra College and the California Community College Library Consortium. On-line tutorials such as the self-paced on-line information literacy tutorial called SearchPath assist students in learning how to use the library and its resources, both print and electronic. Students are able access the library’s eContent collection (books, newspapers, journal articles, reports, and other on-line documents) from home twenty four hours a day. The library also provides the “Ask a Librarian” e-mail reference service where reference librarians respond to student questions and recommend relevant library resources to help them with their research. Beginning fall 2010, LibGuides will allow librarians to create, edit, and save individualized research guides for various classes and subjects. Following is a listing of the links to the library services available on line:

Research Databases  http://lrc.sierracollege.edu/library/databases.html
Ask A Librarian  http://lrc.sierracollege.edu/library/ask.html
Internet Search  http://lrc.sierracollege.edu/library/internet.html
Library Services  http://lrc.sierracollege.edu/library/services.html
Library Instruction  http://lrc.sierracollege.edu/library/instruction.html
New Acquisitions  http://lrc.sierracollege.edu/library/newacq.html
Internet Guidelines  http://lrc.sierracollege.edu/library/guide.html

DegreeWorks

As part of its Banner project, the college recently launched DegreeWorks, an on-line degree audit system that students may access through their mySierra portal. It allows students to check their academic progress toward their identified educational goals (AA/AS degree, certificate, or transfer) and also list the remaining courses and/or requirements to complete their objectives. Students may also create their own educational plans for subsequent semesters so as to project the length of time remaining for them to complete their goals. The program also allows for “what if” queries so students may project how their requirements might change if they change their major. The system is programmed to articulate coursework that students complete at other colleges, thereby assisting transfer students as well as native students. Staff can push out status updates to students on a regular basis; for example, at the end of each semester, or at the completion of thirty units, etc.

Although DegreeWorks became available to students in fall 2010, continued effort will be dedicated to improve its robustness by articulating transfer agreements and other college catalogs into the system.

On-line Student Information

Information about distance learning courses, student support services, and how to be successful in distance learning classes has been expanded significantly. While a general description of Distance Learning is included in the college catalog which is available as a hard copy document or in PDF format on the college web site, extensive and detailed information about on-line
services and the distance-learning program is featured prominently on the Sierra College website both on the main web page at http://www.sierracollege.edu/OnlineServices/index.html and the dedicated distance learning web page http://lrc.sierracollege.edu/dl.

The distance learning web pages and links provide students with comprehensive information about televised courses, on-line courses, the Blackboard course management system, and on-line student support services. Links are provided to the Distance Learning Handbook that contains minimum computer requirements, FAQ’s, strategies for success, and information about course books, adding/dropping procedures, and testing center information. Student information also includes an on-line student readiness quiz.

“Are you ready for On-Line?” Student Readiness Course

This new on-line course was created in 2008-09 to assist students’ awareness and understanding of the on-line learning environment. Although it has not been established as a pre-requisite for other on-line courses, students are strongly encouraged to take this course prior to enrollment in other on-line instruction. Research demonstrates that students who completed the course have a 76% success rate in other on-line courses compared with a 60% success rate for those who do not take the course. Retention rates for those who took the course were 88% compared to 77% for those students who did not take the course. Further data is being collected to determine if there is enough evidence that may support this course as a pre-requisite to all on-line courses. (4.8 SKDV 10 outline)

Distance Learning and Instructional Technology Program

The college completed a Distance Learning and Instructional Technology Plan in spring 2007-08. (4.9 DLIT Plan) One action item called for in that plan was the creation of a lab dedicated to the training of all staff in the use of emerging technologies for teaching, learning and communication needs of the 21st century. The lab was completed in February 2008. A faculty member receives reassigned time to conduct training classes in both MAC and PC environments for web-enhanced courses and emerging instructional technologies. Faculty and staff also participate in the annual Sierra Online Summit, an intensive, weeklong, instructional technology workshop.

Prior to teaching their first on-line section faculty are required to participate in a four-week on-line training course developed and taught by the Distance Learning Coordinator. Additionally, prior to offering a course for the first time, on-line instructors are required to submit at least 25% of the course for review by the Distance Learning and Instructional Technology Committee to ensure that the structure of the on-line course is pedagogically sound and consistent with best practices as shared throughout the training course. A “best practices” rubric is shared with the instructor and used by committee members to evaluate course content and instructor competency.

A few samples of emerging tools currently being introduced to faculty and staff in the iTech Lab and integrated in both on-ground and on-line instruction include:

- Blackboard Course Management System
- Voice Threads
• Pod Casts
• Vod Casts
• Sierra College iTunesU
• Elluminate
• CCC Confer
• Social Networking
• Second Life

The effectiveness of the college’s emphasis on improving on-line services for students enrolled in distance education as well as all enrolled students is demonstrated by recent changes in student success and retention data.

Excerpts Taken from 2009-10 Annual Report – Goals and Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District – All</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Learning</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District – All</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Learning</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The college will continue to assess, evaluate and improve upon these services as well as continue to bring more on-line as an ongoing institutional priority.

FUTURE PLANS

The College will continue its efforts to evaluate, improve and increase its on-line service services to students, particularly as new technology becomes available and additional resources can be applied or redirected. Specifically as mentioned above, the following will be implemented over the next several years:

• Reinstate Sierra College On-line Writing Center as soon as budget restrictions allow.
• On-line Orientation – measure its effectiveness by assessment of the associated Student Learning Outcomes. Evaluate and modify accordingly
• Expand upon the demonstrated success of the Sierra College On-Line Writing Center by offering on-line tutoring services through the same administrative structure
• Ensure the successful launch of the DegreeWorks, the degree audit system; continue to build databases containing the course and programmatic articulations of other 2-year and 4-year colleges and universities
• Continue to offer faculty and staff training in the latest technologies available
• Conduct research to determine whether the “How to be a Successful On-line Student” course can be established as a pre-requisite to other on-line courses
• Continue to develop and post more podcasts on the College’s iTUnes U site that can be used to welcome and orient new students, offer podcasts of student success workshops, as well as a variety of presentations and messages
- Ensure the successful launch in 2010 of LibGuides which will allow librarians to create, edit, and save individualized research guides for various classes and subjects.
- Continue to add functionality and improve usability of the College’s website and MySierra student portal
**Recommendation 5: Plan for Long-Term Debt Financing**

*The team recommends that the college develop a long term debt financing plan to address the costs associated with implementation of GASB 45 requirements.*

**PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS**

The District has long identified the actuarial requirements needed to meet the long-term health and benefit needs of the District employees and retirees. In 1994, the District and the collective bargaining units negotiated the discontinuance of life-time benefits for subsequent hires resulting in a closed-end liability. The first actuarial study was completed in 2001, prior to notification of the mandated reporting requirement.

In June 2005, after an update of the actuarial study, the District and the Omniparty (the joint negotiation group which represents all of the bargaining units) agreed to invest the post-retirement medical funds (PRMF) in an irrevocable trust. In November 2005, the actuarial liability that implementing GASB (Governmental Accounting Standards Board) revealed was directly addressed by funding parameters included in the Compensation Formula; a 5-year contractual agreement between the District and the Omniparty.

In June 2007, the plan administrator for the irrevocable trust was approved by the Board of Trustees. A Board of Authority was established to include designees from the District and each of the bargaining units. The Board of Authority meets several times annually as deemed necessary and abides by the Brown Act provisions. In January 2008, the Omniparty agreed to transfer PRMF funds to the irrevocable trust.

During this period, the District also embarked on an endeavor to educate and inform the faculty, staff, and the Board of Trustees as to the actuarial liability that was revealed by implementing GASB and the responsibility of the organization to address this deficit. A significant effort was made to make information available to the bargaining units, Strategic Council and the Board of Trustees, with multiple presentations and educational sessions. As a result, there is an environment of awareness that supports a collaborative approach to developing additional strategies.

The District continues to use the collaborative interest-based process to identify the interests of the bargaining units and the Board of Trustees for evaluation within the context of the competing demands of the institution. As the Visiting Team reported, the college’s Annual Required Contribution (ARC) is $5.5 million. The District is currently paying $3 million in pay-as-you-go. The Omniparty Compensation Formula automatically sets aside the annual increased cost of retiree benefits off the top of new COLA revenue. This will contribute a minimum of $200,000 each year. It is reasonable to assume that the current balance in the irrevocable trust has the capacity to cover three years of the funding deficit with no financial effect.

The District has identified several additional options, some unilateral and others that require negotiation, that have been shared with the Omniparty and the Board of Trustees. *5.1 GASB 45 Issues Interests and Options, August 12, 2008* These options will augment the long-term strategies already in place; the irrevocable trust and the pay-as-you-go formula agreed upon in 2005.
FUTURE PLANS

The District is currently under contract to update the actuarial study. This report is scheduled to be completed in December 2010. The District will continue to fund the pay-as-you-go formal agreement and will continue to explore and prioritize new resource opportunities and Omniparty funding strategies to further address this long-term obligation.
**Recommendation 6: Governing Board Evaluation**

The team recommends that the Board complete an annual board self evaluation to ensure that its policies promote quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services. *(IV.B.1)*

**PROGRESS AND ANALYSIS**

A Governing Board evaluation was completed by the members of the Board of Trustees and a summary was presented at the Board meeting, March 11, 2008. The Trustees revisited the evaluation for further discussion at the Board meeting on August 12, 2008. As part of the discussion at the August meeting, the Board developed a set of annual goals that were presented for ratification at the Board meeting, October 14, 2008. *(6.1 BOT October 14, 2008)* The goals, which support and promote the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the institution’s programs and services, are as follows.

1. Oversee and support development of the College’s Strategic Plan and the goals identified in that plan.
   a. Annually review the College’s master planning documents.
2. Oversee and support the Superintendent/President in the goals given him by the Board.
   a. Develop a strong evaluation tool/instrument to support the Superintendent/President.
   b. Establish a community report.
   c. Develop an annual calendar of Board tasks.
      i. Include meetings/retreat
      ii. Include review of planning documents
3. Oversee and support a timely and effective accreditation response.
4. Review the Board’s goals and complete a Board evaluation annually.
   a. Address the six items of the 2008 Board Self-evaluation receiving a grade of C.
      i. Part I, Item 4. In conjunction with the Superintendent/President, all Board members have studied and understand their roles.
      ii. Part I, Item 9. The Board requires that the college have annual goals, objectives, and work plans which are succinctly stated and which carry clear statements indicating how it will be known that any goals have been reached and what issues need further attention.
      iii. Part I, Item 10. The Board annually sets specific goals for itself as a Board. What are they this year? What should they be next year?
      iv. Part I, Item 12. The Board is involved in state and federal legislative matters.
      v. Part I, Item 15. The Board periodically requires a review of educational programs and services in order to assess their relevancy and timeliness.
      vi. Part I, Item 16. The Board ensures that the physical plant is adequate and well maintained.
5. Clarify processes for trustees to place items on the agenda of future Board meetings.
6. Refrain from allowing electoral politics or campaign enthusiasm to intrude on Board meetings or College business.

**FUTURE PLANS**

The board has scheduled an annual review of progress toward board goals.
The Commission requires the college to improve its program review process to include analysis of the currency and relevancy of the programmatic curriculum.

PROGRESS and ANALYSIS

In January 2009, the Commission took action to continue the college on Warning and added the Commission Recommendation 1 regarding program review as stated above. Although the existing Program Assessment and Review (PAR) process had received a commendation during the team visit in 2007, was embedded in practice across the district, and supported planning, it was not integral to the planning process and did not necessarily ensure alignment with the strategic goals of the district. Additionally, the PAR process was challenged by a lack of feedback to PAR authors regarding their resource requests and the process only minimally assessed program vitality.

The college acknowledged that it needed to strengthen its Program Review process, especially with regard to the elements of relevancy and currency as well as incorporating program outcomes into the planning process to improve student achievement and learning.

The Program Review Committee
The college has made several substantive changes to the PAR process over the last two years. The duties of the previous PAR Committee were assigned to the Program Review Committee (PRC) in March 2009. (CR1.1 Academic Senate March 4, 2009; CR1.2 Academic Senate March 11, 2009; CR1.3 Academic Senate March 18, 2009) Although PRC is a standing committee of Academic Senate, the committee membership includes representatives from faculty, administration, and classified staff. (2b.4 PRC Executive Report p.3) The committee was charged with broadening and enhancing the existing program review process and developing a new protocol to be used by not only instructional programs, but student services, operations and support offices and services as well.

Defining a “Program”
Within the first few weeks of meeting, the Program Review Committee defined what constituted a “program” for program review. Instructional departments and services were defined by PAR, and now ePAR (electronic Planning and Resources), as they have been for decades at Sierra. While the rule of thumb "If you wrote an ePAR, you're a unit/program" may seem arbitrary for program review purposes, it captured the boundaries and identities of units and achieved wide acceptance. A subsequent review of this approach among other colleges revealed that Sierra's approach is common.

Integration into the Planning Process
The committee defined several basic assumptions of the purpose for program review. The purpose for Program Review includes:

1. Assessing currency and relevancy for all programs – instructional, student services, support services and operations
2. Ensuring the health of the institution through program vitality
3. Improving strategic planning for individual programs and the institution
4. Ensuring a planning and resource allocation process that supports student learning and student success
5. Incorporating the development and assessment of student learning and program outcomes into the planning processes
6. Strengthening the alignment of course and program outcomes for instructional programs
7. Enhancing transparency in decision making and resource allocation

A timeline was developed to allow for a comprehensive assessment of the currency, relevancy, and effectiveness of all programs in the district and thereby facilitating and informing the planning and resource allocation for the coming year. (CR1.2 Academic Senate March 11, 2009)

**Report Templates and Rubric**
Templates were created that incorporated the information the committee would need to evaluate the programs. Three report templates were developed: Instructional Program Review Report, Student Services Program Review Report, and Program Review Report Support Offices and Services. Data elements were provided by the college’s Research and Planning Office and information was requested to enable the assessment of the currency and relevancy of each program.

Finally, to systematically evaluate the reports submitted by the various programs in the district, a rubric was created that addressed the crucial elements: program effectiveness, program relevancy, and program currency. Programs were evaluated using both quantitative and qualitative evidence. (2d.2 Program Review Templates and Rubrics 2009)

**Program Review Results**
The response to an enhanced Program Review process was outstanding as the PRC received completed program review documents from all 130 instructional and student services programs and support offices. The PRC prepared an Executive Report which summarized the findings and presented its formal findings and recommendations to the report authors and the members of Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PARAC), Strategic Council, and Dean’s Council in the Program Review Committee: 2009 Executive Report. (2b.4 PRC 2009 Executive Report)

The committee then generated a feedback report to each program that delineated the strengths and weaknesses of the program’s currency, relevancy, and effectiveness as well as provided suggestions for future reviews. In addition, a report was generated to PARAC that provided recommendations for planning and resource allocation based on the findings of the committee.

The PRC made one of three final recommendations at the end of each individual program review: Critical Attention Needed (C), Opportunity Identified (O) or Stable (S). A program review may be marked “critical attention needed” for either resource allocation or planning. If the program review was marked “critical for planning,” the recommendation was forwarded to the Academic Senate, Appropriate Educational Administrator and/or PARAC. Program reviews recommended as “opportunity identified” were deemed opportunities that would enrich or benefit student learning or the district, though these opportunities were not deemed critical. Most programs were deemed stable. “Stable” did not mean that the program does not have needs or does not deserve resource allocation. Rather, “stable” typically signified that the program was functioning well with existing resources and able to sustain currency, relevancy, and
effectiveness. Furthermore, some recommendations were dependent on conditions or occurrences not yet established, such as external budget decisions or grant funding. For those recommendations, the committee attempted to anticipate possible shifts in the environment in which certain programs function. For these programs, the committee recognized that the status of the program could shift from “stable” to “critical.” *(2b.4 PRC 2009 Executive Report)*

Each of the programs received, in addition to their final recommendation of C, O, or S, an estimated time frame in which to update their program review. Programs deemed critical or existing in a rapidly changing environment are required to update their program reviews within one to two years. Others were requested to return in two to three years and for those programs deemed stable, three years. In fall 2009, the PRC will develop a master schedule that specifically defines the year in which each program will be required to update their program review. Programs requiring accelerated review will be given first priority in the schedule and assessed during the fall 2009 to ensure that updated program review results are available for the 2010-2011 planning and resource allocation cycle which begins in February 2010. The PRC will be available for counsel for each of the programs scheduled for the accelerated program review process in fall 2009 to provide consultation and guidance.

In addition to providing feedback to the authors and recommendations to PARAC, the committee identified strengths and weaknesses of the program review process. As stated in the Program Review Executive Report, the findings were as follows:

**Strengths of this Program Review Cycle:** This program review cycle possessed the following strengths:

1. Provided a comprehensive look at the effectiveness, currency and relevancy of all district programs: instructional, operations and student services with one hundred percent participation in the process.
2. Identified programs that are significantly challenged and in need of planning or resource allocation attention as well as programs that are stable and performing admirably with the limited resources available.
3. Identified district-wide planning and resource allocation themes.
4. Illuminated limited lines of communication between programs and centers.
5. Provided needed feedback to authors of required program documentation.
6. Clarified program needs and the reasons for those needs.
7. Shifted the district further away from a personality-based decision making process to a demonstrated student/program need-based decision-making process.

**Weaknesses of this Program Review Cycle:** The PRC will address these weaknesses in subsequent cycles as well as conduct annual process evaluations:

1. Confusion remains as to who is ultimately responsible for Centers’ ePARs and program reviews - the "District" or the "Center."
2. The Committee lacked sufficient data from operations programs.
3. The usefulness of division reports, "branch" reports, or reports at a high level are in question.
4. As the request for the creation and submission of this revised program review report came within the confines of one semester, the Committee recognizes the need for training for future program review report preparation.
5. The Curriculum Currency area of the form needs development and clarification.
6. There were some technical difficulties with the form itself causing a few program reviews to be written without the appropriate data being available.
7. As the entire program review cycle was being revised simultaneously, program review forms, evaluation rubrics and recommendations from the Program Review Committee were generated without clear direction from PARAC regarding the types and forms of recommendations that they would need to see.

Additionally, the PRC included in the executive summary a description of the overarching themes derived from a review of the combined program reports. The themes found from this analysis included significant technology needs, degree or certificate granting programs that lack full time faculty stewardship, resource commitments for ancillary programs such as the Natural Science Museum and the Ridley Art Gallery, and adequate resources to support program mandates.

The program review process was completed for all instructional, student services, and operational programs by July 1st 2009 and the Executive Report presented to the Academic Senate president, PARAC members, and report authors on July 7th. The Program Review Committee: 2009 Executive Report was internally distributed through the Program Review portal on July 10th and posted to the college website.

As stated in the Executive Report, the following issues were also identified as potential future directions to further improve the process:

1. Develop a working definition of “program.”
2. Clearly delineate and educate staff about program review and ePAR differences.
3. Establish regular flex trainings for Program Review Report authors.
4. Establish an assessment process for the program review cycle.
5. Recommend that the Academic Senate, in conjunction with the district, develop a policy for program initiation and shift from program discontinuance to program vitality.
6. Work with Operations to develop a review process that includes the identification of significant data elements while clarifying what the Program Review Committee expects to see in reports from Operations.
7. Work with the Student Learning Committee to identify benchmarks for program outcome implementation for all programs.
8. Seek clarification regarding the selection process for staffing.
9. Seek clarification from PARAC regarding what data and information is significant for their process.
10. Seek clarification from PARAC and Strategic Council as to what types of recommendations they would find helpful.
11. Refine the Program Review form to better identify the data elements and information that the Program Review Committee needs.
12. Seek clarification from Academic Senate, PARAC and Strategic Council as to whether program requests for “replacement” positions should be considered in addition to program review data elements to inform the Program Review Committee’s recommendations to Academic Senate and PARAC.
During the 2009-2010 academic year that followed, the PRC worked on these items, moving ahead in most of them. It began assembling the critical components of a handbook, refined the Program Review templates, created rubrics for the evaluation of the Program Review document, and set up workshops for staff to train in matters of Program Review and its relationship to ePAR and SLOs. In addition, the Operations programs decided to guide their own Program Review process, and, therefore, this academic year marked the last year in which they were part of the PRC.

A schedule was established that places all Instructional and Student Services programs in a 3-year cycle for Program Review. (CR1.4 Program Review cycle) The factors taken into account to prepare this schedule were both the recommendation given in the first Program Review (as mentioned above) in 2009, and their place in the Curriculum Review 6-year cycle, to mitigate overlap and potential workload issues.

A second cycle of Program Review under the new 3-year rotational cycle is now under way. Each program scheduled for the 2010-2011 academic year is being offered support in the way of one-on-one meetings with the Program Review Chair during the Fall semester of 2010, including a final meeting to check on a draft version of the document before the end of the semester. This will allow programs two months to fine-tune their document before it is due in early February 2011. Most programs responded to this offer of support and are currently already working on their Program Review.

The PRC will be evaluating these documents during February 2011, and the results will be reported to PARAC later in the Spring 2011 semester. As the programs work on their document during the fall, the PRC will use this time to complete the first edition of the Handbook and discuss other matters such as membership, given the excision of the Operations programs.

Last, the definition of a “Program” is happening on its own, as the process of working on Program Review is underway. During the one-on-one meetings, it became clear that sometimes current programs need to merge, while others need to remain as separate programs. This will modify the 3-year cycle schedule, but will make the process more coherent and realistic for all parties involved.

**FUTURE PLANS**

As stated above, the Operational programs have decided to guide their own Program Review process, under the guidance of a committee comprised primarily of managers and representatives from the PRC. A 3-year Program Review schedule for operational programs will be developed in fall 2010 with the first group of programs sharing their findings with PARAC in spring 2011.
Summary of Progress in Self-Identified Planning Agenda Items

The Sierra College 2007 Institutional Self-Study for Reaffirmation of Accreditation document includes a planning agenda that lists a total of forty-seven planning items. Each of the items is listed in the chart that follows with description of the progress made to date and all items are either in progress or completed.

In spring 2008, the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) developed the Planning Agenda database, which includes the planning items along with corresponding college goal, executive staff member accountable, lead unit(s), completion status, timeline for completion, and comments. A database report is created each spring which has been reviewed and updated by the college’s ALO with assistance from the college’s executive staff.

Starting with the 2010-2011 year, assistance with the annual update will be requested from the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and the instructional and student services administrators. In addition, the status of the planning-agenda items will be reviewed each fall by the college’s Strategic Council, with directives to appropriate college constituency as necessary.

The Planning Agenda Items Spring 2010 Update begins on Page 42 of this document.
**UPDATE on SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE in PROGRESS, PENDING, OR PLANNED**

Sierra College has a pending Substantive Change Proposal for the addition of courses that constitute 50% or more of a program offered through distance learning. This proposal includes a request for approval for 49 AA/AS degrees and 21 certificates.

**History**
The district identified the need for a Substantive Change Proposal in the Distance Learning and Instructional Technology Plan in 2008. The proposal was put on hold, however, as the college was placed on Warning by the Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges in early 2008 and continued on Warning in 2009. As the Commission is aware, colleges on Warning are not eligible to submit Substantive Change Reports. Sierra College was removed from Warning and the college’s accreditation reaffirmed in January of 2010.

**Rationale**
The use of technology to connect with students across Sierra College’s 3,200 square miles is critical to students achieving their educational goals. Sierra Joint Community College District is one of the largest geographic districts in the state and serves all of Placer and Nevada Counties. Students in remote areas, particularly those in eastern Nevada and Placer Counties, may have to travel more than an hour to get to a Sierra campus. Weather is also a factor related to access for Sierra students since much of the area served is in the Sierra Nevada or Sierra Foothills where snow and inclement weather can make travel difficult, dangerous, and sometimes, impossible.

The use of distance education modalities allows the college to efficiently maximize student and staff time; improve safety for faculty, staff, and students; decrease the need for additional classroom facilities; reduce the need for parking; and lessen the need for other physical resources related to on-site instruction.

**Current Status**
The Substantive Change Proposal was approved by the Sierra College Board of Trustees on September 14, 2010 and will be submitted to the Committee on Substantive Change for the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) by October 4, 2010, for consideration by the committee at their November 2010 meeting.
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## SIERRA COLLEGE
### 2007 Accreditation - Spring 2010 Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Exec Designee</th>
<th>Responsible Manager or Committee</th>
<th>Date/Semester Completed</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The college will develop new timelines for completion of the PAR Process and completion of the budgeting process.</td>
<td>VPI</td>
<td>R&amp;P</td>
<td>F09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ePAR resource allocation process completely redesigned and implemented spring 09, with further modifications made in spring 10 for 10-11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The college will continue to refine the program assessment and review process to affect continuous program improvement. The dialogue surrounding the process of designing and assessing program outcomes must continue and expand.</td>
<td>VPI</td>
<td>Academic Senate, R&amp;P, SLC</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>In fall 2010, the college has outcomes for 88% of instructional programs, 70% of student services programs, and 75% of courses. Dialogue surrounding the development and assessment of program outcomes has been a continuous and evolving process, allowing for the development of an Institutional Assessment Plan and clearly articulated student learning outcomes in a majority of instructional and student services programs by fall 2010. Conversations around designing outcomes have taken place in a variety of contexts including Department Chairs Meeting, Academic Senate, Division Meetings, Strategic Council, PARAC, and individual departmental meetings. As a result of these conversations, Sierra College has a clearly articulated process that develops student learning outcomes and assessments at the program level, links these outcomes to courses, degrees and certificates (where applicable), and gathers results in courses and contact points. Ongoing dialogue is designed to share this process more widely throughout the campus and encourage discussions around assessment results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The new board leadership in cooperation with the new superintendent/president will reevaluate the goal setting process, the institutional goals and manner of achieving and communicating them.</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>The Board of Trustees reviews/establishes Board goals and institutional goals annually during the summer retreat. In 2009, the Board of Trustees added a second retreat in the spring. The Board also agreed to schedule focused planning sessions before the retreat. The Board continually evaluates the effectiveness of the goal setting process during their self-evaluation and the evaluation of the President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The college will continue to review and evaluate its processes.</td>
<td>VPI</td>
<td>R&amp;P</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>ePAR resource allocation process completely redesigned and implemented spring 09, with further modifications made in spring 10 for 10-11. Planning process evaluated annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Continue to institute processes and mechanisms to improve assessment of student learning outcomes.</td>
<td>Exec Designee</td>
<td>Responsible Manager or Committee</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>In Progress/Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Continue to institute processes and mechanisms to improve assessment of student learning outcomes.</td>
<td>VPI</td>
<td>Academic Senate, SLC</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several mechanisms now help support this process on campus. First, a data management system (Tracdat) gives a consistent structure for entering and generating data on the outcomes assessment process. Second, bi-annual assessment days (during the flex week that precedes both the fall and spring semester) provide training and support for faculty and staff involved in assessment. Third, the Student Learning Committee (a standing committee of Academic Senate) meets regularly to discuss and improve assessment and the dissemination of information about this ongoing process for the campus. Finally, reporting strategies are being developed to aid in the reporting and development of the assessment process for student service and instructional programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Continue to develop and implement processes for identifying and assessing student learning outcomes at the course, program and institutional levels.</th>
<th>Exec Designee</th>
<th>Responsible Manager or Committee</th>
<th>Not Started</th>
<th>In Progress/Ongoing</th>
<th>Deferred</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Continue to develop and implement processes for identifying and assessing student learning outcomes at the course, program and institutional levels.</td>
<td>VPI</td>
<td>Academic Senate, SLC</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment is a faculty-led enterprise. Departments/programs provide the focus for developing and implementing the assessment of student learning. Programs identify their goals for student learning that relate to the global focus of the discipline or service. In instructional programs, SLOs are linked to courses offered in the department. Assessment instruments and results gathered at the program level are recorded in summary/aggregate format. Department chairs hold the more detailed results that are necessary for planning purposes. After assessments have been completed and results gathered, programs discuss successes as well as changes they wish to pursue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Continue to develop and implement the program outcomes review process. Evaluate results and implement changes as appropriate.</th>
<th>Exec Designee</th>
<th>Responsible Manager or Committee</th>
<th>Not Started</th>
<th>In Progress/Ongoing</th>
<th>Deferred</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Continue to develop and implement the program outcomes review process. Evaluate results and implement changes as appropriate.</td>
<td>VPI</td>
<td>SLC</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the direction of the Student Learning Committee, by fall 2010 the college has outcomes for 88% of instructional programs, 70% of student services programs, and 75% of courses.

Student Learning Outcomes are a part of the program review process at several levels.
1. Program Review (3-year cycle) includes a review of program’s place in assessment process. This process is defined a continuous cycle reflected in five steps: identifying outcomes; developing assessments; analyzing results; making improvements; and continuing action.
### 2. ePAR (annual cycle) includes the opportunity to link goals and strategies to district goals of developing outcomes and assessments.

### 3. DSRs (produced each semester) include an overview of each program’s place in the assessment process.

### 4. Formal and informal discussions by department faculty on their assessment activities.

Under the direction of the Student Learning Committee, by fall 2010 the college has outcomes for 88% of instructional programs, 70% of student services programs, and 75% of courses.

**Student Learning Outcomes are a part of the program review process at several levels.**

1. **Program Review (3-year cycle)** includes a review of program’s place in assessment process. This process is defined a continuous cycle reflected in five steps: identifying outcomes; developing assessments; analyzing results; making improvements; and continuing action.

2. **ePAR (annual cycle)** includes the opportunity to link goals and strategies to district goals of developing outcomes and assessments.

3. **DSRs (produced each semester)** include an overview of each program’s place in the assessment process.

4. Formal and informal discussions by department faculty on their assessment activities.

---

#### 8  SS

**Continue to develop and implement the program outcomes review process as well as fully integrate it with the program assessment review report.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exec Designee</th>
<th>Responsible Manager or Committee</th>
<th>Not Started</th>
<th>In Progress/Ongoing</th>
<th>Deferred</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VPI</td>
<td>SLC, PRC</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the direction of the Student Learning Committee, by fall 2010 the college has outcomes for 88% of instructional programs, 70% of student services programs, and 75% of courses.

---

#### 9  SS

**Continue to implement the program outcome review process and integrate program outcome review with the program assessment report.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exec Designee</th>
<th>Responsible Manager or Committee</th>
<th>Not Started</th>
<th>In Progress/Ongoing</th>
<th>Deferred</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VPI</td>
<td>SLC, PRC</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the direction of the Student Learning Committee, by fall 2010 the college has outcomes for 88% of instructional programs, 70% of student services programs, and 75% of courses. Student Learning Outcomes are a part of the program review process at several levels.

1. **Program Review (3-year cycle)** includes a review of program’s place in assessment process. This process is defined a continuous cycle reflected in five steps: identifying outcomes; developing assessments; analyzing results; making improvements; and continuing action.

2. **ePAR (annual cycle)** includes the opportunity to link goals and strategies to district goals of developing outcomes and assessments.

3. **DSRs (produced each semester)** include an overview of each program’s place in the assessment process.

4. Formal and informal discussions by department faculty on their assessment activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Exec Designee</th>
<th>Responsible Manager or Committee</th>
<th>Not Started</th>
<th>In Progress/Ongoing</th>
<th>Deferred</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Spring 2010 Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>VPI</td>
<td>SLC</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. DSRs (produced each semester) include an overview of each program’s place in the assessment process. 4. Formal and informal discussions by department faculty on their assessment activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>VPI</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Curriculum Handbook goes through an annual revision. The Handbook includes a definition of General Education and approval of courses includes a discussion of the relationship between course objectives and the major areas of knowledge. When applicable, the Curriculum Committee considers the appropriateness of courses for inclusion in the general education pattern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>VPI</td>
<td>Academic Senate, SCFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Student Learning Committee, a Standing Committee of Academic Senate, encourages faculty to include established SLOs in their syllabi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>VPSS</td>
<td>VPSS</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Services SLO development, assessment and planning activities are assimilated into those coordinated throughout the district by the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (SLOAC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Exec Designee</td>
<td>Responsible Manager or Committee</td>
<td>Date/Semester Completed</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
<td>Spring 2010 Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>As the Nevada County Campus grows, the college must address the need for a computer classroom within the LRC building devoted to information competency instruction.</td>
<td>VPI</td>
<td>Exec Dean NCC</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>The area scheduled to be remodeled for use as the NCC LRC computer classroom has been reassigned to the Ghidotti Early College High School program. Information competency instruction continues to be held in LRC, disrupting quiet study and testing. No further plans have been made to address this need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Develop methods to provide adequate assistance and supervision of students at the NCC LRC.</td>
<td>VPI, VPSS</td>
<td>Exec Dean NCC</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>The NCC LRC staffing request has been presented to the OMNI Party and Strategic Council for review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The college must find creative ways to address staffing issues.</td>
<td>VPHR</td>
<td>VPHR</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staffing Plan approved April 24, 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The college will conduct training on new evaluation procedures negotiated with the bargaining units.</td>
<td>VPHR, VPI</td>
<td>VPI</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Human Resource office has offered and continues to offer training sessions on changes to evaluation procedures as well as existing procedures and best practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The Academic Senate and the faculty bargaining unit, SCFA, will collaborate to ensure that a component of faculty evaluation includes effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes.</td>
<td>VPHR</td>
<td>Academic Senate, SCFA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>SLO initiative has been addressed through Instruction efforts and is in review by the respective shared governance committees. The addition of SLO’s in the faculty evaluation process has been sunshined by the District as a negotiation item.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The Associate Vice President for Human Resources will work with the management senate to develop professional codes of ethics.</td>
<td>VPHR</td>
<td>VPHR, Management Senate</td>
<td>date</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Management Senate recently agreed to review the current professional code of ethics statement during the fall semester of 2009.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The college will explore creative ways to increase the number of full-time employees.</td>
<td>VPHR</td>
<td>VPHR</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>On April 7, 2009 the district and the faculty unit agreed to increase the number of faculty positions by 5 positions. This is in addition to the districts commitment to maintain two FTE above the full-time faculty obligation number (FON). Note: the SS IIIA.2 references the need to increase full-time faculty only.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The college will continue to explore ways to acquire needed software.

Under the guidance of the new EEO program manager, current efforts in this area will be evaluated and modified as needed.

Under the leadership of the new EEO officer, the district will further assess whether its record in employment equity is consistent with its mission.

The recently hired EEO Program Manager will update the district's EEO plan and the hiring cycle manual.

As part of the long range planning efforts, the Human Resources Department will expand its Program Assessment and Review to project longer range goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Descriiption</th>
<th>Exec. Designee</th>
<th>Responsible Manager or Committee</th>
<th>Not Started</th>
<th>In Progress/Ongoing</th>
<th>Date/Semester Completed</th>
<th>Deferred</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Spring 2010 Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The college will continue to explore ways to acquire needed software.</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>Director, IIT</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The college secured financing for new administrative software (Banner) in May 2008. Software is needed to support instruction and business due to current and new requirements, upgrades, versions, etc. Utilizing our institution’s process for resource allocation is what we use to acquire any needed software for the district. Instructional, business, and technology needs for new and upgraded software are constantly increasing and changing. We are currently behind on several versions of primary systems software throughout the district. This includes the purchase of new software and implementing current versions of software that is still determined to be needed in the district. The progress is based on resource availability and district priorities through our resource request process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Under the guidance of the new EEO program manager, current efforts in this area will be evaluated and modified as needed.</td>
<td>VPHR</td>
<td>EEO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The new Equal Employment Opportunity Representative Training Guide has been drafted, reviewed and adopted. It is now used to train new and existing EEO reps. Drafts of a new EEO plan and hiring guidelines have been developed. They are scheduled for presentation to the respective shared governance groups in 2009/10. EEO now reports to HR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Under the leadership of the new EEO officer, the district will further assess whether its record in employment equity is consistent with its mission.</td>
<td>VPHR</td>
<td>EEO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The EEO/HR Director has reviewed the District hiring practices and determined that they are consistent. An annual assessments process has been drafted (in conjunction with a new EEO policy) and is scheduled for shared governance committee review in 2009/10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The recently hired EEO Program Manager will update the district’s EEO plan and the hiring cycle manual.</td>
<td>VPHR</td>
<td>EEO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drafts of a new EEO plan and hiring guidelines have been developed. They are scheduled for presentation to the respective shared governance groups in 2009/10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>As part of the long range planning efforts, the Human Resources Department will expand its Program Assessment and Review to project longer range goals.</td>
<td>VPHR</td>
<td>VPHR</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The HR department has developed a comprehensive staffing plan and has presented it through the governance process. This plan includes goals for the near and midterm period. The plan will be updated every 3 years as part of the overall Sierra College planning cycle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Spring 2010 Status

| Item | Source | The college must seek ways to fund the repair of the Rocklin Campus. | Exec Designee | Responsible Manager or Committee | Not Started | In Progress/Ongoing | Deferred | Due Date | The condition of Rocklin campus facilities is well understood. The updated Facilities Master Plan for the Rocklin campus will be the basis for the development of a multi-year campus renovations program, which can be funded in a variety of ways including state funding or a local general obligation bond. State funding will be pursued via annual submittal of 5-year construction plans and 5-year maintenance plans for the campus; which will be used for facility repairs, renovations, and new facilities. |
|------|--------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|-------------|---------------------|----------|---------| In addition to the funding sources identified in IIIB.1 a. above, the College Safety Committee uses a small annual budget to correct campus safety issues, and is also the conduit for requesting ASCIP funding as appropriate for safety equipment, safety training, and some facility safety repairs. Additionally in 08/09 The Facility Council, chaired by VPFA, was created to prioritize facility requests and address any unresolved working conditions. |
| 26   | SS     | The college will seek ways to fund improvements to the Rocklin campus so that a safe and healthful working learning and working environment can be maintained. | VPFA          | VPFA                          | x           | TBD                 | TBD      |         | |
| 27   | SS     | Complete the technology master plan and secure support and funding for its implementation. | Pres          | Director, IIT                | 5/13/2008   |                     |          |         | The Technology Master Plan (TMP) was board approved 13 May 2008 and the board is provided an annual update on the progress of this plan. Funding is based on our institutions process for resource allocations and is what we use to acquire resources to support the TMP and the districts goals. Instructional, business, and technology needs based on the TMP are supported by our collaborative environment. This process includes recommendations through our Banner Steering Committee and our Educational Technology Council. The recommendations are then shared with the district that may include Strategic Council and eventually the Board. In our current process resources are assigned based on district prioritization and funding availability. |
### SIERRA COLLEGE
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Complete and fund a comprehensive Technology Master Plan.</th>
<th>Exec Designee</th>
<th>Responsible Manager or Committee</th>
<th>Not Started</th>
<th>In Progress/Ongoing</th>
<th>Date/Semester Completed</th>
<th>Deferred</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The Technology Master Plan was board approved 13 May 2008 and the board is provided an annual update on the status of this plan. Instructional, business, and technology needs aligned with the Technology Master Plan compete for funding using our collaborative environment. Due to the extensive technology needs of the district funding is a challenge and needs to be thought of in the millions of dollars to modernize and update our district in order to be in alignment with our TMP. Utilizing our institutions process for resource allocation is used to acquire needed funding for the district goals that are outlined in the Technology Master Plan in support of the Educational Master Plan. Modernization is proving very challenging in this economic climate as the district struggles to fund not only technology but other competing needs as well and is the primary limitation to completing this plan.</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>Director, IIT</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>S09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The college will work to synchronize the budget timeline, the Compensation Agreement Formula timeline and the PAR process timeline.</td>
<td>VPI</td>
<td>R&amp;P</td>
<td>S09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The college, under the director of IT management, has formed an administrative systems advisory taskforce (ASAT) to evaluate software funding options and provide for the software needs of the Business Services Division.</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>Director, IIT</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Business software is needed to support business services due to new requirements, upgrades, versions, etc. Business services technology needs for new and upgraded software are constantly changing. The Banner Steering Committee meets twice a month to discuss this system and related systems issues. This includes funding, staffing, and other relevant concerns. Utilizing our institutions collaborative structure technology works with our business partners to evaluate and plan for solutions that will meet the needs of our institution. Our new administrative system has been implemented and resources are continuously needed to ensure we are able to support and use it effectively and efficiently. Resource limitations also limit the use of all systems features and enhancements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Exec Designee</th>
<th>Responsible Manager or Committee</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Date/Semester Completed</th>
<th>Spring 2010 Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The college will continue its efforts at integrating key processes and implement changes that synchronize PAR, compensation formula, and budget processes.</td>
<td>VPI</td>
<td>R&amp;P</td>
<td></td>
<td>S09</td>
<td>New planning process synchronizes budget development and ePAR processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The college will undertake efforts to complete the process of developing, publicizing the new ethics statements and conduct a campus wide survey to measure knowledge of and adherence to these statements.</td>
<td>VPHR</td>
<td>VPHR</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>See AP 3050 adopted 6/11/07. The Management group is in the process of updating their Ethics statement (anticipated Spring 2010). Once the Management statement is updated and adopted, the Human Resources Department will develop and deliver a campus wide survey to measure knowledge of and adherence to the statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The college will continue its efforts to communicate and encourage participation to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation of new ideas.</td>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>The college President schedules monthly Open Forums for staff to engage in an open dialogue. Strategic Council is the primary shared governance committee and meets twice monthly. Representatives (five each of students, faculty, classified, and management) are responsible for communicating with their constituent groups and carrying forward their constituent groups' ideas and concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The college will explore ways to help part-time faculty feel more connected to the institution's shared governance process.</td>
<td>VPI</td>
<td>VPI</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Part time faculty can attend the part time faculty orientation, sponsored by the Instruction Office, or the Faculty Caucus sponsored by SCFA (specifically for part time faculty), both offered during flex week. In addition, part time faculty served on Strategic Council, the district's primary shared governance planning council. And finally, all shared governance committee minutes are posted in Shared Folders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Working closely with the new president, the college must engage in long range planning using the PAR tool.</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>R&amp;P</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>The PAR process was revised in 2008-09 to be utilized for short-term (1-2 years) planning. Long range planning is established through the Strategic Master Plan. The President works closely with the college in an ongoing way through Strategic Council and PARAC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Spring 2010 Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Exec Designee</th>
<th>Responsible Manager or Committee</th>
<th>Not Started</th>
<th>In Progress/Ongoing</th>
<th>Date/Semester Completed</th>
<th>Deferred</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The board and the CEO will periodically review and clarify the board’s role as advocate for the institution and representative for the public and incorporate these concerns into its self-evaluation.</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Sierra College will continue to review board policies as recommended. By using reports from the president, retreats and evaluations, the board will be made aware of policies and implementations on a regular basis. The college president will advise board members when they step beyond accepted policy.</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The board will continue to follow its policy regarding an annual self evaluation and work to insure that evaluation is an effective tool in board productivity.</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The new president will work with the board to clarify the Code of Ethics and how it relates to individual board members and to the board as a whole. The board will renew its commitment to work together, ethically, for the good of the college.</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Board of Trustees completes self-evaluation annually, most recently on March 10, 2009, which includes the Board’s role in the community. The Board created a Community Relations subcommittee in spring 2008 and developed a community report which will be updated annually.

- The college has an established process for review and update of Board Policies and Administrative Procedures, which outlines the role of the Board of Trustees. The President interacts with the Trustees, regarding policies and procedures, as appropriate.

- See 18 and 21.

- The Board of Trustees’ Norms for Conduct were reviewed and updated in March 2009.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Exec Designee</th>
<th>Responsible Manager or Committee</th>
<th>Not Started</th>
<th>In Progress/Ongoing</th>
<th>Deferred</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Spring 2010 Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The board will continue to be involved in the accreditation process and will be informed of actions taken when recommendations are received. The board and the college will use the accreditation standards and recommendations in strategic planning and policy deliberations.</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Updates and information regarding accreditation are on the Board of Trustees' agenda monthly. The accreditation recommendations and standards are incorporated in the president's evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The board will work with the superintendent/president to resume the normal process for evaluation of the president now that a full time superintendent/president has been hired. (July 1, 2006)</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>The Board of Trustees evaluates the president on a quarterly basis throughout the year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The new president will continue to assume primary responsibility in these areas and move the college forward for the improvement of student outcomes.</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Ongoing. The president continues to assume primary responsibility for the college's improvement of student outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The president will continue to plan, oversee, and evaluate the administrative structure to ensure that it is organized and staffed to reflect the institution's purposes, size, and complexity.</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Ongoing. The president continues to plan, oversee, and evaluate the administrative structure of the institution to ensure it is organized and staffed to reflect the purpose, size, and complexity of the institution, as guided by the resource allocation process. Additionally, in September 2008 Strategic Council began an extensive interest-based discussion on how to staff the college effectively. The facilitated discussion concluded in April 2009 with several recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Exec Designee</th>
<th>Responsible Manager or Committee</th>
<th>Date/Semester Completed</th>
<th>Deferred</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Spring 2010 Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Under the guidance of the new president, and using the shared governance process, the college will develop long range planning strategies.</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Strategic Master Plan, which includes long-range (3-5 years) planning strategies was completed in December 2008. The Educational Master Plan was completed in December 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Under the leadership of the new president, the board and the campus community need to set priorities and fund them appropriately.</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing/In Progress. The resource allocation process establishes institutional priorities and allocates resources with the participation of the Board of Trustees and the campus community in an ongoing cyclical way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>The president will continue to meet with community members and groups.</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing. The president continues to meet with community groups and organizations as his schedule allows. Community relations are included in his evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>