June 28, 2019

Dr. Joanna Schilling  
President  
Cypress College  
9200 Valley View Street  
Cypress, CA  90630

Dear President Schilling:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, reviewed in June 2019 the Follow-Up Report and related evidentiary materials submitted by Cypress College. The purpose of this review was to determine whether the College has appropriately responded to the issues as identified by the peer review team at the time of the last visit and as expressed in the Commission’s Action Letter of January 26, 2018, and whether the College has demonstrated compliance with the related Standards.

Upon consideration of the information noted above, the Commission acted to **find compliance and reaffirm accreditation for the remainder of the cycle**. The Commission finds that Cypress College has addressed the compliance requirements, corrected deficiencies, and meets Standards II.A.2, II.A.9, and II.A.16. The next report from the College will be the Midterm Report1 due on October 15, 2021. The institution’s next comprehensive review will occur in the fall term of 2024.

The Commission requires the College to disseminate the Follow-Up Report and this letter within the institution, including by posting them on the College’s website.

On behalf of the Commission, I wish to express appreciation for the diligent work and thoughtful reflection that Cypress College undertook to respond to these requirements. These efforts confirm that peer review can well serve the multiple constituencies of higher education by both ensuring and encouraging institutional quality and effectiveness.

If you have any questions about this letter or the Commission’s action, please feel free to contact me or the vice president that has been assigned as liaison to your institution.

Sincerely,

Richard Winn, Ed.D.  
President

cc:  
Dr. Cheryl Marshall, Chancellor, North Orange County Community College District  
Mr. Philip Dykstra, Accreditation Liaison Officer

---

1 Institutions preparing and submitting Midterm Reports, Follow-up Reports, and Special Reports to the Commission should review *Guidelines for the Preparing Institutional Reports to the Commission*, found on the ACCJC website at [https://accjc.org/publications/](https://accjc.org/publications/).
January 26, 2018

Dr. Joanna Schilling, President
Cypress College
9200 Valley View Street
Cypress, CA 90630

Dear President Schilling:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting January 10-12, 2018, reviewed the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER) and evidentiary materials submitted by Cypress College. The Commission also considered the External Evaluation Team Report (Team Report) prepared by the peer review team that conducted its onsite visit to the College Monday, October 9 - Thursday, October 12, 2017.

The purpose of this review was to determine whether the College continues to meet ACCJC’s-Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and Accreditation Standards (hereinafter, the Standards). Upon consideration of the written and oral information noted above, the Commission acted to Reaffirm Accreditation for 18 months and require a follow-up report due no later than March 1, 2019.

Compliance Requirements
The Commission also determined that the College must demonstrate compliance with the following Standards, as addressed in the College recommendations. This demonstration must be addressed in the required Follow-Up Report.

**Standard II.A.2, II.A.16 (College Recommendation 2):** In order to meet the Standards, the college must complete a full review of its processes related to the assessment and review cycle of Student Learning Outcomes for all instructional courses/programs to ensure that all courses, programs, and directly related services are improved.

In accordance with federal regulations, compliance requirements must be addressed and the institution must demonstrate that it aligns with Standards within two years.¹

**Modifications to Recommendations**
In taking its action, the Commission modified the team’s recommendation so that the wording of College Recommendation 2 should be revised as follows:

---

¹ For more information, refer to the Commission policy on “The Two-Year Rule and Extension for Good Cause” on the ACCJC website at [https://accjc.org/eligibility-requirements-standards-policies/](https://accjc.org/eligibility-requirements-standards-policies/).
**Original College Recommendation 2 (Compliance):** In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the college complete a full review of its processes related to the assessment and review cycle of Student Learning Outcomes for all instructional courses/programs to ensure that faculty and others responsible act to continuously improve all courses, programs, and directly related services. Further, the college can utilize the dialog related to this review to more effectively demonstrate that the college awards course credit, degrees and certificates based on student attainment of learning outcomes for all courses and programs. (II.A.2, II.A.9 II.A.16)

**Revised College Recommendation 2 (Compliance):** In order to meet the standards, the team recommends that the college complete a full review of its processes related to the assessment and review cycle of Student Learning Outcomes for all instructional courses/programs to ensure that all courses, programs, and directly related services are improved. (II.A.2, II.A.16)

**Recommendations for Improving Institutional Effectiveness**
The Team Report noted College Recommendations 1, 3, 4, and 5 and District Recommendations 1, 2, and 3 for improving institutional effectiveness. These recommendations do not identify current areas of deficiency in institutional practice but, consistent with its mission to foster continuous improvement through the peer review process, the Commission encourages institutions to give serious consideration to the advice contained in the peer reviewers’ recommendations. The Commission anticipates that you will bring them and the team’s full report to the attention of your institution for serious consideration. In the Midterm Report, the College will include actions taken in response to the peer review team’s improvement recommendations.

**Next Steps**
The Team Report provides details of the peer review team’s findings with regard to the College’s work to meet Standards. The guidance and recommendations contained in the Report represent the best advice of the peer review team at the time of the visit but may not describe all that is necessary for the college to improve or to come into compliance. A final copy of the team report is attached.

The Commission requires that you disseminate the ISER, the Team Report, and this letter to those who were signatories of the ISER and that you make these documents available to all campus constituencies and the public by placing copies on the College website. Please note that in response to public interest in accreditation, the Commission requires institutions to post current accreditation information on a Web page no more than one click from the institution’s home page. In keeping with ACCJC policy, the Commission action will also be posted on the ACCJC website within 30 days of the date of the Commission’s action.

The College’s Midterm Report will be due on October 15, 2021. The institution’s next comprehensive review will occur in the fall term of 2024.

---

2 Institutions preparing and submitting Midterm Reports, Follow-up Reports, and Special Reports to the Commission should review *Guidelines for the Preparing Institutional Reports to the Commission*, found on the ACCJC website at [https://accjc.org/publications/](https://accjc.org/publications/).
On behalf of the Commission, I wish to express appreciation for the diligent work and thoughtful reflection that Cypress College undertook to prepare for this evaluation. These efforts confirm that peer review can well serve the multiple constituencies of higher education by both ensuring and encouraging institutional quality and effectiveness.

If you have any questions about this letter or the Commission’s action, please feel free to contact me or the vice president that has been assigned as liaison to your institution.

Sincerely,

Richard Winn, Ed.D.
President

cc: Dr. Cheryl Marshall, Chancellor, North Orange County Community College District
    Mr. Philip Dykstra, Accreditation Liaison Officer