



**ACCREDITING
COMMISSION
for COMMUNITY and
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

*Western Association
of Schools and 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
MICHAEL T. ROTA
University of Hawai'i

Vice Chairperson
SHERRILL L. AMADOR
Public Member

President
BARBARA A. BENO

Vice President
SUSAN B. CLIFFORD

Vice President
KRISTA JOHNS

Vice President
GARMAN JACK POND

Associate Vice President
JOHN NIXON

Associate Vice President
NORVAL WELLSFRY

February 1, 2012

Dr. Mitch Capet
President
Reedley College
995 North Reed Avenue
Reedley, CA 93654

Dear President Capet:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting January 10-12, 2012, reviewed the institutional Self Study Report and the report of the evaluation team which visited Reedley College Monday, October 17-Thursday, October 20, 2011, and the information received from the College president and the Chancellor. The Commission acted to issue **Warning** and to ask that Reedley College correct the deficiencies noted. The College is required to complete a Follow-Up Report. The report will be followed by a visit of Commission representatives.¹

Warning is issued when the Commission finds that an institution has pursued a course of action which deviates from the Commission's Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, or Commission policies to an extent that raises concern regarding the ability of the institution to meet the Standards. The accredited status of the institution continues during the warning period. However, the institution's accreditation will not be reaffirmed until the conditions which warranted Warning are resolved. Warning is being issued at this time for deficiencies identified in the team report and associated with District Recommendation 1 and College Recommendation 1.

The Commission requires that the Follow-Up Report be submitted by **October 15, 2012**. The Follow-Up Report should demonstrate that the institution has addressed the recommendations noted below, resolved the deficiencies, and now meets Accreditation Standards.

¹ Institutions that will be preparing and submitting Midterm Reports, Follow-Up Reports, and Special Reports to the Commission will want to review the new publication *Guidelines for the Preparation of Reports to the Commission*. This publication contains the background, requirements, and format for each type of report and presents sample cover pages and certification pages. It is available on the ACCJC website under College Reports to ACCJC at: (www.accjc.org/college-reports-accjc).

District Recommendation 1

In order for the colleges and District to fully meet the intent of the previous recommendation, the State Center Community College District must engage in continuous, deliberative, and timely dialog with all District stakeholders to coordinate long term planning and examine the impact on all the stakeholders of the planned increase in the number of colleges and the future roles of the centers. This includes creating, developing, and aligning District and college plans and planning processes in the following areas: strategic planning, facilities planning, technology planning, organizational reporting relationships of centers, locations of signature programs, funding allocation, and human resources and research capacity. (Standards: I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.6, I.B.7, III.A.2, III.A.6, III.B.1.a, III.B.2.b, III.C.2, III.D.1, IV.A.5, IV.B.3.a, IV.B.3.c)

College Recommendation 1

As recommended by the 2005 Accreditation Team and to build on its achievements to date in developing program review and improving institutional planning, the college should develop a practical, integrated planning model with the following characteristics:

1. A focus on a limited number of mid- to long-term initiatives to improve student learning and student support services.
 2. A plan with concrete strategies and actions that are specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented and time based, and that specify individuals or groups responsible for their completion.
 3. A process that clearly ties this planning model to the college's resource allocation processes.
 4. Processes for regularly assessing not only the progress in achieving the goals of the plan but also the effectiveness of the integrated planning model itself.
 5. A model that is inclusive of all institutional planning activities and that clarifies the functions of program review and the various resource committees.
 6. A planning model that clarifies the relationship of the planning processes at Reedley College and the other planning processes of the State Center Community College District.
- (Standards I.B.1 through I.B.7; II.A.2, II.B, II.C, III.A, III.A.6, III.B, III.B.2, III.C, III.C.2, III.D, III.D.1, III.D.3, IV, IV.A, IV.A.1, IV.A.5, IV.B.1, IV.B.3.g.)

College Recommendation 2

In order to meet the Standard and the Commission's 2012 timeline to be at the "proficiency level" in the identification, assessment and use for improvements of student learning outcomes, the team recommends that the college accelerate its activities to ensure that each course and program has measurable outcomes that are published widely, that those outcomes are regularly assessed, that the results of that assessment are clearly documented, widely discussed, and used in decision making aimed at aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning. (II.A.1.a, II.A.1.b, II.A.1.c, II.A.2, II.A.3)

College Recommendation 3

In order to meet Standards, the team recommends that the college further clarify its participatory governance decision-making structures and processes to identify clearly the responsibilities of committees and individuals for decision-making. (Standard: IV.A.2.a; IV.A.3; IV.A.5)

I wish to inform you that under U.S. Department of Education regulations, institutions out of compliance with standards or on sanction are expected to correct deficiencies within a two-year period or the Commission must take action to terminate accreditation.

Dr. Mitch Capet
Reedley College
February 1, 2012
Page Three

While District Recommendation 1 and College Recommendation 1 were identified as deficiencies by the year 2005 evaluation team, the Commission has extended Reedley College's time to correct these deficiencies for good cause. The College must correct the deficiencies noted by **October 2012**.

The College conducted a comprehensive self study as part of its evaluation. The Commission suggests that the plans for improvement of the institution included in its self study efforts be used to support the continuing improvement of Reedley College.

The recommendations contained in the Evaluation Team Report represent the observations of the evaluation team at the time of the visit. The Commission reminds you that while an institution may concur or disagree with any part of the team report, the College is expected to use the report to improve educational programs and services and to resolve issues identified by the Commission.

I have previously sent you a copy of the Evaluation Team Report. Additional copies may now be duplicated. The Commission requires you to disseminate the Evaluation Team Report and this letter to your College staff and to those who were signatories of your College Self Study Report. This group should include the Chancellor, campus leadership, and the Board of Trustees.

The Commission also requires that the College make the Evaluation Team Report, the Self Study Report and action letter available to students and the public by placing them on the institution's website. These reports will become part of the accreditation history of the College and should be used in preparing for the next comprehensive evaluation. Should you want an electronic copy of the report, please contact Commission staff.

Finally, ACCJC staff is available to assist the College with consultation and advice on the recommendations identified above.

On behalf of the Commission, I wish to express continuing interest in the institution's educational quality and students' success. Professional self-regulation is the most effective means of assuring integrity, effectiveness and quality.

Sincerely,



Barbara A. Beno, Ph.D.
President

BAB/tl

cc: Dr. Deborah G. Blue, Chancellor, State Center CCD
Dr. Marilyn Behringer, Accreditation Liaison Officer
Board President, State Center CCD
Dr. James Hottois, Team Chair