

Show Cause 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 3 – 4, 2009

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

**Diablo Valley College
Team Roster**

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

Dr. Joan Smith, Superintendent/President
Columbia College

Mr. Marc Beam
Director of Institutional 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, submitted a comprehensive self-study report in support of its reaccreditation in September, 2008. A nine member team visited the college from October 13 to 16, 2008 for the purpose of determining the college's status in meeting the Standards of Accreditation of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. That team submitted a report to the Commission regarding their findings and recommendations. The Commission met in January 7-9, 2008 to review the documents submitted by the college and the team report. The Commission acted to issue Show Cause, and required that Diablo Valley College correct the deficiencies noted. In addition, the college was required to provide information regarding a district recommendation on finance.

Diablo Valley was put on Show Cause because four of the five deficiencies identified by the 2002 comprehensive evaluation team (Recommendations 1, 2, 4 and 5) were not resolved by the institution and were again identified as deficiencies by the 2008 team. DVC lacked sufficient data-driven program review, integrated planning for ongoing improvement, regular and effective curriculum review, and governance systems and behaviors that focus the institution on educational quality. All of these are deemed necessary to support high quality education and student success. The college was required to provide a report by October 15, 2009 which was followed by a visit of Commission representatives. The Chairperson of the team was accompanied, and greatly assisted by, three other members, all of whom served on the 2008 comprehensive site visiting team.

The team reviewed all written materials and appendices documents (provided on CD-ROM) as well as visiting the college's website prior to the visit. An Addendum Report was also provided to the team, describing all additional work that had occurred in the time between the submission of the Show Cause Report and the arrival of the team on campus. 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. Although the team did not find every pertinent document in the team room, the college promptly provided those documents when asked. There was no instance of evidence cited in the college's reports not being available to the team. The team found the entire college hospitable, professional and forthright in its demeanor, and most eager to demonstrate the progress made in responding to the recommendations listed in the Show Cause action. The team wishes to commend the college for its candor in acknowledging the deficiencies that led to its current status as well as its willingness to accept responsibility for resolving these issues to have a more effective college and thereby meet Commission Standards.

The visiting team met with all accreditation work groups as well as their steering committee, the Accreditation Oversight Task Force (AOTF). In addition, team members met with the college president, senior administrative staff, the Faculty Senate, the Executives of Classified Senate plus classified members from the work groups, the

student body president, Management Council, members of the Curriculum Committee, Technology Committee, Budget Oversight Committee and the new Integration Council. The team chair also met with the district's Chancellor, Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services and Vice Chancellor of Planning and Educational Services. An open forum was also held in which team members heard comments from the general college community.

In response to the Show Cause action, the Chancellor of the district offered support to the college and also offered the services of a senior dean from Los Medanos College and the vice chancellor of district wide planning and educational services. The Accreditation Oversight Task Force (AOTF) was convened in February 2009 by the college president and constituency group leaders to organize the college's work to respond to Commission recommendations and concerns. The senior dean served as facilitator/editor of this group and the vice chancellor served as a resource person. One of the first tasks of the AOTF was to create Work Groups to address each element of the required Show Cause Report, due on October 15, 2009, as follows:

- Work Group 1: Decision-Making and Campus Organizational Structure
(Recommendations 1 and 7)
- Work Group 2: Integrated Planning (Recommendation 2)
- Work Group 3: Program Review (Recommendation 3)
- Work Group 4: Curriculum Updates (Recommendation 6)
- Work Group 5: Instructional program SLOs (Eligibility Requirement 10)
- Work Group 6: Institutional Planning and Evaluation
(Eligibility Requirement 19)

These Work Groups met separately on a regular basis and together for "integration" purposes throughout the spring semester and the summer. By August, the AOTF provided a draft of the new governance structure, associated procedural changes, and other work group products (e.g. curriculum updates, a technology plan) to the college constituency groups for review, feedback and approval

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 either Recommendation or Eligibility Requirement listed in the Show Cause letter.

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:

Diablo Valley College made several previous efforts to restructure its governance system, resulting in little success. Because of widespread dissention and the aftermath of five

years of litigation between faculty and administration, constituency groups were not effectively communicating nor working together for the benefit of the college. Trust between constituent groups deteriorated to the point that individuals and groups interacted only minimally. As a result, many other things, such as having significant college wide dialogue about student success or completing previous accreditation recommendations, did not occur. The team that visited in October, 2008 observed this fractured organization and hostile climate and came to the conclusion that this previous recommendation from 2002 had not been met and provided it again as a result of their visit.

Work Group 1 was the body charged to respond to this 2008 recommendation by “designing decision-making and organizational structures and process that are clear, collaborative and participatory”. These new structures were to be transparent, foster honest dialogue and provide widely disseminated communications and documents. These latter characteristics form the substance of Recommendation 7 and will be covered in more depth under that recommendation.

Evidence and Analysis

Work Group 1 (WG 1) began by reviewing existing structure and processes of the Diablo Valley Colleges governance system, including current policies and procedures of the district and college. During the spring semester WG 1 drafted a new governance structure, and submitted the new structure to the entire college through a series of open work group meetings and “integration sessions” with other work groups. At the college wide forums the community at large could ask questions and/or make comments about the new directions. The integration sessions occurred between work groups when overlapping issues were discovered. Issues raised during these sessions, if not resolved before the end of the semester were deliberated in “parking lot” sessions during the summer and decided as part of the draft preparation. In August, the entire model was presented to the extant governance body delegated to make changes, the Leadership Council, representing the formal dissemination of the final draft to the institution. In September, elements of the new organization (creation of various councils and committees) were approved as well as dissolution of existing committees, either replaced or not needed in the new system. In summary, four new committees were proposed; many existing committees had either their charge or reporting responsibilities changed and five committees were dissolved. In addition four college procedures were changed to allow for these organizational changes.

Interviews with the AOTF and WG 1 provided evidence to the team regarding the motivating principles behind the new organizational structure. In part, the new structure is built to take a new direction and move away from the contentiousness that characterized Diablo Valley College during the past decade. 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.

The new structure contains a College Council which continues to be constituency based with four representatives from Administration, Faculty, Classified and Students. The members within one constituency group however, must be from different parts of the college, e.g. student services, instruction, etc. This group is responsible for policy review and recommendations to the president. There is also an Institutional Planning Committee charged with overseeing the creation and evaluation of all plans of the college. The unique feature of the DVC governance structure is the creation of an Integration Council. This body is a 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 dialog about important college matters. When asked where the college will discuss issues of student success and institutional effectiveness, many respondents replied it would be the Integration Council. All program reviews will be discussed there and prioritized for resource allocation. It is considered to be the institutionalized place for college wide dialog about these and all other important college issues.

Another change is the creation of co-chairs for these new committees from different constituent groups. This new requirement formalizes the motivating principle of more inclusion and cross-constituent dialog. The classified staff responded positively to this; they feel more involved, or as one interviewee stated "we are now invited to table rather than allowed there". A classified person is a co-chair (with a faculty member) of the new Integration Council, one of the most important pieces of the new governance system.

The administrators, as well, feel greater trust and engagement in college affairs. The team saw ample evidence of administrators and faculty working together more productively than was the case in the previous year. Also, the leaders in the Academic Senate expressed determination to keep these good relationships and are building new ones as they collaborate with colleagues within these new councils.

Student leaders involved in the effort felt appreciated. Students were asked to be on every committee and Work Group and were accommodated. Students have also become part of this new structure by having seats on every committee. A major issue for some students was to be able to be elected to chair committees. The AOTF considered the issue, and determined that the College Council would have a permanent student co-chair. Although this solution did not satisfy all students, it did acknowledge their role in a significant way.

The administration is involved and supportive of the effort as well. The team interviewed the management council and confirmed that the deans and vice presidents are encouraged by the change in climate and are eager to work productively in the new system to address important planning and student success issues. The president is widely given credit for supporting and encouraging this entire effort and giving resources needed to do the work. She provided openness for new ideas, supports the evolving new structures and her leadership made others comfortable with these significant changes.

In summary, leaders in the redesign of the governance system have made great effort to change the climate so that every group feels involved and valued and also assure that the college refocuses its attention directly on student success and learning. Also they have put structures in place, such as the new Integration Council, that will minimize the silos that existed before and foster cross-campus dialog about critical issues for the college's future, such as increasing student success. In addition, a reporting calendar for committees and councils has been developed to sustain the work products and focus the work on identified outcomes. A major change to ensure that this work continues is that all resource requests must be founded in data presented in program reviews and college-wide plans before the Integration Council. Since program reviews form a cornerstone in the college's integrated planning model, resource allocation will clearly be tied to planning activities.

Although attention was given to these issues in previous years, the college had been greatly distracted from mobilizing its entire effort to plan and allocate its resources to support college-wide needs. Now a large number feel that the college will have much greater participation in important efforts to promote student success. Whereas people shied away from participating before, they are now saying "yes" to serving, in far greater numbers. They expressed feeling empowered as part of this change effort and want it to continue and be successful. The team observed many instances of people wishing to change the culture by actively contributing to make things work more effectively now.

Conclusions:

A year ago the visiting team found a college that did not have the structure or mechanisms in place to address important college issues in a focused, integrated fashion. A year later, the college has made a significant effort to address these deficiencies by changing its governance structure. This new organization requires college-wide dialogue on important issues leading to planning goals and agendas, creates a decision-making structure to decide upon any changes, and makes a public commitment to clearly communicate those decisions to the entire college. The climate has changed from one of isolation and resistance to inclusion and participation. This was difficult and time-consuming work, but the college is proud of the results to date and believes these changes will be sustained. There is now a critical mass of individuals, the pioneers, who are prepared to dedicate time and energy to not only use the new system, but maintain a climate in which this serious work can be done.

The team verified this work to satisfy Recommendation 1 (and 7) and agrees that the college has initiated fundamental and positive change to address not only accreditation standards, but to make Diablo Valley College a more effective institution of higher learning. It is indeed a different situation than one year ago. The team found ample evidence that the college invited broad engagement in redesigning its governance system and created a climate of investment so that the both the structure and processes could be sustained over time.

Having recognized this significant improvement, the team also recognizes the need to continue the work to its full implementation to achieve desired results. At the time of this 2009 visit, most committees/councils had met only once or twice or were scheduled for their inaugural meeting in the following month. Although the college had implemented these groups ahead of their own deadline of December 31, 2009, their actual work has just begun. The team heard several discussions of potential rearrangements of functions for committees, such as combining the Institutional Planning Committee with the Integration Council. While this makes some sense in regard to overlapping functions, the adding on of important functions in one council could result in a greater burden than that council can tolerate. In reality, however, the college must completely flesh out reporting structure, and find all redundancies or omissions, evaluate the new model, and then perhaps modify functions. To its credit, DVC has built in an evaluation process to be done the end of the academic year. Now it must use its newly created system to provide data for that evaluation.

The college also has work to do in solidifying the relationships that have been established. While the team heard from work groups, councils, committees and governance group leaders that they are highly supportive of these changes, they also heard that not everyone in the college is completely convinced. The team realizes that with any institutional change comes a bit of skepticism, even cynicism that these “new ways” are real or will be sustained over time. This is especially true in the case of Diablo Valley College with its history of dissention and discord. Therefore, the team urges the college leaders and pioneers to consistently demonstrate their commitment to inclusion, honesty, transparency and good communication so that they can bring their more reluctant colleagues into full participation within this new governance structure.

The college has made significant efforts in satisfying this recommendation but has yet to fully implement, test and evaluate the new governance structure and the quality of decision-making that results from it. Therefore, this recommendation has been partially met.

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:

The 2008 visiting team noted the absence of planning agendas in the college's self-study document and found that this lack of commitment for improvement was a serious concern. In addition the 2008 team found that although DVC had done program review, the results were not used in planning or resource allocation. Although the college stated that it had fully met the Standard, the team found that it was at the developmental level of institutional planning and program review. These same concerns regarding the improvements needed in integrated planning and program review were recommendations of the 2002 accreditation team. No apparent improvements had been made since the issue was first identified by the 2002 visiting team. As a result, the team provided this 2008 recommendation on planning.

Diablo Valley College addressed this recommendation by embarking on an intensive review of their September 2008 document, Integrated Planning Model. The Accreditation Oversight Task Force and Work Groups 1, 2, 3 led the college-wide dialogue on integrated planning. Review of minutes and interviews with members of Work Groups 1, 2, and 3 indicated that there was collaboration among persons serving on the various accreditation work groups including integrated planning, governance, program review, student learning outcomes, and the technology master plan committee. It was also noted by members of the work groups that the technology master plan committee greatly improved the quality of the integrated planning model and also assisted in producing meaningful dialogues that enhanced understanding of integrated planning across the campus.

Evidence and Analysis:

The Diablo Valley College integrated planning model is still only in draft form; once fully integrated and adopted as a final document, however, this new plan will address many of the recommendations concerning planning. The draft document was widely disseminated among all college constituent groups (faculty, staff, managers, and students) to facilitate college-wide discussion and feedback. It was evident from all parties interviewed that the integrated planning model was inclusive and widely accepted by all members of the Diablo Valley College community. Even though this plan currently remains a 'work in progress', it appears likely that Diablo Valley College will be able to complete the planning processes that the college designed on schedule. As written in draft form, the plan introduces processes such as program evaluations which will lead to the improvement of college programs and services.

An integral part of integrated planning is the Diablo Valley College Strategic Plan. This document includes the college's Mission, Vision, Values, Philosophy Statement, and Summary of Strategic Directions. It was notably obvious that what was lacking from this planning document were action plans, including timelines for implementation, indicators of success, and needed resources. Upon questioning Diablo Valley College faculty, staff and managers, it was reported that there were indeed action plans; however, they were

not part of the college's strategic document. Evidence further noted in interviews and in the college's integrated planning document that these college wide action plans are valuable tools utilized by managers in their strategic planning.

As a first step in creating a more detailed plan, it is strongly suggested that the action plans now utilized by managers for their strategic planning be included in the strategic plan to more directly detail and support college-wide programs and/or strategies. These are now part of each manager's evaluation and development plan and could be modified slightly for this more general purpose. Action plans are an integral part of any strategic planning process and should have more transparency within an integrated planning process. As action plans evolve out of the new governance structure, they should be included as well, to further augment the planning process

Strong efforts have been made to include members of the San Ramon Valley Center to serve on key committees and participate more fully on the Diablo Valley College campus. Conversely, the reverse is true; Diablo Valley College faculty, staff and managers have been more integrated at the San Ramon Valley Center. The team heard testimony from faculty and staff from both locations that these efforts to include the San Ramon Valley Center were most appreciated and will lead to better communication between the sites.

Conclusions:

Whereas one year ago the college did not acknowledge the necessity for planning in their Self Study Report, there is now a commitment in the newly designed governance system to actively contribute to the college's planning agenda through new processes and dialogue.

Diablo Valley College has developed a multi-layered infrastructure comprised of committees and councils designed to support and enhance planning and evaluation. However, this planning structure is still at the developmental stage, according to the ACCJC rubric. The college has not had the opportunity, at the time of the accreditation show cause visitation, to demonstrate how the committee structure will actually work with respect to planning. Key committees have been redesigned both in purpose and membership and many have only met a few times. The college constituency groups interviewed expressed that they were pleased with the new structures. Even though the new committee/council infrastructure is untested; the college took a significant step in moving toward more participatory processes and toward establishing dialogue to support a culture of evidence, and with connecting resource allocation to planning. The college has begun a more systematic approach to the acquisition of qualitative and quantitative data, and the link between data, planning and resource allocation is becoming more clearly understood at all levels of the institution.

Although commendable progress has been made in a short time, a great deal of work remains to be done in order for the college to reach compliance with the Standard. It is expected that Diablo Valley College will reach the level of proficiency in which planning

is fully integrated and systematically employed in all aspects of college decision making, once the college actually fully implements the integrated planning system that they have designed. This recommendation has been partially 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: IB3, IB4, IIA1, IIA2, IIB1, IIB4, IIIA6, IIC2, IIID1a, IVA5, IV2b)

Observations

According to the DVC Show Cause Report (Oct 2009) “Work Group Three reviewed and proposed revisions to the three Program Review processes to include examination of direct evidence of student learning and links to ... planning and resource allocation.” Interviews confirmed the college has had extensive dialogue regarding data collection, templates, and validation of program findings. The results of these conversations were revised program review templates (annual and cumulative) that collect student achievement data, student learning data as well as curriculum, productivity and enrollment management elements. The team saw evidence that the college has revised processes to include linkage to planning, resource allocation, curriculum, and assessment of student learning. A rubric for ranking program reviews using external validation by other departments has been developed to prioritize funding requests. These revisions will help align program reviews for all three types of units (instruction, student services, and administration) more uniformly across the college; bring wider visibility and transparency to the process; and create linkages to resource allocation and college wide planning through a revised planning process.

Summaries of program reviews are available for instructional units for 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007. In some cases, student services and administrative unit program reviews are also summarized. The team asked DVC faculty and staff about the summary process, specifically who does the summary, and how summaries are used in planning. Responses indicate that the college needs to review and evaluate the validation and summary process with WG3 and the Integration Council in order to manage more than 79 program reviews annually. While it is certainly the prerogative of the college to perform annual reviews, the team is concerned that the sheer volume of work must be managed effectively to yield productive information for decision making. In interviews with the co-chairs of Work Group Three, the team asked DVC staff where they see the college on the ACCJC rubric for program review. Both were familiar with the rubric and quickly provided responses that student services is at proficiency, while instruction and administrative units are in the development stage. DVC expects to be at the proficiency level college-wide within the year.

Evidence and Analysis

Upon arrival the team examined the evidence related to instructional, administrative, and student services program reviews. While no instructional units/departments completed program review during the 2008-09 academic year, 14 units within Student Services and 12 administrative units completed program review during 2008-09.

The office of Planning, Research and Student Outcomes and the Instruction Office provide each instructional unit/department with a pre-filled template with data related to each unit/department for 49 programs annually. The provided data includes: student success measures (e.g. number of students passing with "C" or better, course retention); student enrollment data (number of seats, productivity); student achievement data (number of entering students, number of transfers, total program, college and peer college degree and certificates); student learning outcomes at degree/certificate and course levels; and, numbers of courses added, deleted and revised in accordance with the curriculum schedule. In addition, Career/Technical programs have data on skill attainment, level of proficiency and student persistence or transfer, student placement, licensure pass rates and labor market analyses. There are also sections for resource requests in faculty, equipment and facilities. In addition to these required data elements, there are prompts for faculty to reflect on what improvements in student learning have occurred as a result of SLO assessments. Another prompt asks the faculty to address what is being done in their program for students with basic skills deficiencies. Each unit can complete the template online, and provide narrative/analysis on sections within the template. There is an annual template and a cumulative template, which is to be completed every five years. The templates are similar in data required with the addition of such elements as description of short and long-term goals, faculty development needs, course articulation progress, and an analysis of program strengths, weaknesses and challenges that are required in the cumulative program review. The college has scheduled instructional unit program reviews with academic departments completing either an annual or cumulative (comprehensive) review for 2009-10 and 2010-11. The 128 degree and certificate programs are divided among 49 instructional departments, each of which participate annually in program review. Twenty-four instructional units will complete cumulative program reviews and twenty-five will complete annual program reviews this year. Evidence shows several departments are completing this work in a timely manner. Student services programs follow these timelines as well.

The office of Planning, Research and Student Outcomes developed two online tools that will automate data collection and reporting for program review and student learning outcomes (SLO). In addition, there are online resources to show curriculum status for course rewrites that satisfy state guidelines and a course assessment schedule on a five-year rotation. The office has plans to expand the e-SLO tracking tool to include program level assessments this year. These tools make data available across constituent groups and departments; provide easy access for completing program reviews; and increase

communication and transparency related to program outcomes. These tools clearly support the above recommendation.

Conclusions

Diablo Valley College has certainly given much thought and discussion to Recommendation 3, although no instructional program reviews were conducted during the 2008-09 academic year. Revisions to the program review templates were minor, while discussions about the purpose and process seem to be the significant changes since the 2008 team visit. The online tools, training, and validation process significantly improve the college's program review by including direct evidence of student learning, student achievement and curriculum status. The next steps are to summarize program reviews in a useful manner to then link requests for resource allocation and program improvements with college budget and strategic planning. The program review templates provide ample data to answer questions about student success, whether learning is occurring and what program improvements may be necessary to achieve greater effectiveness. The challenge now is that DVC must follow through with the proposed changes via Integration Council, Planning Council, the Budget Committee and College Council to use the answers to these questions to allocate resources and make institutional changes to effectively reach compliance with this standard. This recommendation is partially met.

Recommendation 6: The team recommends that Diablo Valley College fully implement recommendation 2 from the 2002 Accreditation Evaluation Report which states, "Improvement of existing curriculum process to include a timely, systematic review and efficient procedures for course and program approval with adequate technology and staff support." Furthermore, the team recommends that the curriculum process be fully integrated with the program review process. (Standards: IIA2a, IIA2e)

Observations:

In order to address this recommendation, in February, the Vice President of Instruction, announced to the curriculum committee that out-of-date course outlines needed to be updated and program level SLO's must be developed and published. She explained the college must have all the course outlines and program level SLO's completed before the October 15, 2009 deadline in order to meet the Standard as well as the Title V requirements of the State of California Education Code. She advised the committee that 400 courses lacked outlines that had been updated at least within the last five years. Accreditation Task Group 4, which was essentially the curriculum committee, had the responsibility to bring DVC into compliance with the requirement that all course outlines would be updated to meet the Title V five year rule for course review. While the team recognizes the need for the college to be in compliance with state regulations, the purpose of this team visit and report is an assessment of how well the college meets accreditation Standards, in this case, Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services. Generally these requirements call for courses to be appropriate and current, that the course outlines contain student learning outcomes and are modified when program review indicates they need revisions. Standards that apply specifically to

Recommendation 6 are Standard II.A, requiring the college to “assure the quality and improvement of all instructional programs offered in the name of the institution.” Also, Standard II.A.2.a, calling for the institution to “use established procedures to design, identify learning outcomes for, approve, administer, deliver, and evaluate courses and programs...”, and Standard II.A.2.e, “the institution evaluates all courses and programs through an on-going systematic review of their relevance, appropriateness, achievement of learning outcomes, currency and future need and plans.” The team used these Standards in analyzing the Show Cause Report and gathering evidence during the visit.

Evidence and Analysis

The curriculum committee discussed the process to rewrite, review and approve over 400 course outlines and concluded that over 40 course outlines had to be approved at each meeting during the spring semester. A list of the 400 courses that needed to be rewritten was emailed out to the deans, department chairs and curriculum members. The out-dated course outlines were revised by discipline specific faculty on the Web Curriculum System (WCS), a customized web-based curriculum development tool, which was designed by DVC college staff.

There were several in-service training sessions held in the staff development computer lab to show faculty how to use the WCS tool.. WCS requires the division curriculum representative to review and approve the course outline online before it could be forwarded to the curriculum technical review committee. Each of the technical review committee members must approve the course outline on WCS before it can move on in the process. All course outlines are also read and approved on the WCS by two other curriculum committee representatives outside the division before the course outlines are allowed to be placed on the consent agenda for the entire curriculum committee to review and approve.

According to the February 23, 2009 curriculum committee meeting minutes, the committee “MSC, with no objections, to put all course rewrites on the consent agenda, unless the Tech review committee feels that a discussion is warranted. The WCS tool allowed the college to manage course outline updates electronically, eliminating the paper process and expediting the approval process without losing any of the scrutiny required to insure quality course outlines.

The Curriculum Committee minutes from April 6, 2009 through May 11, 2009 document that all course outlines that were out of date were rewritten, reviewed and approved. Curriculum committee minutes reflect that course outlines were passed and approved as consent items in most cases, however, if the committee felt that course outlines were not of sufficient quality, they were sent back for adjustment and brought back to subsequent meetings. The curriculum committee decided at their April 27, 2009 meeting that any course that did not have a current course outline submitted on time would be removed from the schedule and the catalog and the course would have to go through the new course process again. The curriculum committee forwarded this recommendation which

is called the Course Update Compliance policy, to the faculty senate for formal adoption. The first reading of the Course Update Compliance policy by the Academic Senate took place on November 3, 2009 and the final vote will take place on November 17, 2009. According to team members that witnessed the dialogue at the Academic Senate meeting on Nov. 3, 2009, there was very little discussion on the Course Update Compliance policy and it is expected to be passed at the meeting on the 17th.

The college has established a calendar to insure that course rewrites will happen within a five year period. Each department or division was directed to distribute their course outlines so that approximately 20% were rewritten each academic year so that no course outline would be out of date (older than five years). The calendar for course updates is maintained on the WCS system and a public website and is available online to all faculty. Every course is listed with the date by which the course must be rewritten. The plan is to email a list of courses at the end of the year that need to be updated during the subsequent academic year to the curriculum committee members, department chairs and deans. Divisions will be given specific dates by which course outlines need to be rewritten and submitted to the curriculum committee to prevent course outlines from all coming at the end of the year.

The team reviewed the WCS tool and the curriculum review process and found that it was structured to provide data that would satisfy accreditation standards in terms of assessing and maintaining quality of the curriculum. It also allows for continuous curriculum review in that one fifth of each program's courses are reviewed each year. It is a concern, however, that the process may not support timely change of curriculum, if problems are discovered through program review or other means, within the five year gap of review for any particular course. The college is advised to evaluate the periodicity of review and assessment (including SLO assessment) with the aim of potentially synchronizing with other evaluative efforts, such as program review, and shortening its current timeframe. The purpose of all of these assessment efforts is to improve student learning, therefore the college must establish and maintain a system to respond promptly to data showing improvement is needed.

The program review process has adopted the Instructional Unit Program Review (IUPR) cumulative template that requires a current course outline. The IUPR review form also requires that both program and course level SLO assessments are current as a minimum compliance standard for submitting the Program Review .

The meeting with Work Group 4, Curriculum Committee, was informative and provided evidence of college-wide participation in updating the course outlines more than five years old. There was evidence throughout the discussion that the college community understood the urgency of the college's situation, recognized that this work was long overdue, and that everyone's participation was going to be necessary to successfully complete the process.

College staff expressed to the team that a real sense of accomplishment and cooperative spirit developed among administrators, faculty and classified staff as a result of working together to complete the 400 course outlines. This attitude was not in evidence during the

previous 2008 visit. Current course outlines are now a required part of the program review process as well as data showing courses added and deleted over the review period. Curriculum review plays an integral part role in the analysis of the program. Again, the college is advised to evaluate the periodicity of curriculum review to assure that it is timely and supports necessary curricular change.

Conclusions:

The team verified that all out-of-date course outlines were updated as of May 11, 2009 and that there is a process in place to insure that all course outlines will continue to be updated within a five year review cycle, using a review process that is suitable and sustainable. The next step in improvement of this process is to evaluate the periodicity of curricular review so that it supports the changes necessary to assure student learning. The college is reminded that the accreditation Standards that apply to this Recommendation must continue to be the primary basis upon which improvements and revisions to the process are made. Recommendation 6, as written, has been satisfied.

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

As discussed in Recommendation 1, 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 dialog on college issues and then quickly and widely disseminating both decisions made and information about that dialog. These principles must be promoted effectively to fully satisfy Recommendation 7.

Evidence and Analysis

The college's report listed many communication vehicles which have been introduced to improve dissemination of information. Such items such as newsletters, joint meetings between departments and larger constituent involvement in meetings all support the college's effort to improve communication. There is now widespread commitment to keep track of work and issues discussed in committees and communicate results. Minutes are taken in every meeting and widely disseminated, a welcome departure from the past.

The most compelling evidence to the team was found in the minutes of the Work Groups, integration meetings and college wide forums arranged to discuss the new organization. It was clear that the individuals involved in that design experience modeled the principles of consistent, clear and honest communication. Case in point was the difficulty

encountered in the creation of the new College Council. There was some controversy over the constituent group representation in that it was to include members from different parts of the organization. Also, the notion of co-chairs and which groups could be chairs was controversial. Examination of the minutes as well as individual and group interviews demonstrated that the college engaged in honest dialog about divergent interests, invited input, argued divergent viewpoints vigorously and then clearly and widely communicated their decision. As one person put it, "college business is now conducted with respect rather than dissention".

The individuals involved in designing the new Diablo Valley College governance structure believe they have changed the norms of communication for the college. They point not only to their experiences in designing the new structure, but argue that the structure itself promotes collaboration, requires dialog among constituent groups and the college itself now insists upon clear communication of results. To assure these new expectations are carried forward, new instructors are trained in the new governance structure and expectations of involvement are made explicit. The team agrees that the structure demands these things and hopes that future results show that the college has established clear communication channels as well.

The team also notes the college has now acknowledged its failure to implement practices that meet accreditations standards, and has now accepted responsibility for so doing in the future. The college has stated its dedication to completely implementing the new governance structure. Concomitant to the implementation is the commitment to improve college wide communication. The college as a whole now displays energy rather than discord and disillusionment. The Show Cause action was viewed as a catalyst that galvanized the college to refocus its energy in becoming an effective institution. The team confirmed this change of attitude and increase in commitment and energy and urges the college to continue its work to completion in meeting all accreditation Standards.

Conclusions:

Diablo Valley College has made an earnest and significant effort to respond to this recommendation by improving the quantity and quality of its communication about important college issues. The individuals on the work groups modeled this more transparent and honest approach to dialogue. The new governance system and its attendant communication requirements are just now being implemented. The proof of how well the college sustains its current energy and commitment to improved communication will be to evaluate its effectiveness as part of the scheduled evaluation at the end of the academic year. At the time of the visit, this recommendation has been clearly addressed, but only partially satisfied.

Eligibility Requirement 10 - Student Learning and Achievement: The visiting team confirmed that Diablo Valley College defines and publishes the programs of study leading to an associate degree, certificate, and program of study leading to transfer. Program expected learning and achievement outcomes, however, have yet to be developed and published. (ER 10)

Observations

On Feb. 9, 2009, the curriculum committee minutes reflect that the Vice President for Instruction indicated that program level SLO's were an accreditation issue that needed to be resolved by the end of the spring 2009 semester. The college identified 128 instructional programs that needed program level SLO's developed and published for the public. Work group 5 was identified to work on developing a process to insure that program level SLO's were identified and published in a catalog addendum. This group developed a process with the approval of the Instructional SLO committee of the academic senate and the curriculum committee.

Evidence and Analysis

The list of 128 programs that needed program SLO's was disseminated to deans, department heads and curriculum committee representatives. The eSLO's automated system was developed by the college to assist faculty with the development of SLO's. The eSLO system is on the intranet, requires a login and is password protected. This system automatically populates a SLO development template with course or program identifying information. Course descriptions, course objectives and evaluation methods from the official course outlines are displayed and can be used as the basis for developing course or program level SLO's. Hands on workshops were held throughout the spring 2009 semester to show faculty how to use eSLO's system and to work with them on developing program level SLOs. The college also developed a website that has a wealth of resources available to faculty to assist them with the SLO development and assessment process. This website is available from the college homepage and is accessible to faculty at 24/7. A SLO calendar is posted on the public website that identifies when SLO's are to be updated.

According to the March 23, 2009 curriculum committee minutes and verified through discussions with the curriculum committee members during the visit, the curriculum committee agreed on a process that required the committee to review at least 25 program level SLO's per week beginning on the April 6th agenda. It was also agreed that the curriculum committee would use the same consent agenda process that was used to meet recommendation six. The curriculum committee reviewed and approved all program level SLO's during the meetings held from April 6, 2009 through May 11, 2009. Several program level SLO's were removed from the consent agenda for further discussions and review at future meetings according to the minutes. All program level SLO's were entered into the eSLO system.

The college has established a calendar so that 20% of the SLO assessments for each division will be completed each year to insure that over a five year period all courses and programs will have completed at least one SLO cycle. It is strongly suggested that the calendar for assessment of SLOs be revisited to allow for a more timely assessment of learning. If the college waits five years before assessing learning in a particular course or

program, the students in those programs may not be well served. While this recommendation deals with program level SLOs, the college should also be able to provide clear evidence of how program level SLOs are mapped with both courses and institutional SLOs in order to meet the 2012 timeline for SLO proficiency.

Conclusions:

All college departments fully participated in the development of program level SLO's in a timely fashion in order to meet the spring 2009 deadline the college set. There was college-wide training held over several months to assist faculty members in developing the program level SLO's and in assisting them with the development of assessment strategies. A full-time faculty member was released 100% and appointed the college SLO coordinator. He has been effective in helping to promote the development and assessment of the program level SLO's. In addition, DVC has approved a standing faculty academic senate SLO committee and reassigned a faculty member to work as the Institutional Effectiveness Coordinator. The college has developed a SLO calendar that is updated annually and posted on the website so that all faculty know exactly when SLO's need to be updated. The SLO academic senate committee will continue to serve as a resource and review body for SLO's and will provide the quality assurance necessary to move DVC forward towards proficiency in use of SLO's by 2012. The college has identified all program level SLO's and they are available to the public on the college website. In addition, the college has published a catalog addendum for 2009-10 that includes all college program level SLO's. As written, the college has met Eligibility Requirement 10, although the concerns noted above about the assessment calendar and mapping require further attention in meeting the proficiency level in SLO development by 2012.

Eligibility Requirement 19 - Institutional Planning and Evaluation: The visiting team confirmed that Diablo Valley College has a documented Educational Master Plan, Facilities Master Plan and technology master plan. However, planning processes and outcomes need to be consistent, integrated, evaluated, and updated. Technology planning is not integrated with institutional planning. The institution does not systematically assess the effective use of technology resources or use the results of evaluation as the basis for improvement. Diablo Valley College completed its technology master plan in 2001. The plan was comprehensive and included implementation timelines over a three year period through 2004. Since that time, there has been no comprehensive and integrated effort to guide the development and implementation of technology resources over the last four years.

Observations:

Diablo Valley College completed a Technology Master Plan that addressed the issues cited in Eligibility Requirement 19. The Technology Master Plan 2009-2013 was developed during the spring semester of 2009 by the members of DVC's technology committee. The committee indicated that the plan took three months to develop and utilized as its foundation prior work (in progress) by the technology committee. The committee further noted that they met at least two times per week and in addition often

assigned 'homework' to keep on task with the project. The committee expressed pride in the document and shared that it represented the collaborative efforts of the Technology Committee and Work Group Six of the Accreditation Oversight Task Force.

Evidence and Analysis:

A draft of the technology plan was presented to the Leadership Council (the group then tasked to approve new plans) in the spring 2009. The constituent groups of the Leadership Council provided reviews and comments that were noted in the plan. The draft plan was also posted on-line and constituents were invited to respond to a survey. These results were incorporated into the plan and it was again revised accordingly. The plan was submitted once again to the Leadership Council for final approval. The Leadership Council approved the plan at this time (spring 2009). It is important, to note, that since the plan has been approved the Leadership Council has been restructured and is now called the College Council. The technology co-chairs were ready to note that the change in the oversight council structure did not impact the college's acceptance of the technology plan. This reported change was facilitated to increase participation of college constituent groups.

The DVC Technology Plan states, "...that it is both a strategic plan and an action plan." In reviewing the document, this is indeed the case. The vision, principles, goals and strategies define the strategic plan elements and cover a five year time frame. The Implementation Grid constitutes the action plan. Also, the team confirmed that this plan was integrated with the college's institutional plans, program reviews, and resource allocation procedures.

The technology committee's co-chairs reported that the grid will be revised and/or updated on an annual basis. Further, a progress report of this activity will be presented to the appropriate college council and/or committee groups for review, information and feedback. This should provide the venue for ongoing participation and relevant feedback. It was noted both in the Technology Plan and at the Technology Committee interview that the strategic portion of the plan will be revised every three years.

Conclusions:

It appears to the team that DVC will be able to adhere to their planning timelines with respect to technology. This plan was well designed, well written and had input from all of the DVC constituent groups. This plan should serve as a model for Diablo Valley College in the development of their future planning documents. The plan was comprehensive, user friendly and relevant. Eligibility Requirement 19 has been fully met.

ADDENDUM REPORT

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:

The Contra Costa Community College District self-identified the need to create a new financial allocation model to improve its resource allocation process for the colleges and the district. The 2008 team agreed and made this a district recommendation for improvement. The team fielded to Diablo Valley College was also asked to provide an update on this district recommendation. The following represents the evidence and analysis of the district's status in satisfying this recommendation.

Evidence and Analysis

For most of the district's existence, resource allocation was done by separate formulas for such things as operating funds, adjunct faculty and classified. Other allocations were done by the Chancellor's cabinet or position budgets based on FTE faculty, classified, or managers. These formulas and other allocations were not well understood and appeared at times inconsistent or unequal in their distribution. Starting in 2005 the district began to review its allocation formulas, starting with a set of principles which included such things as being simple, transparent in terms of district wide expenditures, responsive to college planning processes, allowing colleges to initiate new programs and be accountable for them, and providing for financial stability. The design was to provide all available unrestricted funds to be distributed to each college based on the Full Time Equivalent Student (FTES) funds earned according to the State of California's new SB 361 formula. (That formula allows for a base allocation for each college based on size and an FTES allocation based on the FTES generated by the district.) The district was also concerned that the implementation of any new funding model not adversely affect any college. In 2008, work on the formulas continued and the district adopted a "College First" model wherein the college operations would be funded based on revenues as described above and district operations would be funded on an FTES formula basis from each college.

The district held budget forums at all three colleges in spring 2009 to explain the College First model and the SB 361 funding of the model. They also held a budget workshop for the governing Board in April.

At the time of this visit, the district was still modeling several variations of the SB 361 funding model and intended to present the latest version at the Chancellor's Cabinet meeting in early November. The district is using FTES targets to move the colleges gradually into the model. The basic premise being discussed is 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.

Adjunct faculty funding was the second element of the 2008 recommendation. The district has developed an adjunct faculty formula based on dollars per FTES target for each college. The district has developed these targets to increase both accountability and FTES growth and implemented the new strategy this year.

Up until this year, the district did not have a budget line for technology allocations. Instead, technology funds were in separate locations based on projects and/or were found on an as-needed basis each fiscal year. The district now has consolidated all these separate technology funds and projects into one budget. This consolidation increases the overall technology budget by \$982,000 annually. Part of this \$982,000 increase includes \$342,000 of additional funding for the new technology infrastructure. This \$342,000 will be gradually increased annually to a total of \$1.3 million in additional funding for the infrastructure.

Conclusions

The Contra Costa Community College District has responded to the 2008 District Recommendation by making significant progress on developing a new financial model and has also addressed the issues of funding for adjunct faculty and creating a technology budget. During this fiscal year, the new adjunct faculty formula was adopted as well as a base technology budget that is projected to increase in coming years. At the time of this visit, however, the new district resource allocation model was still in discussion and not yet finally adopted. Thus, the recommendation is partially satisfied and will become fully satisfied upon the implementation of the new budget model for the 2010-11 fiscal year on July 1, 2010.