



**ACCREDITING
COMMISSION
for COMMUNITY and
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

CONFIDENTIAL

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. Jeff Marsee
Superintendent/President
College of the Redwoods
7351 Tompkins Hill Road
Eureka, CA 95501

RECEIVED

MAY 21 2009

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

FROM: Barbara A. Beno, President

Barbara A. Beno

DATE: May 20, 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 29, 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 29, 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: Dr. Keith Snow-Flamer, 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 20 2009

Follow-Up Report

College of the Redwoods

7351 Tompkins Hill Road
Eureka, CA 95501

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
College of the Redwoods
on

April 17, 2009

Dr. Marie B. Smith, former Vice Chancellor of Education & Technology, Los Rios
Community College District, Team Chair

Mr. James Barr, Senior Research Analyst, American River College, Team Member

Introduction

College of the Redwoods has experienced significant change during the last three years with transitions in leadership and the necessity to respond to accreditation concerns. Since its last comprehensive evaluation in October 2005, College of the Redwoods has responded to several levels of Commission sanctions based on the inability to adequately respond to either the previous recommendations from the 1999 comprehensive visit or the ones provided in the 2005 evaluation. In January 2006 the college was put on warning and asked to respond to 4 unresolved recommendations from the 1999 visit and 4 recommendations from the 2005 visit. The June 2006 Commission action was to continue the warning status for the same unresolved 2005 recommendations. In June 2007 the college was moved to a sanction of probation based upon the inadequacy of response to the 2005 recommendations. In June 2008, the college was moved from probation to warning sanction, citing great improvement, but recognizing the 2005 recommendation regarding the improvement of comprehensive planning processes was still not completely addressed. In December 2008, a visiting team provided a report showing significant progress in meeting that last recommendation and also found a new issue regarding the program review process. This last concern resulted in a new recommendation about the use of data in program review to inform academic decisions. The Commission acted in January 2009 to remove the college from warning and reaffirm accreditation. The commission also acted to require a Follow-Up Report be submitted by April 1, 2009 demonstrating its resolution of the recent (2008) recommendation. The college was also to provide evidence that it had continued its momentum, sustained the achievements to date and completely resolved the remaining issues related to the integrated planning and Educational Master Plan (EMP), including the development of a long-range educational plan, a Facilities Master Plan and the implementation of budgeting and planning frameworks.

On April 17, 2009 Dr. Marie B. Smith and Mr. James Barr visited the college to review the college's efforts to resolve the 2008 recommendation on program review and to assess the efforts and momentum of the resolution of the remaining planning issues. The college provided a follow-up report on the 2008 recommendation, and later, at the request of the Commission, provided an addendum that updated the college's work to maintain its momentum, sustain achievements and completely resolve the remaining planning issues. The team found the college prepared for the visit and eager to share its latest developments. It should be noted that prior to the visit, the Academic Senate communicated directly with the Commission to express its concern over recent issues. The team was informed of this action, received all communications, investigated these issues as part of the interviews, and included conclusions reached in the body of the report contained below.

During the one day visit, in addition to the Academic Senate, the team met with the President, the administrative team, Board of Trustees members, the Educational Planning Committee, the Program Review Committee, and the Assessment Team and held an open forum for general college community input. The visiting team wishes to express its appreciation for the concern and attention given this visit and the candor with which

every individual and group communicated. This report represents the findings of that visit.

Findings

Recommendation 1 (2008): The college should determine a template for student achievement data and related analyses that is to be included in all program reviews, and should use the institutional research staff and others knowledgeable about data analyses to guide the faculty and ultimately the college in discussions of what these data show about student success; these discussions should become part of the culture and practice of the institution. (Standards II.A.a, and c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.e)

The intention of the December 5, 2008 team recommendation was to encourage the college to strengthen their overall existing evaluation and planning processes with a more robust data driven decision model. The expectation was for the college to develop an appropriate data template for the program review process that would facilitate a more focused evaluation of program strengths and weakness associated with program effectiveness and student learning that could strengthen overall planning activities. The college was also asked to provide evidence that resources to support and help faculty effectively use the new data templates would be developed and implemented. The use of quantitative data for analysis in program review had not been always available, and as a result, was not well understood or embraced by the college. It was also expected that the college would develop practices to ensure that the use of data to evaluate unit effectiveness and student learning would be incorporated in the culture of the institution.

The college had asked the Institutional Research Office to lead a full review and evaluation of the existing program review model rather than to simply enhance the existing review template with a greater range of data related to program performance and student learning as was the primary directive of the recommendation. The evaluation had participation from all functional and temporary workgroups involved in the program review process. Through these discussions the college made the decision to develop new program review templates to accommodate and reflect a more structured analytical model based on the newly proposed data set and modified sections for student learning outcomes. Work on this project began in January 2009.

In the process of the development of the new template a consultant worked with Institutional Research to examine the college's program review practices and identified a number of concerns associated with the existing review templates, the review processes, and evaluation strategies. During this discovery process, it was documented in the Follow-Up Report that there were issues with program review, some more serious than others, that the college identified. Selected examples of program review inadequacies identified by the college in this evaluation were that:

- Program reviews are not completed by all programs;
- Structure of forms do not lead to analysis of trends and data driven conclusions;
- There was no link between program review and educational master plan (EMP);

- There was no administrative review, responsibility, or accountability associated with the process;
- There was separation of program review and resource allocation;
- Lack of clear process for developing planning priorities and budget development
- Lack of clear process of how program review are evaluated
- There are no links between program evaluation and program discontinuances
- SLO and PLO, What they are, how they're measured, how embedded into program review

The full list of program review inadequacies identified by the college are documented in Appendix B of the April 1 2009 Follow-Up Report.

The college determined from this analysis that three major areas in the comprehensive program review structure needed to be addressed: The templates, the review processes, and evaluation components. But the college's candid evaluation indicated that from their perspective, the existing program review process and its link to other planning processes that were in place functioned at a developmental level, rather than a proficiency level as previously believed by the Commission. In the words of the college in their discussion on program review, "*It is recognized that in order to move from the development to the proficiency level in terms of institutional effectiveness these gaps must be acknowledged and removed*" (April 1, 2009 Follow-Up Report, page 4).

Related to this discussion it is important to note that the college has received previous opinions regarding its program review process. The April, 2008 Accreditation Progress Visit Report, stated that "*...the college had implemented program review.*" (Recommendation #1), "*...and was using data to inform decision making.*" (Recommendation # 7), with the conclusion that, "*...the program review process is now occurring on an on-going and systematic basis*" and that "*...this recommendation has been substantially met.*"

The December 5, 2008 visiting team issued the current recommendation for the college to continue to strengthen the program review process through an enhanced use of student achievement data and related analyses to improve the functionality of the program review structure in place. To the college's credit, the team found ample evidence of the persistent effort by the Program Review Committee to continually enhance and improve the program review templates up to the present time. Program review templates were revised by the committee in 2008-2009 with an understanding that consistent, reliable, and formatted data would be available. In responding to the December 2008 recommendation, the evaluation of the program review process was an honest effort to develop a more effective and integrated planning process that will accompany the new Educational Master Plan, but in so doing the college assessed that pieces were missing that were required in order to be proficient in program review. During the current visit, the Program Review Committee openly expressed concern both verbally and in written communications to the team about the past availability and ease of use of data as a major challenge for program review.

To provide the Institutional Research Office with the capacity to address data issues for program review and institutional effectiveness, the college made the decision to hire a highly qualified research analyst in February 2009 who had worked on these issues in a temporary capacity at the college since October 2008. The primary responsibilities of the research analyst has been to focus on the development of data sets, web site delivery of research findings, and the use of software such as Crystal Reports for generating uniform data sets for both program review and institutional effectiveness reporting. The decision to develop a new program review template accompanying the recent review and critical self-analysis of the existing program review templates by the college was prompted by the need to accommodate the new data sets being developed with the expressed intention of addressing past concerns of the Program Review Committee and the new recommendation that had been made by the December 5, 2008 team.

From the teams perspective, the current program review process had not deteriorated or been neglected by the college since the April 2008 visit. If anything the process had been enhanced and improved through evidence provided by the Program Review Committee. From the committee's perspective, the main issue to be resolved is the capacity of the research office to provide appropriate data to support the program review process. The visiting team confirmed that the college has taken the steps to ensure that Institutional Research Office will have the resources to address this issue.

The college, with support from the Institutional Research Office, has developed and proposed a new template for the program review process with a significantly greater emphasis on a data driven decision model. The college also made the decision to develop three new distinct types of program processes so that a format relevant for instruction no longer overlaps with student service or administrative review templates. Most importantly, the college has defined individual templates of data measures that are appropriate and individualized for each of the three new templates. For example, instructional units will be required to analyze and comment on three year trends related to student enrollments, weekly student contact hours, course sections, average enrollments, course fill rates, course success rates, ethnicity, age, and gender success rates, basic skills preparation determined by Accuplacer, course retention rates, grade distribution, English and math skills of incoming students, degree and certificates awarded, along with benchmarking completions. This greatly expanded range of data elements will complement the enhanced development of student and program learning level outcomes sections and allow instructional units to address student learning and success in a more productive way than in the past. The new template also asks instructional units to address topics such as pre/co- requisites, course sequencing, program efficiency, full-time/part-time ratios, teaching/service time, staffing/faculty needs, faculty qualifications and development activities, committee participation, goals and objectives, a five-year educational plan, resources needed for program and an enhanced budget section.

The new non-instructional program review template has been redesigned as well, and will include sections with enhanced data sections associated with student access, success, retention and learning outcomes. .

Both proposed program review templates have been designed to align with the new Educational Master Plan by focusing on student learning outcomes and the performance indicators developed in the fall 2007 Strategic Plan. The college's intent is to create a comprehensive and integrated planning process that will link program review evaluations to budget development and resource allocation and thus will be aligned with the Educational Master Plan and the college Strategic Goals.

Other proposed changes to the processes of program review are that instructional programs will undergo comprehensive program review every four years, and administrative and students services every three years. All units will also be responsible for annual reviews. Though the college did not go into detail regarding the annual program review process, it did indicate that these annual planning documents are also under revision to more effectively evaluate progress toward goals, resource requests, and provide a more visible venue for unit concerns. The college has established the new timelines and calendar for both the comprehensive and annual program review for 2009-1010 through 2015-2016 for all college units. The college has also committed to a new administrative structure of Vice President and Dean level of responsibility to ensure that all deficiencies identified in the March 2009 evaluation of program review are addressed.

To assist units involved in program review, the supervising administrator for units will have the responsibility to provide support when needed. The Institutional Research Office will have the responsibility to provide the data sets for all units undergoing program review will coordinate training and provide ongoing support for interpreting and using the data as needed. The college has also developed and published a new set of proposed Program Review Guidelines to provide an overview of the process as well as to define how program review results will be evaluated within the context of the overall planning process. Central to this process will be the Program Review Committee which is responsible for reviewing the completed unit program reviews. The college has defined measurable criteria referred to as Alerts for both instructional and non-instructional units, that will provide the Program Review Committee with indicators that will be used in conjunction with funding requests, as well as suggesting that a completed program review may require further scrutiny. Recommendations relating to concerns that emerge from this process then become goals and objectives for the unit the following year.

The newly proposed program review templates, review processes, and enhanced data sections will represent a legitimate cycle of evaluation, planning and improvement required by accreditation standards when they are implemented as planned in fall 2009. Yet it must be emphasized that the new template has not been formally adopted by the college, and at the time of the visit this was a matter of great concern of the Program Review Committee. Most importantly the committee was not sure if the new templates would represent a faculty driven process that would be embraced by programs without the committee's interaction and participation. Though discussions for new program review templates began in January 2009, and the candid evaluation of program review practices occurred in March 2009, the Program Review Committee was not formally included in the process until the proposed templates were developed in March. It was

also clear at the time of the visit that the Program Review Committee was not opposed to improving the program review model, but wanted to be an integral part of the process. There was evidence at the time of the visit the Program Review Committee has begun to examine the structure of the new templates and has identified concerns and made recommendations about individual components of the new structure. Further evidence of progress was provided in a March 14, 2009 communication to the Academic Senate in which the committee indicated that "The process does appear to have taken a positive turn and it appears to have returned to the collaborative engagement that previously allowed us to make progress in the important area of our accreditation."

With a product so new, dialog and modifications are to be expected and the college has published a timeline for continued work on the program review model through August 2009. If the model is completed by that time, the new templates will be used by all units scheduled for comprehensive program review in 2009-2010. At the time of the visit the college did not have a finished program review product, and thus these recent developments represent a work in progress. Secondly, it will not be possible to evaluate the effectiveness of the new program review model and its impact and integration on planning and the budget allocation processes until a full cycle can be completed, now scheduled for the end of spring 2010. Given recent events such as the lack of support for the Educational Master Plan by the Academic Senate and the concerns related to the team by the Program Review Committee, the team is also concerned that the proposed new templates for program review will not be completed and approved without a commitment for further dialog and agreement among all stakeholders.

Conclusion

The original intent of this section was to evaluate the progress the college has made in addressing the recommendation to define and implement a data template for the program review process. It became apparent, however, that the college made the decision not just to build in more data and measures for units to address, but to honestly review and evaluate the full scope of the program review process. In so doing, they discovered components of program review that were operating at a developmental level and moved to correct those deficiencies which would hamper the implementation of a new fully integrated planning process. The resulting proposed changes to the program review templates, overall review process and evaluation components in total represent a transformational shift and significant change from what was in place. It is also evident that the addition of a research analyst and the proposed data elements and enhanced learning outcomes sections in the proposed program review framework could represent a significant improvement over the limited data available in the older templates and the central concern of the recommendation. The college is designing a program review process that now has the potential to represent a cycle of evaluation, planning, and improvement at the unit level and when implemented will fully address the accreditation standards. Inherent in the process is that the college will be able to develop a culture supporting the importance and benefits of data driven planning decisions as more units use and complete the new program review model. As units become more proficient at evaluating the strengths and weakness of their programs related to student learning, there

should also be a rising expectation across the college to see the same level of scrutiny of outcomes applied to overall institutional effectiveness. The work accomplished to date on the proposed data templates to strengthen program review addresses the intent of the recommendation to strengthen the program review process through a more effective data driven decision process. If these templates are adopted, then implemented and used as proposed in August 2009, the college will have fully addressed the recommendation.

Update on Momentum and sustainability of achievements to date and resolution of planning issues

As part of this visit, the team was charged with evaluating the completion of the planning activities remaining from Recommendation 5 of the previous visit (integrated planning). The budget and planning frameworks designed to support the Educational Master Plan (EMP) were in place in the fall semester and used by the Budget Planning Committee to create the 2009/10 budget in January. The preliminary budget was approved by the Board of Trustees on March 3, 2009. The evidence shows that the college has sustained its momentum to utilize its new budget frameworks in planning.

In the December 2008 report, the college anticipated it would finish its remaining planning work, essentially the facilities master plan and the educational master plan in the spring semester (by April 2009). In order to meet that deadline, the first draft of the educational master plan was due in December, just after the 2008 visit took place. The team was also told at that time that the facilities master plan was on track for adoption, even though it had required major revision based upon the discovery of seismic issues which required the change of several building sites. The date given for that completion was April 2009 for both plans. In January 2009, College of the Redwoods submitted an updated draft of the EMP as evidence of progress to completion and the president appeared before the Commission to discuss it and assure the commission the college was on track to finish all planning within the spring semester.

Prior to the team visit, the Commission received written communication from the Academic Senate expressing concern about the development of the EMP after its first draft, stating that it had not received the necessary discussion, review and approval prior to being submitted to the Commission. The team also received a copy of correspondence from the college president to the college community with a chronology of the creation and review of the EMP and also stating his concern about the Senate's actions.

The team reviewed evidence which showed that the college community, guided by the EMP Committee (EMPC), produced a draft of the EMP, based on agreed upon metrics of FTES targets and ARCC data, just prior to the college going on winter break. After review of that draft, the college President and a few other individuals formed a writing group to bring the draft into presentable form, by editing and creating portions that were omitted. As a result, the draft presented to the Commission in its January meeting was one that had the basic framework created by the EMPC, but later modified by this small writing group, in some cases in a first draft form. Upon the return of the faculty in late January, the college became aware and concerned about the draft EMP modifications.

The president and the writing team agreed that the EMP would continue to be modified with input from all parties prior to the first draft submission to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees scheduled a special meeting at the end of February and prior to the first reading of the EMP adoption in early March, to review the plan and examine the feedback given by the college community. Although the entire college community was invited to this off-campus meeting (held on a Friday) the faculty participation was small. The Senate stated that when they learned there would be no place on the agenda for discussion of the input, they chose skip the meeting and not be involved. The team learned that the Senate also met with the President in February, expressed their displeasure at the lack of appropriate college review of the submitted document, and asked for more time between the first and second reading of the EMP at the Board level. The first reading of the EMP and the Facilities Master Plan (FMP) took place as scheduled in March. It should be noted that the FMP had been delayed one month very early on because of undiscovered effects of seismic issues, an action taken with full college understanding and agreement. With the great concern regarding the EMP plan however, the president agreed to postpone the final reading one month so that both plans will be finally adopted at the Board meeting in May.

At the time of the visit, the team found that the issues contained in the Senate communication to the Commission had essentially been addressed by the delay of the second reading of the EMP, to allow appropriate input by the EMPC and the college community at large. In fact, that agreement for delay had occurred before the Senate's letter to the Commission was delivered. In agreeing to that delay, the college president fell behind the schedule presented to the Commission. He expressed the opinion that the delay was necessary to rectify the absence of college input and to restore trust with the college.

In summary, the team arrived to find the college in a concerned and anxious state. While the team concentrated on the specific charges of the Commission to examine the program review issues and the completion of the planning work, another set of more fundamental issues arose. As the team proceeded through its interviews with various groups, it became apparent that the issues of communication, lack of trust and mutual respect were at the heart of stress being exhibited in the college. All of the specific concerns raised (lack of input, communication concerns, scheduling issues, distrust regarding various actions) were actually symptoms of these more fundamental underlying issues.

College of the Redwoods is in the midst of great organizational change. The college's permanent president left in 2006, followed by two interim presidents who had to cope with a college suffering under multiple stressors. The college experienced declining enrollments, financial distress and major accreditation concerns which resulted in the college being placed on warning, probation and then back on warning within a two year period. The college, under the last interim president, had put itself on a track to meet accreditation concerns by the end of 2008. A new president, supported by all college constituencies, was hired in July 2008. He proceeded to review the current efforts and make changes intended to improve the college's ability to respond to the various

outstanding concerns. As a result, the planning issues were not completely resolved by December and thus the situation described above unfolded during the spring semester.

It should be noted that the team found a very new administrative team at the time of the visit. The administrator with the longest term of service had been in the role for 3 years. The other three had been there 3 weeks, 3 days and 1 day, respectively. Thus, the president had been operating without the benefit of a full administrative team to provide support and attention to these various issues up until literally the day of the visit. The interview with this new administrative team revealed a cadre of dedicated individuals who are eager to address the concerns of the college and bring enhanced communication and attention to all outstanding concerns.

The team's interview with three Board members provided evidence that the president has the full support of the Board in providing strong leadership to the college in addressing not only these accreditation concerns, but also long standing items such as scheduling, program creation and administrative structure. All of these issues and their potential for disruption of the status quo are concerns for some of the college community, notably the Academic Senate. The need for increased communication was cited by the Academic Senate also as an urgent concern. The team found evidence supporting these concerns across the college, but also found evidence of support for the new directions the college was headed under the president's leadership in every part of College of the Redwoods. The President expressed his willingness to address these communication concerns as evidenced by his release of a new type of memorandum that recaps current initiatives with thorough background information.

The team found that the college genuinely was concerned about the breakdown(s) in communication that resulted in such things as the Academic Senate/Commission communication. When the team explored the notion that there was a breakdown in trust and lack of mutual respect, there was uniform agreement in every case that these things were barriers to their current operations. The various groups (e.g. Academic Senate, EMPC, program review committee, the open forum, etc) expressed support of the president, but also concern that the current situation was hampering forward movement on each of the outstanding issues. For example, the Academic Senate, while expressing initial support of the president, now is concerned about the fast pace of change on a variety of issues that could fundamentally change the role of faculty.

In the team's view, the issues of mutual respect, trust and role clarification are at the heart of this matter. Because of the rapid and significant changes that have been enacted or proposed, the college is reacting, and in some cases resisting these changes.

Conclusion

In the opinion of the team, all college constituencies must come together to find common ground, for the good of the college. Every constituency has its historical opinions, its perception on recent events and its concerns about its role in affecting the future of the

college. All have validity, yet all must now yield to the greater concern of college long-term health. Without resolution of this fundamental matter, the college will be greatly hampered in its progress to address all these other issues.

One avenue for this new approach may well lie in a thorough examination of roles and responsibilities of the various constituencies. Because of a variety of changes and new approaches, old procedures, policies and rules have come into question. The reaction to these changes has been a breakdown in communication and a distrust that has resulted in misunderstandings, miscommunications, and lack of ownership in college processes. It is now time for the administration, faculty and classified staff to come together to discuss how best to forge one team to work for the good of College of the Redwoods and forge a new, united future. The team found evidence in every part of the college that there is willingness to do this hard but crucial work. Everyone cares deeply about their college and its future but presently there is not a common understanding of that future. The team suggests there is no better way to demonstrate loyalty and respect for College of the Redwoods than to suspend the current distrust, disbelief and anxiety and work together to forge new understandings of everyone's responsibilities to make the college an exemplary institution. Thus, the team provides a new recommendation on governance:

Recommendation 1 (2009): In order to meet the Standard and improve both communication and operations of the college, the team recommends that the college undergo a review of roles and responsibilities of each constituent group. In so doing, the college should develop means by which trust can be enhanced and respect increased among the constituent groups to create an environment that supports empowerment, innovation and leads to institutional excellence. (Standard IV.A.1. 2a, b,3,5)

