

Follow Up Report

Diablo Valley College
321 Golf Club Road
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

A Confidential Report Prepared for the Accrediting Commission
For Community and Junior Colleges
This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited

Diablo Valley College
on
November 18, 2010

Dr. Marie B. Smith, Former Vice Chancellor of Education and Technology,
Los Rios Community College District, Chairperson

Team Roster

Dr. Marie B. Smith (Chair)
Former Vice Chancellor
Of Instruction and Technology
Los Rios Community College District

Mr. Marc Beam
Former Director of Research
Kern Community College District

Ms. Deborah Ikeda
Vice President of Instruction and Student Services
North Centers, State Center Community College District

Introduction and Overview

Diablo Valley College, the largest of the three colleges of the Contra Costa Community College District, is located in Pleasant Hill, California. Following a 2008 comprehensive self evaluation and visit, in January 2009, the Accrediting Commission issued a Show Cause order to Diablo Valley College, requiring the college to correct the deficiencies noted. These deficiencies were in the areas of lack of integrated planning, lack of data-driven program review, lack of regular and effective curriculum review as well as concerns with governance systems and communication issues. In addition, the college was required to report on a district finance recommendation.

The college was required to provide a report by October 15, 2009 which was followed by a visit of Commission representatives. Three members of that four person team also served on the 2008 comprehensive site visiting team, providing a valuable frame of reference. At its January 2010 meeting, the Accrediting Commission reviewed the college's report, the report of the visiting team and the update provided by the institution and acted to remove the Show Cause and impose Probation on the college. The college was required to submit a Follow-Up Report by October 15, 2010 to demonstrate the resolution of the remaining recommendations in the original Show Cause order. A visit of Commission representatives was also required and was conducted on November 18, 2010. All three members also served on the 2009 visiting team.

The team reviewed all written materials and appendices documents (provided on CD-ROM) and visited the college's website prior to the visit. The college created an appropriately designed and appointed team room containing hard copies of evidence documents as well as access to the college's web site for other documentation. As was the case in the 2009 visit, the team found the entire college professional and forthright in its demeanor, and also most eager to demonstrate the resolution of the remaining recommendations. The newly appointed interim president (a CEO of another college in the district) was knowledgeable about the issues and provided a valued perspective on the college's work. The college clearly demonstrated its continuing willingness to address and satisfy deficiencies in accreditation Standards in order to become a more effective institution.

The college had provided the Commission two addenda to the original Show Cause Report. To ensure that all of the information was included as evidence to the Follow-Up Report, both addenda were summarized and included as a background section to each recommendation in the report. The team acknowledges this work and found that inclusion of that material was helpful to establish context to the current report.

The visiting team met with the interim college president, senior administrative staff, the Faculty Senate, the Classified Senate, the Associated Students Executive Officers, Management Council, College Council, Institutional Planning Committee, Budget Oversight Committee and the Integration Council. The team chair also met with the

district's Chancellor, and the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services. An open forum was also held in which team members heard comments from the general college community.

Based on review of all documents as well as interviews with individuals and groups, the following report represents the team's observations, evidence, analysis and conclusions, organized by Recommendation.

Recommendation 1: The team recommends that the college clarify the decision making roles of constituent groups in the establishment of the campus organizational structure and implement a participatory process to advance the mission and goals of the institution. (Standards IA3, IB1, IB2, IVA1, IVA2a, IVA3, IVB2b)

Observations:

The 2008 comprehensive evaluation team report concluded that the fractured organization and hostile climate existing at the college resulted in the college not meeting Standards of accreditation in areas of effective communication and governance and further concluded that the previous recommendation from 2002 had not been met and provided it again as a result of the their visit.

To respond to this recommendation, the college began in 2009 by reviewing its current governance structure as well as the policies and procedures that supported it. This work was done under the authority of work groups that were set up to respond specifically to the Show Cause order and each of the recommendations contained within it. By August of 2009, a new governance structure and some of the supporting policies had been approved and the college began to implement the new governance structure. It should be noted that the process employed by the college to gain consensus was in and of itself a response to accreditation Recommendations 1 and 7, in that communication was enhanced through meaningful dialogue, individuals and groups were welcomed into the process, and trust was beginning to emerge as a result of these efforts.

DVC clarified the decision-making roles of constituent groups by adopting new procedures or modifying existing ones. It used these new procedures to structure four new committees that were created to support a more significant participatory process. These new structures are the College Council, Integration Council, Institutional Planning Committee and the Budget Committee. In addition the college created five new committees to fully flesh out the system. These new committees were: Student Equity Committee, Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee, Enrollment Management Committee and Facilities Committee. As mentioned in the previous report, most new committees or councils were purposely designed to be expertise-based rather than constituency-based. Those involved see this new principle as more inclusive and builds on competency of individuals, no matter where they reside in the organization.

New procedures were adopted to support the governance system including regular Mission review and revisions to procedures for: program review, SLO and achievement data, integrated planning, course compliance updates, and Program Revitalization and Discontinuance. In addition, templates for Instructional Unit Program Review, Student Services Program Review and Administrative Program Review were modified as a result of an evaluation process.

At the time of the visit by Commission representatives in November of 2009, the college had recently implemented the new structure and had begun to use it to make decisions. The 2009 team concluded that progress had been made to satisfy Recommendation 1 but more work needed to occur before the Recommendation was fully met. In order to fully satisfy Recommendation 1, the college was urged to fully implement the new structure in decision-making and also to identify redundancies and/or omissions by evaluating the processes that make up the new governance system.

Evidence and Analysis

The new structure contains a College Council which is expertise based, as are all other shared governance councils in the new structure. This group is responsible for policy review and recommendations to the president. Over the past year, evidence shows that the College Council has acted in accordance with its charge and has made significant recommendations to the president, most of which have been adopted. A recent example is the setting of the college's strategic directions which was accomplished with the president requesting involvement from both the College Council and Faculty Senate to identify the priorities. The College Council has also had a year to work under the new structure in terms of learning how to best communicate and become a leadership body. Members spoke of the gaining new knowledge about establishing connections with other councils, learning to be flexible and how to best get information out to the college at large.

The new Institutional Planning Committee, charged with overseeing the creation and evaluation of all plans of the college, has also operated within its charge. Included in the charge of the Committee is the periodic review of the mission statement every two years or sooner if the situation demands. The committee also sets the measurable objectives for the college's strategic directions (I.B.2). Its challenge is to be the site of coordination of planning efforts, and streamlining existing procedures to make the gathering and dissemination of information easier and more understandable. Evidence in meeting minutes shows that the committee is grappling with these issues as they make decisions that will benefit the college as a whole.

The unique feature of the DVC governance structure was the creation of an Integration Council. This body was the result of the college's desire to have, as a permanent part of its governance system, a group that is responsible for cross-discipline, cross-constituency and cross-college dialogue about important college matters. The college had intended that the Integration Council would be the locus of discussion on issues of student success and institutional effectiveness. All program reviews were to be discussed there and

prioritized for resource allocation. Now, a year later, the team found that the Integration Council had not only operated within its charge but was forced to forge new procedures because of the difficult financial circumstances of the college (see discussion under Recommendation 3). Interviews with the Council clearly demonstrated the willingness to continue working toward meaningful communication and integration of all constituencies in on-going, collegial dialogue about student learning and institutional processes (I.B.1).

In order to fully respond to this recommendation, the previous team recommended that the college engage in evaluating its new governance system to identify redundancies and omissions. The college provided substantial evidence, in the form of survey results and comments, that a comprehensive survey was conducted in order to satisfy that requirement. In May 2010 the survey was sent to all constituents, asking for evaluation and comments on the new governance structure. Twenty percent of all full-time and part-time employees of the college responded to the survey and also provided almost 600 comments. Generally respondents were slightly positive, showing values just on the positive side of neutral. Interviews with various governance councils and committees validate the findings, although greater optimism was expressed in person than was found in the survey. The college plans to conduct the same set of evaluations annually and understands the importance of using results to refine its governance structure. The team draws no conclusions regarding this preliminary data but notes that the participation and the comments of the respondents represent the lively dialogue that is needed for this continuing work. Any institutional change of this scope is a continuous work in progress.

The self evaluations done by the committees also showed slight agreement that college wide committees have improved communication, increased the level of transparency and openness, and created more meaningful dialogue, although that level of agreement varied among constituency groups with administrators showing most agreement and faculty the least. Interviews held with members of the College Council, Integration Council, Institutional Planning Committee and Budget Committee confirmed the increased level of meaningful dialogue and open communication. The members of all constituencies reported their commitment to continuing the work, as difficult as it is at times, because they are convinced that their participation has made a difference over the past year and will continue to do so.

When queried about the survey results showing various levels of agreement regarding the changed climate at DVC, interviewees suggested that disagreement was most pronounced among those not participating in the new structure. Thus, lack of knowledge about the changed environment, and perhaps some cynicism, are room for improvement next year. Members that do participate in the new governance structure reaffirmed, again and again, that they were committed to sustaining this new culture. In fact, because of the first year-end evaluations and survey results, the college is evaluating what changes need to be made to clarify the structure and streamline any redundancies.

The team interviewed constituent group leaders and found unanimity in their perceptions that the governance system fostered better communication and trust among the groups by clearly defining roles in governance and also the procedures by which decisions will be

made (IV.A.2.a, IV.A.3). All feel that with greater engagement has come more understanding and also willingness to keep the dialogue going. The team heard many anecdotes regarding how the climate had changed for the better and people who had left the prior governance system were now willing to re-engage to help DVC be a more effective college. Every constituent group spoke about service to students and how this new way of operating allowed them to concentrate on what was most important for student learning and student success (IV.A.1). The team found evidence that the decisions made over the past year did indeed foster institutional effectiveness through such things as careful attention to program reviews and use of them to set priorities by the Integration Council, the Budget Committee and College Council regarding where cuts should be made to minimize the effects on students.

During this year, the president of the college retired and an interim president was appointed by the Chancellor for the remainder of this academic year while a search for a permanent president is conducted. With recognition to the exiting president, the interim president, and the stability of the new governance structure, the college has accepted this change with equanimity. This welcoming atmosphere would have probably not been evident in the DVC of old. The president's role in the governance system is to ensure that goals and priorities are set, evaluation and planning are informed by research, and that planning is integrated with resource allocation. He is actively involved in promoting and sustaining the collegial atmosphere that now exists at the college. The team heard numerous comments that the interim president was helping to refine the new governance system by asking probing questions and thus leading various groups to articulate "how things work" within the new structure. He is providing consistent and demonstrable support for this effort at every level of the institution, including the evaluation of its effectiveness (IV.B.2.b)

Conclusions:

Two years ago the comprehensive visiting team found a college that did not have the structure or mechanisms in place to address important college issues in a focused and integrated fashion. In response to sanction, the college made a significant effort to address these deficiencies by changing its governance structure to be more open, foster dialogue and be more effective in creating a professional environment. In 2009 the visiting team found the climate had changed from one of isolation and resistance to inclusion and participation. In confirming this work, the team was concerned whether this effort could be sustained and codified as the new way of operating for Diablo Valley College. Could the "pioneers" of this system develop a cadre of followers who would carry on the work?

The current visiting team has verified that the college has achieved its goal of sustaining the dialogue and communication that are at the heart of this new system. They have indeed infused their work with so much enthusiasm that it has convinced others to participate. Decisions regarding strategic priorities, resource allocations and program review matters have been made over the past year in accordance with new procedures. The college is genuinely and actively engaged in significant work to improve student

success. The investment of personal and professional time to reestablish Diablo Valley College as an effective and professional college is observable throughout the institution. The team continues to urge the college to further solidify its procedures and structures that support the system, but is equally convinced they are up to the task.

As a result of the 2009 visit, the college was required to use its governance system to make decisions and also evaluate it for omissions and redundancies. The team verified that the college has done both of these things. Thus, this recommendation has been satisfied.

Recommendation 2: The team recommends that the college must develop and implement college wide planning that is tied to the Strategic Plan, mission, and resource allocation that:

- **Integrates all aspects of planning, evaluation, resource allocation (Standards: IB3, IB4, IIA1, IIA2, IIB1, IIB4, IIC2, IIIA.6, IIIC2, IIID1a, IIID2g, IIID3, IVA5, IV2b);**
- **Is well defined, widely disseminated and discussed through reflective college wide dialogue (Standards: IB4, IB5, IIID4, IVA2a); and**
- **Includes faculty, staff, students and administration from the Diablo Valley College's main campus and its San Ramon Campus (Standards: IB4, IIA1, IIB1, IIC1c, IIIA, IIIB, IIIC, IIID, IVA.1, IVA2, and IVA3.)**

Observations:

Based on the past year, there is ongoing review and adaptation of DVC's evaluation and planning processes. The college has strengthened and clarified the role(s) of college council(s) and committees through revisions to policy specifically addressing planning, evaluation, decision making and resource allocation. The college conducted several surveys using quantitative and qualitative data to gather input and improve their governance structure. As a result, the institution is refining its key processes through systematic evaluations.

As trust between colleagues increases, councils and committees are moving from "constituency based" to "expertise based" discussions and members. Representation remains diverse and inclusive of managers, faculty, classified staff and students with notable increased participation by the San Ramon Valley Center and students. To paraphrase comments from DVC faculty: "Good people have come back to the table." The climate has changed and people are working collegially on issues related to student success using data from program reviews across disciplines. These efforts are widely discussed and disseminated across the college with multiple venues for input and reflective dialogue.

Evidence and Analysis:

The college created a matrix showing the 2009-10 Accomplishments of Strategic Goals compiled from the action steps of each manager's evaluations with the corresponding district strategic directions, DVC goals, measures of performance and timelines. The college reports its accomplishments annually to the governing board and regularly shares this information through college councils and committees (I.B.3., I.B.5.).

The College Council recommends the mission and values that inform decision making. The process includes direct links to the college strategic plan with broad-based input as documented in the evidence and interviews. For example, the president asked the faculty senate to participate in selecting the college's strategic directions. This resulted in stronger collaboration to improve outcomes for transfer and basic skills students; narrow the equity gap; and assess student learning outcomes (I.B.4.).

The Institutional Planning Committee (IPC) oversees all planning college-wide. During the past year DVC refined the role and function of this committee with a more focused charge and increased awareness on campus. IPC monitors and evaluates all college plans using annual and multiple-year calendars. These calendars show links to the program review cycle coordinated by the Integration Council. The Integration Council (IC) serves as the focal point for college wide discussions including reviewing and ranking of program reviews, student learning outcomes, and the results of all planning. In 2009-10 council members received training on accreditation, inquiry, interpreting data, and team building.

As a consequence of state budget woes, Diablo Valley College faced \$5.2 million in cuts last year. The district's new budget allocation model gave the college more responsibility but with a process designed to allocate funds, not reduce them. The college's integrated planning model served them well. Interviews and evidence demonstrate that dialogue was robust and healthy, as it resulted in a "Synthesis of Values and Ideas" that guided the college through this difficult time. The Integration Council developed a draft set of guidelines and a rubric for prioritizing resource allocations (with funding or reductions). The Integration Council has been evaluated by the college overall and conducted a self-evaluation with plans to continue the evaluation cycle annually. This process is clearly linked to the district strategic directions, the college goals, and mission of the institution as shown in the evidence (II.A.1).

The Integration Council reviews and validates all program reviews: instructional, student services, and administrative (II.A.2. II.B.1, II.B.4., II.C.1.c., II.C.2.). The Institutional Planning Committee monitors and reviews all planning including: human resources, physical resources, fiscal resources and technology with regular evaluations of each plan (III.A., III.A.6., III.B., III.C., III.C.2., III.D., III.D.1.a., III.D.1.g., III.D.3.). While there remains room for improvement in the collection and use of student learning outcomes; the institution uses both achievement and assessment data, faculty expertise, and the

assistance of advisory committees, as appropriate, to improve instructional programs (II.A.2). The process is well defined through college policy and procedures as found in the evidence. Both the process itself and results of college wide planning are widely discussed through reflective dialogue. For example, agenda items on key councils have been introduced with a first and second reading to help reach consensus. Minutes are kept for all meetings and shared for transparency.

Interviews confirm that leaders across the institution empower colleagues to be innovative and collaborate during this transition. There is a written policy for decision making that is clear and accessible to all (IV.A.1. IV.A.2.). Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in governance and exercise a substantial voice while classified staff and students have established mechanisms for providing input (IV.A.2.a.). The institution relies on faculty, its senate, the curriculum committee and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services (IV.A.2.b.). As stated in the observations above, interviews and evidence demonstrate the college's effective communication and collaboration for the good of the institution (IV.A.3.). The leadership and governance structures are evaluated regularly through action plans, reflective dialogue and surveys. Results are disseminated widely and used as a basis for improvement (IV.A.5.).

Conclusions:

The college has developed and sustained a planning system that is well-defined, integrated with the mission, strategic goals and resource allocation. The system has participation from across the college and the decisions made are well communicated. Based on the evidence and observations, the team agrees the college is at the sustainable continuous quality improvement level of implementation on the ACCJC rubric for planning. This recommendation has been satisfied.

Recommendation 3: The team recommends that Diablo Valley College fully implement Recommendation 1 in the 2002 Accreditation Evaluation Report which states, "Implementation of a uniform process of program review which includes direct evidence of student learning and is used to inform and influence planning and resource allocation and leads to improvements in programs and services. (Standards: I.B.3, I.B.4, II.A.1, II.A.2, II.B.1, II.B.4, II.C.2, III.A.6, III.D.1a, IV.A.5, IV.2.b)

Observations

Diablo Valley College had developed a revised Program Review process for Instructional Units, Student Services and Administrative Services which linked the results to planning, resource allocation, curriculum and assessment of student learning. However, during the visit of November 3-4, 2009, there were no Instructional Unit Program Reviews completed for the 2008-09 academic year. Student Services had completed 14 Program Reviews and Administrative Services had completed 12 Program Reviews. The last evaluation team report indicated that the next step for the college was for Instructional

Units to complete the revised Program Review process and to summarize all the program reviews from all units in a useful manner to link requests for resource allocation and program improvements with the college budget and strategic planning processes via the Integration Council, Integrated Planning Committee, Budget Committee and College Council.

According to the October 2010 Follow-Up Report, the college developed a revised program review process for Instructional Units, Student Services and Administrative Units. Workshops were held on the revised Instructional Unit process, including the validation process developed during the previous year. The Management Council approved the new Administrative Unit Program review process Dec. 9, 2009 and immediately implemented it.

Fourteen Student Services Program Reviews and fifteen Administrative Program Reviews were completed during the 2009-10 academic year using the revised formats. The Instructional Units went from having no program reviews during the previous visit to having completed forty-five Instructional Unit Program Reviews. By November 2009, the Instructional Unit Program Reviews included twenty-one cumulative and twenty-four annual program review reports submitted to the vice president of instruction's office. The implementation of the Instructional Unit Program Review process included a validation process that reviewed linkages to resource allocation and focused on student learning and achievement.

The Instructional Unit Program Reviews were reviewed by a group of staff representing faculty, classified staff and management from a Division outside the originating program. This allowed for cross discipline validation as a broader group of people learned about the college's programs. Student Services completed five comprehensive and nine annual Program Reviews and Administration completed three comprehensive and twelve annual Program Reviews during the 2009-10 academic year. Both the Student Services and Administrative Program Reviews went through a committee validation process approved by the Integration Council.

Evidence and Analysis

The college has developed the Integration Council that is responsible for accepting and ranking all Program Reviews. The Integration Council includes faculty, management, classified staff and students. This broad membership is believed to be strength of the council according to the members. The members of the council expressed the view that all voices of council members were respected regardless of whether or not the person speaking was a faculty member, student, classified staff or management (I.B.1, I.B.2). This was not always the case at Diablo Valley College (DVC) and it was clear to the team that the Integration Council had established an environment for open college-wide dialogue on the results of the Program Reviews and how they affected student learning (I.B.1). During the interview with the Integration Council, examples were given of previously resistant departments now coming to the table as a result of the new program review process. Although the process is now viewed as complex, it has been a

springboard for valuable discussion about improving program effectiveness and student learning. (I.B.2, I.B.3)

The team reviewed the completed Instructional, Student Service and Administrative Program Reviews. The cross discipline validation teams for the Instructional Unit Program Reviews were asked to rate the completed program review. There are a total of five validation ratings. The ratings go from being rejected with a required resubmission in the next year's program review cycle to the highest rating of the program review being accepted as an exemplary effort. The team found evidence that the validation teams were not rubber stamps. In fact, validation teams return Program Reviews to the Departments for reworking and resubmission if they felt it was not thoroughly done. The team reviewed the completed validation and recommendation forms for all the completed Program Reviews and found both the Program Reviews and Validation Forms to be thorough with links to budget allocation and the college's strategic planning processes (I.B.3, I.B.5, IIA.2, and IIA.2.e). The team found evidence that the results of the Program Reviews and recommendations were presented to the college's Integration Council for review, discussion and ranking (I.B.5, IIA.2.f). These recommendations were then forwarded to the College Council and Budget Committee. Interviews of college staff that served on the validation teams confirmed the usefulness of the process - such as learning about programs outside their Division and this made them more cognizant of other program needs besides their own (IIA.2.f). The Instructional Unit Program Review validation process is commended for being thought provoking, thorough and increasing cross discipline dialogue across the campus.

Program Reviews were intended as the basis for allocation of additional funds. However, there were no additional funds for the 2010-11 academic year. Instead the college faced a \$5.2 million reduction. The Integration Council is responsible for reviewing all the Program Review findings and was initially asked to make recommendations regarding cuts to the operational budgets based on the Program Reviews. Initially the Integration Council declined to fulfill this recommendation saying they were not yet well informed enough to make these recommendations. They had not yet seen any of the Instructional Program Reviews, but once they had reviewed the findings of the Program Reviews, the Integration Council felt they had developed enough trust among themselves to make recommendations on principles that could be used to guide the college reductions for the operational budget. The Integration Council presented the recommendations to the Budget Committee and College Council and the Budget Committee used the recommendations in developing budget recommendation for the 2010-11 year (I.B.5, I.B.6, III.D.1.a, and III.D.3).

The college continues to modify the Program Review process in an effort to simplify it and focus on those pieces of information really needed to improve student learning. The college has gone above and beyond the standard in developing both an extensive Program Review and validation process to improve student learning.

Conclusions

Recommendation 3 has been fully satisfied and the process that has been developed is at the sustainable continuous quality improvement level. The team recommends the college sustain this effort by revising the Program Review process to focus on those elements they determine necessary to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness.

Recommendation 7: The team recommends that the college further improve communication to increase collaboration across organizational structures by promoting transparent decision making, honest dialogue and widespread dissemination of internal college documents. (Standards: IIB2b, IIC, IIC2, IID1a, IID1d, IVA1, IVA2, IVA2b)

Observations

In 2009-2010, Diablo Valley College reorganized its governance system to be more collaborative and inclusive. The guiding principles of that restructuring included improving communication by making decisions more openly, having honest and significant dialogue on college issues and then quickly and widely disseminating both decisions made and information about that dialogue. The previous team noted that these principles had to be promoted effectively to fully satisfy Recommendation 7.

Evidence and Analysis

The college introduced many vehicles to improve dissemination of information including email, surveys and newsletters. DVC held joint meetings between departments and across senates to improve communication. This included the creation and dissemination of college plans regarding physical and technology resources. The work of assuring that facilities changes are understood and that technology resources are distributed according to planning priorities is on-going and communicated to the college at large (III.B.2.b, III.C., and III.C.2). There continues to be widespread commitment to keep track of work and issues discussed in committees and communicate results to demonstrate that budget decisions are tied to planning (III.D.1.a). Minutes are taken in every meeting and widely disseminated. There was recognition that everyone is welcome at committee meetings and can participate. This was particularly noted in the Budget Committee where the openness and availability of information was especially appreciated (III.D.1.d.).

The previous team noted that the individuals involved in designing the new governance system modeled the principles of consistent, clear and honest communication. A year later, the team found evidence that these principles are still the basis of the college's work and that controversies of last year were now effectively resolved. Previously there was controversy over constituent group representation in the various councils, as well as challenges to the notion of co-chairs from different constituent groups. Interviews during this visit confirmed that the representation of administrators, faculty, classified and students in the governance system is not only encouraged but expected. The team was impressed with the eagerness of various individuals to participate, e.g. there are almost 60 students actively involved on committees and councils. Council co-chairs from different

groups are now the norm. When questioned about the time involvement, each constituent group separately gave essentially the same answer: their involvement matters (IV.A.1).

During the last visit, the individuals involved in designing the new Diablo Valley College governance structure asserted that they had changed the norms of communication for the college. They argued that the structure itself promoted collaboration, codified in new policies and procedures and also required dialogue among constituent groups. The college as a whole now demands and expects clear communication of results. The current visiting team found substantial evidence, both written and in interviews to substantiate that the college has indeed increased communication and set new norms for professional behavior. One example involves the use of the survey results. Over the summer, several administrators looked at the data and developed a cross-reference document to suggest how various councils could address the results. When the councils reconvened in the fall semester, it was felt that the entire governance system needed to be involved in the review, rather than just administration. After a discussion in College Council, it was agreed that the work would start anew to evaluate the results and determine next steps. In the DVC of old, this situation could have been the beginning of a major disagreement; now it was the beginning of a major discussion in the appropriate governance group and its solution was taken as a matter of course (IV.A.2, IV.A.2,b).

The climate of the college has changed markedly since the 2008 comprehensive visit. The college readily acknowledges the existence of a previously hostile and toxic environment that resulted in the college's inability to meet accreditation Standards. There is now the resolve to change the environment that would allow the college to once again meet accreditation Standards thus restoring its ability to be an effective and responsible institution that serves students with excellence and integrity. The exemplar of this work was the creation of the new governance system and the commitment to quality communication that supports it. Over the past year the college has demonstrated its commitment to this work and has impressed the team that it is serious about its efforts.

When asked about the sustainability of this new system, the college discussed the various ways it will ensure continuity toward effectiveness. First, the college is now so appreciative of the positive climate that no one wants to reprise the past. Secondly, the various councils have mechanisms (e.g. staggered terms, specific team training, new written policies and procedures) that will ensure that the current culture will be passed on to future members. Last year's team described the group of individuals that designed the new system as "pioneers" and challenged them to determine if they would have followers. Indeed, the followers now abound and will continue to come, thanks to the structures put in place and the commitment throughout the college to support them.

Conclusions:

Diablo Valley College has responded to this recommendation by implementing the new governance system and improving the quantity and quality of its communication about important college issues. Throughout the college the team observed a more transparent

and honest approach to dialogue. The college believes it has improved its climate, its meaningful dialogue and its commitment to transparency. The team agrees and adds that it is incumbent upon the college to maintain this healthy environment for its constituents, its public and most of all, its students. This recommendation has been satisfied.

District Recommendation 8: In order to improve its resource allocation process, the district should expedite development of a financial allocation model including the following (Standards: IIC1, IID1a, IID2a, IID3, IV3c):

- a. The model as a whole;
- b. Funding for adjunct faculty in a way that will support the district and college intentions to increase student enrollment;
- c. Technology funding.

Observations:

As part of the 2008 comprehensive self-study process, the district had self-identified the need for a new financial allocation model to improve its resource allocation process for the colleges and the district. The result was a 2008 team recommendation for the district that called for a new financial allocation model. At the time of the 2009 Show Cause Report visit, the district provided an update on the resolution of this recommendation, showing that the new model had been designed by the district and its colleges, including a set of principles based on mission and goals, but it was not yet implemented. The Commission's action letter in January 2010 included the requirement that District Recommendation 8 be fully resolved. The following represents the evidence and analysis of the district's status in satisfying this recommendation.

Evidence and Analysis

The previous allocation model was formula based for operating funds, adjunct faculty and classified staff. The proposed model was based on unrestricted general funds being distributed by an FTES allocation which mirrored SB 361, the State of California's Community College Allocation formula. By 2008 the district had developed a "college-first" model with a set of accompanying principles, which was then discussed at each of the district's colleges during 2009. (III.D.1a, III.D.2.a) The model was also discussed in a Board of Trustees workshop. At the time of the 2009 team visit, the district was still discussing several versions of the model and had further developed guidelines that colleges would be transitioned into the model over several years to mediate the impact of implementation.

Evidence in the Follow-Up report, later verified by on-site interviews, shows that the District adopted the new financial allocation model in July 2010 and also used it during the previous academic year to develop the 2010-11 budget.

In accordance with the new plan, the district is using FTES targets to move the colleges gradually into the model. The district adopted a transition plan to phase in the new funding formula over a five year period, giving the colleges that need to either expand or contract, the time and financial latitude to “right size” to the new formula. Evidence documents and interviews revealed that the district moved 182 FTES from Diablo Valley College to Contra Costa College as part of the “right-sizing” effort. Contra Costa College will then have five years to bring revenues and expenditures in line, thus meeting the formula requirements. There was also an agreement that when growth funds return (as part of state funding), DVC will get the first 182 FTES in restitution. All colleges have agreed to this as part of the new plan.

The district and its colleges have adopted and implemented this new allocation process in an environment of extreme financial stress due to declining state revenues of \$7.6 million in 2009-10 and another \$8 million in 2010-11. Because of this large shortfall and its potential negative effect on the colleges, the district has underwritten two of its colleges (\$1.7 million for Contra Costa and \$445,000 for Los Medanos) for the first year of the transition plan. Diablo Valley College did not receive additional funds since its revenues and expenditures were in line with the new allocation formula.

Adjunct faculty funding and technology funding were the remaining elements of the allocation model and were adopted and implemented as proposed (III.C.1). Thus there is now an adjunct faculty formula based on dollars per FTES target for each college, and a consolidated technology budget. The base budget of \$342,000 for technology shows a gradual increase in multi-year projections to a projected \$1.3 million by 2015.

In order to assess the effectiveness of this model in providing a fair distribution of resources to support college operations, the district has contracted with an external consultant to evaluate the system at the end of the fiscal year (III.D.3, IV.3.c.)

Conclusions

The Contra Costa Community College District has fully responded to the 2008 District Recommendation by developing and implementing its new financial model and has addressed the issues of funding for adjunct faculty and creating a technology budget. There is also a plan to evaluate the system for its effectiveness. This recommendation is satisfied.