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Commission Action:

- The Commission acted to reaffirm accreditation for eighteen months and to require a Follow-Up Report.*
  
  *Section III, Policy on Commission Actions on Institutions, July 2015

- Reaffirmation of accreditation for eighteen months indicates that the institution is in substantial compliance with the Commission’s Standards.

- Citrus College is required to submit its Follow-Up Report by March 15, 2017.

- ACCJC action letter, February 8, 2016
Commission Findings

**Institutional Effectiveness:** “Citrus College is generally at a level of sustainable continuous quality improvement with respect to program review and to planning; with several exceptions it is at the level of proficiency in the assessment of student learning outcomes and perhaps on the verge of sustainable continuous quality improvement in the assessment of course, program, and certificate outcomes.”

*2015 Visiting Team Evaluation Report*
**Six Commendations:**

1. Data literacy is pervasive to college culture; it is organic and authentic. There is a high degree of empirical decision-making.

2. Student Services program review annual retreat and report are effective in assessing and ensuring continued quality improvement.

3. Library “LibGuides” support curriculum, showcase services, provide information competency instruction.
Six Commendations:

4. College landscaping and grounds are attractive, well-maintained, sustainable. Staff takes great pride in their work.

5. College provides safe environment for students, staff, and faculty.

6. College has considerable financial stability – including future liabilities, especially the Other Post-Employment Benefits.
Recommendation #1: Integrity in Communications with the Public: “In order to meet the Eligibility Requirement and the Standard, and to comply with federal regulations, the team recommends the college include precise, accurate, and current information regarding grievance and complaint procedures and sexual harassment in its print or electronic catalog for its constituencies (ER 20, II.B.2.c).”
Recommendation #2:

Integrity in its Relations with the Accrediting Commission:

“In order to meet the Eligibility Requirement and the Standards, the team recommends the college comply with Commission requests, directives, decisions and policies, and make complete, accurate, and honest disclosure (ER 21, I.A.3, I.B.3, IV.A.4).”
Commission Concern 1:

“The Commission urges Citrus College to develop a different approach to its next report to the commission – one that provides for broader college input, more careful attention to presenting the factual evidence of the College’s performance with respect to standards, and more careful review of the report before finalizing it.”
Commission Concern 2:

“The Commission discussed the institution-set standards developed by Citrus College, and like the team, believes that they are set low. The College should review and consider setting those standards to a more rigorous level (Standard I.B.2*).”

* I.B.2 is a 2002 reference to standard I.B.3
Findings Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendations with six citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commission concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>Six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identified improvement plans</td>
<td>Commendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-identified improvement plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since team visit, we have...

- Analyzed the team’s findings
- Responded to specific areas of concern in the team report
- Surveyed members of the college accreditation team
- Met with college team to ‘de-brief’ on the action letter and team report
Next, we will...

Evaluate our structure and approaches as we

1. Address recommendations and concerns
2. Address self-identified improvement plans
3. Comply with regular reports to the Commission such as
   - Annual reports
   - Substantive change requests
4. Index all planning, assessment, analysis to 2014 commission standards, criteria, and policies
Self Evaluation Findings:

Actionable Improvement Plans *
Six areas for enhanced excellence

*Page 339 of Self Evaluation Report
Self Evaluation Findings: Actionable Improvement Plans

- Continue training distance education faculty and monitor and respond to data on distance education, student success and retention. Continue to analyze data and assess the effect of faculty training. (II.A.1.)

- Enhance integration of data, student learning outcomes assessment, program review, planning, and resource allocation processes, with robust technology-supported resources. (II.A.1.c.; I.B.7, II.A.2.b, II.A.2.i, II.A.6, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.C.1.a.)
Self Evaluation Findings: Actionable Improvement Plans

- Complete student educational plans with all students, thus ensuring compliance with Student Success Support Programs mandates. (II.A.2.c.)

- Continue to identify and address the changing demand for library services. (II.C.1.c.)

*Self Evaluation Report*
Self Evaluation Findings: Actionable Improvement Plans

- Make technology resources available in a timely manner to address critical training, manage personnel and financial resources, and procure, replace, sustain, and expand services. (III.C.1.c.)

- Encourage and support engagement in college wide practices. Provide employees and students the continuing opportunity to engage in inclusive dialogue on matters of institutional importance and help craft the strategic objectives that will guide the College as it moves forward. (IV.A.1.; IV.A.3.)

*Self Evaluation Report*