



ACCREDITATION FOLLOW-UP REPORT

February 2019

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 of the Follow-Up Report

Date: February 2019

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 *Follow-Up Report* is submitted to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges for the purpose of determining the resolution of recommendations identified during the October 2017 comprehensive site visit.

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

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

Santanu Bandyopadhyay, Ph.D.
President, Columbia College

Nathan C. Rien, J.D.
President, Academic Senate

Henry C. V. Yong
Chancellor, Yosemite Community College District

Doralyn Foletti
President, Classified Senate

Leslie Beggs
Board Chair, Yosemite Community College District

Klaus G. Tenbergen, Ed.D.
President, Leadership Team Advisory Council

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

Shalom Fletcher
President, Associated Students of Columbia College

Table of Contents

Certification of the Follow-Up Report	2
Statement on Report Preparation	4
Response to District Recommendation 1 (Compliance)	5
Evidence List for District Recommendation 1	12
Response to District Recommendation 4 (Compliance)	14
Evidence for District Recommendation 4	20

Statement on Report Preparation

Columbia College submitted its Institutional Self Evaluation Report and received a visit from an Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) external evaluation team in October 2017. The evaluation team submitted their report to the Commission for review at their meeting in January 2018. The Commission reviewed the college and evaluation team reports and took action to reaffirm the College's accreditation for 18 months and require a follow-up report and visit. In their reaffirmation letter, the Commission detailed four college and four district recommendations. Of these, District Recommendations 1 and 4 were determined to be compliance recommendations, while the remainder were recommendations for improvement. The letter required both recommendations to be addressed in a Follow-Up Report due in March 2019. This Follow-Up Report only addresses the two compliance recommendations. College and District progress on the improvement recommendations will be addressed in the upcoming midterm report.

Following receipt of the letter of reaffirmation, the College began immediate consultations with its sister institution, Modesto Junior College, and members of the Yosemite Community College District administration and Board of Trustees to address these District Recommendations.

Because the two recommendations focused on district activities, leaders from the District and both Colleges worked together to identify areas in need of improvement, delineate corrective actions needed, and carry them through to completion. District leaders in Information Technology and Facilities took the lead in responding to District Recommendation 1, while the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees were instrumental in responding to District Recommendation 4. The Chancellor hired a consultant with extensive experience in accreditation matters to meet with District leaders and help guide the process. The consultant also authored the first draft of the responses to the recommendations.

From January through December 2018, faculty, staff, and administrative leaders at the Colleges were regularly apprised of progress in response to the recommendations. As detailed in the following pages regarding Recommendation 1, the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) documents for Information Technology and for Facilities were widely circulated with input from all constituent groups and appropriate councils and committees at each college. Feedback from these groups was incorporated into the TCOs, resulting in broad support for these essential supporting documents.

The consultant submitted his completed draft to the colleges' Accreditation Liaison Officers (ALOs) in the first week of January 2019. In the two weeks prior to the beginning of the Spring 2019 semester, the ALOs refined the draft for review by each college's participatory governance councils and constituent groups.

From mid-January through early February, the Follow-Up Report was reviewed and approved by the Columbia College Council, composed of leaders of all constituent groups on campus, who sought and provided input from their constituents. Edits and corrections were incorporated into the document. A copy of the response to Recommendation 4 was provided to the Board of Trustees and their feedback was incorporated into the final draft.

The Board of Trustees approved the report for a first reading on February 13, 2019, and finalized their approval with a second reading at a specially-called meeting on February 19, 2019.

Response to District Recommendation 1 (Compliance)

Standards III.B.4 and III.C.2 (District Recommendation 1):

In order to meet the standard, the District must address the total cost of ownership for physical and technological resources in support of the Colleges' missions, operations, programs, and services.

Yosemite Community College District (YCCD) administration and staff reviewed the Commission recommendation with respect to addressing the total cost of ownership (TCO) for physical and technological resources in consultation with college leaders and constituents. They also conferred with consultants and colleagues at other community colleges. The collaborative work of the Colleges and District resulted in effective TCO documents for facilities and technology that serve a dual role: 1) These plans guide the process for purchases and investments to ensure sustainable long-term costs. 2) Fiscal, Facilities, and Technology personnel analyzed overall College and District replacement and maintenance costs of buildings and technology to provide critical information for TCO planning. As such, the TCO documents provide a pivotal foundation for long-range planning and continuous efforts to maintain quality and capacity that support the mission of the Colleges.

Discussions at the Colleges and District identified three specific priorities related to the total cost of ownership in support of the Colleges' missions, operations, programs, and services:

1. Develop a district wide process for identifying total costs of facilities and technology, including personnel, maintenance, and replacement costs.
2. Develop district wide guiding principles to support priorities and decision-making.
3. Identify funding sources to support new and ongoing capital improvement and technology needs.

The District began addressing these priorities with the development of separate TCO plans for Facilities and Technology. These plans provide formal processes for identifying long-term costs when considering facilities or technology requests. The respective TCO plans were developed separately, aligning with the organizational structures and history of operations at YCCD. The processes, while different in their specifics, followed the same essential steps in the creation, review, and approval of the individual TCO plans.

TCO for Physical Resources and Facilities

The Vice Chancellor of Fiscal Services (VCFS) began the development of the Facilities TCO by discussing the importance of addressing total cost of ownership to the facilities and services committees at the Colleges ([DR1-1](#), [DR1-2](#)). Discussions were focused on the importance of processes to identify and plan for long-term costs. Specifically, the presentations addressed facilities development, annual operations, long-term management of facilities, and relevant

building data. In addition, the definition of total cost of ownership and the type of information that would be included in the TCO document were discussed ([DR1-3](#)).

With the goal of developing guidelines and factual cost estimates to help budgeting and decision-making at Columbia College (CC), Modesto Junior College (MJC), and Central Services (CS), the Chancellor asked Central Services staff to examine a range of sample TCO models that could be used to create a viable YCCD process ([DR1-4](#)). The district team, led by the VCFS and the Director of Facilities, Planning, and Operations, reviewed guidelines related to physical plant and educational facilities standards published by [APPA: Leadership in Educational Facilities](#) and the California Community Colleges' [FUSION](#) report. The team tracked and shared a summary status update with College leaders on the development of the TCO ([DR1-5](#)).

A progress update on the Facilities TCO plan was provided to MJC and CC cabinet members, Academic Senate leaders, and Associated Student leaders in April 2018. The Chancellor advised District Council members that the VCFS team was working on the TCO plan to implement a solid budgetary practice and to meet accreditation expectations, and that the plan would be brought back to the council for review and feedback as part of participatory governance ([DR1-6](#)).

In fall 2018, the VCFS presented a draft of the TCO to the District Council, consisting of constituent group leaders from across the District. As stated in the executive summary, the TCO is intended to “*establish a data driven procedure to assure adequate, well maintained capital assets to meet the educational mission of the district*” and to “*provide information and an awareness of all costs expended over the life-cycle of a building.*” ([DR1-7](#)) Over the last decade, the YCCD facilities investment rate matches the industry average for ongoing investment to maintain facilities for their effective use ([DR1-8](#), p. 28). Additionally, the Facilities TCO plan prioritizes four areas of focus to meet Accreditation Standards: 1) safe and secure facilities that support educational needs, 2) facilities that maintain effective utilization and continuing quality, 3) ongoing evaluation, and 4) long-term capital plans that are developed according to the TCO process ([DR1-9](#)).

In the fall meeting, the VCFS asked members to solicit feedback from their constituent groups ([DR1-10](#)). In October 2018, feedback was provided at the monthly District Council meeting ([DR1-11](#)). The VCFS presented the plan to the College Facilities Committee and the Board of Trustees as an information item in November 2018, including the purpose of the plan, the efforts to create the plan, and its current and future use ([DR1-12](#), [DR1-13](#), [DR1-14](#), [DR1-15](#), [DR1-16](#), [DR1-17](#), [DR1-18](#)).

TCO for Technology

The Information Technology (IT) department applied similar methods of analysis when creating the technology TCO plan. They reviewed IT TCO plans and accreditation recommendations from similar institutions and districts, considered YCCD structures and processes, and vetted the TCO plan with constituent groups.

Discussions regarding the need for an IT TCO began in February 2018 at the District Technology Working Group (DTWG) meeting ([DR1-19](#)). Focused discussions continued

through three subsequent DTWG meetings ([DR1-20](#), [DR1-21](#), [DR1-22](#)). Participants strategized how the TCO process could be incorporated into YCCD's existing processes and plans. From these discussions, several needs were identified:

- Prioritizing technology as a resource for the colleges and district
- A defined process for submitting, approving, and prioritizing technology
- IT Project Management
- Technology standards

District IT personnel developed a TCO plan, based on the identified needs from the DTWG meetings and model TCO plans from similar districts in the California Community College system ([DR1-23](#)). The draft was shared with participatory governance groups at both Colleges to ensure educational needs were appropriately addressed and all voices and interests had the opportunity to provide input. Groups that reviewed the TCO included the MJC College Technology Committee, the CC Technology Committee (by email), the MJC Academic Senate and College Council, the CC Academic Senate and College Council, and the YCCD District Administrative Council ([DR1-24](#), [DR1-25](#), [DR1-26](#)).

An important topic at many of the committee meetings was the issue of replacement cycles and standards for maintaining hardware. The committees identified desktop, laptop, and classroom computers as fundamental tools for all employees. IT staff developed an inventory and cost estimate of desktop and laptop computers as a resource document to the TCO ([DR1-27](#), [DR1-28](#)). The list was shared and discussed with the College Technology Committees as a tool to help prioritize one-time monies ([DR1-29](#), [DR1-30](#)). The Computer Inventory and Replacement Planning List/Aging Report provides a cost estimate for maintaining desktop and laptop computer replacements on an annual schedule.

The IT TCO Plan documents how identified technology needs are evaluated, and a total cost assigned, approved, and prioritized. This new process was designed to help YCCD focus on priority needs and functional requirements. All major technology selections are processed through the College Technology Committees, the District Technology Advisory Committee, and finally the District Administrative Council. The process is outlined in detail in the IT TCO Plan ([DR1-31](#), p.12). A scoring rubric is included in the TCO to ensure that all major technology projects are aligned with the District Mission, District Strategic Plan, College Strategic Plans, IT Strategic Plan, and Facilities Master Plan (page 15) ([DR1-32](#)).

Implementation of Total Cost of Ownership Processes

As described in the visiting team's report, the District and its Colleges have struggled in the past with limited resources for both facilities and technology maintenance. In spite of these limitations, significant investments have been made in both facilities and technology, with close coordination between Central Services and the Colleges through the Strong Workforce Initiative, grants, one-time funds, Instructional Equipment and Library Materials (IELM) funds, state scheduled maintenance allocations, and other funding sources.

The development of Total Cost of Ownership plans in IT and Facilities provided a powerful opportunity to synthesize, systematize, and strategically match resources to ongoing needs. By following these TCO plans, the District and Colleges will incorporate long-term planning for sustainability with both short-term and long-term funding sources. Ongoing obligations are now identified within each TCO ([DR1-33](#), [DR1-34](#)).

Because of the increasing number of facility improvement projects, the District drafted process guidelines to clarify expectations, steps toward cost estimates, and potential timelines for new projects. To assist College and District personnel in understanding the process of capital project development, a procedural document has been drafted to clarify fiscal and regulatory requirements and steps. The draft *Special Projects Funding Guidelines* document helps College and District personnel develop budgets and program plans that align with initiative funding and Department of the State Architect (DSA) regulations ([DR1-35](#)).

New awareness of the importance of addressing long-term costs has led to additional actions, including plans to develop district wide priorities for technology initiatives and building use, implementation of a project management system for technology projects, and draft guidelines for renovation projects. Processes outlined in the Facilities TCO and in the IT TCO are now being implemented. IT personnel have met with College leaders to identify technology priorities ([DR1-36](#)). The IT department now utilizes a project management software system to track requests and changes and to monitor progress toward benchmarks and implementation ([DR1-37](#), [DR1-38](#)). Small capital projects, such as those undertaken with Strong Workforce funds, are now planned and documented in meetings of District Facilities and Planning personnel, College administrators, division deans, architects, and other experts ([DR1-39](#)).

Following the process steps outlined in the *Special Projects Funding Guidelines* draft, Strong Workforce resources have been used for multiple capital improvement projects. For example, Columbia College is working to remodel a hospitality management facility at Modesto Junior College and offer classes there starting in summer 2019 ([DR1-40](#)). The extent of the remodel necessitated significant additional costs to remodel aging restrooms in the building. Strong Workforce funds were leveraged with carryover funds from Measure E, a bond measure to renovate and build new campus facilities. The combined funding was used to cover the costs of renovating the instructional space, improvements to the restrooms, and updates to the HVAC system of the building ([DR1-41](#)).

As the TCO for Information Technology (IT) was being developed, the District and Colleges began intentionally implementing its principles in decision-making. For example, IT staff found that a large number of computers across the district were aging and/or at end-of-life. Instead of simply buying all new machines, IT staff established “upgrade kits” to bring older-but-functional machines up to current standards.

Nearly \$500,000 in savings associated with staff vacancies was allocated toward equipment replacement. ([DR1-42](#), [DR1-43](#)) To date, more than 200 new computers for employees and students have been purchased and installed as well as several hundred upgrade kits. With the

finalized TCO Plan and the inventory report of district computers, the YCCD is now positioned for improved long-range planning of computer replacements on an ongoing basis.

Another example illustrating use of the TCO's principles involved purchasing a new software system for electronic forms and approvals. In May 2017, a constituency-based committee was assembled to identify the needs of online forms, document imaging, and workflow for the District and develop a scoring rubric for vendor presentations ([DR1-44](#)). Fiscal Services led the development of a Request for Proposal (RFP), including technical specifications, developed with IT experts ([DR1-45](#)). Representatives from MJC, CC, and Central Services, including IT, convened to review vendors' proposed solutions, with careful attention to the total cost of ownership from purchase through installation, training, and long-term maintenance and stability ([DR1-46](#)). The team selected SoftDocs and worked toward its implementation, achieving district wide deployment for travel requests as of January 1, 2019 ([DR1-47](#)). This process was valuable in understanding critical steps in the acquisition of new technology, contributing to the IT TCO Plan.

Developing Strategic Priorities

The next step in effective total cost of ownership is to establish overarching district goals to provide direction, help prioritize proposed facility and technology investments, and estimate the most effective pending expenditures for long-term cost efficiency. To that end, at the December Study Session of the Board of Trustees, the Board learned about the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) Vision for Success and the expectation that colleges establish goals aligned with this Vision ([DR1-48](#)).

The Board reviewed student metrics at both colleges and discussed their role in helping establish district wide goals. In spring 2019, both colleges are engaged in the process of setting target goals to align with the CCCCCO Vision goals. Collectively, the College and District goals will represent the high-level strategic priorities to help guide technology and facilities investments ([DR1-49](#), [DR1-50](#)). Moreover, Facilities and IT staff are prioritizing the most pressing technology infrastructure needs and assessing the appropriate timing for replacement and maintenance.

Identifying Resources

The final component of effective total cost of ownership is to identify resources to meet current and ongoing needs. This involves both long-term and short-term planning.

Long-Term Planning

While not a subject of this follow-up report to the Commission, an improvement recommendation by the visiting team called for broader collaborative dialog and decision making in the areas of planning and resource allocation, including one-time funds [[District Recommendation 2 \(Improvement\)](#)]. In response to this recommendation, the VCFS worked with leaders from all constituent groups to establish the foundation for a new participatory governance body to provide input on fiscal issues. The first meeting of the newly established District Fiscal Advisory Committee (DFAC) occurred on January 31, 2019 ([DR1-51](#)). The most pressing matter

for this new Committee is to collaboratively revise the District's internal funding allocation model that provides proportional shares of resources to the two Colleges and Central Services.

Under the new Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF), the District received additional funding over the previous year. This funding increase provides a welcome source of ongoing resources to meet the identified needs in technology and facilities, among others. Among many competing needs, the DFAC discussed the need to identify resources that address the total cost of ownership of facilities and technology at the inaugural meeting ([DR1-51](#)). The revised funding allocation model will consequently represent the long-term planning needed to support these TCOs.

Short-Term Planning

In spring 2018, the facilities and services committees at both Colleges considered potential small capital project needs and provided input to District priorities for these projects ([DR1-52](#), [DR 1-53](#)). Other technology and facilities needs have been addressed historically by blending a wide variety of funds. Examples include:

- A major renovation was accomplished at MJC by combining funds from a federal Title V grant, the Adult Ed Block Grant, and District deferred maintenance funding ([DR1-54](#)).
- Investment into a new district wide electronic forms database came from a Title III grant and existing programming resources to create a 21st Century document platform ([DR1-55](#)).
- Instructional Equipment and Library Materials (IELM) funds have been allocated by the District to the Colleges. Each college has formal processes by which technology is reviewed, prioritized, and funded ([DR1-56](#), [DR1-57](#), [DR1-58](#)).

This approach of leveraging multiple resources to meet institutional needs will continue but will be guided more systematically by the processes outlined in the TCOs. The TCO documents and associated prioritization of needs in facilities and IT have identified the most pressing items for short-term replacement or refurbishment. Resources from state and federal grants and categorical budgets will be allocated to technology and facilities projects that meet the missions of the Colleges and conform to the constraints of the funding source. An update on projects completed in spring 2019 will be provided to the Commission prior to their meeting in June.

Conclusion

The Colleges and District have genuinely collaborated to establish broad understanding of how total cost of ownership is addressed. Both TCO plans were thoughtfully created. They provide data on relevant resources and needs that will be used for decision-making. Both outline clear processes for the Colleges and District to follow when considering new technology or facility needs. All parties now have a clear understanding of standard equipment costs and a recommended replacement cycle. The new District Fiscal Advisory Committee provides an essential participatory governance venue to discuss the allocation of resources and attend to short- and long-term needs. In the next year, it is expected that the DFAC will shepherd a new

funding allocation model through all governance bodies that, among other needs, supports the total cost of ownership of essential district resources in facilities and technology. Moreover, the Colleges and the District are engaged in establishing overarching goals to help discern the most effective investments to “move the needle” while minimizing the total cost of ownership.

Evidence List for District Recommendation 1

DR1-1	CC College Services Committee Minutes (Item 4) 04.04.18
DR1-2	MJC Facilities Council Meeting Minutes (Item 3) 04.16.18
DR1-3	Facilities TCO PowerPoint Presentation April 2018
DR1-4	District Council Meeting Minutes (Item 5) 04.25.18
DR1-5	Email from S. Yeager re: TCO Facilities 06.18.18
DR1-6	District Council Meeting Minutes (Item 5) 04.25.18
DR1-7	YCCD TCO Facilities Plan 11.13.18
DR1-8	YCCD TCO Facilities Plan, Industry Rates (p. 28-30)
DR1-9	YCCD TCO Facilities Plan, Accreditation Standards (p. 31-32)
DR1-10	District Council Meeting Minutes (Item 4a) 09.26.18
DR1-11	District Council Meeting Minutes (Items 1c and 2) 10.24.18
DR1-12	MJC Facilities Council Meeting Minutes (Item 5) 09.17.18
DR1-13	YCCD Board of Trustees Minutes (Item 5.1) 11.14.18
DR1-14	TCO PowerPoint Presentation to the BOT 11.14.18
DR1-15	MJC Academic Senate Minutes (01.24.19)
DR1-16	CC Academic Senate Minutes (01.10.19)
DR1-17	MJC College Council Meeting Minutes (01.28.19)
DR1-18	CC College Services Committee Meeting Minutes 10.12.18
DR1-19	District Technology Meeting Minutes (Item IIC) 02.06.18
DR1-20	District Technology Working Group (DTWG) Notes (Item IV) 04.17.18
DR1-21	District Technology Working Group (DTWG) Notes (Item III) 07.24.18
DR1-22	District Technology Working Group (DTWG) Notes (Item III) 11.02.18
DR1-23	YCCD IT TCO Plan
DR1-24	MJC Academic Senate Minutes 12.06.2018
DR1-25	MJC College Council Minutes (Item C) 12.10.18
DR1-26	CC Council Minutes 01.18.2019 UNAPPROVED
DR1-27	YCCD Computer Inventory and Replacement/Aging Report
DR1-28	CC Computer Purchase Summary 02.12.18
DR1-29	MJC College Technology Committee Minutes (Items III, IV) 12.04.18
DR1-30	CC Technology Committee Minutes (Item 2) 02.22.18
DR1-31	YCCD Technology TCO Plan - Process (Page 12)
DR1-32	YCCD Technology TCO Plan - Rubric (Page 15)
DR1-33	YCCD Computer Inventory and Replacement/Aging Report
DR1-34	YCCD Facilities TCO Plan Cost Estimates (Section 4.2)
DR1-35	YCCD Special Projects Funding Guidelines DRAFT (Capital Projects)
DR1-36	CC Admin Team Meeting Notes 11.20.18
DR1-37	Project Management Tool (WRIKE)
DR1-38	Technology requests for project priorities (meeting notes)
DR1-39	Measure E Strong Workforce Funded Projects Meeting Notes 08.13.18
DR1-40	Status re: Hospitality Management Facility Project

<u>DR1-41</u>	BOT Minutes re: John Muir Facility Maintenance 06.13.18
<u>DR1-42</u>	2017-2018 End of Year Technology Purchases from Salary Savings
<u>DR1-43</u>	YCCD Information Technology Meeting Minutes 02.02.18
<u>DR1-44</u>	Electronic Document Workgroup Minutes 07.18.17
<u>DR1-45</u>	Electronic Document RFP
<u>DR1-46</u>	Electronic Document Vendor Rubric
<u>DR1-47</u>	Snapshot of SoftDocs Program
<u>DR1-48</u>	BOT Special Study Session Minutes 12.18.18
<u>DR1-49</u>	MJC Vision Goal Setting Plan
<u>DR1-50</u>	CC Vision Goal Setting Plan
<u>DR1-51</u>	District Fiscal Advisory Committee Minutes 1.31.2019
<u>DR1-52</u>	MJC Facilities Council PowerPoint Presentation
<u>DR1-53</u>	Columbia College Small Capital Projects Presentation
<u>DR1-54</u>	MJC Student Services area renovations funded by leveraged funding sources
<u>DR1-55</u>	Columbia College Title III funding for SoftDocs
<u>DR1-56</u>	2017-2018 Approved Program Review and Shared Institutional Needs Requests funded by IELM
<u>DR1-57</u>	MJC Resource Allocation Council Meeting Minutes 01.19.18
<u>DR1-58</u>	CC PC Upgrade IELM 2018

Response to District Recommendation 4 (Compliance)

Standards IV.C.7 and IV.C.12 (District Recommendation 4):

In order to meet the Standards, the Board must fully delegate operational authority to the Chancellor and the College Presidents as specified in Board Policies 2430 and 2430.1, and demonstrate through practice, their policy making role while refraining from interfering with the CEO's authority to operate the District/Colleges.

The Yosemite Community College District (YCCD) Board of Trustees, together with district and college leaders and external consultants, reviewed the compliance recommendation from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) and identified two related expectations:

1. Delegate full operational authority to the Chancellor and the College Presidents pursuant to Board Policies 2430 and 2430.1 and
2. Demonstrate, through practice, the Board's policymaking role while refraining from interfering with the CEO's authority to operate the District/Colleges ([DR4-4](#)).

The Board examined the conclusions of the Commission about its performance as described in the letters of reaffirmation for Columbia College and Modesto Junior College, considered the findings of the site visit teams as described in their evaluation reports, and engaged thoughtfully with the recommendations ([DR4-2](#), [DR4-3](#), [DR4-4](#), [DR4-9](#); [DR4-10](#), [DR4-11](#)). The Board reflected on its effectiveness on these matters as a component of their annual self-evaluation process and discussed ways to improve board effectiveness, meet the expectations of the Commission, and establish practices and policies to assure continued alignment with the Accreditation Standards going forward ([DR4-6](#), [DR4-7](#)). Moreover, in Board Study Sessions, the Board received targeted training on roles and responsibilities of board members individually and the Board of Trustees as an entity, the distinction between policymaking and the execution of established policy, and the expectation of the Commission that the latter is delegated to the Chancellor and the College Presidents ([DR4-8](#), [DR4-9](#), [DR4-17](#), [DR4-18](#)). These training sessions refreshed the understanding of existing board members and established expectations for newly elected members.

As a component of study sessions, the Board conducted a gap analysis to identify knowledge, structural, and organizational hurdles to successfully meeting the relevant standards ([DR4-12](#), [DR4-17](#), [DR4-19](#)). Among others, the Board identified that increased clarity from the District regarding areas of concern would create a greater sense of transparency in college and district operations, which would, in turn, improve their delegation of operations to the CEO. The hiring of a new chancellor and new presidents at both colleges and the election of three new board members provides an opportunity for increased transparency, trust, and delegation of responsibilities.

As a result of their ongoing reflection and training, the Board agreed to establish a standing agenda item on accreditation, to conduct ongoing study sessions to assess progress on these matters over time, and to proactively identify areas of possible conflict in order to address them in a manner aligned with the Standards ([DR4-17](#), [DR4-18](#)). To this end, the Board has built an open dialogue with the new Chancellor to identify and address organizational impediments and areas where additional information is needed or greater input is desired (e.g., greater clarity in the board policy development process).

Full Delegation of Authority

The Board of Trustees began its efforts to meet the Standard immediately after receiving the recommendation from the visiting teams. In December 2017, the Board carefully reviewed and reiterated its commitment to Board Policy 2430 (Delegation to the Chancellor) and Board Policy 2430.1 (Delegation to the Presidents) ([DR4-3](#); [DR4-4](#)). The Board reviewed the contents of these policies with specific attention to the delineation of duties and responsibilities and the distinction between policymaking and the execution of established policy. The Board’s review culminated in a resolution stating, “The YCCD Board of Trustees reaffirms its commitment to fully delegating operational authority to the Chancellor and the College Presidents as specified in Board Policies 2430 and 2430.1, and demonstrates through practice, its policy making role” ([DR4-2](#)).

Importantly, the Trustees recognized that the review of the policies alone would not be enough to meet the Standard. The Board would have to put the refreshed knowledge into action over time, and regularly revisit the recommendation. To that end, the Board again reviewed its roles and responsibilities during its regular annual review of goals and evaluation of effectiveness in August of 2018 ([DR4-6](#), [DR4-7](#)). Board members identified areas of improvement and identified professional development opportunities to increase member effectiveness.

Reviewing Roles and Responsibilities

Subsequent to the board evaluation, the Trustees, in cooperation with the Chancellor, scheduled and hosted two accreditation and board governance workshops on September 24, 2018 and December 18, 2018. The September Board Study Session was convened to review and address the recommendation ([DR4-8](#), [DR4-9](#)). Participants in the robust discussion included board members, district administrators, college administrators, and a faculty representative. The meeting established a timeline for completing the work needed to satisfy the Commission’s expectations. The workshop provided a welcome opportunity for conversation and feedback on becoming a more effective board, effective trusteeship, the Brown Act, and ethics of board members. To facilitate the discussion, William McGinnis, a consultant with the Community College League of California, addressed the following topics:

- Required board actions to meet accreditation standards.
- Proper conduct for interaction with district and college employees and the community at large.
- Conducting more effective and efficient board meetings.

- Broadening communication between board members and the college constituencies ([DR4-11](#)).

In addition, at the September training, the Board of Trustees reaffirmed the delineation of the following roles as aligned with Standard IV, Leadership and Governance including:

- The role of the Chancellor and the Presidents to execute the Board's oversight of the quality of the institution.
- The role of the Board of Trustees with respect to policy creation to assure student success and the effectiveness of student learning.
- The expectation that the Board of Trustees needs to act as a collective entity after board decisions have been made, regardless of individual voting on an issue.
- The need to establish policies in alignment with the district mission to ensure institutional quality and financial integrity and stability ([DR4-11](#), [DR4-12](#)).

Finally, the Board reviewed the timeline to produce the report and the role of the Board in the process to develop narrative and capture evidence for meeting its recommendation expectations ([DR4-10](#)).

From October 24 to 27, 2018, the Board Vice Chair (who has since become Board Chair) attended the 2018 Association of Community College Trustees Leadership Congress in New York City in order to broaden her knowledge of the role and responsibilities of trustees ([DR4-14](#)).

The December Board Study Session focused on review of the first draft of the narrative for accuracy and completeness ([DR4-17](#), [DR4-18](#)). Newly elected board members learned about the recommendation and the steps already taken by the Board to meet its obligations to assure continued compliance with the Standards ([DR4-19](#)). Further new member onboarding and training occurred on January 25-26, 2019, at the Effective Trusteeship Workshop hosted by the Community College League of California ([DR4-25](#)). Five of the seven Trustees attended the workshop.

The Board also spent significant time at the December session focusing on their upcoming policymaking role regarding the Vision for Success, a document prepared by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office presenting a series of overarching statewide goals and expectations for improved student success. The Chancellor's Office requires that each college, by May 31, 2019, establish goals and benchmarks, aligned with the Vision for Success ([DR4-28](#)). The Board received training on this new expectation, the nature of the Vision for Success goals, and baseline college data on each of the metrics ([DR4-20](#)). Subsequently, the Board reviewed its policymaking role in assuring that the goal-setting work is accomplished in the spring semester with broad-based support among all constituents and the communities served by the colleges. The Board also considered other related state initiatives such as Guided Pathways, the Student Equity and Achievement Program, and the Strong Workforce Program. The Board discussed their policymaking role as it relates to these important student success initiatives, including roles in accountability, fostering innovation and experimentation, learning of the colleges' successes and struggles, providing oversight and overarching direction, and supporting

student success and completion initiatives ([DR4-18](#)). Collectively, these activities represent the high-level, student-centered policy efforts that the Board will be focusing on in coming months and years while delegating the task of planning and carrying out the details to the Colleges.

Demonstrating, Through Practice, the Board's Policymaking Role

As a follow-up to reaffirming Board Policies 2430 and 2430.1, and to fully illustrate their commitment to ongoing effective practice, the Board of Trustees reflected on its own recent actions to ascertain whether any warranted revision to align with the expectation of the Standards. The Board sought to take specific corrective actions based on issues raised by the visiting teams and noted in the reports from the Commission. Four key examples illustrate the Board's reflective reconsideration of their own actions and ongoing commitment to fully delegating operational authority to the Chancellor and Presidents.

1. **Selection of College Presidents.** In keeping with past practice, the expectation of the Standards, and the tenets of this recommendation, the Board has fully delegated the essential task of selecting the College Presidents to the Chancellor. Since the site visits in Fall 2017, the President of Columbia College retired and the President of Modesto Junior College took a position in another district. To fill these vacancies, the Board delegated the selection process to the Chancellor. No task is more essential to the operation of an effective college than selection of its president. Consequently, such a selection is of great interest to the Board. Yet they have consistently refrained from interfering in the process, illustrating their adherence to this recommendation from the Commission ([DR4-30](#)).
2. **Parking Issues.** Neighbors of the Modesto Junior College (MJC) East Campus have long complained about excessive street parking by students at the beginning of the semester that eliminates parking for residents. Residents brought these concerns to their elected trustees. The College reported to the Board regarding this matter at the April board meeting, at which time they called for a committee to address the issues ([DR4-5](#)). However, it was unclear at that time whether this would be a college committee or a board committee. Upon reflection, the Board recognized its role to identify the problem as shared by constituent members, but not insert itself in the resolution of the problem directly. At the October board meeting, Chancellor Yong reported that this would be a college committee ([DR4-13](#)). At the subsequent board meeting, the Chair shared the rationale for delegating this matter to the College. His comments illustrate the reflective thought process engaged in by the Board based on this recommendation:

“The Board’s decision to refer the MJC parking issue to a college committee was made in light of their reflection on the Commission’s recommendation, their delegation of authority to the CEO, and the proper execution of the Board’s role. The Board referred parking issue relating to the east and west campuses to a college committee made up of various constituency groups with a particular focus

on securing student participation.” (DR4-15)

MJC administration consequently created an ad hoc parking committee, with student participation as expected by the Board, to address the problem and reduce neighbor complaints about traffic flow. The College will report out to the Board on progress on the parking issue in future board meetings.

- 3. Out of State Travel.** The Board reconsidered its role in reviewing and approving out of state travel. In August 2017, the Board revised Board Policy 7400 (Staff Travel) to require board approval for all out-of-state travel except when timeliness required more immediate approval by the Chancellor (DR4-1). Since that time, the Chancellor has improved reporting on staff travel and the district is implementing a new software system, effective in January 2019, to provide timely and relevant reports to the Board. In recent months, and in light of the recommendation from the Commission, the Board has delegated approval of out-of-state travel to the Chancellor as an operational matter, reversing its practice of directly reviewing the requests themselves. Moreover, the Board called for reconsideration of BP 7400 to address the proper roles of the Board and the administration in this matter. In verbal comments, a Board member shared the rationale for this change in practice:

“The decision to rely on the Chancellor’s approval of out-of-state travel is to reiterate the Board’s delegation of authority to the Chancellor as the CEO of the District, to respect the Board’s role in such matters, and most importantly, to meet accreditation recommendations. Further, the Board noted that November’s out-of-state travel requests have all been pre-approved by the Chancellor. A formal change of policy will be implemented through the participatory governance process.” (DR4-16)

In keeping with district practice, the formal change to Policy 7400 was made through established review procedures, not by unilateral action by the Board. To that end, the revised policy was first reviewed by constituent groups then was submitted to and approved by the Board for a first reading on January 9, 2019 (DR4-23, DR4-24). The Board approved the change upon its second reading on February 13, 2019.

- 4. Board Member Office Hours.** Members of the Board have long held the practice of engaging in conversation sessions, referred to as office hours, with community members, students, faculty, and staff. These sessions provide a touch-point between the elected board member and his or her constituents. Out of convenience in the past, these sessions were conducted in the faculty lounge or a conference room on the MJC campus. However, upon considering this recommendation, the Board learned that this practice appears to encroach on the operational work of the colleges. Further, the on-campus location potentially limits participation by off-campus constituents. To provide a better opportunity for elected board members to have these vital conversations and listen to the

constituents who elected them, these office hours have been moved to an off-campus location ([DR4-29](#)).

In each of these examples, the Board, through self-reflection, considered the team and Commission findings and amended its practices to make clear its role as a policy-making body and not as administrators of policy.

Steps for Ongoing Progress

The Board recognizes that while the progress report is due to the Commission by March 1, 2019, its work on this matter is ongoing. At its organizational meeting in December, the Board selected a new chair who declared the Board's commitment to openness and to its role as a governing body. The Chair commented on the shared hope of the Trustees to "create a climate of openness, trust and respect as we work together on the many difficult tasks before us" ([DR4-16](#)). She also referred to one of the Board's 2018-19 Special Priorities: "Work to create an institutional culture in which everyone treats others as they would wish to be treated to foster a positive educational environment" ([DR4-21](#)). In her words:

We chose that priority because as a Board, we agreed with it – and my desire is that all of us will consistently model that behavior as we go forward. I hope that everyone in this room, despite the difficult months behind us and whatever difficulties may lie ahead of us, will join in that endeavor of treating others as we would wish to be treated." ([DR4-16](#))

These public pronouncements set the stage for the Board's ongoing efforts on the recommendation for the spring 2019 semester and beyond.

On February 13, a Board Study Session was convened on accreditation and effective board practices with ACCJC Vice President Dr. Steven Reynolds ([DR4-22](#), [DR4-26](#)). This provided an excellent opportunity for members of the Board to review relevant standards and gain a broader understanding of the accreditation process, while also preparing for the most effective follow-up site visit. On February 19, the Board held a second Board Study Session with CCLC representative William McGinnis to continue their training on Effective Trusteeship ([DR4-27](#)).

The College ALOs will provide regular progress updates at monthly board meetings. Additional activities undertaken in spring 2019 to align with this recommendation will be provided as a supplemental report to the Commission prior to its meeting in June.

Evidence for District Recommendation 4

- [DR4-1:](#) 2017.08.09-BOT Minutes
- [DR4-2:](#) 2017.12.13-Board Resolution Re Delegation of Authority to CEOs
- [DR4-3:](#) 2017.12.13-BOT Agenda
- [DR4-4:](#) 2017.12.13-BOT Minutes
- [DR4-5:](#) 2018.04.11-BOT Minutes
- [DR4-6:](#) 2018.08.08-BOT Study Session and Regular Meeting Agenda
- [DR4-7:](#) 2018.08.08-BOT Study Session and Regular Meeting Minutes
- [DR4-8:](#) 2018.09.24-BOT Study Session Agenda
- [DR4-9:](#) 2018.09.24-BOT Study Session Minutes
- [DR4-10:](#) 2018.09.24-PowerPoint Presentation of CCLC Rep Robert Pacheco
- [DR4-11:](#) 2018.09.24-PowerPoint Presentation of CCLC Rep William McGinnis
- [DR4-12:](#) 2018.09.24-Study Session Consultants Discussion and Gap Analysis
- [DR4-13:](#) 2018.10.10-BOT Minutes
- [DR4-14:](#) 2018.10.24-ACCT Leadership Congress Program
- [DR4-15:](#) 2018.11.14-BOT Minutes
- [DR4-16:](#) 2018.12.12-BOT Minutes
- [DR4-17:](#) 2018.12.18-BOT Study Session Agenda
- [DR4-18:](#) 2018.12.18-BOT Study Session Minutes
- [DR4-19:](#) 2018.12.18-PowerPoint Presentation of CCLC Rep Robert Pacheco
- [DR4-20:](#) 2018.12.18-PowerPoint Presentation on Vision for Success (Note: an earlier draft of this January presentation was shared with the Board in December.)
- [DR4-21:](#) 2018-19 Board Special Priorities
- [DR4-22:](#) 2019.01.04-ALO outreach to ACCJC VP
- [DR4-23:](#) 2019.01.09-BOT Agenda Item BP7400
- [DR4-24:](#) 2019.01.09-BOT-Approved First Reading of Revised BP 7400 Travel
- [DR4-25:](#) 2019.01.25-CCLC Effective Trusteeship Workshop Agenda
- [DR4-26:](#) 2019.02.13-BOT Study Session Agenda with ACCJC VP
- [DR4-27:](#) 2019.02.19-BOT Study Session Agenda with William McGinnis
- [DR4-28:](#) CCCCCO Vision for Success
- [DR4-29:](#) Off Campus Office Hours
- [DR4-30:](#) Second Round Presidential Interview Participants