

## **PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL LEASING**

### **MEMORANDUM**

**TO;** Campus Constituency **DATE:** July 19, 2009  
**FROM:** Donald F. Averill  
**SUBJECT:** SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ON RESPONSE TO ACCJC SANCTION

The campus is making effective progress in addressing the sanctions that have been placed before you. Following review and discussion of the progress being made to address the recommendations and prepare your response, I want to summarize the important steps that need to be addressed in preparing the final report.

#### **FORMAT OF THE FOCUSED REPORT**

All of the reports are currently being prepared by separate teams responding to the specific recommendations from the visiting team report and sanction letter from ACCJC. Richard Livingston will be charged with editing the report and ensuring that the report has continuity and clarity for the next visiting team. To assist Richard, I have asked each of the teams to make changes in the report. The overall report needs to meet the following requirements:

- The cover page needs to follow the recommended format of the Commission.
- A signature page needs to be developed that includes signatures of the appropriate constituent leaders on campus and the Chancellor and Board of Trustees President.
- The report should start out describing the recommendations being addressed by the report.
- A description of the process and timeline for preparing the report needs to be included.
- A coding system needs to be developed for the filing of evidence that will indicate where and how the reader can access the evidence that is being prepared for each section of the report.

#### **INDIVIDUAL SECTIONS OF THE REPORT**

- Describe the setting of the college in relation to the standard that brought about the recommendation.
- Describe what the institution has done to date to correct or meet the recommendation.
- Link the response to the accreditation standards that apply.
- Talk about results within the narrative of the report.
- Prepare evidence and code that evidence in the report.
- Have the paper evidence available for the committee and coded or arranged so it is easy to find.

The progress being made on the recommendations is commendable. You have taken the sanction seriously and are working across campus to resolve the problem. There are specific areas of the progress that need further dialogue and action. It is not important to have the conditions for each of the recommendations completed by the October 15<sup>th</sup> date when the progress report has to be submitted. However, you do need to complete the following:

- Identify what you have to do to meet the standards that are referenced in the recommendations.
- Define the progress that has been made to meet the standards.
- Define what has to be done to complete meeting the requirements.
- Define the timeline when the campus will have completed this work.

## **CONSIDERATION FOR ADDRESSING SPECIFIC PARTS OF THE REPORT**

### **District Recommendations**

Since the Commission accredits colleges and not districts; when district issues are raised, the recommendation is made as part of the college report. There are two issues for the district to address: the allocation of resources to the colleges; and the negotiation of language for evaluation of faculty progress in using SLOs to stimulate continuous improvement. This report information will have to be integrated into the larger report. The following points need attention:

- A section of the report needs to address the recommendation for the evaluation language, the process for resolving the recommendation and include the evidence of progress to meet the requirement.
- The allocation of resources solution also needs to be integrated into the campus report. The six points listed for completion of individual sections of the report should apply to this report as well.
- Some attention will be needed to show how the process for addressing this recommendation was vetted with the college constituencies.

### **Student Learning Outcomes**

Progress is being made on identifying the student learning outcomes (SLOs) at the classroom level and a robust data base is defined for eventually managing this data. The campus has even experimented with measuring progress on course and program level SLOs. The campus now needs to direct its attention to meeting the following elements of the standards:

- The development of course and program SLOs needs to be completed and placed into a data system for future measurements.
- The rubrics for measuring SLOs need to be completed and placed in the data system.
- The work to establish “institutional” SLOs needs to be completed and included into the data model.
- The college will probably need to address future refinement of SLOs at the class and program level based on the impact of the institutional SLOs on that work.
- The college has started to measure the success of your SLOs at the class and some program levels. A matrix for completing and tracking the evaluation of SLOs at all levels needs to be prepared and included in the report.
- The SLOs evaluation data needs to be blended into program review so that it integrates into the overall assessment of the college and resource needs.

### **Course Curriculum Update**

Significant progress has been made on completing course curriculum updates throughout the college, and along with that effort, the inclusion of student learning outcomes (SLOs) into those documents. The system for monitoring future progress has been completed. Attention needs to be given to completing the following points:

- A matrix needs to be developed to define the number of curriculum reviews that will be completed each year. Curriculum reviews should be contiguous with the program review model. At the present time, a significant number of courses have been reviewed in the last year and the work needs to be distributed evenly.
- Work is started on getting the SLOs included in the catalog and that work needs to continue.
- The modification and review of syllabi needs to have some closure. Since few students consistently use the college catalog to define their course requirements, it is important to have closure for the students in the syllabi for each course.

## **Program Review**

The college has been moving forward on program review and completing that process. The college has two levels of program review which is commendable with all programs going through program review annually. The data system for the management of program review is robust and will help to manage the process in the future. There are several important issues to be resolved in completing the expectations of ACCJC standards.

- The current report has established a program review schedule that is not consistent throughout the report. The report talks about a six (6) year model a three (3) year model, a two (2) year model, and a one (1) year model. The District policy calls for career technical education programs to be reviewed every two (2) years and for all other programs to be reviewed every four (4) years. The report language needs to be consistent and I would recommend that it follow district policy.
- The concept of annual program reviews is commendable, but the campus may want to assess what is being required in each review. Since the annual review is intended to address budget considerations, more weight should be placed on budget elements in that report with the comprehensive data being used in a comprehensive review cycle.
- Progress and timelines need to be considered for program reviews for the administrative units of the college.
- Consideration needs to be given to consolidation of the data base for tracking program review. The current system does not accommodate input into the data base for the student services program since it is in a separate data system from other program review data.

## **College-wide Planning**

This working group has responsibility for the flow of planning from the Educational Master Plan, the Strategic Plan, and the various planning committees required for specific college programs. The purpose was to provide for the integration and oversight of these planning models to focus on institutional improvement. The work of this work group will assimilate the information from the Student Learning Outcomes work group, the Program Review work group and the Course Review work group. It is the work group that has the responsibility for integrating the processes for planning, evaluation, and resource allocation. The models in the report address all of these areas and a data system is being adjusted to facilitate this planning process. The mission statement was modified to meet the recommendation for addressing student learning outcomes and this was vetted with all constituent groups. Consideration needs to be given to the following issues:

- There is considerable overlap of the work of this group and the workgroup on Decision Making Roles and Collaboration. (1 and 7) I am finding conflicting direction in the reports particularly as it addresses integration issues. This needs to be worked out in the final draft.

- A lot of attention is being given to who will decide on the allocation of resources. There is need for a workshop from the budget folks on the amount of discretionary funding that is available and what flexibility the campus has in the allocation of fiscal resources.
- The proposed model is good at identifying and developing a model to address the integration issues from the Commission, but conflicts with responsibilities being addressed in work group 1 and 7. This needs to be clarified.
- Attention is given to the elements of dialogue and consultation in the report. Evaluation and reporting are apparently addressed in the data base for tracking this information. What is lacking is an evaluation of the overall effectiveness of the institution leading to areas needing future improvement. I will address this further under the topic Addressing Continuous Improvement.

### **Institutional Planning and Evaluation**

The workgroup on Eligibility Requirement 19 has inappropriately focused on the technology master plan. The Eligibility Requirement 19 is entitled Institutional Planning and Evaluation which is being addressed by workgroup 2. Technically, the visiting team was concerned about the lack of an up-to-date technology plan, but it is not the intent of the Eligibility Requirement 19 to isolate technology from other planning on the campus. Consideration needs to be given to the following points.

- Combine the findings from the technology work group with the report on College Wide Planning. At the least, the title for Eligibility Requirement 19 should be Institutional Planning and Evaluation
- The intent of the Eligibility Requirement is to have a systematic and cyclical planning and evaluation process that annually evaluates the effectiveness of the institution in addressing its mission and goals and defines what it needs to do to provide for continuous improvement. The College has not clearly provided for this process.

### **Decision Making Roles and Collaboration**

The public community colleges of California have complicated requirements that are embedded in statute regarding collegial consultation. While the ACCJC has established standards for participatory decision making, they do not ascribe to the enforcement of California statute. The Commission direction has been defined in the Dialogue and Themes that are included in the self study prepared by each college. There is an expectation that the entire college community will enter into dialogue to determine college missions and goals; that these purposes will be regularly reviewed and evaluated. It is expected that resources will be allocated to meet these needs and that plans will be developed to address the continuous improvement of the institution.

Accreditation standards further clarify the dialogue and responsibilities that are expected of the administration, the board of trustees, and the campus constituencies, with the expectation that there will be open dialogue.

California statute has put into place a process entitled “collegial consultation” that provides for a governance process for all constituent groups. This model further defines specific responsibilities for academic and professional standards that are vested in the Academic Senate and requires districts to develop policy on how the collegial model will operate within each district. Constituent groups have responsibilities as well to define functions assigned to its senate, bargaining unit and for the inclusion of other constituent groups in the collegial consultation process.

Neither the AACJC Standards nor the California statute usurps the responsibility of the Board of Trustees in setting policy or taking responsibility for the quality of education being offered by the District.

Your report is attempting to meld the state governance process with the expectation of the standards addressing participatory governance. There has been an inordinate amount of attention given to the composition and equality of representation on committees. On the other hand it is difficult to determine how the campus will implement a process of continuous improvement. Consideration needs to be given to the following discussion.

- Open up additional discussion of how the models being developed in work group 1/7 and work group 2 meshes together and address the duplication and conflict between the two reports.
- The college community has used the term *integration* in different contexts. Work is needed to clarify the use of this term.
- College Council is more appropriate to address the state collegial consultation process for bringing forward policy decisions. This body should follow the district policy for collegial consultation; if that exists.
- The Integration Team needs further discussion. It is developing into a super committee for determining budget allocation. I don't think that is where you want to go.
- There is a need to increase the openness of dialogue addressed in the accreditation *Themes*. This includes the overall evaluation of the decision making process on an annual basis. This is not clear in the existing model.

### **Addressing Continuous Improvement**

The College Leadership Council was provided excerpts from the ACCJC Guide for Evaluation Institutions that address dialogue and the themes established for institutional review. What the Commission is seeking from member institutions is a commitment to these themes. The Commission wants the colleges to have reflective dialogue on

- Institutional Commitment
- Evaluation, Planning, and Improvement
- Student Learning outcomes
- Organization
- Dialogue
- Institutional Integrity

To sustain this commitment to dialogue it is expected that the entire constituency will define a model where they jointly define the direction of the institution and develop a cyclical evaluation model that will measure progress on the accomplishments of the institution that leads to continuous improvement

The governance processes being defined and changed and the integration efforts for planning, evaluation, and resource allocation will bring a data set together to implement this purpose. The college needs to go another step with the current design to incorporate that continuous review model.

My discussions with the college community on the integration team revealed a desire to have broader input into the institutional missions, and the review of the success of the institution. I would suggest that the current development of the Integration Team is misdirected in giving this committee oversight over the existing work of budget allocation.

The college needs to consider taking the Integration Team and charge this group with the ongoing evaluation of the processes for governance and the identification of improvement needs of the college. This committee should be charged with the following:

- Maintain the recommended membership that provides for the broad representation of all constituent groups.
- Evaluate annually the collegial governance and consultation model for the college and recommends changes.
- Review the program review evaluation data, student learning outcome data, and other student achievement data to determine areas that the college needs to provide for improvement.
- Make recommendations to the College Council, and as appropriate to the budget committee, on priorities for available fiscal resources.
- Work with the college community to disseminate information on their findings to the college constituency and the broader community.

It is not my intent to throw a monkey wrench into the fine work that has been accomplished by all the work groups to date. What you do need to do is consider these findings with the intent of strengthening your response and moving the institution forward.

On a final note: Some thought needs to be given to the ongoing attention to the accreditation process. The Accreditation Oversight Committee or the former Accreditation Steering Committee needs to keep in place a process for monitoring continuous progress on the standards. You do not want to find yourself at the end of an accreditation period rushing to address issues that should have been given attention already.

I will be available by email ([donaldfaverill@msn.com](mailto:donaldfaverill@msn.com)) or by phone (909) 553-6085 to clarify my comments to any of the workgroups as this process is moved forward. You are moving in the right direction to strengthen your college and to more effectively address the ACCJC standards.