



MIDTERM REPORT

October 2021

Submitted to:

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Submitted by:

Columbia College

11600 Columbia College Drive

Sonora, CA 95370

Certification Page

Date: October 15, 2021

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From: Columbia College
11600 Columbia College Drive
Sonora, CA 95370

This *Midterm Report* is submitted in accordance with expectations of the Commission to illustrate our ongoing improvement efforts and to demonstrate progress since our Institutional Self Evaluation Report in 2017.

We certify that there was broad participation in the preparation of this Report by the campus community, and we believe the *Midterm Report* accurately reflects the nature and substance of the institution.

Certified by signatures submitted directly to the Commission under separate cover:

G.H. Javaheripour, Ed.D.
Interim President, Columbia College

Lahna VonEpps
President, Academic Senate

Henry C. V. Yong, Ed.D., Ed.S.
Chancellor, Yosemite Community College District

Abby Sunday
President, Classified Senate

Marguerite Bulkin
Board Chair, Yosemite Community College District

Jillian Daly
President, Leadership Team Advisory Council

Brian K. Sanders, Ed.D.
Vice President of Instruction/ALO

Ricki Lee Korba
President, Associated Students of Columbia College

Colin Thomas, Ph.D.
Institutional Effectiveness Council Co-Chair

Table of Contents

Certification Page.....	2
Table of Contents	3
1. Statement of Report Preparation	4
2. Plans Arising from the Self-Evaluation Process	5
2.1 List and Disposition of Actionable Improvement Plans	6
3. Institutional Reporting on Quality Improvements	17
3.1 Response to Recommendations for Improvement	17
3.2 Reflection on Improving Institutional Performance: Student Learning Outcomes and Institution Set Standards	24
4. Report on the Outcomes of the Quality Focus Projects	33
4.1 Quality Focus Project 1 – More Effectively Using Learning Outcomes Assessment Results to Improve Programs, Instruction, and Student Learning	33
4.2 Quality Focus Project 2 – Increasing Program Completion Rates	37
Appendix 1 – Evidence	40
Appendix 2 – 2021 Annual Report	42
Appendix 3 – 2021 Annual Fiscal Report	48

1. Statement of Report Preparation

Columbia College began addressing actionable improvement plans identified in its 2017 *Institutional Self Evaluation Report* (ISER) and following its external evaluation site visit in October 2017. The College fully implemented its new governance councils established just prior to the site visit, and set in motion improvement activities like those outlined in the two Quality Focus Projects in the ISER. Upon receipt of the External Evaluation Report and the subsequent action letter from the Commission, the College rectified the two compliance matters included therein and submitted a follow-up report in February 2019, resulting in the reaffirmation of the College's accreditation in June of 2019. Meanwhile, the College's three participatory governance councils have continued to implement plans for improvement.

This Midterm Report was completed under the oversight of the College's *Institutional Effectiveness Council* (IEC), and coordinated by the College's Vice President of Instruction/Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) and IEC Faculty Co-Chair. The IEC developed a plan to gather evidence of progress and shared it with College Council, Student Success Council, Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Committee, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Associated Students, and other committees and groups at the college. The matrix of *Actionable Improvement Plans* generated in the College's ISER was also circulated for review and input about its updated disposition, then again circulated for adjustments and validation. The IEC delegated the writing process for Quality Focus Project 1, about the College's SLO Improvements, to the SLO Committee, whose leaders authored drafts, gathered input, edited, and submitted their work to the ALO. The IEC delegated the writing for Quality Focus Project 2 about improving student completion to the Student Success Council, whose leaders likewise engaged in an authoring, reviewing, and editing cycle with council members. The College's Director of Research and Planning developed the analysis of Institutional Performance.

The draft report was circulated through all governance councils and constituent groups by the end of Spring 2021. A smaller team of writers worked through Summer 2021 to add final content and streamline the document into a final draft, which was reviewed and approved by all constituent groups and College Council in early Fall 2021. The final Midterm Report was approved by the Yosemite Community College Board of Trustees in early October, 2021.

2. Plans Arising from the Self-Evaluation Process

As part of the 2017 ISER, Columbia College reflected about what is expected of high quality academic institutions and noted areas where its own performance could be improved. These areas were recorded in a matrix of *Actionable Improvement Plans*. Two primary themes frequently arose – student learning outcomes and student completion – and these two items were consequently selected as Columbia College's Quality Focus Projects. The matrix of Actionable Improvement Plans was reviewed and updated for this midterm report to indicate progress made since 2017 and identify outstanding items with a completion timeline and responsible parties (Section 2.1 below), while more detailed updates on the Quality Focus Projects are given in Chapter 4 in this report.

2.1 List and Disposition of Actionable Improvement Plans

I.A.2	The College will follow through on its plans to cyclically assess its Institutional SLOs and use those results for improvement.
Progress and Outcomes	The College's ISLOs were reviewed by the SLO Committee in Spring 2019. The committee resolved to reduce from sixteen ISLOs to a smaller, focused set to provide more useful, less redundant data. The new ISLOs were approved by College Council in Fall 2019. The College engaged in a re-mapping of CSLOs to the new ISLOs in Spring 2020 through Spring 2021. The College will assess the effectiveness of these revised ISLOs in the current year and revise further if needed. The SLO Committee will establish a review cycle thereafter.
Evidence	2.1.I.A.2.a-SLO Comm.Academic Senate.College Council minutes-adopting new ISLOs 2.1.I.A.2.b-Table showing CSLO to ISLO Mappings Completed
I.B.2	The College will work to improve the integration of learning outcomes into planning and the use of assessment for program improvement.
Progress and Outcomes	The College adopted an integrated planning cycle where SLO results are incorporated into Program Reviews (PR), and has been working on its implementation. The College has been working on improving its SLO process through committee planning, and ensuring that information is being gathered tracked in anticipation of the eLumen solution helping to tie SLOs to curricular outcomes. For Spring 2020, the College moved its Instructional PR template from an antiquated online system into a fillable PDF as an intermediate step in anticipation of integrating PR into eLumen. With the major disruption caused by COVID-19, the IEC suspended the PR process for Spring 2020, and, resumed it in a more limited fashion (i.e., only full-cycle reviews not mid-cycle reviews) using the PDF template in Spring 2021. The College will continue using the PDF template with the intention of transitioning instructional PR into eLumen for a more integrated solution once that system is fully set up.
Remaining Steps	In Fall 2021 , the Director of Research & Planning and VPI will lead the IEC to create a new Program Review system to be implemented in Spring 2022 .
Evidence	2.1.I.B.2-Program Review Files-Chemistry and Entrepreneurship.Sp2019
I.B.4	The College will improve the ways in which it utilizes results of assessment for program improvement.
Progress and Outcomes	Incorporated in I.A.2 and I.B.2 above.
I.B.7	The College's new Institutional Effectiveness Council will develop clear processes and cycles of evaluation for all college policies and procedures.
Progress and Outcomes: Completed	College policies and procedures are found in two primary places – explicitly delineated in Board Policies and Procedures and incorporated into the college's catalog. Review cycles for the former are well established and ongoing. The Catalog Chunking Committee was established by IEC in February 2018 to attend to the latter. The committee divided introductory catalog pages housing most college policies and procedures into sections. Members carefully work through each section on a cyclical basis, attending to effective voicing for students, clarity, removal of unnecessary steps, and currency. Appropriate constituencies review each policy. For example, the Catalog Chunking Committee led efforts to revise the Academic Integrity Policy to utilize vocabulary at the college freshman level. As another example, the committee led the College to revise its Pass/No-Pass unit restrictions to align with Title 5 minimum criteria.
Evidence	2.1.I.B.7.a-IEC minutes indicating Establishment of Chunking Committee 2.1.I.B.7.b-IEC Minutes illustrating work of Chunking Committee

I.C.3	The College will continue its eLumen implementation project and ensure that PSLO and ISLO data are analyzed and discussed as indicated in this report.
Progress and Outcomes: <i>Nearing Completion</i>	Both PSLO and ISLO data were incorporated into Spring 2019 Program Reviews. In their analysis of PSLO and ISLO results, faculty members found data that was difficult to interpret because the information in eLumen was not mapped in a sensible way, especially following a full historical load of curriculum and catalog information as part of its implementation plan. The college's ISLOs have also been since revised, requiring additional updates in the system. Programming and mapping elements into eLumen has been a large and ongoing task, but is finally nearing completion.
Evidence	2.1.I.C.3.a-Sp20 review of ISLO data college-wide 2.1.I.B.2-Program Review Files-Chemistry and Entrepreneurship.Sp2019
I.C.5	The College will develop a more formal listing of its local policies and procedures and a regular cycle for their review and improvement.
Progress and Outcomes: <i>Completed</i>	Effective Summer 2021, the College shifted to an online catalog. Local policies and procedures affecting students previously housed in the printed catalog were moved to the online catalog. These were parsed into individual webpages within the online catalog. Behind the scenes, each page was tagged with responsible parties, last date of review, and next expected date of review.
Evidence	2.1.I.C.5.a-Revised College Academic Integrity Policy from 2021-22 Catalog 2.1.I.C.5.b-IEC Chunking Committee Catalog Policy Spreadsheet 2021
II.A.3	The College will continue the effective implementation of eLumen and regular assessment of all types of SLOs as scheduled.
Progress and Outcomes: <i>Nearing Completion</i>	CSLO assessment has become routine, with about 80% of expected assessments completed each term. Faculty contractual duties have recently been modified to reinforce expectations to participate in SLO assessment for individual courses and collective activities. "SLO Camps" described in the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report were used as a means to gather assessment results in the past, but have been discontinued because they are no longer necessary. The SLO Committee's recommendation to revise ISLOs was readily adopted by IEC and College Council, illustrating commitment to revisions for effectiveness. During AY2021-22, eLumen will be fully adopted and implemented for SLOs, Curriculum, and Catalog. Ultimately, Instructional Program Review will be incorporated into the system, providing for maximal integration of SLO results.
Evidence	2.1.II.A.3.a-Contract language re faculty participation in SLO process 2.1.I.A.2.a-SLO Comm.Academic Senate.College Council minutes-adopting new ISLOs 2.1.II.A.3.c-Fall 2020 Assessment Completion List

II.A.4	The College will continue to expand its offerings to ESL students and strengthen the supports provided to these students in order to help them move into credit-bearing, college-level coursework.
Progress and Outcomes	The College hired new part-time coordinator for its California Adult Education Program (CAEP) in Fall 2019. He was working to identify places to expand ESL offerings in the region, such as local churches with higher numbers of Latinx members, when COVID resulted in a shift to online instruction. ESL struggled in the shift in Spring 2020. In Fall 2020 and Spring 2021, online ESL offerings were approximately half of previous terms. To align college efforts, CAEP and ESL were incorporated into the new External Initiatives (EI) department at the College. The EI team worked in spring and summer 2021 to restore face-to-face ESL offerings and will continue to work to expand these vital services to our community.
Remaining Steps	The External Initiatives team will continue identifying communities with unmet need for ESL in our region and providing courses to support them. This project will continue to expand in 2021 through 2024 .
Evidence	2.1.II.A.4.a-Job description for Program Specialist for CAEP 2.1.II.A.4.b-ESL Offerings and Enrollments by Term 2017-2021
II.A.5	The College will continue with the project, discussed in other areas of this report, to build clear graphics showing pathways through degree and certificate programs. These pathway graphics will be used in counseling sessions, seminars, and online to guide students toward program completion in a reasonable amount of time.
Progress and Outcomes: Completed	Program-specific advising guides have been produced for most award pathways. These are incorporated into Programs of Study webpages where they are accessed and used by counselors. Each program advising guide can be downloaded by students as a pdf to help guide their selection of courses. In the next phase of the online catalog, we will include eLumen’s new Recommended Sequencing feature to more readily indicate term-by-term scheduling patterns for efficient program completion. The new Online Catalog allows students to view Programs of Study by area, illustrating the nested nature of different award levels.
Evidence	2.1.II.A.5.a-Screenshot of new Programs of Study webpages 2.1.II.A.5.b-Screenshot of Online Catalog Programs of Study 2.1.II.A.5.c-Examples of Program Advising Guides 2.1.II.A.5.d-Program Webpage Illustrating Advising Guides 2.1.II.A.5.e-Sample eLumen Program with Recommended Sequence 2.1.II.A.5.f-Nested Programs of Study in Catalog

II.A.11	The College recognizes that its systems are well planned but that it will require a continued investment of time and energy to fully institutionalize the process of assessing PSLOs and ISLOs based on its CSLO data.
Progress and Outcomes	The College has been using eLumen for more than five years now. In that time, about 84% of currently active courses that have enrolled any students have been assessed at least once, and many have been assessed multiple times. The early CSLO generated by eLumen illustrated a functional problem with the college's CSLO-ISLO mappings – redundant and clouded data. As a result, the College has streamlined its ISLOs and instituted a one-to-one matching expectation wherein each CSLO maps to at most one ISLO. The next phase of this project will be to make systemic revisions of CSLO statements to improve clarity and ensure they effectively inform ISLOs and PSLOs. These revisions are in progress.
Remaining Steps	The SLO Committee will begin the process of revising CSLO statements to better inform PSLOs and ISLOs. This will be their ongoing work over the next three to five years as courses and programs go through their typical curriculum review cycles.
Evidence	2.1.I.A.2.b-Table showing CSLO to ISLO Mappings Completed 2.1.II.A.11.a-SLOAssessmentTrackingAnalysis 2.1.II.A.11.b-Senate and SLO Committee minutes illustrating revisions of SLO structure to improve effectiveness
II.A.12	The College will develop more effective online class filtering and searching tools to simplify the process for students to meet their GE requirements.
Progress and Outcomes: Completed	<p>Class Search (WebAdvisor) was modified to include the ability to search for courses by GE category. This significantly improved students' abilities to find the courses they need.</p> <p>The expanded use of Starfish allows students to search for courses by GE category and place those into their planned schedule of classes.</p> <p>The district has deployed Ellucian Self-Service whose functionality will far exceed its predecessor, Class Search. Modern filters will support search characteristics by location, GE category, instructional modality, and more.</p> <p>The next phase of eLumen Catalog will illustrate the recommended scheduling pattern to fulfill the requirements of each program of study. Students can then utilize Starfish to establish their own custom schedule to match the recommended sequencing with specific course selections by term.</p>
Evidence	2.1.II.A.12.a-Screenshot of current Class Search GE filter 2.1.II.A.12.b-Screenshot of Starfish Student Planner GE search 2.1.II.A.12.c-Screenshot of new Self Service GE filter 2.1.II.A.5.e-Sample eLumen Program with Recommended Sequence

II.A.14	The College will focus its attention on additional areas within CTE to refresh the curriculum, revitalize enrollments, and reinvigorate relationships with local businesses.
Progress and Outcomes	The College has refined its program offerings in CTE areas to streamline student pathways. The welding program has been expanded to include a fabrication course as a first step toward a more thorough program. Conversations have begun regarding retooling the automotive program to support electric automobile repairs. The new Dean of CTE is engaging community businesses and will increase those efforts as COVID-19 restrictions are lifted. The CTE Dean has also taken responsibility for coordinating annual CTE advisory meetings, ensuring that agendas cover essential topics, and housing records of all such meetings. The College is partnering with MJC and Adventist Health to offer Medical Assisting and Certified Nursing Assistant training in Sonora in response to community need.
Remaining Steps	From 2021-23 , in accordance with expected two-year review cycles, CTE faculty will conduct additional program refinements to align programs with student demand and community need and validate the changes with their advisory committees. Annual CTE Advisory meetings will be scheduled and held to conduct meaningful discussion of community needs. The CTE Dean is responsible to oversee these efforts.
Evidence	2.1.II.A.14.a-Minutes of Spring 2021 CTE Advisory meetings – folder screenshot 2.1.II.A.14.b-Revisions to Welding – new fabrication course outline 2.1.II.A.14.c-2016-17 program awards vs 2021-22 program awards
II.A.15	To improve, the Academic Senate will conclude its revision of its program viability process and the College will assess its programs using those criteria. The College will pursue cooperative programs and video-conferencing to support the widest possible reliable offerings for its students.
Progress and Outcomes: Completed	<p>The Program Viability, Revitalization, and Discontinuance Procedures were adopted in January 2019. The College followed these procedures to examine two program areas, Auto Body and Office Technology, in the 2020-21 year, resulting in discontinuance of these programs. Students affected by the discontinuances were contacted and substitute courses from other institutions were identified to enable students to complete their programs.</p> <p>In 2019-20, the College received a Partnership Resource Team grant from the CCCCO to support video-based instruction as an outreach to new markets. In October 2020, the College received a five-year, \$2.25M Title III grant to support continued efforts in this area and has hired a program director and two additional staff members to support outreach efforts.</p> <p>The College has also established a connection to the California Virtual College, cvc.edu, wherein all online courses are visible across the state to all users of the cvc website. This will increase enrollments in online classes, which will provide the balance needed to prevent cancellation of on-campus advanced courses necessary for program completion.</p>
Evidence	2.1.II.A.15.a-Program Viability Majority Report – Auto Body 2.1.II.A.15.b-Program Viability Majority Report – Office Technology 2.1.II.A.15.c-Columbia College PRT Institutional Innovation and Effectiveness Plan-04.27.2020 2.1.II.A.15.d-Title III Grant Logic Model and Budget Summary 2.1.II.A.15.e-Screenshot of Columbia College courses in cvc.edu

II.A.16	The College will demonstrate its ongoing commitment to effective program review by following its newly established four-year integrated cycle of review, continuing to fund resources and personnel based on inclusion in program reviews, and through the oral/visual presentations to the college community associated with each full program review. It is also expected that the program review instrument itself will be revisited in the coming year to ensure that it effectively integrates the results of assessment of learning outcomes.
Progress and Outcomes: Completed	The College has firmly established a culture of Program Review presentations at fall in-service day. Each year, those programs who completed their PR in the spring give a brief, engaging presentation to the full college community in August. Doing so has heightened general understanding of other programs at the institution outside one's own area. Each year, departments update their PR resource requests. These requests are then compiled and ranked by divisions, reviewed by the administrative team, and vetted by College Council prior to funding. Some resource requests, such as the need for additional fulltime faculty, are reviewed and ranked in other ways. The faculty hiring prioritization process was fine-tuned in Spring 2021 to better align with Strategic Staffing goals for the institution. See previous action plans in this table for further information about integrating CSLO, PSLO, and ISLO results into PR.
Evidence	2.1.II.A.16.a-In-Service Agendas showing Program Review presentations 2.1.II.A.16.b-Prioritization of Faculty Hiring Requests 2.1.II.A.16.c-College Council minutes re budget development and funding of resource requests 2.1.II.A.16.d-Existing and in-progress new Faculty Hiring Prioritization Process 2.1.II.A.16.e-Strategic Staffing Diagram
II.B.3	The College can expand its culture of assessment by creating and evaluating SLOs for additional learning support areas, assessing those SLOs, and utilizing the results for improvement of services. Areas to be addressed include the Math Lab, Instructional Technology Center, DSPS tutoring and the Hi-Tech Center, Career/Transfer Center, and TRIO SSS tutoring and peer mentoring.
Progress and Outcomes: Completed	SLOs each of the service areas cited were developed in conjunction with the college's Student Support Services Division (SSS) integration into the Program Review/SLO cycle. During Summer 2021, the College Research and Planning Office reviewed all of the SSS SLOs and observed that, while most of them broadly supported the college's mission and ISLOs, many of them were non-evaluable, or had not been updated to the college's new strategic goals and ISLOs that were adopted in Fall 2020.
Remaining Steps:	The Research and Planning Office will consult with SSS staff to improve and update SLOs each full-cycle Program Review, and will develop additional recommendations and guidance for developing measurable goal-statements derived from SLOs during the course of the next academic year, and in conjunction with plans to further develop Instructional Review.
Evidence	2.1.II.B.3.a-Student Services SLO Statements 2.1.II.B.3.b-DSPS SLO Assessment Summary 2.1.II.B.3.c-TRIO SLO Assessment Summary

II.C.1	The format of program review continues to be improved each year. These continued improvements will better incorporate the results of assessment of SLOs. The College's eLumen SLO management system will also be further developed and refined to gather and compile assessment results more easily and provide a forum to record the meaningful dialog and recommendations needed based on these assessments.
Progress and Outcomes	Incorporated in I.A.2, I.B.2, I.C.3, II.A.3,II.A.16, and II.B.3.
II.C.2	To provide more thorough and effective online guidance and advising resources to its students, the College has joined the pilot of California's Educational Planning Initiative (EPI). A key component of the EPI is implementation of Hobsons Starfish Degree Planner. Implementation is expected by fall 2017. Counselors and faculty are also working together to construct coherent, structured pathways to each of the College's certificates, degrees, and transfer options through advising guides. Each guide will present a clear, easy-to-follow pathway through the courses required for a given award.
Progress and Outcomes: Completed	Starfish has been fully implemented at Columbia College. All counselors use it to advise students. Students are independently using it to plan their educational journeys. Deans have finalized a master two-year plan and committed to offering the core courses required for program completion in each area of study, ensuring that students' plans are not voided by cancellations. Program advising guides have been created for most programs to illustrate term-by-term enrollment patterns to complete a program of study in a timely manner.
Evidence	2.1.II.A.12.b-Screenshot of Starfish Student Planner GE search 2.1.II.C.2.b-Report of Active Education Plans in Starfish 8.17.2021 2.1.II.A.5.c-Examples of Program Advising Guides
II.C.3	A cross-program assessment of services will be undertaken to gauge the best practices of the College and deploy those to other service areas. For example, the EOPS online orientation may be replicated within DSPS and the TRIO Canvas learning environment may prove useful for other programs.
Progress and Outcomes: Completed	EOPS's online orientation has been replicated in the college's TRIO program. The best practice of utilizing Canvas as a central hub for activities is growing at the College. In addition to EOPS, TRIO is now using this approach. Moreover, in Fall 2020, a group of faculty members conducted a professional development project to record essential faculty duties (e.g. certifying rosters, assigning grade) as modules in a Faculty Hub, an online faculty handbook housed in Canvas. Likewise, faculty engaged in our new video broadcast mode of instruction collaborated to create a Canvas-based how-to manual for effective instructional methods.
Evidence	2.1.II.C.3-Screenshots illustrating expansion of best practices

II.C.5	The College continues to strive for improvement in accuracy, completeness, and clarity of information for students. To that end, counselors will continue working with instructional faculty to develop Advising Guides, which delineate two-year maps through college coursework, leading to awards and employment or transfer. The College is implementing the Educational Planning Initiative's recommended student online advising tool, Hobsons Starfish. Training and marketing for students and faculty will provide a smooth transition to using this new tool.
Progress and Outcomes: Completed	Advising guides have been constructed for most of the College's programs. Starfish is fully deployed and utilized by counselors, other faculty, and students. Extensive training sessions have been offered. Starfish has been marketed to students. The College continues to refine the data underlying Starfish and is seeking resolution to some lingering technical difficulties. Once finalized, further marketing will take place to get students familiar with the tool.
Evidence	2.1.II.A.5.c-Examples of Program Advising Guides 2.1.II.C.5.a-Communications to Students about Starfish
II.C.6	As in the previous standard, continue to develop and publish Advising Guides, in print and online, to help students choose a program based on their interest and follow its requirements through an appropriate pattern of coursework.
Progress and Outcomes	Incorporated in II.A.5, II.C.2, and II.C.5.

II.C.7	While meeting validity and review expectations, the College recognizes that students placed into remedial courses have lesser chances of program completion. The College is actively engaged in an expansion of the ways in which students can demonstrate eligibility for higher-level coursework using multiple measures. Dialog is ongoing and new approaches and benchmarks are under consideration. The College is also meeting with its sister institution, Modesto Junior College, to co-develop the content maps required for use with the new statewide Common Assessment Instrument (CAI). The goal is for a student's performance on the CAI to result in common placement across the two Colleges.
Progress and Outcomes: <i>Completed</i>	<p>The statewide Common Assessment Instrument has been dropped. AB 705 has been fully implemented at the College. As a result, all students have direct access to transferrable English and Math courses, either with or without a concurrent support course. For students who graduated high school in the last ten years, the College automatically places students based on their high school GPA, with some students receiving a recommendation to also enroll in a corequisite support course. Students further removed from high school and others seeking more customized recommendations may use Guided Self-Placement instruments to point them toward the appropriate English and Math courses.</p> <p>The observable impacts of these changes to success in terms of transferrable English and Math completion in students' first year have been modest, but are directionally promising. According to the district's annual factbook, the percentage of students who attempted transferrable English in their first year increased from about 30% for the AY2016-17 first-year student cohort to about 48% for the AY2020-21 cohort, while the percentage who completed English increased from about 24% to about 31%. The percentage of students who attempted transferrable Math in their first year increased from a much lesser baseline of just 11% for the AY2016-17 first-year cohort to 32% for the AY2020-21 cohort. The percentage who completed transferrable Math increased from about 8% to about 21%. The increases for Math are much sharper than those for English, but remain at levels that suggest additional effort is needed to boost first-year completion.</p>
Evidence	2.1.II.C.7.a-Screenshot of Math Self-Placement webpage 2.1.II.C.7.b-Catalog pages showing math placement advice 2.1.II.C.7.c-Catalog pages showing English placement advice 2.1.II.C.7.d-YCCD Factbook 2021
III.A.6	Changes to the faculty evaluation process are currently being negotiated and will help document the activities that the College already completes as it relates to the assessment of learning outcomes and the improvement of student learning.
Progress and Outcomes: <i>N/A</i>	Standard III.A.6 has been deleted by the Commission. Consequently, this actionable improvement plan is no longer needed. Nevertheless, faculty contractual duties now contain expectations to participate in assessment practices.

III.A.14	The College will utilize its new Institutional Effectiveness Council (IEC) and a Focused Inquiry Group (FIG) in the Academic Wellness Educators (AWE) Committee to reinvigorate professional development for all employees. The IEC will establish meaningful evaluation processes for professional development activities and measure the impact of these activities on the improvement of teaching and learning.
Progress and Outcomes: Completed	The Academic Wellness Educators Committee was discontinued. In its place, the Teaching, Learning, and Community Initiative was established to provide professional development for all employees. Extensive professional development opportunities are provided each term, including Peer Observation Pools (POPs) for faculty and staff, Teaching Test Kitchen Laboratories (TTKLs) in which a group of employees work together on a specified topic, thematic in-service and flex days for both fulltime and part-time faculty, classified staff workshops and retreats, and frequent flex workshops on a variety of topics. Moreover, due to COVID-19, all full- and part-time faculty completed extensive training for online instruction.
Evidence	2.1.III.A.14.a-TLC Report in Academic Senate Newsletter 2.1.III.A.14.b-Sample Flex Day Agendas hosted by TLC 2.1.III.A.14.c-TLC Report 2017-2018 2.1.III.A.14.d-TLC Report 2019-2020 2.1.III.A.14.e-Report on Video Broadcast TTKL 12.2020 2.1.III.A.14.f-Description of POP and TTKL Activities 2.1.II.C.3-Screenshots illustrating expansion of best practices
III.B.3	Deans currently work to maximize scheduling efficiencies using a blend of spreadsheets and other limited tools. To improve efficiency of the process and effectiveness of results, the College will follow through on an objective in its Strategic Plan and adopt a robust scheduling software solution for use by Deans.
Progress and Outcomes: No longer pursued	The College explored various scheduling software solutions, including demonstrations from several vendors. However, these products are designed to serve large institutions with many sections of each class. They do not help small colleges with only one or two sections of each class. Consequently, the College determined to keep using lower tech (and lower cost) solutions to carefully place each section to maximize student progression and completion. Deans have striven to condense offerings where possible, increasing enrollment in introductory courses to support lower enrollment in more advanced courses.
Evidence	2.1.III.B.3.a-Software Demonstration Calendar Appointments
III.B.4	Upon the completion of the District Technology Plan, the College will update its own Technology Plan. The College will work with the District to identify funding for replacement of technology on a cyclical basis.
Progress and Outcomes: Completed	As part of the follow-up process to the Fall 2017 site visit, the District developed a well-constructed Total Cost of Ownership plan for all district technology resources, outlining fundamental expectations for functionality, replacement cycles, and estimating costs. This TCO plan effectively negated the need for a college-specific technology plan. In fall 2020, the College Technology Committee recommended to College Council that we adopt the District TCO as our college's technology plan. This motion was strongly supported by the Council.
Evidence	2.1.III.B.4.a-College Technology Committee Minutes 2020.10.22 2.1.III.B.4.b-College Council minutes November 2020 adopting District TCO as our plan

IV.A.7	To increase institutional effectiveness, the College will develop a plan for systematic evaluation of the participatory decision-making structure, procedures, and processes to ensure integrity and overall effectiveness. The evaluation plan will include dissemination of results and communication of improvements.
Progress and Outcomes: Completed	At the conclusion of the first year under the new governance structure (Spring 2018), the College conducted an analysis of its effectiveness. The results indicated general satisfaction coupled with a lack of full awareness. The most common response was “Don’t Know.” In Spring 2021, the College conducted a similar review. Results showed that the College’s constituents are knowledgeable and confident in the governance process, feel their contribution is valuable, and believe the governance structures are functioning well. In 2021-22, in response to an identified gap, the College will expand its governance structure to include a body focused on matters of budget and finance.
Evidence	2.1.IV.A.7.a-Spring 2018 survey results and word cloud 2.1.IV.A.7.b-Spring 2021 survey results and analysis

3. Institutional Reporting on Quality Improvements

3.1 Response to Recommendations for Improvement

The Commission Action Letter dated January 26, 2018, noted two District Compliance Requirements, four College Recommendations for Improvement, and two District Recommendations for Improvement. Columbia College leaders worked collaboratively with leaders of its sister institution, Modesto Junior College, and with leaders from the Yosemite Community College District, including members of the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, and district facilities and information technology leaders to attend to the compliance matters. These efforts were delineated in the Follow-Up Report of February 2019 and in June of 2019 the Commission accepted the report and reaffirmed Columbia College's accreditation for the duration of the cycle. In accordance with expectations for this Midterm Report, those details will not be revisited here. However, it is worth noting that the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) documents for the college's facilities and information technology infrastructures that were developed in response to those compliance matters have proven very helpful. In the new District Fiscal Advisory Council, members have ensured that funds are set aside to support ongoing replacement and repairs of facilities and technology to stay abreast of those TCOs. Moreover, Trustees continue to reflect on their role in establishing policy while fully delegating operational authority to the Chancellor and College Presidents. One way Trustees carry this out is in Board Policy meetings where they attend to policy matters with great care and precision.

College Recommendation 1 (Improvement): *In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the College continue its efforts to fully implement its plan to sustain meaningful SLO assessment, incorporate SLO data into program review, and refine and clarify its integrated planning processes to link institutional planning, assessment, and continuous improvement efforts as outlined in Quality Focus Essay Project #1. (I.B.5, I.C.3, II.A.3, II.A.11)*

How the College Responded: The College continues to implement its plan to sustain meaningful SLO assessment and use these results. As noted earlier in this report in the table of Actionable Improvement Plans and later in the progress report on Quality Focus Essay Project #1, the College's SLO infrastructure has become a systemic part of its ecosystem. Courses and programs are assessed as scheduled on a cyclical basis, and results are used for program improvement. The College has also engaged in continuous improvement efforts by revising its Institutional SLOs and illustrating how each course SLO aligns, or maps, to the ISLOs, and for its Student Services departments by considering ways to improve the evaluability of its SLOs as part of its departments' full-cycle program reviews. Evidence of these efforts is noted in the table and in the Quality Focus Essay section of this report.

College Recommendation 2 (Improvement): *In order to improve effectiveness with the Commission Policies, and USDE Regulations regarding Distance Education, the team recommends that faculty, academic deans, the Vice President of Instruction, along with the Distance Education Committee, continuously engage distance education instructors in a careful review of the definitions, standards, policies and regulations pertaining to regular and substantive interaction between instructor and student. (I.B.5, II.A.7, Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education)*

How the College Responded: This recommendation was reviewed and discussed with all participatory governance groups on campus. The Distance Education Committee, the Curriculum

Committee, the Academic Senate and the College Council each had an opportunity to hear about, discuss and make suggestions for responding to the recommendation and then again to hear about and endorse actions taken. Faculty and administrators were surprised by this recommendation, since the college's Distance Education Coordinator and Distance Education Committee have consistently taught and reinforced strong expectations regarding regular and substantive interaction between and among instructors and students.

An informal survey was circulated to all faculty teaching fully online/hybrid courses to ascertain the tools and methods they were currently using to implement regular and substantive (effective) contact with their students. The survey additionally asked for feedback and suggestions for future trainings and workshops. The DE Coordinator used faculty responses as a roadmap to develop and offer training over the next year, which included Canvas tools such as the Inbox, Announcements, Discussions, Grading Feedback, and Surveys, along with third party communication tools such as FlipGrid, VoiceThread, Notebowl, Padlet, etc. In addition, the DE Coordinator made follow up contact with individual faculty to answer questions and offer support as needed.

The College offers a Skills Attainment Certificate in Learning Design and Technology consisting of a trio of three-unit courses in the EDUC, Education, subject code. [\[3.1.C2.c-Learning Design and Technology SAC\]](#) All three were reviewed to ensure that the OEI Course Design Rubric was incorporated and that each course focused on regular and effective contact with and between students. The DE Coordinator created a Canvas page template to be used as part of a Getting Started Module that listed the multiple ways students and faculty would potentially interact within a course, and the places within a course where interaction could be found. This template page was added to the Canvas Commons, where all faculty have access and can download and customize the page in their courses. [\[3.1.C2.d-Screenshot of Getting Started Module faculty training\]](#)

For ongoing, self-paced support, a Canvas course was created that allowed faculty to self-enroll and included modules on many aspects of online course design and teaching. A specific module for regular and effective contact was included. [\[3.1.C2.e-Screenshot of RefEffContact Module for faculty training\]](#) This course allowed faculty to complete training modules for flex credit. In addition, our DE Coordinator works individually with many faculty, and consistently shares both the requirement and options for creating regular and substantive interaction.

The Instructor's DE Handbook was updated to ensure guidance on regular and substantive contact requirement was included. [\[3.1.C2.f-Instructor Expectations and Resources for RegEffContact\]](#)

As part of the curriculum process, our Distance Education Addendum already had a question asking faculty to describe how they were incorporating regular and effective contact. When the campus transitioned to a new curriculum system, the DEA was recreated and the wording on that question was reviewed and updated. [\[3.1.C2.g-Distance Education Addendum Example from eLumen\]](#) Curriculum committee members were trained on the type of methods and examples that would exhibit the practice of regular and effective interaction.

The tools used in both Canvas and third party options are always changing. But throughout our training, we focus on best practices for student success, which include regular and substantive contact both between students and their instructors as well as among students. Faculty are supported with training on a wide variety of methods and means to ensure that is happening in all their courses.

College Recommendation 3 (Improvement): *In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that that College institute a comprehensive system of evaluation of the council and committee structure in order to measure adherence to the mission, progress toward the College’s strategic goals, and general effectiveness of the new structure. (I.B.7, I.B.9, IV.A.7)*

How the College Responded: In Spring 2018, after one year under the newly-developed governance structure, the College conducted an assessment of this structure via a college-wide survey. Results of the survey were discussed by the Institutional Effectiveness Council and College Council. The responses indicated that members of the college community did not yet know quite how the new councils and committees would work, but that no glaring problems were apparent at that time. [[2.1.IV.A.7.a-Spring 2018 survey results and word cloud](#)]

In 2020-21, in response to events in our nation, the College established a new standing committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI). This led to revisions of the Participatory Governance Handbook to incorporate the new DEI Committee into the illustration of councils and standing committees, adding its charge to the handbook, and also updating other aspects of the handbook to reflect evolutions of the institution since 2017. These discussions reaffirmed the effectiveness of the three-council governance model established in 2017 but inserted the DEI Committee as a permanent college group dedicated to keeping the college community focused on these important matters. [[3.1.C3.b-Draft Revisions to Governance Handbook](#)]

In Spring 2021, the Office of Research and Planning conducted a college-wide assessment of the effectiveness of its governance structures via a survey distributed to all college employees and members of student government. It illustrated that college constituents are knowledgeable about the college’s governance structure, that they believe that their participation is important to the governance process, that they perceive outcomes of governance discussions are as effectively communicated, that they perceive all constituent groups to be effectively represented, and that they perceive that the overall governance structure to be sensible. The survey and follow-up discussions among College Council members brought to light a gap in the College’s governance structure. Although budget matters are brought before College Council prior to implementation, there is not a dedicated governance body on budget and finance. Over the 2021-22 year, the College will discuss and consider establishing a budget council or committee to attend to increase understanding of and transparency in fiscal matters. [[2.1.IV.A.7.b-Spring 2021 survey results and analysis](#)]

College Recommendation 4 (Improvement): *In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the College update and implement a sustainable college technology plan that ensures its technological infrastructure, quality, and capacity are adequate to support its mission, operations, programs, and services, and that the plan will also align with. (III.C.2)*

How the College Responded: This recommendation was discussed at meetings of the College Technology Committee and College Council, among others. However, it was determined that the first step was to respond to the Commission's compliance requirement regarding Total Cost of Ownership for Information Technology (TCO). As described in the Follow-Up Report to the Commission in Fall 2019, the College and District co-developed this [TCO](#) and set aside funds and personnel to begin fulfilling its expectations. [[3.1.C4.a-Accreditation Follow-Up Report - February 2019 - Final](#), [3.1.C4.b-YCCD IT TCO Feb 2019](#)]

The TCO for Information Technology was very detailed, including conceptual guidelines such as classroom technology and infrastructure expectations coupled with extensive equipment inventory lists and recommended replacement cycles.

The process of developing this TCO was collaborative between District IT leaders and those of both colleges in the district, resulting in a much richer understanding of the needs of each institution. Greater clarity emerged as to the role of district personnel and leaders in maintaining the College's IT needs.

After careful deliberation, the College Technology Committee determined that a College Technology Plan would be redundant alongside the District TCO, and that time spent maintaining the local plan could be better used elsewhere. Consequently, in Fall 2020 the College Technology Committee formally recommended adoption of the District TCO to serve as Columbia College's Technology Plan. This recommendation was forwarded to College Council and ratified in November, 2020. [[2.1.III.B.4.a-College Technology Committee Minutes 2020.10.22](#), [2.1.III.B.4.b-College Council minutes November 2020 adopting District TCO as our plan](#)]

District Recommendation 2 (Improvement): *In order to improve effectiveness and transparency, the District needs to engage college and district constituencies with timely, deliberative, and collaborative dialogue to coordinate ongoing efforts in the creation, development, and alignment of all college and district plans and planning processes, including: college and district-wide strategic plans, facilities plans, technology plans, resource allocation (including one-time funds), and human resources. As well, it is recommended that the District strengthen communication regarding district decisions. (III.B.4, III.C.2, III.D.3, IV.D.5, IV.D.6, IV.D.7)*

How the Institution Responded: District and College leaders discussed this recommendation extensively through monthly meetings of District Council and subsequent reports to and discussions among constituent groups. The process of responding to the recommendation has prompted an ongoing spirit of collaboration among all participants and ongoing efforts to align and streamline processes on behalf of employees throughout the district and students at both colleges.

The Commission's compliance requirement for the district to develop Total Cost of Ownership documents for facilities and for information technology served to jump-start these collaborative discussions. Through extensive meetings, sharing matters of importance and concern, and envisioning the future together, the two TCO documents have served to become unifying resources across the District. [[3.1.D2.a-Yosemite Total Cost of Ownership Report-3-1-19](#), [3.1.C4.b-YCCD IT TCO Feb 2019](#)]

As another byproduct of this recommendation, to improve communication and clarity regarding fiscal affairs, District Council members and their constituent groups created a new governance body, the District Fiscal Advisory Council (DFAC), charged with overseeing matters of fiscal importance. This group was first charged with a very challenging task: Developing a new Resource Allocation Model (RAM) to distribute fiscal resources provided by the State to the two colleges and district office in a manner that is perceived as equitable and sufficient by all parties and, where practicable, aligned with the new Student Centered Funding Formula for California Community Colleges.

The District brought in a consultant, an experienced fiscal leader from another district, to assist in navigating the challenges of building the new council and developing the RAM. After several iterations, the RAM was adopted on a pilot basis and used to fund the 2020-21 year, then extended to 2021-22 also to allow review of a full fiscal cycle. [[3.1.D2.c-Resource Allocation Model for 2021-22](#)]

Upon the resignation of the previous Vice Chancellor of Fiscal Affairs, district and college fiscal leaders began meeting together regularly to collaboratively review the RAM and other fiscal matters. This group, referred to locally as the “Fiscal Four,” consists of the Vice Chancellor of Educational and Support Services, the Interim Controller, the Vice President of College and Administrative Services at Modesto Junior College, and the Vice President of College and Administrative Services at Columbia College. These leaders meet with their constituent institutions, gather input on matters of relevance, meet to compare notes and prepare data for review, then present recommendations to the members of DFAC for their consideration. After discussion and voting, recommendations of DFAC are then forwarded to the Chancellor for consideration and implementation. [[3.1.D2.d-District Fiscal Advisory Council illustrating Fiscal Four discussions](#)]

Other administrative areas have also engaged in increased districtwide collaboration. For example, leaders in equity matters at the two colleges collaborated with human resources leaders from the district office to create a new equity-minded faculty job description to appeal to more diverse candidates and lay out clear expectations for incoming faculty members, and they are working together to advertise positions in ways to attract diverse candidates. The template is found online at the Yosemite Community College District’s [Recruitment webpage](#). [[3.1.D2.e-YCCD Equity Faculty Job Description Template - 2021](#)] The two colleges are also collaborating with Human Resources to establish a centralized minimum qualifications review process, ensuring that determinations of faculty qualifications are unified across the district and recorded in personnel files and proper locations in the district database.

To support better communication regarding facility needs, district facilities leaders now bring the annual scheduled maintenance plans to the colleges for review and prioritization of needs prior to their being sent to the Chancellor’s Office. [[3.1.D2.f-College Services Committee Agenda 2020.10.09](#)]

In Spring 2021, in anticipation of the expiration of several significant plans within the District, leaders began the process of developing new master plans, doing so in a collaborative way to

maximize dialog and input from constituents. The District engaged a consulting firm specializing in master planning to consult with college and district officials regarding their needs for the present and future and develop new master plans. This work is ongoing as of this writing, but the plans are expected to be aligned and interwoven in pursuit of common district and college goals. District and college strategic goals are expected to align with the student-focused goals of the California Community Colleges *Vision for Success* and principles of Guided Pathways, closing equity gaps as outlined in each college's *Student Equity and Achievement Plan*, and improve performance on each college's Institution-Set Standards. The plans are anticipated to be published by March 2022. [[3.1.D2.g-2021_02.24 District Council Minutes Re Strategic Master Planning](#)]

District Recommendation 3 (Improvement): *In order to increase effectiveness, the team recommends that the Trustees act as a collective entity in support of Board decisions. (IV.C.2)*

How the Institution Responded: The Board of Trustees, District, and College leaders began reviewing the tenets of this recommendation immediately upon its receipt from the visiting team in October 2017. Upon receipt of the Action Letter from the Commission in January 2018, work began to address a closely related Compliance Requirement. In effect, the Board attended to both of these items collectively through reflection and action.

Immediate efforts included unanimous approval of a resolution reaffirming its commitment to the expectations of the Standards. [[3.1.D3.a-2017.12.13-Board Resolution Re Delegation of Authority to CEOs](#)] Technical assistance was provided by the Commission and a delegate from the Community College League of California. [[3.1.D3.b-2019.02.13 - Board Study Session with ACCJC VP Reynolds](#), [3.1.D3.c-2019.02.19-BOT Study Session Agenda with CCLC rep William McGinnis](#)] Throughout these efforts, the Board worked collaboratively and acted as a collective entity. All Trustees participated in study sessions and the process of editing the Follow-Up Report to the Commission, which was approved in June 2019.

ACCJC Standards IV.C.2 states, "The governing board acts as a collective entity. Once the board reaches a decision, all board members act in support of the decision." This standard does not call for unanimous voting by Trustees, but rather that Trustees act in support of the decision of the Board as a whole. A review of voting records illustrates that, on most items, the Trustees have voted either unanimously or with an occasional dissenting vote. [[3.1.D3.d-Summary of Board Collective Voting Record](#)] Challenging events in recent years include a labor conflict and strike; college closures due to forest fires and smoke, public safety power shutoffs, and snow; an equipment malfunction that rendered the Modesto Junior College pool and adjacent buildings unusable for over a year; the COVID-19 pandemic that shuttered both colleges for over a year; and the concomitant wholesale shift to online and synchronous-video-based instruction within a matter of days. Throughout these difficulties, the Trustees acted in support of the decisions of the Board as a whole, in keeping with the Standard.

Trustees have also acted collectively in proactive ways. For example, Trustees attending to their duties to establish and review district policies observed a discrepancy in due process between different employee groups in the District. They worked collectively through the District's Policies and Procedures committee, with review by all constituent groups and through participatory governance councils, to develop and achieve agreement on new policies in support of due

process protections for all employees. The Board unanimously approved Board Policy 3-8020 – Due Process on February 10, 2021. [[3.1.D3.e-2021.02.10 BOT Minutes – Approval of Due Process Board Policy](#)]

To promote effectiveness of the Board of Trustees and provide training for Trustees, the Board frequently holds Study Sessions. In April 2019, the Board engaged in training on Clifton’s Strengths and has utilized that knowledge to inform their teamwork and complementary leadership strengths. [[3.1.D3.i-Board Study Session-Clifton’s Strengths](#)] The Board held two Study Sessions including new Trustees in Fall 2021. On September 1, former State Chancellor Dr. Brice Harris conducted a training session entitled, “Board Professional Development for a High Performing Board.” [[3.1.D3.f-2021.09.01-Board Study Session-Professional Development for a High Performing Board](#)] The following week, on September 8, ACCJC Vice President Dr. Catherine Webb provided training entitled, “ACCJC Accreditation Standard IV and the role of Trustees.” [[3.1.D3.g-2021.09.08-Board Study Session-Review of ACCJC Std IV](#)] This thorough training will serve as foundational knowledge as the District and Colleges proceed forward and begin developing the Institutional Self-Evaluation Reports, to be submitted in December, 2023. [[3.1.D3.h-Yosemite CCD BOT Training Sept2021 BOTmtg 9-8-2021](#)] To further improve its effectiveness, the Board held a Study Session entitled, “California’s Open Meeting Law – Brown Act – Professional Development for Trustees” on September 29, 2021, with Joseph Sanchez, Partner at Best, Best, & Krieger. [[3.1.D3.j-2021.09.29-Board Study Session-Brown Act](#)]

3.2 Reflection on Improving Institutional Performance: Student Learning Outcomes and Institution Set Standards

3.2.1 Student Learning Outcomes (Standard I.B.2)

1) Student Learning Outcomes for Instructional Areas

Columbia College maintains a robust and continuously developing program of *student learning outcomes* (SLOs) for its instructional programs. As general procedure, SLOs are managed by a dedicated committee which is administered by the IEC. The *SLO Committee* has become an integral component of the participatory governance of Columbia College and SLO assessment has itself become an ingrained, ongoing process. The ongoing work of the SLO and Curriculum committees are common discussion items in Columbia's *Institutional Effectiveness Council, Academic Senate, College Council*, and other standing committees and workgroups that combine faculty, staff and other members of the college community. The SLO Committee considers the college's overall mission and values, and relies on its faculty expertise to recommend institution-level SLOs (ISLOs).

The SLO Committee recently updated the college's ISLOs. The new ISLOs are:

- *Excel in the workplace and enter into fulfilling and productive careers* (Career-based SLOs)
- *Communicate effectively across levels and disciplines utilizing a variety of methods, mediums, and technologies* (Communication-based SLOs)
- *Think critically about the world, solve problems using appropriate analytic skills, and be discerning about the quality of information* (Critical-thinking-based SLOs)
- *Possess a framework of facts, skills, and understanding of the subjects studied* (Knowledge-based SLOs)
- *Participate in a vibrant community and culture, understand others, value diversity, and encourage sustainability* (Culture-and-community-based SLOs)
- *Describe and define the scope, key principles, and methods of scientific inquiry and quantitative reasoning* (Calculation-based SLOs).

The new ISLOs are anticipated to work more smoothly with eLumen, the software solution chosen by the college to integrate its curriculum, catalog, SLO, and program review functions. To prevent redundancies, the SLO Committee also adopted a policy that CSLOs could only map to one ISLO at a time. [\[2.1.II.A.11.b-Senate and SLO Committee minutes illustrating revisions of SLO structure to improve effectiveness\]](#) The SLO Committee, including faculty members and administrative support staff, works with instructional faculty to develop updated CSLOs and PSLOs, and to ensure that the relationships between ISLOs, CSLOs, and PSLOs are clearly mapped (both conceptually and literally into the eLumen curriculum management system). Members of the SLO Committee work directly with their peers to craft evaluable course-level and program-level SLOs (CSLOs and PSLOs) that inform and are informed by ISLOs.

The SLO Committee has a role in ensuring that faculty regularly complete their CSLO assessments, as does the college instructional administration, and sets a course-assessment schedule designed to promote persistent review of courses and programs throughout. With their guidance, faculty have achieved a planned CSLO-assessment completion rate of about 80% aggregated between AY2016-17 and AY2020-21 (i.e., the year in which the college first started using eLumen to track SLOs to the most recent year, Table 1 in this section).

In Summer 2021, the College Planning and Research Office evaluated the number of assessments of active courses that had had any non-zero enrollment during the five-year period (Table 1). The analysis showed that most such courses had been assessed at least once during the timeframe (84%), but also revealed a difference in the extent to which courses had been assessed between its *Arts, Sciences, and Human Performance* programs (90%), its *Career-Technical Education* programs (77%), and its *Student Support Services* course offerings (75%). The collegewide outcomes were further considered against a guideline that all courses should be assessed at least twice during a two-year period, a goal that is phrased to provide some scheduling flexibility, but can be inferred to mean that all courses should be assessed at a rate of about once per year. [[3.2.1-Integrated Program Review and SLO Cycle](#)] Given the five-year study-period, for example, the average number of assessments per course should approach (1 assessment per year X 5 years =) 5.0 assessments. However, the outcomes showed that the average number of assessments per course during the study period was only 2.6. Similarly, if each course was assessed about once each year, the average number of assessments per year per course should be at least 1.0, but the collegewide average was only about .7 assessments per course per year.

The rate at which faculty are adhering to their planned assessment schedule (80%, Table 1) and at which all courses have been assessed at least once (84%) suggests that faculty participation in assessment is high, but assessment itself might be occurring a bit too infrequently if the goal is to achieve an CSLO assessment for each active course about once each year.

2) Student Learning Outcomes for Student Service Areas

Columbia College's SLO process for student service areas is unique compared to instructional areas. In many ways, the integrated SLO and Program Review processes for the college's student service areas function more like traditional summative program evaluations. Each one is discrete and informed by different types of evidence, and they are not measured as standardized course-by-course or student-by-student learning outcomes tallied by the eLumen system as they are for instructional areas. Rather, each student service area has its own discrete set of program-like SLOs crafted to its individual mission or purpose. The SLOs are primarily developed and set by department managers rather than a committee. Because they are not uniformly measured, the SLOs for any given department are reviewed in narrative fashion as part of Program Review, and using a range of evidence like student surveys and feedback, administrative tracking information (e.g., a tally of the number of students who completed new-student orientation), and even behavioral observation.

In Summer 2021, the Columbia College Planning and Research Office examined all of the SLOs for the college's student service areas. It observed that many of the SLOs were evaluable, but not clearly tied to the college's updated mission or goals. Many others were simply unevaluable because they did not lend themselves to metric evidence or were overly generic. Still others were conflated with what had previously been called *service area outcomes* (SAOs), such that SAOs were variously used synonymously as SLOs themselves or as measurable goal-statements derived from SLOs.

On closer examination of actual student service department program reviews, it seemed apparent that the SLO portions were informed by a range of appropriate evidence, and that most of the cyclical written narratives were robust and informative. The Counseling Department, for example, and consistent with its SLOs, gathered student satisfaction survey data from the Planning and Research Office, and tallied the number of students who achieved things like having met with a counselor, completed a new student orientation, and completed a degree-plan. Rather, the disconnect between the level of student-service areas' written SLOs and the rigorous level of actual activity conducted to review SLOs suggested greater need for assistance crafting and documenting evaluable SLO statements and derivative measurable goal statements, and otherwise helping student service areas pursue organized and manageable program evaluations to inform their service delivery and adherence to promoting student learning and fulfilling the college's mission.

To improve the SLO and Program Review process for student service areas the College Planning and Research Office will work with student service managers on a cyclical basis (e.g., approaching a department's full-cycle Program Review) to examine and ensure that SLOs are stated in such a way that lends to evaluability using a range of evidence, and to otherwise help to improve the SLO development and tracking process for the college's student services.

Table 1. Collegewide CSLO Assessment Outcomes for Currently Active Courses AY2016-17 through AY2020-21

Indicator	College	Arts, Sciences, and Human Performance	Career-Technical Education	Student Support Services
Total active courses ^a	549	281	233	35
Total with non-zero enrollment ^b	472	245	199	28
Total assessed at least once ^c	395	221	153	21
Percentage assessed at least once ^d	83.7%	90.2%	76.9%	75.0%
All planned assessments ^e	1542	857	601	84
All completed assessments ^f	1228	721	443	64
Planned completion rate ^g	79.6%	84.1%	73.7%	76.2%
Average assessments per course ^h	2.602	2.943	2.226	2.286
Average assessments per course per year ⁱ	0.66	0.73	0.58	0.68

Sources. ¹ California Community College's Chancellor's Office (2021). *The Chancellor's Office Curriculum Inventory System (COCI)* [Database]. Accessed Monday, July 26, 2021 from <https://coci2.ccctechcenter.org/>. ² eLumen (2021). *Columbia College Faculty Participation Report*. Retrieved Monday, July 5, 2021 from <https://gocolumbia.elumenapp.com/elumen/>. ³ Yosemite Community College District (2021). *Colleague* [Database]. Accessed Monday, July 26, 2021.

Definitions.

- ^a *Total active courses* - The total number of courses identified as active in COCI, and which had already started by the end of AY2020-21.
- ^b *Total with non-zero enrollment* - The total number of active courses that had any enrolled students during the timeframe. The courses that had not enrolled students were primarily newer ones that had been state-activated, but in which no sections had been yet scheduled. Except for a) Total Active Courses, metrics were only examined for courses with nonzero enrollment.
- ^c *Total assessed at least once*
- ^d *Percentage assessed at least once* - The total/percentage of active courses with nonzero enrollment where CSLOs were assessed at least once during the five-year timeframe.
- ^e *All planned assessments* - The total number of CSLO assessments planned for active courses with non-zero enrollment during the timeframe.
- ^f *All completed assessments* - The total number of CSLO assessments completed for active courses with non-zero enrollment during the timeframe.
- ^g *Planned completion rate* - The percentage of CSLO assessments that were completed for those that were planned for active courses with non-zero enrollment.
- ^h *Average assessments per course* - The average number of assessments per course across all courses in the timeframe.
- ⁱ *Average assessments per course per year* - The average of the assessments per course per year, scaled course-by-course by the number of years each has been offered.

3.2.2 Institution-Set Standards (Standard I.B.3)

Columbia College revised its *Institution-Set Standards* (ISS) in AY2020-21. The revisions coincided with an anticipated renewal of its cyclical strategic plan, which was updated to six collegewide goals.

Columbia College’s Strategic Goals

1. Maintain institutional stability
2. Reduce equity gaps
3. Reduce barriers to completion
4. Increase workforce readiness
5. Increase transfer readiness
6. Increase award completion

The revised goal areas were informed by conceptual analysis of prominent initiatives that governed the college, including the Foundation for California Community College’s *Vision for Success* (VFS), the California Community College *Student Equity and Achievement Program*, the directives of California’s Assembly Bill 705 (AB 705) legislation, ACCJC’s accreditation standards, and the ISS areas. The conceptual groupings were refined into goal areas through the college’s participatory governance process, and generally provided the basis for realigning the ISS. [[3.2.2.a-2020.11.02 IEC Minutes re new Institution Set Standards](#), [3.2.2.b 2020 11.20 College Council Minutes re new Institution Set Standards](#)] In particular, the VFS is a California Community Colleges initiative to improve student achievement and equity statewide over a five-year period from AY2016-17, and incorporates a series of goals that Columbia considered as a starting point for benchmarking guidance in 4 of the 6 ISS.

1) Course Completion Rates

None of the college’s initiatives spoke directly to a benchmark for course completion, but it was presumed that greater rates of course completion would facilitate other goals, such as increasing award completion. Columbia College had an existing ISS floor goal set at 72.0%. The college had exceeded the goal by a few percentage points in most years, but had not set a recent ISS stretch goal (Table 1 in this section). College researchers proposed a stretch goal of 83.2%, which was 10% increase over the three-year average course success rate from AY2017-18 to AY2019-20. The stretch goal was ultimately lowered to a round number of 80.0%, and the value continues to provide an aspirational target based on actual outcomes.

Table 1. Course Completion Rates					
	AY2016-17	AY2017-18	AY2018-19	AY2019-20	AY2020-21
Existing Floor Goal ^a	72.0%	72.0%	72.0%	72.0%	72.0%
Adopted Stretch Goal	80.0%	80.0%	80.0%	80.0%	80.0%
Actual Outcomes ^b	75.2%	75.8%	76.1%	74.5%	76.3%
Sources. ^a Columbia College (2020). <i>ACCJC 2020 Annual Report: Final Submission 5/12/2020</i> . Accessed October 21, 2020 from https://www.gocolumbia.edu/accreditation/default.php ; ^b Columbia College (2021). <i>YCCD Annual Factbook</i> . Accessed September 9, 2021 from [2.1.II.C.7.d-YCCD Factbook 2021]					

2) Certificate Level Completions

Columbia College had previously determined to reach an ISS floor goal of 87 certificate level awards per year, and it achieved this goal in AY2018-19 and AY2019-20 (Table 2). This standard, however, counted the total number of awards granted in a given year. The college had opted to align its ISS to VFS goals where possible, which was to increase the total number of unique students who earned awards by 20% from an AY2016-17 baseline, rather than the number of awards earned by students. From this lens, Columbia’s floor goal would be 25 students per year, a target that was exceeded in every subsequent year. However, the number of individual students earning certificates varied widely year by year, reaching a high point of 76 in AY2018-19, while far fewer students completed in the AY2016-17 baseline year. Since the baseline year was perhaps a bit lean in generating certificate earners to be used for setting an aspirational benchmark against a typical year, college researchers proposed a stretch goal set as a 20% over a baseline derived as the three-year average number of individual certificate earners between AY2017-18 and AY2019-20. The average number of certificate earners during this time was about 51, and a 20% increase over this number was calculated as about 61 students. Both the proposed floor goal and the more aspirational stretch goal were adopted through Columbia’s participatory governance process.

Note that the observable number of completions shown in Table 2 have changed slightly since the new floor and stretch goals were proposed, and would suggest slightly different benchmarks if computed in the same way today. This is because the historical completion numbers have been revised slightly as new information has been entered into the college’s student management system and as the college continues to refine its methods of reporting.

Table 2. Certificate Level Completions					
	AY2016-17	AY2017-18	AY2018-19	AY2019-20	AY2020-21
<i>Previous standard: Total awards given</i>					
Previous Floor Goal ^a	87	87	87	87	87
Previous Stretch Goal ^a	Not Set	Not Set	Not Set	Not Set	Not Set
Actual Outcomes ^b	61	83	120	89	85
<i>Adopted standard: Total students awarded</i>					
Adopted Floor Goal	--	25	25	25	25
Adopted Stretch Goal	--	61	61	61	61
Actual Outcomes ^b	19	50	76	29	24
<i>Sources.</i> ^a Columbia College (2020). <i>ACCJC 2020 Annual Report: Final Submission 5/12/2020</i> . Accessed October 21, 2020 from https://www.gocolumbia.edu/accreditation/default.php ; ^b Columbia College (2021). <i>YCCD Annual Factbook</i> . Accessed September 9, 2021 from [2.1.II.C.7.d-YCCD Factbook 2021]					

3) Associate Level Completions

Columbia’s previous ISS floor goal for associate level completions was set at 240 total awards each year. This goal was exceeded in all completed years, including AY2019-20 in which the 374 associate degrees earned was more than 50% above the standard. Like certificates, however, associate level completions benchmarked using VFS goals would be a 20% increase in *individual* students completing in any given year, regardless of the total number of degrees they earned. From this lens, Columbia’s ISS floor goal was calculated as 202, or 20% over an AY2016-17 baseline of 168, and note that the college met this

floor in 2 of the 3 subsequent years. As with certificates, the baseline year seemed coincidentally low in individual completers compared to the following years, and college researchers proposed a more aspirational stretch goal derived as a 20% increase over the three-year average number of associate degree earners between AY2017-19 and AY2019-20. The average number of associate degree earners in this time was 217, and a 20% increase over this number of students was determined as 260 per year. Both the updated floor goal and the stretch goal regarding associate degree completion were adopted as proposed through Columbia’s participatory governance process.

As in Table 2, the observable outcomes in Table 3 have been revised slightly since the new ISS benchmarks were proposed, as information has updated in the college's system.

Table 3. Associate Level Completions					
	AY2016-17	AY2017-18	AY2018-19	AY2019-20	AY2020-21
Previous standard: Total awards given					
Previous Floor Goal ^a	240	240	240	240	240
Previous Stretch Goal ^a	Not Set	Not Set	Not Set	Not Set	Not Set
Actual Outcomes ^b	245	277	252	381	377
Adopted standard: Total students awarded					
Adopted Floor Goal	--	202	202	202	202
Adopted Stretch Goal	--	260	260	260	260
Actual Outcomes ^b	198	235	214	289	289
Sources. ^a Columbia College (2020). <i>ACCJC 2020 Annual Report: Final Submission 5/12/2020</i> . Accessed October 21, 2020 from https://www.gocolumbia.edu/accreditation/default.php ; ^b Columbia College (2021). <i>YCCD Annual Factbook</i> . Accessed September 9, 2021 from [2.1.II.C.7.d-YCCD Factbook 2021]					

4) Transfers to a Four-Year Institution

Columbia College had an existing ISS floor goal of 180 exit transfers to any four-year institution. It had approached, though not achieved this goal based on available reporting of transfer activity from the California Community Colleges. The VFS goals around exit transfers suggested a benchmark of a 35% increase in transfers to a UC or CSU from an AY2016-17 baseline. However, Columbia College opted to keep the ISS focused on all four-year exit transfers. It adopted a new ISS floor goal of 10% over an AY2016-17 baseline, or an increase from 168 to 185 transfers per academic year, and it retained the VFS target of a 35% increase in transfers as an ISS aspirational stretch goal, or an increase from 168 to 227 transfers. Columbia College did not meet either its previous or newly adopted floor goal in years with available data.

The College’s Guided Pathways efforts are intended to improve the number of students completing their educational goals, including transfer. Activities include improvements to its website, student advising, application process, cohort-based communications and engagement, and transfer center activities. The College expects that the results of these activities will lead to increased transfers.

Table 4. Transfers to a Four-Year Institution					
	AY2016-17	AY2017-18	AY2018-19	AY2019-20	AY2020-21
Previous Floor Goal ^a	180	180	180	180	180
Previous Stretch Goal ^a	Not Set	Not Set	Not Set	Not Set	Not Set
Adopted Floor Goal	--	185	185	185	185
Adopted Stretch Goal	--	227	227	227	227
Actual Outcomes ^b	170	164	182	Not Yet Reported	Not Yet Reported

Sources. ^a Columbia College (2020). ACCJC 2020 Annual Report: Final Submission 5/12/2020. Accessed October 21, 2020 from <https://www.gocolumbia.edu/accrreditation/default.php>; ^b California Community Colleges (2020). Student Success Metrics [webpage]. Accessed July 26, 2021 from <https://www.calpassplus.org/LaunchBoard/Student-Success-Metrics.aspx>

5) Licensure Examination Pass Rate

Columbia College had not recently reported ISS floor or stretch goals for this category in its ACCJC annual report, and college administrators considered the reasons why. After consulting with members of ACCJC and faculty program-leads, it was determined that only one of Columbia College's programs (*Emergency Medical Services*) qualified as needing a formal professional certification in order to work in the field, and that the number of annual examinations in this regard fell below the masking threshold of fewer than 10 examinations per program. In the interest of adopting a basic planning goal, college researchers proposed an ISS floor goal set to the number of students who completed an examination to the masking threshold (i.e., 10 examinations), and a modest stretch goal of 12 examinations. The proposal was adopted through the college's governance. The College will continue to reflect upon this licensure category and seek ways to access program completers' license or certification pass rates in other areas, as applicable.

Table 5. Licensure Examination Completions					
	AY2016-17	AY2017-18	AY2018-19	AY2019-20	AY2020-21
Previous Floor Goal ^a	Not Set	Not Set	Not Set	Not Set	Not Set
Previous Stretch Goal ^a	Not Set	Not Set	Not Set	Not Set	Not Set
Adopted Floor Goal	10	10	10	10	10
Adopted Stretch Goal	12	12	12	12	12
Actual Outcomes ^b	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10

Sources. ^a Columbia College (2020). ACCJC 2020 Annual Report: Final Submission 5/12/2020. Accessed October 21, 2020 from <https://www.gocolumbia.edu/accrreditation/default.php>; ^b Columbia College (2020). Academic Programs Summary [Webpage]. Accessed October 21, 2020 from <https://yosemiteccd.sharepoint.com/sites/cc-IRP/SitePages/Academic-Programs-Outcomes-Summary.aspx>

6) Job Placement Rates for Students Completing CTE Programs

Until recently, Columbia College included job placement rates for students completing CTE programs in its ACCJC annual reporting, and was typically unable to meet its benchmark even when it was lowered to 68.0%. Closer examination of this metric illustrated that the underlying data are themselves unreliable because they were based on the self-reported outcomes of just a few graduates per program. The 2020 CTE Outcomes Survey College Report provided by the Researchers at Santa Rosa Junior College provides encouraging college-wide data to illustrate that students, by and large, are satisfied with their training, quickly found full employment, and experienced increased wages. [\[3.2.2.c-Columbia College CTEOS\]](#)

[College Summary 2020](#)] In AY2019-20, the college opted not to report job placement outcomes until a more reliable data source could be identified. Nevertheless, for the sake of setting a planning goal, the college adopted the VFS goals to increase the percent of exiting CTE students who report being employed in their field from 60.0%, which Columbia set as its ISS floor goal, to 76.0%, which the college set as its ISS stretch goal.

Table 6. Job Placement Rates for Students Completing CTE Programs					
	AY2016-17	AY2017-18	AY2018-19	AY2019-20	AY2020-21
Previous Floor Goal ^a	68.0%	68.0%	68.0%	68.0%	68.0%
Previous Stretch Goal ^a	Not Set	Not Set	Not Set	Not Set	Not Set
Adopted Floor Goal	60.0%	60.0%	60.0%	60.0%	60.0%
Adopted Stretch Goal	76.0%	76.0%	76.0%	76.0%	76.0%
Actual Outcomes	Not Reported	Not Reported	Not Reported	Not Reported	Not Reported
<i>Sources.</i> ^a Columbia College (2020). <i>ACCJC 2020 Annual Report: Final Submission 5/12/2020</i> . Accessed October 21, 2020 from https://www.gocolumbia.edu/accreditation/default.php					

4. Report on the Outcomes of the Quality Focus Projects

4.1 Quality Focus Project 1 – More Effectively Using Learning Outcomes Assessment Results to Improve Programs, Instruction, and Student Learning

In its 2017 ISER, Columbia College tasked itself to improve its use of *Student Learning Outcomes* (SLO) assessments. It identified three project focus areas including:

- **Project Focus Area 1.1:** *Enhance and sustain meaningful SLO assessment*
- **Project Focus Area 1.2:** *Use SLO results to drive planning and sustain continuous improvement*
- **Project Focus Area 1.3:** *Implement technology for program review and outcomes assessment*

The college set an ambitious agenda towards achieving these foci. Projects to be undertaken by the institution included:

1. Implementing the *eLumen* software system, an electronic hub designed to integrate curriculum management, SLO assessment, online college catalog, and program review processes to more closely link SLO assessment results to program reviews, integrated planning, and continuous improvement processes across the institution.

The *eLumen* platform was selected as a technological solution for integration of curriculum, SLOs, an online catalog, and program reviews. It is now fully implemented as a catalog solution, and a comprehensive online catalog is published to the college's website. It is also nearly implemented as a curriculum management solution. All of the college's courses and programs have been fully uploaded, and members the college's Curriculum Committee and curriculum administrators are working to develop clear business processes and training protocols as a final step Fall 2021.

The system is not as fully implemented for either SLOs or Instructional Program Review, although both are anticipated for resolution in AY2021-22. Two challenges arose as the College transitioned from previous systems to *eLumen*, which affected its SLO implementation. First, as assessment data was aggregated via CSLO-to-ISLO maps over time, redundancies within the mappings prevented a clear understanding of their connections, both obscuring areas of the institution in need of improvement and escalating problems that, upon further examination, proved invalid. Second, the lengthy process of migrating the college's curriculum data (including courses and their CSLOs and programs and their PSLOs) to *eLumen* further complicated the existing SLO mappings that had been set up around the time of the college's 2017 ISER.

The existing mappings between SLOs in *eLumen* were ultimately severed in anticipation of replacing the ISLOs in AY2020-21, as described earlier (Section 3.2). During Summer 2021, the college's curriculum team focused on programming and mapping elements into *eLumen*, building *eLumen workflows* (i.e., small programs that will help faculty do things in *eLumen* like manage their PSLOs and CSLOs, or route proposed curriculum changes to the college's Curriculum Committee), scheduling trainings with *eLumen* staff, and recording training videos in anticipation of staff and faculty returning for Fall 2021. This work included a project to re-map CSLOs to the new ISLOs. The SLO remapping project is expected to be completed enough to restore a meaningful interpretation of the college's SLOs for Instructional Program Review in Spring 2022. A full updating and remapping of all CSLOs, however, will be a continuous

process as the SLO Committee engages with faculty to periodically review and update SLOs, and make sure the CSLOs are clear and align to ISLOs. In fact, by design, the SLO Committee outreach process described in Section 3.2 ensures an ongoing and organic community conversation about SLOs.

The college's Instructional Program Review also remains in a transitional state. In AY2019-20, Columbia College stopped using its previous template because the SharePoint version it was built upon was no longer supported by its District, and because the form collection method did not facilitate public display of finalized program review results. Rather than rebuilding the form into the newer version of SharePoint, the College Planning and Research Office opted to rebuild the form as a fillable PDF as a temporary measure in anticipation of finally building the content into eLumen. [\[4.1.1.a-Fillable Program Review pdf template\]](#) This also provided an opportunity to review the form with the IEC and Academic Senate to make the response structure more user-friendly in ways that the previous SharePoint version did not allow, and for the College Planning and Research Office to improve the datasheet of enrollment and completion outcomes it provides for Instructional Program Review.

Ultimately, the IEC suspended Instructional Program Review for AY2019-20 due to the contemporaneous COVID-19 pandemic and sudden transition to a fully-remote work environment. While still working remotely, the IEC recommenced Instructional Program Review on a more limited basis in AY2020-21, such that only those academic programs scheduled to complete a full program review in either year were asked to complete them. Faculty for those programs presented their outcomes at the college's Fall 2021 In-Service Day. The college will return to its fully-synchronized SLO and Program Review cycle in Spring 2021.

The college continues its plan to transition Instructional Program Review into eLumen, once additional elements of that system have been implemented. The primary value of the system will be a centralized workspace that is designed for the task, and the integration of CSLO outcomes directly into the Instructional Program Review template. Program enrollment and completion data will be provided by the college's research office. Unfortunately, eLumen does not presently provide a means to publish annually updated Instructional Program Review templates, and the outcomes must still be extracted as PDF in order to best make them publicly accessible (e.g., per standard I.B.8).

2. Developing methods for tracking *administrative unit outcomes* (AUO) and *service area outcomes* (SAO) to complement instructional SLO processes at the course, program (PSLO), and institutional (ISLO) levels.

It is less clear, at this point, that eLumen will be used as a hub either for Program Review or for SLOs for the college's administrative and student service areas (a.k.a. AUOs and SAOs). The primary value of tracking CSLOs in eLumen is that they are always measured by an instructor tallying the number of students who, in their opinion, satisfied that outcome in a given course-section. While the method of determination is subjective, though certainly professionally informed, the method of counting is standardized. It is always one student who either did or did not satisfy the outcome. Because any given CSLO is mapped to one PSLO or another, or to one ISLO or another, the CSLO tallies mapped to any given PSLO or ISLO can be aggregated (summed) to estimate the extent that it is institutionally supported.

As described in Section 3.2, the methods of observing and counting outcomes for the college's student service areas is highly varied, and informed by a much wider range of sources. The eLumen system is not designed to track these widely different sources, and most SLOs tied to the college's student service

areas are not directly tied to curriculum outcomes tracked in eLumen. Data and information sheets could be gathered and appended to the eLumen system so that student service area staff could complete their Program Reviews within. However, this seems like an unnecessary step since the content would ultimately be extracted again. Since the bulk of demonstration for the college's student service areas tends to be in narrative format, more basic desktop tools (e.g., MS Word and fillable PDF forms) will likely be easier to manage and give each unit some flexibility in how they compile their review. However, they will still follow a Program Review template that connects SLOs to their selected observable trends and outcomes, to resource allocations, to ISLOs, and the collegewide mission, and which otherwise preserves the Program Review conceptual structure outlined in the 2017 ISER (p.239).

As suggested earlier (Section 3.2), most of the student service units seem to be pursuing a data-informed approach as part of their Program Review and ongoing self-evaluation, but the evaluation is not always clearly tied to an SLO, or the SLOs are not always clearly evaluable. In other words, the underlying activity is appropriate, but the language or reporting concept is not always streamlined. The college's institutional researchers will lend their expertise in program evaluation while working with student service area staff over time to review and update their SLOs. Depending on the student service area, for example, it might make sense to approach SLOs as a theory of change, or to use them as conceptual platforms to derive a set of measurable goal-statements or benchmark targets.

Formal Program Review methods or SLOs have not been developed for the college's administrative areas. However, the college has recently begun conversations to embark on these efforts.

3. Providing more effective guidance about the use of SLO assessment results and program review to members of the campus community.

Columbia College has developed a robust culture of interpersonal guidance, in terms of developing, tracking, and using SLO assessments, through the efforts of the SLO Committee and its practice of direct outreach, by participatory engagement through the IEC and Academic Senate. Program Review and SLO outcomes are presented by the faculty and staff who completed them each Fall Semester during the collegewide In-Service Day. Information about Program Review is accessible from the [College Planning and Research webpage](#).

The [SLO Committee webpage](#) includes a statement of purpose, a description of the college's ISLOs and how they were developed, and examples, templates, and training resources for developing SLOs. Importantly, this webpage also includes access to eLumen, an *SLO Assessment Tracking Calendar* to help instructional faculty anticipate their next CSLO assessment, and faculty CSLO completion reports downloaded from eLumen.

Student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and courses (PSLOs and CSLOs) are clearly posted in the college's eLumen catalog. The *Division of Student Services* maintains a [dedicated Student Services Assessment webpage](#), on which is posted links to the college's *Student Equity Plan*, and links to SLOs by department.

Columbia College continues to set a high bar for itself in terms of effectively using its SLOs, and its integrated SLO, Program Review, and resource planning more generally. It continues down a pathway of effective SLO development and planning that it began around its last ISER, and which is a long term process of program implementation with varying phases of advancement. There have certainly been

setbacks, for example the recognition that the initial CSLO to ISLO mappings in eLumen were causing confusion and needed to be reworked. The college has also experienced some circumstantial impacts that slowed its implementation, namely the COVID-19 pandemic. Despite such circumstances, the college has generally remained nimble. Particularly through ongoing participatory governance and team collaboration, as demonstrated throughout this report, it has been able to recognize and confront challenges with its initial implementation and adapt its process. In the meanwhile, it has developed a rich culture of assessment and planning, has conducted Program Reviews with integrated SLO reflections and resource allocations, and developed processes of continuous SLO improvement.

4.2 Quality Focus Project 2 – Increasing Program Completion Rates

To address the goal of increasing overall completion rates, three project focus areas were identified:

- **Project Focus Area 2.1:** *Determine factors that encourage, discourage, or impede student completion and implement strategies to promote completion.*
- **Project Focus Area 2.2:** *Improve student placement, guidance, and educational planning to promote completion.*
- **Project Focus Area 2.3:** *Provide students greater access to coursework needed to complete their educational goals.*

In response to Project Focus Area 2.1, Focused Inquiry Groups (FIG) reviewed factors that encourage, discourage, or impede student completion and identified and implemented the following strategies to promote completion:

- **Pathway to Two-Year Completion** – The College has mapped [15 major areas of interest](#) that filter down to specific *programs of study*. Major advising guides have been created for the majority of programs and include a two-year sequence of recommended courses, example careers, and connections to faculty and counselors. A [general counselor has been assigned to each program of study](#) and serves as a connection point for both students and faculty within each major.
- **On-track momentum** – Full-time students are encouraged to stay on track by completing 30 units within their first year. The Columbia College Promise program provides recent high school graduates taking a minimum of 12 units with free tuition and specialized counseling services. Students are frequently monitored by Promise program staff and their cohort counselor to ensure they are staying on-track. Various financial incentives are offered to qualifying students to assist with their success to completion. *GetSAP* is a new online tool that teaches students how to obtain and maintain their financial aid while in school. Additionally, financial literacy resources are provided in an effort to keep students on-track.

Additionally, a new report from Hobson’s Starfish will be implemented that will provide notice when students go “off-track” from the educational plan. Student Success Assistants will monitor and follow-up with these students to identify potential needs and connect them to their cohort counselor. Students close to completion will be contacted through a forthcoming “close to completion” report in development by Hobson’s to be included in the Student Success Assistant cohort management model.

Other implementations that address Project Focus Areas 2.2. and 2.3 are:

- **Proactive Advisement and Counseling** – Student Success Assistants have been hired to provide proactive advising support by reaching out to students that have applied but not enrolled, administering and reviewing “student intake survey” details in Starfish to recommend needed supports to newly matriculated students, and introduce students to their cohort counselor. Students on academic probation will receive proactive outreach connecting them to an online

Student Success Workshop to provide the opportunity to learn strategies for returning to good academic standing.

Counselors use Starfish for identifying and communicating timely information to student cohorts, facilitating the early alert process and following up and resolving student concern “flags” submitted by faculty. In fall 2020, cohort counselors began using Starfish exclusively for appointment setting, allowing students to access counselors online to schedule an appointment by selecting an open time that works for their schedule. Starfish provides students with a descriptive “support network” for all counselors within their program of study or special population.

- **Placement** – All students are permitted to enroll in transfer-level mathematics and English courses at Columbia College. Students who graduated from high school within the past ten years receive an automatic placement into transferable courses either with or without recommended corequisite support based on their high school GPA. Students further removed from their high school years, plus any other student who is so inclined, complete the online Guided Self Placement instrument, from which they are guided to the most appropriate transferable math and English courses, with or without recommended corequisite support depending on how they respond to the online prompts. In addition, Counselors meet individually with students to provide input and advisement as to the best course for a given student’s intended pathway. The college catalog includes “which class should I start with?” graphics depicting how major interests and known academic background combine to determine students’ best math or English class options, even as a newly admitted student.
- **Student Onboarding** – To improve counseling process, the counseling team will assess the current onboarding process, using the Guided Self-Placement model as a best practice. Students will be highly encouraged to see a counselor to receive the *career placement instrument* in Starfish, be informed on the difference between local and transfer degrees and certificates, explore interests and potential employment and consider suitable coursework. Counselors will help them select a program of study, clarify their educational goal(s), and review the desired math and GE pathway.
- **Educational Planning** – Hobson’s Starfish platform has been adopted and is currently utilized by 100% of counselors to develop educational plans. Thereafter, students are encouraged by the counselor and Student Success Assistants to meet with a counselor each semester to review the plan to keep them on-track. Launch pads (first-semester plans based on major area of interests) were created so students can get started with their first semester in general education courses related to their area of interest. Student Ambassadors reach out to students who have not completed a comprehensive educational plan by the time they reach 15 units.

Student Success Assistants, previously discussed, will help provide outreach and retention strategies using a cohort model. By providing proactive advising and follow-up, students will be assisted in meeting their enrollment and financial aid deadlines, connecting with the campus resources they need, exploring co-curricular opportunities that enhance their engagement, and pursuing on-campus jobs, off-campus internships and career options. Progress Reports, Success

Plans, and tracking items in Starfish will be the primary means Student Success Assistants document and follow-up on these interventions with their assigned cohorts.

- **Greater Access to Courses** – The College is currently participating in The California Virtual Campus-Online Education Initiative (CVC-OEI), a collaborative effort among California Community Colleges to ensure that significantly more students are able to complete their educational goals by increasing both access to and success in high-quality online courses. Columbia has invested significant resources in the training of faculty in distance education and online modes, thus increasing the number of qualified instructors for quality online course offerings. External Initiative staff have been hired to promote Dual Enrollment with high school students, increase CCAP classes at the high schools and increase distance learning opportunities in remote locations of the college’s service areas. Counselors are working with the deans to identify course scheduling sequence needs, and identify start dates and times that do not conflict with high school schedules and graduation dates.
- **Schedule Planning** – Division Deans are actively working to maintain two-year plans, sync with course predictions in Starfish which impact student degree plans, and utilize the administrative degree planning tool to identify the number of students planning on each particular course.
- **New Registration System** – The District is in final implementation stages of streamlining the registration process and removing barriers to concurrent enrollment with Modesto Junior College. By implementing Ellucian Self-Service and updating processes between the two colleges, students will find an easier experience searching and identifying classes within the District and registering for either college without having to request permission to register, logging out of current system and logging into other college’s system to register.

The College remains committed to these efforts. As noted above, we have made significant strides to improve and streamline processes, increase effectiveness of operations, and improve the student experience. These efforts should result in marked improvement in student completion. However, the COVID-19 pandemic has created a significant cloud in our data, making it very difficult to observe the overall trend. As we emerge from the pandemic, the supports, adjustments, and structures described above should be instrumental in leading toward improvements in student completion.

Appendix 1 – Evidence


[2.1.A.14.f-Description of POP and TTKL activities](#)
[2.1.I.A.2.a-SLO Comm.Academic Senate.College Council minutes-adopting new ISLOs](#)
[2.1.I.A.2.b-Table showing CSLO to ISLO Mappings Completed](#)
[2.1.I.B.2-Program Review Files-Chemistry and Entrepreneurship.Sp2019](#)
[2.1.I.B.7.a-IEC minutes indicating Establishment of Chunking Committee](#)
[2.1.I.B.7.b-IEC Minutes illustrating work of Chunking Committee](#)
[2.1.I.C.3.a-Sp20 review of ISLO data college-wide](#)
[2.1.I.C.5.a-Revised College Academic Integrity Policy from 2021-22 Catalog](#)
[2.1.I.C.5.b-IEC Chunking Committee Catalog Policy Spreadsheet 2021](#)
[2.1.II.A.11.a-SLOAssessmentTrackingAnalysis](#)
[2.1.II.A.11.b-Senate and SLO Committee minutes illustrating revisions of SLO structure to improve effectiveness](#)
[2.1.II.A.12.a-Screenshot of Current Class Search GE filter](#)
[2.1.II.A.12.b-Screenshot of Starfish Student Planner GE search](#)
[2.1.II.A.12.c-Screenshot of new Self Service GE filter](#)
[2.1.II.A.14.a-Minutes of Spring 2021 CTE Advisory meetings - folder screenshot](#)
[2.1.II.A.14.b-Revisions to Welding - new fabrication course outline](#)
[2.1.II.A.14.c-2016-17 program awards vs 2021-22 program awards](#)
[2.1.II.A.15.a-Program Viability Majority Report - Auto Body](#)
[2.1.II.A.15.b-Program Viability Majority Report - Office Technology](#)
[2.1.II.A.15.c-Columbia College PRT Institutional Innovation and Effectiveness Plan-04.27.2020](#)
[2.1.II.A.15.d-Title III Grant Logic Model and Budget Summary](#)
[2.1.II.A.15.e-Screenshot of Columbia College courses in cvc.edu](#)
[2.1.II.A.16.a-In-Service Agendas showing Program Review presentations](#)
[2.1.II.A.16.b-Prioritization of Faculty Hiring Requests](#)
[2.1.II.A.16.c-College Council minutes re budget development and funding of resource requests](#)
[2.1.II.A.16.d-Existing and in-progress new Faculty Hiring Prioritization Process](#)
[2.1.II.A.16.e-Strategic Staffing Diagram](#)
[2.1.II.A.3.a-Contract language re faculty participation in SLO process](#)
[2.1.II.A.3.c-Fall 2020 Assessment Completion List](#)
[2.1.II.A.4.a-Job description for Program Specialist for CAEP](#)
[2.1.II.A.4.b-ESL Offerings and Enrollments by Term 2017-2021](#)
[2.1.II.A.5.a-Screenshot of Online Catalog Programs of Study](#)
[2.1.II.A.5.b-Screenshot of new Programs of Study webpages](#)
[2.1.II.A.5.c-Examples of Program Advising Guides](#)
[2.1.II.A.5.d-Program Webpage Illustrating Advising Guides](#)
[2.1.II.A.5.e-Sample eLumen Program with Recommended Sequence](#)
[2.1.II.A.5.f-Nested Programs of Study in Catalog](#)
[2.1.II.B.3.a-Student Services SLO Statements](#)
[2.1.II.B.3.b-DSPS SLO Assessment Summary](#)
[2.1.II.B.3.c-TRIO SLO Assessment Summary](#)
[2.1.II.C.2.b-Report of Active Education Plans in Starfish 8.17.2021](#)
[2.1.II.C.3-Screenshots illustrating expansion of best practices](#)
[2.1.II.C.5.a-Communications to Students about Starfish](#)
[2.1.II.C.7.a-Screenshot of Math Self-Placement webpage](#)
[2.1.II.C.7.b-Catalog pages showing math placement advice](#)
[2.1.II.C.7.c-Catalog pages showing English placement advice](#)

[2.1.II.C.7.d-YCCD Factbook 2021](#)
[2.1.III.A.14.a-TLC Report in Academic Senate Newsletter](#)
[2.1.III.A.14.b-Sample Flex Day Agendas hosted by TLC](#)
[2.1.III.A.14.c-TLC Report 2017-2018](#)
[2.1.III.A.14.d-TLC Report 2019-2020](#)
[2.1.III.A.14.e-Report on Video Broadcast TTKL 12.2020](#)
[2.1.III.A.14.f-Description of POP and TTKL Activities](#)
[2.1.III.B.3.a-Software Demonstration Calendar Appointments](#)
[2.1.III.B.4.a-College Technology Committee Minutes 2020.10.22](#)
[2.1.III.B.4.b-College Council minutes November 2020 adopting District TCO as our plan](#)
[2.1.IV.A.7.a-Spring 2018 survey results and word cloud](#)
[2.1.IV.A.7.b-Spring 2021 survey results and analysis](#)
[3.1.a-2021.02.09 Board Policy Committee Minutes](#)
[3.1.C2.g-Distance Education Addendum Example from eLumen](#)
[3.1.C2.c-Learning Design and Technology SAC](#)
[3.1.C2.d-Screenshot of Getting Started Module faculty training](#)
[3.1.C2.e-Screenshot of RefEffContact Module for faculty training](#)
[3.1.C2.f-Instructor Expectations and Resources for RegEffContact](#)
[3.1.C3.b-Draft Revisions to Governance Handbook](#)
[3.1.C4.a-Accreditation Follow-Up Report - February 2019 – Final](#)
[3.1.C4.b-YCCD IT TCO Feb 2019](#)
[3.1.D2.a-Yosemite Total Cost of Ownership Report-3-1-19](#)
[3.1.D2.c-Resource Allocation Model for 2021-22](#)
[3.1.D2.d-District Fiscal Advisory Council illustrating Fiscal Four discussions](#)
[3.1.D2.e-YCCD Equity Faculty Job Description Template – 2021](#)
[3.1.D2.f-College Services Committee Agenda 2020.10.09](#)
[3.1.D2.g-2021_02.24 District Council Minutes Re Strategic Master Planning](#)
[3.1.D3.a-2017.12.13-Board Resolution Re Delegation of Authority to CEOs](#)
[3.1.D3.b-2019.02.13 - Board Study Session with ACCJC VP Reynolds](#)
[3.1.D3.c-2019.02.19-BOT Study Session Agenda with CCLC rep William McGinnis](#)
[3.1.D3.d-Summary of Board Collective Voting Record](#)
[3.1.D3.e-2021.02.10 BOT Minutes – Approval of Due Process Board Policy](#)
[3.1.D3.f-2021.09.01-Board Study Session-Professional Development for a High Performing Board](#)
[3.1.D3.g-2021.09.08-Board Study Session-Review of ACCJC Std IV](#)
[3.1.D3.h-Yosemite CCD BOT Training_Sept2021_BOTmtg 9-8-2021](#)
[3.1.D3.i-Board Study Session-Clifton's Strengths](#)
[3.2.1-Integrated Program Review and SLO Cycle](#)
[3.2.2.a-2020.11.02 IEC Minutes re new Institution Set Standards](#)
[3.2.2.b 2020_11.20 College Council Minutes re new Institution Set Standards](#)
[3.2.2.c-Columbia College CTEOS College Summary 2020](#)
[4.1.1.a-Fillable Program Review pdf template](#)

Appendix 2 – 2021 Annual Report

[Link to report online](#)

3/23/2021
ACCJC Annual Report



ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR
COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES
WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

[| Help](#) | [Logout](#)

2021 Annual Report
Final Submission
03/23/2021

Columbia College
11600 Columbia College Drive
Sonora, CA 95370

General Information

#	Question	Answer
1.	Confirm your College Information	Confirmed
2.	Name of individual preparing report:	Brian K. Sanders, Ed.D.
3.	Phone number of person preparing report:	(209) 588-5107
4.	E-mail of person preparing report:	sandersb@yosemite.edu
5.	Type of Institution (select one)	California Community College

Headcount Enrollment Data

#	Question	Answer
6.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment:	2017-18: 4,279 2018-19: 4,219 2019-20: 4,194
6a.	Percent Change 2017-18 to 2018-19: (calculated) Percent Change 2018-19 to 2019-20: (calculated)	-1% -1%
6. Additional Instructions and Data Definitions:		
For the purposes of this report, unduplicated headcount is defined as the total number of students (credit and non-credit) enrolled at the end of the general enrollment period (also referred to as first census date). The academic year should include leading summer, fall, winter, and spring terms. If your institution calculates the academic year differently for the purposes of monitoring annual enrollment, you may respond using your local calculation and describe your method in Question 20.		
7.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in degree applicable credit courses:	2017-18: 3,652 2018-19: 3,646 2019-20: 3,665
7a.	Please list any individual program which has experienced a 50% increase or decrease in the last year. Columbia College continues to streamline and optimize its program offerings. Consistent with this effort, programs are treated as "pathways" rather than strict actuarial objects. For example, as a result of evolutions to programs directed through its curriculum process combined with the fact that students retain rights to enroll in certain programs even after they have been inactivated based on	

https://survey.accjc.org/annualreport/final_view.php
1/6

their "catalog year," the college had students enrolled in three programs that all provided the same associate degree in Water Resources Management. For this report, these three programs are simply labeled by the most recent title, "Water Resources Management | AS". Columbia College saw +50% increases or decreases in 78 program areas during the reporting period. **DECLINES IN SMALL PROGRAMS** (starting with 10 enrollments or fewer): Automotive Maintenance Technician | AS; Automotive Maintenance Technician | CERT; Business Administration (Accounting) | ASOE; Business Administration (Management) | ASOE; Computer Science | AS; Business/Web Development | AS; Computer Science | CERT; Computer Science - Digital Graphic Arts | CERT; Computer Science - Management Information Systems | CERT; Multimedia Technician for Entrepreneurs | SAC; Video Production for Entrepreneurs | SAC; Language Arts; Emphasis in English | AA; Entrepreneurship | CERT; E-Marketing Your Business | SAC; Hospitality Mgmt: Hotel Management | AS; Pantry & Dessert Chef | AS; Dinner Line Cook | CERT; Pantry & Dessert Chef | CERT; Hospitality Mgmt Tourism and Recreation Studies | C; Baker | SAC; Dining Room Staff | SAC; Safety and Sanitation | SAC; Baking for Entrepreneurs | SAC; Social and Behavioral Sciences | AA; LIBERAL ARTS Em in Beh/Soc Sci (Transfer GE) | AA; LIBERAL ARTS Emp in Sci (Transfer GE) | AA; Learning Design & Technology | SAC; Watershed Management Technology | CERT; Office Assitant | ASOE; Virtual Office Professional | CERT; Virtual Entrepreneur Technician | SAC; Post-Sec Studies: Biological Sciences-IGETC | AS; Post-Secondary Studies: Business Admin-CSU GE | AS; Post-Secondary Studies: Environ Sci-CSU GE | AS; Post-Secondary Studies: Physical Sci-CSU GE | AS; Post-Secondary Studies: Physical Sciences-IGETC | AS; Psychosocial Rehabilitation | SAC; Social Science | AA. Importantly, note that all but 3 of these programs are inactive. **DECLINES IN LARGE PROGRAMS** (starting with more than 10 enrollments): Automotive Service Technician | CERT; Automotive - Engine Performance | CERT; Business Administration: Accounting | CERT; Programming | AS; Health and Human Performance | AA; Chef | CERT; Deli Cook and Baker | SAC; Post-Secondary Studies: Computer Science-CSU GE | AS; Post-Secondary Studies: Pre-Engineering-CSU GE | AS; Transfer Other - With Degree; Transfer Other: Without Degree; Transfer - UC - Without Degree; Transfer - UC - with Degree. Note that "Automotive Service Technician | CERT" is the only program on this list that remains currently active. **INCREASES IN SMALL PROGRAMS** (ending with 10 enrollments or fewer): Drive Train Technician | AS; Automotive Technology for Entrepreneurs | SAC; Organizational Behavior | CERT; Tax Clerk | CERT; Payroll Clerk | CERT; Business Digital Media Development | AS; Digital Media Technician-Web Development | Cert; Website Development for Entrepreneurs | SAC; Emergency Medical Services | CERT; Intermediate ESL | Cert of Competency; Mgmt & Restoration of Fire-Adapted Ecosystems | SAC; Restaurant Management | CERT; Hospitality Supervision | CERT; Chef for Entrepreneurs | SAC; Bakery Staff | SAC; Public Health Science-IGETC | AST. **INCREASES IN LARGE PROGRAMS** (ending with more than 10 enrollments): Early Childhood Education-IGETC | AST; Computer Programming | AS; English-IGETC | AAT; Engineering Fundamentals | AS; General Ed. Development Prep. | Cert of Competency; Kinesiology-IGETC | AAT; Baking and Pastry Arts | CERT; Culinary Arts | CERT; Physics | AST; Public Health Science | AST; IGETC Pattern | CERT.

7. Additional Instructions and Data Definitions:

Per federal regulations, ACCJC is responsible for monitoring for significant program growth (or decline) that may potentially impact an institution's ability to meet Accreditation Standards. ACCJC does not determine what constitutes a program for colleges. For the purposes of this report, you may define degree-applicable credit programs as appropriate for the context of your institution's unique mission.

Distance Education and Correspondence Education

#	Question	Answer
8.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in distance education in last three years:	2017-18 1,550
		2018-19 1,745
		2019-20 1,897
8a.	Percent Change 2017-18 to 2018-19: (calculated) Percent Change 2018-19 to 2019-20: (calculated)	13%
		9%

8. Additional Instructions and Data Definitions:

Distance education is defined as education that uses technology to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor(s) and to support regular and substantive interaction between the students and the instructor, either synchronously or asynchronously. For the purposes of this report, include only those courses that are 100% online in your calculation of unduplicated headcount enrollment for distance education. Do not include hybrid courses or courses in which all the class hours are face to face, but some material is posted online.

IMPORTANT NOTE REGARDING DATA FROM SPRING 2020: When calculating total DE enrollment for 2019-20, please include 100% online courses from summer 2019, fall 2019, and winter 2020. For Spring 2020, please include only

courses that were originally scheduled as 100% online. Omit any courses that shifted to a distance modality due solely to the COVID-19 pandemic.

9.	Do you offer Correspondence Education?	Yes	
9a.	Total unduplicated headcount enrollment in all types of Correspondence Education:	2017-18	0
		2018-19	0
		2019-20	257
9b.	Percent Change 2017-18 to 2018-19: (calculated)	N/A	
	Percent Change 2018-19 to 2019-20: (calculated)	100%	

If your institution experienced more than a one-year increase (or decrease) of 50%, please explain:

9c. **Columbia began offering correspondence education for its Incarcerated Students Programs in Spring 2020, with acknowledgement from the Commission, because the COVID-19 shutdown precluded instructors from teaching courses face to face in correctional facilities, and incarcerated students are precluded from using the internet to take regular online offerings. Correspondence education was a way to retain these students and keep them on their academic path.**

9. Additional Instructions and Data Definitions:

Correspondence education is defined as education in which (1) the institution provides instructional materials (and examinations on these materials), by mail or electronic transmission (including transmission via learning management system) to students who are separated from the instructor; and where (2) interaction between the instructor(s) and the student is limited, is not regular and substantive, and is primarily initiated by the student. Online courses or online portions of courses which primarily involve "paperwork" (e.g., reading textbook and other materials posted by the instructor, taking examinations, and submitting assignments) will fall within the definition of correspondence education rather than distance education. If the online portion of a class meets the definition of correspondence education, then even if the class also meets on site, it will be considered a correspondence education course for Title IV qualification purposes. Correspondence education is not considered distance education within the U.S. Department of Education definition (see question 8, above).

Federal Data

#	Question	Answer
10.	List the Graduation Rate per the US Education Department College Scorecard	18 %

10. Additional Instructions and Data Definitions:

The US Education Department College Scorecard can be accessed at <https://collegescorecard.ed.gov/>. Enter your institution's name in the search box to find the current graduation rate. For the purposes of the College Scorecard, graduation rate is defined as "the share of students who graduated within 8 years of entering this school for the first time."

11.	If your college relies on another source for reporting success metrics, please identify the source. Click all that apply.	Other: We use CCCCO metrics and/or local data stores depending on the context
12.	Please provide a link to the exact page on your institution's website that displays its most recent listing of student achievement data.	https://www.gocolumbia.edu/institutional_research/institutional%20outcomes%20and%20student%20achievement%20reporting.php

12. Additional Instructions and Data Definitions:

ACCJC will include a link to this page in your institution's entry in the ACCJC Directory of Accredited Institutions (<https://accjc.org/find-an-institution>). This reporting and monitoring requirement supports ACCJC's recognition by the Council of Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) and is aligned with ACCJC's Accreditation Standard I.C.3 and Eligibility Requirement 19.

Institution Set Standards for Student Achievement

#	Question	Answer						
Course Completion Rates								
13.	List your Institution-Set Standard (floor) for successful student course completion rate:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2017-18</th> <th>2018-19</th> <th>2019-20</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>72 %</td> <td>72 %</td> <td>72 %</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	72 %	72 %	72 %
2017-18	2018-19	2019-20						
72 %	72 %	72 %						
13a.	List your stretch goal (aspirational) for successful student course completion rate:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2017-18</th> <th>2018-19</th> <th>2019-20</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>80 %</td> <td>80 %</td> <td>80 %</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	80 %	80 %	80 %
2017-18	2018-19	2019-20						
80 %	80 %	80 %						
13b.	List the actual successful student course completion rate:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2017-18</th> <th>2018-19</th> <th>2019-20</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>76 %</td> <td>76 %</td> <td>74 %</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	76 %	76 %	74 %
2017-18	2018-19	2019-20						
76 %	76 %	74 %						
13. Additional Instructions and Data Definitions: For the purposes of this report, the successful course completion rate is calculated as the number of student completions with a grade of C or better divided by the number of students enrolled in the course. If your institution calculates successful course completion differently, you may respond using your local calculation and describe your methodology in Question 20.								
Certificates								
14.	Type of Institute-set standard for certificates (Please Select Number or Percentage):	Number-Other						
	If Number-Other or Percent-other, please describe:	The headcount of individual students earning one or more awards each year						
14a.	List your Institution-Set Standard (floor) for certificates:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2017-18</th> <th>2018-19</th> <th>2019-20</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>25</td> <td>25</td> <td>25</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	25	25	25
2017-18	2018-19	2019-20						
25	25	25						
14b.	List your stretch goal (aspirational) for certificates:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2017-18</th> <th>2018-19</th> <th>2019-20</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>61</td> <td>61</td> <td>61</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	61	61	61
2017-18	2018-19	2019-20						
61	61	61						
14c.	List actual number or percentage of certificates:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2017-18</th> <th>2018-19</th> <th>2019-20</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>46</td> <td>76</td> <td>30</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	46	76	30
2017-18	2018-19	2019-20						
46	76	30						
14. Additional Instructions and Data Definitions: For purposes of this report, include only those certificates which are awarded with 16 or more units.								
Associate Degree (A.A./A.S.)								
15.	Type of Institute-set standard for degrees awarded (Please Select Number or Percentage):	Number-Other						
	If Number-Other or Percent-other, please describe:	The headcount of individual students earning one or more awards each year						
15a.	List your Institution-Set Standard (floor) for degrees:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2017-18</th> <th>2018-19</th> <th>2019-20</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>202</td> <td>202</td> <td>202</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	202	202	202
2017-18	2018-19	2019-20						
202	202	202						
15b.	List your stretch goal (aspirational) for degrees:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2017-18</th> <th>2018-19</th> <th>2019-20</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>260</td> <td>260</td> <td>260</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	260	260	260
2017-18	2018-19	2019-20						
260	260	260						
15c.	List actual number or percentage of degrees:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2017-18</th> <th>2018-19</th> <th>2019-20</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>214</td> <td>191</td> <td>246</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	214	191	246
2017-18	2018-19	2019-20						
214	191	246						
Bachelor's Degree (B.A./B.S.)								
16.	Does your college offer a Bachelor's Degree (B.A./B.S.)?	No						
Transfer								

17.	Type of Institute-set standard for transfers (Please Select Number or Percentage):	Number-Other		
	If Number-Other or Percent-other, please describe:	Number of transfers as reported by CCCC Student Success Metrics (currently only reporting to 2018-19)		
17a.	List your Institution-Set Standard (floor) for the students who transfer to a 4-year college/university:	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
		185	185	185
17b.	List your stretch goal (aspirational) for the students who transfer to a 4-year college/university:	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
		227	227	227
17d.	List actual number or percentage of students who transfer to a 4-year college/university:	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
		164	182	0

Licensure Examination Pass Rates

18.	Examination pass rates in programs for which students must pass a licensure examination in order to work in their field of study:						
	Program	Exam (National, State, Other)	Institution set standard (%) (Floor)	Stretch (Aspirational) Goal (%)	2017-18 Pass Rate	2018-19 Pass Rate	2019-20 Pass Rate

18. Additional Instructions and Data Definitions:

Report only those programs for which a license or other similar examination is required before students can qualify for employment in their chosen field of study, and where there were at least 10 students who completed the program in the designated year.

Employment rates for Career and Technical Education students

19.	Job placement rates for students completing certificate programs and CTE (career-technical education) degrees:					
	Program	Institution set standard (%) (Floor)	Stretch (Aspirational) Goal (%)	2017-18 Job Placement Rate	2018-19 Job Placement Rate	2019-20 Job Placement Rate

19. Additional Instructions and Data Definitions:

For the purposes of the Annual Report, Job Placement Rate is defined as the percentage of students who are employed in the year following completion of a CTE (career-technical education) certificate or degree program. (This means that the denominator for the 2019-20 job placement rate will be the number of students who completed the program in 2018-19.) Report only those programs with a minimum of 10 students in the completion year. For example, if a program had 9 students complete in 2018-19, you do not need to report a job placement rate for 2019-20. Report only those programs for which reliable data are available. If your institution has defined its job placement rate differently than what is described above, you may complete this question using your local definition provided that you describe this definition in Question 20.

Other Information

20.	Please use this text box to provide any comments regarding the data submitted in this report (optional, no limit).
	Columbia College engaged in a major revision to its Institution Set Standards in conjunction with its strategic planning and its participatory governance process. For course completion, the college retained its floor goal but established a new stretch goal. In a more major shift to be more consistent with statewide initiatives like the Vision for Success, the metrics used for reporting associate awards and certificates changed from reporting the absolute number of awards earned in a given year to the unduplicated number of students who earn them, and the college set new floor and stretch goals around these standards. It slightly revised its floor goal for four-year exit-transfers, and established a new stretch goal. It also decided to use CCCC Student Success Metrics as the primary source for estimating exit-transfers, as well as CTE job placement. Columbia College

3/23/2021

ACCJC Annual Report

continues to not report outcomes for licensure examination pass rates or for CTE job placement, both because it remains skeptical about the reliability of its available information and because it typically has too few students completing any relevant program to breach the masking threshold in any regard. In an effort to be thorough, however, the college did establish floor and stretch goals for each of these areas.

The data included in this report are certified as a complete and accurate representation of the reporting institution.

[Click to Print This Page](#)


[ACCJC | Contact Us](#)

◆ 2010 ACCJC

Appendix 3 – 2021 Annual Fiscal Report

[Link to report online](#)

3/26/2021
ACCJC Annual Fiscal Report



ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR
COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES
WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

[Help](#) | [Logout](#)

Annual Fiscal Report
Reporting Year: 2019-2020
Final Submission
03/26/2021

Columbia College
11600 Columbia College Drive
Sonora, CA 95370

General Information

#	Question	Answer
1.	Confirm College Information	Confirmed
2.	District Name: Is the college a single college district?	Yosemite Community College District No
2. Additional Information: If the college is a single college district, questions 21a, 21b, 22, 23 and 24 will "auto fill" from 18a, 18b, 4a, 6a, and 6d respectively.		
3.	a. Name of College Chief Business Officer (CBO) b. Title of College CBO c. Phone number of College CBO d. E-mail of College CBO e. Name of District CBO f. Title of District CBO g. Phone number of District CBO h. E-mail of District CBO	Trevor Stewart Vice President, College & Administrative Services 2095885112 stewartt@yosemite.edu G.H. Javaheripour Vice Chancellor of Educational Support Services 209 575-6507 javaheripourg@yosemite.edu
3. Additional Information: The District CBO email address will be copied on the final report once it has been approved by the CEO.		

DISTRICT DATA (including single college organizations) Revenue

(Source: Unrestricted General Fund, CCFS 311 Annual, Revenues, Expenditures, and Fund Balance)

		FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20																												
a.	Total Unrestricted General Fund Revenues (excluding account 8900)	\$ 103,520,928	\$ 111,769,336	\$ 120,950,878																												
b.	Other Unrestricted Financing Sources (Account 8900)	\$ 4,815	\$ 9,397	\$ 504																												
4.	i. Other Unrestricted Financing Sources (account 8900) is primarily comprised of (if applicable):																															
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 10%;">Year</th> <th style="width: 50%;">Description</th> <th style="width: 20%;">Amount</th> <th style="width: 20%;">Sustainable/One-time</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">FY 17/18</td> <td>Disposal of Equipment-Supplies</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 4,815</td> <td style="text-align: center;">One-time</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">FY 17/18</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">FY 18/19</td> <td>Disposal of Equipment-Supplies</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 9,397</td> <td style="text-align: center;">One-time</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">FY 18/19</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">FY 19/20</td> <td>Disposal of Equipment-Supplies</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 504</td> <td style="text-align: center;">One-time</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">FY 19/20</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 0</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Description	Amount	Sustainable/One-time	FY 17/18	Disposal of Equipment-Supplies	\$ 4,815	One-time	FY 17/18		\$ 0		FY 18/19	Disposal of Equipment-Supplies	\$ 9,397	One-time	FY 18/19		\$ 0		FY 19/20	Disposal of Equipment-Supplies	\$ 504	One-time	FY 19/20		\$ 0				
Year	Description	Amount	Sustainable/One-time																													
FY 17/18	Disposal of Equipment-Supplies	\$ 4,815	One-time																													
FY 17/18		\$ 0																														
FY 18/19	Disposal of Equipment-Supplies	\$ 9,397	One-time																													
FY 18/19		\$ 0																														
FY 19/20	Disposal of Equipment-Supplies	\$ 504	One-time																													
FY 19/20		\$ 0																														
4. Additional Information: ACCJC does not count other unrestricted financing sources as a regular and ongoing source of revenue, unless it is a sustainable annual revenue.																																
5.	(Source: Unrestricted General Fund, CCFS 311 Annual, Revenues, Expenditures, and Fund Balance)																															
		FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20																												
a.	Net (Adjusted) Unrestricted General Fund Beginning Balance	\$ 15,652,519	\$ 17,374,178	\$ 17,858,754																												
b.	Net Unrestricted General Fund Ending Balance, including transfers in/out	\$ 17,374,178	\$ 17,858,754	\$ 23,551,891																												

https://survey.accjc.org/fiscalreport/CCC/final_view.php
1/5

5. Additional Information:

- a. Use adjusted beginning fund balance from CCFS 311 Annual.
 b. This amount is the amount reported on the CCFS 311 report after transfers in/out

Expenditures/Transfers (General Fund Expenditures/Operating Expenditures)

(Source: Unrestricted General Fund, CCFS 311 Annual, Revenues, Expenditures, and Fund Balance)			
	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
a. Total Unrestricted General Fund Expenditures (including account 7000)	\$ 101,804,084	\$ 111,294,157	\$ 115,258,245
b. Total Unrestricted General Fund Salaries and Benefits (accounts 1000, 2000, 3000)	\$ 90,861,654	\$ 99,263,041	\$ 103,552,060
6. c. Other Unrestricted General Fund Outgo (6a - 6b)	\$ 10,942,430	\$ 12,031,116	\$ 11,706,185
d. Unrestricted General Fund Ending Balance	\$ 17,374,178	\$ 17,858,754	\$ 23,551,891
e. If the report year closed with an Unrestricted General Fund deficit, does the district anticipate to close 2020-21 with a deficit?			No
i. If yes, what is the estimated unrestricted deficit?			

6. Additional Information:
 d. 6.d. same as 5.b., which includes transfers in/out

Liabilities

	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
7. Did the District borrow funds for cash flow purposes?	No	No	No
8. Total Borrowing/Total Debt — Unrestricted General Fund			
a. Short-Term Borrowing (TRANS, etc)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
b. Long Term Borrowing (COPs, Capital Leases, other long-term borrowing):	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0

8. Additional Information:
 a. list total short-term Unrestricted General Fund Borrowing/Debt
 b. list total long-term Unrestricted General Fund Borrowing/Debt (not G.O. Bonds)

	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
9. a. Did the district issue long-term debt instruments or other new borrowing (not G.O. bonds) during the fiscal year noted?	No	No	No
b. What type(s)			
c. Total amount	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0

	FY 19/20	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
10. Debt Service Payments (Unrestricted General Fund)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0

10. Additional Information:
 This amount also includes transfers made from the Unrestricted General Fund to any other fund for the purposes of debt service payments.

Other Post Employment Benefits

	FY 17/18
11. (Source: Most recent GASB 74/75 OPEB Actuarial Report)	
a. Total OPEB Liability (TOL) for OPEB	\$ 42,007,868
b. Net OPEB Liability (NOL) for OPEB	\$ 7,542,110
c. Funded Ratio [Fiduciary Net Position (FNP/TOL)]	79.66 %
d. NOL as Percentage of OPEB Payroll	9.3 %
e. Service Cost (SC)	\$ 1,422,274
f. Amount of Contribution to Annual Service Cost, plus any	

	additional funding of the Net OPEB Liability	\$ 1,862,340		
11. Additional Information: Annual contribution to the Service Cost is generally the pay-as-you-go cost paid by the unrestricted general fund. Any contribution to the NOL is generally above that amount, and is paid into an Irrevocable Trust during the fiscal year. Please list both amounts here. Note this does not include any change in value or investment earnings of the trust.				
12.	Date of most recent GASB 74/75 OPEB Actuarial Report - use valuation date (mm/dd/yyyy)	06/30/2020		
	a. Has an irrevocable trust been established for OPEB liabilities?	Yes		
		FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
13.	b. Amount deposited into Irrevocable OPEB Reserve/Trust	\$ 2,047,587	\$ 2,646,846	\$ 1,021,104
	c. Amount deposited into non-irrevocable Reserve specifically for OPEB	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
	d. OPEB Irrevocable Trust Balance as of fiscal year end	\$ 32,732,647	\$ 33,654,372	\$ 33,635,534
	e. Has the district utilized OPEB or other special retiree benefit funds to help balance the general fund budget in 2019/20?	No		
13. Additional Information: b. Add amounts deposited during the fiscal year. These amounts are usually included in the District's Annual Audit. e. If "yes", that description and amount should be reported in 4.b.i. for FY 19/20				

Cash Position

		FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
14.	Cash Balance at June 30 from Annual CCFS-311 Report (Combined General Fund Balance Sheet Total — Unrestricted and Restricted-accounts 9100 through 9115)	\$ 36,786,972	\$ 36,621,494	\$ 33,628,424
15.	a. Does the district prepare cash flow projections during the year?	Yes		
	b. Does the district anticipate significant cash flow issues during 2020-21?	No		
15. Additional Information: b. Significant cash flow issues are defined as needing additional cash equal to or exceeding 15% of unrestricted general fund revenues				

Annual Audit Information

16.	Date annual audit report for fiscal year was electronically submitted to accjc.org, along with the institution's response to any audit exceptions (mm/dd/yyyy)	02/22/2021		
NOTE: Audited financial statements are due to the ACCJC no later than April 9, 2021. A multi-college district may submit a single district audit report on behalf of all the colleges in the district.				
17.		FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
	a. List the number of audit findings for each year (enter 0 if none):	0	0	0
	b. From Summary of Auditors Results (Annual Audit) for 2019-20 (this is usually a single page at the beginning of the Findings and Questioned Costs section):			
	<u>Financial Statements</u>			
	i. Type of auditor's report issued	Unmodified		
	ii. Internal Control Material Weaknesses identified	No		
	iii. Internal Control Significant Deficiencies identified	No		
	<u>Federal Awards</u>			
	i. Type of auditor's report issued on compliance	Unmodified		
	ii. Internal Control Material Weaknesses identified	No		
	iii. Internal Control Significant Deficiencies identified	No		

3/26/2021

ACCJC Annual Fiscal Report

iv. Qualified as low-risk auditee	<input type="text" value="Yes"/>
State Awards	
i. Type of auditor's report issued on compliance	<input type="text" value="Unmodified"/>
If qualified, how many state programs were qualified	<input type="text" value="0"/>
ii. Internal Control Material Weaknesses Identified	<input type="text" value="No"/>
iii. Internal Control Significant Deficiencies Identified	<input type="text" value="No"/>

Other District Information

	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
18. a. Final Adopted Budget — budgeted Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) (Annual Target)	<input type="text" value="16,542"/>	<input type="text" value="16,542"/>	<input type="text" value="16,542"/>
b. Actual Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) from Annual CCFS 320	<input type="text" value="16,542"/>	<input type="text" value="15,937"/>	<input type="text" value="16,253"/>

18. Additional Information:

- a. Resident FTES only.
- b. Report resident FTES only. Please use actual FTES, not hold harmless FTES.

	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
19. Number of FTES shifted into the fiscal year, or out of the fiscal year	<input type="text" value="333"/>	<input type="text" value="-333"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>

19. Additional Information:

- d. If the District shifted both in and out of a fiscal year, report the net (positive or negative). A negative number may be entered. For FTES shifted into a given year, that same amount should be subtracted from the corresponding report year.

20. a. During the reporting period, did the district settle any contracts with employee bargaining units?	<input type="text" value="No"/>
b. Did any negotiations remain open?	<input type="text" value="No"/>
c. Describe significant impacts of settlements. If any negotiations remain open over one year, describe length of negotiations, and issues	<input type="text" value="N/A"/>

College Data

NOTE: For a single college district the information is the same that was entered into the District section of the report.

	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
21. a. Final Adopted Budget — budgeted Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) (Annual Target)	<input type="text" value="1,885"/>	<input type="text" value="1,885"/>	<input type="text" value="1,868"/>
b. Actual Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) from Annual CCFS 320	<input type="text" value="1,832"/>	<input type="text" value="1,871"/>	<input type="text" value="1,850"/>
c. Is the college experiencing enrollment decline in the current (2020-21) year?	<input type="text" value="Yes"/>		
i. If yes, what is the estimated FTES decline?	<input type="text" value="363"/>		

21. Additional Information:

- Report resident FTES only.

	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
22. Final Unrestricted General Fund allocation from the District (for Single College Districts, use the number in 4a.)	<input type="text" value="\$ 13,497,277"/>	<input type="text" value="\$ 14,266,951"/>	<input type="text" value="\$ 14,721,161"/>

	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
23. Final Unrestricted General Fund Expenditures (for Single College Districts, use the number in 6a.)	<input type="text" value="\$ 13,235,688"/>	<input type="text" value="\$ 14,174,925"/>	<input type="text" value="\$ 14,719,676"/>

23. Additional Information:

	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
24. Final Unrestricted General Fund Ending Balance (for Single College Districts, use the number in 6a.)	<input type="text" value="\$ 0"/>	<input type="text" value="\$ 0"/>	<input type="text" value="\$ 0"/>

https://survey.accjc.org/fiscalreport/CCC/final_view.php

4/5

3/26/2021

ACCJC Annual Fiscal Report

		FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
25.	What percentage of the Unrestricted General Fund prior year Ending Balance did the District permit the College to carry forward into the next year's budget?	0 %	0 %	0 %
26.	USDE official cohort Student Loan Default Rate (FSLD) (3 year rate)	Cohort Year 2014 0 %	Cohort Year 2015 0 %	Cohort Year 2016 0 %

District and College Data

27.	a. Were there any executive or senior administration leadership changes at the College or District during the fiscal year, including June 30? List for the District and for the College.	Yes
	b. Please describe the leadership change(s)	Dr. Santanu Bandyopadhyay moved from President of Columbia College to Interim President of Modesto Junior College. Dr. G.H. Javaheripour moved from Vice Chancellor of Educational Services to Interim President of Columbia College.
	c. How many executive or senior administration positions have been replaced with an interim, or remain vacant?	1

27. Additional Information:
Senior administrative leadership generally includes the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the college/district and any administrators who report to that position and/or sit on the CEO's cabinet or executive committee. 'Senior executive leadership' always includes the chief business official, chief financial officer of the college/district.

The data included in this report are certified as a complete and accurate representation of the reporting college.

[Click to Print This Page](#)

ACCJC | [Contact Us](#)

© 2010 ACCJC