BACKGROUND AND TIMELINE

Self study and ACCJC visit in March, 2007
Outcome: Accreditation reaffirmed with progress report and visit in 2008
Six college recommendations and two Commission concerns

2008 Progress Report
Outcome: Report accepted with a follow-up report to address Recommendations 2 and 3 (Governance) and Concern 2 (Accountability)

2009 Follow-up Report
Outcome: Report accepted with no further action required on recommendations and concerns.

2010 Midterm Report – to be submitted by March 15, 2010

ACTIONS TAKEN TO ADDRESS THE TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Campus Relationships - What college policies that encourage institutional leaders to work together collegially have been established and have they been distributed widely?
   • Developed a College Code of Conduct which encourages institutional leaders to work together collegially by promoting conflict resolution, respect, fairness, and a commitment to student success and learning. The Code is part of all shared governance charters, is posted on the college website and has been widely distributed to the campus community.
   • Hold annual College Council Planning retreats in which the College Strategic Plan is reviewed and updated. The College Strategic Plan is aligned with the District Strategic Plan and includes six main areas: access, planning, quality of programs and services, fiscal stability, technology, community and business partnerships. The Strategic Plan is posted on the college website.
   Since 2007, the campus climate has improved in a significant and sustainable manner.

2. College Governance - Have the areas of responsibility been clarified and outcomes defined?
   • The six shared governance committees have been reorganized and revitalized, charters written, areas of responsibility and outcomes defined, memberships established, meetings with agendas held, minutes recorded and posted on the college website.

3. Evaluation and Effectiveness of Governance Committees - Have the Shared Governance committees been evaluated regularly and systematically?
   • A task force responsible for the systematic evaluation of the shared governance process was established in spring of 2007 and has continued to monitor the effectiveness of the Shared Governance committees.
     1. Shared Governance committees perform an annual self-evaluation every spring.
     2. External Shared Governance committee annual evaluations are conducted every fall.

4. Planning - Is there a clear link between budgeting, enrollment planning, staffing, instructional equipment, technology, and facility maintenance?
   • Created a Strategic Plan summer 2008, revised 2009; established an annual revision process.
   • Developed and implemented an online program review and unit planning process for academic, student service and administrative areas which consists of four components: the unit effectiveness review (five-year trend data is analyzed), curriculum review, student learning outcome review, instructional equipment and supply request. Each section includes objectives and activities which are linked to the college goals and all resource requests are based on the objectives listed. The unit plan is monitored and updated on an annual basis and comprehensively evaluated every three years. The timing of the resource requests, based on the annual program review update, is designed to coincide
with the college’s operational budget preparation cycle so that the resource requests can be incorporated in the next year’s operational budget. This year’s unit plan information is being used to develop the 2010-11 operational plan. The college has developed and implemented changes to both its program review system and shared governance model which ensure the linkage of planning to resource allocation and budget development.

- Developed a Budget and Planning Handbook in 2008 which clearly delineates the planning process.
- Updated the Educational Master Plan in spring 2008; complete revision spring 2010.
- Updated the Technology Master Plan based on SWOT analysis 2008-2010.
- Updated the Facility Master Plan 2009.
- Instituted enrollment planning resulting in increased instructional efficiency though enrollment management.
  1. Average classroom size has increased from 32.2 students in 2006-07 to 39.6 in 2008-09.
  2. Cost per FTES has been reduced from $4,567 in 2006-07 to $4,076 in 2008-09.

5. **Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment** - Has SLO development and assessment been accelerated?
   - Almost 90% of all courses have SLOs; 45% of these have been assessed.
   - All Student Service areas have SAOs/SLOs and are working on assessment.
   - SLO website has been in place since 2007.

6. **District-wide Decentralization** - In light of district-wide decentralization, have administrative systems and responsibilities been strengthened and clarified?
   - District and college roles have been clarified and many procedures and responsibilities have been established at both the campus and district level.

**COMMISSION CONCERNS**

1. **Administrative Support** – Does the institution have sufficient staff with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support its mission and purpose?
   - All senior administrators are permanently assigned. As the college has grown in enrollment, the number of administrators has increased in response to the need for additional administrative services; four academic deans were hired to fill vacancies as a result of a retirement and restructuring of the division of Academic Affairs.

2. **Accountability** - Eligibility Requirement 19 requires the institution to systematically evaluate and make public how it is accomplishing its purposes, including assessment of student learning outcomes. Does the institution provide evidence of planning and assess progress through an ongoing and systematic cycle?
   - The college has addressed this concern by (1) revitalizing the shared governance committees and establishing a task force responsible for the systematic evaluation of the shared governance process; (2) developing a College Strategic Plan; (3) updating the Educational Master Plan and Technology Plan; (4) funding a position for an SLO Coordinator who regularly reports to College Council, the Academic Senate, Council of Instruction, and the Educational Planning Committee and who works closely with the Curriculum Committee, Basic Skills Committee, and the Professional and Staff Development Committee; SLO materials and updates are posted on the college SLO website; (5) developing an online program review process for instructional and non-instructional areas; (6) linking the program review process to the budget allocation process; (7) developing a Budget and Planning Handbook; (8) making all planning documents public by posting them on the college website and in the college library.
   - A systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation and re-evaluation has been established which illustrates the college’s commitment and ability to ensure a firm linkage of planning to resource allocation.