



**ACCREDITING
COMMISSION
for COMMUNITY and
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

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

Chairperson
LURELEAN B. GAINES
East Los Angeles College

Vice Chairperson
FLOYD K. TAKEUCHI
Public Member

President
BARBARA A. BENO

Vice President
SUSAN B. CLIFFORD

Vice President
STEVE MARADIAN

Vice President
GARMAN JACK POND

Associate Vice President
LILY OWYANG

Business Officer
DEANNE WILBURN

ITAS
TOM LANE

Administrative Assistant
WHITNEY SPARKS

MEMO TO: Dr. Douglas Houston
Superintendent/President
Lassen Community College
P. O. Box 3000
Susanville, CA 96130

RECEIVED MAY 18 2009

FROM: Barbara A. Beno, President *Barbara A. Beno*

DATE: May 14, 2009

SUBJECT: Enclosed Report of the Evaluation Team

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

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

- If you believe that the report contains inaccuracies, you are invited to call them to the attention of the Commission. To do so, a letter stating recommended corrections should be directed to the ACCJC President and signed by the chief executive officer of the institution. The letter should arrive at the Commission office by **May 25, 2009** in order to be included in Commission materials.
- ACCJC policy provides that, if desired, the chief administrator may request an appearance before the Commission to discuss the evaluation report. The Commission requires that the institution notify the Commission office by **May 25, 2009** or earlier of its intent to attend the meeting. This enables the Commission to invite the team chair to attend. The next meeting of the Accrediting Commission will be held on **June 9-11, 2009** at the San Francisco Airport Marriott. The enclosure, "Appearing Before the Commission," addresses the protocol of such appearances.

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

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

BAB/tl

Enclosure

cc: Ms. Susan Mouck, Accreditation Liaison Officer (w/o enclosure)



**ACCREDITING
COMMISSION
for COMMUNITY and
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

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

Chairperson
LURELEAN B. GAINES
East Los Angeles College

Vice Chairperson
FLOYD K. TAKEUCHI
Public Member

President
BARBARA A. BENO

Vice President
SUSAN B. CLIFFORD

Vice President
STEVE MARADIAN

Vice President
GARMAN JACK POND

Associate Vice President
LILY OWYANG

Business Officer
DEANNE WILBURN

ITAS
TOM LANE

Administrative Assistant
WHITNEY SPARKS

Appearing before the Commission

ACCJC policy provides that, if desired, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of an institution may request an appearance before the Commission to discuss the evaluation report. The opportunity is provided when the Commission is deliberating or acting upon matters that affect the institution.

The Commission meets in January and June. An institution must send written notification to the ACCJC office at least 15 days before the scheduled meeting if the CEO wishes to attend. If the institution wishes to submit additional material to the Commission, it should exercise care, keeping in mind the Commission cannot read and absorb large amounts of material on short notice. Material should arrive at the ACCJC office with the written notification that the CEO has accepted the invitation to address the Commission.

The Chief Executive Officer is expected to be the presenter, and should consult with Commission staff if there are plans to invite other representatives to join the CEO. On the day of the Commission meeting, ACCJC staff will escort the CEO (and additional representatives) to and from the designated waiting area to the meeting at the appropriate time.

An institution's presentation should not exceed five (5) minutes. The Chair of the institution's evaluation team or designee will also be invited to attend. The Commissioners may ask questions of the CEO or representatives, and then will continue their deliberations in private. The CEO will be notified in writing of the subsequent action taken by the Commission.

The Commission considers this opportunity beneficial to the process of accreditation and values the occasion to learn new information from the institution.

Policies that are relative to this process are the *Policy on Access to Commission Meetings*, *Policy on Commission Actions on Institutions*, *Policy on Commission Good Practice in Relations with Member Institutions*, and *Policy on the Rights and Responsibilities of ACCJC and Member Institutions in the Accrediting Process*.

MAY 13 2009

FOLLOW UP VISIT REPORT
LASSEN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

P. O. Box 3000
Susanville, CA 96130

A Confidential Report Prepared for
The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team
that visited

Lassen Community College

on

March 31, 2009

Sherrill L. Amador, Ed.D., Team Chair
Stuart Wilcox, Ph.D., Team Member

Lassen Community College Follow Up Visit Report

March 31, 2009

Introduction

At its January 2009 meeting, the Commission reviewed the Lassen Community College Follow Up Report of October 15, 2008, the College's December 4, 2008, Update Report to the Commission, and the report of the evaluation team which visited Lassen Community College on October 16, 2008. The Commission acted to remove Lassen Community College from Probation, placed the College on Warning, and required a follow up report by March 15, 2009, followed by a visit of Commission representatives.

The institution was on probation prior to its comprehensive evaluation in March 2008 as a result of recommendations identified by earlier team visits. At its June 2008 meeting, the Commission acted to continue the College on probation because the institution had not resolved issues identified by earlier teams. The eight recommendations in the comprehensive evaluation team's report encompassed five recommendations from the July 2006 Special Visit Report, addressing institutional planning and decision-making, student learning outcomes, institutional research capacity, unfilled administrative positions, and an implemented faculty staffing plan.

The Commission's February 3, 2009, action letter to the College stated that the March 2009 Follow Up Report must demonstrate the institution's resolution of three recommendations related to integrated planning and decision making, student learning outcomes, and institutional research. Based on the October 2008 evaluation team report, the institution was also required to demonstrate resolution of recommendations on adjunct faculty evaluations and a faculty staffing plan by the March 2009 visit.

The College submitted its March 15, 2009 Follow Up report and an evaluation team visit was conducted on March 31, 2009 by Dr. Sherrill L. Amador, team chair and commissioner, and Dr. Stuart Wilcox, Dean Institutional Planning and Research at Pasadena City College. In preparation for the visit, the team reviewed the March 2008 comprehensive evaluation visit report, and the College's October 2008 Follow Up Report, the College's December 2008 update report to the Commission.

The team met with five Governing Board members and the student trustee. The team also held meetings and interviews with the College President, the Special Trustee assigned by the California Community College Chancellor's Office, the Vice President/Dean of Instruction, the Vice President of Administrative Services, the Dean of Student Services/Institutional Research, the Director of Human Resources, and the Accreditation Liaison Officer as well as available members from the following groups: Strategic Planning Committee/Consultation Council, President's Cabinet, Academic Planning Committee/Division Chairs, Academic Senate/Curriculum Committee/Academic

Standards Committee, Institutional Research Team, faculty and counselors. Although the team made itself available to other college members by appointment, there were no requests for appointments with the team. The team noted that the College had done extensive work to codify its policies, processes, plans, and practices and all the appropriate documentation was provided to the team.

The team found the college culture to be collaborative and those persons interviewed to be open, and very honest in their assessment of the College's progress in meeting the five remaining recommendations from the October 2008 visit. The College is currently at impasse with the faculty with the prominent issues being salary (no raises for seven years) and student learning outcomes (who is responsible for assessing them).

Background

Lassen Community College is located in Susanville, California, just east of the Sierra Mountain crest and about eighty miles north of Reno and Lake Tahoe. The College is an important institution for the small town of Susanville, where the other major employers are the Forest Service, three local prisons, and services for tourists. The College serves all of Lassen County with a population of 27,000 of which 10,000 are in the prisons; and has an outreach center in Alturas as well as large enrollments in correspondence courses that primarily serve prison inmates. The College is in the process of revitalizing its business programs and is making efforts to respond to other local economic needs, including the increased demand for basic skills courses at the prisons. At the time of this visit, the College was experiencing approximately 6% growth over FY 07-08 enrollments and anticipated exceeding its student enrollment goals for the budget of FY 2008-09.

With the assistance of the special trustee, the administration and various governance groups submitted the institution's September 2008 Multi-Year Fiscal and Academic Recovery Plan to the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. This document addresses the corrective actions required for fiscal stability and aligns compliance to the accreditation standards with those actions as well as incorporates the College's integrated plans. The College continues to implement these corrective actions. The FY 07-08 year ended with a deficit of \$583,000. Although the College's Recovery Plan forecasts a FY 08-09 year-end deficit of approximately \$300,000, the College now anticipates balancing the current-year budget, one year earlier than forecasted in the Plan. Nevertheless, with uncertain growth opportunities and an unstable State economy, the College is still fiscally fragile. The Chancellor's Office has revised the College's payback schedule for past improper FTES claims and for not meeting minimum conditions by allowing the expenses for the special trustee and any required consultants to be paid out of the annual repayment fee, thus reducing expenses to the College. The current payback amount is \$165,000 per year. The special trustee has been assigned to the College through spring 2010.

It was very evident to the team that the governing board, administration, and the majority of faculty and staff have committed to improving Lassen College and are very serious about the institutional work needed to comply with the Accreditation Standards. The

College continued to address its issues since the evaluation team left in October 2008 and is following its own plans and decisions using appropriate and agreed upon processes and practices.

College Response to the Commission Recommendations

The visiting team's evaluation of the College's March 2009 Follow up Report focused on the following five recommendations from the March 2008 Comprehensive Evaluation Visit Report which had not been resolved at the time of the October 2008 visit:

Recommendation 1 (previous Recommendation 19 - 2002): Institutional Planning and Decision-Making

The college must implement and evaluate ongoing student learning outcomes and institutional planning processes, which should be based on data and research that results in a strategic plan, and incorporate all other college planning documents, such as an educational master plan, a technology plan, and a facilities plan. These processes should guide future enrollment management decisions, resource allocation, and most importantly educational programs and services for the students and the community. The processes should be evaluated, using agreed-upon criteria, on an annual basis to determine the effectiveness of the governance groups and leadership responsible for them, as well as the success of the planned outcomes and actions stated in the plans. (Standards IA.4, IB.3, 4, 5, 6, & 7, IIA.1c, IIA.2e, IIA.2f, III B.2a&2b, III C.1&2, IID.1 – d, IID.2 a – g, III D.3, IV A.3, IV A.5)

Observations and analysis of evidence: Lassen College, using its planning and budgeting processes, is in its second annual cycle. These processes are outlined in the Institutional Planning and Budget Development Process Handbook and the Shared Governance & Collegial Consultation Process Handbook, 2008-09. The Consultation Council completed an evaluation of the defined processes and the College's 2007-08 Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan, which were used for developing the plans and resource allocations for the budget FY 2008-09 in May 2008. Based on the evaluation, a revised handbook (2009-10) will be used for the budget FY 2009-10. The College's 2009-2014 Comprehensive Master Plan, "Keeping an Eye on the Future," is in the final draft form and incorporates the latest program reviews and the new Strategic Plan, approved by the Governing Board in September 2008.

The College has had a number of separate planning documents for several years; however, the latest draft 2009-2014 Comprehensive Plan incorporates all plans (technology, human resources, educational master plan, etc.). The team noted that the educational and facilities plans are not based on educational programming and services forecasting using anticipated and planned changes in student populations and needed education and services (See Recommendation 3 of this document). Instead the plans reflect actions based on program reviews only. However, the team found several positive program examples where the College used the results of the program reviews to

determine plans, make the necessary changes to curriculum, and to request funds for implementation.

The Strategic Planning/Consultation Committee, responsible for plans and budgets, developed an accountability document, "Strategic Goal Implementation and Evaluation Matrix--Spring 2009." This document identifies who is responsible for achieving the goals/objectives from the comprehensive plan and the status/evidence for each to date. The team determined that this document will be helpful to the College as it monitors completion of the actions/activities to accomplish the comprehensive plan's defined objectives to meet institutional goals. This document also illustrates the need for the College to be more diligent in setting priorities versus attempting to do more than achievable in one year.

The team also suggests that the College determine the criteria for evaluating the results achieved by the implementation of its plans. The College needs some mechanism for determining effectiveness of meeting its planned goals and objectives. The team noted the College is still evaluating process, and should now focus on evaluating results. In discussions with the Strategic Planning Committee, the members admitted this is the next step they must take.

The Academic Senate is responsible for instructional program reviews (IPR). The current program review process only requires that SLOs are developed for courses and programs, not assessed. The March 23, 2009, outlined the Senate's discussion for revising the IPR process and handbook indicating the addition of an annual review cycle intended to capture changes more frequently than the current cycles of two years for vocational programs and four years for all others. The minutes also stated:

The second addition to the IPR process discussed was an item for evaluating SLO assessment results, examining results for trends or needs that may be considered in budget and planning requests. Although the Senate recognizes that the measure of SLOs is the topic of discussion and negotiation between LCFA (faculty union) and the District, it is important to include evaluation of said assessments as part of the IPR process. Language will be carefully added so as to include this element without contradicting the current position of LCFA.

The team observed that even though the assessment of SLOs may be considered negotiable by the faculty union, the majority of faculty has continued to follow Academic Senate processes.

The revised IPR process will also reflect the change of the due date for program reviews to September thereby more effectively influencing the planning and budgeting cycle before it begins in October.

The program reviews for student services and administrative services are reviewed by cabinet and brought forward to the Strategic Planning Committee. The team determined that the program reviews from these areas had driven the human resources staffing recommendations for the budget FY 2009-10.

Conclusion: The College has almost implemented this recommendation. Clearly, the College has a defined planning and budgeting process and is in its second cycle of implementation. Evidence exists that last year's cycle was followed and was evaluated. The use of assessed SLOs are planned to be a part of the program review process and their use is further being refined by the Academic Senate with an expected completion of those revisions by the end of the spring 2009 semester.

The 2009-2014 Comprehensive Master Plan has an expected completion date of spring 2009 as well. The team observed that the College appears to have the institutional will to complete the work. The College has taken very seriously the self-assessment of its processes, actions, and plans. With an enhanced research function, the College will be able to add the data-driven analysis required to evaluate its planned goals and objectives, which is the final step needed for complete resolution of this recommendation.

Recommendation 2: (previous Recommendation #14 - 2002) Student Learning Outcomes

The team recommends that the college achieve a sustainable level of assessing student learning outcomes, which can be used for continuous quality improvement. Administrators, faculty, and staff need to continue to conduct meaningful, timely, and inclusive dialogue with all constituent groups to identify, develop, implement, and assess student-learning outcomes at the course, instructional and non-instructional programs, and degree levels and use the results of those assessments to improve student learning, services, plans, and institutional effectiveness. (Standards IB.1, IB.4, IB.7; Standard IIA.1c, IIA.2a, IIA.2b, IIA.2e, IIA.2f, IIA.2g, IIA.2i, IIA.3, IIA.6, IIA.6a, IIB.1, IIB.3.e, IIB.4, IIC.2; Standard III; and Standard IVA.1, IVA.2b, IVB.1b)

Observations and analysis of evidence: The March 2009 Follow-Up Report described the participation of contract and adjunct faculty in the submission of SLO assessment plans and in the submission of assessment results. The following table summarizes the faculty participation information presented on pages 8 and 9 of that report.

	Contract Faculty			Adjunct Faculty		
	Fall 07	Spring 08	Fall 08	Fall 07	Spring 08	Fall 08
Submitted Assessment Plan	74%	71%	97%	15%	7%	29%

Submitted Assessment Results	74%	57%	42%	3%	7%	13%
------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	----	----	-----

The team found evidence that course level SLOs have been created, assessed, and instructional changes made as a result of the SLO assessment results. Faculty also reported that significant dialogue has occurred as faculty who teach different sections of the same course worked to come to agreement as to the SLOs for the course.

The team confirmed that the College had adopted 63 degree and certificate SLOs (100% of all degrees and certificates). As of January 2009, the College had adopted SLOs for 516 courses (90% of all active courses). The College is currently discussing current institutional SLOs, and plans to have a revised set of SLOs by spring 2009 to better incorporate the non-instructional program SLOs.

The pilot semester for assessment of course SLOs was fall 2007. The table above discussed the results of assessment plan submissions and the actual assessments. The team found where program/degree SLOs' and course SLOs were mapped and assessed the results were positive in creating changes to curriculum and offerings. The team suggests these successes be used as models and examples to further institution-wide practices and processes for SLO assessment.

Because of the College's current lack of institutional, research-based assessment protocol, the team questions the validity and reliability of the all the results achieved to date. Increased institutional research resources are needed to provide assistance to faculty and staff for assessing SLOs and implementing research projects.

The non-instructional outcomes assessments had not occurred. Student Services developed three global outcomes and are now developing program specific outcomes, e.g. Counseling is currently developing SLOs. Administrative Services is only talking about its intended outcomes. The team determined that the college needs to do more work on outcomes assessment in non-instructional areas.

The data on faculty participation in SLO assessment shown in the table above raised two concerns for the team: 1. the participation of contract faculty in submitting assessment results has been declining each term; and 2. the general participation of adjunct faculty is much lower than that of the contract faculty. When the team asked about these observations, the Vice President of Instruction replied that SLO assessment is viewed as a topic of negotiation with the faculty union. The team noted that the College would ultimately fail to comply with Accreditation Standards should SLO assessments not become a continuous and comprehensive process.

Conclusion: This recommendation has been partially implemented. SLOs are being created, assessed, and appropriate changes made in the instructional areas but not in non-instructional area. Per the ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness—Part III Student Learning Outcomes, the College is still in the developmental stage. The College is commended for its faculty driven SLO processes. However, the coordination of the research practices and protocols for measurement of SLOs should better inform educational program and services decisions. See Recommendation 3 below for research issues.

Recommendation 3: (previous Recommendation #17 - 2002): Institutional Research

The college must fully develop, implement, and evaluate its research capabilities (staff skills, data analysis/interpretation and use of data) assuring the college has the appropriate resources and staff to perform the necessary research, data collection, and analysis to meet all accreditation standards. The college needs to conduct research on programs and services, student achievement and learning outcomes, and institutional effectiveness, such that program reviews and stated learning outcomes can draw on this resource to improve the effectiveness of the college. The results of the research need to be used by the leadership and all governance groups in their deliberations, dialogue, and decision-making. (Standards IB.3, IB.4, 5, 6, 7, IIA.1a, IIA.2e, IIA.2f, IIB.3a – 3e, IIB.4, IIC.2, IVA.1-4)

Observations and analysis of evidence: The College installed a new Datatel enterprise resource computer system. This system came with a variety of standardized reports that enable the generation and distribution of information on a variety of student demographics, full-time equivalent students (FTES), and success and retention rates for use in program review. These reports have been distributed to department and decision-makers. The reports have also facilitated the production of the College's fact book which was distributed to offices at the College. The College has moved beyond these "canned" reports and is working on the development of a data-mart that will enable decision makers to extract and summarize unique information tailored to their individual needs. A goal of finishing the data-mart by the end of the spring 2009 semester has been set. Those staff responsible for research acknowledged that this may be an overly optimistic goal; however, the College is prepared to adjust this timeline as necessary.

The team observed that the College suffers from a limited budget and few employees. To deal with these limitations, the College has used a team approach to address its research needs. A research committee was formed to help guide the development of the data-mart. Representatives from Student Services, Admissions and Records, Information Technology (IT) and Administrative Services make up this committee. An individual in the IT department has been largely committed to developing the College's new data-mart system. The College has created a research analyst position at the college by reallocating the soon to be vacant Director of Admissions and Records position. The research analyst position is currently being advertised with a start date set to be July 1, 2009. This position will report to the college president.

Currently, the research function is the assigned responsibility of the Dean of Student Services. He has conducted a variety of studies for the purpose of improving institutional effectiveness. Examples of some of the studies and institutional change that resulted follow: 1. A review of the funds owed by student athletes was conducted. This led to changes in the college's debt collection procedures and changes in the athletics program to reduce costs. 2. An environmental scan that included a community survey led to some recommendations for possible new educational programs. As information has been produced and distributed, faculty report that it has stimulated dialogue, raised questions and a desire for more research. For example, mathematics faculty reported a desire for a study to determine if the method by which a student gets into a course, i.e. through the prerequisite course or by placement test, relates to the student's class attendance and success. While faculty reported that they found the provided information useful, they also expressed frustration that they just received raw data with no analysis and no interpretation.

The team determined that data is being generated, summarized and distributed, in the form of reports. A fact book and a few research studies to improve institutional effectiveness have been produced. The College is working on developing a data-mart system that will enable decisions-makers to extract and summarize information tailored to their individual needs. However, only raw data with no analysis and no interpretation has been made available. At least one instructional department questioned the accuracy of some of the data produced. Evidence of studies of student achievement and the effectiveness of programs and services was not available. The absence of a full time research analyst continues to limit the development of the College's research capabilities. The Governing Board also indicated to the team they wanted more information on institutional performance based on research and analysis.

The team learned through interviews that the College's Datatel computer system was funded by a grant and the grant has now ended. This situation is forcing the College to explore ways to maintain the computer system with existing college resources. Two alternatives that were mentioned are to hire administrative support from another Datatel college or become involved in a consortium of Datatel colleges.

Conclusion: The College has partially addressed this recommendation. It has started a rudimentary research function. More resources, particularly a full-time research analyst and adequate computer support, are needed to fully develop a research function in order for the College to create a culture of evidence. A review of committee and council minutes revealed that the educational quality research issues surrounding student achievement and performance, learning outcomes, service outcomes, and institutional outcomes have not been the foundation of these groups' discussions. The College does not have a research advisory committee/group where discussion is held on what issues need to be researched to improve student and institutional performance.

Recommendation 4: Employee Evaluations

The college must take steps to assure that evaluation processes of all personnel are current, and the evaluation processes seek to assess effectiveness of personnel and encourage improvement. Evaluation of faculty members must include, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing student learning outcomes. (III.A.1.a&b)

Observations and analysis of evidence: A schedule for the evaluations of full-time employees and a memo summarizing the status of the evaluations was made available to the team. As of March 30, 2009, all evaluations of full-time employees (managers, faculty and classified) were complete with the exception of four. These last four were in various stages of being completed. The Director of Human Resources indicated the full-time employee evaluations on schedule are to be completed by June.

For adjunct faculty evaluations, this issue has been under faculty negotiation with the district. An agreement on the adjunct faculty evaluation process and the form to be used was reached on March 27, 2009. The team determined that a schedule for the completion of all adjunct faculty evaluations by the end of the spring term had been created.

On review of the faculty agreement, the team noted that the signed agreement stated, *"This Action Agreement will sunset on August 15, 2009. The evaluation tools may not be used by the District after that date."* Therefore, while the College will be able to meet this recommendation by the end of the spring 2009 term, the Accreditation Standard that all employees must be evaluated on a regular basis still applies.

Conclusion: The College should have fully met this recommendation by the end of the spring 2009 semester. However, the Team is unable to conclude that the adjunct faculty evaluations will continue beyond the expiration of the contractual agreement in August; and therefore that the College will continue to comply with the Standards. The Commission's expectation is that a regular schedule for all employees will be adhered to on a continuing basis to meet the Accreditation Standard.

Recommendation 6: (previous Recommendation # 15 - 2002): Faculty Staffing Plan

The college must implement and assess the effectiveness of a staffing plan that will ensure full-time faculty members are proportionally distributed, based on a long-term plan, which results in an effective course schedule. Faculty must be assigned to a course schedule that will meet the demands of students, so that they can achieve their academic goals in a timely manner. (Standards IIIA.1a, III.2, III.6)

The College implemented a staffing plan as part of its Comprehensive Master Institutional Master Plan, 2007-08 and 2008-09. In the 2009-2014 Comprehensive Master Plan there is a section entitled, Human Resources Section (Staffing Plan). The section includes current staffing patterns and organizational charts. Page 93 of the plan states: *"The plan over the next few years is to meet staffing needs through the reallocation of existing human resources."* The team found evidence that the College is following its human resource plan by basing decisions on program reviews in all areas and using existing resources when available to fund the priorities listed. The plan has priorities for educational administration, faculty, classified management and staff, and confidential positions through 2014 in some categories. All positions identified in the original Master Plan in 2007-08 were carried forward, and based on more current information were either funded or a decision was made to not fund due to changing priorities.

For faculty positions, the plan helped the College make some decisions to better align staffing with student need. In several instances, the College either hired or reassigned full time faculty to meet identified student program requirements. These needs were based on student enrollment data and current teaching schedules of full time faculty. The College has not completed planning for faculty positions in a manner that uses external and internal data as part of an educational master plan that projects several years of program enhancements, deletions, and additions based on anticipated and planned enrollment.

Although there is improved balance of faculty to student needs over past years due to decisions to delete and/or reduce programs, the College is still currently faced with overstaffing of full-time faculty in some areas of low student need, and under staffing in other areas. Also, the College has a high reliance on part time faculty especially in critical areas such as English and the basic skills. The College's remote location poses a challenge for meeting student enrollment demand as qualified faculty do not live in the service area. These issues all must be addressed in any future staffing plans. The instructional and student services staff has been working on coordinating program requirements and student schedules and the initial work has been effective. The staffing plan section of the College's comprehensive plan also has stated actions which begin to address the institution's staffing issues.

Conclusion: The College has improved in the area of faculty staffing. The team determined that this recommendation had been substantially met. Because the College will need to build enrollments for fiscal reasons or be forced to make the appropriate reductions, it is imperative planning and scheduling is oriented toward building foundational enrollments, such as basic skills and English. Such an approach builds sustainability versus the practice of chasing student enrollments in areas that are not part of future educational program plans or student and community educational needs.

